

## **SOURCE SELECTION DECISION**

### **Operation of the Center for Aerospace Information (CASI) and Scientific and Technical Information (STI) Program Support Request for Proposal (RFP) Number: NNL10ZB1017R**

On October 27, 2010, the NASA Source Evaluation Team (SET), appointed to evaluate proposals for the Operation of the Center for Aerospace Information (CASI) and Scientific and Technical Information (STI) Program Support procurement, presented their evaluation of the proposals to me.

#### **BACKGROUND**

The CASI requirement supports the Agency-Wide NASA STI Program Office (STIPO). NASA Policy Directive (NPD) 2200.1B, Management of NASA Scientific and Technical Information, directs NASA to conduct an STI program to acquire, produce, manage, and disseminate STI to advance NASA's goals in aeronautics and space science and technology, communicate knowledge, and improve U.S. competitiveness. To assist NASA in achieving this directive, contractor support is required to: (1) Capture and disseminate NASA and non-NASA STI; (2) Provide STI via a web-based environment; and (3) Maintain web-based search and access capability.

Market research was conducted using a Sources Sought Synopsis on the NASA Acquisition Internet Service (NAIS) and the Federal Business Opportunities (FedBizOpps) websites. There were ten respondents to the Sources Sought Synopsis. The procurement was conducted on a competitive 8(a) set-aside basis.

The CASI procurement will result in award to the offeror who presents the best value to the Government based on the evaluation of Mission Suitability, Cost/Price, and Past Performance evaluation factors. The base requirement is firm-fixed-price and consists of the operation of the CASI, the support of all STI Program activities, and the support for NASA HQ Office of the Chief Technologist (OCT). Additionally, firm-fixed-price task orders may be awarded on an indefinite delivery-indefinite quantity (IDIQ) basis in support of the STI Program, the OCT Program, and other organizational support. The period of performance will be five years from the contract effective date consisting of a two-year base period and three one-year option periods. The contract will include a phase-in period. The total estimate of this contract is \$42.2M, the base effort is \$34.2M and the IDIQ portion is \$8M.

The Request for Proposal (RFP) was released on June 25, 2010, with a response date of August 3, 2010. The following companies (with significant subcontractors) responded to the RFP:

Prime: Chugach Federal Solutions, Inc. (Chugach)

Prime: Infused Solutions, LLC

Subcontractor: Progressive Technology Federal Systems, Inc.

Prime: Logical Innovations, Inc.

Subcontractor: L-3 STRATIS

Joint Venture: MCH Corporation/Information International Associates, Inc. (MCH-IIa LLC)

Prime: Syneren Technologies Corporation (Syneren)

Subcontractor: ARES Corporation

## **EVALUATION FACTORS**

Prior to the issuance of the RFP, an SET was appointed to conduct an evaluation of proposals received in response to the RFP. The proposals were evaluated in accordance with the evaluation factors contained in Section M of the RFP. The RFP set forth the following three evaluation factors:

Factor 1: Mission Suitability

Factor 2: Cost/Price

Factor 3: Past Performance

The RFP specified the adjectival ratings and definitions in NFS 1815.305, Proposal Evaluations, and stated that these adjectival ratings and definitions would be used to evaluate the Mission Suitability subfactors.

The Mission Suitability Subfactors are as follows:

Subfactor 1: Understanding the Requirement and Technical Approach

- Technical Understanding
- Transition Management of IT Systems
- Understanding through Innovation

Subfactor 2: Management

- Organizational Structure and Key Positions
- Recruitment and Retention
- Phase-In Plan

The RFP stated that overall, in the selection of an offeror for contract award, Mission Suitability, Price, and Past Performance will be of essentially equal importance. All evaluation factors other than Price, when combined, are significantly more important than Price. Each subfactor under Mission Suitability will be essentially equal in importance.

