

National Aeronautics and Space Administration
Ames Research Center

Selection of Contractor
For
Financial Support Services
NNA14408214R

September 4, 2014

On June 26, 2014, I, along with certain NASA Source Evaluation Board (SEB) ex-officio members, met with the SEB members appointed to evaluate the proposals for the Financial Support Services procurement at NASA Ames Research Center (ARC). During this meeting, the SEB presented its Initial Evaluation findings to me, the Source Selection Authority (SSA), and we discussed those findings to assure that I had a full understanding of its evaluation.

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

Procurement Description

ARC has a continuing need for financial support services for the ARC Office of the Chief Financial Office (OCFO). This procurement will yield a contract that will provide support in the following financial areas, including but not limited to: resources management, financial management, program analysis and business integration, business systems support services, and special financial analysis.

This procurement was conducted as a full and open competition and will result in a single award, hybrid contract consisting of a Firm Fixed Price (FFP) Core requirement and Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) requirements with FFP task orders and one Time and Materials (T&M) task order. The IDIQ minimum and maximum is \$500,000 and \$51,000,000, respectively. The period of performance consists of a two year base period (including a 45 day phase in period), and three one-year option periods, resulting in a maximum performance period of five years.

Evaluation Procedure

Proposals were evaluated in accordance with the requirements of Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Subpart 15.3, "Source Selection," as supplemented by NFS (NASA FAR Supplement) Subpart 1815.3, "Source Selection." Section M of the solicitation,

paragraph M.2, Evaluation Approach, advised offerors that the Government may award a contract based solely on the initial offers received, without discussion of such offers. Accordingly, each offeror was required to submit its initial proposal to the Government using the most favorable terms from a price and technical standpoint. However, the Government reserved the right to hold discussions if award on initial offers was determined not to be in the best interest of the Government.

The RFP identified three evaluation Factors: Mission Suitability (Volume I), Past Performance (Volume II), and Price (Volume III). Of these evaluation Factors, Mission Suitability is slightly more important than Price, and Price is significantly more important than Past Performance. When combined, Mission Suitability and Past Performance are moderately more important than Price.

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

Mission Suitability	
Sub-factor	Assigned Weight
Management Approach Phase-In Plan Organizational Structure/Partnering Approach Key Personnel Staffing and Recruitment Total Compensation Plan Organizational Conflict of Interest Avoidance Plan	600
Technical Understanding Overall Understanding and Technical Approach of SOW Requirements 4.2.3, 4.3.1, and 4.3.4	400
Total Points Available	1,000

Each offeror's Mission Suitability proposal was evaluated based on the offeror's ability to fulfill the technical requirements while meeting quality, schedule, and safety requirements and the offeror's management and business approaches. The compatibility between the proposed technical and management approaches, and the overall resources proposed to accomplish the work were important consideration in the evaluation of this factor. The Mission Suitability sub-factors were assigned adjectival ratings and were numerically weighted and scored. The RFP stipulated that the overall Mission Suitability Factor would only receive a numerical score. In accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(3), "Technical Evaluation," the following were potential Mission Suitability adjectival ratings: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, and Poor. In Section M,

paragraph M.2, Evaluation Approach, the RFP defined these adjectival ratings and provided applicable percentile ranges at each rating level.

With regard to Past Performance Factor, the RFP stated that the evaluation would be an assessment of the Government's level of confidence in the offeror's ability to perform the solicitation requirements. The evaluation would include information provided by the offeror and information obtained on past performance questionnaires submitted by the relevant Government and industry contracts. The past performance of the offeror and major subcontractors would be thoroughly evaluated for the currency and relevance of the information, source of the information, context of the data, and general trends in performance of the offeror and major subcontractors regarding the following areas: Cost/Price Control, Timeliness of Performance, and Management Effectiveness. Further, for each offeror and its major subcontractors, the SEB evaluated overall past performance with respect to comparability in contract size, content, and complexity to the requirements of the current acquisition. The RFP required an evaluation of the Past Performance Factor using the following level of confidence ratings: Very High Level of Confidence, High Level of confidence, Moderate Level of Confidence, Low Level of Confidence, Very Low Level of Confidence, and Neutral/Unknown Confidence. In Section M, paragraph M.2, Evaluation Approach, the RFP defined these levels of confidence ratings. The SEB evaluated each offeror's suitability to fulfill the requirements of this contract, as prescribed in Section M of the RFP.

