Selection Statement
for the
Acquisition and Business Support Services Contract
Request for Proposals (RFP)
(Solicitation Number NNM10305211R)

On February 4, 2011, I, along with other senior officials of NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center (MSFC), met with the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed to evaluate proposals in connection with the Acquisition and Business Support Services (ABSS) procurement.

I. PROCUREMENT HISTORY

The purpose of the ABSS procurement is to obtain a wide range of operational and administrative support for MSFC's Office of the Chief Financial Officer, Office of Procurement, and other Offices and Directorates. The performance work statement (PWS) broadly defines the requirements for providing a variety of acquisition and business support services to assist MSFC, its Michoud Assembly Facility (MAF), the NASA Enterprise Application Competency Center (NEACC), the National Space Science Technology Center (NSSTC) and other MSFC-managed locations as required in fulfilling their missions. Work under this indefinite-delivery/indefinite-quantity (ID/IQ) contract will be authorized and more specifically defined in individual task orders.

The successful contractor will be responsible for providing support in the following functional areas: (1) accounting and resource management, (2) budget integration and analysis, (3) business systems (4) business best practices, (5) administrative services, (6) acquisition policy services, and (7) acquisition management services.

The proposed contract has a base period of performance from April 1, 2011, through March 31, 2012; a first option period from April 1, 2012, to March 31, 2013, a second option period from April 1, 2013, through March 31, 2014, a third option period from April 1, 2014, through March 31, 2015, and a fourth option period from April 1, 2015, through March 31, 2016. The proposed contract will be performed under a firm-fixed-price (FFP) ID/IQ contract with performance being evaluated in accordance with the performance measures in the contract.

The ABSS RFP was released on November 5, 2009. On December 16, 2009, proposals were received from the following 15 companies: Al-Razaq Computing Services; Alutiig 3SG, LLC; Brace Management Group, Inc; C&L Services, LLC (i.e., a joint venture between Corporate Allocation Services, Inc. and L&M Technologies, Inc.); Corporate Resource Solutions, LLC; Defense Acquisition, Inc.; Enterprise Technology Corporation; Far Better Solutions; GAP Solutions Inc.; Gonzales Consulting Services, Inc.; Integration Innovation, Inc.; Intuitive Research and Technology Corporation; Kihomac, Inc.; Skyline Ultd Inc.; and Systems Development Corporation.

II. EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

The proposals were evaluated in accordance with the procedures prescribed by FAR Part 15 and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Part 1815 with an objective of achieving the best value for the government based on careful evaluation of proposals and a tradeoff determination involving weighing the three essentially equal evaluation factors as prescribed in the RFP: Mission Suitability, Price, and Past Performance. Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, were more important than Price.

Under the Mission Suitability factor, proposals were evaluated to ensure the offeror: (1) understood the requirements of the PWS, (2) understood the processes MSFC employs to accomplish acquisition and business tasks, and (3) mitigated the risks inherent in the proposed approach. Each proposal received a mission suitability score based on the following subfactors and associated numerical weights.

Management and Technical Approach	400 points
Staffing and Total Compensation	500 points
Safety, Health, and Environmental	100 points
Total	1000 points

The evaluation of Past Performance included the overall corporate past performance of the offeror and any proposed major subcontractors or team members on efforts comparable in size, content, and complexity to the ABSS contract. The evaluation was based on information provided by the offerors, past performance questionnaires provided by customers of the offerors, and other relevant information reasonably available to the SEB. Emphasis was given to the extent of the direct experience and quality of past performance on previous contracts that were highly relevant to the effort defined in the PWS. Past Performance was assessed using level of confidence ratings: "Very High," "High," "Moderate," "Low," "Very Low," and "Neutral." In accordance with the NFS 1815.305, firms with no relevant past performance received a "Neutral" rating.

