

National Aeronautics and Space Administration  
Ames Research Center  
Moffett Field, CA 94035-0001

Selection of Contractor  
for  
Logistics Management Services  
NNA09281196R  
September 14, 2012

On June 7, 2012, I, along with certain NASA Source Evaluation Committee (SEC) ex-officio members, met with the SEC members appointed to evaluate the proposals for the Logistics Management Services (LMS) procurement supporting the NASA Ames Research Center (ARC). During this meeting, the SEC presented its evaluation findings to me, the Source Selection Authority (SSA), and we discussed those findings to assure that I had a full understanding of its evaluation.

I assessed the SEC's findings and evaluation of proposals. This Source Selection Statement reflects my independent judgment, which I based upon a comparative assessment of the relative strengths and weaknesses of the proposals and the evaluation criteria prescribed in the Request for Proposal (RFP). My selection decision is set forth below.

**Procurement Description**

ARC has a continuing need for LMS and support. The Logistics Office supports NASA's mission by providing institutional services for ARC, which includes contractor and government staff, other federal and non-federal tenants, other Centers, and NASA Headquarters. This procurement will yield a contract that will provide services and support to the following eleven (11) functional areas:

1. supply management;
2. equipment management support;
3. property disposal support;
4. janitorial services;
5. refuse and recyclable materials collection, remove and disposal;
6. shipping, receiving, mail service center, warehousing and re-distribution;
7. fleet management services;
8. industrial property support;
9. documentation support;
10. business office support; and
11. NACC support.

This procurement was conducted as an 8(a) set-aside and will result in a single award Indefinite Delivery, Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract. Services will be ordered using Firm Fixed Price

(FFP) task orders, and Other Direct Costs (ODCs) proposed for materials, travel, and training will be ordered using Time and Materials (T&M) task orders. The minimum amount of supplies or services that will be ordered during the effective period of this contract is \$100,000.00, and the maximum amount is \$48,000,000.00. The performance period of this requirement includes a 30 day Phase-In period, effective the date of contract award, followed by a 23 month base period, and three option periods for 12 months each, resulting in a maximum performance period of five years.

### **Evaluation Procedure**

Proposals were evaluated in accordance with the requirements of FAR Subpart 15.3, "Source Selection," as supplemented by NFS Subpart 1815.3, "Source Selection." Section M of the solicitation, paragraph M.2 Evaluation Approach, advised Offerors that the Government may award a contract based solely on the initial offers received and without discussion of such offers. Accordingly, each Offeror was required to submit its initial proposal to the Government using the most favorable terms from a technical and price standpoint. However, the Government reserved the right to hold discussions if award on initial offers was determined not to be in the best interest of the Government.

The RFP identified three evaluation factors: Mission Suitability (Volume I), Past Performance (Volume II), and Price (Volume III). Of these evaluation factors, Price is somewhat more important than Past Performance, and Past Performance is somewhat more important than Mission Suitability. All evaluation factors other than Price, when combined, are approximately equal to Price. The overall Price for evaluation purposes was the sum of the Prices proposed for line items 02, 04, 05 and 06 in Section B.1 of the solicitation. The Price of Phase-In (line item 01) was not included in the evaluated total Price, but was evaluated in terms of risk assessment for selection purposes. This consideration involved performing an analysis of the proposed Phase-In Price which could have led to Mission Suitability weaknesses, and adversely affect Mission Suitability scores, if the proposed resources had not been consistent with the proposed Phase-In plan. The proposals were evaluated to determine if the Prices proposed were fair and reasonable and were balanced between individual line items, sub-line items, or functions. An offer would have been considered materially unbalanced when, despite an acceptable total evaluated Price, the Price of one or more contract line items was significantly overstated or understated as indicated by the application of Price analysis techniques [FAR 15.404-1(g)(3)]. A proposal could have been rejected if the Contracting Officer had determined that the lack of balance posed an unacceptable risk to the Government. Relatively low Prices were evaluated to determine whether there would be a risk of default in the event of award to that Offeror. If the Government determined that there was an unreasonably high risk of default, such a determination would have served as the basis for non-selection.