**Factor 1: Mission Suitability**

**Adjectival Ratings:** The SET used the following adjectival ratings to evaluate the Mission Suitability Factor (NFS 1815.305):

| Adjectival Rating | Description  |
|-------------------|--|
| Excellent         | A comprehensive and thorough proposal of exceptional merit with one or more significant strengths. No deficiency or significant weakness exists.   |
| Very Good         | A proposal having no deficiency and which demonstrates over-all competence. One or more significant strengths have been found, and strengths outbalance any weaknesses that exist.   |
| Good              | A proposal having no deficiency and which shows a reasonably sound response. There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both. As a whole, weaknesses not offset by strengths do not significantly detract from the offeror's response. |
| Fair              | A proposal having no deficiency and which has one or more weaknesses. Weaknesses outbalance any strengths.   |
| Poor              | A proposal that has one or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses that demonstrate a lack of overall competence or would require a major proposal revision to correct.  |

**Definitions:** The SET used the following definitions to develop its findings:

| Type of Finding      | Definition  |
|----------------------|---|
| Significant Strength | An aspect of the proposal that appreciably enhances the potential for successful contract performance.  |
| Strength             | An aspect of the proposal that enhances the potential for successful contract performance.  |
| Significant Weakness | A flaw in the proposal that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.  |
| Weakness             | A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.  |
| Deficiency           | A material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level. |

**Factor 2: Cost/Price**

The RFP does not provide for adjectival ratings or numerical scores under the Cost/Price Factor. Cost/Price evaluation language within Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award, is as follows: "An analysis of the proposed price will be conducted to determine price reasonableness and cost realism. The specific elements of each offeror's proposed price will be reviewed and evaluated by the Government to determine whether the proposed cost/price elements are realistic for the work to be performed, reflect a clear understanding of the requirements, and are consistent with the unique

methods of performance and materials described in the offeror's technical proposal. Results of this analysis may be used in performance of risk assessments and responsibility determinations."

**Factor 3: Past Performance**

The past performance factor assesses each offeror's record of performing services that are similar in size, scope, and complexity to the requirements of the solicitation. Specifically, the RFP states that "each of the adjective ratings below has a "performance" component and a "relevance" component."

Both components contribute to a particular rating. In assessing relevance, the Government will consider the degree of similarity in size, scope, and complexity to the requirements in this solicitation, as well as the currency/recency of the past performance (NFS 1815.305).

**Rating Description:** The SET used the following confidence level ratings to evaluate the Past Performance Factor [NFS 1815.305(a)(2)(A)]:

**Very High Level of Confidence:** The Offeror's relevant past performance is of exceptional merit and is very highly pertinent to this acquisition; indicating exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner; very minor (if any) problems with no adverse effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

**High Level of Confidence:** The Offeror's relevant past performance is highly pertinent to this acquisition; demonstrating very effective performance that would be fully responsive to contract requirements with contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part with only minor problems with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

**Moderate Level of Confidence:** The Offeror's relevant past performance is pertinent to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

**Low Level of Confidence:** The Offeror's relevant past performance is at least somewhat pertinent to this acquisition, and it meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements.

**Very Low Level of Confidence:** The Offeror's relevant past performance does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas which adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

**Neutral:** In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance [see FAR 15.305(a)(2)(ii) and (iv)].

## **EVALUATION PROCEDURES**

The SET conducted the evaluation of proposals in accordance with Section M of the RFP. The SET began its evaluation upon receipt of the Past Performance Volumes (Volume III), which were received from the offerors prior to the proposal due date. The SET members reviewed each offeror's Past Performance Proposal in alphabetical order, all of the past performance questionnaires, and information obtained from the NASA Past Performance Database (PPDB) and the DoD Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS). The SET considered all of the "performance" and "relevance" findings in assigning a confidence rating for each offeror as defined in the RFP.

