

Source Selection Statement for the Safety and Mission Assurance Engineering Contract (SMAEC) Acquisition

On May 17, 2013, I met with members of the Streamlined Procurement Team (SLPT) appointed to evaluate the proposals for the Safety and Mission Assurance Engineering Contract (SMAEC), Solicitation NNJ12424577R. Several other officials of the Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center (JSC) also attended the presentation. On May 21, 2013, I met in executive session with the senior JSC officials who had attended the SLPT presentation, solicited their views and opinions, and made my selection decision.

Background

The SMAEC procurement is for an Indefinite-Delivery, Indefinite-Quantity (IDIQ) contract with Cost-Plus-Award-Fee Task Orders (TOs), Firm-Fixed-Price TOs and a Firm-Fixed-Price phase-in period for Safety and Mission Assurance (S&MA) engineering services. The performance period of the contract is a three-year base period, with two one-year option periods and a 60-day phase-in period. The maximum not-to-exceed (NTE) amount for all TOs to be issued under the contract is \$150M for the five-year period of performance. Three IDIQ Maximum Flex Options are included in the contract, which allow the Government to increase the maximum NTE amount by up to \$52.5M for a total potential maximum NTE amount of \$202.5M. This is a follow-on contract to the Safety and Mission Assurance Support Services (SMASS) Contract.

The goal of the SMAEC acquisition is to procure safety services for current and future National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) programs and projects, providing safety, quality and reliability support through the NASA JSC Safety and Mission Assurance Directorate. It is essential to augment the civil servant resources with industry expertise to ensure that the highest levels of safety and mission assurance are achieved. This is especially important for Human Spaceflight (HSF) programs and projects, where astronaut health, safety and even lives are at stake. The majority of the work will be located at JSC and the White Sands Test Facility (WSTF). However, contractor services could also be required at other NASA Centers, contractor or subcontractor locations, or vendor facilities. These locations may be both domestic and abroad.

A Sources Sought Synopsis was issued on February 7, 2012, followed by a Request for Information (RFI) from potential offerors regarding potential organizational conflicts of interest (OCI) on February 23, 2012. An Industry Day Synopsis was posted on the SMAEC website on April 11, 2012, with the Industry Day being held on May 1, 2012. A draft Statement of Work (SOW), draft Sample TOs and draft Document Requirement Descriptions (DRDs) were posted on the SMAEC website on July 17, 2012. A draft Request for Proposal (DRFP) was issued on August 28, 2012. A Pre-Solicitation Synopsis was posted on the website August 28, 2012. The Pre-proposal Conference and Site Tour were held on September 10, 2012, and a Cost and Pricing WebEx was held on September 17, 2012. The site tour included a tour of the Receiving and Inspection Test Facility (Building 15). A Request for Proposal (RFP) was released on November 6, 2012. One amendment to the RFP was issued on November 30, 2012, which made administrative corrections to items in Sections J, L, M, the IDIQ Workbook, Past Performance Questionnaire and some representative IDIQ TOs.

RFP Section M, Provision M.4.3, Performance Price Tradeoff (PPT) Proposal Evaluation, states, in part, that:

The Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the Offeror whose proposal offers the best overall value to the Government, meets all solicitation requirements, and is determined responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104, *Standards*. . . .

The RFP, Section M, Provision M.4.7, Tradeoff Process, defines the criteria for 'best value,' and the relative importance of the evaluation factors in any tradeoff:

- (a) For those Offerors who are determined to be technically acceptable, tradeoffs will be made between past performance and cost/price. Past performance is significantly more important than cost/price.
- (b) If all offers are of approximately equal past performance, award will be made to the Offeror with the lowest most probable cost/price.
- (c) The Government will consider awarding to an Offeror with higher past performance if the difference in probable cost/price is commensurate with added value.
- (d) The Government will consider making award to an Offeror whose offer has lower past performance if the probable cost/price differential between it and other offers warrant doing so.