Under Price, the offeror's fully-burdened labor rates and burden(s) on other direct costs (ODCs) were assessed for realism and reasonableness. In addition, to the extent an offeror's price or elements of price were determined unrealistic or unreasonable, the SEB determined whether such inconsistencies represented a risk to the performance of the ABSS effort and, with respect to all proposals, reported the price risk level as "Low Risk," "Medium Risk," or "High Risk." In accordance with Section M.4 of the RFP, for purposes of comparing proposals, an evaluated price was also calculated for each proposal using a government-provided ID/IQ evaluated price formula. There were no adjustments to an offeror's proposed fully burdened labor rates.

Using the above-described evaluation procedure, the SEB evaluated all 15 proposals and presented its findings to me on August 25, 2010. As a result, the contracting officer, with my concurrence, determined that the highest rated proposals for the competitive range were submitted by: Al-Razaq Computing Services (Al-Razaq); C&L Services, LLC; Defense

Acquisition, Inc. (DAI); GAP Solutions, Inc. (GAPSI); Gonzales Consulting Services, Inc. (GCS); Integration Innovation, Inc. (i3); and Kihomac, Inc.

Discussions were held with the seven offerors in the competitive range beginning on August 25, 2010. On October 7, 2010, discussions were closed and final proposal revisions (FPRs) were requested. FPRs were received on October 15, 2010.

On November 29, 2010, discussions with these seven offerors were re-opened to address additional concerns. On January 14, 2011, discussions were closed for the second time and a second set of FPRs were requested. Final FPRs were received on January 20, 2011. The evaluation of the FPRs is summarized below.

Al-Razaq

Under the Mission Suitability factor, the proposal from Al-Razaq received a score of 867. Across the three subfactors, the proposal received four significant strengths, eleven strengths, no significant weakness, and no weaknesses.

Under the management and technical approach subfactor, the proposal from Al-Razaq received an adjectival rating of "very good" and a score of 348. The proposal received one significant strength, four strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strength related to the management approach for accomplishing the PWS. The strengths related to (1) the detailed description of the robust Program Information Management System (PIMS) for reporting on work status, metric productivity, and cost/schedule/technical management information, (2) the implementation of a comprehensive risk management plan, (3) a program manager with full corporate authority commensurate with the performance of the ABSS contract, and (4) the continuous employee training program.

Under the staffing and total compensation subfactor, the proposal from Al-Razaq received an adjectival rating of "very good" and a score of 425. The proposal received one significant strength, seven strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strength related to the acquisition team lead, who has 25 years of experience in acquisition support, including 16 years in management positions. The strengths related to (1) the program manager who has 27 years experience in both business and acquisition support, (2) the proposed retention of the current workforce, (3) the comprehensive medical (including dental) and vision benefits package offered to employees at no cost to the employee (but with additional costs for families), (4) the deputy program manager/business team lead, who has 13 years of management experience in business support services, (5) the vacation accrual rate, (6) the 401(k) retirement plan offered to employees, and (7) the performance awards/bonus program.

Under the safety, health, and environmental subfactor, the proposal from Al-Razaq received an adjectival rating of "excellent" and a score of 94. The proposal received two significant strengths, no strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strengths related to (1) the Safety, Health, and Environmental (SHE) plan and (2) the risks in the risk analysis and mitigation plan, which are inherent to implementing the Safety, Health, and Environmental (SHE) program at the Marshall Space Flight Center (MSFC).

Under the Price factor, the proposal from Al-Razaq had an evaluated price of $56.082 million and was assessed as having a "low" price risk.

Under the Past Performance factor, the proposal from Al-Razaq received a "high" level of confidence. The proposal received one significant strength, three strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strength related to receiving an excellent customer rating for past performance on the highly relevant Financial Management Services contract with the NASA Johnson Space Center. The strengths related to (1) the demonstrated relevant past performance on the Financial Support Services Contract with the NASA Ames Research Center, (2) the three-year lost time case (LTC) rate, and (3) the three-year total recordable injury rate (TRIR).

