**Selection Statement**
**for the**
**Engineering and Science Services and Skills Augmentation (ESSSA)**
**Services Contract**
**Request for Proposals (RFP)**
**Solicitation Number NNM11386243R**

On May 3, 2012, I, along with other senior officials of NASA's George C. Marshall Space Flight Center (MSFC), met with the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed to evaluate proposals in connection with the Engineering and Science Services and Skills Augmentation (ESSSA) Services Contract.

## I. PROCUREMENT HISTORY

The purpose of the RFP for the ESSSA Services Contract is to obtain services necessary to provide MSFC with the continuous requirement for engineers, scientists, and technicians necessary to support the Engineering Directorate, Science and Technology Office, Flight Programs and Partnerships Office, future programs/projects, and other offices that have similar needs; the effort needed is dependent upon fluctuating work requirements of the Center relative to commensurate civil service personnel. The services requested include a wide range of engineering and science disciplines deployed among a large number and variety of MSFC activities. Also included are integral technicians defined as individuals whose purposes are to perform technician tasks under the direction of an engineer assigned to a specific task order supporting technology or unique process/product development.

The successful contractor will be responsible for providing all the necessary management, personnel, and equipment/supplies (not otherwise provided by the Government) required to perform the engineering and science (also referred to throughout the Performance Work Statement (PWS) as technical) tasks broadly defined in this PWS and more specifically described in Task Orders (TOs) issued by the Government in accordance with Clauses H.5, *1852.216-80 Task Ordering Procedure* and H.6, *Supplemental Task Ordering Procedure* of the solicitation.

The proposed contract has a two-year, base period of performance from August 1, 2012, through July 31, 2014; a first option period from August 1, 2014 through July 31, 2015; a second option period from August 1, 2015 through July 31, 2016; and a third option period from August

1, 2016 through July 31, 2017. The proposed contract will be performed under a performance-based, cost-plus-fixed-fee less deductions indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity (IDIQ) contract.

The ESSSA Services Contract RFP was released on June 24, 2011, and four amendments were issued to the RFP. On August 8, 2011, proposals were received from the following five companies: BAE Systems Technology Solutions & Services, Inc. (BAE), Booz Allen Hamilton, Inc. (BAH), Jacobs Technology, Inc. (Jacobs), Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC), and Stinger Ghaffarian Technologies, Inc. (SGT).

## II. EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

The proposals were evaluated in accordance with the procedures prescribed by Federal Acquisition Regulation (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. Therefore, all evaluation factors other than Cost, (i.e., Mission Suitability and Past Performance), when combined, are significantly more important than Cost.

Under the Mission Suitability factor, proposals were evaluated to ensure the Offeror 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.

| Mission Suitability Subfactor | Weighting |
|---|---|
| Management Approach | 500 points |
| Staffing and Total Compensation | 400 points |
| Small Business (SB) Utilization | 100 points |
| TOTAL | 1,000 points |

Under Cost, the Offeror's proposed fully burdened, composite labor rates and other direct cost burden rates for each year of the contract were assessed to determine reasonableness and realism (including the impact of proposed uncompensated overtime). 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. The evaluation was conducted in accordance with FAR Part 15.305(a)(1) and NFS Part 1815.305(a)(1)(B) and (C). The Government computed a proposed value (cost and fee) for each

