

National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Ames Research Center
Moffett Field, CA 94035-0001

Selection of Contractor
For
Safety, Environmental, and Medical Support Services (SEMSS)
NNA09263816R-AMJ

June 13, 2012

On March 12, 2012, I, along with certain NASA Source Evaluation Board (SEB) ex-officio members, met with the SEB members appointed to evaluate the proposals for the Safety, Environmental, and Medical Support Services (SEMSS) procurement supporting the NASA Ames Research Center (ARC). During this meeting, the SEB presented the findings from its Final Presentation to me, the Source Selection Authority (SSA), and we discussed those findings to assure that I had a full understanding of its evaluation.

I assessed the SEB's findings and evaluation of proposals. This Source Selection Statement reflects my independent judgment, which I based upon a comparative assessment of the relative strengths and weaknesses of the proposals and the evaluation criteria prescribed in the Request for Proposal (RFP). My selection decision is set forth below.

Procurement Description

ARC has a continuing need for safety, environmental, and medical support services that will enable the Center to fulfill the Agency's mission as well as to meet a multitude of regulatory requirements. The services provided will support all organizations and employees at ARC and the NASA Research Park. This procurement will yield a contract that will provide support in the following areas, including but not limited to:

- Safety, Health, and Environmental Training
- Emergency Response
- Fitness Center Operation
- Safety Services
 - Industrial Hygiene
 - Confined Spaces
 - Chemical Exposure Assessment and Control
 - Noise Monitoring and Hearing Conservation
 - Ventilation
 - Asbestos and Lead
 - Health Physics and Radiation Safety
 - Occupational Safety
 - Mishap Investigation and Data Analyses

- Voluntary Protection Program
 - Ergonomics Program
 - Construction Safety
 - Fire Protection Engineering
 - Electrical Safety Administration
- Environmental Services:
 - Environmental Management System Program
 - Pollution Prevention, Recycling, Affirmative Procurement, and Sustainability Practices
 - Air Quality Program
 - Hazardous Materials Management
 - Hazardous Waste Management
 - Petroleum, Oils, and Lubricants/Spill Control and Countermeasures/Above-ground Storage Tank/Polychlorinated Biphenyl Program
 - Restoration/Sub-surface Program
 - National Environmental Policy Act/Environmental Justice Program
 - Cultural Resources Management
 - Wildlife, Plants, Ecosystems (Natural Resources) Program
- Medical Support Services
 - Health Unit Operation and Administration
 - Disaster Preparedness Medical Response
 - Injury and Illness Care
 - Health Maintenance
 - Medical Surveillance
 - Employee Assistance Program

This procurement was conducted as a small business set-aside and will result in a single award, hybrid Indefinite-Delivery, Indefinite-Quantity (IDIQ) contract with Firm Fixed Price (FFP) as well as Time-and-Materials (T&M) task orders. The minimum amount of supplies or services that will be ordered during the effective period of this contract is \$100,000.00, and the maximum amount is \$55,000,000.00. The period of performance consists of a two-year base period (including a 45-day phase-in period), and three one-year options, resulting in a maximum performance period of five years.

Evaluation Procedure

Proposals were evaluated in accordance with the requirements of FAR Subpart 15.3, "Source Selection," as supplemented by NFS Subpart 1815.3, "Source Selection." Section M of the solicitation, paragraph M.2, Evaluation Approach, advised Offerors that the Government may award a contract based solely on the initial offers received and without discussion of such offers. Accordingly, each Offeror was required to submit its initial proposal to the Government using the most favorable terms from a technical and cost/price standpoint. However, the Government reserved the right to hold discussions if award on initial offers was determined not to be in the best interest of the Government.

The RFP identified three evaluation factors: Mission Suitability (Volume I), Past Performance (Volume II), and Cost/Price (Volume III). Of these evaluation factors, Mission Suitability is somewhat more important than Cost/Price. Cost/Price is significantly more important than Past Performance. Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, are somewhat more important than Cost/Price.

The Mission Suitability Factor consists of four Sub-factors. The Sub-factors are shown below with their respective point allocation, which signifies their weight.