C&L Services

Under the Mission Suitability factor, the proposal from C&L Services received a score of 919. Across the three subfactors, the proposal received seven significant strengths, eight strengths, no significant weakness, and no weaknesses.

Under the management and technical approach subfactor, the proposal from C&L Services received an adjectival rating of "excellent" and a score of 368. The proposal received one significant strength, six strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strength related to the in-depth explanation of its management and technical approach for accomplishing performance work statement requirements. The strengths related to (1) the program management web portal business system, (2) the detailed ID/IQ workflow process, (3) registration in accordance with International Standards Organization (ISO) 9001:2008, (4) the risk analysis and mitigation plan, which is thorough, comprehensive, and includes a continuous risk management model that consists of identifying, analyzing, planning, tracking, controlling, and communicating risk factors, as well as a detailed approach for mitigating the performance risks of this contract, (5) a program manager with full corporate authority commensurate with the performance of the ABSS contract, and (6) the employee training program.

Under the staffing and total compensation subfactor, the proposal from C&L Services received an adjectival rating of "excellent" and a score of 455. The proposal received four significant strength, two strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strengths related to (1) the program manager (PM), who has 26 years experience in government financial management and acquisition, including 17 years of management experience, (2) a comprehensive medical, vision, and dental benefits package and a disability benefits package that will be provided to employees and families at no cost, (3) a paid time off (sick and vacation) carryover policy, and (4) a 401(k) retirement plan. The strengths related to (1) the proposed retention of the current workforce and (2) the paid time off accrual rate.

Under the safety, health, and environmental subfactor, the proposal from C&L Services received an adjectival rating of "excellent" and a score of 96. The proposal received two significant strengths, no strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strengths related to (1) the Safety, Health, and Environmental (SHE) plan, and (2) the

risks in the risk analysis and mitigation plan, which are inherent to implementing the Safety, Health, and Environmental (SHE) program at the Marshall Space Flight Center (MSFC).

Under the Price factor, the proposal from C&L Services had an evaluated price of $57.250 million and was assessed as having a "low" price risk.

Under the Past Performance factor, the proposal from C&L Services received a "moderate" level of confidence. The proposal received no significant strengths, four strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The strengths related to (1) the demonstrated relevant past performance on the contract for business resources and support services with the U.S. Air Force Research Laboratory, (2) the demonstrated relevant past performance on the Facilities Support Services contract with the United Space Alliance, (3) the receipt of OSHA's Voluntary Protection Program (VPP) Star for safety performance and the Contractor Safety Forum Excellence Award (STELLAR) at the Johnson Space Center, and (4) the three-year lost time case (LTC) rate.

DAI

Under the Mission Suitability factor, the proposal from DAI received a score of 909. Across the three subfactors, the proposal received seven significant strengths, ten strengths, no significant weakness, and no weaknesses.

Under the management and technical approach subfactor, the proposal from DAI received an adjectival rating of "very good" and a score of 352. The proposal received one significant strength, four strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strength related to (1) the technical and management approach for fulfilling the requirements of the PWS. The relevant strengths related to (1) the efficient and streamlined organizational structure, (2) the Task Order Management System (TOMS), which automates the task order process and procedures into a logical progression of steps, (3) a program manager with full corporate authority commensurate with the performance of the ABSS contract, and (4) the employee training program.

Under the staffing and total compensation subfactor, the proposal from DAI received an adjectival rating of "excellent" and a score of 475. The proposal received five significant strengths, six strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strengths related to (1) the program manager, who has 30 years of experience, including 7 years of experience as the program manager on a relevant contract, (2) the comprehensive medical (including dental) and vision benefits package offered to employees and families at no cost to the employee, (3) the business team lead, who has 17 years of experience in business support services, including serving as a business team lead (3 years) on a relevant contract, (4) the business manager, who has 9 years of relevant experience in business support services, including serving as a business manager for 1 year on a relevant contract, and (5) the 401(k) retirement plan offered to employees. The strengths related to (1) the proposed retention of the current workforce, (2) the vacation accrual rate, (3) the leave carryover policy (vacation and sick leave), (4) tuition assistance for employees, (5) the performance bonus program, and (6) the incumbent sick leave portability policy.