With regard to the Past Performance Factor, the RFP stated that the evaluation would be an assessment of the Government's level of confidence in the Offeror's ability to perform the solicitation requirements. The Past Performance evaluation was completed in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(2) and NFS 1815.305(a)(2), and it was based on the information provided by the

Offeror in its Volume II proposal, Past Performance, the assessment of customer questionnaires submitted on behalf of each Offeror and its major subcontractors, and information found in the Government’s Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS). The Past Performance evaluation assessed each Offeror's performance under previously awarded relevant contracts. By acquiring and reviewing information from a variety of sources, noted above, the Government evaluated each Offeror's suitability to fulfill the requirements of this contract. The Government evaluated the currency and relevance of the information, source of the information, context of the data, and general trends in performance of the Offeror and its major subcontractors. Specifically, the Government evaluated information on past and current performance regarding relevant technical performance, contract management, and corporate management responsiveness and other information. The RFP required evaluation of the Past Performance Factor using the following level of confidence 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. In Section M, paragraph M.2 Evaluation Approach, the RFP defined these ratings. If an Offeror had not had any relevant Past Performance history, it would not have been evaluated favorably or unfavorably and would have been given a Neutral rating.

The Mission Suitability Factor consists of three sub-factors. The sub-factors are shown below with their respective point allocation, which signifies their weight. The numerical weights assigned to the Mission Suitability Sub-factors are indicative of the relative importance of those evaluation areas.

<b>MISSION SUITABILITY</b>	
<b>Subfactors</b>	<b>Assigned Weight</b>
1. Management Approach Organizational Structure and Approach Staffing Phase-In Plan Organizational Conflicts of Interest Avoidance Plan	<b>400</b>
2. Technical Understanding General Contract Task Orders	<b>350</b>
3. Safety and Health Plan	<b>250</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1000</b>

Overall, the Offerors’ Mission Suitability proposals were evaluated based on the Offeror's ability to fulfill the technical requirements while meeting quality, schedule, and safety requirements and the Offeror's management and business approaches. The compatibility between the proposed technical and management approaches and the overall resources proposed to accomplish the work was an important consideration in the evaluation of this factor. In addition, proposal risk was evaluated with respect to price, performance, technical approach, and management approach. Information submitted in Volume I of the proposal that was not

relevant to the Mission Suitability factor was not evaluated, except that if a proposal did not adequately demonstrate that the Offeror would be able to perform the work with the resources proposed, a Mission Suitability weakness could have been generated, adversely affecting the Offeror's Mission Suitability score. This integration between Mission Suitability and Price was critical to determining Price reasonableness. The RFP stipulated that the overall Mission Suitability Factor would only receive a numerical score, and the Mission Suitability Sub-factors would be assigned adjectival ratings and numerical scores. In accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(3) Technical Evaluation, the following were the potential Mission Suitability adjectival ratings: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, and Poor. In Section M, paragraph M.2 Evaluation Approach, the RFP defined these adjectival ratings and provided applicable percentile ranges at each rating level.

### **Solicitation and Receipt of Proposals**

In an effort to better inform industry of NASA's requirements and to improve communications between all parties, ARC issued a Draft Request for Proposals (DRFP) on March 9, 2009 that allowed for industry recommendations and comments on all aspects of the Government's proposed approach in satisfying the requirements. ARC also posted a "Virtual Tour" or presentation electronically on the NASA Acquisition Internet Service (NAIS) Business Opportunities portal ([http://prod.nais.nasa.gov/cgi-bin/nais/link\\_syp.cgi](http://prod.nais.nasa.gov/cgi-bin/nais/link_syp.cgi)) on September 17, 2009. The "Virtual Tour" was posted in lieu of a site tour of Ames Research Center. Additionally, ARC issued a "Highlights Document" containing pertinent LMS information. Industry was encouraged to ask questions about the LMS requirements and the procurement process. The recommendations and comments received in response to these communications with industry were carefully evaluated and incorporated into the final RFP, as appropriate. A Government response to each recommendation or comment was prepared and was made available electronically to the public.

All documents pertinent to the acquisition were posted electronically on the NAIS portal as well as the Federal Business Opportunities (FBO) web portal (<https://www.fbo.gov>). The final RFP was posted on February 22, 2010.

