Source Selection Statement for the Computational and Information Sciences and Technology Office – Hydrospheric and Biospheric Support (HBS) Services Solicitation Number NNG13454034R

On May 29, 2014, I, along with senior officials from the Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC) met with the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed to evaluate proposals in connection with the Hydrospheric and Biospheric Support (HBS) Services acquisition and a supplemental meeting followed on June 6, 2014.

Procurement Description

The purpose of the HBS Contract is to provide support to the Hydrospheric and Biospheric Sciences Laboratory in the areas of, but not limited to: acquiring, processing and analyzing scientific data; requirements analysis; systems definition; evaluation of existing systems; development of software; programming; algorithm development; and scientific mission planning and operations. This effort will support satellite remote sensing as well as field and aircraft instruments and activities for measuring Earth, oceanic, biospheric and atmospheric processes. This effort will include scientific and engineering support for the design, development, and testing of remote sensors and sensor systems, including mechanical, electronic, optical, laser and electro-optical, data system engineering and software support for the development and testing of space-based instrument systems as well as sensor calibration and on-orbit performance analysis.

The HBS Request for Proposal (RFP) was released on August 15, 2013 and subsequent amendments were issued. Three amendments were issued. Among other things, these amendments provided as follows; Amendment 1 permitted receipt of past performance questionnaires by email, facsimile or mail; Amendment 2 changed the recency of past performance from 3 years to 5 years; Amendment 3 merely addressed an oversight in Amendment 2 which was posted without signature.

The contract is a Cost Plus Fixed Fee (CPFF) Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract with an effective ordering period of 5 years from the effective date of the contract. A separate contract for a 30-day phase-in period is anticipated.

This procurement was conducted as a Small Business Set-Aside under NAICS Code 541712 Research and Development Physical, Engineering, Life Sciences, Exception for 1000 Employees: Space Vehicles and Guided Missiles, their Propulsion Units, their Propulsion Units Parts, and their Auxiliary Equipment and Parts.

Proposals Submitted

On September 16, 2013, NASA received timely proposals from the following three companies:

ADNET

Science Systems and Applications Inc. (SSAI)
Sigma Space

Evaluation Procedures

The SEB evaluated proposals in accordance with the source selection procedures identified in Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) part 15.3 "Source Selection," and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.3. The Source Evaluation Board procedures at NFS 1815.370, NASA Source Evaluation Boards, were applied.

The RFP listed three evaluation factors, Mission Suitability, Cost, and Past Performance. The RFP specified the relative order of importance of these factors as follows:

The Cost Factor is significantly less important than the combined importance of the Mission Suitability Factor and the Past Performance Factor.

As individual Factors, the Cost Factor is less important than the Mission Suitability Factor but more important than the Past Performance Factor.

Mission Suitability has two Subfactors as follows: Subfactor A, Technical Approach to Representative Task Orders (RTOs), and Subfactor B, Management Approach. The available points for each subfactor are set forth below.

Subfactor A	Technical Approach to RTOs	600
Subfactor B	Management Approach	400

The Mission Suitability subfactors and the total Mission Suitability factor were evaluated using the adjectival rating, definitions and percentile ranges at NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(A). The maximum points available for each subfactor was multiplied by the assessed percent for each subfactor to derive the score for the particular subfactor. The proposed costs of the Government Pricing Model and the rates proposed in Attachment B, Direct Labor Rates, Indirect Rates and Fixed Fee Matrices, were assessed to determine reasonableness and cost realism. The cost evaluation was conducted in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(1) and NFS 1815.305(a)(1)(B). Offerors were referred to FAR 2.101(b) for a definition of "cost realism" and to FAR 15.404-1(d) for a discussion of "cost realism analysis" and "probable cost."

Both the "proposed and probable cost" reflected the offeror's proposed fee amount. Any proposed fee was not adjusted in the probable cost assessment.

Past Performance evaluations were based on FAR Part 15 and were conducted in accordance with provision M.5 of the solicitation. As stated in provision L.15 all past performance references must meet the "recent" and minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria provided below for both prime contractor references and significant subcontractor references in order to be evaluated. An Offeror's past performance record indicates the relevant quantitative and qualitative aspects of performing services or delivering products similar in size and content to the requirements of this acquisition.