Under the safety, health, and environmental subfactor, the proposal from DAI received an adjectival rating of "very good" and a score of 82. The proposal received one significant strength, no strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strength related to the Safety, Health, and Environmental (SHE) plan.

Under the Price factor, the proposal from DAI had an evaluated price of $67.842 million and was assessed as having a "low" price risk.

Under the Past Performance factor, the proposal from DAI received a "moderate" level of confidence. The proposal received no significant strengths, four strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The strengths related to (1) the demonstrated relevant past performance as a subcontractor on the Labor Technical Allocation Plan to support Ground-Based Midcourse Defense contract with the Missile Defense Agency, (2) the demonstrated relevant past performance as a subcontractor on the Acquisition Management Support contract with the Missile Defense Agency, Department of Army, (3) the three-year lost time case (LTC) rate, and (3) the three- year total recordable injury rate (TRIR)

GAPSI

Under the Mission Suitability factor, the proposal from GAPSI received a score of 782. Across the three subfactors, the proposal received three significant strengths, ten strengths, no significant weakness, and no weaknesses.

Under the management and technical approach subfactor, the proposal from GAPSI received an adjectival rating of "very good" and a score of 340. The proposal received one significant strength, three strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strength related to the comprehensive program management life model involving planning, scheduling, processing, controlling, and completing the effort. The strengths related to (1) the use of a corporate quality inspector who will administer performance evaluation surveys and produce reports, maintain master quality control documents and make revisions as needed, and perform weekly quality control checks, (2) the use of a management oversight tool, and (3) a program manager with full corporate authority commensurate with the performance of the ABSS contract.

Under the staffing and total compensation subfactor, the proposal from GAPSI received an adjectival rating of "good" and a score of 350. The proposal received no significant strengths, seven strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The strengths related to (1) the program manager who has 30 years of program/project management experience, including 7 years of experience serving in relevant management positions, (2) the proposed retention of the current workforce, (3) the comprehensive medical, vision, and dental benefits at minimal cost to the employee for both employee and family coverage, (4) the business team lead, who has 20 years experience in government-related business support services, (5) the acquisition team lead, who has 7 years of relevant acquisition services support experience, including 8 years of supervisory experience, (6) the leave accrual rates, and (7) tuition assistance.

Under the safety, health, and environmental subfactor, the proposal from GAPSI received an adjectival rating of "excellent" and a score of 92. The proposal received two significant strengths, no strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strengths related to (1) the Safety, Health, and Environmental (SHE) plan and (2) the risks in the risk analysis and mitigation plan, which are inherent to implementing the Safety, Health, and Environmental (SHE) program at the Marshall Space Flight Center (MSFC).

Under the Price factor, the proposal from GAPSI had an evaluated price of $56.405 million and was assessed as having a "low" price risk.

Under the Past Performance factor, the proposal from GAPSI received a "moderate" level of confidence. The proposal received no significant strengths, five strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The strengths related to (1) the demonstrated relevant past performance on the Administrative and Technical Support Services contract with the Department of Health and Human Services, (2) the demonstrated relevant past performance on the Training Support Services contract with the Department of State Foreign Service Institute, (3) a subcontractor's demonstrated relevant past performance on the G-3 (Operations) Functional, Program Management, Plans, and Integration Support contract with the Aviation and Missile Command (AMCOM), (4) the three-year lost time case (LTC) rate, and (5) the three-year total recordable injury rates (TRIR).

