SOURCE SELECTION STATEMENT FOR THE
TEST AND OPERATIONS SUPPORT CONTRACT
REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
(SOLICITATION NUMBER NNK12403225R)

On December 10, 2012, I, as the designated Source Selection Authority (SSA) for the Test and Operations Support Contract (TOSC), along with senior officials of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and NASA John F. Kennedy Space Center (KSC), met with the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed to evaluate proposals for TOSC. My decision on selection of the successful offeror is set forth in this Source Selection Statement.

PROCUREMENT DESCRIPTION

The objective of this procurement was a single processing contract for performing the overall management and implementation of ground systems capabilities, flight hardware processing, and launch operations in support of the International Space Station (ISS), Ground Systems Development and Operations (GSDO), Space Launch System (SLS) and Multi-Purpose Crew Vehicle (MPCV) Programs, as well as select support services for the Launch Services Program (LSP). This procurement involved the following specific services to be provided to NASA Programs and other NASA customers (e.g., other NASA programs/projects, commercial companies, and other government agencies): launch vehicle, spacecraft, and payload integration and processing; operations and development of associated processes and ground systems to support integration, processing, and launch; servicing and testing of flight hardware; and launch of development and operational flights at KSC.

The TOSC acquisition was conducted using full and open competitive procedures. The RFP advised offerors that the Government would use a trade-off process, as described in Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.101-1, in making source selection, and that proposals would be evaluated in accordance with the RFP and the source selection procedures provided at FAR Subpart 15.3 as supplemented by NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Subpart 1815.3.

This procurement will result in a performance-based cost-plus-award-fee contract with a provision for obtaining additional requirements on an indefinite-delivery indefinite-quantity (IDIQ) basis. TOSC has a one-year, seven-month basic performance period and six option periods totaling eight years (two, 2-year option periods and four, 1-year option periods), for a total potential period of performance of nine years, seven months. The resulting contract includes requirements for the following areas: program management and control; safety and mission assurance; information and data management; processing support systems and integration; flight hardware processing; ground systems operations, maintenance and sustaining engineering; logistics and spaceport services.

WHG
13d#.3013

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The RFP defined the evaluation factors as Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost and provided the relative importance of these factors. The Mission Suitability factor and Past Performance factor, when combined are approximately equal to the Cost factor. The RFP further provided that the Cost factor is more important that the Mission Suitability factor which is more important than the Past Performance factor.

The Mission Suitability factor addressed the offeror's overall understanding of contract requirements and adequacy of its approach. The RFP provided that each offeror's Mission Suitability proposal would be evaluated and point scored. This procedure required the Government to evaluate proposals under each subfactor, identifying significant strengths, strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, or deficiencies; to assign an adjectival rating for each subfactor based on the findings; to determine a percentile score for each subfactor based on the findings; and to calculate a total point score for the Mission Suitability factor using the weighted sum of subfactor scores. In this regard, the RFP defined Mission Suitability as consisting of the following subfactors and assigned points to each as indicated.

Technical Approach	375
Management Approach	375
Safety, Mission Assurance and Environmental Management	150
Small Business Participation Approach	100
Total	1000

The RFP provided for the evaluation of the Past Performance factor using levels of confidence ratings to assess the Government's confidence in the offeror's ability to perform TOSC requirements. The RFP defined the following levels of confidence ratings: Very High, High, Moderate, Low, Very Low, and Neutral. Under this factor, the SEB was required to evaluate each Offeror's recent and relevant performance of work similar in size, content, and complexity to the TOSC requirements. The RFP provided that past performance within the last five years was considered recent, and performance in any of the following areas was considered relevant: human space flight experience, spaceflight hardware experience, or high-risk, hazardous activities in areas other than space. The RFP further provided for evaluation of past performance for any major subcontractor, defined as a company having a subcontract value greater than or equal to $50 million over the total potential period of performance.

Regarding the Cost factor, the RFP provided for the evaluation, but not numerical scoring or adjectival rating of cost. The RFP advised offerors that the Government would perform both a cost analysis and a cost realism analysis and provided that the Government would use these analyses to determine the most probable cost to the Government. As defined in the RFP, the probable cost to the Government includes the contract phase-in period, the basic performance period and option periods for all contract line item numbers (CLINs) identified in the Schedule including optional CLINs and their respective option periods, and other specified Government

 WHG 13de 2012

costs. In accordance with the RFP, the SEB was to evaluate the reasonableness and realism of the offerors' proposed costs as well as the reasonableness of the proposed IDIQ rates.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION PROCESS

NASA issued the TOSC RFP on December 6, 2011. During the course of the procurement, five amendments were issued by the Contracting Officer to respond to questions submitted by offerors, revise the basic performance period and certain technical requirements, and incorporate other minor changes.