MISSION SUITABILITY	
Sub-factors	Assigned Weight
1. Technical Approach a. Technical Understanding b. Response to Case Study A	275
2. Management Approach a. Organizational Structure and Approach b. Staffing, Recruitment, Retention, and Training c. Key Personnel d. Total Compensation Plan e. Quality Assurance Plan f. Response to Case Study B g. OCI Avoidance Plan	275
3. Contract Task Order Plan	350
4. Safety and Health Plan	100
TOTAL	1000

Overall, the Offerors' Mission Suitability proposals were evaluated based on the Offerors' abilities to efficiently fulfill the technical requirements while meeting quality, schedule, and safety requirements. The compatibility between the proposed management and technical approaches to accomplish the work was an important consideration in the evaluation of this Factor. In addition, proposal risk was evaluated with respect to cost, performance, technical approach, and management approach. The RFP stipulated that the overall Mission Suitability Factor would only receive a numerical score, and the Mission Suitability Sub-factors would be assigned adjectival ratings and numerical scores. In accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(3), "Technical Evaluation," the following were the potential Mission Suitability adjectival ratings: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, and Poor. In Section M, paragraph M.2, Evaluation Approach, the RFP defined these adjectival ratings as well as provided applicable percentile ranges at each rating level.

For the Cost/Price Factor, the SEB assessed what each Offeror's proposal would cost the Government should it be selected for award. The overall evaluated cost/price for selection purposes was determined by the sum of the cost/price proposed for the Summary Price Templates for all five (5) years of contract performance (base plus all options)—Summary Price

Template-Firm Fixed Price (SPT-FFP) and Summary Price Template Time-and-Materials (SPT-T&M). The price of phase-in was not included in the total evaluated price, but it was evaluated in terms of risk assessment. An analysis was performed to ensure the proposed resources were consistent with the proposed phase-in plan. Additionally, the Emergency Response T&M was not included in the total evaluated price.

In accordance with Subpart FAR 15.4, the SEB conducted Cost/Price proposal evaluations. The SEB analyzed the proposed costs to determine the price and associated risks of doing business with each Offeror. In accordance with FAR 15.404-1(b), the SEB performed a price analysis to assess the reasonableness of the proposed prices under the firm fixed price task orders. The integration between Mission Suitability findings and price was critical to determining price reasonableness. In accordance with FAR 15.404-1(c), the SEB performed a cost analysis to assess the cost realism of the time-and-materials task orders. An evaluation of profit was conducted. The proposed profit was evaluated for reasonableness and for the extent that it will serve as a motivator of efficient and effective contract performance as referenced in FAR 15.404-4(a).

With regard to the Past Performance Factor, the RFP stated that the evaluation would be an assessment of the Government's level of confidence in the Offeror's ability to perform the solicitation requirements. The past performance evaluation was based on the information provided by the Offeror in its Past Performance Volume II and on the assessment of customer questionnaires submitted on behalf of each Offeror and of its major subcontractors. The RFP required evaluation of the Past Performance Factor using the following level of confidence ratings: Very High Level of Confidence, High Level of Confidence, Moderate Level of Confidence, Low Level of Confidence, Very Low Level of Confidence, and Neutral. In Section M, paragraph M.2, Evaluation Approach, the RFP defined these levels of confidence ratings. The SEB evaluated each Offeror's suitability to fulfill the requirements of this contract, as prescribed in Section M of the RFP.

The SEB evaluated the currency and relevancy of the information, source of the information, context of the data, and general trends in performance of the Offeror, major subcontractors, predecessor companies, key personnel with relevant experience, and any organization that would substantially contribute to the proposed contract, or would have the potential to significantly impact performance of the proposed contract. Further, for each Offeror and its major subcontractors, the SEB evaluated overall past performance with respect to comparability in contract size, content, and complexity to the requirements of the current acquisition. The SEB evaluated the depth of the Offerors' relevant past performance and gave evaluative credit to the quantity, as well as the quality, of the Offerors' past performance. This factor provided an opportunity to evaluate the quality of goods and services that the Offerors provided to the Government and other organizations as either a prime contractor or a subcontractor.

Solicitation and Receipt of Proposals

In an effort to better inform industry of NASA's requirements and to improve communications between all parties, ARC held a pre-solicitation conference to allow interested parties to tour the Center and its facilities and to ask questions of the technical and procurement staff. ARC also issued two draft Requests for Proposals (RFP) that allowed for industry recommendations and comments on all aspects of the Government's proposed approach in satisfying the requirements. ARC also issued a Highlights Document containing pertinent SEMSS information. Industry was encouraged to ask questions about the SEMSS requirements and the procurement process. The recommendations and comments received in response to these communications with industry were carefully evaluated and incorporated in the final RFP, as appropriate. A Government response to each recommendation or comment was prepared and was made available electronically to the public.