GCS

Under the Mission Suitability factor, the proposal from GCS received a score of 766. Across the three subfactors, the proposal received three significant strengths, seven strengths, no significant weakness, and no weaknesses.

Under the management and technical approach subfactor, the proposal from GCS received an adjectival rating of "good" and a score of 280. The proposal received no significant strengths, four strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The strengths related to (1) the quality assurance methodology, (2) the use of Deltek Costpoint software to collect, monitor, track, and report on various metrics, (3) the detailed approach to assessing contract performance risks, and (4) the proposed price deductions for contract performance evaluated to be less than excellent.

Under the staffing and total compensation subfactor, the proposal from GCS received an adjectival rating of "very good" and a score of 405. The proposal received two significant strengths, three strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strengths related to (1) the leave accrual rate and (2) the 401(k) retirement plan. The strengths related to (1) the proposed retention of the current workforce, (2) the comprehensive medical, vision, dental, life, accident, short- and long-term disability benefits package provided to employees at no cost to the employee, and (3) the performance awards/bonus program.

Under the safety, health, and environmental subfactor, the proposal from GCS received an adjectival rating of "very good" and a score of 81. The proposal received one significant

strength, no strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strength related to the Safety, Health, and Environmental (SHE) plan.

Under the Price factor, the proposal from GCS had an evaluated price of $60.179 million and was assessed as having a "low" price risk.

Under the Past Performance factor, the proposal from GCS received a "moderate" level of confidence. The proposal received no significant strengths, four strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The strengths related to (1) demonstrated relevant past performance on the National Business Center contract with Department of Interior (DOI), (2) the demonstrated relevant past performance on the Continental United States National Guards Units contract with the National Guard Bureau, (3) the two-year and three-year lost time case (LTC) rates, and (4) the three-year total recordable injury rate (TRIR).

i3

Under the Mission Suitability factor, the proposal from i3 received a score of 912. Across the three subfactors, the proposal received six significant strengths, twelve strengths, no significant weakness, and no weaknesses.

Under the management and technical approach subfactor, the proposal from i3 received an adjectival rating of "very good" and a score of 356. The proposal received one significant strength, four strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strength related to the management and technical approach for fulfilling the requirements of the PWS. The strengths related to (1) the streamlined organizational structure, (2) the task order management approach, (3) a program manager with full corporate authority commensurate with the performance of the ABSS contract, and (4) the employee training program.

Under the staffing and total compensation subfactor, the proposal from i3 received an adjectival rating of "excellent" and a score of 470. The proposal received four significant strengths, seven strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strengths related to (1) the program manager, who has 13 years experience as a program manager on a relevant contract, (2) the business team lead, who has 12 years experience in business support services, including 6 years serving in a supervisory capacity, (3) the acquisition team lead, who has 14 years experience in acquisition support, including relevant experience serving as an acquisition team lead, and (4) the 401(k) retirement plan. The strengths related to (1) the proposed retention of the incumbent workforce, (2) the comprehensive medical, vision, and dental benefits package provided to employees (and families) at minimal cost to the employee and life, accident, and short- and long-term disability insurance provided at no cost to the employee, (3) the vacation accrual rate, (4) the vacation carryover policy, (5) the educational and professional organization membership fee reimbursement benefits, (6) the performance awards/bonus program, and (7) the incumbent sick leave portability policy.

Under the safety, health, and environmental subfactor, the proposal from i3 received an adjectival rating of "very good" and a score of 86. The proposal received one significant strength, one strength, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strength

related to the identification of substantive risks in the risk analysis and mitigation plan, which are inherent to implementing its Safety, Health, and Environmental (SHE) program at the Marshall Space Flight Center (MSFC). The strength related to the SHE plan.

Under the Price factor, the proposal from i3 had an evaluated price of $66.356 million and was assessed as having a "low" price risk.