Evaluation Procedures

The proposals were evaluated in accordance with evaluation criteria stated in the RFP. The evaluation process was as follows: (1) an initial evaluation was performed to determine if any proposals were unacceptable in accordance with NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.305-70, Identification of Unacceptable Proposals; (2) all Offerors were checked against the "List of Parties Excluded from Federal Procurement and Non- Procurement Programs," and all proposals were reviewed for compliance with the solicitation instructions; and (3) all proposals were then evaluated against the Technical Acceptability requirements listed in the RFP and all Technically Acceptable and Potentially Acceptable Offerors were evaluated against Past Performance and Cost/Price. For those offerors determined to be Technically Acceptable, tradeoffs were made between past performance and cost/price, with past performance being significantly more important than cost/price.

The SLPT initially evaluated each proposal for Technical Acceptability and assigned ratings of Acceptable (A), Potentially Acceptable (PA), or Unacceptable (U). To be considered Technically Acceptable, the proposal had to pass all Technical Acceptability subfactors. The two subfactors were Overall Management Approach and Technical Approach. In accordance with Provision M.4.4 of the RFP:

. . . **ALL** Technical Acceptability subfactors must be passed to be considered technically acceptable. A proposal is rated “Potentially Acceptable” when after the initial evaluation, the proposal does not have an Unacceptable rating for any of the Technical Acceptability subfactors and the Government anticipates the provision of additional information during discussions could result in a proposal rating of “Acceptable” . . .

For each proposal not found to be Unacceptable in one or more Technical Acceptability subfactors, the SLPT then assigned a performance confidence assessment rating based on the SLPT's evaluation of available information regarding that Offeror's relevant Past Performance on recent projects. The SLPT used information provided by the Offeror and other sources, including the narrative provided by the Offeror in Volume II Past Performance; completed Past Performance Questionnaires submitted by the Offerors' customers on work similar to SMAEC; conversations with Contracting Officers and Contracting Officer Representatives to obtain details about the questionnaires; the Government Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS); the Government Award Fee Evaluation System (AFES); information independently obtained from other sources (including commercial sources); OSHA logs, Underwriter Letters and the OSHA website; and EPA Enforcement and Complaints History Online website. In accordance with the RFP, the SLPT used the following adjective ‘level of confidence’ ratings as the Past Performance ratings: Very High Level of Confidence, High Level of Confidence, Moderate Level of Confidence, Low Level of Confidence, Very Low Level of Confidence, and Neutral.

To ensure that the final agreed-to costs and prices are fair and reasonable, the Government performed cost analysis and price analysis (including a cost realism analysis) in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) 15.305 - Proposal Evaluation, FAR 15.404 - Proposal Analysis, and NFS 1815.305 - Proposal Evaluation. The Government performed a cost realism analysis of the proposed direct labor rates and resources, which included the multiplier prescribed for TOs 2 through 4 in the Technical Resources Summary Template (TRST) entitled “Resource Roll-Up – TOs 2-5,” and developed a probable cost estimate for TOs 2 through 6. The Government also evaluated the reasonableness of the non-labor resources. In addition, the Government performed a price analysis of the fixed price proposed for TO 1 as well as a price analysis of the fully burdened fixed price rates proposed in Section B of the proposals for future fixed price IDIQ tasks. This resulted in a probable cost/price which differed, for one offer, from the proposed cost/price. The probable cost/price reflected the Government’s best estimate of the cost/price of any contract that would result from either of the Offeror’s proposals.

Evaluation of Initial Proposals

In response to the SMAEC RFP, two Offerors submitted proposals for the SMAEC procurement. Both proposals were received by the proposal due date. The companies that provided proposals are: 1) ManTech SRS Technologies, Inc. (ManTech); and 2) Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC).

None of the proposals submitted took exception to the RFP requirements.

Both initial proposals were evaluated in accordance with the SMAEC RFP Section M, FAR Part 15, and NFS Part 1815. After the Technical Acceptability evaluation was complete, both initial proposals were determined to be "Potentially Acceptable." The SLPT then evaluated the past performance and cost/price of both proposals.

Based on the SLPT evaluation of initial proposals, on March 6, 2013, I determined that it was in the Government's best interest to include ManTech and SAIC in the competitive range.

