Source Selection Statement for the
Human Health and Performance Contract (HHPC)
NASA Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center
(Solicitation Number NNJ12399614R)

On July 23, 2013, I, along with other key officials of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's (NASA's) Johnson Space Center (JSC), met with the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed to evaluate proposals submitted in response to the HHPC Solicitation, NNJ12399614R. On July 29, 2013, I met in executive session with senior JSC officials who attended the SEB presentation. In this session, I solicited their views and opinions and made my selection decision. The July 23, 2013 presentation charts represent the final source evaluation report and are herein incorporated by reference.

I. Procurement History

The HHPC provides support for a broad range of activities including fundamental and applied biomedical research; biotechnology development; operational space medicine; occupational health and medicine; management of clinical, biomedical, space food and environmental laboratories; behavioral sciences; human factors engineering; spacecraft environment monitoring and management; biomedical engineering; biomedical flight hardware requirements, design, fabrication, testing and operation; payload and hardware integration with the International Space Station (ISS), and other space flight platforms.

HHPC is a Cost-Plus-Award-Fee (CPAF) contract with Indefinite-Delivery, Indefinite-Quantity (IDIQ) Task/Delivery Orders. The basic period of performance for this acquisition is 5 years, from October 1, 2013 through April 30, 2018, with an additional 3-year option and a 2-year option. The maximum value, not to exceed (NTE) amount, that can be ordered under the IDIQ of the base contract and option periods is $1,764,200,000. This acquisition is a follow-on contract to the current Bioastronautics Contract.

The contracting officer issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) NNJ12399614R on July 12, 2012. Amendment 1 was posted on July 25, 2012 to provide a list of questions and answers. Amendment 2 was posted on August 17, 2012 to provide revisions and replacement pages. Amendment 3 was posted on August 29, 2012 to provide a list of questions and answers and to provide revisions and replacement pages.

This procurement was conducted as a full and open competition in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 15, Contracting by Negotiation. The RFP divided the proposals into four volumes. Volume I, related to mission suitability; Volume II, related to past performance; Volume III, related to cost/price and Volume IV related to the model contract. All volumes were due on September 11, 2012. However, Volume II, related to past performance, was requested for submittal before the official due date on August 31, 2012. Complete and timely proposals were received from the following companies:

Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC)
1710 SAIC Drive
McLean, VA 22102

Wyle Laboratories, Inc. (Wyle)
1290 Hercules Ave.
Houston, TX 77058

As provided in Section M of the RFP, Evaluation Factors for Award:

> The Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the Offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government. This procurement shall be conducted utilizing a combination of mission suitability, past performance and cost/price evaluation factors. The lowest price proposals may not necessarily receive an award; likewise, the highest technically rated proposals may not necessarily receive an award.

Under the mission suitability factor, the proposals were evaluated to assess the ability of the Offeror to provide and administer the requirements of the Statement of Work (SOW). Each proposal received a mission suitability score based on the following sub-factors and corresponding numerical weights, which also reflect their relative importance:

Mission Suitability Sub-Factors	**Points**
Technical Approach	500
Management Approach	250
Safety & Health Approach	150
Small Business Participation	100
TOTAL	**1000**

The mission suitability subfactors were each evaluated, scored numerically, and assigned an adjectival rating using the following scale: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, and Poor.

In addition to Mission Suitability, the RFP identified, and the SEB evaluated, Past Performance and Cost/Price. However, these evaluation factors were not numerically scored.

Since Past Performance can be a significant indicator of performance under the proposed contract, the Past Performance of each Offeror was evaluated by the SEB for recent and relevant experience in order to determine its ability to perform the required work. The evaluation of Past Performance was conducted in accordance with the FAR 15.305(a)(2), Proposal Evaluation, and NFS 1815.304-70, NASA Evaluation Factors. The evaluation assessed information submitted from proposal data as required by provisions of Section L, information obtained by the SEB based on communications with listed references, Past Performance Questionnaires, data independently obtained from other government and commercial sources, such as the NASA Past Performance Database and similar systems of other governmental departments and agencies, Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) channels, interviews with client program managers and contracting officers, and other sources known to the Government. More recent

and relevant Past Performance received greater consideration in the performance confidence assessment than less recent and relevant performance. Past Performance was evaluated and rated for each Offeror using the following confidence rating scale: Very High, High, Moderate, Low, Very Low, and Neutral/Unknown.