For the Price Factor, the SEB assessed what each offeror's proposal would cost the Government should it be selected for award. The overall price for selection purposes was determined by the sum of the prices proposed for the Contract Management requirement (CLINs 02A, 03A, 04A and 05A), the Core Requirements (CLINs 02B, 03B, 04B and 05B) and IDIQ pricing model (CLINs 02C, 03C, 04C and 05C). Phase-In (CLIN 01) was not included in the total evaluated price, but was evaluated in terms of reasonableness and risk assessment for selection purposes. The Government conducted Price Proposal evaluations in accordance with Section 15.4 of the FAR. Particular attention was given to FAR 15.404-1(b) entitled Price Analysis. Elements of FAR 15.40-1(b) that were considered include comparison of proposed prices received in response to the solicitation; comparison of proposed prices with Government independent cost estimates; and analysis of pricing information provided by the offeror.

Solicitation and Receipt of Proposals

In an effort to better inform industry of NASA's requirements and to improve communications between all parties, ARC held a pre-proposal/pre-bid conference. Interested Parties had the opportunity to meet with the Contracting Officer and Contracting Officer's Representative for 25 minute break-out meetings. All information regarding the pre-proposal/pre-bid conference was posted through the Federal Business Opportunities (FBO) and NASA Acquisition Internet Services (NAIS) websites. Industry was encouraged to submit questions about the FSS requirements and the procurement process. The recommendations and comments received in response to

these communications with industry were carefully evaluated and incorporated into the final RFP, as appropriate.

All documents pertinent to this acquisition were posted electronically on the NASA Acquisition Internet Services (NAIS) Business Opportunities web portal <https://prod.nais.nasa.gov/cgi-bin/nais/index.cgi> as well as the Federal Business Opportunities (FBO) web portal <https://www.fbo.gov>. The draft RFP was released on May 6, 2013. The pre-proposal/pre-bid conference was held on July 16 – 18, 2013. The final RFP was released on November 18, 2013. Two (2) Amendments were posted to NAIS and FBO. Amendment 1 was posted on November 26, 2013, and it contained the following: amendment to the Final Request for Proposal and responses to Questions received. Amendment 2 was posted on December 10, 2013, and it contained the following: amendment to the Final Request for Proposal and responses to Questions received, Contract Data Requirements List CDRL (J.1(a) Attachment 4), and Wage Salary and Fringe Benefit Data (J.1(a) Attachment 12).

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

Al-Razaq Computing Services
6001 Savoy, Suite 505
Houston, Texas 77036

Anglin Consulting Group
4408 First Place NE, #33
Washington, DC 20011

Brandan Enterprises, Inc.
625 Barrow Lane
Knoxville, Tennessee 37932

Cognitive Professional Services
16333 South Great Oaks Drive, Suite 201
Round Rock, Texas 78681

IPT Associates, LLC
Interactive Process Technology, LLC
700 Technology Park Drive, Ste. 204
Billerica, MA 01821

Level 4 Ventures, Inc.
13518 Jamul Drive
Jamul, California 91935

Media Fusion, Inc.

4951 Century St.
Huntsville, AL 35816

The Logical-R Joint Venture, LLC
16902 El Camino Real, Suite 3C
Houston, Texas 77058

Wichita Tribal Enterprises, LLC
1831 E. 71st Street
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74136

The Anglin Consulting Group proposal was deemed to be unacceptable and was not evaluated.