Under the Past Performance factor, the proposal from i3 received a "high" level of confidence. The proposal received one significant strength, two strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strength related to a major subcontractor receiving an excellent customer rating for past performance on the highly relevant Acquisition and Business Support Services contract with MSFC. The strengths related to (1) the three-year lost time case (LTC) rate and (2) the two-year total recordable injury rate (TRIR).

Kihomac

Under the Mission Suitability factor, the proposal from Kihomac received a score of 816. Across the three subfactors, the proposal received four significant strengths, ten strengths, no significant weakness, and no weaknesses.

Under the management and technical approach subfactor, the proposal from Kihomac received an adjectival rating of "good" and a score of 280. The proposal received no significant strengths, four strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The strengths related to (1) the use of various automated tools to fulfill the requirements of the PWS, (2) a program manager with full corporate authority commensurate with the performance of the ABSS contract, (3) the employee training program, and (4) the proposed price deductions for contract performance evaluated to be less than excellent.

Under the staffing and total compensation subfactor, the proposal from Kihomac received an adjectival rating of "excellent" and a score of 455. The proposal received three significant strengths, six strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strengths related to (1) the business team lead, who has 17 years of experience in business support services, including serving as a business team lead (3 years) on a relevant contract, (2) the acquisition team lead, who has 14 years experience in acquisition support, including relevant experience serving as an acquisition team lead, and (3) the 401(k) retirement plan for incumbent employees. The strengths are related to (1) the program manager who has 35 years experience in acquisition support, including 8 years management experience, (2) the proposed retention of the current incumbent workforce, (3) the comprehensive medical, vision, and dental benefits package provided to the employees (and families) at minimal cost to the employee and life, accident, and short- and long-term disability insurance that is provided at no cost to the employee, (4) the vacation accrual rate, (5) the educational and professional organization membership fee reimbursement benefits, and (6) the incumbent sick leave portability policy.

Under the safety, health, and environmental subfactor, the proposal from Kihomac received an adjectival rating of "very good" and a score of 81. The proposal received one

significant strength, no strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strength related to the the Safety, Health, and Environmental (SHE) plan.

Under the Price factor, the proposal from Kihomac had an evaluated price of $60.460 million and was assessed as having a "low" price risk.

Under the Past Performance factor, the proposal from Kihomac received a "neutral" rating. The proposal received no significant strengths, one strength, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The strength related to the three-year total recordable injury rate (TRIR).

III. SELECTION DECISION

During the presentation, I carefully considered the detailed findings of the SEB and the Board's responses to my questions about those findings. I solicited and considered the views of key senior personnel at MSFC who attended the SEB presentation. These key senior personnel have responsibility related to this procurement and understood the application of the evaluation factors set forth in the RFP.

I determined that the SEB conducted a thorough and accurate review of the proposals, identifying significant findings, explaining how it believed the findings would affect performance, and evaluating the proposals according to the evaluation factors in the RFP. Although I agreed with findings the SEB made, I also recognized it was my responsibility as the Source Selection Authority (SSA) to examine the findings for each proposal and use my independent judgment to determine the appropriate discriminators for purposes of selection.

After carefully considering the detailed findings of the SEB, I determined that the Mission Suitability adjectival ratings and scores were supported by the respective findings and accurately reflected the relative standing of the proposals under the Mission Suitability factor. I also determined that the Past Performance confidence ratings were supported by the respective findings and accurately reflected the relative standing of the proposals under the Past Performance factor. Furthermore, I determined that the assessment of "low risk" was properly assigned to the evaluated prices of all seven offerors in the competitive range under the Price factor. As a result of these determinations, I concluded that the proposals from Al-Razaq and from C&L Services were the highest rated proposals in the competitive range based on the following comparisons.