An Offeror's Past Performance was assigned an overall confidence rating that reflects a subjective evaluation of the information contained in the written narrative; past performance evaluation input provided through customer questionnaires; and other references. As set forth and described in Section M.5 of the RFP, the applicable level of confidence ratings were: Very High, High, Moderate, Low, Very Low, and Neutral.

For purposes of past performance, the term "offeror" refers to a prime contractor and its significant subcontractors. Accordingly, the past performance of significant(s) subcontractors was also evaluated and attributed to the offeror. The past performance of a significant subcontractor was compared to the work proposed to be performed by that subcontractor, and weighted accordingly in assigning the overall past performance adjectival rating to the offeror. The past performance of the prime contractor was weighted more heavily than any significant subcontractor or combination of significant subcontractors in the overall past performance evaluation.

Detailed Results of the Evaluation

As a result of the evaluation process, the Mission Suitability Subfactor ratings and Total Score are summarized below:

Offeror	Subfactor A	Subfactor B	Total Score
ADNET	Fair	Very Good	564
SSAI	Excellent	Very Good	914
SIGMA SPACE	Very Good	Very Good	858

Mission Suitability Factor

ADNET

Subfactor A: Technical Approach to RTOs

ADNET received 1 significant strength, 3 strengths, 5 weaknesses, 2 significant weaknesses, and no deficiencies, resulting in an adjectival rating of Fair for this subfactor.

Significant Strength #1

Team ADNET designed, built, tested and is successfully operating their PASCAL scatter measurement system at its significant subcontractor's facility. Team ADNET proposes to use its unique, scatter measurement engineering expertise in maintaining and improving the operation of the existing NASA Diffuser Calibration Laboratory (DCL) optical scatter instrument and in developing the DCL's next generation scatterometer. The impact is a high assurance of providing continued, high quality optical scatter data to remote sensing projects and achieving success in the development of the state-of-the-art next generation instrument. This approach greatly enhances the potential for successful performance.

Strength #1

Through the Suomi-NPP VIIRS project, Team ADNET has experience in working with tunable wavelength laser sources, such as T-SIRCUS, and in analyzing data in support of the calibration and characterization of electro-optical instruments. Team ADNET proposes to use this experience to improve the quality and efficiency of operation and data analysis from the laser systems in the Radiometric Calibration Facility (RCL) at GSFC. The impact is a higher assurance of success in the continued operation of the SIRCUS-G laser system at GSFC, in the timely production of instrument test data for facility customers, and in the implementation of hardware and software improvements needed to realize new measurement capabilities. This approach contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the government.

Strength #2

Team ADNET has substantial understanding of the MODAPS (MODIS Adaptive Processing System) architecture and design from their development and enhancement of the OMIDAPS (Ozone Monitoring Instrument Adaptive Processing System) that is built upon MODAPS. This understanding combined with their approaches for automated testing and deployment of software

changes enhances the potential for successful performance through reducing the time required to test software changes.

Strength #3

The technical approach proposed by Team ADNET in RTO-3 properly recognized the most likely areas of risk; identified important relevant information needed from the government to perform the proposed work; accurately assessed the telescope; and, proposed a Reliability and Safety Engineer and a Quality Assurance Engineer in the staffing plan. This increases the government's confidence that Team ADNET would be able to develop effective technical solutions, which enhances the potential for successful performance, and contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the government.

