SOURCE SELECTION STATEMENT
FOR WALLOPS ENGINEERING SERVICES CONTRACT (WESC)
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) NNG13374674R

On July 28, 2014, I, along with senior officials from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC), met with the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed to evaluate proposals in connection with the WESC procurement. A full briefing of the results of the evaluation conducted by the SEB was presented to me, resulting in this Source Selection Statement.

PROCUREMENT DESCRIPTION

The WESC requirement was issued as a small business set-aside competitive procurement. The purpose of the contract is to provide multi-faceted engineering services for direct mission support to NASA and associated customers including the Department of Defense, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and commercial customers at NASA GSFC's Wallops Flight Facility (WFF). The following disciplines were included within the Statement of Work (SOW):

Electrical Engineering
Software Engineering
Guidance, Navigation, and Control (GN&C)
Mechanical Engineering
Systems Engineering
Education and Public Outreach
Technology Development
Safety Engineering
Metrology
Formulation Support
Facilities Engineering

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The RFP defined the evaluation factors as Mission Suitability, Cost, and Past Performance. The RFP specified the relative order of importance of the evaluation 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.

The RFP established that only the Mission Suitability factor would be point scored in the evaluation process. The Mission Suitability factor consisted of the following two subfactors with assigned points as indicated:

	SUBFACTOR	POINTS
A	Technical Approach	500
B	Management Approach	500
	TOTAL	**1000**

Each Offeror was requested to respond to two (2) Representative Task Orders (RTOs) by providing written task plans which detailed their approach for accomplishing each of the RTOs. The information provided by each Offeror was expected to demonstrate the competence to successfully complete the requirements specified in the SOW as demonstrated by the approach to the RTOs.

The Prime Offeror/Significant Subcontractors were allowed to propose their own labor categories as determined by the approach to the SOW requirements. A labor category description document was provided as a guide. Offerors were required to "map" proposed labor categories to those provided in the document for evaluation purposes.

Regarding the Cost Factor, the RFP stated that the proposed costs of the RTOs and the Direct Labor Rates, Indirect Rates, and Fixed Fee Matrices, would be assessed to determine reasonableness and cost realism. The RFP further stated that the cost evaluation would be conducted in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.305(a)(1) and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.305(a)(1)(B) and (C).

The total firm fixed Phase-In price and the proposed and the total probable RTO costs, as well as any cost risks associated with each proposal, were presented at the Source Selection briefing.

For the Past Performance Factor, the RFP stated the past performance evaluation would be conducted in accordance with FAR Part 15. Past Performance information was evaluated to determine relevance and performance. In evaluating Past Performance, the SEB relied on narratives on relevant past/current contracts provided by the Offerors, the Government-wide Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) database and in cases where additional information was needed, telephone calls were made to contacts given within the proposal. The Past Performance factor was not point scored, but was assigned an adjectival rating of "Very High Level of Confidence," "High Level of Confidence," "Moderate Level of Confidence," "Low Level of Confidence," "Very Low Level of Confidence" or "Neutral."

PROCUREMENT HISTORY AND EVALUATION PROCESS

NASA's Source Selection Authority for this procurement appointed the SEB, which included a team of technical members, the Contracting Officer, and consultants from appropriate disciplines, to assist in proposal evaluation.

The WESC RFP was posted on March 18, 2013. Four amendments were issued to the RFP as follows: (1) Amendment One was issued on March 18, 2013, to attach exhibits 1-16 for cost and labor categories; (2) Amendment Two was issued on April 4, 2013, to insert the Statement on

Federal Equivalent Hires and the Service Contract Act of 1965; (3) Amendment Three was issued on April 30, 2013, to revise various sections of the RFP to include a removal of the SOW matrix in L.13 (a)(5) and removal of the comprehensive hiring plan in L.15; and (4) Amendment 4 was issued on May 8, 2013, to revise Section L of the RFP to increase the page limit in Section L.13 (b)(1) from 85 pages to 90 pages.

The following companies submitted acceptable proposals as Prime Offerors (listed in the random order in which they were evaluated):

Sierra Lobo
Vantage Space Technologies (VST)
All Points
Jackson & Tull (J&T)
ASRC Federal Space and Defense (AS&D)
LJT & Associates Incorporated (LJT)
ADNET
Science Systems and Applications, Inc. (SSAI)

The RFP indicated that "The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award contract(s) without discussions with Offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a))."

