

**Source Selection Statement for the
Aircraft Maintenance and Operational Support (AMOS) Contract
National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center**

On April 5, 2012, I, along with other key officials of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's (NASA) Johnson Space Center (JSC) met with the members of the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed to evaluate proposals in response to the Aircraft Maintenance and Operational Support (AMOS) Contract Solicitation, NNJ11061911R. The AMOS solicitation contemplates award of a hybrid contract, containing Fixed-price Award Fee (FPAF) and Cost Plus Award Fee (CPAF) elements. The base period of performance for AMOS is from June 1, 2012 through September 30, 2013. There are two options. Option 1 is from October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2015 and Option 2 is from October 1, 2015 through May 31, 2017. This acquisition is a partial follow-on to the Aircraft Maintenance and Modification Program (AMMP) Contract.

The AMOS contract provides for aircraft maintenance and operational support for Johnson Space Center at Ellington Field (EFD), Houston, Texas, Forward Operating Locations (FOL) at El Paso, Texas and Edwards Air Force Base, California, Langley Research Center at Hampton, Virginia, and other locations as required within the contiguous United States (CONUS) and outside the contiguous United States (OCONUS). The scope of the AMOS contract effort includes flight operations; maintenance; repairs and alterations to aircraft; component parts and support equipment; and engineering services. Additional services include spaceflight readiness training, airborne research and development, and Astronaut Office support.

Background

In accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 5.2 "Synopsis of Proposed Contract Actions," AMOS was synopsisized on August 5, 2011 via the FedBizOps website and was thereafter placed on the NASA Acquisition Internet Service business opportunities website. NASA issued a Draft Request for Proposal (DRFP) on September 9, 2011 and an industry comment period ensued.

The Contracting Officer issued the final Request for Proposal (RFP) NNJ11061911R on October 28, 2011. The Contracting Officer posted Amendment 1 on November 3, 2011 to change all references in the heading for the AMOS Request for Proposal from "AMOS Draft RFP NNJ11061911R" to "AMOS RFP NNJ11061911R." The Contracting Officer posted Amendment 2 on November 16, 2011 to publish questions and answers pertaining to the DRFP and RFP, revise the DD254 "Contract Security Classification Specification," update pertinent clauses, and extend the proposal due date to December 5, 2011. The Contracting Officer posted Amendment 3 on November 21, 2011 to publish questions and answers pertaining to the RFP and update various clauses, Fixed-price Templates, and Other Supporting Templates. The Contracting Officer issued Amendment 4 on January 23, 2012 to revise Section M language to allow for the evaluation of the Offerors' proposed Basis of Estimate for the entire proposal rather than only the scenarios detailed in Section M. The Contracting Officer issued Amendment 5 on February 17, 2012 to add several FAR clauses and correct a typographical error. The Contracting Officer issued Amendment 6 on February 23, 2012 to revise, update and add various

FAR clauses and provisions. Amendments 1 - 5 issued change pages, where necessary, to update the pertinent portions of the RFP. Amendment 6 did not provide change pages.

The RFP required that proposals be divided into four volumes with the same due date of December 5, 2011. Offerors were requested, but not required, to submit Volume II early on November 22, 2011. 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. Two Offerors, CSC Applied Technologies, LLC (CSC), and DynCorp International, LLC (DynCorp), submitted timely proposals in response to the RFP.

RFP Section M, "Evaluation Factors for Award," Provision M.2 stated that:

The Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible 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.

RFP Section M outlined three evaluation factors – Mission Suitability (Provision M.3), Past Performance (Provision M.4), and Cost/Price (Provision M.5).

Provision M.2 also included two eligibility requirements for award, which required Offerors to submit supplemental documentation of a current Facility (Security) Clearance and an Organizational Conflict of Interest Mitigation Plan.

Provision M.3 divided the Mission Suitability factor into four sub-factors used to assess the ability of each Offeror to provide and administer the requirements of the SOW. Each proposal received a Mission Suitability score based on the associated numerical weights for each sub-factor as described in Provision M.3:

Sub-factor 1 Management Approach	400
Sub-factor 2 Technical Approach	350
Sub-factor 3 Safety & Health Approach	150
Sub-factor 4 Small Business Utilization	<u>100</u>
Total	1,000

Provision M.3 made clear that the weights corresponding to each of the Mission Suitability sub-factors reflected the relative importance of each sub-factor. The SEB evaluated and rated Mission Suitability sub-factors using the following adjectival ratings: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, and Poor.