All documents pertinent to the acquisition were posted electronically on the NASA Acquisition Internet Service (NAIS) Business Opportunities portal (http://prod.nais.nasa.gov/cgi-bin/nais/link_syp.cgi) as well as the Federal Business Opportunities web portal (<https://www.fbo.gov>). The pre-solicitation conference was held on January 21, 2010. The first draft RFP was released on February 11, 2010. The second draft RFP was released on July 23, 2010. The final RFP was released on November 19, 2010. Three (3) Amendments were posted to NAIS and FBO. Amendment 1 was posted on November 23, 2010, and it contained questions and answers regarding the RFP. Amendment 2 was posted on December 1, 2010, and it contained revised solicitation clauses as well as questions and answers regarding the RFP. Amendment 3 was posted on December 13, 2010, and it contained questions and answers regarding the RFP. Proposals in response to the final RFP were due on December 20, 2010.

Five proposals were received in response to the RFP by the specified closing time and date. The Offerors' names and addresses (listed alphabetically) are as follows:

Earth Resources Technology, Inc. (ERT)
6100 Frost Place, Suite A
Laurel, MD 20707

InoMedic, Inc. (InoMedic)
2 Eaton Street, Suite 908
Hampton, VA 23669

Integrated Science Solutions, Inc. (ISSi)
1777 North California Boulevard, Suite 305
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Pacific Western Technologies, Ltd. (PWT)
11049 West 44th Avenue, Suite 200
Wheat Ridge, CO 80033

PAI Corporation (PAI)
116 Milan Way
Oak Ridge, TN 37830

Evaluation Process

After receipt of proposals, the SEB members individually reviewed each proposal and met to discuss individual findings. Following review of each of the Mission Suitability proposals, the SEB identified strengths and weaknesses for each proposal. In the Mission Suitability Factor, the identified strengths and weaknesses were categorized as a "Significant Strength" or "Significant Weakness" or, if not significant, as a "Strength" or a "Weakness." Following NFS 1815.305, strength and weakness findings were used to establish adjectival ratings and numerical scores for each Mission Suitability Sub-factor. Then, a numerical score was assigned for the overall Mission Suitability Factor. The SEB did not identify any "Deficiency" findings in any of the Mission Suitability proposals.

The SEB and the Price Analyst reviewed all of the Cost/Price proposals. In accordance with FAR 15.4, the SEB and the Price Analyst evaluated cost realism and price reasonableness for each proposal. Neither a numerical score nor an adjectival rating was assigned for the Cost/Price Factor.

The SEB members evaluated the Past Performance Factor and identified findings based on the Offerors' proposals and the questionnaires completed by past and current customers. In Past Performance, the identified findings were not categorized as strengths or weaknesses. NFS 1815.305 gives discretion to the individual NASA Centers on whether to assign strengths or weaknesses. For purposes of this procurement, NASA ARC decided not to assign strengths or weaknesses in the Past Performance Factor. The SEB's evaluation documented each Offeror's relevant past performance and the currency of the past performance to assess the Offeror's overall confidence rating. The SEB assigned overall confidence ratings to each Offeror based on the provided information.

The SEB first briefed me on its initial findings over two days, August 9th and 11th of 2011, after which I directed the SEB to do further analysis of the proposals. Another briefing session took place on August 29, 2011. I reviewed the findings, and thereafter it was determined that it would be in the best interests of the Government to hold discussions. Accordingly, a competitive range was established on August 29, 2011. The Contracting Officer prepared and finalized a Competitive Range Determination Memorandum on September 19, 2011. The establishment of the competitive range eliminated one Offeror, PAI Corporation, because it did not have a reasonable chance of award, even if discussions were held.

Discussions began with the four Offerors in the competitive range on September 21, 2011 with responses due on October 12, 2011. Discussions were completed on October 26, 2011. Discussions covered all of the Offerors' Significant Weaknesses and Weaknesses in Mission Suitability, as well as Cost/Price issues. On October 28, 2011, the remaining four Offerors were

requested to submit their Final Proposal Revisions (FPR) by November 22, 2011. All four of the Offerors incorporated their discussion responses in their timely Final Proposal Revisions.