On February 21, 2012, timely proposals were received from the following offerors (in alphabetical order):

- **Boeing Space Operations Company (Boeing)**
- **Jacobs Technology Inc. (Jacobs)**
- **Northrop Grumman Technical Services, Inc. (Northrop Grumman)**

The SEB reviewed each offeror's Mission Suitability proposal, reached consensus on findings, rated and scored each subfactor, applied the established numerical weights, and produced an overall Mission Suitability score for each proposal. To arrive at the level of confidence rating for Past Performance, the SEB relied on the performance data provided in each proposal and information obtained for the relevant contracts identified in the proposals, as well as other past performance information available to the SEB. The SEB also evaluated each offeror's cost and arrived at a probable cost to the Government. In addition to the evaluation of the factors and subfactors identified above, the SEB ensured all solicitation requirements established by the RFP were met. Further, as part of the evaluation process, the SEB found all Offerors to be responsible, to have acceptable Organizational Conflict of Interest Mitigation Plans, and to have indicated their intent to comply with the contract terms and conditions. On August 7, 2012, the SEB presented their initial findings to me as the SSA.

Based on the results of the initial evaluation and with my concurrence as the SSA, the Contracting Officer determined that discussions were necessary and a competitive range consisting of all three offerors was established. Discussions were conducted with each offeror during the period of August 16, 2012, through October 26, 2012. During discussions, the Contracting Officer advised each offeror of all weaknesses, significant weaknesses, and aspects in its proposal requiring further clarification. Moreover, as part of discussions, each offeror was provided an opportunity to address significant weaknesses, weaknesses, and aspects of the proposal requiring further clarification in writing, orally, and through proposal change pages. At the conclusion of discussions, each offeror was provided an opportunity to submit a Final Proposal Revision (FPR). FPRs were received from all three offerors before the cut-off date of November 5, 2012.

Following the same evaluation process used for the initial evaluation, the SEB completed the final evaluation of the offerors' FPR for all factors. As a result of the SEB's final evaluation, the

 WHG 13dec 2013

relative order of offerors according to Mission Suitability score (highest to lowest) is as follows: Jacobs, Boeing, and Northrop Grumman. For probable cost, the offerors were ordered from lowest to highest as follows: Jacobs, Boeing, and Northrop Grumman. This order did not differ from the offerors' proposed cost. Finally, the evaluation of each offeror's Past Performance yielded a Very High level of confidence rating. The SEB reported its findings to me on December 10, 2012, as discussed by factor below.

MISSION SUITABILITY EVALUATION

The substance of the SEB's evaluation of each offeror's proposal with regard to Mission Suitability follows, in order of their ranking from highest to lowest:

Jacobs

Jacobs' proposal received the highest overall Mission Suitability score. The SEB identified seven significant strengths, four strengths, and no significant weaknesses or weaknesses in the proposal. The following is a summary of the SEB's evaluation of Jacobs' proposal under the four subfactors:

Management Approach: The SEB rated Jacobs' proposal to be "Excellent" in the Management Approach subfactor. Within this subfactor, Jacobs' proposal contained three significant strengths and two strengths. The three significant strengths in Jacobs' Management Approach were: (1) key personnel possessed significant qualifications and experience highly relevant to their respective functional area of responsibility, and a team with demonstrated leadership in aerospace operations, human spaceflight, and operations and maintenance of aging unique ground systems; (2) an integrated team approach that employs the same administrative procedures and processes as well as personnel compensation policies across the contract, resulting in a cohesive and organizationally blended team; and (3) a comprehensive continuous learning and improvement culture that is based on defined overarching goals and priorities and reinforced through numerous methods.

Technical Approach: The SEB rated Jacobs' proposal to be "Very Good" in the Technical Approach subfactor. Within this subfactor, Jacobs' proposal contained two significant strengths and two strengths. The two significant strengths in Jacobs' Technical Approach were: (1) a comprehensive ground systems asset management program that utilizes a suite of strategies, processes, and tools that appreciably increase the reliability and supportability of ground systems; and (2) an exceptional approach to provide staffing flexibility and cross-utilization of personnel by maximizing access and use of expertise and skills across Performance Work Statement elements, incentivizing employees to expand skills, and providing access to expertise and skills through external resource programs.