MISSION SUITABILITY EVALUATION

The table below provides the adjectival ratings assigned in each Mission Suitability Subfactor and the total Mission Suitability scores after evaluating each Subfactor in accordance with RFP section M.4. The eight WESC proposals are listed in the order in which they were randomly evaluated.

OFFEROR	SUBFACTOR A TECHNICAL APPROACH	SUBFACTOR B CONTRACT MANAGEMENT	TOTAL SCORE
Sierra Lobo	Fair	Good	555
VST	Very Good	Fair	630
All Points	Fair	Good	455
J&T	Good	Good	590
AS&D	Excellent	Excellent	935
LJT	Good	Good	535
ADNET	Good	Good	650
SSAI	Fair	Good	445

The substance of the SEB's evaluation of Mission Suitability for each Offeror is presented below.

Sierra Lobo

Subfactor A: Technical Approach
Sierra Lobo's proposal received an adjectival rating of "Fair" with no (0) significant strengths, two (2) strengths, one (1) weakness, (1) significant weakness, and no (0) deficiencies for its technical approach.

Strength 1 of 2
Sierra Lobo's proposal received a strength for its efficient, effective, realistic, and well-organized software engineering approach. Plans for an iterative approach to address evolving requirements were presented and the proposal described plans to effectively identify critical software life cycle milestones, test points, and hardware dependencies.

Strength 2 of 2
Sierra Lobo's proposal received a strength for its demonstration of an understanding of the operations and sustaining engineering support required for the Thermal Vacuum Chamber specific to RTO 2/Work Element (WE) 1. The approach is clear with numerous plans provided that will ensure successful Thermal Vacuum Chamber operations. Various tools and approaches to provide effective management of the Thermal Vacuum Chamber were presented.

Weakness 1 of 1
Sierra Lobo's proposal received a weakness for insufficient detail in demonstrating the capability to perform essential engineering functions needed to meet the objectives of RTO 1. The lack of detail and analyses in the proposal resulted in concerns regarding proposed design and did not provide confidence that the proposed solutions would meet RTO 1 requirements.

Significant Weakness 1 of 1
Sierra Lobo's proposal received a significant weakness for providing an inadequate skill mix or a match of skills to functions that was reasonable, effective, and realistic to ensure the objectives of RTO 1 were accomplished. Staffing proposed was inadequate in multiple disciplines including Systems, Electrical, and Mechanical Engineering. In addition, there was inadequate participation proposed for Systems and Thermal Engineering during test activities.

Subfactor B: Management Approach
Sierra Lobo's proposal received an adjectival rating of "Good" with no (0) significant strengths, two (2) strengths, no (0) weaknesses, no (0) significant weaknesses, and no (0) deficiencies for its management approach.

Strength 1 of 2
Sierra Lobo's proposal received a strength for the flexibility of its organizational process and resources and the responsiveness in meeting the objectives of the WESC. A detailed response on

resolving priority conflicts was provided and unique approaches to providing reach-back and recruiting capabilities was described.

Strength 2 of 2
Sierra Lobo's proposal received a strength for the proposed task order management system which will provide various resources and cost, schedule and work progress insight to the Government. The proposed task order management system will also support reporting and configuration control of project documentation.

VST

Subfactor A: Technical Approach
VST's proposal received an adjectival rating of "Very Good" with one (1) significant strength, one (1) strength, two (2) weaknesses, no (0) significant weakness, and no (0) deficiencies for its technical approach.

Significant Strength 1 of 1
VST's proposal received a significant strength for its extremely detailed and thorough overall technical approach for accomplishing RTO 1. The proposal fully discussed all aspects of the engineering process to include project management, design, development and analysis. The proposal demonstrated the Offeror's capability to carry out mechanical and engineering functions necessary to meet and exceed the RTO 1 objectives, including engineering decisions that provided exceptional management of risks.

Strength 1 of 1
VST's proposal received a strength for its approach to RTO 2 which demonstrated a strong understanding of the requirements and capabilities needed to support the Thermal Vacuum Chamber Test Lab and the Calibration Lab. The Offeror's description of cross-training, risk mitigation, maintenance plans, and lab management will ensure successful lab operations.