Pursuant to Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 9.405, Wichita Tribal Enterprises, LLC was excluded from competition.

Evaluation Process

Proposals were to include a cover letter from each offeror. Each proposal was to consist of three separate volumes, corresponding to the three respective evaluation Factors, in accordance with Section L of the solicitation and FAR Parts 15.101 and 15.306. A copy of each proposal was issued to each of the voting members, and the Price/Cost Analyst (non-voting members) of the SEB.

After receipt of proposals, the SEB members individually reviewed each of the proposals which included the oral presentations and met to discuss individual findings. Following review of each of the Mission Suitability proposals, the SEB identified findings through consensus (significant strengths, strengths, significant weaknesses, weaknesses and deficiencies, if applicable). In accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(3), findings were used to establish the appropriate adjectival rating, and numerical score for each Mission Suitability sub-factor. The overall Mission Suitability Factor only received a numerical score.

The SEB members evaluated the Past Performance Factor by reviewing the proposals and identifying findings (significant strengths, strengths, significant weaknesses, weaknesses and deficiencies, if applicable). The evaluation included information provided by the offeror, information obtained on past performance questionnaires, and information found in the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) for each offeror and its subcontractor(s). Based upon the above findings, a level of confidence rating was assigned.

After completion of the above steps, the SEB performed a price reasonableness analysis on the proposed prices, considering findings from the Price Analyst in

accordance with FAR 15.4. Neither a numerical score nor an adjectival rating was assigned for the Price Factor.

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

Evaluation Findings of the SEB

Mission Suitability Factor

The following addresses the Mission Suitability findings for the seven Offerors. The SEB did not identify any "Deficiency" findings in any of the Mission Suitability proposals.

Al-Razaq Computing Services

The Al-Razaq Computing Services Mission Suitability proposal received 692 points (out of a possible 1000 points) – the third highest score among all offerors.

In the Management Approach sub-factor, Al-Razaq Computing Services received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 360 points (out of a possible 600 points). There were no strengths or weaknesses identified in this sub-factor.

In the Technical Understanding sub-factor, Al-Razaq Computing Services received an adjectival rating of Very Good with a numerical score of 332 points (out of a possible 400 points). One (1) Significant Strength and one (1) Strength were identified. The Significant Strength was assigned for: (1) the offeror's in-depth, thorough and robust overall technical understanding and approach to how the work will be accomplished for SOW 4.3.4 Cost Estimating and Analysis. The Strength was assigned for: (1) the offeror's comprehensive overall technical understanding and approach of SOW 4.3.1 Program Planning & Control (PP&C).

Brandan Enterprises, Inc.

The Brandan Enterprises, Inc. Mission Suitability proposal received 576 points (out of a possible 1000 points) – the third lowest score among all offerors.

In the Management Approach sub-factor, Brandan Enterprises, Inc. received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 360 points (out of a possible 600 points). There were no strengths or weaknesses identified in this sub-factor.

In the Technical Understanding sub-factor, Brandan Enterprises, Inc. received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 216 points (out of a possible 400

points). One (1) Weakness was identified. The Weakness was assigned for: (1) the offeror's broad approach which did not demonstrate an overall technical understanding of SOW 4.3.1 Program Planning and Control (PP&C).

Cognitive Professional Services

Cognitive Professional Services Mission Suitability proposal received 418 points (out of a possible 1000 points) – the lowest score among all offerors.

In the Management Approach sub-factor, Cognitive Professional Services received an adjectival rating of Fair with a numerical score of 282 points (out of a possible 600 points). One (1) Weakness was identified. The Weakness was assigned for: (1) the offeror's proposed PM who does not appear to have the appropriate and reasonable qualifications to be effective in ensuring successful contract management of the FSS contract.