The SEB evaluated and rated Past Performance using the following scale: 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.

Under the Cost/Price factor, the Government performed a price analysis to ensure the final agreed-to prices are fair and reasonable, and also performed a cost analysis, including a cost realism analysis, in accordance with FAR 15.305, FAR 15.404, and NASA FAR Supplement 1815.305.

RFP, Provision M.2 “Evaluation Factors for Award” provided:

Of the three evaluation factors, Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost/Price. Mission Suitability is more important than Past Performance. Past Performance and Cost/Price are approximately equal in importance.

In accordance with FAR Part 15, “Contracting by Negotiation,” NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Part 1815, the RFP, and the approved evaluation plan, the SEB evaluated each proposal on the basis of Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost/Price with the objective of achieving the best value for the Government. The SEB presented the results of the initial evaluation to me, the Source Selection Authority (SSA), on February 3, 2012. At that time, the Contracting Officer recommended that both CSC’s and DynCorp’s proposals should fall within the competitive range. I concurred with the Contracting Officer’s recommendation and authorized the SEB to proceed with discussions leading to the submission of final proposal revisions (FPRs) with those two Offerors. Accordingly, the SEB invited both Offerors to participate in written and oral discussions. The SEB held written and oral discussions with both Offerors. The SEB gave each Offeror the opportunity to correct, clarify, substantiate, or confirm the contents of its respective proposal and to submit a FPR, as well as a signed model contract reflecting the Offeror’s intent to be bound contractually. The SEB received FPRs and signed model contracts from both Offerors on or before March 7, 2012, the due date for FPRs.

After considering the results of the FPRs, the SEB presented their findings to me as the SSA on April 5, 2012. I have reviewed the detailed findings of the SEB and I agree with the SEB’s findings and adopt them.

Mission Suitability Evaluation

CSC Applied Technologies, LLC

The SEB gave CSC’s proposal an overall Mission Suitability score of 825 out of a maximum 1000 points. CSC received three significant strengths, six strengths, and one weakness across the four sub-factors.

Under the management approach sub-factor, CSC received an adjectival rating of very good. CSC received one significant strength, three strengths, and one weakness under this sub-factor. CSC’s significant strength under the management approach sub-factor was CSC’s current quality certification to AS9110 standards at Ellington Field. This certification demonstrates capability of effectively meeting the AMOS quality requirements, which significantly enhances confidence that CSC would continue to promote process improvement in their Quality Management System. I find significant value in CSC’s current AS9110 certification.

CSC's weakness under the management approach sub-factor was associated with the resume submitted for the key personnel position of "Engineering Manager." The submitted resume did not demonstrate the required ten years of aerospace industry experience in a key leadership role. The SEB determined that the omission of this qualification on the candidate's resume put critical engineering tasks at risk of unsatisfactory completion.

Under the technical approach sub-factor, CSC received an adjectival rating of good. CSC received two strengths under this sub-factor.

Under the safety and health sub-factor, CSC received an adjectival rating of excellent. CSC received one significant strength under this sub-factor. CSC received a significant strength for its proposed Safety and Health Plan which included a strong safety and health program that is well documented and contains proactive approaches in the areas of safety, health and environmental practices. This plan reflects strong management and employee involvement and excellent technical knowledge of OSHA and EPA standards.

Under the small business utilization sub-factor, CSC received an adjectival rating of excellent. CSC received one significant strength and one strength under this sub-factor. CSC's significant strength in small business utilization was based on reasonable and sound subcontracting goals that significantly exceed NASA's established goals in all seven areas set forth for the AMOS procurement. This demonstrates CSC's exceptional commitment to their small business program.

DynCorp International LLC.

The SEB gave DynCorp's proposal an overall Mission Suitability score of 871 out of a maximum 1000 points. DynCorp received four significant strengths, eight strengths and one weakness across the four sub-factors.

Under the management approach sub-factor, DynCorp received an adjectival rating of excellent. DynCorp received one significant strength, five strengths, and one weakness under this sub-factor. DynCorp's significant strength under the management approach sub-factor related to DynCorp's thorough description of proposed innovations and efficiencies to improve effectiveness across the whole spectrum of operational, administrative, technical and support functions called for in the AMOS contract. DynCorp's proposed innovations and efficiencies include the implementation of a Lean Six Sigma Program to reduce cost and increase productivity and efficiency, and a Continuous Process Improvement Blitz Team to rapidly respond using Kaizen activities to remove waste from processes. DynCorp proposes an organizational structure that assures process effectiveness and efficiency without incurring safety and performance risk. Although not called out as a significant strength, DynCorp received a strength in their management approach for their comprehensive understanding of the fixed-price and cost labor accounting processes by proposing procedures and surveillance methods that are clearly defined, thorough, and ensure proper documentation of labor allocations. I noted this strength in DynCorp's proposal since it specifically addressed a risk the Government identified during procurement development related to improper labor allocations between fixed-price and

cost labor under the AMOS contract. DynCorp's management approach includes training, automated time accounting systems, charge code accounting procedures, surveillance, audits, and corrective action and mitigation strategies which I believe will ensure that employee time accounting is accurate.