Weakness 1 of 2
VST's proposal received a weakness for its inadequate discussion of System Integration and Testing (I&T). The proposal did not provide clear plans for conducting systems level I&T of the Multi Spacecraft Carrier (MSC). The test plans proposed focused on subassembly and assembly I&T, did not provide an adequate description of System level activities, and did not adequately describe how these activities would be managed.

Weakness 2 of 2
VST's proposal response to RTO 1 received a weakness because it did not adequately describe the proposed interface with WFF Code 800 project personnel; communication and coordination with the Code 800 Project Manager, Resource Analyst, and Scheduler were not adequately described.

Subfactor B: Management Approach
VST's proposal received an adjectival rating of "Fair" with no (0) significant strengths, no (0) strengths, two (2) weaknesses, one (1) significant weakness, and no (0) deficiencies for its management approach.

Weakness 1 of 2
VST's proposal received a weakness because it failed to adequately describe its approach for providing program management during phase-in. Management functions performed by the Deputy Program Manager (DPM) in relation to the Program Manager (PM) were not clearly described, and the transition of personnel from "temporary" phase-in staff to "permanent" contract staff were not adequately addressed.

Weakness 2 of 2
VST's proposal received a weakness for lack of detail and discrepancies relating to its proposed task order management system. Although several systems are described, the proposal failed to clearly define which task management system VST will use for task order management. Additionally, there were insufficient details provided to adequately describe how the proposed system will interface with the GSFC Task Order Management System (TOMS).

Significant Weakness 1 of 1
VST's proposal received a significant weakness because it did not clearly describe its proposed organizational structure and did not adequately describe, as required by the RFP, lines of communication, span of control, processes for resolving priority conflicts, and subcontractor interfaces. In addition, the method of management and reporting to NASA of subcontractor financial and technical plans and performance was not adequately described.

ALL POINTS

Subfactor A: Technical Approach
All Points' proposal received an adjectival rating of "Fair" with no (0) significant strengths, no (0) strengths, three (3) weaknesses, no (0) significant weaknesses, and no (0) deficiencies for its technical approach.

Weakness 1 of 3
All Points' proposal received a weakness because its RTO 1 response lacked details describing how the team will interface with Code 800 project personnel. Communication and coordination with the Code 800 Project Manager, Resource Analyst, and Scheduler were not adequately described.

Weakness 2 of 3
All Points' proposal received a weakness because it proposed an inadequate skill mix and staffing levels required to meet the objectives of RTO 1. There was limited labor category/skill mix information presented in the mission suitability section of the proposal, and there was inadequate senior level discipline engineering support provided for several engineering disciplines.

Weakness 3 of 3
All Points' proposal received a weakness because it provided insufficient technical detail to demonstrate the capability of performing various engineering functions specific to meeting the objectives of RTO 1. The electrical systems design, software engineering approach, and proposed testing approach for components and subsystems were inadequately described.

Subfactor B: Management Approach
All Points' proposal received an adjectival rating of "Good" with no (0) significant strengths, two (2) strengths, no (0) weaknesses, one (1) significant weakness, and no (0) deficiencies for its management approach.

Strength 1 of 2
All Points' proposal received a strength for its proposed management system information tool which would not only provide the Government insight into cost, schedule, safety, and quality activities, but improve workflow management, action tracking, and reporting.

Strength 2 of 2
All Points' proposal received a strength for its proposed cooperative education program which would promote the development of engineering skills and enhance the future workforce.

Significant Weakness 1 of 1
All Points' proposal received a significant weakness for the lack of detail provided to support its overall proposed management approach. Inadequate detail is provided to describe the DPM role and its interaction with the PM or other roles. Additionally, the proposal provided insufficient detail regarding its proposed approach for subcontractor management, and financial and technical reporting.

J&T

Subfactor A: Technical Approach
J&T's proposal received an adjectival rating of "Good" with no (0) significant strengths, two (2) strengths, two (2) weaknesses, no (0) significant weaknesses, and no (0) deficiencies for its technical approach.

Strength 1 of 2
J&T's proposal received a strength for its detailed and logical systems engineering design approach of the MSC for RTO 1. Details about the engineering process and strategies for addressing cost and schedule drivers were provided. In addition, potential future mission requirements were considered, and trade studies including alternate configurations are discussed.