Safety, Mission Assurance and Environmental Management (SMAE) Approach: The SEB rated Jacobs' proposal to be "Excellent" in the SMAE Approach subfactor. Within this subfactor, Jacobs' proposal contained one significant strength for establishment of a proactive, culture-based approach demonstrating an exceptional commitment to safety, mission assurance and environmental management.

 WHG 13dec 2012

Small Business Utilization: The SEB rated Jacobs' proposal to be "Excellent" in the Small Business Utilization subfactor. Jacobs' proposal contained one significant strength for Jacobs' significant commitment to small business utilization demonstrated by greatly exceeding the Government's recommended total small business subcontracting goal, by assigning high technology work to small businesses across the entire PWS, and by documenting teaming agreements with small businesses identified as major subcontractors.

Boeing

Boeing's Mission Suitability proposal ranked second. The SEB gave Boeing's proposal a marginally lower overall Mission Suitability score than Jacobs. The SEB identified seven significant strengths, five strengths, no significant weaknesses, and one weakness in the proposal. The following is a summary of the SEB's evaluation of Boeing's proposal under the four subfactors:

Management Approach: The SEB rated Boeing's proposal to be "Excellent" in the Management Approach subfactor. Within this subfactor, Boeing's proposal contained two significant strengths and three strengths. The two significant strengths in Boeing's Management Approach were: (1) key personnel possessed significant qualifications and experience highly relevant to their respective functional area of responsibility, and a team with demonstrated leadership and related experience in launch operations, processing flight hardware, and providing engineering, ground systems and logistics services for complex launch vehicles, spacecraft, and payloads; and (2) a comprehensive continuous improvement approach based on sound principles and processes, utilizing wide-ranging methods.

Technical Approach: The SEB rated Boeing's proposal to be "Very Good" in the Technical Approach subfactor. Within this subfactor, Boeing's proposal contained three significant strengths, two strengths, and one weakness. The three significant strengths in Boeing's Technical Approach were: (1) a highly-effective and flexible staffing approach which efficiently meets processing surge staffing requirements through external sources and provides continuity, technical integration, and leadership to effectively cross-utilize its workforce; (2) a comprehensive and methodical processing operations approach, which utilizes multiple, highly-effective strategies and processes; and (3) a comprehensive integrated logistics approach that optimizes logistics support to operations and processing activities through strategies, processes, and tools.

SMAE Approach: The SEB rated Boeing's proposal to be "Very Good" in the SMAE Approach subfactor. Within this subfactor, Boeing's proposal contained one significant strength for a rigorous, process-oriented approach demonstrating a strong commitment to safety, mission assurance and environmental management.

Small Business Utilization: The SEB rated Boeing's proposal to be "Excellent" in the Small Business Utilization subfactor. Boeing's proposal contained one significant strength for Boeing's significant commitment to small business utilization by greatly exceeding the

 WHG 13 dec 2013

Government's recommended total small business subcontracting and socioeconomic subcategory goals, and by assigning high technology work to its small business subcontractors.

Northrop Grumman

Northrop Grumman's proposal received the lowest overall Mission Suitability score, scoring lower than Jacobs and Boeing in this factor. The SEB identified five significant strengths, three strengths, and no significant weaknesses or weaknesses in the proposal. The following is a summary of the SEB's evaluation of Northrop Grumman's proposal under the four subfactors:

Management Approach: The SEB rated Northrop Grumman's proposal to be "Very Good" in the Management Approach subfactor. Within this subfactor, Northrop Grumman's proposal contained two significant strengths. These significant strengths were: (1) key personnel possess significant qualifications and experience highly relevant to their respective functional area of responsibility and a team that brings experience in spaceflight systems processing and launch from multiple human spaceflight and other NASA programs; and (2) a comprehensive continuous improvement approach demonstrating Northrop Grumman's commitment to improve products and services through various performance evaluation techniques and a full suite of continuous improvement tools.

Technical Approach: The SEB rated Northrop Grumman's proposal to be "Very Good" in the Technical Approach subfactor. Within this subfactor, Northrop Grumman's proposal contained one significant strength and three strengths. The significant strength was based on Northrop Grumman's staffing approach to provide a highly-flexible and cross-utilized workforce, utilizing a team-based methodology to effectively support multiple programs and customers, proactive training techniques, and mechanisms for supporting surge requirements.