Weakness #1

Team ADNET states that VIIRS model and simulation tools will be used to enhance and improve MODIS L1B products and to monitor the build and test of ATMS and CrIS. This is a technically incorrect approach and, if pursued, would result in an inability to perform a critical part of the satellite instrument activities of RTO-1. This approach is a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Weakness #2

In figure 3 of Team ADNET's response, the Diffuser Calibration Laboratory (DCL) National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) Coordination line shows no deployments of the DCL reflectance standards to NIST for calibration. The impact of this approach is a loss of traceability of DCL Bidirectional Reflectance Distribution Function (BRDF) and Directional Hemispherical Reflectance (DHR) measurements to NIST standards which increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Weakness #3

The Team ADNET response contains a number of areas which reflect a technically incorrect and/or incomplete understanding of the Calibration Facility (CF) (i.e. Part A) and flight project (i.e. Part B) work of RTO-1, such as; incorrectly describing the state-of-the-art in instrument calibration and characterization; and incorrectly attributing the quality of calibrated radiance products from MODIS and VIIRS to the Code 618 Calibration Facility. The impact of this is an inability to initially perform the work described in RTO-1 in an efficient manner which increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Weakness #4

Failure to provide an adequate explanation of the staffing profile and for the duration and timing of activities in the schedule, calls into question Team ADNET's approach for staffing, managing and executing the activities under this RTO which increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Weakness #5

In the RTO-3 (Science Instrumentation – Development of Spaceflight Lidar) staffing plan, Team ADNET proposes to streamline the Project Manager, (PM) to halftime for all four years of the task. Not having a full time PM increases the risk of miscommunication, schedule delays and unsuccessful contract performance which reduces the government's confidence in Team ADNET's proposal.

Significant Weakness #1

The staffing for the MODIS and S-NPP/JPSS project work in RTO-1 is not clearly explained in Team ADNET's proposal, and the number of FTEs proposed to perform this work is inadequate. Failing to adequately staff these activities is a proposal flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance in the high visibility MODIS and S-NPP/JPSS project work within RTO-1.

Significant Weakness #2

The Team ADNET response states that its significant subcontractor will not participate in any monitoring tasks related to the MODIS, VIIRS, ATMS, and CrIS satellite instrument work. However, in later sections of the response dealing with satellite instrument work, examples of the efforts of its significant subcontractor in monitoring the testing, calibration, and characterization of VIIRS and MODIS are invoked as positive examples of the capabilities ADNET will bring to this RTO. This is an inconsistency in the response. The response does not describe the capabilities that the ADNET part of the team will use to perform this part of RTO-1.

Subfactor B: Management Approach

ADNET received 1 significant strength, 3 strengths, 1 weakness, no significant weaknesses, and no deficiencies, resulting in an adjectival rating of Very Good for this subfactor.

Significant Strength #1

Team ADNET has proposed a strong collection of partnerships and corporate resources in support of HBS. Team ADNET includes a well assembled network of technology experts that can support a broad array of contract activities. This increases the government's confidence that Team ADNET will be able to develop and manage innovative, effective, and state-of-the-art technical solutions, which greatly enhances the potential for successful performance and contributes significantly toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the government.

Strength #1

Team ADNET proposes a comprehensive, well structured, and effective no-cost phase-in plan that would provide an orderly transition of ongoing HBS tasks, management and personnel. Team ADNET's phase-in would ensure the continuity of HBS tasks. Team ADNET's phase-in plan for staffing a qualified workforce enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Strength #2

Team ADNET has proposed a comprehensive and detailed Total Compensation Plan (TCP) that helps ensure continuity and retention of staff for critical HBS services. They have a clear understanding of the importance and strategy of retaining and hiring qualified personnel. This recapture and compensation plan gives a high level of confidence that ADNET can hire and retain a skilled workforce, which contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides value to the government.

Strength #3

Team ADNET has described IT security procedures that are fully compliant with NASA and NIST guidelines. Their proposed methods ensure confidentiality, availability and integrity of the data as well as compliancy with NASA directives. Effective execution of IT security procedures enhances the potential for successful performance of all activities under this contract.

Weakness #1

Team ADNET did not use the latest version of the NASA Procedural Requirement (NPR) resulting in elements of their Safety and Health (S&H) Plan not being in compliance with current NASA requirements. This is a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful

contract performance. Should Team ADNET be award this contract, certain sections must be incorporating the S&H Plan.

Science Systems and Applications (SSAI)

Subfactor A: Technical Approach to RTOs

SSAI received 3 significant strengths, 3 strengths, no weaknesses, no significant weaknesses, and no deficiencies, resulting in an adjectival rating of Excellent for this subfactor.

