Source Selection Statement for the
MSFC Information Technology Services (MITS)

RFP NNM09270570R

On November 13, 2009, I along with other senior officials of the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center (MSFC) met with the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed to evaluate the proposal in connection with the MSFC Information Technology Services (MITS) procurement.

I. PROCUREMENT DESCRIPTION

I appointed members of the SEB, which included representation from the IT Security Office, Applications, Web and Multimedia Services Office, and the Systems Engineering and Operation Office of the Office of the Chief Information Officer, Customer Support Office of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer and the Procurement Office. To aid in the evaluation, the SEB appointed technical evaluators with expertise in appropriate disciplines in order to provide assessments of proposal strengths and weaknesses. The SEB utilized this information in conjunction with the predetermined evaluation factors and subfactors in formulating its assessment of the strengths and weaknesses for each Offeror.

The Request for Proposals (RFP) NNM09270570R for the MITS was released on February 27, 2009. The RFP required the Offerors to provide the necessary management, personnel, equipment, and supplies to provide Information Technology (IT) Security Services; IT Planning, Policy, Architecture and Integration; Telecommunications Services; Applications and Web Services; Computer Services; and Audio Visual Information Services.

This effort will be performed under a cost reimbursement type contract. Fee will be a fixed performance fee and will utilize various methods to calculate deductions from the potential fixed performance fee based upon the defined acceptable quality levels for the performance of this contract. The contract consists of a two-year base period with one option of two years and another option of one year for a potential five year total.

Four amendments were issued to the RFP:

Amendment No. 001 was released on April 3, 2009, and provided Offerors with answers to written questions received in response to the RFP as well as revisions to the RFP; Amendment No. 002 was released on April 14, 2009, and corrected the formulas in rows 134 and 135 for WBS 3.0 of worksheet CB of Attachment L-A1; Amendment No. 003 was released on April 17, 2009, and provided Offerors with a clarification to an Offeror's questions; and Amendment No. 004 was released on February 27, 2009, and replaced Wage Determination 2005-2008 Revision 9 with Revision 12 and Wage Determination 2005-2234 Revision 9 with Revision 11, noted a clarification to Performance Work

Statement (PWS) 4.1.5 and included the Emergency Preparedness and Response clause to PWS 1.2b.

The Government designated this procurement as a 100 percent small business set-aside under Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 19.5. The procurement was conducted as a full and open competition in accordance with FAR Part 15, entitled "Contracting by Negotiation." On April 28, 2009, proposals were received from the following companies:

Abacus Technology Corporation
5454 Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1100
Chevy Case, MD 20815

ADNET Systems, Incorporated
164 Rollins Avenue, Suite 303
Rockville, MD 20852

Arcata Associates, Incorporated
1525 Perimeter Parkway, Suite 190
Huntsville, AL 35806

ASRC Aerospace Corporation
350 Voyager Way
Huntsville, AL 35806

The Centech Group, Incorporated
6402 Arlington Blvd., 10th Floor
Falls Church, VA 22042

Dynetics, Incorporated
1002 Explorer Boulevard
Huntsville, AL 35806

ERC, Incorporated
4901 Corporate Drive, Suite E
Huntsville, AL 35805

Metters Industries, Incorporated
8200 Greensboro Drive, Suite 500
McLean, VA 22102

Tessada Associates, Incorporated
8001 Forbes Place, Suite 310
Springfield, VA 22151

II. EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The proposals were evaluated in accordance with the procedures prescribed by FAR Part 15 and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Part 1815. The Government evaluated the proposals in two general steps:

Step One – An initial evaluation was performed to determine if all information had been provided and that the Offeror had made a reasonable attempt to present an acceptable proposal. No proposal was determined to be unacceptable.

Step Two – All acceptable proposals were evaluated against the three evaluation factors contained in the RFP. Based on this evaluation, the Government had the option to utilize one of the following methods: (1) Make selection and award without discussions; or (2) strike a Competitive Range of the most highly rated proposals, conduct discussions with these remaining Offerors, afford each Offeror an opportunity to revise its proposal, and then make selection.

Selection and award is in accordance with the "Best Value Selection" (BVS) technique delineated in the RFP. A best value selection seeks to select a proposal based upon the best combination of cost and qualitative effort, which includes Mission Suitability and Past Performance. The BVS evaluation is based upon the premise that, if all proposals are of approximately equal qualitative merit, award will be made to the Offeror with the lowest evaluated Cost. However, the Government will consider awarding to an Offeror with the higher qualitative merit if the difference in Cost is commensurate with added value. Conversely, the Government will consider making award to an Offeror whose proposal has lower qualitative merit if the Cost differential between it and other proposals warrants doing so.

The RFP prescribed three evaluation factors considered essential in an offer: Mission Suitability, Cost, and Past Performance. Offerors were advised that the three factors were essentially equal in importance. The evaluation of the proposals are described as follows:

Mission Suitability: The proposals were analyzed for the excellence of the work proposed to be performed, as well as proposal risk. Mission Suitability consisted of three subfactors, and each subfactor received both an adjective rating and a numerical score:

A. Management and Technical Approach	(525 points)
B. Staffing and Total Compensation Plan	(400 points)
C. Safety, Health and Environmental Plan	(75 points)

Overall, each Offeror could receive a total of 1000 points. Offerors were evaluated in each of the above subfactors using applicable adjective ratings and scoring approach set forth and described in the NASA FAR Supplement and contained in the solicitation and the NASA Source Evaluation Plan.

Cost: The adequacy, realism and reasonableness of the cost proposal and the probable cost to be incurred were evaluated. The evaluation was conducted in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(1) and NFS 1815.305(a)(1)(B) and (C). Upward or downward adjustments were made to the proposed cost as a result of the assessment of cost realism. The Government assessment of the "probable cost of doing business" with each Offeror, of the possible cost growth during the course of the contract, and of features that could cause a given proposal to cost more or less than proposed was included in the evaluation. The G&A ceiling rates were used in establishing the "probable cost of doing business." For the proposed fees, the fee(s) were not adjusted, but were included in the probable cost in the amounts proposed. Each Offeror's proposed phase-in price for the separate Phase-In Purchase Order was identified separately. Adjustments to the proposed phase-in price were not made by the SEB. The proposed cost, the evaluated probable cost and proposed phase-in price were noted. A level of confidence determination (high, medium, or low) was made for the probable cost assessment for each proposal.