In the Technical Understanding sub-factor, Cognitive Professional Services received an adjectival rating of Fair with a numerical score of 136 points (out of a possible 400 points). Two (2) Significant Weaknesses were identified. Two (2) Significant Weaknesses were assigned for: (1) the offeror failed to demonstrate an overall technical understanding of SOW 4.3.1 Program Planning and Control (PP&C) and how the work will be accomplished; (2) the offeror failed to demonstrate an overall technical understanding of SOW 4.3.4 Cost Estimating and Analysis and how the work will be accomplished.

IPT Associates, LLC

IPT Associates, LLC Mission Suitability proposal received 648 points (out of a possible 1000 points) – the fourth highest score among all offerors.

In the Management Approach sub-factor, IPT Associates, LLC received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 324 points (out of a possible 600 points).—One (1) Strength and one (1) Weakness were identified. One (1) Strength was assigned for: (1) the offeror's proposed efficient and innovative approach to employee training which includes an outstandingly qualified Training Lead/instructor and a comprehensive list of courses to ensure employees are fully trained to meet FSS requirements. One (1) Weakness was assigned for: (1) the offeror's proposed PM who does not appear to have the appropriate and reasonable qualifications to be effective in ensuring successful contract management of the FSS contract.

In the Technical Understanding sub-factor, IPT Associates, LLC received an adjectival rating of Very Good with a numerical score of 324 points (out of a possible 400 points). One (1) Significant Strength was identified. One (1) Significant Strength was assigned for: (1) the offeror demonstrating an excellent

understanding of SOW 4.3.4 Cost Estimating and Analysis by proposing an in-depth 13 Step Cost Estimating process to accomplish the work.

Level 4 Ventures, Inc.

Level 4 Ventures, Inc. Mission Suitability proposal received 794 points (out of a possible 1000 points) – the second highest score among all offerors.

In the Management Approach sub-factor, Level 4 Ventures, Inc. received an adjectival rating of Very Good with a numerical score of 426 points (out of a possible 600 points). One (1) Significant Strength, one (1) Strength and one (1) Weakness were identified. One (1) Significant Strength was assigned for: (1) the offeror's proposed outstanding group of Leads/Subject Matter Expert (SME) III's as key personnel. One (1) Strength was assigned for: (1) the offeror's proposed Program Manager (PM) V who possesses outstanding relevant experience. One (1) Weakness was assigned for: (1) the offeror's proposed PM III who does not appear to have the appropriate and reasonable skills, and does not have the experience required to be effective in ensuring successful contract performance.

In the Technical Understanding sub-factor, Level 4 Ventures, Inc. received an adjectival rating of Excellent with a numerical score of 368 points (out of a possible 400 points). Three (3) Significant Strengths were identified. The Significant Strengths were assigned for: (1) The offeror's demonstrated excellent understanding of the Reimbursable Agreements Services process and an in-depth approach to accomplishing the SOW 4.2.3 Reimbursable Agreements Management Services requirements; (2) The offeror's in-depth, thorough and robust overall technical understanding and approach to how the work will be accomplished for SOW 4.3.1 Program Planning & Control (PP&C); (3) The offeror provided an in-depth, thorough and robust overall technical understanding and approach to how the work will be accomplished for SOW 4.3.4 Cost Estimating and Analysis.

Media Fusion, Inc.

Media Fusion, Inc. Mission Suitability proposal received 514 points (out of a possible 1000 points) – the second lowest score among all offerors.

In the Management Approach sub-factor, Media Fusion, Inc. received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 366 points (out of a possible 600 points). One (1) Strength was identified. One (1) Strength was assigned for: (1) the offeror's demonstration of a notably efficient and innovative approach to employee training and knowledge transfer by proposing to develop an online training library tool and the offeror's proposed innovative approach to policies and incentives aimed at contributing to employee retention, morale, productivity, growth and development.

In the Technical Understanding sub-factor, Media Fusion, Inc. received an adjectival rating of Fair with a numerical score of 148 points (out of a possible 400 points). Two (2) Significant Weaknesses were identified. The Significant Weaknesses were assigned for: (1) the offeror's failed demonstration of an overall technical understanding of SOW 4.3.1 Program Planning and Control (PP&C) and how the work will be accomplished; (2) the offeror's failed demonstration of an overall technical understanding of SOW 4.3.4 Cost Estimating and Analysis and how the work will be accomplished.