Discussions and Evaluation of Final Proposal Revisions

ManTech and SAIC were informed of their inclusion in the competitive range. The SLPT conducted discussions in two phases with both Offerors. The first phase involved written discussions that requested responses to questions provided in the competitive range determination letters regarding Technical Acceptability Evaluation Statements; Past Performance; Cost/Price; and Model Contract Clarifications. The second phase consisted of oral discussions during which the Offerors had an opportunity to clarify their written responses. At the conclusion of oral discussions, both Offerors were given an opportunity to submit final proposal revisions (FPRs) and signed model contracts that would reflect their intent to be contractually bound. The SLPT received FPRs and signed model contracts from both Offerors by the delivery due date of April 18, 2013. After evaluating both Offerors' FPRs, the SLPT rated the proposals submitted by ManTech and SAIC as Technically Acceptable. The SLPT also assessed a past performance level of confidence rating for each Offeror after evaluating its recent past performance deemed relevant to the effort described in the RFP. The SLPT also determined a probable cost/price for each proposal in accordance with RFP Provision M.4.6, Cost/Price Proposal (Volume III).

Past Performance Evaluations

The SLPT rated the ManTech Team's past performance at a Very High Level of Confidence. The SLPT evaluated past performance information for ManTech and its five major subcontractors (with subcontracts that have an estimated annual value greater than \$1,000,000), which included Anadarko Industries, LLC; Booz Allen Hamilton (BAH); GeoControl Systems, Inc. (GCS); Management Technology Associates, Inc. (MTA) and Wyle Laboratories, Inc. The past performance of the proposed Program Manager (PM) was also evaluated. The SLPT's review of past performance data considered performance data within three years preceding the date of the solicitation for past performance contracts, and performance within five years preceding the date of the solicitation for the proposed Program Manager. Assessment reports of past performance in the Performance Information Retrieval System (PIRS) and the Award Fee Evaluation System (AFES) were considered for any reports which included performance within three years preceding the date of the solicitation. The SLPT assessed the relevancy of the past performance contracts in the ManTech team's proposal by assessing the technical relevance, complexity, and magnitude of the effort. Overall, the SLPT found the ManTech team's past performance contracts to be Very Relevant to the work to be performed on the SMAEC contract. The ManTech team's past performance includes multiple contracts which involve much of the same or essentially the same complexity as the SMAEC solicitation. The ManTech proposal includes multiple examples of contracts which involve essentially the same or a larger magnitude of effort than is expected for the SMAEC. In particular, the MASC II contract involved essentially the same magnitude of effort as the

SMAEC. It is noted that contracts which involved a larger magnitude of effort than is expected for the SMAEC were considered to have essentially the same magnitude of effort for the purposes of determining an overall confidence rating. The SLPT also assessed the contract performance and quality of work performed on the past performance contracts referenced in ManTech's proposal, as well as other relevant work the SLPT identified through independent research. The SLPT interviewed Contracting Officers (COs), Contracting Officer's Representatives (CORs), and other points of contact (POCs) to obtain a better understanding of the quality of support provided. Only three ratings below "Very Good" were found in the SLPT's review of the ManTech team's past performance contracts. A rating of "Satisfactory" was noted in the PPIRS assessment report for ManTech's performance under the Consolidated Safety Support Contract for the period of October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010 in the area of cost control. Interviews indicated this rating was due to an error in ManTech's business reporting system originating from a transition from the previous contractor's system, but the issue was corrected and there have been no subsequent issues with financial reporting. A rating of "Satisfactory" was also noted in the PPIRS assessment report for ManTech's performance under the Launch and Range Systems Engineering and Integration (LRSW) Contract for the period of March 23, 2011 through March 22, 2012 in the area of schedule. Interviews indicated the issue was due to some late deliveries during one reporting period, but the contractor has taken steps to correct the deficiency. A rating of "Satisfactory" was also noted in the PPIRS assessment report for Anadarko Industries, LLC's performance under the Center Institutional Safety Services Contract for the period of July 1, 2011 through June 30, 2012 in the area of safety and health. The assessment report included the statement "The contractor had one lost time injury as a result of an auto accident. The investigation showed that the contractor could not have prevented the accident. There was also a small property damage incident due to inadvertent deluge activation. The contractor thoroughly investigated the incident and took corrective action beyond what was expected." The SLPT considered the issues associated with these three "Satisfactory" ratings to be minor in nature with no adverse effect on overall performance. Additionally, as shown above, these issues were corrected to the satisfaction of the SLPT. All other ratings identified in the SLPT's review of the ManTech team's past performance contracts were "Very Good" or "Excellent." The SLPT found that the difference between "Very Good" and "Excellent" had more to do with the criteria the evaluator used in rating and the rating scale itself than any issues associated with the quality of the work performed. This was particularly pronounced in the differences between NASA and Department of Defense (DoD) rating officials ratings. It was noted by an Assessing Official with the United States Air Force (USAF) that it is their practice to require multiple "exceeds" in order to assign an "Excellent" or "Exceptional" rating. ManTech initially proposed one individual as the PM for the SMAEC. However, ManTech revised their FPR to substitute a second individual as the Program Manager in place of the first. The newly-proposed PM has extensive experience in safety and mission assurance as evidenced by his role as the PM on the LRSW Contract. The ratings given by the USAF reviewers on the Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs) were "Very Good." Again, the SLPT found that the "Very Good" rating had more to do with the criteria that the evaluator used in rating than any issues associated with the quality of the work performed, and, as above, was due in large part to the different rating approaches used by NASA and DOD rating officials. The comments included on the PPQs and in interviews indicated that the customers on the proposed PM's past performance contract were highly satisfied with his performance as PM.