Upon receipt of Volumes I and II of the proposals, the SET conducted an initial review of each Technical Proposal (Volume I) in alphabetical order and the NASA Cost/Price Analyst reviewed each Business Proposal (Volume II) in alphabetical order to determine if any proposals were unacceptable as defined in NASA FAR Supplement 1815.305-7, Identification of Unacceptable Proposals. All proposals received were found to be acceptable and thus all warranted a full evaluation.

The SET members then performed a detailed individual review of each of the offerors' Mission Suitability proposals and documented strengths and weaknesses for each subfactor under the Mission Suitability factor. After completion of the individual evaluations for each subfactor, the SET met to discuss individual findings and to develop consensus strengths and weaknesses for each of the offerors. The SET then reviewed the findings for each offeror, and performed a check of the findings to ensure that all proposals were evaluated consistently and objectively and made adjustments as necessary. Upon completion of the evaluation of all subfactors for all offerors, the SET assigned adjectival ratings to each subfactor based on the consensus findings in accordance with NFS 1815.305.

The SET reviewed each of the offeror's Business Proposals to determine whether the cost proposal was reasonable, realistic, and consistent with the technical approach. The cost proposals were assessed to ensure compliance with the RFP. The SET provided the results of its review to the NASA Cost/Price Analyst who incorporated the results into the detailed analysis of the individual cost proposals.

The SET presented the initial findings for the 3 evaluation factors to the Contracting Officer on October 4, 2010. The Contracting Officer determined that, based on the evaluation team's consensus findings, discussions were not required and selection for award could be made based on the initial evaluation of the proposals.

## **EVALUATION FINDINGS**

### **Factor 1: Mission Suitability**

Set forth below is a summary of the Mission Suitability Findings for the five offerors.

#### **Chugach**

Chugach received an overall adjectival rating of Excellent for the Mission Suitability Factor.

Chugach's proposal was found to contain several significant strengths and strengths, and no weaknesses or significant weaknesses.

#### **Subfactor 1 - Understanding the Requirement and Technical Approach**

Chugach received an adjectival rating of Excellent for Subfactor 1.

Chugach received a significant strength for demonstrating their exceptional understanding of the significant technical risk of releasing export controlled and Sensitive But Unclassified (SBU) information, including protected Personally Identifiable Information (PII), to unauthorized individuals and provided a highly effective multi-faceted approach to mitigate the risk utilizing both manual and automated processes and tools.

Chugach received another significant strength for providing a methodically phased and highly disciplined approach to managing the transition from the current CASI legacy IT System to BridgeLogiQ, including transition planning, configuration, testing, and implementation. The approach included the development and execution of several documents/plans to facilitate a successful transition.

Chugach received strengths for demonstrating their clear understanding of the significant technical risks of CASI legacy IT system security vulnerabilities, CASI legacy IT system stability, and poor quality Portable Document File (PDF) images present in the NASA Aeronautics and Space Database (NA&SD) as a risk to the successful migration to an all-digital model for data archiving and dissemination and sound approaches to mitigating these risks. Chugach also received strengths for their proposed staffing changes to reduce IT staff and reallocate content management staff leveraging system efficiencies across the CASI operations following the BridgeLogiQ implementation and for their sound approach to identifying and implementing innovations and improvements to further the objectives of the STI Program.

#### Subfactor 2 - Management

Chugach received an adjectival rating of Excellent for Subfactor 2.

Chugach received a significant strength for their identification of key positions considered essential to the successful implementation and performance of the contract and proposed highly qualified personnel for each of the key positions. Chugach's proposed personnel for the five key positions identified are incumbents with many years of combined CASI management experience. In addition, the Program Manager (PM) and Content Management Group Manager possess many years of STI content management experience. Four of the proposed personnel are Certified BridgeLogiQ Systems Integrators and two are Project Management Professionals (PMP).