Under the cost/price factor, the Government performed a cost and price analysis, which included a cost realism analysis in accordance with FAR 15.305, FAR 15.404 and NFS 1815.305 to ensure that the final agreed-to costs are fair and reasonable. The Government performed a cost realism analysis of the proposed IDIQ direct labor rates and resources (inclusive of the multiplier prescribed in Section L), and developed a probable cost estimate for the RFP Task/Delivery Orders (TDOs). Based on this cost realism analysis, the Government determined the probable cost of performance for each Offeror, which may differ from the proposed cost, and reflects Government's best estimate of the cost of any contract that is most likely to result from the Offeror's proposal. The Government also evaluated the reasonableness of the non-labor resources.

As provided in the solicitation, of the three evaluation factors, Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost. Mission Suitability is more important than Past Performance.

II. Evaluation of Initial Proposals

Both of the proposals that were submitted in response to the solicitation were determined to be acceptable and were evaluated in accordance with FAR Part 15 and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Part 1815 as well as the RFP. The results of the initial evaluation were presented to me, the Source Selection Authority (SSA), on December 6, 2012, and are summarized below.

SAIC

Under the mission suitability factor, SAIC received an initial total point score of 811 out of 1000 points. SAIC received 4 significant strengths, 8 strengths, 1 significant weakness and 9 weaknesses across the four subfactors.

Under the technical approach subfactor, SAIC received an adjectival rating of "good." SAIC received 0 significant strengths, 4 strengths, 1 significant weakness, and 6 weaknesses.

Under the management approach subfactor, SAIC received an adjectival rating of "excellent." SAIC received 2 significant strengths, 4 strengths, 0 significant weaknesses, and 3 weaknesses.

Under the safety & health approach subfactor, SAIC received an adjectival rating of "excellent." SAIC received 1 significant strength, 0 strengths, 0 significant weaknesses, and 0 weaknesses.

Under the small business utilization, SAIC received an adjectival rating of "excellent." SAIC received 1 significant strength, 0 strengths, 0 significant weaknesses, and 0 weaknesses.

Under the past performance factor, SAIC received a confidence rating of "high."

Under the cost/price factor, adjustments in the proposed cost were made for skill mix/staffing and incumbent labor rates.

Wyle

Under the mission suitability factor, Wyle received an initial total point score of 873 out of 1000 points. Wyle received 5 significant strengths, 7 strengths, 0 significant weaknesses, and 5 weaknesses across the four subfactors.

Under the technical approach subfactor, Wyle received an adjectival rating of "very good." Wyle received 2 significant strengths, 5 strengths, 0 significant weaknesses, and 4 weaknesses.

Under the management approach subfactor, Wyle received an adjectival rating of "excellent." Wyle received 1 significant strength, 2 strengths, 0 significant weaknesses, and 1 weakness.

Under the safety & health approach subfactor, Wyle received an adjectival rating of "excellent." Wyle received 1 significant strength, 0 strengths, 0 significant weaknesses, and 0 weaknesseses.

Under the small business utilization, Wyle received an adjectival rating of "excellent." Wyle received 1 significant strength, 0 strengths, 0 significant weaknesses, and 0 weaknesses.

Under the past performance factor, Wyle received a confidence rating of "very high."

Under the cost/price factor, adjustments in the proposed cost were made for skill mix/staffing and incumbent labor rates.

Based on the findings from the SEB, I determined that award on initial proposals was not appropriate and I established a competitive range of the most highly rated proposals. I determined that SAIC and Wyle to be within the competitive range. I authorized the SEB to proceed with discussions leading to the submission of Final Proposal Revisions for the two Offerors.