The SLPT rated the SAIC Team's past performance at a Very High Level of Confidence. The SLPT evaluated past performance information for SAIC and its four major subcontractors (with subcontracts that have an estimated annual value greater than \$1,000,000), which included ARES Corporation; GHG Corporation; JES Tech; and Millennium Engineering and Integration Company. The past performance of the proposed PM was also evaluated. The SLPT's review of past performance data considered performance within three years preceding the date of the solicitation for past performance contracts and performance within five years preceding the date of the solicitation for the Program Manager. Assessment reports found in PPIRS and AFES for past performance contracts were considered for any reports which included performance within three years preceding the date of the solicitation. The SLPT assessed the relevancy of the past performance contracts in the SAIC team's proposal by assessing the technical relevance, complexity, and magnitude of the effort. In accordance with the RFP's adjective "relevancy" rating, the SLPT found the SAIC team's past performance to be Very Relevant to the work to be performed in the SMAEC solicitation. The SAIC team's past performance includes multiple contracts with much of the same or essentially the same complexity as the proposed SMAEC contract. This work includes all of the work performed on the current JSC SMASS contract. No completion form TOs were identified in the past performance contracts reviewed for SAIC, however 10% of the SMASS contract is a completion form baseline. In addition, the SLPT was unable to identify any past performance information in regards to SAIC's proposed IDIQ management tool. The SAIC proposal includes multiple examples of contracts which involve essentially the same or a larger magnitude of effort than is expected for the SMAEC. In particular the current SMASS contract involved essentially the same magnitude of effort as the SMAEC. It is noted that contracts which involved a larger magnitude of effort than is expected for the SMAEC were considered to have essentially the same magnitude of effort for the purposes of determining an overall confidence rating. The SLPT assessed the overall contract performance and quality of work performed on the past performance contracts referenced in SAIC's proposal, as well as other relevant work the SLPT identified through independent research. The SLPT interviewed Contracting Officers (COs), Contracting Officer's Representatives (CORs), and other points of contact (POCs) to obtain a better understanding of the quality of support provided. Only three ratings below "Very Good" were found in the SLPT's review of the SAIC team's past performance contracts. A rating of "Good" was noted in the PPIRS assessment report for SAIC's performance under the SMASS contract for the period of May 1, 2010 through October 31, 2010 in the area of cost control. This rating was due to a cost overrun of 6.6% for the period. The SLPT noted that cost control ratings for all subsequent periods were "Very Good." A rating of "Satisfactory" was noted in the PPIRS assessment report for ARES Corporation's performance under the International Space Station (ISS) Program Integration and Control (PIC) II contract for the period of October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2011 in the area of property plans and procedures. The assessment report stated that the rating was due to the contractor's late submission of an approved property management plan. Interviews indicated that the issue was corrected and there have been no further issues. A rating of "Good" was also noted in the PPIRS assessment report for ARES Corporation's performance under the Safety and Mission Assurance Support Services contract at NASA Glenn Research Center for the period of December 1, 2008 through November 30, 2009 in the area of cost control. This "Good" rating was included in the PPIRS assessment report for the period of 12/01/2008 through 11/30/2009. The assessment report stated "The overall costs on some tasks were significantly higher than expected Recently the contractor has done a