Strength 2 of 2
J&T's proposal received a strength for its detailed electrical systems engineering approach to RTO 1. Communications system architecture details that addressed current objectives and anticipated future missions were provided. Significant electronics manufacturing and solar array design details were included.

Weakness 1 of 2
J&T's proposal received a weakness because it failed to adequately describe potential challenges associated with a Class-D mission. The proposal references NASA documents including NASA/SP-2007-6105, NPR 7123.1, GSFC-STD-7000 (GEVS) numerous times, but does not include an adequate discussion of how these requirements may be tailored to support the Class-D mission for RTO 1. In addition, J&T's proposal provided options and examples which could present cost and schedule risks for a Class-D mission.

Weakness 2 of 2
J&T's proposal received a weakness because it lacked adequate details for labor hours and lacked rationale for the proposed staffing associated with each RTO. The proposed staffing was insufficient and in some cases inconsistent with hours proposed for the same categories in other portions of the proposal.

Subfactor B: Management Approach
J&T's proposal received an adjectival rating of "Good" with no (0) significant strengths, one (1) strength, one (1) weakness, no (0) significant weakness, and no (0) deficiencies for its management approach.

Strength 1 of 1
J&T's proposal received a strength for its well-defined conflict resolution process and resource management. A documented action plan to reach resolution, including a detailed strategy for each step, and variations of the process for Collective Bargaining Agreement employees was described. In addition, a process for redirecting subcontract resources was well-defined.

Weakness 1 of 1
J&T's proposal received a weakness for the lack of adequate detail provided for its proposed management information system. There were insufficient details describing how the proposed system would interface with the GSFC TOMS.

AS&D

Subfactor A: Technical Approach
AS&D's proposal received an adjectival rating of "Excellent" with one (1) significant strength, three (3) strengths, no (0) weaknesses, no (0) significant weaknesses, and no (0) deficiencies for its technical approach.

Significant Strength 1 of 1
AS&D's proposal received a significant strength for its comprehensive, robust approach to RTO 1 that was thorough, detailed, process-oriented, and flexible. The proposal provided multiple design solutions that would not only meet and exceed MSC mission requirements, but address potential future requirements as well. The proposal not only provided a clear and thorough plan for tailoring NASA processes to achieve the aggressive schedule provided, but provided a highly detailed technical solution addressing electrical and mechanical configurations, design heritage,

and technical budgets. Interfaces were clearly identified and the approach to I&T and Verification and Validation (V&V) were excellent and likely to reduce risk.

Strength 1 of 3
AS&D's proposal received a strength for its comprehensive insight into labor categories and projected hours for the approach to both RTOs. A detailed description of AS&D's planned methodology and technical approach was included for each WBS element as well as a detailed rationale for their estimate. The strategy by which responsibilities will be divided among the team members was clearly described.

Strength 2 of 3
AS&D's proposal received a strength for its proposed utilization of a work ticket system in RTO 2. The system will track, manage, and monitor incident occurrences, problem issues, system changes, and current configuration. The system will provide NASA with insight of requirements and priorities and enable efficiencies through lessons learned.

Strength 3 of 3
AS&D's proposal received a strength for its proposed innovation plan which offered various activities that would enhance capabilities at NASA WFF. Among other things, a program to provide surge support and make use of excess workforce was described, and a plan to provide regular research and development recommendations was presented.

Subfactor B: Management Approach
AS&D's proposal received an adjectival rating of "Excellent" with two (2) significant strengths, one (1) strength, no (0) weaknesses, no (0) significant weakness, and no (0) deficiencies for its management approach.

Significant Strength 1 of 2
AS&D's proposal received a significant strength for its excellent management plan that exhibited a substantial degree of autonomy at multiple levels and included detailed processes for each proposed area. The management system addressed key areas such as customer relationship management, managing interfaces and dependencies, and avoiding duplication. A clear process for the senior members of the prime and subcontractor companies to assess and regularly provide feedback on performance, resources, and recommendations to the Government was described. The proposed organization was efficient and very well described, with all team members utilizing a central management system.

Significant Strength 2 of 2
AS&D's proposal received a significant strength for proposed management tools and processes that provide greater efficiencies, enhancements, and effectiveness for ongoing work on WESC. A central information hub to facilitate task order information management and communication to the Government was clearly described. All team members will use a single time collection system. In addition, the Offeror's proposal described a detailed subcontractor monitoring process that utilizes observation and auditing to evaluate performance.