Chugach received another significant strength for their all-inclusive phase-in plan to minimize changeover difficulties and maximize continuity of services which included a dedicated corporate Phase-In Team, beginning phase-in activities immediately upon contract award with incumbent hiring finalized prior to the holiday season, and assumption of both CASI North and South leases with more favorable terms than the existing leases.

Chugach received a strength for their proposed efficient organizational structure for managing the work providing appropriate program management emphasis and oversight on NASA's high risk projects. Chugach also received a strength for their strategy for recruitment and retention of highly qualified professional employees which included flexible schedules and telecommuting, tuition assistance, and cross training.

---

#### Infused Solutions

Infused Solutions received an overall adjectival rating of Poor for the Mission Suitability Factor.

Infused Solutions' proposal was found to contain several weaknesses, a few significant weaknesses, and no strengths or significant strengths.

Subfactor 1 - Understanding the Requirement and Technical Approach

Infused Solutions received an adjectival rating of Poor for Subfactor 1.

Infused Solutions received a weakness for their incomplete approach to identifying and implementing innovations and improvements to further the objectives of the STI Program during the life of the contract. Infused Solutions' brief discussion of their approach is focused solely on continuous improvement and did not address innovations.

Infused Solutions received a significant weakness for their lack of technical understanding demonstrated by the improper identification of significant technical risks and their inappropriate approach for managing those risks. Infused Solutions identified numerous technical risks, many of which are contractual risks directly resulting from failure to perform the requirements of the SOW, not technical risks as required. For some risks identified, Infused Solutions proposed an inappropriate approach for managing that risk. In many cases, Infused Solutions' approach to managing the risk identified is already a requirement of the SOW. Infused Solutions identified several IT related risks, but did not identify significant technical risks in the areas of growing IT security requirements and vulnerabilities, as well as, the CASI legacy system stability.

Infused Solutions received another significant weakness for their unclear approach to managing the transition from the CASI legacy IT System to BridgeLogiQ. Infused Solutions did not provide adequate details regarding their technical approach to transition planning, testing, configuration, and implementation of the new system for NASA to determine the effectiveness of their approach. Infused Solutions' approach was unclear because it contained many undefined terms and acronyms. In addition, Infused Solutions did not properly identify staffing changes nor did they provide an approach to the retirement and disposal of the legacy system following implementation to BridgeLogiQ.

Subfactor 2 - Management

Infused Solutions received an adjectival rating of Fair for Subfactor 2.

Infused Solutions received a weakness for their improper identification of all key positions considered essential to the successful implementation and performance of the contract. Infused Solutions also received a weakness for their failure to provide adequate details about their recruitment and retention strategy, specifically the total compensation plan, for NASA to determine the adequacy of the strategy to effectively recruit and retain highly qualified professional employees.

---

**Logical Innovations**

Logical Innovations received an overall adjectival rating of Poor for the Mission Suitability Factor.

Logical Innovations' proposal was found to contain a strength, a weakness, several significant weaknesses and no significant strengths.

Subfactor 1 - Understanding the Requirement and Technical Approach

Logical Innovations received an adjectival rating of Poor for Subfactor 1.

Logical Innovations received a strength for their approach to handling any potential Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCIs) which may arise in the performance of the contract which included the development and adherence to an OCI Plan.

Logical Innovations received a weakness for their incomplete approach to identifying and implementing innovations and improvements. Logical Innovations' approach vaguely described how they proposed to identify innovations and improvements; however, they failed to provide an approach for implementing innovations and improvements once identified.

Logical Innovations received a significant weakness for their lack of understanding demonstrated by the improper identification of significant technical risks and their inappropriate approach for managing those risks. Logical Innovations identified several technical risks as significant; however, the risks were not prioritized and several key content management and IT related risks were not identified. For the risks identified, Logical Innovations did not provide an acceptable approach to managing the risks and in many cases, the approach to managing the risk identified is already a requirement of the SOW. Logical Innovations described several processes they will implement to manage the risks, but did not provide detailed information on how the processes worked. Without further details on these processes, NASA could not evaluate Logical Innovations' effectiveness in managing these risks.