All SEB members evaluated each Offeror's FPR and findings were identified for each Factor and Sub-factor, if applicable. In accordance with NFS 1815.370(h)(2), an adjectival rating (e.g. Excellent, Very Good, etc.) and a numerical score were assigned to each Mission Suitability Sub-Factor. A numerical score, but not an adjectival rating, was assigned for the overall Mission Suitability Factor. For the Cost/Price Factor, the SEB and Price Analyst evaluated the cost realism and price reasonableness of the proposal. In accordance with the solicitation, the SEB also determined whether the proposals adequately demonstrated the Offerors' ability to perform the work with the proposed resources. Neither a numerical score nor an adjectival rating was assigned for the Cost/Price Factor. For the Past Performance Factor, there were no changes to the original proposals or the evaluation.

The briefing of the final findings to me took place on February 29, 2012, after which I directed the SEB to do further analysis of the proposals. The final briefing to me took place on March 12, 2012. At the conclusion of the presentation of its final findings, I directed the SEB to conduct clarifications with two of the Offerors regarding their FPRs. Clarification questions were sent to the two Offerors on March 15, 2012 with responses due on March 21, 2012. These clarifications constituted a limited exchange to resolve and to explain minor proposal errors and, in turn, the Offerors were not afforded an opportunity to revise or modify their proposals. All SEB members reviewed the clarification responses, and then reported its conclusions to me on April 2, 2012. On April 19, upon further review of the final findings as well as the Offerors' FPRs, I met with the SEB for the final time to discuss its conclusive analysis of all the provided information.

I reviewed the SEB's findings, adjectival ratings and numerical scores for Mission Suitability. I read all of the FPRs in their entirety. I reviewed the Cost/Price evaluation results, including the proposed costs and the cost realism and price reasonableness. I reviewed the findings and level of confidence ratings for Past Performance. I fully considered all of this information prior to making my final selection decision.

Evaluation Findings of the SEB

Mission Suitability Factor

The following addresses the Mission Suitability findings for the four Offerors in the competitive range. There were no Deficiencies, Significant Weaknesses, or Weaknesses identified in any of the proposals.

ERT

The ERT Mission Suitability proposal received 845 points (out of a possible 1000 points)—the highest score among all Offerors in the competitive range.

In the Technical Approach Sub-factor, ERT received an adjectival rating of Very Good with a numerical score of 234 points (out of a possible 275 points). One (1) Significant Strength and two (2) Strengths were identified. The Significant Strength was assigned for the Offeror's innovative and synergistic functional delivery approach to the technical requirements, which demonstrated an exceptionally thorough understanding of all of the Statement of Work (SOW) elements and their interrelationships, and thus would bring integration and efficiencies to the contract. The two Strengths were assigned for: (1) the Offeror's proposed innovative and synergistic approach regarding preventative medicine, health education, and fitness activities; and (2) its response to Case Study A, which showed a clear understanding of the technical requirements, the ability to perform work in a reasonable and effective manner, and the ability to comply with applicable regulations.

In the Management Approach Sub-factor, ERT received an adjectival rating of Excellent with a numerical score of 261 points (out of a possible 275 points). One (1) Significant Strength and three (3) Strengths were identified. The Significant Strength was assigned for the Offeror's highly effective and innovative management approach that demonstrated all technical areas would be performed in an integrated, coherent, and efficient manner, and thus would provide great flexibility, collaborative communication, and staff coverage across multiple technical areas. The three Strengths were assigned for: (1) its Quality Assurance Plan, which would achieve high quality deliverables with efficiency and economy; (2) its effective and appropriate response to Case Study B; and (3) its Total Compensation Plan, which would provide an effective and reasonable approach to recruiting and retaining staff.

In the Contract Task Order Plan Sub-factor, ERT received an adjectival rating of Very Good with a numerical score of 280 points (out of a possible 350 points). One (1) Significant Strength and two (2) Strengths were identified. The Significant Strength was assigned for the Offeror's highly effective approach to the management of the Health Unit under Task Order 5, which would optimize customer service. The two Strengths were assigned for: (1) its effective and proactive approach to the Phase-in task; and (2) its effective and efficient approach to Task Order 4.

In the Safety and Health Plan Sub-factor, ERT received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 70 points (out of a possible 100 points). One (1) Strength was identified. The Strength was assigned for the Offeror's Safety and Health Plan, which detailed an effective and comprehensive approach that exceeded the minimum requirements of the RFP.