The Logical-R Joint Venture, LLC

The Logical-R Joint Venture, LLC Mission Suitability proposal received 922 points (out of a possible 1000 points) – the highest score among all offerors.

In the Management Approach sub-factor, The Logical-R Joint Venture, LLC received an adjectival rating of Excellent with a numerical score of 546 points (out of a possible 600 points). One (1) Significant Strength was identified. One (1) Significant Strength was assigned for the offeror's proposed Program Manager who possesses thirty years of exceptionally relevant experience combined with his education, leadership, and authority can allow for efficiencies in the execution of contract requirements, which can greatly enhance the potential for successful performance of the contract.

In the Technical Understanding sub-factor, The Logical-R Joint Venture, LLC received an adjectival rating of Excellent with a numerical score of 376 points (out of a possible 400 points). Three (3) Significant Strengths were identified. The Significant Strengths were assigned for: (1) the offeror demonstrated excellent understanding of SOW 4.2.3 Reimbursable Agreements Management Services and provided an in-depth approach to accomplishing the work; (2) the offeror demonstrated excellent understanding of SOW 4.3.1 Program Planning & Control (PP&C) and provided an in-depth approach to accomplishing the work; (3) the offeror demonstrated an excellent understanding of SOW 4.3.4 Cost Estimating and Analysis and provided an in-depth approach to accomplishing the work.

Past Performance Factor

The following addresses the Past Performance findings for the seven Offerors. Past Performance was evaluated in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(2) and NASA FAR Supplement 1815.305(a)(2).

AI-Razaq Computing Services

The evaluation of AI-Razaq Computing Services Past Performance resulted in a High Level of Confidence. Two (2) Significant Strengths and one (1) Weakness were identified. The Significant Strengths were assigned for: (1) the offeror's

excellent experience performing services similar in scope and complexity to the requirements of the current acquisition, demonstrating exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner; (2) the offeror's cost efficiencies implemented that resulted in savings to the government. The one (1) Weakness was assigned for: (1) the offeror's encountered difficulties in hiring and retaining qualified employees in addressing specific requirements of the current FSS contract.

Brandan Enterprises, Inc.

The Brandan Enterprises, Inc. Past Performance resulted in a Moderate Level of Confidence. There were no strengths or weaknesses identified in this sub-factor.

Cognitive Professional Services

Cognitive Professional Services Past Performance resulted in a Moderate Level of Confidence. There were no strengths or weaknesses identified in this sub-factor.

IPT Associates, LLC

IPT Associates, LLC Past Performance resulted in a Moderate Level of Confidence. There were no strengths or weaknesses identified in this sub-factor.

Level 4 Ventures, Inc.

Level 4 Ventures, Inc. Past Performance resulted in a Moderate Level of Confidence. There were no strengths or weaknesses identified in this sub-factor.

Media Fusion, Inc.

Media Fusion, Inc. Past Performance resulted in a Moderate Level of Confidence. Two (2) Strengths were identified. The Strengths were assigned for: (1) the offeror's cost efficiencies implemented that resulted in savings to the government; (2) the offeror's excellent experience hiring and retaining highly qualified employees to meet the contract requirements.

The Logical-R Joint Venture, LLC

The Logical-R Joint Venture LLC Past Performance resulted in a Very High Level of Confidence. One (1) Significant Strengths and one (1) Strength were identified. The Significant Strength was assigned for: (1) the offeror's excellent experience performing services similar in scope and complexity to the requirements of the current acquisition, demonstrating exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner. The Strength was assigned for; (1) the offeror's ability to hire and retain qualified employees in order to meet the requirements of the contract, the offeror's excellent past

performance scores attributing to hiring as a key factor, and laudatory comments in the Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs) in this area.