Logical Innovations received another significant weakness for their inadequate approach to managing the transition from the legacy systems to BridgeLogiQ. Logical Innovations did not elaborate on any of the key steps identified in the transition process. In addition, Logical Innovations did not properly identify staffing changes nor did they provide an approach to the retirement and disposal of the legacy system following implementation to BridgeLogiQ.

#### Subfactor 2 - Management

Logical Innovations received an adjectival rating of Poor for Subfactor 2.

Logical Innovations received a significant weakness for their failure to identify all key positions considered essential to the successful implementation and performance of the contract. Logical Innovations proposed two key positions; however, it is not clear that either of the key positions are responsible for content management or on-site management at CASI North and CASI South. In addition, Logical Innovations did not propose fully qualified personnel for the key positions identified. The PM's experience is not related to either content management or IT Operations and the Technical Lead possesses little operational IT management experience needed to manage the day-to-day operations of the CASI IT infrastructure. Additionally, Logical Innovations did not provide evidence of commitment for either key position.

---

#### **MCH-IIa**

MCH-IIa received an overall adjectival rating of Good for the Mission Suitability Factor.

MCH-IIa's proposal was found to contain several strengths, a few weaknesses, and no significant strengths or significant weaknesses.

#### Subfactor 1 - Understanding the Requirement and Technical Approach

MCH-IIa received an adjectival rating of Good for Subfactor 1.

MCH-IIa received a strength for demonstrating a clear understanding of the significant technical risks inherent in performing the requirements of the SOW. MCH-IIa also received a strength for their sound approaches to managing the inadvertent release of PII and the incorrect management of copyright and intellectual property rights.

MCH-IIa received a weakness for their failure to provide an approach to the retirement and disposal of the legacy system following implementation to BridgeLogiQ. MCH-IIa also received a weakness for not providing adequate information on their approach to staffing changes following the BridgeLogiQ implementation.

#### Subfactor 2 - Management

MCH-IIa received an adjectival rating of Good for Subfactor 2.

MCH-IIa received a strength for their proposed efficient organizational structure for managing the work providing appropriate program management emphasis and oversight on NASA's high risk projects. MCH-IIa also received a strength for their proper identification of key positions considered essential to the successful implementation and performance of the contract and their proposed qualified personnel for each of the key positions including a Deputy PM/Content Manager with many years of experience in content management. MCH-IIa also received a strength for their detailed phase-in plan to minimize changeover difficulties and maximize continuity of services which included a dedicated corporate Phase-In Team, a 21 day phase-in beginning immediately upon contract award, and assumption of both CASI North and South leases based on the current lease terms (with contingent leases in hand).

---

#### Syneren

Syneren received an overall adjectival rating of Poor for the Mission Suitability Factor.

Syneren's proposal was found to contain a strength, several weaknesses and significant weaknesses, and no significant strengths.

#### Subfactor 1 - Understanding the Requirement and Technical Approach

Syneren received an adjectival rating of Fair for Subfactor 1.

Syneren received a strength for their approach to managing the transition from the current CASI legacy IT System to BridgeLogiQ, including transition planning, testing, configuration, and implementation.

Syneren received a weakness for their failure to provide an approach to the retirement and disposal of the legacy system following implementation to BridgeLogiQ. Syneren also received a weakness for not providing adequate information on their approach to staffing changes following the BridgeLogiQ implementation.

Syneren received a significant weakness for their lack of technical understanding demonstrated by the improper identification of significant technical risks and their inappropriate approach for managing those risks. Syneren identified numerous technical risks, many of which are contractual risks directly resulting from failure to perform the requirements of the SOW, not technical risks as required. In most cases, Syneren's approach to managing the risk identified is already a requirement of the SOW. Syneren identified several IT related risks, but did not identify significant technical risks in the areas of growing IT security requirements and vulnerabilities, as well as, the CASI legacy system stability.