Strength 1 of 1
AS&D's proposal received a strength for its proposed Phase-In plan which featured a detailed strategy, specific milestones, and validation phase. A readiness review will be held prior to the end of the Phase-In period. The Offeror proposed a post phase-in strategy to ensure performance and operations success.

LJT

Subfactor A: Technical Approach
LJT's proposal received an adjectival rating of "Good" with no (0) significant strengths, two (2) strengths, three (3) weaknesses, no (0) significant weaknesses, and no (0) deficiencies for its technical approach.

Strength 1 of 2
LJT's proposal received a strength for its proposed development of a high fidelity MSC simulator. Use of this system will allow multi-use during testing and eliminate priority conflicts, and may result in time and costs savings to NASA.

Strength 2 of 2
LJT's proposal received a strength for its proposed System Administration (SA) tools that will improve management of SA requirements and priorities. The proposed system includes a repository of lessons learned related to common user issues and for system configuration information. The proposed SA tools include implementation of a help-desk to manage requirements and on-line access for end users requiring support.

Weakness 1 of 3
LJT's proposal received a weakness for inadequate RTO 1 test activities. Several expected test activities are not adequately addressed in the proposal, and some proposed test activities are inadequate or unrealistic. The proposal included inadequate rationale for how subsystem and components testing will meet NASA engineering standards.

Weakness 2 of 3
LJT's proposal received a weakness for lack of sufficient detail described for RTO 2 Thermal Vacuum Chamber and Calibration Lab support. Insufficient detail was provided to describe how risks would be mitigated, and there was insufficient discussion provided describing the preparation and operation of the Thermal Vacuum Chamber .

Weakness 3 of 3
LJT's proposal received a weakness because it failed to provide adequate detail describing its proposed engineering solutions to RTO 1. General plans were provided, but without adequate technical details that would provide evidence that the Offeror clearly understood the effort and had a robust approach that would meet the task requirements. There was inadequate information provided describing the GN&C system and the electrical power systems.

Subfactor B: Management Approach
LJT's proposal received an adjectival rating of "Good" with no (0) significant strengths, no (0) strengths, one (1) weakness, no (0) significant weaknesses, and no (0) deficiencies for its management approach.

Weakness 1 of 1
LJT's proposal received a weakness because it provided inadequate details describing its proposed management approach including roles and responsibilities and lines of communication. The distinction between the roles of the PM and Engineering Services Office manager is unclear. The discussion of potential risks and mitigation of cross-utilization of resources was not adequately addressed.

ADNET

Subfactor A: Technical Approach
ADNET's proposal received an adjectival rating of "Good" with no (0) significant strengths, two (2) strengths, three (3) weaknesses, no (0) significant weaknesses, and no (0) deficiencies for its technical approach.

Strength 1 of 2
ADNET's proposal received a strength for its strong description of engineering processes associated with performance of RTO 1 activities. A clear flow of activities that included deliverables and milestones for each phase of the task was presented and included an incremental development approach for software. The proposal contained a detailed analysis of risk associated with the overall effort and individual work elements in addition to providing mitigation for each scenario.

Strength 2 of 2
ADNET's proposal received a strength for proposed innovations in education outreach and technology development. The proposed intern program focused on recruitment of college and high school students in the local area. In addition, a proposed organization will offer recommendations on efficiencies and improvements for WESC.

Weakness 1 of 3
ADNET's proposal received a weakness because it provided insufficient technical detail to demonstrate its capability of performing various engineering functions needed to meet the objectives of RTO 1. The proposal failed to provide a realistic strategy for accomplishing all of the proposed activities within the time constraints specified in the RTO, and failed to provide an adequate discussion of the Offeror's draft concept describing its approach to RTO 1.

Weakness 2 of 3
ADNET's proposal received a weakness because it provided inadequate detail describing its approach to support RTO 2 Thermal Vacuum Chamber operations. The proposal provided an inadequate plan for working with engineers to establish test article specific temperature levels

and limits. Few details were provided describing the timing of various steps necessary to meet test objectives.

Weakness 3 of 3
ADNET's proposal received a weakness for its proposed inadequate staffing of RTO 2 System Administration objectives. The proposal suggested enhanced efficiencies with the proposed skill mix but a description of how these efficiencies would be realized was inadequately addressed.