Significant Strength #1

In the response to RTO-3, Team SSAI demonstrated an in-depth technical understanding of the development and risk mitigation of the Earth Venture class Imaging Laser Altimeter (ILA) instrument in optical, electrical and risk assessment areas. The in-depth understanding is reflected in the concept the offeror developed and in the technical approach as described in the science objectives, optical engineering and electrical engineering support sections as well as in their risk and mitigation assessment. The approach greatly enhances the potential for successful performance.

Significant Strength #2

In the response to RTO-1, Team SSAI's proposed overall technical approach for performing the work within the NASA Calibration Facility (CF) is comprehensive, complete, and clearly presented, reflecting a level of understanding which greatly enhances the potential for successful task performance. In their proposal, Team SSAI has identified improvements to existing CF instrumentation and measurement methodologies which would enable the CF to continue to provide state-of-the art calibrations. Specific examples included identifying: the areas of lidar calibration and characterization for expansion of the CF measurement capabilities which would significantly expand the CF customer base; the importance of maintaining calibration consistency with other NASA calibration facilities, e.g. the Code 614 Radiometeric Calibration Development Laboratory; the important annual calibration of NASA Diffuser Calibration Laboratory (DCL) standards by NIST; and the automation of labor intensive calibrations as an area in the CF where significant efficiencies could be realized.

Significant Strength #3

In the response to RTO-2, Team SSAI demonstrated an excellent understanding of the design and operation of the MODAPS (MODIS Adaptive Processing System), the processes involved in

integrating science software into the production system, interaction with science team members and external data providers/data archives. Their understanding of the system greatly enhances the potential for successful performance.

Strength #1

Team SSAI's proposed use of their web-based Calibration Facility Operational Database (CFOD) for logging/scheduling customer measurement submission requests, for accessing facility maintenance records, procedure documentation, and calibration data will improve the overall efficiency of the Radiometric Calibration and Diffuser Calibration Laboratories. The CFOD will provide additional value to the government at no additional cost through improving efficiency in capturing, retrieving and reporting the results of measurements made in the Calibration Facility. This will directly benefit not only the staff in the Calibration Facility who have to manage all facility records and data but also indirectly benefit the customers of the Calibration Facility by ensuring the facility is providing calibration data of highest quality.

Strength #2

Team SSAI's proposal to coordinate and host an annual Cal/Val (Calibration and Validation) Summit will provide an effective forum for the identification, exchange, and discussion of state of the art approaches in instrument calibration and characterization. These summits will provide an important blue print for the development of future measurement capabilities within the Radiometric Calibration Laboratory (RCL) and Diffuser Calibration Laboratories (DCL). These summits will contribute towards exceeding the contract requirements that will provide additional value to the government at no additional cost.

Strength #3

In their proposal, Team SSAI has identified the most important issues in monitoring and assessing the performance of the MODIS, VIIRS, CrIS, and ATMS instrument pre-launch and on-orbit performance. This reflects a complete and mature understanding of the extent of the work necessary on RTO-1 that enhances the potential for successful performance of this task.

Subfactor B: Management Approach

SSAI received 1 significant strength, 4 strengths, no weaknesses, no significant weaknesses, and no deficiencies, resulting in an adjectival rating of Very Good for this subfactor.

Significant Strength #1

Team SSAI has proposed a very comprehensive and detailed management approach that brings strong efficiencies to HBS services. The proposed plan provides a very high level of confidence that Team SSAI can manage the work effectively contributing towards significantly exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the government.

Strength #1

Team SSAI has proposed a strong collection of staffing, partnerships and corporate resources in support of HBS objectives that will support a broad array of contract activities. This approach increases the government's confidence that Team SSAI will be able to develop effective, state of the art and innovative solutions that will contribute towards exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the government.

Strength #2

Team SSAI proposes the use of an integrated suite of contract, task, financial and project management tools developed specifically for managing and controlling IDIQ contracts and tasks. Use of the proposed system will enhance Team SSAI's tracking of task performance, provide greater insight and management of risks, and will improve SSAI's overall efficiency and effectiveness in monitoring, controlling and administering multiple task orders simultaneously. This approach exceeds requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the government.