Cost/Price Factor

The SEB evaluated what each Offeror's proposal would cost the Government should it be selected for award. Proposed prices were analyzed to determine the cost and associated risks of doing business with the offeror based upon the offeror's proposed approach for the proposed price. A price analysis was performed to assess the reasonableness of the proposed prices under the firm-fixed price contract. It was not numerically scored.

Al-Razaq Computing Services had the third to the lowest total proposed Price.

Brandan Enterprises, Inc. had the third highest total proposed Price.

Cognitive Professional Services had the lowest total proposed Price.

IPT Associates, LLC had the highest total proposed Price.

Level 4 Ventures, Inc. had the fourth highest total proposed Price.

Media Fusion, Inc. had the second highest total proposed Price.

The Logical-R Joint Venture, LLC had the second to the lowest total proposed Price.

SELECTION DECISION OF THE SOURCE SELECTION AUTHORITY FOR FINANCIAL SUPPORT SERVICES

FAR 15.308, "Source Selection Decision," states:

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

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

Assessment of the SEB's findings

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

Selection

To reiterate, Mission Suitability is slightly more important than Price, and Price is significantly more important than Past Performance. When combined, Mission Suitability and Past Performance are moderately more important than Price.

The Cognitive Professional Services' Mission Suitability proposal received the lowest Mission Suitability score of all proposals with a score of 418. In the Mission Suitability factor, the Cognitive Professional Services proposal earned no strengths, and three weaknesses, two of which were "Significant." I am particularly concerned with the two "Significant Weaknesses," for (1) failing to demonstrate an overall technical understanding of Program Planning and Control (PP&C) and failing to demonstrate how the PP&C work will be accomplished, and (2) failing to demonstrate an overall technical understanding of Cost Estimating and Analysis and failing to demonstrate how the Cost Estimating and Analysis work will be accomplished. These weaknesses increase the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. With regard to Price, I note that the Price factor is slightly less important than the Mission Suitability factor. Although Cognitive Professional Services was the lowest priced proposal, it also received the lowest score in Mission Suitability. For me, the qualitative difference in Mission Suitability between the highest rated proposal (which is 504 points higher) and Cognitive Professional Services, more than offsets the price savings offered by Cognitive Professional Services. Additionally, it was one of five proposals assessed as having a Moderate Level of Confidence for Past Performance. The Moderate rating assessed for these five proposals was the lowest level of Confidence given for Past Performance by the SEB. Also, Cognitive Professional Services proposal had a significant problem in price which led me to conclude that price adjustments would be required. Therefore, I conclude that Cognitive Professional Services' lowest price does not merit its selection given Cognitive Professional Services' lowest Mission Suitability score along with it having one of the lowest Past Performance ratings of "Moderate." Therefore, I do not select Cognitive Professional Services for contract award.

The Media Fusion, Inc. proposal properly received the second lowest Mission Suitability score of all proposals with a score of 514. In the Mission Suitability factor, Media Fusion, Inc. earned one strength and two significant weaknesses. The one strength noted a proposed unique employee training process and additionally Media Fusion, Inc. provided an innovative approach to employee incentives. With regard to the two "Significant Weaknesses," I am concerned with (1) the failure to demonstrate an overall technical understanding of Program Planning and Control (PP&C) along with the failure to demonstrate how the PP&C work will be accomplished, and (2) the failure to demonstrate an overall technical understanding of Cost Estimating and Analysis along with the failure to demonstrate how the Cost Estimating and Analysis work will be accomplished. These weaknesses increase the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. Media Fusion, Inc. was the second highest priced proposal. It received the second lowest Mission Suitability score. Additionally, it was one of five proposals assessed as having a Moderate Level of Confidence for Past Performance. The Moderate rating assessed for these five proposals was the lowest level of Confidence given for Past Performance by the SEB. Noting Media Fusion, Inc.'s high price along with its second lowest Mission Suitability score and its having one of the lowest Past Performance ratings of "Moderate," I do not select Media Fusion, Inc. for contract award.