Thirteen Amendments were issued. Amendments 1 thru 8 were posted to NAIS and FBO, and amendments 9 thru 13 were issued after proposal receipt and directly to Offerors having submitted a proposal in response to the final RFP. Amendment 1 was posted on February 23, 2010, and it contained minor changes to section L.7(b)(7)B of the RFP, and incorporated a Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). Amendment 2 was posted on February 24, 2010, and it contained responses to questions regarding the RFP. Amendment 3 was posted on March 12, 2010, and it contained clarifications to section L5(b)1 and section L.6(a), as well as changes to attachments J.1(b)1, 6, and 7 of the RFP. Amendment 4 was posted on March 15, 2010, and it contained a revision to section L, Volume I – Mission Suitability Proposal page limit, and revised due dates for Past Performance Questionnaires, List of Past Performance respondents, and solicitation closing. Amendment 5 was posted on March 16, 2010, and it restated Amendment 4 except that Amendment 5 included the responses to questions that were referenced as an

attachment in Amendment 4 but accidentally not included. Amendment 6 was posted on March 16, 2010, and it contained responses to questions regarding the RFP and corrected a form. Amendment 7 was posted on March 19, 2010, and it amended the SOW, provided an answer to a question regarding the RFP, as well as corrected an answer posted to a question in Amendment 3. Amendment 8 was posted on March 22, 2010, and it contained the updated CBAs applicable to the LMS solicitation. Amendment 9 was emailed on December 29, 2010, only to Offerors in the competitive range, and it incorporated the new wage determination applicable to the LMS solicitation. Amendment 10 was emailed on January 3, 2010, only to Offerors in the competitive range, and it contained responses to questions regarding the RFP. Amendment 11 was issued after all Offerors were notified that the Government became aware of a possible Procurement Integrity Act violation and, consequently, to ensure the integrity of the procurement process, decided to cancel the competitive range, request updated proposals from all five original Offerors, and replace all of the members of the original SEC. As a result, Amendment 9 and Amendment 10 were issued again and sent to all five original Offerors, on November 21, 2011, and Amendment 11 was emailed on December 3, 2011, to all five original Offerors. Amendment 11 requested updated proposals, and it included clarifications to the RFP Pricing submittals, as well as updated wage determination rates. Amendment 12 was emailed to all five original Offerors on December 12, 2011, and it contained responses to questions regarding the RFP. Amendment 13 was emailed to all five original Offerors on December 13, 2011, and it contained responses to questions regarding the RFP.

Proposals in response to the initial RFP originally had been due on March 30, 2010. Five proposals had been received in response to the initial RFP by the specified closing time and date. The Offerors' names and addresses (listed alphabetically) were as follows:

**Akima Logistics Services, LLC**

3901 Old International Airport Rd., Ste 200-D  
Anchorage, AK 99502

**CMTI/Olympus**

191 Center Street, Suite 102  
Cape Canaveral, FL 32920

**Customer FIRST, Ames (C1Ames)**

17495 Old Stagecoach, Suite D  
Dumfries, VA 22026

**Mission Critical Technologies, Inc (MCT)** – *Withdrew from competition December 15, 2011*

2041 Rosecrans Avenue, Suite 220  
El Segundo, CA 90245

**Zero Waste Solutions**

39899 Balentine Drive, Suite 200  
Newark, CA 94560

As mentioned above, on December 3, 2011, the Government requested updated proposals to be submitted – by the new deadline of January 5, 2012 – due to a possible Procurement Integrity Act violation. Four of the original five Offerors submitted an updated proposal by that new deadline. MCT withdrew its proposal from competition on December 15, 2012.

### **Evaluation Process**

On October 4, 2011, the Government notified all Offerors that the Government became aware of a possible Procurement Integrity Act violation related to Solicitation NNAA09281196R, and that the Government conducted an investigation into the possible violation. As a result of this investigation, and as mentioned above, the Government decided to cancel the competitive range that formerly had been established. The Government then released copies of the SEC findings relating to each Offerors' proposal (i.e. its own Strengths and Weaknesses in Mission Suitability and Past Performance, and its own findings in Price) to each respective Offeror. To further ensure the integrity of the procurement process, the Government replaced all members of the original SEC with new members who had no knowledge of the previous evaluation findings. The Government provided all of the five original Offerors the opportunity to submit updated proposals.