Strength #3

Team SSAI offers a no-cost phase-in and proposes a comprehensive, well structured, and effective phase-in plan that would provide an orderly transition of ongoing HBS tasks and personnel. Team SSAI's phase-in would ensure the continuity of current HBS tasks. Team SSAI's phase-in plan for staffing a qualified workforce enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Strength #4

Team SSAI proposed a very good and detailed Total Compensation Plan (TCP) that should ensure recapturing most of the staff for critical HBS services. They describe a TCP that provides a compensation package that overall exceeds most industry standards. This compensation plan and retention strategy gives a high level of confidence that SSAI will recapture and retain the staff on the current contract which enhances the potential for successful performance.

SIGMA SPACE

Subfactor A: Technical Approach to RTOs

Sigma Space received 3 significant strengths, 2 strengths, 1 weakness, and no significant weaknesses, and no deficiencies, resulting in an adjectival rating of Very Good for this subfactor.

Significant Strength #1

In the response to RTO-1, Sigma Space accurately identifies and summarizes the large number of EOS Terra and Aqua MODIS and S-NPP VIIRS related calibration and characterization activities performed by the MODIS Characterization Support Team (MCST) and the VIIRS Characterization Support Team (VCST), respectively. Sigma Space also identifies in their proposal a number of future investigations aimed at better understanding and/or improving the on-orbit performance of EOS MODIS and S-NPP VIIRS. The offeror's response greatly enhances the potential for successful performance.

Significant Strength #2

In the response to RTO-2, Sigma Space demonstrated an in-depth technical understanding of the design and operation of the MODAPS (MODIS Adaptive Processing System), the processes and level of effort required for integrating and testing science software from initial delivery by the Science Team to final approval to place science software into operational processing. This in-depth understanding is reflected in: the proposed organization of the task, staffing of sub-tasks driven by an analysis of the complexity of the work, and a schedule of activities that provides deliverables as required while avoiding large changes in staffing levels that can be detrimental to progress and morale. The approach proposed for software integration and MODAPS maintenance and operations greatly enhances the potential for successful performance.

Significant Strength #3

In the response to RTO-3, Sigma Space demonstrated an in-depth technical understanding of the development, test and risk mitigation of the Earth Venture class imaging laser altimeter instrument (ILA) in the optical, mechanical and digitizer components. The in-depth understanding is reflected in their descriptions of: the optical design and analysis, inspection and inventory of optical components, opto-mechanical fabrication and inspection, the mechanical analysis for the telescope mass trade study and design of the digitizer subsystem. Their in-depth understanding of the development process of the ILA greatly enhances the potential for successful performance.

Strength #1

In the technical approach to RTO-1, Sigma Space not only identifies all the technical activities currently underway in the NASA Calibration Facility (CF) but also identifies areas for improving those activities and expanding future facility capabilities. In addition, Sigma Space's proposal recognizes the need to establish a close working relationship with NIST, the U.S. National Measurement Laboratory. These activities enhance the potential for successful performance and contribute toward exceeding the contract requirements.

Strength #2

In the technical approach to RTO-1, Sigma Space presents a complete, sound, systems engineering approach for successfully designing, building, and testing the Next Generation Scatterometer within the Diffuser Calibration Laboratory (DCL). The proposed approach to this work will enhance the potential for successful performance in building this instrument.

Weakness #1

In the proposal, Sigma Space's RTO-1 schedule provides timelines for only three (3) Calibration Facility WBS activities in RTO-1, all related to improvements within the facility. This schedule and timeline should include all the WBS areas related to work within the Radiometric Calibration Laboratory (RCL) (i.e. WBS 1.4) and the Diffuser Calibration Laboratory (DCL) (i.e. WBS 1.5) including activities related to the maintenance of current measurement capabilities and traceability to NIST. Failure to adequately address the frequency and type of activities required in maintaining current measurement capabilities and NIST traceability in the CF increases the risk of inaccurate measurements during instrument calibrations thereby leading to unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor B: Management Approach

Sigma Space received 1significant strength, 5 strengths, no weaknesses, no significant weaknesses, and no deficiencies, resulting in an adjectival rating of Very Good for this subfactor.