Comparing the proposal from Al-Razaq with the proposal from DAI, while the proposal from DAI had a slight advantage (i.e., 42 points) under the Mission Suitability factor, the proposal from Al-Razaq had a significant advantage (i.e., $11.400M) under the Price factor and a higher adjectival rating under the Past Performance factor. Comparing the individual findings related to Mission Suitability and Past Performance (i.e., the non-price factors) summarized above and considering the difference in price, I determined the proposal from Al-Razaq was the best value between these two proposals. Comparing the proposal from C&L Services with the proposal from DAI, while both proposals had similar ratings under the Past Performance factor and similar scores (i.e., within 10 points) under the Mission Suitability factor, the proposal from

C&L Services had a significant advantage (i.e., $10.232M) under the Price factor. Thus, given the advantage under the Price factor, I determined the proposal from C&L Services was the best value between these two proposals.

Comparing the proposal from Al-Razaq with the proposal from GCS, the proposal from Al-Razaq had a significant advantage (i.e., 101 points) under the Mission Suitability factor, an advantage (i.e., $4.097M) under the Price factor, and a higher adjectival rating under the Past Performance factor. As a result, I determined the proposal from Al-Razaq was the best value between these two proposals. Comparing the proposal from C&L Services with the proposal from GCS, while both proposals had similar ratings under past performance, the proposal from C&L Services had a significant advantage (i.e., 153 points) under the Mission Suitability factor and an advantage (i.e., $2.929M) under the Price factor. As a result, I determined the proposal from C&L Services was the best value between these two proposals.

Comparing the proposal from Al-Razaq with the proposal from Kihomac, the proposal from Al-Razaq had an advantage (i.e., 51 points) under the Mission Suitability factor, an advantage (i.e., $4.378M) under the Price factor, and more of an advantage under the Past Performance factor. As a result, I determined the proposal from Al-Razaq was the best value between these two proposals. Comparing the proposal from C&L Services with the proposal from Kihomac, the proposal from C&L Services had a significant advantage (i.e., 103 points) under the Mission Suitability factor, an advantage (i.e., $3.210M) under the Price factor, and a higher adjectival rating under the Past Performance factor. As a result, I determined the proposal from C&L Services was the best value between these two proposals.

Comparing the proposal from Al-Razaq with the proposal from i3, while both proposals had similar ratings under past performance, the proposal from Al-Razaq had a significant advantage (i.e., $10.274M) under the Price factor that outweighed the slight advantage (i.e., 45 points) under the Mission Suitability factor associated with the proposal from i3. Comparing the two proposals under the Mission Suitability factor, I determined that i3's advantage under the Mission Suitability factor was primarily due to a stronger key personnel team (i.e., the program manager and the business team lead under the proposal from i3 received significant strengths and the program manager and the business team lead under the proposal from Al-Razaq only received strengths) and a better retirement plan (i.e., the retirement plan under the proposal from i3 received a significant strength and the retirement plan under the proposal from Al-Razaq received a strength). In my view, this advantage under mission suitability associated with the proposal from i3 was not worth the significantly higher evaluated price associated with the proposal from i3. Thus, I determined that, between these two proposals, the proposal from Al-Razaq provided the best value. Comparing the proposal from C&L Services with the proposal from i3, while both proposals had similar scores (i.e., within 7 points) under the Mission Suitability factor, the proposal from C&L Services had a significant advantage (i.e., $9.106M) under the Price factor that outweighed the higher adjectival rating under the Past Performance factor associated with the proposal from i3. In my view, considering the supporting significant strengths and strengths, the higher past performance rating was not worth the additional cost. As a result, I determined the proposal from C&L Services was the best value between these two proposals.