SMAE Approach: The SEB rated Northrop Grumman's proposal to be "Very Good" in the SMAE Approach subfactor. Within this subfactor, Northrop Grumman's proposal contained one significant strength for Northrop Grumman's commitment to safety, mission assurance and environmental management including a comprehensive safety program with initiatives indicative of a safety culture dedicated to creating and maintaining a safe and healthy workplace.

Small Business Utilization: The SEB rated Northrop Grumman's proposal to be "Excellent" in the Small Business Utilization subfactor. Northrop Grumman's proposal contained one significant strength for a significant commitment to small business utilization by greatly exceeding the Government's recommend total small business subcontracting goal, by assigning high technology work to subcontractors, and by documenting subcontract agreements with small businesses identified as major subcontractors.

PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

The SEB evaluated each offeror's past performance during the initial evaluations, with a validation of initial level of confidence ratings for the Past Performance factor during the final evaluation. Boeing, Jacobs, and Northrop Grumman received an overall level of confidence rating of "Very High," meaning the Government has a very high level of confidence that each of the three offerors will successfully perform the required effort based upon their past

 WHG 13dec 2012

performance. The SEB found that each offeror had highly relevant experience performing contracts of similar content, complexity, and size as the requirements of TOSC. The Government's assessment was that, overall, Boeing, Jacobs, and Northrop Grumman demonstrated very effective performance in the areas of technical and management performance; schedule performance; cost performance and contract management; and SMAE performance. All offerors had effective past performance in the area of small business performance.

COST EVALUATION

In the final evaluation, the total proposed cost and the Government's probable cost for the three offerors in the competitive range were below the Government's Independent Cost Estimate. Jacobs had the lowest probable cost followed by Boeing and Northrop Grumman. Boeing's probable cost was slightly higher than Jacobs, and Northrop Grumman's probable cost was significantly higher than Jacobs. The relative proposed cost ranking of the three offerors did not change as a result of the Government's probable cost assessment.

No probable cost adjustments were required for Jacobs' proposal. A minor probable cost adjustment was made to Boeing's proposal for insufficient technician staffing to successfully perform maintenance of TOSC ground systems during certain years of contract performance. A probable cost adjustment was made to Northrop Grumman's proposal to correct omission of RFP workload indicators.

The SEB found that the costs proposed by Jacobs, Boeing, and Northrop Grumman in their FPRs were realistic for the work to be performed and that all three offerors proposed adequate fee levels. Finally, the SEB found the IDIQ rates proposed by all three offerors to be reasonable.

SELECTION DECISION

During the presentation, I questioned the SEB on the material presented and carefully considered the detailed findings presented by the SEB. I concluded that the evaluation of proposals by the SEB was comprehensive, thorough, and well-documented. In addition, I solicited and considered the views of key senior personnel at NASA Headquarters and Center representatives. These key senior personnel have responsibility related to this procurement and understood the application of the evaluation factors set forth in the RFP.

In determining which proposal offered the best value to NASA, I referred to following the relative order of importance of the three evaluation factors specified in the RFP:

> Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, are approximately equal to Cost. Cost is more important than Mission Suitability, which is more important than Past Performance.

My selection was based on a comparative assessment of each proposal against each of the source selection factors.

 WHG 13 dec 2013

a. Mission Suitability

I noted Jacobs' proposal scored slightly higher overall than Boeing's proposal and both scored higher than Northrop Grumman's proposal with regard to the Mission Suitability factor. None of the proposals were found to have any significant weaknesses or deficiencies.

Under the Management subfactor, the SEB rated Jacobs and Boeing as "Excellent" with Jacobs receiving a slightly higher point score than Boeing. The SEB rated Northrop Grumman "Very Good" for this subfactor. All three offerors proposed well-qualified and experienced key personnel and had comprehensive approaches to continuous improvement. I agreed with the SEB's higher rating for Jacobs' proposal primarily based on its Integrated Team Management Approach (ITMA) which was unique to Jacobs' proposal. Jacob's ITMA will fully integrate teammates in the TOSC organizational structure and across the entire TOSC scope with the key components being: operating as a blended workforce, utilizing the same procedures and processes, and comparable compensation. I believe this approach will create a cohesive, blended team which results in efficiencies realized through the use of common processes, policies, and procedures. Use of unified procedures is expected to minimize the likelihood of errors by simplifying roles and responsibilities between teammates. ITMA will also foster a healthy working environment in which employees are treated as equal members of a team.