Past Performance: The Offeror's overall corporate past performance, which included the corporate past performance of any proposed teammates/subcontractors, was evaluated. Emphasis was given to the extent of direct relevant corporate experience and quality of past performance on previous contracts that were relevant to the effort defined in the RFP. Greater emphasis was placed on more recent experience and past performance. Past Performance was not numerically scored, but was assigned an adjective rating. The adjective rating system/definitions set forth in NFS 1815.305(a)(2)(A) were utilized in the evaluation of past performance. Relevancy of past performance was assessed utilizing, as a minimum, the areas of: (1) types of services provided; (2) size and complexity of the contract; and (3) contract type. However, Offerors without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance was not available, were not evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv).

The Offeror's safety, health, and environmental performance and Lost Time Case (LTC) rate were also evaluated as part of the Past Performance evaluation. Each referenced contract/ project LTC rate were averaged (3 years) and compared to the latest available Department of Labor (DOL) Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) LTC rate national average for the given NAICS. The Offeror's Total Reportable Injury Rate (TRIR) rate was evaluated. The TRIR was evaluated by averaging (3 year) the Contractor's OSHA Form 300A "Total number of other recordable cases" and comparing it to the latest available DOL BLS national average for the NAICS provided on the Contractor's OSHA Form 300A. The Offeror, including subcontractors' and teammates', voluntary turnover history for the past 3 years for exempt and nonexempt employees (or other major categorizations used by the Offerors) for the Corporate entity bidding on the MITS contract was evaluated as set forth and described in the solicitation.

III. DISPOSITION AND EVALUATION OF INITIAL PROPOSALS

All offers received were determined to be acceptable and were evaluated consistent with the criteria identified in the RFP. The initial findings of the SEB were presented to me, the SSA, on September 8, 2009. Based on these findings, I determined that award on initial proposals was not appropriate, and I established a Competitive Range of the most highly rated proposals. The Offerors determined to be within the Competitive Range included Arcata Associates, Incorporated (Arcata); Dynetics, Incorporated (Dynetics); and Tessada Associates, Incorporated (Tessada).

The proposal submitted by Abacus Technology Corporation (Abacus) was not included in the Competitive Range because it was not among the most highly rated proposals. It was determined that Abacus's proposal was outside the Competitive Range based primarily on its relative standing in Mission Suitability. Although the Abacus proposal received one significant strength and six strengths in the Management and Technical Approach subfactor of Mission Suitability, the proposal also included five weaknesses for this subfactor. Abacus's proposal received one significant strength, five strengths, no significant weaknesses, and ten weaknesses in the Staffing and Total Compensation subfactor. The proposal received no significant strengths or weaknesses and one strength and one weakness for the Safety and Health subfactor. The Abacus proposal's Mission Suitability rating was lower than the lowest score of those firms included in the Competitive Range by 103 points out of a possible 1000. The Abacus's cost proposal, both as proposed and as adjusted by the SEB, was deemed to be competitive; the Abacus proposal's Probable Cost was competitive with those proposals remaining in the Competitive Range and received a cost confidence rating of High like those in the Competitive Range. The proposal received one significant strength, four strengths, no significant weaknesses and no weaknesses for the Past Performance factor. The Abacus proposal received an adjectival rating of Very High Level of Confidence (VHLC), in the Past Performance factor, which is equal to the other Offerors in the Competitive Range. Taking into consideration that the Abacus' proposal was competitive in the Cost and Past Performance factors to those that remain in Competitive Range, it was determined that based on its lower Mission Suitability rating and score, which accurately reflected all of the proposal's strengths and weaknesses, with those Offeror's remaining in the Competitive Range, it was not one of the most highly rated proposals, and therefore, was deemed not to be in the Competitive Range.

The proposal submitted by ADNET Systems, Incorporated (ADNET) was not included in the Competitive Range because it was not among the most highly rated proposals. It was determined that ADNET's proposal was outside the Competitive Range based primarily on its relative standing in Mission Suitability. The ADNET proposal received no significant strengths, nine strengths, no significant weaknesses and four weaknesses in the Management and Technical Approach subfactor of the Mission Suitability area. The ADNET proposal received one significant strength, four strengths, one significant weakness, and seven weaknesses in the Staffing and Total Compensation subfactor. The proposal received two significant strengths and no other strengths or weaknesses for the Safety and Health subfactor. The ADNET proposal's Mission Suitability score was

lower than the lowest score of those firms included in the Competitive Range by 141 points. It should be noted that ADNET's cost proposal, both as proposed and as adjusted by the SEB, was deemed competitive; the ADNET proposal's Probable Cost was competitive with those proposals remaining in the competitive range and received a cost confidence rating of High like those in the Competitive Range. The proposal received two significant strengths, three strengths, no significant weaknesses and one weakness for the Past Performance factor. ADNET's proposal received an adjectival rating of VHLC, in the Past Performance factor, which is equal to the scores of the Offerors in the competitive range. Taking into consideration that the ADNET's proposal was competitive in the Cost and Past Performance factors to those that remain in Competitive Range, it was determined that based on its lower Mission Suitability rating and score, which accurately reflected all of the proposal's strengths and weaknesses, with those Offeror's remaining in the Competitive Range, it was not one of the most highly rated proposals, and therefore, was deemed not to be in the Competitive Range.

The proposal submitted by ASRC Aerospace Corporation (ASRC) was not included in the competitive range because it was not among the most highly rated proposals. It was determined that ASRC's proposal was outside the competitive range based on its relative standing in Mission Suitability and its Moderate Level of Confidence rating in the Past Performance factor. Although ASRC's proposal received no significant strengths and six strengths in the Management and Technical Approach subfactor of Mission Suitability, the proposal also included two weaknesses. ASRC's proposal received one significant strength, one strength, one significant weakness, and eight weaknesses in the Staffing and Total Compensation subfactor. The proposal received no significant strengths or weaknesses and one strength and one weakness for the Safety and Health subfactor. The ASRC proposal's Mission Suitability rating was lower than the lowest score of those firms included in the competitive range by 228 points. ASRC's cost proposal, both as proposed and as adjusted by the SEB, was deemed to be competitive; the ASRC proposal's Probable Cost was competitive with those proposals remaining in the competitive range and received a cost confidence rating of High like those in the Competitive Range. The proposal received no significant strengths, three strengths, no significant weaknesses and one weakness for the Past Performance factor. ASRC's proposal received an adjectival rating of Moderate Level of Confidence (MLC), in the Past Performance factor, which is lower than the other Offerors in the competitive range. Taking into consideration that the ASRC's proposal was competitive in the Cost factor to those that remain in Competitive Range, it was determined that based on its lower Mission Suitability score and Past Performance rating, which accurately reflected all of the proposal's strengths and weaknesses, with those Offeror's remaining in the Competitive Range, it was not one of the most highly rated proposals, and therefore, was deemed not to be in the Competitive Range.