III. Discussions and Evaluation/Findings of Final Proposal Revisions (FPR)

Both SAIC and Wyle were informed of their inclusion in the competitive range via letters dated December 7, 2012. Included in the letters was Amendment 4 to the solicitation to provide an administrative revision, which clarified the RFP, updated clauses and provided change pages. Oral discussions were held with both Offerors on December 20, 2012. Discussions ended and FPRs were requested on January 7, 2013. FPRs were received from both Offerors on January 14, 2013. The results of the FPR evaluation were presented to me, the Source Selection Authority (SSA), on February 20, 2013, and are summarized below.

SAIC

Under the mission suitability factor, SAIC's proposal received a total point score of 836 out of 1000 points. Six of the weaknesses were adequately addressed in the FPR; however, 3 weaknesses were not adequately addressed. Some portions of the significant weakness identified from the initial proposal were adequately addressed but other portions remained. This resulted in the significant weakness being changed to a weakness. SAIC received 4 significant strengths, 8 strengths, 0 significant weaknesses, and 4 weaknesses across the subfactors.

Under the technical approach subfactor, SAIC's proposal received an adjectival rating of "good." SAIC received 0 significant strengths, 4 strengths, 0 significant weaknesses, and 4 weaknesses.

Under the management approach subfactor, SAIC's proposals received an adjectival rating of "excellent." SAIC received 2 significant strengths, 4 strengths, 0 significant weaknesses, and 0 weaknesses. The SEB assessed a significant strength for a cross-cutting management approach that includes many comprehensive processes that merge traditional and new methodologies for technology development with a streamlined approach, accountability, and thorough oversight to integration activities. The SEB assessed a second significant strength for SAIC's corporate reach-back approach that will enable access to an extensive corporate knowledge base and resources to assist in solving unique problems, including immunology, radiation, and behavioral health for space flight needs.

Under the safety & health approach subfactor, SAIC's proposal received an adjectival rating of "excellent." SAIC received 1 significant strength, 0 strengths, 0 significant weaknesses, and 0 weaknesses. The SEB found a significant strength for the proposal's highly effective, comprehensive, and proactive Safety and Health Plan that recognizes the critical role of environmental compliance in day-to-day operations.

Under the small business utilization, SAIC's proposal received an adjectival rating of "excellent." SAIC received 1 significant strength, 0 strengths, 0 significant weaknesses, and 0 weaknesses. The SEB assigned the significant strength for their commitment to the Small Business Program, as reflected by their proposal to exceed the goals in six of the seven small business categories and binding teaming arrangements.

Under the past performance factor, SAIC's proposal moved from a confidence rating of "high" to "very high." SAIC demonstrated that the contracts cited in its proposal were similar to HHPC in terms of magnitude and complexity. SAIC proposed 11 contracts and subcontracts to cover itself and its subcontractors. Five of SAIC's contracts were deemed "relevant" and "very relevant"; 6 of its subcontracts were deemed "relevant" and "very relevant." Of these contracts, 3 were rated as "excellent" and 3 of its subcontracts were rated as "excellent." The change in the confidence rating was primarily the result of SAIC demonstrating that they had relevant past performance experience in specific trades/types of work across its proposed contracts essentially of the same magnitude and complexity of HHPC. The SEB deemed that the relevant past performance of SAIC and its team members is very highly pertinent to this acquisition.

Under the cost/price factor, adjustments in the proposed cost were made for skill mix/staffing and incumbent labor rates.

Wyle

Under the mission suitability factor, Wyle's proposal received a total point score of 910 out of 1000 points. Four of the weaknesses were adequately addressed in the FPR; however, 1 weakness was not adequately addressed. Wyle received 5 significant strengths, 7 strengths, 0 significant weaknesses, and 1 weakness across the subfactors.

Under the technical approach subfactor, Wyle's proposal received an adjectival rating of "very good." Wyle received 2 significant strengths, 5 strengths, 0 significant weaknesses, and 1 weakness. The SEB assessed a significant strength for the proposed use of cross-cutting strategies that will include research collaborations to facilitate the sharing of discipline expertise and best practices; flight hardware certification that is tailored to actual hardware use and the most appropriate hardware development paradigm; and utilization of an approach that will lead to an efficient use of NASA resources and a sharing of knowledge and expertise between Wyle, NASA, and relevant external organizations. The SEB assessed a second significant strength to the proposal's sound technical approach to implement environmental requirements, perform complex analyses, and effectively resolve in-flight anomalies.