Looking at the Technical subfactor, I recognized the SEB gave all three offerors a rating of "Very Good." The SEB gave Boeing and Jacobs identical scores in this area, scores which were higher than Northrop Grumman's score. Jacobs' proposal included an exceptional approach to provide staffing flexibility and cross-utilization in performing TOSC requirements and its proposed ground asset management program. Boeing's proposal provided an exceptional integrated logistics approach as well as a comprehensive approach to processing operations and a strong approach to provide staffing flexibility and cross-utilization. These significant strengths in the Boeing proposal were slightly offset by a regular weakness for insufficient technician staffing in ground systems maintenance. Northrop Grumman's proposed staffing approach provided a highly flexible and cross-utilized work force. With respect to the technical subfactor, I noted unique aspects in Jacobs' technical approach; in particular, the comprehensive program Jacobs proposed in the area of asset management would be valuable to the agency's efforts to maintain agency legacy ground systems. The program Jacobs proposed would utilize a suite of strategies, processes, and tools that appreciably increases the reliability and supportability of ground systems to perform flight hardware processing throughout the contract performance period.

I agreed with the SEB's findings and scoring in the Safety, Mission Assurance, and Environmental Management subfactor. The SEB gave Jacobs a rating of "Excellent" while Boeing and Northrop Grumman received a rating of "Very Good," with Boeing receiving a slightly higher point score than Northrop Grumman. In addition to third-party certifications, Jacobs proposed the use of Safety Evaluation Reports (SER) which are independent assessments performed by Jacobs employees external to TOSC. I concurred that Jacobs' use of the SER process would enable a more objective review of TOSC performance and exposure to industry best practices for implementation. Jacob's approach differed from the approaches in the proposals from Boeing and Northrop Grumman. Boeing proposed a comprehensive, process-

 WHG
13 Dec
2013

oriented approach that would embed the principles of safety, quality, health, and environmental management using third-party certifications. The Northrop Grumman's proposal evidenced a significant commitment to safety, mission assurance and environmental management through organizational independence using third-party certifications. I believed all of the proposed approaches to SMAE would be effective and, therefore, I found no discriminators in this subfactor for purposes of my selection.

With regard to the subfactor on Small Business Utilization, I agreed with the SEB that the Boeing proposal deserved a score of 97 with the accompanying adjectival rating of "Excellent" The SEB based this score on Boeing's thorough small business subcontracting approach involving numerous small businesses. Boeing proposed a goal for total small business of 30% that exceeded the suggested goal of 22% in the solicitation and, more importantly, proposed goals for the small business subcategories that greatly exceeded those suggested goals in the solicitation.

I also recognized the SEB gave Jacobs a score of 97 with the accompanying adjectival rating of "Excellent" for the Small Business Utilization subfactor. The SEB based this score primarily upon Jacobs' approach to Integrated Team Management Approach which would involve small business in high technology areas across the Performance Work Statement and that Jacobs proposed a total small business goal of 31% that exceeded the suggested goal in the solicitation. While I concur with the SEB that Jacobs showed a significant commitment to small business utilization, I did not believe it deserved a score that was as high as the one Boeing received. My conclusion was based largely on the fact Boeing significantly exceeded the suggested goals for all small business subcategories while Jacobs' proposed approach slightly exceeded the suggested goals for small business subcategories.

Additionally, I was aware the SEB gave Northrop Grumman a score of 97 with the accompanying adjectival rating of "Excellent" for the Small Business Utilization subfactor. The SEB explained that it believed this score was required because Northrop Grumman proposed a total small business goal of 37.4% which significantly exceeded the Government's recommended goal of 22%. The SEB stated Northrop Grumman proposed to achieve its total small business goal, in part, by selecting a small business to conduct its subcontracting procurement, which does not involve small businesses in high technology work. Northrop Grumman proposed goals that significantly exceeded the suggested goals in one subcategory and met the suggested goals in the remaining subcategories. For these reasons, I did not believe Northrop Grumman deserved the same score or rating Boeing received for this subfactor. Since all of the offerors' proposed goals that met or exceeded all the suggested goals in the RFP, I did not find this subfactor to be a discriminator for purposes of selection.