InoMedic

The InoMedic Mission Suitability proposal received 645 points (out of a possible 1000 points)—the lowest score among all Offerors in the competitive range.

In the Technical Approach Sub-factor, InoMedic received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 165 points (out of a possible 275 points). Two (2) Strengths were identified. The Strengths were assigned for: (1) the Offeror's integrative technical approach to solving

complex health hazard issues; and (2) its response to Case Study A, which showed comprehensive regulatory compliance and a thorough understanding of the technical requirements of radiation safety and waste management.

In the Management Approach Sub-factor, InoMedic received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 165 points (out of a possible 275 points). One (1) Strength was identified. The Strength was assigned for the Offeror's Total Compensation Plan, which provides an effective and reasonable approach to recruiting and retaining staff.

In the Contract Task Order Plan Sub-factor, InoMedic received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 245 points (out of a possible 350 points). Two (2) Strengths were identified. The Strengths were assigned for: (1) the Offeror's efficient and effective approach to Task Order 4; and (2) its creative approach to Task Order 5 (Health Unit) and Task Order 6 (Fitness Center).

In the Safety and Health Plan Sub-factor, InoMedic received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 70 points (out of a possible 100 points). One (1) Strength was identified. The Strength was assigned for the Offeror's approach to monitoring compliance with safety and health requirements, which would ensure accountability for conducting tasks in a safe and healthful manner.

ISSi

The ISSi Mission Suitability proposal received 666 points (out of a possible 1000 points)—the second lowest score among all Offerors in the competitive range.

In the Technical Approach Sub-factor, ISSi received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 193 points (out of a possible 275 points). Three (3) Strengths were identified. The Strengths were assigned for: (1) the Offeror's integrative approach to the Safety, Environmental, and Medical technical requirements of the SOW; (2) its effective and innovative approach to the Emergency Response requirements of the SOW; and (3) its effective and reasonable methods for developing and infusing best practices and industry standards for all of the areas identified in the SOW.

In the Management Approach Sub-factor, ISSi received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 193 points (out of a possible 275 points). Four (4) Strengths were identified. The Strengths were assigned for: (1) the Offeror's inclusion of a highly qualified and effective key person with relevant experience; (2) its response to Case Study B, which proposed a multitude of effective and appropriate mitigations to potential hazards and risks; (3) its reasonable and effective approach to staffing as well as its access to additional facilities and equipment; and (4) its effective Total Compensation Plan, which provides an effective and reasonable approach to recruiting and retaining staff.

In the Contract Task Order Plan Sub-factor, ISSi received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 210 points (out of a possible 350 points). One (1) Strength was identified. The Strength was assigned for the Offeror's innovative, proactive, and integrative approach to addressing contract task orders.

In the Safety and Health Plan Sub-factor, ISSi received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 70 points (out of a possible 100 points). One (1) Strength was identified. The Strength was assigned for the Offeror's effective and comprehensive approach that would encourage employees under the contract to work safely.

PWT

The PWT Mission Suitability proposal received 724 points (out of a possible 1000 points)—the second highest score among all Offerors in the competitive range.

In the Technical Approach Sub-factor, PWT received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 165 points (out of a possible 275 points). One (1) Strength was identified. The Strength was assigned for the Offeror's innovative and effective method for continuous improvement regarding the Health Unit.

In the Management Approach Sub-factor, PWT received an adjectival rating of Very Good with a numerical score of 234 points (out of a possible 275 points). One (1) Significant Strength and two (2) Strengths were identified. The Significant Strength was assigned for the Offeror's integrative management approach, which would provide contract transparency, an innovative approach for quality communication, and effective management in an integrated and coherent manner. The Strengths were assigned for: (1) the Offeror's reasonable and realistic response to Case Study B; and (2) its effective Total Compensation Plan, which provides an effective and reasonable approach to recruiting and retaining staff.

In the Contract Task Order Plan Sub-factor, PWT received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 245 points (out of a possible 350 points). Two (2) Strengths were identified. The Strengths were assigned for: (1) the Offeror's proactive and efficient approach to the Phase-in task requirements; and (2) its thorough approach to identifying and implementing efficiencies and process improvements across seven of the ten firm fixed price task orders.