Subfactor B: Management Approach
ADNET's proposal received an adjectival rating of "Good" with no (0) significant strengths, three (3) strengths, no (0) weaknesses, no (0) significant weaknesses, and no (0) deficiencies for its management approach.

Strength 1 of 3
ADNET's proposal received a strength for its clearly described interfaces and communication strategies with NASA organizations. The proposal offers specialized training to managers covering NASA and WFF specific topics and overall Government expectations to better acclimate management to the culture.

Strength 2 of 3
ADNET's proposal received a strength for its Total Compensation Plan that will attract, motivate, and retain employees. A unique fee sharing incentive is offered, and methodologies to alleviate fringe benefit cost variations to employees are discussed.

Strength 3 of 3
ADNET's proposal received a strength for its Web-Based Management Tool that will provide various resources and insight to the Government. The system has the ability to manage concurrent tasks in real time and presents valuable information to management. The system will maintain a document database, can be customized and easily exports information.

SSAI

Subfactor A: Technical Approach
SSAI's proposal received an adjectival rating of "Fair" with no (0) significant strengths, one (1) strength, two (2) weaknesses, one (1) significant weakness, and no (0) deficiencies for its technical approach.

Strength 1 of 1
SSAI's proposal received a strength for its strong and effective operations and data collection approach in support of RTO 2 Thermal Vacuum Chamber and Calibration Lab requirements. The proposal provides a clear description of Thermal Vacuum Chamber test requirements and delineates test user and chamber operator responsibilities. Plans to provide a predictive maintenance schedule in addition to electronically recording pertinent data are thoroughly discussed.

Weakness 1 of 2
SSAI's proposal received a weakness for inadequate staffing levels and skill mix proposed to meet the objectives of several areas within RTO 1 and 2. Inadequate staffing is proposed for Systems Engineering, GN&C, Electrical, and System Administration. The staffing levels proposed are not adequate to support the activities described and expected thereby making it difficult to successfully meet the objectives of RTO 1 or 2.

Weakness 2 of 2
SSAI's proposal received a weakness for inadequately describing risks and assumptions associated with its proposed technical approach. Reasonable and effective approaches to mitigate or identify risks were insufficiently described. Assumptions made in developing the proposed technical approach were not adequately described and the rationale for the assumptions was not fully explained.

Significant Weakness 1 of 1
SSAI's proposal received a significant weakness for its proposed inadequate technical approach to RTO 1. The proposed solution is not consistent with the mission described in RTO 1. The proposed approach included elements that reduced reliability, increased complexity and the rationale for proposed component selections was not adequate. Roles and responsibilities for key products were not clearly delineated, and there was an inadequate description or schedule of planned I&T activities.

Subfactor B: Management Approach
SSAI's proposal received an adjectival rating of "Good" with no (0) significant strengths, two (2) strengths, no (0) weaknesses, one (1) significant weakness, and no (0) deficiencies for its management approach.

Strength 1 of 2
SSAI's proposal received a strength for its proposed employee development and benefit programs, which accomplish WESC objectives while maintaining motivated and productive employees. Effective leadership, mentoring, internship, and award programs were described.

Strength 2 of 2
SSAI's proposal received a strength for its task management system which will provide various resources and insight to the Government. The system offers full task lifecycle support at the contract level and a repository of task plans and other pertinent data. The proposed system also enables immediate Government insight into task performance and quality management.

Significant Weakness 1 of 1
SSAI's proposal received a significant weakness for its management approach including an ambiguous organization structure and inadequately described interfaces. The roles of certain positions within the Project Management staff proposed are not adequately described. Responsibilities for some positions are overburdened while others are inadequately described. Lines of communication between the Offeror and NASA are not adequately delineated.

PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

In evaluating Past Performance of the Prime Offerors and their Significant Subcontractors, the SEB found:

The overall relevance (considering content and size) of Sierra Lobo's reference contracts were rated Moderate to Very High with overall performance rated mostly High, which resulted in a High Confidence rating.

The overall relevance (considering content and size) of VST's reference contracts were rated Low to Very High with overall performance rated mostly High to Very High, which resulted in a High Confidence rating.