Overall, I found the proposal from Northrop Grumman was the lowest ranked with regard to Mission Suitability when compared to the proposals submitted by Boeing and Jacobs. I recognized the proposals from Boeing and Jacobs contained similar strengths as those in the Northrop Grumman while both the Boeing and Jacobs proposals contained strengths not in the Northrop Grumman proposal. In contrast, the proposals from Boeing and Jacobs were technically close with the Jacobs' proposals having a very slight advantage. Although Jacobs

 WHG 13dec.DIR

had a small advantage in Mission Suitability, this advantage was not a primary basis for my selection.

b. Past Performance

I concurred with the rating of "Very High" the SEB gave all offerors for the Past Performance factor. Each offeror demonstrated very high relevant experience executing contracts of similar content, complexity, and size as TOSC. Each offeror demonstrated very effective performance in the areas of technical and management performance; schedule performance; cost performance and contract performance; and S&MA and environmental performance. Each offeror demonstrated effective performance in the area of small business performance. Past performance, therefore, was not a discriminator for purposes of selection.

c. Cost

I recognized Jacobs had the lowest proposed cost and lowest probable cost with Boeing having a slightly higher proposed cost and probable cost and Northrop Grumman having a significantly higher proposed cost and probable cost. The SEB did not make any adjustments for probable cost to Jacobs' costs. The SEB made one minor adjustment to Boeing's proposed cost due to insufficient technician staffing to implement ground maintenance approach. Jacobs' proposed cost was lower than Boeing's probable cost. The SEB also made two adjustments to Northrop Grumman's proposed cost for IT legacy systems and corrosion control subcontracts. The SEB explained these adjustments represented non-labor work load indicators (plug numbers) that Northrop Grumman had not included in its FPR. All adjustments for probable cost were minor and cost ranking of the three offerors did not change as a result of the Government's probable cost assessment. These adjustments had no effect on my evaluation of the cost factor.

Given Northrop Grumman's proposed and probable cost were significantly higher, I focused my analysis on the proposed and probable cost from Boeing and Jacobs to better understand the type of benefit associated with the lower costs Jacobs offered. My analysis revealed lower fee and lower burdens were the reasons Jacobs had a lower proposed and probable cost even though Jacobs proposed more hours than Boeing. Jacobs' lower cost was driven primarily by a lower average hourly composite rate due to a much lower overhead rate and a lower G&A rate even though it proposed higher salaries for some labor classifications. The lower average hourly rate will also be favorable over the life of the contract when considering the potential for up to $500 million in IDIQ tasks.

d. Overall Trade-off Analysis

My first decision involved the proposal from Northrop Grumman. Although I believed this offeror was capable of performing the TOSC requirements successfully, I found that this proposal was the least competitive of the proposals received due to the Mission Suitability factor and Cost factor. The Northrop Grumman proposal contained comparable significant strengths to Boeing and Jacobs within the management, SMAE, and small business subfactors. However, unlike the other proposals, Northrop Grumman's only significant strength under the technical subfactor was associated with staffing flexibility and cross-utilization. All offerors were rated

 MHC 13 dec 2013

equally in the Past Performance factor. Based upon this and their significantly higher cost, I did not find the proposal from Northrop Grumman to be competitive for purposes of selection.

Conversely, I found the proposals from Boeing and Jacobs to be highly competitive with one another. Each proposal had extremely similar scores regarding the Mission Suitability factor, making it difficult to rely on this as a sole discriminator for purposes of selection. However, a detailed analysis of the findings revealed that the Jacobs' proposal was marginally superior to Boeing with regard to Mission Suitability. I recognized Jacobs' Integrated Team Management Approach created a cohesive, blended team which will result in efficiencies realized through the use of common processes, policies, and procedures controlling all aspects of contract activity and performance. I believed Jacobs' comprehensive ground systems asset management program that utilized a suite of strategies, processes, and tools would appreciably increase the reliability and supportability of ground systems necessary for flight hardware processing throughout the contract performance period.

I based my selection decision primarily on the difference in cost between Boeing and Jacobs, finding that the proposal from Jacobs offered the best value to the Government. Jacobs proposed the lowest cost. The probable cost was the same as the proposed cost. Of equal importance, the basis of Jacobs' lower cost was proposing a lower fee and proposing lower burdens – cost advantages that will exist throughout the life of the contract and will benefit potential IDIQ users of TOSC. Moreover, consistent with the RFP relative order of importance, the lower proposed cost is valuable to NASA and KSC in the post-Shuttle era where funding is less certain and there is a need to efficiently support commercial customers.

I was not required to perform a trade-off to determine best value because Jacobs received the highest Mission Suitability score, had the lowest proposed and lowest probable costs, and had the same level of confidence for Past Performance as the other offerors.

Therefore, I select Jacobs Technology for award of the Test and Operations Support Contract at KSC.

William H. Gerstenmaier

13 dec 2012

William H. Gerstenmaier
Source Selection Authority

Date