In the Safety and Health Plan Sub-factor, PWT received an adjectival rating of Very Good with a numerical score of 80 points (out of a possible 100 points). One (1) Significant Strength was identified. The Significant Strength was assigned for the Offeror's highly effective and comprehensive approach, which would encourage employees to work safely and to reduce workplace accidents.

Cost/Price Factor

The SEB evaluated each Offeror's Cost/Price proposal, including all required Cost/Price Templates. This included verifying the following for each Offeror: (1) compliance with the RFP requirements, (2) evaluating the reasonableness of the proposed rates, fringe benefits, overhead, G&A rates, and profit; and (3) ascertaining that proposed labor rates are reasonable for the labor market in which the contract will be performed. The cost elements were analyzed, including subcontractors' costs, proposed labor rates and skill mix, indirect rates, and applicable fees. Each Offeror's Cost/Price proposal was deemed to be reasonable and realistic, and no cost adjustments were made by the SEB for any of the Offerors.

ERT had the highest total proposed Cost/Price.

InoMedic had the lowest total proposed Cost/Price.

ISSi had the second lowest total proposed Cost/Price.

PWT had the second highest total proposed Cost/Price.

Past Performance Factor

The following addresses the Past Performance findings for the four Offerors. In accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(2)(A), strengths or weaknesses were not assigned.

ERT

The evaluation of ERT's Past Performance resulted in a High Level of Confidence. The Offeror and its major subcontractors demonstrated very effective past technical performance, contract management, and corporate responsiveness on relevant contracts of comparable scope, which was reflected in high award fee scores, team and individual awards from multiple Government agencies, and the provision of best value to the Government customers with performance innovations and efficiencies.

InoMedic

The evaluation of InoMedic's Past Performance resulted in a High Level of Confidence. The Offeror and its major subcontractor demonstrated very effective past technical performance, contract management, and corporate responsiveness on relevant contracts of comparable scope, as evidenced by high award fee scores and individual and team awards at NASA.

ISSi

The evaluation of ISSi's Past Performance resulted in a High Level of Confidence. The Offeror and its major subcontractors demonstrated very effective past technical performance, contract

management, and corporate responsiveness on relevant contracts of comparable scope, which was reflected in high award fee scores, cost-saving innovations, and performance awards and commendations across multiple Government agencies.

PWT

The evaluation of PWT's Past Performance resulted in a High Level of Confidence. The Offeror and its major subcontractor demonstrated very effective past technical performance, contract management, and corporate responsiveness on relevant contracts of comparable scope, which was reflected in high award fee scores, individual and team awards across multiple Government agencies, and high levels of technical expertise with minimal personnel turnover.

SELECTION DECISION OF THE SOURCE SELECTION AUTHORITY FOR SAFETY, ENVIRONMENTAL, AND MEDICAL SUPPORT SERVICES

FAR 15.308, "Source Selection Decision," states: "The source selection authority's (SSA) decision shall be based on a comparative assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria in the solicitation. While the SSA may use reports and analyses prepared by others, the source selection decision shall represent the SSA's independent judgment. The source selection decision shall be documented, and the documentation shall include the rationale for any business judgments and tradeoffs made or relied on by the SSA, including benefits associated with additional costs. Although the rationale for the selection decision must be documented, that documentation need not quantify the tradeoffs that led to the decision."

My selection decision represents my independent judgment. I carefully reviewed all of the SEB's findings as well as read all of the Offerors' FPRs to ensure a full understanding thereof. I did not simply count and compare the numbers of Significant Strengths and Strengths; rather, I considered the potential impact of Significant Strengths and Strengths and their relevance to this proposed effort, against the selection criteria prescribed in the RFP.

Assessment of the SEB's findings

I carefully studied all of the findings of the SEB, and I concur with all of them. I am fully satisfied that the SEB conducted a thorough and cogent analysis of each of the proposals submitted and that their findings are appropriate and reasonable. As the SSA, I hereby adopt all of the findings of the SEB.

Selection

To reiterate, Mission Suitability is somewhat more important than Cost/Price. Cost/Price is significantly more important than Past Performance. Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, are somewhat more important than Cost/Price.

First, I find no discriminator amongst the four Offerors in Past Performance. ERT, InoMedic, ISSi, and PWT each properly received the same level of confidence rating of High.

Therefore, my selection decision must be, and is, based on a tradeoff between the two remaining, and most important, Factors: Mission Suitability and Cost/Price. As referenced above, of these two remaining Factors, Mission Suitability must be given somewhat more weight. For this reason, the structure of my selection analysis below revolves on Mission Suitability.

