

**Selection Statement
for the
Huntsville Operations Support Center (HOSC) Services Contract
Request for Proposals (RFP)
Solicitation Number NNM11374206R**

On February 7, 2012, I, along with other senior officials of NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center (MSFC), met with the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed to evaluate proposals in connection with the Huntsville Operations Support Center (HOSC) Services Contract.

I. PROCUREMENT HISTORY

The purpose of the RFP for the HOSC Services Contract is to obtain ground support for MSFC's payload operations and development, testing, and support of launch vehicles. The HOSC Services Contract will provide support for a variety of programs and projects including support for the transition and closeout of legacy programs (e.g., space shuttle), ongoing programs (e.g., the International Space Station), and new programs (e.g., the Space Launch System).

The successful contractor will be responsible for providing support for all mission phases including planning, testing, simulations, pre-launch operations, launch operations, all aspects of flight operations, and post-flight analysis in connection with various spacecraft, payload, satellite, and propulsion systems. The HOSC contractor will also provide services related to engineering, operations and maintenance, and system development.

The proposed contract has a base period of performance from April 1, 2012, through September 30, 2013; a first option period from October 1, 2013, through September 30, 2014; a second option period from October 1, 2014, through September 30, 2015; a third option period from October 1, 2015, through September 30, 2016; and a fourth option period from October 1, 2016, through March 31, 2017. The proposed contract will be performed under a cost-plus-award-fee contract.

The HOSC Services Contract RFP was released on June 17, 2011. On August 18, 2011, proposals were received from the following four companies: Abacus Technology Corporation; COLSA Corporation; Modern Technology Solutions, Inc. (MTSI); and ZIN Technologies, Inc.

II. EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

The proposals were evaluated in accordance with the procedures prescribed by FAR Part 15 and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Part 1815 with an objective of achieving the best value for the government based on careful evaluation of proposals and a tradeoff determination involving weighing the three essentially equal evaluation factors as prescribed in the RFP:

Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost. Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, were more important than Cost.

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

Management and Technical Approach	600 points
<u>Staffing and Total Compensation</u>	<u>400 points</u>
Total	1000 points

The evaluation of Past Performance included the overall corporate past performance of the offeror and any major subcontractors on efforts comparable in size, scope, complexity, and (to a lesser extent) contract type to the requirements of the proposed HOSC Services Contract. The evaluation was based on information provided by the offerors, past performance questionnaires provided by customers of the offerors, and other relevant information reasonably available to the SEB. Past Performance was assessed using level of confidence ratings of “Very High,” “High,” “Moderate,” “Low,” “Very Low,” and “Neutral.”

Under Cost, the offeror’s proposed cost was evaluated for reasonableness and realism. Individual cost elements were evaluated to determine if they were realistic for the work to be performed, reflected a clear understanding of the requirements, and were consistent with the offeror’s approach. In addition, to the extent an offeror’s cost or elements of cost were determined unrealistic or unreasonable, the SEB made appropriate adjustments to determine the probable cost of doing business with the offeror. The SEB also assessed its cost confidence in the probable cost as “Low,” “Medium,” or “High.”

Using the above-described evaluation procedure, the SEB evaluated all four proposals and presented its findings to me on November 16, 2011. As a result, the contracting officer, with my concurrence, determined that the highest rated proposals for the competitive range were submitted by Abacus Technology Corporation and COLSA Corporation

Oral discussions were held with the two offerors in the competitive range beginning on January 6, 2012. On January 10, 2012, discussions were closed and final proposal revisions (FPRs) were requested. FPRs were received on January 18, 2012.

The evaluation of the FPRs is summarized below.

Abacus Technology Corporation

Under the Mission Suitability factor, Abacas’ proposal received a total score of 888 (out of a possible 1,000 points). The proposal received six significant strengths, sixteen

strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The following is a summary of the evaluation under the two Mission Suitability subfactors.