The proposal submitted by The Centech Group, Incorporated (Centech) was not included in the competitive range because it was not among the most highly rated proposals. It was determined that Centech's proposal was outside the competitive range based primarily on its relative standing in Mission Suitability. Although the Centech proposal received no significant strengths and six strengths in the Management and Technical

Approach subfactor of Mission Suitability, the proposal also included two weaknesses. Centech's proposal received one significant strength, one strength, one significant weakness, and eight weaknesses in the Staffing and Total Compensation subfactor. The proposal received no significant strengths or weaknesses and two strengths and no weaknesses for the Safety and Health subfactor. The Centech proposal's Mission Suitability rating was lower than the lowest score of those firms included in the Competitive Range by 326 points. Centech's cost proposal, both as proposed and as adjusted by the SEB, was deemed to be competitive; the Centech proposal's Probable Cost was competitive with those proposals remaining in the Competitive Range and received a cost confidence rating of High like those in the Competitive Range. The proposal received one significant strengths, three strengths, no significant weaknesses and one weakness for the Past Performance factor. Centech's proposal received an adjectival rating of VHLC, in the Past Performance factor, which is equal to the other Offerors in the Competitive Range. Taking into consideration that the Centech's proposal was competitive in the Cost and Past Performance factors to those that remain in Competitive Range, it was determined that based on its lower Mission Suitability rating and score, which accurately reflected all of the proposal's strengths and weaknesses, with those Offeror's remaining in the Competitive Range, it was not one of the most highly rated proposals, and therefore, was deemed not to be in the Competitive Range.

The proposal submitted by ERC, Incorporated (ERC) was not included in the Competitive Range because it was not among the most highly rated proposals. It was determined that the ERC proposal was outside the Competitive Range based on its relative standing in Mission Suitability and its Moderate Level of Confidence rating in the Past Performance factor. Although ERC's proposal received no significant strengths and five strengths in the Management and Technical Approach subfactor of Mission Suitability, the proposal also included one significant weakness and eight weaknesses. The ERC proposal received no significant strengths, two strengths, two significant weaknesses, and six weaknesses in the Staffing and Total Compensation subfactor. The proposal received no significant strengths or weaknesses and one strength and one weakness for the Safety and Health subfactor. The ERC proposal's Mission Suitability rating was lower than the lowest score of those firms included in the Competitive Range by 362 points. ERC's cost proposal, both as proposed and as adjusted by the SEB, was deemed to be competitive; the ERC proposal's Probable Cost was somewhat lower than those proposals remaining in the competitive range and received a cost confidence rating of High like those in the Competitive Range. The proposal received no significant strengths, two strengths, no significant weaknesses and no weaknesses for the Past Performance factor. The ERC proposal received an adjectival rating of Moderate Level of Confidence (MLC), in the Past Performance factor, which is lower than the other Offerors in the Competitive Range. Taking into consideration that the ERC's proposal was competitive in the Cost factor to those that remain in Competitive Range, it was determined that based on its lower Mission Suitability score and Past Performance rating, which accurately reflected all of the proposal's strengths and weaknesses, with those Offeror's remaining in the Competitive Range, it was not one of the most highly rated proposals, even with the tradeoff of competitive cost, and therefore, was deemed not to be in the Competitive Range.

The proposal submitted by Metters Industries, Incorporated (Metters) was not included in the Competitive Range because it was not among the most highly rated proposals. It was determined that the Metters proposal was outside the Competitive Range based on its relative standing in Mission Suitability, its Moderate Confidence rating in Past Performance, and its Low Cost Confidence rating. Although, Metters' proposal received four strengths in the Management and Technical Approach subfactor of Mission Suitability, the proposal received no significant strengths, and also included two significant weaknesses and four weaknesses. Metters' proposal received no significant strengths, no strengths, three significant weaknesses, and four weaknesses in the Staffing and Total Compensation subfactor. The proposal received no significant strengths or weaknesses and one strength and one weakness for the Safety and Health subfactor. The Metters' proposal's Mission Suitability rating was lower than those firms included in the Competitive Range by 429 points. Metters's cost proposal as proposed was deemed to be competitive; however, the Metters proposal's Probable Cost was somewhat higher than those proposals remaining in the Competitive Range and received a cost confidence rating of Low. The proposal received no significant strengths, one strength, no significant weaknesses and one weakness for the Past Performance factor. Metters received an adjectival rating of Moderate Level of Confidence (MLC), in the Past Performance factor, which is lower than the other Offerors in the Competitive Range. Therefore, Metter's proposal was not one of the most highly rated proposals, and therefore was deemed not to be in the Competitive Range, due to its low Mission Suitability score, which accurately reflected all of the proposal's strengths and weaknesses, with those Offeror's remaining in the Competitive Range; its Moderate Level of Confidence rating in Past Performance; and its Low Cost Confidence rating.

Therefore, Arcata Associates, Incorporated; Dynetics, Incorporated; and Tessada & Associates, Incorporated were the Offerors selected for inclusion in the Competitive Range.

Arcata's initial proposal received an overall Mission Suitability score of 816, a Very High Level of Confidence rating under Past Performance and a High Cost Confidence rating. Under the Management and Technical Approach subfactor, the Arcata proposal received an adjective rating of Excellent. The Arcata proposal received one significant strength, eleven strengths, no significant weaknesses or weaknesses. Under the Staffing and Total Compensation subfactor, the Arcata proposal received an adjective rating of Good. The Arcata proposal received one significant strength, three strengths, no significant weaknesses, and five weaknesses. In the Safety, Health, and Environmental subfactor, the Arcata proposal received an adjective rating of Excellent. The Arcata proposal received two significant strengths, no strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses. In the Past Performance factor, the Arcata proposal received one significant strength, two strengths, no significant weaknesses, and one weakness which resulted in the adjective rating of Very High Level of Confidence. In the Cost factor, the Arcata proposal's cost was $346.8M and SEB's evaluated probable cost of $366.7M. The only areas of adjustment for probable cost were: (1) labor adjustment for insufficient Work Year Equivalent (WYE) and skill mix adjustments in Performance Work Statements

(PWS) 2.0, 4.0, and 5.0; and (2) adjustment for the difference between the proposed rate and Forward Pricing Rates proposed for a subcontractor's G&A. The SEB determined the proposed cost was reasonable, complete, and ensured that all PWS requirements were reflected in the cost. After completing the probable cost adjustment, the SEB evaluated the Arcata proposal to be a High cost confidence rating.