DynCorp's weakness under the management approach sub-factor was associated with the resume submitted for the key personnel position of "Engineering Manager." The submitted resume did not demonstrate the required ten years of aerospace industry experience in a key leadership role. Further, DynCorp's candidate's resume did not demonstrate the required experience with computer aided design processes. The SEB determined that the omission of these two qualifications on the candidate's resume put critical engineering tasks at risk of unsatisfactory completion.

Under the technical approach sub-factor, DynCorp received an adjectival rating of excellent. DynCorp received three significant strengths and two strengths under this sub-factor. The first significant strength under the technical approach sub-factor involved DynCorp's highly effective and sound response to Scenario 2, which significantly mitigates inherent risk to mission success and personnel safety. DynCorp's highly developed response proposed using a Medical Evacuation Manager, a Family Liaison Representative, a pro-active pre-deployment planning process, and satellite communications technology on deployed locations to mitigate risk. Continuity of operational support during aircraft deployments is of great value as it is critical to NASA's mission accomplishment.

The second significant strength under the technical approach sub-factor involved DynCorp's comprehensive response to Scenario 4. DynCorp's approach to managing conflicting work priorities within the same work area where both Fixed-price and Cost labor will be accomplished is very effective and consistent with their management approach. This approach offers significant value as it will ensure proper documentation of labor allocations.

The third significant strength under the technical approach sub-factor involved DynCorp's response to Scenario 5. DynCorp's response illustrates the value of a comprehensive approach to supporting NASA's diverse fleet of aging and one-of-a-kind aircraft. DynCorp's response to scenario 5 included a very effective logistics approach to networking and establishing "in advance" customer/supplier relationships to support one-of-a-kind aircraft and obsolete parts. DynCorp's plan of action for anticipating and preventing obsolescence issues offers the Government great value by mitigating part availability problems.

Under the safety and health sub-factor, DynCorp received an adjectival rating of good. DynCorp received one strength under this sub-factor.

Under the small business utilization sub-factor, DynCorp received an adjectival rating of good. DynCorp received no strengths or weaknesses under this sub-factor.

Past Performance

Since Past Performance is a significant predictor of likely performance, the SEB evaluated the Past Performance of each Offeror. Offerors were asked to provide data on at least three relevant contracts with work performed within the last three years and were instructed to have their customers complete questionnaires on that work. The overall rating for Past Performance was related, in part, to the relevancy and quality of performance on referenced contracts provided by the prime and subcontractors as they related to the specific kind of work the prime/subcontractor would be performing for the proposed effort. The SEB also considered the following data sources in its evaluation of each Offeror's overall Past Performance:

- Narrative provided by the Offeror in Volume II, Past Performance
- Contractor Performance Assessment and Reporting System (CPARS)
- Government Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS)
- Completed Past Performance Questionnaires submitted by the Offerors' customers on work similar to AMOS
- Conversations with COs and COTRs to obtain details about the questionnaires and PPIRS data
- Safety metrics associated with OSHA 300 and 300A forms

CSC submitted several relevant contracts for review. CSC received an excellent rating on the very relevant current NASA AMMP contract and satisfactory ratings on two other very relevant contracts. CSC's performance on the current NASA AMMP contract is of exceptional merit. In addition to the AMMP Contract, CSC submitted Past Performance on two other very relevant contracts, one relevant contract, and one somewhat relevant contract. CSC's performance on the two other very relevant contracts was rated as satisfactory and indicated several identifiable problems. CSC's Past Performance on the relevant contract was considered very good and their performance on the somewhat relevant contract was excellent. CSC's safety performance was uniformly excellent across all relevant contracts within the three year period reviewed, including an OSHA Days Away Case Rate and Days Away Restricted and Transfer rates that were better than the industry average. Based on CSC's total Past Performance record in concert with their OSHA ratings, the SEB found, and I concurred with, an overall High Level of Confidence that CSC will successfully perform the effort required under AMOS.