Under the management approach subfactor, Wyle's proposal received an adjectival rating of "excellent." Wyle received 1 significant strength, 2 strengths, 0 significant weaknesses, and 0 weaknesses. The SEB assessed a significant strength for Wyle's proposed management approach that offers multiple benefits, which includes an organizational structure that will allow synergy for very clear and effective communications; an organization structure that will stimulate effective integration of these areas and allow quicker application of findings into operational objectives; establishment of an outreach team that will provide NASA with new partners to seek innovative and effective mitigation strategies for the risks of human space flight; an innovation and technology plan that blends traditional methodologies and new approaches to innovation development; and contract management processes that will allow flexible and responsive implementation of contract changes.

Under the safety & health approach subfactor, Wyle's proposal received an adjectival rating of "excellent." Wyle received 1 significant strength, 0 strengths, 0 significant weaknesses, and 0 weaknesses. The SEB found significant strength in the proposal's highly effective, comprehensive, and proactive Safety and Health Plan that recognizes the critical roles of environmental compliance in day-to-day operations.

Under the small business utilization, Wyle's proposal received an adjectival rating of "excellent." Wyle received 1 significant strength, 0 strengths, 0 significant weaknesses, and 0 weaknesses. The SEB assigned the significant strength for their commitment to the Small Business Program, as reflected by their proposal to exceed the goals in four of the seven small business categories and by their binding teaming arrangements.

Under the past performance factor, Wyle's proposal received a confidence rating of "very high." The relevant past performance of Wyle and its team members is very highly pertinent to this acquisition. Wyle demonstrated that the contracts cited in its proposal were similar to HHPC in terms of magnitude and complexity. Wyle proposed 9 contracts and subcontracts to cover itself and its subcontractors. Of the contracts in its proposal, 2 were deemed "very relevant"; 6 of its subcontracts were deemed "relevant" and "very relevant." Of these contracts, one was rated as "excellent."

Under the cost/price factor, adjustments in the proposed cost were made for skill mix/staffing and incumbent labor rates.

IV. Re-opening of Discussions and Final Proposal Revision (FPR)

Discussions were re-opened with both Offerors in the competitive range, SAIC and Wyle, via letters dated February 13, 2013, in accordance with NFS 1815.307. Included in the letter was Amendment 5 to the solicitation to notify offerors not to assume future construction of Building 21. The letter also advised offerors that the phase-in period may potentially be shortened by 14 days at the Government's option. Oral discussions were offered to both Offerors, although only accepted by SAIC. Oral discussions with SAIC took place on February 13, 2013. Wyle declined the offer and oral discussions were not held with them. Discussions were closed on February 14, 2013. An electronic version of FPRs was requested of both Offerors by February 15, 2013 but was not officially due until February 18, 2013. A complete FPR submission was received from SAIC on February 15, 2013. Wyle did not submit another FPR.

The submission of the February 15, 2013 FPR by SAIC did not result in any changes in the scoring or rating between the initial FPR and subsequent FPR; however, SAIC updated their cost/price.

V. Contract Award; Bid Protest; Corrective Action Plan; New FPR

On March 4, 2013, HHPC was awarded to Wyle. Post-award debriefings were requested and held with both Offerors. The contract award was subsequently protested by SAIC before the Government Accountability Office (GAO) on March 20, 2013. In its protest, SAIC challenged various aspects of NASA's evaluation and source selection process. On April 9, 2013, NASA provided a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) to the GAO to cancel the contract award, issue an RFP amendment for both Offerors, conduct a new round of discussions, solicit new FPRs, and make a new source selection. On April 12, 2013, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) dismissed the protest in response to the CAP.