Significant Strength #1

Sigma Space's strong organizational structure and approach to provide HBS services will provide significant confidence that the government will receive the services for which it is contracting. Sigma Space has a comprehensive and well documented management approach that employs ISO-compliant processes to ensure regular monitoring, bi-directional communications (both internal and with the government) with built-in mechanisms to address and respond to

issues, problems and conflicts. Sigma Space has implemented and proposed several strategic, corporate-wide approaches to ensure that a diverse, and well-designed management approach includes successful policies and procedures for the HBS work which will greatly enhance the potential for successful performance.

Strength #1

Sigma Space has proposed a strong collection of staffing and corporate resources in support of HBS objectives that increases the likelihood of successful contract performance by retaining experienced technical staff at a low risk and a low cost plan to the government. Overall Sigma Space has provided a strong and experienced management team with a knowledgeable workforce to meet HBS requirements.

Strength #2

Sigma Space has a detailed and comprehensive Total Compensation Plan (TCP) that helps ensure continuity and retention of staff for critical HBS services. The compensation plan gives a high level of confidence that Sigma Space can retain a motivated and experienced incumbent staff to perform the proposed work thereby enhancing the potential for successful performance.

Strength #3

Sigma Space has described an IT security plan and procedures that are fully compliant with NASA and NIST guidelines. Execution of the plan and procedures has been highly effective as demonstrated by little to no reportable security incidents. Effective execution of IT security procedures enhances the potential for successful performance in all activities under this contract.

Strength #4

The Sigma Space Safety and Health (S&H) Plan is very good. The proposed S&H Plan exceeds NASA expectations and enhances the potential for successful safety performance. Sigma Space demonstrates an excellent understanding and familiarity with NASA and OSHA safety program requirements. Sigma Space also proposes to coordinate its goals and objectives for safety with the government aiming at compliance with Voluntary Protection Program Star requirements. Overall the S&H plan contributes toward exceeding contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the government.

Strength #5

Sigma Space offers a no-cost phase-in and proposes a comprehensive well-structured phase-in plan that would provide a smooth transition of work to the new contract. Sigma Space's phase-in

SSAI

SSAI, Inc. was assigned an overall confidence level rating of Very High that is reflective of the HBS Source Evaluation Board's subjective evaluation of the information contained in the written narrative; past performance evaluation input provided through customer questionnaires; and other references. The Offeror's relevant past performance is very highly pertinent and of exceptional merit; indicating exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner; very minor problems with no adverse effect on overall performance. SSAI, Inc. received a Very High Level of confidence in its past performance rating. This rating was based on its Very Highly rated performance on multiple relevant contracts. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a Very High level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

SIGMA SPACE

Sigma Space Corporation was assigned an overall confidence level rating of High that is reflective of the HBS Source Evaluation Board's subjective evaluation of the information contained in the written narrative; past performance evaluation input provided through customer questionnaires; and other references. The Offeror's relevant past performance is highly pertinent; demonstrating very effective performance that would be fully responsive to the contract requirements in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part with only minor problems (technical issues and communication problems) with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a High Level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Source Selection Decision

I carefully reviewed the Source Evaluation Board's documentation entitled "Presentation to the Source Selection Authority, Hydrospheric and Biospheric Sciences (HBS) Support Services." On May 29, 2014, I, the Source Selection Authority, along with several ex-officios, met with the Source Evaluation Board to hear findings and the briefing was supplemented on June 6, 2014. I determined that the findings presented by the SEB, as documented in its presentation and the accompanying "HBS Cost Evaluation Report" were detailed, consistent with the evaluation criteria in the HBS RFP, and provided a clear description of the merits of each proposal. I questioned the SEB with regard to its rationale for the findings and the adjectival ratings and scores for the mission suitability subfactors, and also questioned the rationale for the evaluation of cost and past performance. Further, I solicited the views of my ex-officio advisors in their

areas of expertise. I determined that the findings were reasonable and valid for the purpose of making a selection decision. I accept the findings from the Source Evaluation Board and concur with the Contracting Officer that a competitive range and discussions are not necessary. In determining which proposal offered the best value to NASA, I referred to the relative order of importance of the three evaluation factors as specified in the RFP.