year of the contract utilizing the "Government Worksheet-IDIQ Cost Model" provided in the RFP. The Offeror's proposed Total Cost for each year of the contract was computed using the Offeror-provided fully burdened, composite labor rates applied to a Government predetermined allotment of labor hours for each labor category, and Offeror-provided burden rates applied to a Government predetermined estimate for travel, training, other direct costs, and material. In addition, the Government computed a value (cost and fee) for an additional six-month period of performance that may be exercised by the Government in accordance with Clause 52.217-8, Option to Extend Services. The Offeror's proposed Total Cost for the six-month period was computed using the proposed Contract Year 5 (CY5) fully burdened, composite IDIQ labor rates and burden rates applied respectively to the CY5 Government predetermined allotment of hours and amounts for travel, training, ODCs, and material prorated for the six-month period. The Offeror's proposed Total Fixed Fee amount was computed by using the proposed fee rate applied to the cost as proposed. The Total Cost and Total Fixed Fee amounts were summed to obtain a Total Proposed Government IDIQ Cost Model Value. The calculated proposed fixed fee amount was not adjusted and was included in the probable cost. The SEB made upward or downward adjustments to the proposed rates as a result of the assessment of cost realism, including adjustments to all proposed direct and indirect rates, and used the adjusted rates to calculate the Total Probable Cost using the methodology described above. The SEB determined a level of confidence ("High," "Medium," or "Low") in each Offeror's ability to successfully perform at the computed probable cost value.

The evaluation of Past Performance included the overall corporate past performance of the Offeror and any Teammate/Major Subcontractors on efforts of comparable types of services provided, size and complexity, and contract type (to a lesser extent) to the requirements of the proposed ESSSA Services Contract. As stated in the RFP, the baseline for the ESSSA contract size relevancy was approximately $40M per year for the Prime Offerors and commensurate with the percentage of the proposal effort for subcontractors per year. In addition, Past Peformance included an assessment of key safety metrics for Lost Time Case and Total Recordable Injury Rates. 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. In accordance with NFS Part 1815.305, Past Performance was assessed using level of confidence ratings of "Very High," "High," "Moderate," "Low," "Very Low," and "Neutral." Offerors without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance was not available were not evaluated favorably or unfavorably on Past Performance and received "neutral" ratings in accordance with FAR Part 15.305(a)(2)(iv).

Using the above-described evaluation procedure, the SEB evaluated all five proposals and presented its findings to me on February 10, 2012. As a result, the contracting officer, with my concurrence, determined that the most highly rated proposals in the competitive range were submitted by Jacobs and SGT.

Written and oral discussions were held with the two Offerors in the competitive range. On March 28, 2012, discussions were closed and final proposal revisions (FPRs) were requested. FPRs were received on April 4, 2012.

The evaluation of the FPRs using the same evaluation procedure as the initial evaluation is summarized below.

**Jacobs Technology, Inc. (Jacobs)**

**Under the Mission Suitability factor**, the proposal from Jacobs received an overall numerical score of 945 (out of a possible 1,000 points). The proposal received seventeen significant strengths, twelve strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The following is a summary of the SEB evaluation of the Jacobs' proposal under the three Mission Suitability subfactors (i.e., Management Approach, Staffing and Total Compensation, and Small Business Utilization).

Under the Management Approach subfactor, the proposal received an adjectival rating of "Excellent" and a numerical score of 465 (out of a possible 500 points). The proposal received six significant strengths, seven strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strengths related to: (1) the exceptionally well-developed Integrated Team Management Approach, (2) the detailed and comprehensive approach regarding innovations in the work processes and proposed enhancements to Automated Task Order Management System (ATOMS), (3) an Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) plan which provided a detailed and clear approach to resolve possible OCIs, notably the Offeror proposed a limitation of future contracting and agreed to its incorporation in the contract via Clause 1852.209-71, *Limitation of Future Contracting*, (4) the proven comprehensive and thorough approach to enhance customer satisfaction and service delivery through improved internal and external communications, including development of a Customer Communication Plan, (5) an exceptional and comprehensive Safety, Health, and Environmental (SHE) Plan which includes an extremely thorough and detailed description of each MSFC SHE Core Program Requirement (CPR) and sub-element, and safety initiatives that exceed the requirements, and (6) a fee deduction approach that will incentivize excellence.