On May 1, 2013, both Offerors within the competitive range were notified by letter that discussions were re-opened. Included in the letter was Amendment 6 to provide updates and additional information for the RFP in accordance with the CAP. Amendment 7 was issued on June 12, 2013 to provide further updates and additional information for the RFP.

Discussions were closed for both Offerors on June 17, 2013. Both SAIC and Wyle submitted FPRs on June 25, 2013. The results of the final FPR evaluation were presented to me, the Source Selection Authority (SSA), on July 23, 2013, and are summarized below.

VI. Findings of Final FPR Evaluation

SAIC

Under the mission suitability factor, SAIC's final FPR increased from a total point score of 836 to 876 out of 1000 points. The change in score was a result of all of the weaknesses being adequately addressed and the improvement of a strength to a significant strength based on additional information provided in the final FPR. SAIC received 5 significant strengths, 7 strengths, 0 significant weaknesses, and 0 weaknesses across the subfactors.

Under the technical approach subfactor, SAIC's final FPR moved from an adjectival rating of "good" to "very good." SAIC received 1 significant strength, 3 strengths, 0 significant weaknesses, and 0 weaknesses. Based on additional information provided in the final FPR, the SEB evaluation assessed a significant strength for what was previously assessed as a strength for SAIC's comprehensive strategic approach to innovation that includes the use of existing diverse methods, technologies, and tools that have a proven successful track record in the area of human health Research &Technology Development (R&TD) in both the public and private sectors.

Under the management approach subfactor, SAIC's final FPR received an adjectival rating of "excellent." SAIC received 2 significant strengths, 4 strengths, 0 significant weaknesses, and 0 weaknesses. The SEB assessment of the 2 significant strengths remained the same as no additional information was provided in the final FPR that changed the SEB findings for this subfactor .

Under the safety & health approach subfactor, SAIC's final FPR received an adjectival rating of "excellent." SAIC received 1 significant strength, 0 strengths, 0 significant weaknesses, and 0 weaknesses. The SEB assessment of a significant strength for the proposal's highly effective, comprehensive, and proactive Safety and Health Plan remained the same as no additional information was provided in the final FPR that changed the SEB findings for this subfactor .

Under the small business utilization, SAIC's final FPR received an adjectival rating of "excellent." SAIC received 1 significant strength, 0 strengths, 0 significant weaknesses, and 0 weaknesses. SAIC updated their final FPR to reflect that they would exceed their small business goals in all seven of the small business categories and made minor revisions to their goals. The SEB assessment of a significant strength for their commitment to the Small Business Program remained the same and did not change as a result of the final FPR evaluation.

Under the past performance factor, SAIC's final FPR received a "very high" level of confidence rating. SAIC did not provide any additional past performance information in their final FPR that changed the board's assessment; therefore, the confidence rating remained the

same. **Under the cost/price factor,** SAIC's proposed costs in the final FPR were adjusted based on incumbent labor rates in accordance with their proposed staffing approach.

Wyle

Under the mission suitability factor, Wyle's final FPR increased from a total point score of 910 to 925 out of 1000 points. The change in score was a result of all of the weaknesses being adequately addressed and the SEB assessment of a new strength based on additional information provided in the final FPR. Wyle received 5 significant strengths, 8 strengths, 0 significant weaknesses, and 0 weaknesses across the subfactors.

Under the technical approach subfactor, Wyle's final FPR received an adjectival rating of "very good." Wyle received 2 significant strengths, 6 strengths, 0 significant weaknesses, and 0 weaknesses. The SEB assessment of the 2 significant strengths remained the same and did not change as a result of the final FPR evaluation. However, the SEB assessed a new strength in this subfactor based on new information provided in the final FPR.

Under the management approach subfactor, Wyle's final FPR received an adjectival rating of "excellent." Wyle received 1 significant strength, 2 strengths, 0 significant weaknesses, and 0 weaknesses. The SEB assessment of a significant strength for Wyle's proposed management approach remained the same as no additional information was provided in the final FPR that changed the SEB findings for this subfactor.