more effective job of accurately forecasting, managing and controlling burn rates to control costs when possible." The SLPT noted that Cost Control was rated as "Exceptional" for both subsequent periods under this contract. The SLPT considered the issues associated with these three "Satisfactory" ratings to be minor in nature with no adverse effect on overall performance. Additionally, as shown above, these issues were corrected to the satisfaction of the Government. All other ratings identified in the SLPT's review of the SAIC team's past performance contracts were "Very Good" or "Excellent." The SLPT found that the difference between the "Very Good" and "Excellent" ratings had more to do with the criteria or the rating scale that the evaluator used in giving the rating than any issues associated with the quality of the work performed. This was particularly pronounced in the differences between NASA and DoD rating officials. SAIC's proposed PM has extensive experience in safety and mission assurance as evidenced by his role as Program Manager on the SMASS Contract. The ratings shown for the individual proposed as PM on the PPQs were all "Excellent" and the comments included in the PPQs and in interviews indicated that the customers on the proposed PM's past performance contract were highly satisfied with his performance as PM.

Cost/Price Evaluations

ManTech's final proposed cost/price proposal was completed in accordance with the RFP instructions. In accordance with RFP Provision M.4.6, Cost/Price Proposal (Volume III), to ensure that the final agreed-to prices are fair and reasonable, the SLPT performed price analysis and cost analysis to include a cost realism analysis. The SLPT did not adjust the proposed FFP for Task Order 1. However, a final probable cost adjustment was developed for the Cost Reimbursement Task Orders 2-6 as a result of ManTech's proposed approach to labor rates, which required a very slight upward adjustment.

SAIC's final proposed cost/price proposal was completed in accordance with the RFP instructions. In accordance with Section M, to ensure that the final agreed-to prices are fair and reasonable, the SLPT performed price analysis and cost analysis to include a cost realism analysis. No probable cost adjustments were required for SAIC's proposal.

Source Selection Tradeoff

At the conclusion of the SLPT's presentation on May 17, 2013, I remarked on the quality of each proposal, the excellence of each Offeror's past performance, the closeness of their proposed and probable costs, and the thoroughness and high quality of the SLPT's analysis across all evaluation factors stated in the RFP. I have no doubt that either of the two Offerors has an acceptable approach to the work, possesses excellent and highly relevant past performance, and would do a superior job. However, my task was to determine which one of them could provide the greater value to JSC's life-critical Safety and Mission Assurance program as measured by the criteria and standards set forth in the RFP. My principal touchstone, to which I have returned frequently over the last several days of further discussion and deliberation, including the executive session on May 21, 2013, was the RFP's statement of the relative weights of the two evaluation factors involved in my tradeoff decision, and the description of other interplay between those two factors:

- (a) For those Offerors who are determined to be technically acceptable, tradeoffs will be made between past performance and cost/price. Past performance is significantly more important than cost/price.
- (b) If all offers are of approximately equal past performance, award will be made to the Offeror with the lowest most probable cost/price.
- (c) The Government will consider awarding to an Offeror with higher past performance if the difference in probable cost/price is commensurate with added value.
- (d) The Government will consider making award to an Offeror whose offer has lower past performance if the probable cost/price differential between it and other offers warrant doing so.

Preliminary to my tradeoff, I confirmed for myself that both Offerors had submitted technically acceptable proposals, as the SLPT had assessed. I concurred in the SLPT's assessment after hearing the SLPT's presentation, reviewing the back-ground material to the presentation, and asking questions during the presentation seeking clarification and further explanation. I determine both offers to be technically acceptable.

I then moved on to Past Performance, the significantly more important of the two factors I must consider in any tradeoff. For each Offeror, I used the Past Performance evaluation criteria stated in Provision M.4.5, Past Performance (Volume II), as applied to the past performance information collected by the SLPT and presented to me, and to past performance information otherwise known to me. Generally, to reach a decision on the Past Performance level of confidence, I weighed the recency, the relevance (scope, complexity and size) and the quality of the extensive past performance information available to me for each Offeror.