DynCorp submitted several relevant contracts for review. This in addition to the SEB's review of other Past Performance sources resulted in six very relevant contracts. Of these six very relevant contracts, DynCorp received excellent Past Performance ratings on three contracts, very good ratings on two contracts, and a marginal rating on one contract. DynCorp's safety performance was inconsistent across relevant contracts within the three year period reviewed, including OSHA Days Away Case Rate and Days Away Restricted and Transfer rates that were worse than industry average. However, based on DynCorp's total Past Performance record in concert with their OSHA ratings, the SEB found and I concurred with an overall High Level of Confidence that DynCorp will successfully perform the effort required under AMOS.

Cost/Price

The Cost/Price proposals were evaluated consistent with the evaluation criteria in RFP Provision M.5. DynCorp's proposed Cost/Price was approximately 6% lower than CSC's proposed Cost/Price.

The SEB conducted a cost realism analysis in accordance with FAR 15.404-1(d) and NFS 1815.305. As part of the cost realism analysis, the SEB evaluated information proposed in Volume III, cost proposal, and Volume I, Mission Suitability, for specific elements of the Offeror's proposed cost estimate to determine whether the estimated proposed cost elements (1) were realistic for the work to be performed; (2) reflected a clear understanding of the requirements; and (3) were consistent with the unique methods of performance and materials described in the Offeror's technical proposal. Based on this cost realism analysis, the Government determined a probable cost of performance for each Offeror.

No adjustments were made to either the Cost or fixed-price portion of CSC's proposal as a result of this cost realism analysis. Under the Cost/Price factor, an upward probable cost adjustment was made to the cost portion of DynCorp's proposal to account for the delta between DynCorp's proposed fully burdened direct labor rates and the fully burdened incumbent labor rates. This adjustment was made due to DynCorp affirming in its proposal that it intended to retain approximately 90% of the incumbent workforce. No price adjustments were made to the fixed-price portion of DynCorp's proposal. DynCorp's probable Cost/Price was approximately 5% lower than CSC's probable Cost/Price, which was not adjusted from CSC's proposed Cost/Price.

Selection Decision

Following the presentation by the SEB on April 5, 2012, I fully considered the SEB's findings. I commended the SEB on their comprehensive and detailed evaluation of two very strong proposals. I have reviewed the detailed findings of the SEB and I agree with each of the SEB's findings.

In making my selection decision, I first reviewed the relative importance of evaluation factors. For this solicitation, of the three evaluation factors, Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost/Price. Mission Suitability is more important than Past Performance. Past Performance and Cost/Price are approximately equal in importance.

Under the Mission Suitability factor, I find that the overall Mission Suitability scores are representative of the Offerors' Mission Suitability proposals. Qualitatively, I have noted a number of distinguishing factors within the Mission Suitability assessments.

With respect to CSC's proposal, I agree with the very good rating the SEB gave CSC under the management approach sub-factor, the good rating the SEB gave CSC under the technical approach sub-factor, and the excellent ratings the SEB gave CSC under the safety and health approach and small business utilization sub-factors.

I noted CSC's significant strengths in management approach, safety and health approach, and small business utilization. CSC's current quality certification to AS9110 standards at Ellington Field would assure continuous improvement in the quality of the work CSC performs. I have also noted and agree with the significant strength the SEB gave CSC for their safety and health plan. This finding demonstrates the value CSC places on safety. NASA JSC has a strong safety

culture with the goal of eliminating workplace injuries and needless damage to government property. I believe CSC's plan would mitigate safety risks to JSC employees and property. A strong commitment to workplace safety and health also minimizes risk to mission. I also agree with the rating of excellent CSC received for the small business utilization sub-factor. CSC's subcontracting goals are ambitious and demonstrate the company's commitment to fostering small business.

With respect to DynCorp's proposal, I agree with the excellent ratings the SEB gave DynCorp under the management approach and technical approach sub-factors, and the good ratings the SEB gave DynCorp under the safety and health approach and small business utilization sub-factors.

I noted DynCorp's significant strength under the management sub-factor related to the innovations and efficiencies they proposed. DynCorp's proposed implementation of Lean Six Sigma and a Continuous Improvement Blitz Team will reduce cost, increase productivity and efficiency, and reduce waste from operations at Ellington Field. The proposed High Performance Work Organization will increase production level and quality output, and the Safety Management System will increase aircraft reliability and safety. I believe these innovations and efficiencies add significant value to DynCorp's proposal.