Under the safety & health approach subfactor, Wyle's final FPR received an adjectival rating of "excellent." Wyle received 1 significant strength, 0 strengths, 0 significant weaknesses, and 0 weaknesses. The SEB assessment of the significant strength in the proposal's highly effective, comprehensive, and proactive Safety and Health Plan remained the same as no additional information was provided in the final FPR that changed the SEB findings for this subfactor.

Under the small business utilization, Wyle's final FPR received an adjectival rating of "excellent." Wyle received 1 significant strength, 0 strengths, 0 significant weaknesses, and 0 weaknesses. The SEB assessment of the significant strength for their commitment to the Small Business Program remained the same despite minor updates to their goals in their final FPR.

Under the past performance factor, Wyle's final FPR received a "very high" level of confidence rating. Wyle did not provide any additional past performance information in their final FPR that changed the board's assessment; therefore, the confidence rating remained the same.

Under the cost/price factor, Wyle's proposed costs in the final FPR were adjusted based on incumbent labor rates in accordance with their proposed staffing approach.

VII. Decision

On July 23, 2013, I presided over the SEB presentation of its final FPR evaluation findings and engaged the SEB in a detailed discussion of their findings. At the conclusion of the SEB presentation, I accepted the findings of the SEB as they were presented to me. I commended the SEB on their comprehensive evaluation of the two proposals. I requested and received the opinions of the advisors present, asked for their comments, objections, or concerns with the materials presented to us. I concluded the meeting without making my decision.

On July 29, 2013, I met in executive session with senior JSC officials who attended the SEB presentation and made an assessment of the proposals based on the evaluation factors in the solicitation- Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost/Price.

I first considered the two proposals under the Mission Suitability factor. In comparing the relative Mission Suitability factor of the two proposals, both proposals exhibited generally balanced significant strengths and strengths in their management approach, safety and health approach, and small business utilization subfactors. Both Offerors received an adjectival rating of "excellent" in each of these areas. I could not find any meaningful discriminators in these subfactors. Both proposals also set forth a sound technical approach. However, SAIC improved its adjectival rating to "very good" and was considerably closer in point score in the technical approach subfactor to Wyle after the FPR evaluation. This required a closer analysis of the qualitative differences between the proposals in this subfactor.

Having noted the board's conclusion that Wyle's proposal on technical approach scored higher quantitatively than SAIC, I proceeded with an assessment of the underlying qualitative factors of the two proposals. I saw that SAIC took advantage of the opportunity to improve its proposal and provided additional information turning a previously assessed strength, into a significant strength. As a result, SAIC had one significant strength in addition to its three previously assessed strengths in the technical approach subfactor. I was extremely impressed with SAIC's new significant strength in this subfactor. SAIC proposed a comprehensive strategic approach to innovation that honed in on some of the most pressing human health and performance issues facing the human space flight program. The first element of SAIC's approach provides extremely valuable opportunities for external collaboration focused on human health and performance Research & Technology Development (R&TD) with current SAIC partners. For example, SAIC proposed collaborative human health and performance research projects with Frederick National Laboratory for Cancer Research and the Naval Submarine Medical Research Laboratory (NSMRL). The details provided in SAIC's proposal to facilitate external collaborations in critical human health R&TD with their pre-existing partners in areas such as radiation induced cancer, intracranial pressure induced vision impairment, intracranial pressure monitoring, closed loop environmental systems, isolation and occupational health give me a high degree of confidence in SAIC's ability to effectively bring the proposed collaborations to fruition. SAIC's focus on specific mission critical areas of concern underscores the depth of their understanding of high priority issues that will have a significant impact on human and health and performance in human space flight. This approach also offers NASA an opportunity to leverage other federal and private funding through the identified synergies in the area of

human health R&TD through collaboration with external organizations. The second element of SAIC's comprehensive strategic approach involves their data and knowledge management system. Their proposed approach to integrate the capabilities and knowledge between NASA clinical, laboratory, and research data sets with external databases and laboratories such as Frederick National Laboratory and Stanford University's phenotypic/disease database will result in a faster assessment of what could be critical health risks for crewmembers. The third key element of SAIC's approach to identify external customers for Human Health and Performance Directorate (HHPD) services, which will offset HHPD costs and open new avenues for collaboration on human health R&TD. Overall, this significant strength for SAIC's technical approach was of particular value to me because it is believable, achievable and specific.