The Cost Factor is significantly less important than the combined importance of the Mission Suitability Factor and the Past Performance Factor. As individual Factors, the Cost Factor is less important than the Mission Suitability Factor but more important than the Past Performance Factor.

Regarding the Mission Suitability Factor, the most important factor, I noted that the proposals submitted by SSAI and Sigma Space were technically superior to the proposal submitted by ADNET, based on the content of the findings. I also found that SSAI's proposal received the highest overall total point score, which was slightly higher than Sigma Space's, and significantly higher than ADNET's.

Regarding Subfactor A, the most heavily weighted subfactor, I noted that SSAI's Excellent rating was higher than that of Sigma Space (Very Good), which was in turn higher than that of ADNET (Fair). ADNET's significantly lower "Fair" rating was deemed to make it uncompetitive in Subfactor A. SSAI's and Sigma Space's evaluation findings were further comparatively assessed for discriminators. While SSAI and Sigma Space both received three Significant Strengths for Subfactor A, I noticed a discriminator in SSAI's Significant Strength #2, in which their proposal completely and accurately identified all aspects of the work of the NASA Calibration Facility (CF) and provided a sound approach for accomplishing the work with maximum efficiency. SSAI also identified improvements to the existing CF instrumentation and measurement methodologies which would enable the CF to continue to provide state-of-the art calibrations to NASA's remote sensing projects. SSAI's technical approaches demonstrate forward looking solutions that reflect a strong capacity for innovation while maintaining a level of understanding that greatly enhances successful contract performance. Additionally, I found discriminators in two additional areas. SSAI's proposal offered a multi-task web-based tool and an annual Calibration and Validation summit. The web-based tool is unique to SSAI and will provide uniform reporting and recording of laboratory records, and provide calibration and characterization data which will be of value to all facility users at no additional cost. I also find that the summit would be of value to the user community. Finally, I note that SSAI did not receive any weaknesses in Subfactor A in comparison to the other offerors.

Regarding Subfactor B, the second most important subfactor, I noted that all offerors demonstrated a sound understanding of the approach, policies, procedures, and techniques

required to efficiently manage the proposed work and the ability to deliver quality support services. Each offeror received an adjectival rating of Very Good in Subfactor B, therefore I did not find any meaningful discriminators between them in this subfactor.

Regarding the cost evaluation, ADNET had the lowest probable cost, which was moderately lower than Sigma, which was in turn slightly lower than SSAI. The cost difference between SSAI and Sigma Space is approximately 1%, and deemed inconsequential.

Regarding the past performance evaluation, I noted that ADNET and SSAI both had Very High past performance ratings, while Sigma Space received a High past performance rating. While SSAI and Sigma Space both provided past performance that was very highly relevant to this acquisition, SSAI's performance on its relevant contracts notably exceeded that of Sigma Space.

Finally, I carefully considered the findings in relation to the evaluation criteria in the RFP, and exercised my independent judgment regarding the significance of the findings as discriminators between the proposals in accordance with the evaluation criteria in the RFP.

Based on the foregoing evaluations and upon consideration of the relative importance of the three evaluation factors under the RFP, I determined that one Offeror, Science Systems and Applications, Inc., presented an overall superior proposal that offered the best value to the government. SSAI's Mission Suitability Subfactor A rating of Excellent was a clear discriminator in my decision, as noted above. I noted that SSAI received the highest possible rating in the past performance factor, receiving a "Very High Level of Confidence" rating meaning there is a very high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Further, SSAI's proposal offered a reasonable and competitive probable cost. Given that the cost factor is significantly less important than the combined importance of the Mission Suitability and Past Performance Factors, the technical and past performance advantages offered by SSAI's proposal more than off-set the minimal cost premium associated with SSAI's proposal. Therefore, I select Science Systems and Application (SSAI) for award of the Hydrospheric and Biospheric Support (HBS) Services.

Maria M. So
Source Selection Authority