#### Subfactor 2 - Management

Syneren received an adjectival rating of Poor for Subfactor 2.

Syneren received a weakness for their unclear approach for contract phase-in and for minimizing changeover difficulties and maximizing continuity of services. Syneren’s approach contained unclear and conflicting statements with regard to phase-in schedule, staffing, and lease assumptions.

Syneren received a significant weakness for their organizational structure. Syneren’s organizational structure allocated an exceptionally low number of WYE to the key functional area of content management which does not facilitate work in an efficient manner.

Syneren received another significant weakness for their failure to identify a key position responsible for content management as well as the insufficient experience of the proposed Technical Leads, who possessed little operational IT management experience needed to manage the day-to-day operations of the CASI IT infrastructure.

**Factor 2: Cost/Price**

The CASI contract will be Firm-Fixed-Price Base Effort with an Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity portion on which task orders will be issued by the Government.

The SET and NASA Cost/Price Analyst performed an analysis of the proposed prices to assess price reasonableness and cost realism, confirm the offerors demonstrated a clear understanding of the requirements, and possessed the ability to perform the contract for the stated price.

In accordance with FAR 15.402, the Contracting Officer has determined that three of the five proposed prices are fair and reasonable based on the spread from the highest proposed price to the lowest proposed price, comparison of the proposed prices to the Government estimate, and the fact that adequate price competition was obtained. Chugach’s proposed price for the firm-fixed-price base effort was the lowest followed by MCH-IIa, Infused Solutions, Syneren, and Logical Innovations. Chugach’s proposed price of \$38.9M (base effort of \$30.9M and IDIQ of \$8.0M) is slightly below the Government estimate.

**Factor 3: Past Performance**

The SET evaluated the offerors’ past performance records (including significant subcontractors) in accordance with M.3 of the RFP. The SET considered the records of performing contracts similar in size, scope and complexity to the CASI. Both the performance records and the relevance of the experience were evaluated. A confidence rating was assigned in accordance with NFS 1815.305.

| Name of Offeror     | Performance Rating | Relevance Rating      | Confidence Rating |
|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Chugach             | Very Good          | Very highly pertinent | High Level        |
| Infused Solutions   | Very Good          | Somewhat Pertinent    | Low Level         |
| Logical Innovations | Excellent          | Somewhat Pertinent    | Low Level         |
| MCH-IIa             | Excellent          | Highly Pertinent      | High Level        |
| Syneren             | Excellent          | Somewhat Pertinent    | Low Level         |

Chugach’s experience overall was found to be very highly pertinent in comparison to the CASI requirements. Chugach demonstrated very highly pertinent experience in all SOW task elements.

Chugach was found to have very highly pertinent experience with contracts of similar size and complexity. Overall, Chugach demonstrated a very good past performance record. Therefore, Chugach was assigned a High Level of Confidence rating for the Past Performance factor.

The Infused Solutions team's experience overall was found to be somewhat pertinent in comparison to the CASI requirements. The Infused Solutions team demonstrated very highly pertinent experience in information digitization; highly pertinent experience in general management; pertinent experience in IT infrastructure operation and maintenance; somewhat pertinent experience in physical and information disaster readiness and recovery, information ingest, program office support and Spinoff magazine publication & support; and did not demonstrate any pertinent experience in the other SOW elements. The Infused Solutions team was not found to have pertinent experience with contracts similar in size or complexity to the CASI requirements. Overall, the Infused Solutions team demonstrated a very good past performance record. Therefore, the Infused Solutions team was assigned a Low Level of Confidence rating for the Past Performance factor.