I was also influenced by SAIC's three previously assessed strengths in the technical approach subfactor. SAIC's first strength involves their proposed interactive working relationship, cross-training between the Tier 1 and Tier 2 information technology help desks. I feel that their proposed approach in this area is an efficient, effective way to handle help desk issues at the lowest level. Over time, this help desk structure will increase the efficiency and productivity of day-to-day workstation operations and result in a cost savings to the Government. SAIC's second strength involves their proposed integration of training, research, and operations across the biomedical laboratories. This streamlined structure will provide more effective mission support by providing efficient, daily operations, which will also result in a cost savings to the Government. I was very pleased with SAIC's third strength attributed to their use of an integrated clinical services approach that includes the use of a Clinical Operations Manager to oversee and integrate all clinical services across the contract at contract start, which will immediately result in efficiencies in this area. SAIC's implementation of technical trade-off studies will also optimize the use of already limited resources. This integrated approach will provide more efficient, effective operations, thereby resulting in a lower cost to the Government.

On the other hand, I contrasted this with Wyle's previously assessed two significant strengths, five strengths and one new strength in the technical approach subfactor. Although one of these significant strengths related to a single TDO, I was particularly impressed by Wyle's proposed cross cutting strategies across the contract by embedding integration and innovative practices throughout their organization. I am strongly in favor of Wyle's proposed use of communities of practice to facilitate knowledge sharing. I agree with the board's assessment that the diversity of expertise and skill sets in the community will lead to better problem solving strategies to address NASA's challenges. However, I do not find that Wyle's proposed flight hardware development and certification process to appropriately tailor hardware for actual use and development adds as much value as evaluated by the Board.

I was also impressed with Wyle's second significant strength that demonstrates Wyle's thorough understanding of requirements for acoustic support and extensive experience with toxicological air requirements. Wyle presented an impressive list of their collaborations in the Toxicology area with several entities including Sionex, Draper, United Kingdom, United States Navy, and New Mexico State University. However, unlike SAIC there is no indication that Wyle proposed specific collaborations with these entities on NASA's behalf. I concur with the board's

assessment that Wyle's proposal optimized efficient operational support of the Water and Food Analysis Laboratory by keeping appropriate staff available for daily operations.

I also commend the six strengths identified in Wyle's proposal for their technical approach. However, three of the six identified strengths involve Wyle's proposal to cross-train personnel and leverage skill sets in different task orders. While this will result in an overall benefit of efficient and effective contract support over time, I saw these collective strengths as essentially a single strength.

I was particularly impressed with Wyle's strengths for its proposed leveraging of skill sets within the Environmental Factors Laboratory; proposed collaboration with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) to address issues in the hiring and retention of biomedical flight controllers; proposed use of software to standardize and improve project management documentation; and a proposed paperless Task Preparation Sheet system to reduce processing time for flight projects. I am equally pleased with Wyle's proposed elimination of overlapping functions, streamlined processes and establishment of cross functional standards within medical research and operations area. Overall, this will increase the likelihood of efficient resource utilization.

Both Offerors proposed extensive consolidation and cross-training across the contract to improve efficiency and cut costs as a part of their technical approach. Although I was very impressed with Wyle's proposed efficiencies, I was compelled by the specificity provided in SAIC's proposed technical approach to innovation through external collaboration with existing SAIC partners who are currently working on pressing human health and performance R&TD issues. These proposed external collaborations will address high priority issues facing the human spaceflight program in the area of human health and performance. I have a high level of confidence that SAIC's technical approach significantly enhances the likelihood to develop solutions critical to mission activities. For this reason, I determined that SAIC's final proposal was qualitatively and quantitatively much closer to Wyle's final proposal than the Board's assessment in the technical approach subfactor. After extensive, careful review and reflection, I did not find this subfactor to be a material discriminator.