Brandan Enterprises, Inc. received the third lowest Mission Suitability score of all proposals with a score of 576. In the Mission Suitability factor, Brandan Enterprises, Inc. earned no strengths and one weakness. I am concerned with this one weakness which is the failure to demonstrate an overall technical understanding of Program Planning and Control (PP&C) along with the failure to demonstrate how the PP&C work will be accomplished. This weakness increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. Brandan Enterprises, Inc. was the third highest priced proposal. It received the third lowest Mission Suitability score. Additionally, it was one of five proposals assessed as having a Moderate Level of Confidence for Past Performance. The Moderate rating assessed for these five proposals was the lowest level of Confidence given for Past Performance by the SEB. Noting Brandan Enterprises, Inc.'s high price along with its third lowest Mission Suitability score and its having one of the lowest Past Performance ratings of "Moderate," I do not select Brandan Enterprises, Inc. for contract award.

The IPT Associates, LLC's Mission Suitability proposal received the fourth highest Mission Suitability score of all proposals with a score of 648. In the Mission Suitability factor, IPT Associates, LLC earned one significant strength, one strength and one weakness. I am impressed with the one significant strength which demonstrated an excellent understanding of Cost Estimating and Analysis by proposing an in-depth multi-step Cost Estimating process. Additionally, IPT Associate, LLCs received a strength for its proposed efficient and innovative approach to employee training along with proposing an outstandingly qualified Training Lead. However, I am concerned with the weakness IPT Associates, LLC received: namely its proposed Program Manager does

not appear to have the appropriate and reasonable skills, and does not have the experience required to be effective in ensuring successful contract performance. In my opinion, this lack of appropriate skills and experience increases the likelihood that this Program Manager will not, to the greatest extent possible, efficiently and effectively manage this important contract. IPT Associates, LLC was the highest priced proposal. Additionally, it was one of five proposals assessed as having a Moderate Level of Confidence for Past Performance. The Moderate rating assessed for these five proposals was the lowest level of Confidence given for Past Performance by the SEB. Noting IPT Associates, LLC highest price along with its fourth highest Mission Suitability score and its having one of the lowest Past Performance ratings of "Moderate," I do not select IPT Associates, LLC for contract award.

Al-Razaq Computing Services received the third highest score of 692 for the Mission Suitability factor. In the Mission Suitability factor, Al-Razaq Computing Services earned one significant strength and one strength. I noted the significant strength assessed for Al-Razaq Computing Services from a finding for an in-depth and robust overall technical understanding and approach to how the work will be accomplished for Cost Estimating and Analysis. I also noted its one strength which was given for a comprehensive overall technical understanding and approach for Program Planning & Control (PP&C). I noted that the Al-Razaq Computing Services proposal had strengths only in the Mission Suitability Technical Understanding sub-factor and none in the Management Approach sub-factor. The strengths were therefore in the sub-factor which has the lower number of points assigned (i.e. 400 points assigned to Technical Understanding versus 600 points assigned to Management Approach). Whereas, the highest rated proposal had strengths across both subfactors. I note that The Logical-R Joint Venture, LLC had a distinct advantage over Al-Razaq Computing Services in the Mission Suitability factor score which is the most important factor. This advantage was a substantial difference with Al-Razaq Computing Services having a 230 point lower Mission Suitability score. Additionally, The Logical-R Joint Venture, LLC had a lower price than Al-Razaq Computing Services with Al-Razaq Computing Services proposing the third lowest price. Finally, while Al-Razaq Computing Services received a "High" Level of Confidence for Past Performance, The Logical-R Joint Venture, LLC received a rating of "Very High." Based upon this assessment, I do not select Al-Razaq Computing Services for contract award.