The overall relevance (considering content and size) of All Points' reference contracts were rated mostly Low with some Moderate to Very High ratings with overall performance ratings ranging from Moderate to Very High, which resulted in a Moderate Confidence rating.

The overall relevance (considering content and size) of J&T's reference contracts were rated mostly Very High with overall performance rated mostly Very High, which resulted in a Very High Confidence rating.

The overall relevance (considering content and size) of AS&D's reference contracts were rated mostly Very High with overall performance rated Very High, which resulted in a Very High Confidence rating.

The overall relevance (considering content and size) of LJT's reference contracts were rated mostly Very High with overall performance rated Very High, which resulted in a Very High Confidence rating.

The overall relevance (considering content and size) of ADNET's reference contracts were rated Very High with overall performance rated High and Very High, which resulted in a Very High Confidence rating.

The overall relevance (considering content and size) of SSAI's reference contracts were rated mostly Very High with overall performance rated mostly Very High, which resulted in a Very High Confidence rating.

COST EVALUATION

The combination of RTO 1 and 2 (with proposed/probable cost inclusive of unadjusted fee), and Phase-In Price resulted in the following:

OFFEROR	PROPOSED	PROBABLE	ADJUSTMENT
Sierra Lobo	First	First	Upward
VST	Eighth	Eighth	Downward
All Points	Second	Second	Upward
J&T	Fourth	Seventh	Upward
AS&D	Fifth	Fourth	Upward
LJT	Seventh	Sixth	Upward
ADNET	Sixth	Fifth	Upward
SSAI	Third	Third	Upward

As a result of its cost realism assessment, the evaluation team made adjustments in the areas of direct labor hours and indirect costs. Sierra Lobo offered the lowest total probable cost, which was slightly lower than All Points, which was in turn slightly lower than SSAI. SSAI was moderately lower than AS&D, ADNET, LJT, and J&T.

DECISION

I have carefully reviewed the SEB's detailed written evaluation results for Mission Suitability, Cost, and Past Performance. The SEB's presentation on July 28, 2014, provided additional insight and explanation of the SEB's findings. I solicited and considered the views of all of the attendees at the presentation, including the SEB members and other key senior officials at GSFC. These key senior officials have responsibility related to this acquisition and understood the application of the evaluation factors set forth in the RFP.

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

My selection was based on a comparative assessment of each proposal against each of the RFP source selection Evaluation Factors.

Regarding the Mission Suitability Factor, the most important factor, I noted that the proposal submitted by AS&D was superior to the proposals submitted by all other Offerors based on the content of the findings documented by the SEB. AS&D's proposal received the highest overall total point score, which was significantly higher than all other Offerors.

AS&D's Excellent rating in the Technical Approach Subfactor A was higher than that of VST (Very Good), which was in turn higher than the same ratings for J&T (Good), LJT (Good), and ADNET (Good). Sierra Lobo, All Points, and SSAI all received significantly lower "Fair" ratings within this Subfactor and were far less competitive than all other offerors; none of these

Offerors received any significant strength findings and all had weakness and/or significant weakness findings which significantly detracted from their Subfactor A proposal.

AS&D received one significant strength and three strengths in Subfactor A. While J&T, LJT, and ADNET offered strong technical approaches ultimately warranting Good overall ratings within Subfactor A, each of these Offerors received multiple weaknesses and none received a significant strength finding within Subfactor A (unlike AS&D and VST). I further analyzed the differences between AS&D and VST's findings within Subfactor A, and found that both AS&D and VST received similar significant strengths for their overall technical approach to RTO 1; the proposals submitted by VST and AS&D were both exceptionally detailed and demonstrated an exceptional understanding of the RTO 1 requirements. Next, I noted that while VST received a single additional strength for its thorough and detailed approach to managing the Calibration Lab requirements of RTO 2, AS&D received three additional strength findings within Subfactor A. First, AS&D received a strength because its proposal provided comprehensive insight into the labor categories and projected hours for RTOs 1 and 2 along with a detailed description of their planned methodology and technical approach for each WBS element. Second, AS&D received a strength for its proposed system administration work ticket system that will allow efficient and organized management of WBS elements that will provide NASA with greater insight and oversight of requirements and priorities, and enable efficiencies through lessons learned. Third, AS&D received a strength for its proposed numerous innovations that will contribute to the technical development at NASA Wallops, reduce contract costs and contribute towards further cultivating a thriving workforce. AS&D's proposal included multiple specific plans and initiatives which detailed its approach for implementing the innovations, and further explained how these plans and programs would not only contribute towards additional technical developments, but would result in cost and technical efficiencies to NASA. Although I was impressed with AS&D's first strength, I found the technical features offered by its second and third strengths to be of particular value to NASA because they will likely result in reduced contract costs and efficient work flows.