Dynetics' initial proposal received an overall Mission Suitability score of 771, a Very High Level of Confidence rating under Past Performance and a High Cost Confidence rating. Under the Management and Technical Approach subfactor, the Dynetics proposal received an adjective rating of Excellent. The Dynetics proposal received three significant strengths, thirteen strengths, no significant weaknesses or weaknesses. Under the Staffing and Total Compensation subfactor, the Dynetics proposal received an adjective rating of Fair. The Dynetics proposal received one significant strength, three strengths, three significant weaknesses, and four weaknesses. In the Safety, Health, and Environmental subfactor, the Dynetics proposal received an adjective rating of Excellent. The Dynetics proposal received two significant strengths, one strength, no significant weaknesses or weaknesses. In the Past Performance factor, the Dynetics proposal received two significant strengths, three strengths, no significant weaknesses or weaknesses which resulted in the adjective rating of Very High Level of Confidence. In the Cost factor, the Dynetics proposal cost was $325.4M and the SEB evaluated probable cost was $369.4M. The only areas of adjustment for probable cost were: (1) labor adjustment for insufficient WYE and skill mixes in PWS 4.0, 5.0, 6.0, 7.0, and 8.0; (2) inclusion of Material/Subcontract Handling in accordance with Dynetics accounting practice; and (3) an adjustment to the G&A to reflect G&A costs as audited (which exceeded G&A cost ceiling proposed). The SEB determined the proposed cost was reasonable, complete, and ensured that all statement of work requirements were reflected in the cost. After completing the probable cost adjustment, the SEB evaluated the Dynetics proposal to be a High cost confidence rating.

Tessada's initial proposal received an overall Mission Suitability score of 819, a Very High Level of Confidence rating under Past Performance and a High Cost Confidence rating. Under the Management and Technical Approach subfactor, the Tessada proposal received an adjective rating of Very Good. The Tessada proposal received one significant strength, eight strengths, no significant weaknesses, and one weakness. Under the Staffing and Total Compensation subfactor, Tessada received an adjective rating of Very Good. Tessada received two significant strengths, one strength, no significant weaknesses, and three weaknesses. In the Safety, Health, and Environmental subfactor, the Tessada proposal received an adjective rating of Good. The Tessada proposal received no significant strengths, one strength, no significant weaknesses or weaknesses. In the Past Performance factor, the Tessada proposal received two significant strengths, one strength, no significant weaknesses, and weakness which resulted in the adjective rating of Very High Level of Confidence. In the Cost factor, the Tessada proposal cost was $366.2M and the SEB evaluated probable cost was $385.0M. The only areas of adjustment for probable cost were: (1) labor adjustment for insufficient WYE and skill mix adjustments in PWS 4.0 and 8.0; (2) adjustment for the difference between the proposed rate and Forward Pricing Rates proposed for a subcontractor's G&A; and (3) an

adjustment to the G&A cost ceiling (in accordance with the RFP). The SEB determined the proposed cost was reasonable, complete, and ensured that all statement of work requirements were reflected in the cost. After completing the probable cost adjustment, the SEB evaluated the Tessada proposal to be a High cost confidence rating.

By letters dated September 16, 2009 all Offerors were advised of their status. In a letter dated September 16, 2009, the SEB opened discussions and provided the Offerors in the competitive range with their weaknesses and clarification issues as identified by the SEB during the evaluation of their proposals. The letters established September 25, 2009, as the due date for the receipt of all written responses. In addition to written discussions, oral discussions were held with all three Offerors' whose proposals were in the competitive range.

On October 19, 2009, a letter requesting Final Proposal Revisions (FPRs) was sent to Arcata, Dynetics, and Tessada with a due date for receipt of FPRs on October 30, 2009. On October 20, 2009, a letter was sent to all three Offerors indicating that the page limitation was inadvertently omitted from the October 19, 2009 letter. In addition, on October 22, 2009, a letter was submitted to all three Offerors with answers to certain clerical questions regarding FPR submissions. Revisions were received on October 30, 2009, and were subsequently evaluated consistent with the criteria identified in the RFP.

The following summarizes the evaluation findings for the proposals in the Competitive Range based on discussions and Final Proposal Revisions. In order to protect the proprietary data of the Offerors, some findings have been summarized.

Arcata Associates, Incorporated

Under the Management and Technical Approach subfactor, the Arcata proposal received an adjective rating of Excellent. The Arcata proposal received two (2) significant strengths, ten (10) strengths, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and zero (0) weaknesses. These findings are summarized as follows:

Significant Strengths: 2

- A significant strength is that the Offeror has assembled an excellent team of complementary companies with distinct, well-defined areas of expertise that have depth and scope covering all technical and management areas of the PWS which greatly enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A significant strength is that the Offeror has proposed a management tool which will provide near real time financial data, including all team members' timekeeping information, on all projects by using their integrated business system resulting in more timely capture of all labor costs. It augments Management Information Control System (MICS) without sacrificing any of the intrinsic audit trails of MICS data.

Other Strengths: 10

- A strength is that the Offeror's approach has demonstrated a comprehensive knowledge of tracking, planning, controlling and reporting costs for large Government contracts which will result in accurate data delivery to plan and execute the Government budget, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is that the Offeror's approach demonstrates knowledge of the Management Information Control System (MICS) that was developed by one of the Offeror's teammates which eliminates the learning curve associated with this required system which enhances the potential for successful performance of the contract.
- A strength is that the Offeror's approach is to provide access to expertise and experience on a wide variety of issues from a Senior Executive Council which consists of Senior Managers from each teammate and other members with previous MSFC experience in OCIO, Center Operations and Engineering Directorate, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is that the Offeror proposes a purchasing system, in addition to the required accounting system, that has been reviewed and deemed adequate by DCMA and/or DCAA which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is that the Offeror's phase-in plan, proposed at no cost, is very descriptive and demonstrates a very good understanding of the phase-in requirements for the MITS contract, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is that the Offeror will develop an Annual Technology Investment Program, at Contractor expense, to fund the acquisition of specialized hardware, software, Industry Business Analysis, training or participation in conferences in support of MITS, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is that the Offeror proposes to automate the NPR 7120.1 project management workflow in the same manner as the Software Engineering Framework (SEF) is currently implemented by the OCIO. This automation will allow for more efficient management of projects which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is that the Offeror is ISO 9001:2000 registered which ensures that the Offeror meets quality requirements and eliminates waste, reduces performance risks and controls process variations, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is that the Offeror developed a transformation roadmap as a systematic and incremental approach to achieving the key objectives and characteristics through a set of very specific and well defined milestones which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is that the Offeror's comprehensive export control approach, which includes access control for systems and data, demonstrates a very good understanding of the export control process which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Significant Weakness: None

Other Weakness: None

Under the Staffing and Total Compensation subfactor, the Arcata proposal received an adjective rating of Very Good. The Arcata proposal received one (1) significant strength, three (3) strengths, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and zero (0) weaknesses. These findings are summarized as follows:

Significant Strengths: 1

- A significant strength is that the proposed key personnel for the Program Manager position is well qualified for the position, which enhances the potential for successful performance of the contract. This person has over 25 years of relevant experience and received excellent feedback from the customer reference.