Comparing the proposal from Al-Razaq with the proposal from GAPSI, the proposal from Al-Razaq had an advantage (i.e., 85 points) under the Mission Suitability factor, a slight advantage (i.e., $0.323M) under the Price factor, and a higher adjectival rating under the Past Performance factor. As a result, I determined the proposal from Al-Razaq was the best value between these two proposals. Comparing the proposal from C&L Services with the proposal from GAPSI, while both proposals had similar past performance ratings, the proposal from C&L Services had a significant advantage (i.e., 137 points) under the Mission Suitability factor that outweighed the slight advantage (i.e., $0.845M) under the Price factor associated with the proposal from GAPSI. Specifically, with respect to the Mission Suitability factor, the proposal from C&L Services received an "excellent" rating under the staffing and total compensation subfactor (which was the most important subfactor under the Mission Suitability factor) compared to a rating of "good" associated with the proposal from GAPSI. In addition, under the management and technical approach subfactor, the proposal from C&L Services received an "excellent" rating compared to a "very good" rating associated with the proposal from GAPSI. As a result, and in consideration of the detailed findings summarized above, I determined the proposal from C&L Services was the best value between these two proposals.

In light of the above comparisons, I eliminated the proposals from DAI, GCS, Kihomac, i3, and GAPSI from further consideration, and I turned my attention to the proposals of Al-Razaq and C&L Services.

Comparing the proposal from Al-Razaq with the proposal from C&L Services, while the proposal from C&L Services had an advantage (i.e., 52 points) under the Mission Suitability factor, the proposal from Al-Razaq had an advantage (i.e., $1.168M) under the Price factor and was rated "high" under the Past Performance factor, while C&L Services was rated "moderate." I determined that the SEB correctly found that Al- Razaq offered a lower price and a higher Past Performance rating, while C&L scored higher in Mission Suitability. I proceeded with my final best value tradeoff evaluation of these two proposals, weighing the three essentially equal evaluation factors prescribed in the RFP: Mission Suitability, Price, and Past Performance. Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, being more important than Price.

Comparing the two proposals under the Mission Suitability factor, both proposals received similar significant strengths for: the approach for accomplishing the performance work statement; the proposed safety, health, and environmental (SHE) plan; and for the risk analysis and mitigation plan inherent with the implementation of the SHE plan. In addition, both proposals had strong key personnel teams: the proposal from C&L Services received a significant strength for the program manager, and the proposal from Al-Razaq received a significant strength for the acquisition team lead, a top-ranked strength for the program manager, and a strength for the business team lead. With respect to benefits, the proposal from C&L Services received three significant strengths: (1) a comprehensive medical/vision/dental package, (2) a paid time off carryover policy for sickness and vacations, and (3) a 401(k) retirement plan. Overall, the advantage under the Mission Suitability factor was primarily due to a better benefits package under the proposal from C&L Services. While recognizing the proposal from C&L Services provides a better benefits package, the benefit package proposed by Al-Razaq is competitive, as evidenced by strengths for both its medical/vision/dental benefits package and its 401(k) retirement plan.

Comparing the two proposals under the Past Performance factor, the proposal from Al-Razaq received a higher rating than the proposal from C&L Services. I determined that the higher rating was justified and due primarily to a significant strength for having received an "excellent" customer rating pertaining to overall performance on a highly relevant contract. Specifically, I noted that the "excellent" rating for Al-Razaq's past performance was related to a contract that was highly similar to and very closely aligned with the performance work statement under the ABSS contract. This higher rating demonstrates Al-Razaq's ability to assemble a team of qualified personnel in order to provide excellent performance over an extended period of time. In contrast, C&L Services received no significant strengths under the Past Performance factor.

While I am mindful that this is a close competition between Al-Razaq and C&L Services, when I compare the non-price factors (i.e., the Mission Suitability factor and the Past Performance factor), I conclude that the advantage under Past Performance associated with the proposal from Al-Razaq outweighs the advantage of the proposal from C&L Services under Mission Suitability. Therefore, in my judgment, when considering Al-Razaq's advantage regarding the non-price factors, as well as the advantage under the Price factor, the selection of Al-Razaq represents the best value to the Government.

Accordingly, I select Al-Razaq's proposal for award of the Acquisition and Business Support Services contract.

Robin N. Henderson
Source Selection Authority

3/7/11
Date