The Logical Innovations team's experience overall was found to be somewhat pertinent in comparison to the CASI requirements. The Logical Innovations team demonstrated highly pertinent experience in IT infrastructure operation and maintenance; pertinent experience in program office support; somewhat pertinent experience in general management; and did not demonstrate any pertinent experience in the other SOW elements. The Logical Innovations team was not found to have pertinent experience with contracts similar in size or complexity to the CASI requirements. Overall, the Logical Innovations team demonstrated an excellent past performance record. Therefore, the Logical Innovations team was assigned a Low Level of Confidence rating for the Past Performance factor.

MCH-IIa experience overall was found to be highly pertinent in comparison to the CASI requirements. MCH-IIa demonstrated very highly pertinent experience in general management, information ingest, IT infrastructure operation and maintenance, and Spinoff magazine publication & support; highly pertinent experience in information disaster readiness and recovery, information acquisition, and information digitization; pertinent experience in information dissemination and program office support; and somewhat pertinent experience in facilities management and operation and information management and archive. MCH-IIa was found to have pertinent experience with contracts of similar size and complexity. Overall, MCH-IIa demonstrated an excellent past performance record. Therefore, MCH-IIa was assigned a High Level of Confidence rating for the Past Performance factor.

The Syneren team's experience overall was found to be somewhat pertinent in comparison to the CASI requirements. The Syneren team demonstrated highly pertinent experience in IT infrastructure operation and maintenance; pertinent experience in program office support; somewhat pertinent experience in general management; and did not demonstrate any pertinent experience in the other SOW elements. The Syneren team was not found to have pertinent experience with contracts similar in size or complexity to the CASI requirements. Overall, the Syneren team demonstrated an excellent past performance record. Therefore, the Syneren team was assigned a Low Level of Confidence rating for the Past Performance factor.

### **BASIS FOR SELECTION**

The SET presented its findings to me on October 27, 2010. I am convinced that the SET conducted a thorough, fair, and objective evaluation of all proposals in accordance with the established evaluation factors. I comparatively assessed the proposals against all evaluation factors and subfactors in the RFP. I also considered all factors, and their relative ratings, in the selection of the offeror that can perform the contract in a manner most advantageous to the Government.

In reviewing the SET findings I noted that three of the five offerors received Mission Suitability ratings of Poor, along with Low Level of Confidence ratings for Past Performance. I further noted that these same three offerors had the highest proposed prices. (I did note that there was a calculation error in Logical Innovations' price proposal; however, even if corrected, they would remain in the highest priced grouping.) Consequently, I determined that none of these three offerors would receive further consideration for award.

In reviewing the remaining two offerors in the area of Factor 1, Mission Suitability, I noted that Chugach received an Excellent rating for having several significant strengths and strengths with no weaknesses, while MCH-IIa received a Good rating for having several strengths and a few weaknesses. It is my judgment that Chugach demonstrated a superior understanding of the CASI requirements, provided sound approaches to managing the significant technical risks inherent in the CASI operation, and provided an excellent approach to managing the transition from the current CASI legacy IT System to BridgeLogiQ. Chugach also received significant strengths for staffing key positions and for their all-inclusive phase-in plan to minimize changeover difficulties and maximize continuity of services.

In the area of Factor 2, Cost/Price, I noted that the price proposed by Chugach was lower than the price proposed by MCH-IIa.

In the area of Factor 3, Past Performance, I noted that both Chugach and MCH-IIa received a High Level of Confidence rating and that each is essentially equal in past performance and well suited for the performance of the CASI contract.

**DECISION**

I conducted an integrated assessment of each proposal in accordance with the RFP's evaluation factors.

Having compared the strengths and weaknesses of Chugach and MCH-IIa, it is clear that Chugach offers a superior approach in the area of Mission Suitability, as evidenced by the Excellent rating in Mission Suitability. This superior approach, when combined with Chugach's lower price and High Confidence rating in Past Performance, provides the best value to the Government. Therefore, I select Chugach Federal Solutions, Inc. for award of the Operation of the CASI and STI Program Support contract.

Signed Original on File

---

Panice H. Clark  
Source Selection Authority

---

Date