Under the Staffing and Total Compensation subfactor, the proposal received an adjectival rating of "Excellent" and a numerical score of 384 (out of a possible 400 points). The proposal received eight significant strengths, four strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strengths related to: (1) the proposed General Manager, (2) the proposed Deputy General Manager, (3) the comprehensive approach to timely recruiting and provisioning of mission critical, highly specialized and general skills for Phase-In and throughout the contract period of performance, (4) the exceptionally detailed and comprehensive contract Phase-In plan which clearly demonstrates a proven approach to transition on-going work while ensuring completeness and continuity of operations with minimal impact and disruption, (5) the innovative and demonstrated adaptation of the Offeror's workforce management tools and processes that provide enhanced workforce flexibility to accommodate significant short-term and long-term workload variations, (6) the proposed Engineering Task Lead, (7) the proposed Skills Provisioning Department Director, and (8) the proposed Business Operations Office Manager.

Under the Small Business Utilization subfactor, the proposal received an adjectival rating of "Excellent" and a numerical score of 96 (out of a possible 100 points). The proposal received three significant strengths, one strength, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strengths related to: (1) the subcontracting goals significantly exceed the recommended subcontracting goals as a percentage of total proposed contract value and a strong and logical rationale is provided in the small business subcontracting plan to substantiate the proposed goals, (2) the clear demonstration of an exceptional level of commitment to utilize small business concerns and to support their development through procedures and an organizational structure that provide a logical and systematic approach, and (3) the clear demonstration of exceptional management commitment to utilizing small business concerns as subcontractors in high technology areas and high quality areas (versus a mere pass through) in addition to the integration of the subcontracted work into the total effort through a strong reliance on formal, mutually-binding teaming agreements.

**Under the Cost factor**, the SEB calculated the total proposed cost and fee to be $161.1M ($177.5M if the 6-month contract extension authorized by Clause 52.217-8, *Option to Extend Services* is exercised). A total probable cost adjustment of $2.7M ($3.0M if the 6-month contract extension authorized by Clause 52.217-8 is exercised) resulted from adjustments to direct labor rates that were lower than the industry average. Therefore, the total probable computed cost and fee is $163.8M ($180.5M if the 6-month contract extension authorized by Clause 52.217-8 is exercised). The probable cost was assessed as having a "High" level of cost confidence by the SEB.

**Under the Past Performance factor**, the proposal received an adjectival rating of "Very High Level of Confidence" resulting from three significant strengths, five strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strengths related to the relevancy and quality of performance demonstrated on: (1) the Engineering, Science, and Technical Services (ESTS) contract with NASA by the Prime, (2) the Engineering and Science Contract (ESC) with NASA by the Prime, and (3) the Operation, Maintenance, Information Management, and Support contract with the U.S. Air Force by the Prime.

**Stinger Ghaffarian Technologies, Inc. (SGT)**

**Under the Mission Suitability factor**, the proposal from SGT received an overall numerical score of 920 (out of a possible 1,000 points). The proposal received eleven significant strengths, nineteen strengths, no significant weaknesses, and one weakness. The following is a summary of the SEB evaluation of the SGT proposal under the three Mission Suitability subfactors (i.e., Management Approach, Staffing and Total Compensation, and Small Business Utilization).

Under the Management Approach subfactor, the proposal received an adjectival rating of "Excellent" and a numerical score of 470 (out of a possible 500 points). The proposal received six significant strengths, ten strengths, no significant weaknesses, and one weakness. The significant strengths related to: (1) the exceptional description of the teaming arrangements and subcontracting approach using an effective and thorough Technology Capabilities Integration Management approach, (2) the approach to provide an integrated, effective, and efficient work process and ATOMS, (3) the comprehensive and innovative approach to proactively utilize unique MSFC technical capabilities, (4) a management approach that establishes a clear and comprehensive strategy for proactively infusing innovation and Technology Advancement into ESSSA technical operations, (5) an OCI Plan which demonstrates an exceptional level of commitment by identification and avoidance/mitigation in accordance with FAR Part 9.5, and (6) an exceptional and comprehensive SHE Plan which includes an extremely thorough and detailed description of each MSFC SHE CPR and sub-element, and safety initiatives that exceed the requirements.