Finally, I noted that while AS&D received no weakness findings within Subfactor A, VST received two individual weakness findings. First, VST's proposal received a weakness because its proposal did not adequately provide a clear and complete approach for conducting essential integration and testing activities. Second, VST's proposal received a weakness for its inadequate description of proposed interfaces to NASA Wallops Code 800 project personnel during the implementation of RTO 1.

Next, within Subfactor B, the Management Approach Subfactor, I noted that just as in Subfactor A, AS&D was the only offeror who received an overall Excellent rating. Sierra Lobo, All Points, J&T, LJT, ADNET, and SSAI all received Good overall ratings, while VST received a Fair rating. Ultimately, while most other Offerors demonstrated solid Management Approach proposals, AS&D's Management Approach proposal demonstrated the most comprehensive and thorough response in addressing the various Management Approach areas that were identified in the evaluation criteria. Specifically, AS&D was the only Offeror to receive significant strength findings in Subfactor B. First, AS&D's proposal received a significant strength for its well-defined, extremely detailed management plan which exhibits a substantial degree of autonomy at

multiple levels and included detailed processes for each proposed area. The management system addressed key areas such as customer relationship management, managing interfaces and dependencies, and avoiding duplication which will increase the likelihood of effective management of the WESC contract. Second, AS&D's proposal received a significant strength for its proposed utilization of multiple business tools and processes that will provide greater management efficiencies, effectiveness, and visibility under the WESC contract. Finally, though not a significant discriminator, I noted that AS&D also received an additional strength in Subfactor B for its strong Phase-In plan.

Ultimately, for the Mission Suitability Factor, I concluded that AS&D had a superior proposal with the most advantages and highest likelihood for successful contract performance. Unlike any other Offeror, AS&D was the only Offeror to receive an overall Excellent rating in both Mission Suitability Subfactors. Moreover, as detailed above, AS&D's significant strength, coupled with its three strength findings in Subfactor A, give it a clear advantage within Subfactor A, and AS&D's superior Management Approach, echoed by its two significant strength findings, provide it with a similar advantage over all other Offerors in Subfactor B.

Regarding the cost evaluation, Sierra Lobo offered the lowest total probable cost, which was slightly lower than All Points, which was in turn slightly lower than SSAI. SSAI was moderately lower than AS&D, ADNET, LJT, and J&T. Of the three most highly rated Mission Suitability offerors, AS&D offered the lowest total probable costs, which was slightly lower than ADNETs, and significantly lower than VST's.

Regarding the Past Performance factor, I noted that AS&D, J&T, ADNET, LJT, and SSAI all received Very High ratings, Sierra Lobo and VST received High ratings, and All Points received a Moderate rating. However, I found no discriminator among those Offerors who received Very High ratings for past performance; all Offerors demonstrated overall Very High performance on very highly relevant contracts and demonstrated that they had successfully performed on similar contract efforts.

After reviewing all of the proposal evaluation data, I again referred back to the RFP evaluation criteria, and the relative order of importance of each of the three evaluation factors. Based on the foregoing evaluations, I determined that AS&D presented an overall superior proposal that offered the best value to the government. Unlike any other Offeror, AS&D's proposal was the only one to receive "Excellent" overall ratings in both Mission Suitability Subfactor A and Subfactor B. As detailed above, AS&D offered the most comprehensive and detailed response across both Mission Suitability Subfactors, which ultimately results in a high level of confidence in their ability to perform WESC requirements. Next, I noted that AS&D 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, AS&D'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 AS&D's proposal more than off-set the minimal cost premium associated with AS&D's proposal.

Accordingly, based on my analysis of the SEB evaluation results and the RFP evaluation criteria, I have determined that AS&D's proposal offers the best value to the Government and I have selected AS&D for contract award.

Arthur F. Obenschain
Source Selection Authority

8/27/14
Date