Other Strengths: 3

- A strength is that the Key Person identified as IT Security Manager has over 13 years of IT Security experience supporting MSFC and DoD and received very positive feedback from the customer reference, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is that the Key Person identified as Business Manager has over 25 years of relevant experience including 20 years of management experience and received very positive feedback from the customer reference, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is that the Key Person identified as Manager for Telecommunications & AVIS Services has over 18 years of IT experience including directly relevant NASA experience and received very positive feedback from the customer reference, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Significant Weaknesses: None

Other Weaknesses: None

In the Safety, Health, and Environmental subfactor, the Arcata proposal received an adjective rating of Excellent. The Arcata proposal received two (2) significant strengths, zero (0) strengths, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and zero (0) weaknesses. These findings are summarized as follows:

Significant Strengths: 2

- A significant strength is that the Offeror's SHE Plan is comprehensive, of exceptional merit, extremely thorough in addressing each CPR and sub-elements in sufficient detail in addressing all 1292SA-001 CPRs and sub-elements, and proposed additional safety initiative beyond the MSFC requirements. These include forming a SHE Committee, use of NASA e-PORT to manage risk, and

use of a continuous risk management process, which greatly enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

- A significant strength is that the Offeror's risk assessment is comprehensive, of exceptional merit and is extremely thorough in identifying several SHE Program risks and provided sufficient detail in how to mitigate these risks. These risks include lack of employee involvement and understanding of the Offeror's SHE philosophy and program, employees understanding and identifying job/task hazards, and employees receiving SHE training and certifications which greatly enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Other Strength: None

Significant Weakness: None

Other Weakness: None

In the Past Performance factor, the Arcata proposal received one (1) significant strength, two (2) strengths, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and zero (0) weaknesses which resulted in the adjective rating of Very High Level of Confidence. These findings are summarized as follows:

Significant Strengths: 1

- A significant strength is that the Offeror is successfully performing as subcontractor under a highly relevant in scope, size and type subcontract with 10 award fee scores greater than 90 and NASA purchasing experience of $50M per year, which greatly enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Other Strengths: 2

- A strength is that the Offeror as a member of the UNITeS team achieved cost savings/avoidance during October 2008 PEB period, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is that the Offeror demonstrated an ability to implement safety and health programs as evidenced by (1) the contractor's and 2 subcontractors' 3 year total recordable injury rate (TRIR) average is less than 50% of the national average for a given NAICS, (2) the contractor's and 2 subcontractors' 3 year lost time case (LTC) rates less than 50% of the national average for a given NAICS, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Significant Weakness: None

Other Weakness: None

In the Cost factor, the Arcata proposal cost was $339.6M and the SEB evaluated probable cost was $339.6M. The SEB determined the proposed cost was reasonable, complete, and ensured that all statement of work requirements were reflected in the cost. After

completing the probable cost assessment, the SEB evaluated the Arcata probable cost to be a High cost confidence rating.

Dynetics, Incorporated

Under the Management and Technical Approach subfactor, the Dynetics proposal received an adjective rating of Excellent. The Dynetics proposal received three (3) significant strengths, thirteen (13) strengths, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and zero (0) weaknesses. These findings are summarized as follows:

Significant Strength: 3

- A significant strength is that the Offeror has assembled an excellent team of complementary companies with distinct, well-defined areas of expertise that have depth and scope covering all technical and management areas of the PWS which greatly enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A significant strength is that the Offeror's approach demonstrated comprehensive knowledge in all operational areas of the PWS which greatly enhances the potential for successful contract performance. This included excellent innovative, detailed plans for execution including: (1) an integrated Governance and Mission Alignment organization to ensure strategic alignment in PWS 4.0, IT Planning, Policy, Architecture & Integration, (2) remote management and support concept for PWS 5.0, Telecommunications Services, (3) application of effective software processes for PWS 6.0, Applications and Web Services, (4) a structured management approach that supports high volume for systems management in PWS 7.0, Computing Services, and (5) an efficient and effective resource planning process for rapid response in PWS 8.0, Audio Visual Information Services.
- A significant strength is that the Offeror has proposed to provide near real time financial data, including all team members' timekeeping information, on all projects by using their integrated business system resulting in more timely capture of all labor costs. It augments the Management Information Control System (MICS) without sacrificing any of the intrinsic audit trails of MICS data which greatly enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Other Strengths: 13

- A strength is that the Offeror has proposed a management structure that has a positive impact on the successful performance of the OCIO operational priorities, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is that the Offeror proposes a well-defined and structured approach to implementing innovations with detailed supporting programs and tools that will enhance the effectiveness of the Offeror's MITS support throughout the contract term, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is that the Offeror proposes systems, in addition to the required accounting system, that have been reviewed and deemed adequate by DCMA and/or DCAA which enhances the potential for successful contract performance. These systems are property management and purchasing.

- A strength is that the Offeror shows a very good understanding of the need for implementation of local autonomy, and proposed a clear, realistic team decision making approach which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is the Offeror's Phase-in plan is very descriptive, comprehensive, demonstrates a very good understanding of the phase-in requirements and has designated phase-in managers who have extensive experience in phasing in large contracts, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is that the Offeror's approach demonstrates a strong understanding of the Agency IT Security requirements through their proposed plans for implementing and enhancing several of NASA's existing processes with the Information Assurance (IA) Maturity Model and IT Security System Development Life-Cycle, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is that the Offeror provided a comprehensive management and technical approach risk assessment that included realistic IT risks and mitigations, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is that the Offeror has Federate Enterprise Architecture Certification (FEAC), Capability Maturity Model Integration (CMMI), ITIL and ISO certifications which ensures that the Offeror meets quality requirements and eliminates waste, reduces performance risks and controls process variations, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is that the Offeror proposes the innovative and successful Security Data Warehouse tool which won the 2006 Exceptional Software Award at Johnson Space Center, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is that the Offeror's certification and accreditation (C&A) management approach has the capability to streamline the MSFC C&A process and to increase the number of successful C&A audits, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is that the Offeror's team demonstrates a very good understanding of Continuity of Operations (COOP), Disaster Recovery (DR) and mobile emergency operations through their proposed plans for COOP, DR and mobile emergency operations which have been successfully implemented at NASA, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is that the Offeror proposed a comprehensive Audio Visual Information Services (AVIS) inventory of assets (graphic, video, photographic, etc.) with thumbnails and metadata to improve asset location and retrieval on both Macintosh and Windows platforms across all AVIS services. This will increase process efficiencies which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is that the Offeror is a certified Pearson Vue Testing Center and offers numerous IT Security training and certification courses and 5 security labs within 7 miles of MSFC which they propose to use in performance of the contract, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Significant Weakness: None