InoMedic had the least impressive Mission Suitability proposal, as reflected in its score of 645 points. It simply met the RFP requirements in many areas of the SOW, and none of its six (6) Mission Suitability Strengths identified above rose to the level of "Significant". In my judgment, its proposed lowest Cost/Price, although notable, does not offset this lack of distinction or Significant merit in Mission Suitability, the most important evaluation Factor. Therefore, I do not select InoMedic for award.

The Mission Suitability proposal of ISSi properly earned a score of 666 points—the second lowest of the four Offerors. Like InoMedic, ISSi simply met the RFP requirements in many areas of the SOW. ISSi received nine (9) Strengths, identified above, but, like InoMedic, none of those Strengths rose to the level of "Significant". Therefore, in my judgment, and similar to my thinking and decision regarding InoMedic, the second lowest Cost/Price proposed by ISSi does not offset its lack of distinction or Significant merit in Mission Suitability. Therefore, I do not select ISSi for award.

PWT had a strong Mission Suitability proposal, and received the second highest Mission Suitability score of 724 points. Of its seven (7) Mission Suitability Strengths, two were "Significant".

The first of these two (2) Significant Strengths is in the Sub-factor with the lowest weight, Safety and Health Plan, for its highly effective and comprehensive approach, which would encourage employees to work safely and reduce workplace accidents.

Its second Significant Strength is in the Management Approach Sub-factor, for its integrative management approach, which would provide contract transparency, an innovative approach for quality communication, and effective management in an integrated and coherent manner. This Significant Strength, and the overall "Very Good" approach to contract management proposed by PWT, was the highlight of its strong Mission Suitability proposal.

Regarding the remaining two Sub-factors: In the Technical Approach Sub-factor, PWT received one (1) Strength relating to continuous improvement for the Health Unit, but it only met the remaining technical requirements of the SOW for this Sub-factor. In the Sub-factor with the highest weight, Contract Task Order Plan, PWT received two (2) Strengths relating to, respectively, Phase-In, and its implementation of efficiencies and process improvements.

However, although these Strengths are worthy, the overall Contract Task Order Plan proposed by PWT was not sufficiently distinctive to garner any Significant Strengths.

PWT proposed the second highest Cost/Price.

ERT had the strongest Mission Suitability proposal, and received the highest Mission Suitability score of 845 points. Of its eleven (11) Mission Suitability Strengths, three were "Significant".

While the number of Significant Strengths is reflective of the merits of the ERT Mission Suitability proposal, I consider it even more important that these three Significant Strengths exist in the three most heavily weighted Mission Suitability Sub-factors — Contract Task Order Plan, Technical Approach, and Management Approach. ERT is the only Offeror to receive Significant Strengths in all three Sub-factors, and ERT earned the highest scores in each of those three Sub-factors. Most important of all, in my judgment, is the content of those three Significant Strengths, each of which reflect distinctively innovative and effective approaches to contract performance. I primarily base my selection decision on the markedly stronger approaches proposed by ERT in these three most heavily weighted Mission Suitability Sub-factors.

The first Significant Strength earned by ERT is in the Technical Approach Sub-factor, for its innovative and synergistic functional delivery approach to the technical requirements, which demonstrated an exceptionally thorough understanding of all of the SOW elements and their interrelationships, and thus would bring integration and efficiencies to the contract. This Significant Strength, joined by two (2) other Strengths, earned ERT an adjectival rating of Very Good in this Sub-factor – the highest of all Offerors. In contrast, none of the other Offerors earned a Significant Strength in Technical Approach, and all received lower scores and lower adjectival ratings in this Sub-factor. In my judgment, the innovation, synergy, and functionality of the proposed Technical Approaches of ERT across the technical requirements of this SOW provide a clear and compelling distinction between it and the other Offerors. None of the Strengths earned by the other Offerors reflected, or coalesced into, an equally integrative, or valuable, Technical Approach. The integrative Technical Approach of ERT is distinct, will add greater value to the contract, and will create superior opportunities for greater contract efficiencies and economies.

The second Significant Strength earned by ERT is in Management Approach, for its highly effective and innovative management approach that demonstrates that all technical areas of the SOW would be performed in an integrated, coherent, and efficient manner, and thus would provide great flexibility, collaborative communication, and staff coverage across multiple technical areas. This Significant Strength, joined by three (3) other Strengths, earned ERT an adjectival rating of Excellent in this Sub-factor – the only Offeror to do so.