I also noted DynCorp's strength for their demonstrated comprehensive understanding of fixed-price and cost labor accounting processes. DynCorp's proposal detailed procedures and surveillance methods are clearly defined, thorough, and ensure proper documentation of labor allocations. I find substantial value to the Government in DynCorp's comprehensive approach to accurate reporting and time accounting between fixed-price and cost work under the AMOS contract, as DynCorp's approach minimizes the risk to NASA posed by increased contract labor costs and additional effort and expense in contract administration associated with improper labor allocations.

The most notable difference I found between the two proposals in Mission Suitability was DynCorp's extremely well developed and thorough responses to the five technical scenarios. The quality of DynCorp's responses to these scenarios demonstrated DynCorp's superior understanding of the technical requirements of the AMOS contract and the risks to successful contract performance. They represented substantial value to the Government.

DynCorp's proposal to address Scenario 2 regarding medical evacuation of personnel from a deployed environment, while effectively supporting aircraft repair, evidences a thorough and highly developed response to this risk. I believe that DynCorp's response to Scenario 2 provides a superior approach to mitigating this risk of interruption in operational support for deployed aircraft and crew. I found value in DynCorp's effective and feasible methodology for addressing this scenario minimizes the risk to NASA that an ill or injured contractor mechanic will lead to a deployed aircraft left in a "not mission capable" maintenance condition.

DynCorp's comprehensive response to Scenario 4 shows a well considered approach to areas of aircraft maintenance and operations where the AMOS contractor will encounter conflicting work priorities and will perform both fixed-price and cost labor in the same physical work area. The hybrid cost and fixed-price nature of the AMOS contract presents a risk to NASA of a contractor

improperly charging in situations like those described in Scenario 4. This risk is especially prominent in areas such as back shop maintenance. DynCorp's response to Scenario 4 demonstrates the application of their comprehensive management approach to accounting for fixed-price and cost labor in a situation where both types of labor will be accomplished in the same work area. I believe that DynCorp's comprehensive response to Scenario 4 demonstrates the application of their superior approach to allocation of labor under the AMOS contract. DynCorp's response to Scenario 4 adds confidence in their ability to successfully mitigate the risk to NASA of a contractor improperly charging between fixed-price and cost labor under the AMOS contract.

NASA is constantly challenged to support aging and one-of-a-kind aircraft. Among the challenges in this area is NASA's ability to obtain parts for older or unique aircraft. DynCorp's response to Scenario 5 includes a highly-developed analysis of the problem and a detailed plan of action to address it. DynCorp's methodology for supporting out of production and obsolete parts includes a logistics approach that pre-establishes networks of vendors and manufacturers in anticipation of the need for obsolete parts. DynCorp's methodology will greatly increase aircraft sustainability and reliability. I believe DynCorp's superior approach to mitigating the inherent risks associated with maintaining NASA's fleet of aging aircraft will lead to higher value to the Government.

In comparing the two proposals under Mission Suitability, I determined that DynCorp had the superior proposal. My conclusion was primarily based upon the differences in management approach and technical approach. I found DynCorp's proposed implementation of Lean Six Sigma and a Continuous Improvement Blitz Team to be an innovative approach that adds significant value by increasing productivity and efficiency and reducing waste in aircraft maintenance and operations processes. I agree with DynCorp's excellent rating for the management approach sub-factor. For each of the five technical scenarios presented in the RFP, DynCorp's response generated either a significant strength or a strength. In their responses to the technical scenarios, I believe that DynCorp showed a better understanding of the risks associated with AMOS contract performance and provided superior approaches to mitigating those risks. Although CSC excelled in their safety and health approach and small business subcontracting plan, these two sub-factors were given substantially less weight under the overall Mission Suitability factor than were management approach and technical approach. Provision M.3 in the RFP made clear that the weights corresponding to each of the Mission Suitability sub-factors reflected the relative importance NASA placed on each sub-factor.

I reviewed CSC's record of Past Performance as a whole, taking into consideration the company's excellent performance under the current NASA AMMP contract and their excellent record of safety performance throughout the past three years. As the current contractor under NASA JSC's Aircraft Maintenance and Modification Program (AMMP) Contract, CSC clearly has highly relevant experience with the type of work required under AMOS and their Past Performance of that work has been exemplary. I noted that CSC's Past Performance on the other two very relevant contracts was only rated as satisfactory, revealing several identifiable problems such as quality concerns, cost overruns, and personnel retention concerns. CSC's Past Performance on the relevant contract was considered very good and their performance on the somewhat relevant contract was excellent. CSC's safety performance was excellent throughout

the three year period reviewed. Considering CSC's entire record of Past Performance, I have a high level of confidence that CSC can successfully perform the work required under AMOS.