Other Weakness: None

Under the Staffing and Total Compensation Subfactor, the Dynetics proposal received an adjective rating of Very Good. The Dynetics proposal received one (1) significant strength, three (3) strengths, zero (0) significant weakness, and zero (0) weaknesses. These findings are summarized as follows and have been redacted to protect corporate proprietary information:

Significant Strength: 1

- A significant strength is that the Offeror proposes a Program Manager with 25 years Government and Commercial customers experience, executive leadership experience including Program Manager, Chief Technology Officer and Phase-in Manager for Federal Government Information Technology projects, and received excellent feedback from the customer reference since 1999, for the identified key roles and contributions, which greatly enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Other Strengths: 3

- A strength is that the Offeror has proposed a key person for the position of IT Service Delivery Manager and Deputy Program Manager that has over 29 years of successful experience managing programs for Government, military, and other organizations, was an Army CIO with $24M budget and 4300 users and received very positive feedback from the customer reference, that enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is that the Key Person identified as IT Security Manager has over 23 years of security management experience and received very positive feedback from the customer reference, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance
- A strength is that the Offeror demonstrated a very good approach for working with organized labor, having no work stoppages, lockouts or strikes. This will assist in a smooth transition and continued performance, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Significant Weakness: None

Other Weaknesses: None

In the Safety, Health, and Environmental subfactor, the Dynetics proposal received an adjective rating of Excellent. The Dynetics proposal received two (2) significant strengths, one (1) strengths, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and zero (0) weaknesses. These findings are summarized as follows:

Significant Strengths: 2

- A significant strength is that the Offeror's SHE Plan was comprehensive, of exceptional merit, is extremely thorough in addressing each Core Program Requirements (CPR) and sub-elements in sufficient detail in addressing all 1292SA-001 CPRs and sub-elements and proposed additional safety initiatives beyond the MSFC requirements, including establishment of a SHE Committee, provide regular SHE training to employees and require testing to ensure employee knowledge of SHE Program requirements, and conduct a baseline survey for all MITS contracted hazards which greatly enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A significant strength is that the Offeror's risk assessment is comprehensive and of exceptional merit. It identified several SHE Plan risks and provided sufficient detail in how to mitigate these risks, which greatly enhances the potential for successful contract performance. For example, the plan included mitigations for potential risks of 1) employees ignoring safe practices as outlined in the plan, 2) SHE Plan implementation weaknesses, and 3) non compliant work areas.

Other Strength: 1

- A strength is that the Offeror's team member received OSHA VPP Star designation with their Safety and Fire Services contract at JSC, received OSHA's Star of Excellence award in 2004, 2005, and 2006, and received the Nova Award for safety excellence for the JSC Contractor Safety Forum in 2008, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Significant Weakness: None

Other Weakness: None

In the Past Performance factor, the Dynetics proposal received two (2) significant strengths, three (3) strengths, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and zero (0) weakness which resulted in the adjective rating of Very High Level of Confidence. These findings are summarized as follows:

Significant Strength: 2

- A significant strength is that the Offeror and entire proposed team demonstrated an ability to implement safety and health programs as evidenced by (1) the contractor's and 5 subcontractors' 3 year total recordable injury rate (TRIR) average is less than 50% of the national average for a given NAICS, (2) the contractor's and 5 subcontractors' 3 year lost time case (LTC) rates less than 50% of the national average for a given NAICS, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A significant strength is that an Offeror's team member has successful experience on a highly relevant contract in scope and type with all excellent ratings, which greatly enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Other Strengths: 3

- A strength is that the Offeror is Huntsville/Madison County 'Best Place to Work Award' winner in 2008, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is that the Offeror worked over 43,000,000 hours with only 20 lost days. This equates to less than 1/2 day lost per 1,000,000 hours worked, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is that the Offeror demonstrates the successful management of 148 subcontractors with relevant work in size and scope with high award fees, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Significant Weakness: None

Other Weaknesses: None

In the Cost factor, the Dynetics proposal's cost was $334.5M and the SEB's evaluated probable cost of $337.6M. The only adjustments were: (1) to correct for a discrepancy between what Dynetics proposed for a subcontract and what the subcontractor provided for its total estimated cost; and (2) an adjustment to the G&A cost ceiling (in accordance with the RFP). The SEB determined the proposed cost was reasonable, complete, and ensured that all PWS requirements were reflected in the cost. After completing the probable cost adjustments, the SEB evaluated the Dynetics probable cost to be a High cost confidence rating.

Tessada Associates, Incorporated

Under the Management and Technical Approach subfactor, the Tessada proposal received an adjective rating of Excellent. The Tessada proposal received one (1) significant strength, eight (8) strengths, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and zero (0) weakness. These findings are summarized as follows:

Significant Strength: 1

- A significant strength is that the Offeror has assembled an excellent team of complementary companies with distinct, well-defined areas of expertise that have depth and scope covering all technical and management areas of the PWS which greatly enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Other Strengths: 8

- A strength is that the Offeror proposes to implement a web-based Commercial-off-the-shelf tool that will control workflow across all of MITS and include executive dashboards to give senior management and OCIO near real-time access to cost, schedule and quality data, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance. The Offeror proposed a realistic timeline and details on the transition from the systems currently in use to the proposed system.

- A strength is that the Offeror's approach has demonstrated a comprehensive knowledge of tracking, planning, controlling and reporting costs for large Government contracts which will result in accurate data delivery to plan and execute the Government budget, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is that the Offeror proposes the establishment of a MITS Advisory Board (MAB) to assist in staying current on IT industry trends and best practices, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is that the Offeror proposes systems, in addition to the required accounting system, that have been reviewed and deemed adequate by DCMA and/or DCAA which enhances the potential for successful contract performance. These systems are property management and purchasing.
- A strength is that the Offeror has a comprehensive and effective phase-in plan that takes full advantage of a proven experienced Phase-In manager, who successfully performed this same task for the current contract, increasing the likelihood of a successful phase-in, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is that the Offeror's team is comprised of Federated Enterprise Architecture Certification (FEAC)-Certified Enterprise Architecture (EA) Team and is ISO 9001:2000 registered, which ensures that the Offeror meets quality requirements and eliminates waste, reduces performance risks and controls process variation, and has arranged to transfer the current ISO registration to MITS upon contract award, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is that the Offeror has proposed to purchase the enhanced modules of Remedy required for the Enhanced Work Management System (EWMS) as an investment in the MITS program success at no direct cost to the MITS contract, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.
- A strength is that the Offeror has proposed a management innovation to implement a contract mechanism to accept NASA credit cards for small purchases for PWS 5.0, Telecommunications Services and 8.0, Audio Visual Information Services, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance. This will reduce service delivery time and concomitant funding transactions.