Under the management and technical approach subfactor, the proposal received an adjectival rating of “Very Good” resulting from three significant strengths, eleven strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strengths related to (1) software engineering methodologies, (2) the approach to real-time problem resolution, and (3) use of smart phones.

Under the staffing and total compensation subfactor, the proposal received an adjectival rating of “Excellent” resulting from three significant strengths, five strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strengths related to (1) the program manager (2) the operations and maintenance director, and (3) the business office director.

Under the Past Performance factor, the proposal received an adjectival rating of “High” resulting from one significant strength, seven strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strength related to the subcontractor’s performance under the current HOSC services contract.

Under the Cost factor, the SEB determined the probable cost to be \$96.4M, which was equivalent to the proposed cost (i.e., no adjustments were necessary to the proposed cost). Consequently, the probable cost was assessed as having a “High” level of confidence.

COLSA Corporation

Under the Mission Suitability factor, COLSA’s proposal received a total score of 980 (out of a possible 1,000 points). The proposal received ten significant strengths, twenty-one strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The following is a summary of the evaluation under the two Mission Suitability subfactors.

Under the management and technical approach subfactor, the proposal received an adjectival rating of “Excellent” resulting from six significant strengths, seventeen strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strengths related to (1) the establishment of a customer service team, (2) the approach for IT security management, (3) the approach to database production, (4) a demonstrated understanding of the Consultative Committee for Space Data Systems standards and working groups, (5) the proposed collaboration with JSC to replace the Limited Space Operations Support facility, and (6) a comprehensive safety, health, and environmental plan.

Under the staffing and total compensation subfactor, the proposal received an adjectival rating of “Excellent” resulting from four significant strengths, four strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strengths related to (1) the program manager, (2) the operations and maintenance manager, (3) the engineering manager, and (4) the customer service team manager.

Under the Past Performance factor, the proposal received an adjectival rating of “Very High” resulting from three significant strengths, eight strengths, no significant weaknesses, and one weakness. The significant strengths related to (1) the performance under the current HOSC services contract, (2) the subcontractor’s performance under the current HOSC contract, and (3) the performance under the Advanced Research Center contract with the Missile Defense Agency.

Under the Cost factor, the SEB determined the probable cost to be \$94.6M, which was equivalent to the proposed cost (i.e., no adjustments were necessary to the proposed cost). Consequently, the probable cost was assessed as having a “High” level of confidence.

III. SELECTION DECISION

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

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

After carefully considering the detailed findings of the SEB, I determined that the Mission Suitability adjectival ratings and scores were supported by the respective findings and accurately reflected the relative standing of the proposals under the Mission Suitability factor. Specifically, with respect to Abacus’ proposal, I determined that the strengths under the management and technical approach subfactor supported an adjectival rating of “Very Good.” While the strengths (e.g., software engineering methodologies, the approach to real-time problem resolution, and use of smart phones) in this subfactor represented a very good approach, the strengths were not considered to be of exceptional merit. I also determined that the Past Performance confidence ratings were supported by the respective findings and accurately reflected the relative standing of the proposals under the Past Performance factor. Furthermore, I agreed with the level of confidence assigned to the probable cost for each of the proposals.

Comparing the two proposals, the proposal from COLSA had an advantage over the proposal from Abacus under the Mission Suitability factor (i.e., 980 for COLSA compared to 888 for Abacus); the proposal from COLSA had an advantage over the proposal from Abacus under the Past Performance factor (i.e., “Very High” for COLSA compared to “High” for Abacus); and the proposal from COLSA had an advantage under the Cost factor (i.e., \$94.6M for

COLSA compared to \$96.4M for Abacus). Thus COLSA's proposal had an advantage under all three factors. Thus, having previously determined each proposal was accurately represented by the scores and adjectival ratings, there is no need to make a trade off analysis among the three factors. Accordingly, I select COLSA's proposal for award of the HOSC Services Contract.



Arthur E. Goldman
Source Selection Authority

2/8/2012
Date