After completing my analysis under the Mission Suitability factor, I considered the Past Performance factor. The SEB rated both Wyle and SAIC's past performance as "Very High". The SEB assigned equal confidence levels to both proposals based on recent and relevant experience of the Offerors. I am mindful that the SEB made sure that it was fair in its application and assessed both Offerors accordingly. I previously asked the SEB about the corollary between SAIC's past performance on contracts and elements of the HHPC. I was concerned about properly considering and weighing the scope and complexity of SAIC's past performance to the HHPC, so as not to give undue advantage to the uniquely space-based experience of the incumbent. The SEB pointed to three different contracts in which SAIC or an SAIC subcontractor had experience that presented a terrestrial corollary to different aspects of HHPC, such as the effect of radiation on human health and associated modeling, that they deemed similar in magnitude and complexity to work on the HHPC. Specifically, contracts with Frederick National Laboratory, Naval Submarine Medical Research Laboratory, and Edgewood

Chemical Biological Center Research and Technology are very relevant/relevant to the HHPC Statement of Work (SOW). Both SAIC and Wyle had relevant and recent past performance that reflects that they can perform the contract. However, after my assessment of the full breadth of the past performance data, I determined that Wyle played a more major role in its most relevant contracts related to the HHPC SOW, specifically more closely tied to human space flight medical operations and ISS operations than SAIC had played in its relevant contracts. I also concluded that although I agreed with the board and had very high confidence in the past performance of both Offerors, I believed that between the two, Wyle had more relevant past performance experience relative to this contract because of the magnitude, breadth and nature of its proffered experience. Accordingly, notwithstanding the fact that the SEB evaluated both as overall "very high" confidence, my relative confidence in Wyle's past performance is slightly higher than SAIC with respect to aspects of the HHPC that are related to the unique space environment. This unique environment requires the adherence to stringent launch and operational timelines and requires the contractor to understand the unique nature of the astronaut test subjects, who must remain in top condition for flight and remain fit for duty for operating the ISS and conducting research in microgravity.

In looking at the Cost/Price factor, SAIC has a strikingly lower probable cost in contrast to Wyle. The delta in probable cost represents a difference of approximately ten percentage points, which I find material and significant. I questioned the SEB closely on this point and they could not articulate, nor could I ascertain a measurable justification for the premium in cost. As a result, I was unable to find a meaningful increase in benefit to the Government commensurate with the higher cost. The most apparent explanation for the difference in probable cost was the difference in approaches to accomplish the requirements of the HHPC.

As provided for in the RFP, the Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible Offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government. The provisions of the RFP dictated my approach to making the necessary trade-off between the proposals. Section M.3 of the RFP states that:

> Of the three evaluation factors, Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost. Mission Suitability is more important than Past Performance. The lowest price proposal may not necessarily receive an award; likewise, the highest technically-rated proposal may not necessarily receive an award.

In Mission Suitability, I determined that there was little appreciable difference between the merits of Wyle and SAIC's proposals. Both proposals demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of the work required under the HHPC. I am confident that either Offeror could successfully perform the HHPC. The Board assessed some delta in the technical approach subfactor, which after careful review I considered to be minor. In Past Performance, I noted that Wyle had a slight advantage over SAIC based on its past performance experience that is similar to the work that will be performed on the HPPC. Finally, SAIC was substantially lower than Wyle in terms of the Cost/Price factor.

Based on my assessment of both Offerors' strong proposals in accordance with the specified evaluation criteria, it is my decision that both proposals are essentially equal in Mission Suitability and demonstrate an essentially equal level of Past Performance. However, SAIC represents a sizable advantage in Cost/Price. Although Mission Suitability and Past Performance are significantly more important than cost when combined, SAIC's advantage in Cost/Price is of such magnitude that it overpowers any slight differences in Mission Suitability and Past Performance. My decision is that the proposal submitted by SAIC represents the best value to the Government to fulfill the needs for the HHPC solicitation.

I, therefore, select SAIC for award.

Melanie Saunders

Source Selection Authority