In my judgment, this Significant Strength earned by ERT in Management Approach is highly innovative and reflects true Excellence. The RFP challenged Offerors to propose efficiencies that may result from integration, as well as to staff the contract efficiently in order to address

possible budget fluctuations and short notice changes in requirements. My own study of the proposals confirmed that ERT excelled in meeting this challenge, as reflected, for example, in a Management Approach that creatively integrates and embeds its management team across all of the functional areas of this SOW. In my opinion, this highly innovative and unique Management Approach will help ensure sound communications, enable service efficiencies, reduce costs, and best satisfy the technical and management requirements of the SOW.

It is important to note that, as described above, PWT also received a Significant Strength for its integrative, innovative, and coherent Management Approach and, as I concluded above, this was the highlight of the PWT Mission Suitability proposal. However, this highlight, which earned PWT a Very Good rating in Management Approach, is eclipsed by the Excellence of ERT which, in both the opinion of the SEB and my own independent judgment, provided even greater comprehensive quality and value in this Sub-factor.

The third Significant Strength earned by ERT is in the Contract Task Order Plan Sub-factor, for its highly effective approach to the management of the Health Unit under Task Order 5, which would optimize customer service. This Significant Strength, joined by two (2) other Strengths, earned ERT an adjectival rating of Very Good in this Sub-factor – the highest of all Offerors. This Sub-factor has the highest weight, and only ERT received a Significant Strength in it. I find this Significant Strength particularly compelling because, in my judgment, this Significant Strength – which was earned for its specific proposed strategies and tactics to perform a specific Sample Task – gives practical traction to its other Significant Strengths, for its overall, and superior, Technical and Management Approaches to contract performance. In its approach to the Health Unit Task Order, ERT identified many efficiencies that would provide a highly effective use of staff and greater customer service. In this Sub-factor, the RFP challenged Offerors to complete their own independently-developed determination of necessary labor categories and labor hours to perform task requirements, based on their analyses of the task requirements. ERT met, and exceeded, this challenge, with a Contract Task Order Plan that will create efficiencies and innovations, minimize unnecessary labor efforts, and yield effective performance throughout the life of the contract; it thus stood well above the Plans of the other Offerors.

The RFP stated that “[t]he Offeror's proposal will be evaluated based on the Offeror's ability to fulfill the technical requirements while meeting quality, schedule, and safety requirements and the Offeror's management and business approaches. The compatibility between the proposed technical and management approaches, and the overall resources proposed to accomplish the work will be an important consideration in the evaluation of this factor. In addition, proposal risk will be evaluated with respect to cost, performance, technical approach, and management approach.” ERT satisfies, and singularly exceeds, this prescribed synergy in the RFP amongst technical and management/business approaches, resources, and risk.

As stated above, ERT submitted the superior Mission Suitability proposal – 121 points higher than the next highest Offeror – with the strongest, and most integrated, Approaches in Technical, Management, and Contract Task Order Plan. This, in my opinion, will translate into better risk avoidance and management. In my opinion, the overall approach proposed by ERT

will be more executable in the day-to-day operation of this contract. The entire ERT proposal is highly credible; its Approaches in Technical and Management correlate; its proposal is rooted in the reality of the current market; its proposed Cost/Price directly corresponds to its Significant Strengths and Strengths in Mission Suitability, and supports the likelihood it will obtain, and retain, high quality staff throughout the life of the contract, and provide superior contract performance within budget and with potential future efficiencies.

The other Offerors each propose a lower overall Cost/Price, and the SEB found none of them to be unrealistic or unreasonable. However, in my judgment as SSA, each of these lower Cost/Price proposals carries some level of performance risk, and does not correspond as well to what is promised in Mission Suitability; this generates, in my judgment, potential budget and performance risks. And I have concerns regarding some of the proposed profit rates, which, in my opinion, may not be high enough to serve as a motivator of efficient and effective contract performance.

Mission Suitability is the most important Factor, and ERT submitted the very best Mission Suitability proposal. Past Performance is not a distinguishing factor. The differences amongst the Offerors in Cost/Price are notable but do not, in my judgment, offset the distinct superiority of ERT in Mission Suitability.

I select ERT for contract award.



Charles W. Duff II
Source Selection Authority