Level 4 Ventures, Inc. was assessed by the SEB as having the second highest Mission Suitability score of 794. This score of 794 is 128 points lower than the highest score. Level 4 Ventures, Inc. had a very respectable and notable Mission Suitability proposal, which properly earned 794 points out of a possible 1000 points. It earned a total of four significant strengths, one strength, and one weakness. Of these findings, two of the significant strengths were particularly noteworthy to me: (1) the offeror proposed an outstanding group of Leads/SME III's as key personnel who would be available for meeting critical specific technical FSS SOW requirements, and (2) the offeror provided an in-depth, thorough and robust overall technical understanding and approach to how the work will be accomplished for Cost Estimating and Analysis which may greatly

contribute to successfully winning proposals, thus increasing ARC's program and project funding. However, Level 4 Ventures, Inc. had a weakness which concerns me. Its proposed Program Manager III does not appear to have the appropriate and reasonable skills, and does not have the experience required to be effective in ensuring successful contract performance. In my opinion, this lack of appropriate skills and experience increases the likelihood that this Program Manager will not, to the greatest extent possible, efficiently and effectively manage this important contract. Also, it was one of five proposals assessed as having a Moderate Level of Confidence for Past Performance. The Moderate rating assessed for these five proposals was the lowest level of Confidence given for Past Performance by the SEB. Additionally, Level 4 Ventures, Inc. was significantly higher in price. Based upon this assessment, I do not select Level 4 Ventures, Inc. for contract award.

The Logical-R Joint Venture, LLC earned the highest Mission Suitability score of 922 points out of a possible 1000 points – 128 points higher than the next highest score of Level 4 Ventures, Inc. It submitted the most robust and noteworthy Mission Suitability proposal, with four significant strengths. And again, it had no weaknesses of any kind in Mission Suitability. Of its four significant strengths, most important to me were (1) the offeror demonstrated an excellent understanding of Cost Estimating and Analysis and provided an in-depth approach to accomplishing the cost estimating and analysis work, which should greatly enhance the potential for successful contract performance, and (2) the offeror's proposed Program Manager who possesses thirty years of exceptionally relevant experience combined with his education, leadership, and authority can allow for efficiencies in the execution of contract requirements, which can greatly enhance the overall potential for successful performance of the contract. I judged the significant strength for the Program Manager as particularly noteworthy because of its pervasive impact across the whole contract effort.

The Logical-R Joint Venture, LLC's Mission Suitability proposal, received the highest Mission Suitability sub-factor scores for both its Management Approach and Technical Understanding and was the only offeror to receive Excellent adjectival ratings for both sub-factors. Overall the Mission Suitability proposal submitted by The Logical-R Joint Venture, LLC displayed a distinct and superior understanding of the requirements of the RFP and SOW, and best demonstrates that it possesses the necessary technical understanding and capability and critical management prowess, and can support the complex work associated with the FSS.

Acknowledging that Mission Suitability is the most important factor, I therefore conclude that the superiority of The Logical-R Joint Venture, LLC Mission Suitability proposal is the most important discriminator in favor of The Logical-R Joint Venture, LLC.

Additionally, The Logical-R Joint Venture, LLC was the only proposer that had the highest Past Performance Level of Confidence rating of "Very High" and its price was one of the two lowest prices out of the seven proposals evaluated.

The superiority of The Logical-R Joint Venture, LLC Mission Suitability proposal and its Very High Level of Confidence rating for Past Performance indicates that The Logical-R Joint Venture, LLC will provide superior contract management and technical performance throughout the life of the contract. Furthermore, The Logical-R Joint Venture, LLC proposal, which offers the superior response to Mission Suitability at fair and reasonable total proposed price, which is lower than that of Level 4 Ventures, Inc., its closest competitor, will provide the best value to the Government.

In conclusion, based on the above discussion of its proposal and the relative importance of the evaluation Factors set forth in the RFP, I select The Logical-R Joint Venture, LLC for contract award.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ronald J. Liang", is written over a light blue rectangular background.

Ronald J. Liang
Source Selection Authority