I also reviewed DynCorp's Past Performance record. I noted that DynCorp Past Performance record included six very relevant contracts. This demonstrates their extensive corporate experience with work relevant to the work required under AMOS. Of these six very relevant contracts, DynCorp received excellent Past Performance ratings on three contracts and very good ratings on two contracts. The last very relevant contract was rated as marginal due to concerns with product quality, management instability and other concerns. DynCorp also had inconsistent to poor Past Performance with respect to OSHA reportable safety and health issues. When I consider DynCorp's record of Past Performance as a whole, I find that there is a high level of confidence that they can also successfully perform the work required under AMOS.

After detailed review of the SEB's findings for both Offerors, I believe that the proposals contained essentially equivalent areas of excellent or very good Past Performance and off-setting and essentially equal areas of satisfactory or marginal Past Performance. After a detailed review of the SEB's findings, I agree with the overall assessment of the SEB that both Offerors' Past Performance provides a high level of confidence that either Offeror could successfully perform the effort required under AMOS. Accordingly, I did not find Past Performance to provide any clear basis for discrimination between the two Offerors.

I did carefully consider the difference in the proposals' Past Performance findings related to OSHA reportable safety and health issues. CSC's safety performance was excellent throughout the three year period reviewed. DynCorp's safety performance was inconsistent across relevant contracts within the three year period reviewed. Where CSC's safety rates were better than the industry average, DynCorp's rates of these same categories were worse than the industry average. Although it appears to me from these figures that CSC's Past Performance with regard to OSHA safety and health has historically been better than DynCorp's Past Performance, I believe that any risk to performance of the AMOS contract in the area of safety and health can be mitigated in a number of ways. First, in their management approach DynCorp indicated their intention to retain 90% of the incumbent NASA JSC workforce. To their credit, these employees have historically performed their work in an extremely safe and conscientious fashion. These employees have worked in and will continue to work within a NASA workplace culture that is extremely focused on health and safety. I do not believe that the movement of these employees from one company to another will diminish their personal commitment to safety or degrade the safety-focused culture in which they work. Secondly, during contract phase-in NASA will have the opportunity to communicate NASA's focus on health and safety to incoming AMOS contractor management to ensure that they understand the importance NASA places on safety. Lastly, in their proposed price/cost volume DynCorp has proposed a very limited amount of profit for the fixed-price portion of the AMOS contract. Safety and health performance is a significant factor in NASA's determination of award fee and will motivate the AMOS contractor to perform the AMOS contract work safely.

With regard to the Cost/Price factor, I noted that DynCorp's proposed Cost/Price was 6% less than CSC's proposed Cost/Price. I noted that the SEB performed a cost realism analysis on both Offerors' proposed Cost/Price to determine their respective probable Cost/Price. CSC's proposed Cost/Price was not changed following this analysis. DynCorp's proposed Cost/Price was adjusted upward to account for the difference between their proposed rates and the

incumbent labor rates based upon DynCorp's indication that they intend to retain 90% of incumbent employees. DynCorp's adjusted Cost/Price was approximately 5% lower than CSC's proposed Cost/Price, which was not adjusted. After NASA's probable cost adjustment, DynCorp's proposal still results in less cost to the Government.

I applied the evaluation criteria in the RFP in making my final determination. RFP, Provision M.2 "Evaluation Factors for Award" provided: Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined are significantly more important than Cost/Price. Mission Suitability is more important than Past Performance. Past Performance and Cost/Price are approximately equal in importance.

My ultimate decision involved a determination of which proposal I determined represented the best value to the Government. After a thorough consideration of each Offeror's Past Performance, I find there is a high level of confidence that either Offeror could successfully perform the work required under AMOS. In making my decision I found that the Mission Suitability and Cost/Price factors were key discriminators in my selection decision. DynCorp's proposal demonstrated a superior management approach which includes innovations that will increase productivity and efficiency while reducing waste, as well as a superior understanding of the technical requirements of the AMOS contract and the associate risks to successful contract performance. These advantages lead to a proposal that offers higher quality contract performance at a lower probable Cost/Price to the Government, thus resulting in higher value.

I concluded that the DynCorp proposal offered the best value to the Government.

I select DynCorp International, LLC as the awardee.

Ellen Ochoa
Ellen Ochoa
Source Selection Authority

4/13/12
Date