Under the Staffing and Total Compensation subfactor, the proposal received an adjectival rating of "Very Good" and a numerical score of 360 (out of a possible 400 points). The proposal received three significant strengths, seven strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strengths related to: (1) the exceptionally detailed and

comprehensive contract Phase-in plan which clearly demonstrates an effective approach to transition on-going work while ensuring completeness and continuity of operations with minimal impact and disruption, (2) the overall approach for provisioning of skills (i.e. general skills, highly specialized skills, mission critical skills, and subject matter experts) during Phase-In and throughout the contract period of performance, and (3) the detailed approach and methodology to implement workforce flexibility to accommodate significant reductions and increases in the short-term and long-term levels of support.

Under the Small Business Utilization subfactor, the proposal received an adjectival rating of "Very Good" and a numerical score of 90 (out of a possible 100 points). The proposal received two significant strengths, two strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strengths related to: (1) the clear demonstration of an exceptional level of commitment to utilize small business concerns and to support their development through procedures and an organizational structure that provide a logical and systematic approach and (2) the clear demonstration of exceptional management commitment to utilizing small business concerns as subcontractors in high technology areas and high quality areas (versus a mere pass through) in addition to the integration of the subcontracted work into the total effort through a strong reliance on formal, mutually-binding teaming agreements.

**Under the Cost factor**, the SEB calculated the total proposed cost and fee to be $182.7M ($201.6M if the 6-month contract extension authorized by Clause 52.217-8 is exercised) which was equivalent to the total probable computed cost and fee. The probable cost was assessed as having a "High" level of confidence by the SEB.

**Under the Past Performance factor**, the proposal received an adjectival rating of a "Very High Level of Confidence" resulting from three significant strengths, six strengths, no significant weaknesses, and no weaknesses. The significant strengths related to the relevancy and quality of performance demonstrated on: (1) the Multidisciplinary Engineering and Technology Services (METS) contract with NASA by the Prime, (2) the Mechanical Systems Engineering Services (MSES) contract with NASA by the Prime, and (3) the Systems Research and Development Support (ISRDS) contract with NASA by the Prime.

## 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 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. Comparing the two proposals, I determined that the proposal from Jacobs had an advantage over the proposal from SGT under the Mission Suitability factor (i.e., overall numerical score of 945 for the Jacobs proposal compared to 920 for the SGT proposal out of a possible 1,000 points). To understand the overall numerical score for both proposals, I examined the findings associated with each of the three Mission Suitability subfactors.

First, I compared the two proposals under the Management Approach subfactor. I determined that the SGT proposal offered a very slight advantage in this subfactor with an adjectival rating of "Excellent" and a numerical score of 470; the Jacobs proposal received an adjectival rating of "Excellent" and a slightly lower numerical score of 465 out of a possible 500 points. The SGT proposal received six significant strengths and ten strengths while the Jacobs proposal received six significant strengths and seven strengths. Both proposals received similar significant strengths for the proposed approach and innovations to the ATOMS, the OCI plan and avoidance strategies, and the comprehensive SHE plan that exceeded each CPR and sub-element. In addition, the SGT proposal received significant strengths for the exceptional teaming arrangements and subcontracting approach using a Technology Capabilities Integration Management approach, an approach to proactively utilize unique MSFC technical capabilities, and a management approach to proactively infuse innovation and Technology Advancement into ESSSA technical operations. The Jacobs proposal received significant strengths for an Integrated Team Management Approach, an approach to enhance customer satisfaction and service delivery through improved internal and external communications, and a fee deduction approach that incentivizes excellence. I noted that the SGT Final Proposal Revision retained a weakness, but the finding did not rise to the level of significance.