ManTech

First, I examined the past performance information for ManTech (the first Offeror the SLPT evaluated) for relevance. ManTech, its team and its proposed PM had, within the RFP-required periods of recency, performed contracts very relevant to the SMAEC effort, including HSF work and some subcontractors' work here at JSC. That past performance closely related to the same or similar scope of the work here. It matched the SMAEC effort in technical and management complexity, including Safety and Mission Assurance in human spaceflight. ManTech's prior work involved managing completion form TO's (the contract approach on SMAEC), and that corresponds to NASA's change in contract approach over the predecessor contract, SMASS. In addition, the favorable past performance regarding ManTech's contract management systems and software tools was a good indicator they could manage the complexity expected in the SMAEC. With respect to size, I noted that there were many examples that the ManTech team had worked contracts of the same size as or even larger than this procurement.

I find the very relevant past performance of the ManTech team was delivered with nearly uniform excellence. While there were a few instances where a DoD reporting source had rated ManTech or its

major subcontractors 'Very Good,' my independent assessment was that all the team's performance of relevant contracts represented overall excellent quality. I based my judgment on the facts behind the ratings; the responses recorded in the SLPT's questionnaires and interviews explaining DoD's observations, rating processes and rating standards; and my consideration of the SLPT's opinion of that data. I was impressed that ManTech had earned three years of 'award term' on the very relevant LRSW contract. On a very relevant NASA CPAF HSF-related contract, ManTech achieved award fee scores in the high 90's, with a rising trend over time. Their success in recruiting on the LRSW contract despite the availability of only a limited labor pool (an incumbent contractor protested award to ManTech, making its incumbent employees unavailable for ManTech to hire) was also noteworthy, as it makes a smooth phase-in and an appropriate level of incumbent capture more likely.

The very relevant and excellent performance of ManTech's proposed PM is a component in my rating of ManTech's Past Performance level of confidence. The proposed PM worked as PM on the very relevant LRSW contract. He successfully managed multiple types of TOs under the contract; effectively represented the government customer in decision-making meetings without exceeding contractual limits of authority; the contract was 100% staffed within a week of award despite the disruptive protest matter referenced above; and he kept turnover very low during contract performance despite hiring some personnel at lower than market rates, as ManTech proposes to do here. The SLPT further noted his ability to control costs on a complex cost-type contract. While the Air Force rated ManTech's (and thus its proposed PM's) work on the LRSW as 'Very Good,' I find that the proposed PM's work was of excellent quality.

Finally, I also considered the ManTech team's past environment and safety data, and its small business performance as components of the team's Past Performance level of confidence. I find that the environmental and small business aspects represent excellent past performance. ManTech has exhibited exceptional merit in working with small business, including the degree of its commitment to an effective small business program, its use of high-tech small business firms, and its history of exceeding its small business goals. The safety data, however, indicated that ManTech International Corp. (of which ManTech is part) and a major subcontractor both had Experience Modifier Rates (EMRs) above 1.0, indicating potential issues with both companies' loss prevention programs. I did note and take into consideration that the ManTech International Corp. rating included ManTech affiliates, not just ManTech SRS itself. These ratings had no effect on my rating of ManTech's Past Performance level of confidence.

In sum, I find ManTech has very relevant past performance, and that it is of exceptional merit. I therefore concur with the SLPT's detailed analysis, and I assess ManTech at a Very High Level of Confidence in Past Performance.

SAIC

Next, I examined the past performance information for SAIC. SAIC, its team and its proposed PM had, within the RFP-required periods of recency, performed contracts very relevant to the SMAEC effort, including HSF work and SAIC's performance of the very relevant predecessor S&MA contract here at JSC. That past performance closely related to the same or similar scope of the work here. It matched the

SMAEC effort in technical complexity, including Safety and Mission Assurance in human spaceflight. SAIC has managed some completion form work, experience which I viewed as directly transferable to managing completion form TOs. SMAEC's use of completion form TOs represents a change in contract approach from SMASS to SMAEC. The Offeror has experience on the predecessor contract in managing costs in a challenging and dynamic time, after the Space Shuttle had retired and the Constellation Program had been cancelled; the future budgetary and mission environments are very likely to be just as challenging and dynamic for the SMAEC contractor. With respect to size, I noted that there were many examples that the SAIC team had worked contracts of the same size or even larger than this procurement.