Significant Weakness: None

Other Weakness: None

Under the Staffing and Total Compensation subfactor, Tessada received an adjective rating of Very Good. Tessada received two (2) significant strengths, one (1) strength, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and zero (0) weaknesses. These findings are summarized as follows:

Significant Strengths: 2

- A significant strength is that the Key Person identified as Manager for IT Planning, Policy, Architecture, & Integration (PPA&I) has over 32 years of

relevant experience and received excellent feedback from the customer reference, which greatly enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

- A significant strength is that the Key Person identified as Manager of Applications and Web Services has 22 years of highly relevant experience in various roles including 15 years in management and received excellent customer reference feedback, which greatly enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Other Strength: 1

- A strength is that the Key Person identified as Manager for Telecommunications Services has over 30 years of relevant IT experience including 15 years of management experience and received very positive feedback from the customer reference, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Significant Weakness: None

Other Weaknesses: None

In the Safety, Health, and Environmental subfactor, the Tessada proposal received an adjective rating of Good. The Tessada proposal received zero (0) significant strengths, one (1) strength, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and zero (0) weaknesses. These findings are summarized as follows:

Significant Strength: None

Other Strengths: 1

- A strength is that the Offeror's SHE Plan was comprehensive and addressed all 1292SA-001Core Program Requirements (CPR) and each sub-element in sufficient detail and proposed additional safety initiatives beyond the MSFC requirements, including established yearly goals/objectives in their SHE commitment policy to reduce the days away from work rate/OSHA recordable injury rate and forming SHE Committee, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Significant Weaknesses: None

Other Weaknesses: None

In the Past Performance factor, the Tessada proposal received two (2) significant strengths, one (1) strength, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and zero (0) weaknesses which resulted in the adjective rating of Very High Level of Confidence. These findings are summarized as follows:

Significant Strengths: 2

- A significant strength is that the Offeror performed successfully on a highly relevant in size, scope, and type contract and with excellent award fee scores

since September 2004, which greatly enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

- A significant strength is that the Offeror's team member performing on a highly relevant in size, scope, and type of contract with NASA/MSFC excellent award fee ratings for the last 10 consecutive periods, which greatly enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Other Strength: 1

- A strength is that the Offeror demonstrated an ability to implement safety and health programs as evidenced by (1) the contractor's (multiple NAICS) 3 year total recordable injury rate (TRIR) average is less than 50% of the national average for a given NAICS, and (2) the contractor's and 2 subcontractors' (multiple NAICS) 3 year lost time case (LTC) rates less than 50% of the national average for a given NAICS, which enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Significant Weaknesses: None

Other Weaknesses: None

In the Cost factor, the Tessada proposal cost was $369.3M and the SEB evaluated probable cost was $372.1M. The only adjustments were: (1) to correct for a discrepancy between what Tessada proposed for a subcontract and what the subcontractor provided for its total estimated cost; and (2) an adjustment to the G&A cost ceiling (in accordance with the RFP). The SEB determined the proposed cost was reasonable, complete, and ensured that all statement of work requirements were reflected in the cost. After completing the probable cost adjustments, the SEB evaluated the Tessada probable cost to be a High cost confidence rating.

IV. DECISION

Immediately following the SEB presentation on November 13, 2009, I met in executive session with the key senior advisors, all of whom heard the presentation and were familiar with the RFP. These advisors included representatives from the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Office of Chief Counsel, Office of Procurement, and Safety and Mission Assurance Directorate. I solicited and considered their views in reaching my decision. With respect to the process and findings, we concluded that the evaluation plan was followed, and the evaluation of the proposals was comprehensive, thorough, and well-documented.

During the presentation, the senior advisors and I thoroughly questioned the SEB on a number of points. We noted that the discussion process was well utilized because all three Offerors increased their Mission Suitability scores and eliminated all of their Mission Suitability weaknesses. Also, in Past Performance both Arcata and Tessada eliminated a weakness by providing information concerning mitigation strategies which were put in place concerning reported incidences on their OSHA 300A forms. In

addition, all Offerors satisfactorily resolved staffing issues during the discussion process and with the submittal of their FPRs.

We noted that the competition was close, however discriminators existed in two of the three evaluation factors, with the remaining factor (i.e., Past Performance) being only a slight discriminator. Arcata received an overall Mission Suitability score of 893; Dynetics received an overall Mission Suitability score of 911; and Tessada received an overall Mission Suitability score of 871. In probing the SEB during its presentation and taking into consideration its evaluation of the proposals against the prescribed evaluation criteria contained in the RFP, I concluded the successful Offeror is Dynetics, Incorporated. The rationale for my decision follows.

Dynetics received the highest overall Mission Suitability score of the three Offerors with six significant strengths, seventeen strengths, no significant weaknesses or weaknesses. Arcata received five significant strengths, thirteen strengths and no significant weaknesses or weaknesses. Tessada received three significant strengths, ten strengths and no significant weaknesses or weaknesses. A comparison of the Offerors in Mission Suitability revealed that Dynetics and Arcata received the same adjectival ratings across each of the three subfactors, while Tessada received the same adjectival rating as both Dynetics and Arcata in the Management and Technical Approach and the Staffing and Total Compensation subfactors, however under the Safety, Health and Environmental subfactor, Tessada received a Good while Dynetics and Arcata both received Excellent.

In the Management and Technical subfactor (MTA) both Dynetics and Arcata received Excellent while Tessada was assessed a Very Good. Of the three Mission Suitability subfactors, MTA is the most heavily weighted and therefore, a strong indicator of performance. Of the three Offerors, Dynetics received the highest score in the MTA subfactor. It is important to note that Dynetics' score in the MTA subfactor did not change from its initial proposal submission to its Final Proposal Revision; Dynetics was very strong in the Management and Technical area from the outset. This was due in part to a key discriminator noted in the findings by the SEB centered around the innovative approach proposed by Dynetics.