Second, I compared the two proposals under the Staffing and Total Compensation subfactor. I determined that the Jacobs proposal offered a clear advantage in this subfactor with an adjectival rating of "Excellent" and a numerical score of 384; the SGT proposal received a lower adjectival rating of "Very Good" and a lower numerical score of 360 out of a possible 400 points. The Jacobs proposal received eight significant strengths and four strengths while the SGT proposal received three significant strengths and seven strengths. Both proposals received similar significant strengths for the Phase-in plan to effectively transition on-going work with minimal impact and disruption, the approach to timely recruiting and provisioning of mission critical, highly specialized and general skills for Phase-In and throughout the contract period of performance, and the capacity to accommodate significant short-term and long-term workload variations and levels of support. In reviewing the Staffing and Total Compensation subfactor, I noted that the Jacobs proposal received five significant strengths for key personnel, including the proposed General Manager, Deputy General Manager, Engineering Task Lead, Skills Provisioning Department Director, and Business Operations Office Manager. In contrast, the SGT proposal received no significant strengths for proposed key personnel.

Third, I compared the two proposals under the Small Business Utilization subfactor. I determined that the Jacobs proposal offered a clear advantage in this subfactor with an adjectival rating of "Excellent" and a numerical score of 96; the SGT proposal received a lower adjectival rating of "Very Good" and a lower numerical score of 90 out of a possible 100 points. Both proposals received similar significant strengths for the clear demonstration of an exceptional level of commitment to utilize small business concerns and to support their development through procedures and an organizational structure that provide a logical and systematic approach, and the clear demonstration of exceptional management commitment to utilizing small business concerns as subcontractors in high technology areas and high quality areas (versus a mere pass through) in addition to the integration of the subcontracted work into the total effort through a strong reliance on formal, mutually-binding teaming agreements. However, I noted that the Jacobs proposal received an additional significant strength for proposed subcontracting goals that significantly exceeded the recommended subcontracting goals as a percentage of total proposed contract value with a strong and logical rationale provided in the small business subcontracting plan to substantiate the proposed goals.

Comparing the two proposals, I next determined that the proposal from Jacobs had an advantage under the Cost factor. The SEB calculated a total probable cost and fee of $163.8M (or $180.5M if the 6-month contract extension is exercised) for the Jacobs proposal compared to a total probable cost and fee of $182.7M (or $201.6M if the 6-month contract extension is exercised) for the SGT proposal. The SEB assigned a "High" cost confidence rating for both

proposals. Therefore, I determined that the Jacobs proposal offered significant cost savings to the Government.

After carefully considering the detailed findings of the SEB, I determined that the Past Performance ratings were supported by the respective findings and accurately reflected the relative standing of the proposals under the Past Performance factor. Comparing the proposals from Jacobs and SGT under this factor, I noted that both proposals received "Very High Level of Confidence" ratings. The SGT proposal received three significant strengths and six strengths while the Jacobs proposal received three significant strengths and five strengths. Both proposals received three similar significant strengths for the past performance of the Prime Offerors, but I determined that the past performance of both Offerors was essentially equal with no apparent discriminators under this factor. Therefore, the Past Performance factor was not a discriminator in my selection decision.

Finally, I proceeded with my best value tradeoff evaluation of the two proposals, weighing the essentially equal evaluation factors as prescribed in the RFP: Mission Suitability, Cost, and Past Performance. Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost. I noted that the Jacobs' proposal had a clear advantage under two (i.e., Mission Suitability and Cost) of the three factors; the remaining factor (i.e., Past Performance) was relatively equal between both proposals and ranked as a "Very High Level of Confidence." In my judgment, when considering the clear advantages in Mission Suitability and Cost presented by the Jacobs proposal and that the SGT proposal offers no clear advantage over Jacobs' proposal in Past Performance, the Jacobs proposal represents the best value to the Government.

Accordingly, I select the Jacobs Technology, Inc. for award of the ESSSA Services Contract.

Robert M. Lightfoot
Source Selection Authority

5/4/12
Date