I find the very relevant past performance of the SAIC team was delivered with nearly uniform excellence. As with ManTech, there were a very few instance where a DoD reporting source had rated SAIC or its major subcontractors 'Very Good,' but here, too, my independent assessment is that all the team's performance of relevant contracts represent overall excellent quality. I base my judgment on the facts behind the ratings; the responses recorded in the SLPT's questionnaires and interviews explaining DoD's observations, rating processes and rating standards; and my consideration of the SLPT's opinion of that data. SAIC has achieved award fee scores in the high 90's, with a rising trend over time, on the contract most highly relevant to the SMAEC work, the predecessor JSC SMASS contract. SAIC cost performance on the SMASS was only 'Good' to 'Very Good' in the 2010 timeframe, but unique external circumstances (the retirement of the Space Shuttle and the cancellation of the Constellation Program) were contributing factors to the cost management challenges SAIC encountered. SAIC's subsequent cost performance has been effective, with consistent underruns.

The very relevant and excellent performance of SAIC's proposed PM is a component in my rating of SAIC's Past Performance level of confidence. The proposed PM has worked as PM on the very relevant SMASS contract. All ratings for the proposed PM were "Excellent," as confirmed in SLPT interviews; in my position as the Fee Determining Official (FDO) for the SMASS, those ratings corresponded with my personal observations. SAIC's proposed PM demonstrated an ability to maintain critical skills in a dynamic environment of program close-out and cancellation, and budget reductions. The proposed PM was particularly responsive in dealing with cost challenges, and was able to sustain SAIC's "Very Good" ratings in cost management on the SMASS, by working closely with his government customers in daunting conditions. All these considerations contribute to my finding his work was of excellent quality.

Finally, I also considered the SAIC team's past environment and safety data, and its small business performance as components of the team's Past Performance level of confidence. I find that the environmental, safety and small business aspects each represent excellent past performance. The team's safety data indicated that SAIC and its entire team exceeded industry-average safety performance in nearly every measure. I find this demonstrates a team-wide emphasis on safety that closely matches and complements JSC's safety culture, and bodes well for the Safety & Mission Assurance Directorate. SAIC has exhibited exceptional merit in working with small business, including the degree of its commitment to an effective small business program, its use of high-tech small business firms, and its history of exceeding its small business goals.

In sum, I find SAIC has very relevant past performance, and that it is of exceptional merit. I therefore concur with the SLPT's detailed analysis, and I assess SAIC at a Very High Level of Confidence in Past Performance.

I next considered whether one Offeror was, in a qualitative sense, measurable superior to the other in Past Performance. The mere fact I rated both at the same general level of confidence was not dispositive of this closer question. I find that one Offeror is not qualitatively superior to the other in any distinguishing matter. There was close equivalence in both the very high relevance and the excellent quality of each Offeror's past performance. Each may have one or two very minor differences, which I cited above, where it has a slight edge over the other Offeror, but I find any such marginal advantages on both sides are not meaningful and, in any event, have offsetting and essentially equivalent relative value to the government. I therefore determine that the Offerors are of approximately equal past performance.

Selection for Award

The RFP best value tradeoff process requires that, "If all offers are of approximately equal past performance, award will be made to the Offeror with the lowest most probable cost/price."

With respect to ManTech's cost/price, I decide, in agreement with the SLPT's findings, that ManTech's FPR cost/price proposal addressed all the SLPT's discussion concerns, except for the proposed direct labor rate adjustment for TOs 2-6. This required a very slight upward probable cost adjustment to ManTech's proposed cost/price, and I concurred in that assessment. With a ManTech upward cost/price adjustment of much less than one percent, I decide that the ManTech's proposed cost/price, as adjusted, is its most probable cost/price.

With respect to SAIC's FPR cost/price proposal, I decided, in agreement with the SLPT's findings, that SAIC's FPR cost/price addressed all the SLPT's discussion concerns. The SLPT could find no reason to adjust SAIC's proposed cost/price, and I concurred in that assessment. Accordingly, I decide that SAIC's unadjusted proposed cost/price is its most probable cost/price.

SAIC's most probable cost/price is slightly lower than ManTech's most probable cost/price. Therefore, having previously determined that the Past Performance of the two Offerors is approximately equal, in consonance with the evaluation criteria and process stated in the RFP I select SAIC for award of the SMAEC.



Melanie W. Saunders
Source Selection Authority



Date