Dynetics received a significant strength for its innovative approach which demonstrated its comprehensive knowledge in ***all*** (emphasis added) operational areas of the Performance Work Statement (PWS). Dynetics proposed excellent, innovative, detailed plans for an integrated Governance and Mission Alignment organization to ensure strategic alignment in PWS 4.0, (IT Planning, Policy, Architecture & Integration), remote management and support concept for PWS 5.0 (Telecommunications Services), application of effective software processes for PWS 6.0 (Applications and Web Services), a structured management approach that supports high volume for systems management in PWS 7.0 (Computing Services), and an efficient and effective resource planning process for rapid response in PWS 8.0 (Audio Visual Information Services). Dynetics also received significant strengths for its proposed excellent team of complementary companies and a significant strength for its integrated business system

which results in near real time financial data, including all team members' timekeeping information.

In contrast, we noted both Arcata and Tessada also received similar significant strengths for their proposed excellent team of complementary companies and, in addition, Arcata also received a significant strength for its management tool which will also provide near real time financial data, including all team members' timekeeping information. However, the SEB noted that neither Arcata nor Tessada received a strength, significant or otherwise, for their innovative approach across all operational areas of the PWS.

Based on my review and analysis of the other strengths for all three Offerors in addition to the one similar significant strength for all three Offerors for their complementary team and the one similar significant strength for Dynetics and Arcata for their management tool which provide near real time financial data, I determined that all three Offerors were suited to perform these efforts. However, Dynetics demonstrated an advantage in the numerical score in the Management and Technical Approach subfactor due to its innovative approach across all operational areas of the PWS.

In the Staffing and Total Compensation subfactor, all three Offerors received adjectival ratings of Very Good; however, Tessada received a slightly higher numerical score than Dynetics and Arcata. Under this subfactor both Dynetics and Arcata received one significant strength and three strengths, while Tessada received two significant strengths and one strength. Both Dynetics and Arcata received significant strengths for their proposed Program Managers (PM). Dynetics' PM has 25 years of Government and Commercial customer experience, executive leadership experience and received excellent customer reference feedback. Similarly, Arcata's PM has over 25 years of relevant experience and received excellent customer reference feedback. It was noted that while Tessada received two significant strengths, one for its Manager for IT Planning, Policy, Architecture & Integration and one for its Manager of Applications and Web Services.

It was noted that all three proposals initially had weaknesses in the Staffing and Total Compensation subfactor. However, all three Offerors managed to eliminate all weaknesses, significant or otherwise, during the discussion process and with the submission of their Final Request for Proposals. It was also noted that both Dynetics and Arcata improved significantly in this subfactor from their initial proposal submission. However, while Tessada ultimately received the highest overall numerical score in this subfactor, Tessada only improved slightly from its initial proposal submission.

Based on my review and analysis of the other strengths for all Offerors, the similar significant strengths for Dynetics and Arcata for their proposed Program Managers and the significant strengths for Tessada for its proposed Manager for IT Planning, Policy, Architecture & Integration and its Manager of Applications and Web Services, I determined that Tessada demonstrated an advantage in numerical score in the Staffing and Total Compensation subfactor.

In the Safety, Health, and Environmental subfactor, both Dynetics and Tessada received adjectival ratings of Excellent, while Tessada received an adjectival rating of Good; however, Dynetics had a higher numerical score than Arcata. Both Dynetics and Arcata received two significant strengths, but Dynetics also received an additional strength in this subfactor. Tessada only received one strength in the Safety, Health and Environmental subfactor. Based on my review and the analysis of the significant strengths for both Dynetics and Arcata and the strength for both Dynetics and Tessada, I determined that Dynetics demonstrated an advantage in numerical score in the Safety, Health, and Environmental subfactor.

Based on the above information, I concluded that Dynetics demonstrated an advantage in the Mission Suitability factor which was accurately reflected in its numerical score.

We next considered the Cost factor. All three Offerors adjusted their cost proposals in response to discussions, and the SEB assigned a "High" cost confidence to the Government's probable cost of all three firms. However, Dynetics' proposed cost (*i.e.*, $334.5M) was less than Arcata's (*i.e.*, $339.6M) and Tessada's (*i.e.*, $369.3M) proposed cost. Dynetics proposed a lower cost than Arcata and Tessada across the (1) Labor Rates, (2) Overhead/Fringe, and (3) General and Administrative expenses. These lower cost elements established a cost advantage for Dynetics of $5.1M (as proposed), compared to the next lowest Offeror. Also, as adjusted by the Government, Dynetics' probable cost was the lowest at $337.7M, Arcata's probable cost was $339.6M, and Tessada's probable cost was $372.2M. As a result, selection of Dynetics would result in a small, but not insignificant, cost savings to the Government. From this information, I determined that Dynetics demonstrated a slight advantage over Arcata and a larger advantage over Tessada in the Cost factor.

In the Past Performance factor, all three Offerors received Very High Level of Confidence ratings. In Past Performance Dynetics received two significant strengths and three strengths; Arcata received one significant strength and two strengths; and Tessada received two significant strengths and one strength. We noted that both Dynetics and its subcontractors (i.e., 100 percent of the proposed MITS work) received a significant strength for their past performance for their implementation of safety and health programs. It was also noted that after review of the Past Performance findings, Tessada looks slightly stronger in this subfactor than Dynetics and Arcata. Tessada received a significant strength for performance on a highly relevant contract in size, scope and type with excellent award scores and Tessada's team member also received a significant strength on a highly relevant contract in size, scope and type with excellent award fee ratings. Arcata also received a significant strength for its successful performance as a subcontractor on a highly relevant contract in size, scope and type. In addition, I duly noted the other strength given to Dynetics for receiving the 2008 Huntsville/Madison County "Best Place to Work" award. However, through my own independent knowledge, I also took into consideration that Tessada was awarded the 2008 Johnson Space Center Minority Contractor of the Year award and Arcata received the 2008 NASA Small Business Prime Contractor of the Year award. From this information noted

above, I concluded that Tessada demonstrated a slight advantage over Dynetics and Arcata in the Past Performance factor.

After polling all of my advisors and obtaining their inputs, I concluded that Dynetics, Incorporated provided the best value selection for the Government based on their advantage in the Mission Suitability factor coupled with their slight advantage in the Cost factor as compared to Arcata, and its significant cost advantage compared to Tessada. The slight advantage gained by Tessada in the Past Performance factor did not offset the Mission Suitability advantage and the low Cost advantage for Dynetics, Incorporated. While Arcata's proposal was competitive with Dynetics' proposal in each of the subfactors, it did not offer an advantage over Dynetics in any subfactor. Consequently, I select Dynetics, Incorporated for award of the MSFC Information Technology Services contract.

Robin N. Henderson — 11/20/09

Robin N. Henderson — Date
Source Selection Authority