After the receipt of updated proposals on January 5, 2012, the newly appointed SEC evaluated each proposal in accordance with the requirements of FAR Subpart 15.3, "Source Selection," as supplemented by NFS Subpart 1815.3, "Source Selection." The Government evaluated afresh – with no reference to the earlier, defunct evaluation findings of the original SEC – each Offeror's proposal as it then existed in the Government's possession. The SEC members individually reviewed each proposal and met to discuss individual findings to reach consensus on findings.

The SEC and the Price Analyst reviewed all of the Price proposals. In accordance with FAR 15.4, the SEC, in consultation with the Price Analyst, evaluated Price reasonableness for each proposal. Neither a numerical score nor an adjectival rating was assigned for the Price factor.

The SEC evaluated Past Performance by identifying findings based on the Offerors' proposals, Questionnaires completed by past and current customers, and information found in PPIPRS. No weaknesses or deficiencies were assigned in Past Performance for any of the Offerors. Strengths were identified, and were categorized as either a "Significant Strength" or as a "Strength." The SEC then assigned a level of confidence rating in Past Performance to each Offeror.

The SEC evaluated Mission Suitability by identifying strengths and weaknesses within each Mission Suitability Sub-factor. Strengths were categorized as either a "Significant Strength" or as a "Strength," and weaknesses were categorized as either a "Significant Weakness" or a "Weakness." No deficiencies were assigned in Mission Suitability for any of the Offerors. The SEC then developed adjectival ratings and numerical scores for each Mission Suitability Sub-factor, and, thereafter, a numerical score was assigned for the overall Mission Suitability Factor.

In accordance with NFS 1815.305, the SEC's Past Performance and Mission Suitability findings included a description of how each strength and weakness would impact performance in terms of benefit or risk. In evaluating Mission Suitability and Past Performance, the SEC used the following defined terms:

Significant Strength = some aspect of the proposal that greatly enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Strength = an aspect of the proposal that will have some positive impact on the successful performance of the contract.

Weakness = a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Significant Weakness = a flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Deficiency = a material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful performance to an unacceptable level.

The SEC briefed me on its evaluation findings on June 7, 2012. I reviewed the Price evaluation results and Price reasonableness determinations. I reviewed the findings and level of confidence ratings for Past Performance. I reviewed the SEC's findings, adjectival ratings and numerical scores for Mission Suitability. I fully considered all of this information prior to making my final selection decision. The findings were as follows:

#### **EVALUATION FINDINGS OF THE SEC**

The SEC's choice of which Offer to evaluate first, as well as its listing throughout this report, was based upon the alphabetical order of the Offerors' corporate names.

#### **Price Factor**

The SEC, in consultation with the Price Analyst, evaluated each Offeror's Price proposal, including all required Price templates. This included verifying the following for each Offeror: (1) compliance with the RFP requirements, (2) evaluating the reasonableness of the proposed rates, fringe benefits, overhead, G&A rates, and profit; and (3) ascertaining that proposed labor rates were reasonable for the labor market in which the contract will be performed. Cost elements were analyzed, including subcontractors' costs, proposed labor rates and skill mix, indirect rates, and applicable fees. Each Offeror's Price proposal was deemed to be fair and reasonable.

**Akima** had the lowest total proposed Price.

**CMTI/Olympus** had the highest total proposed Price.

**C1Ames** had the second highest total proposed Price.

**Zero Waste Solutions** had the second lowest total proposed Price.

### **Past Performance Factor**

The following addresses the Past Performance findings for the four Offerors. As stated above, no weaknesses or deficiencies were assigned in Past Performance for any of the Offerors.

#### **Akima**

The evaluation of Akima's Past Performance resulted in a Very High Level of Confidence. Two (2) Significant Strengths and no other Strengths were identified. The two Significant Strengths were assigned for: (1) its excellent experience performing services and delivering products that are similar in size, scope, and complexity to the current acquisition; and (2) its Past Performance demonstrates its ability to deal effectively with unexpected changes to technical requirements in a timely manner and provide cost savings to the Government.

#### **CMTI/Olympus**

The evaluation of CMTI/Olympus's Past Performance resulted in a High Level of Confidence. One (1) Significant Strength and no other Strengths were identified. The Significant Strength was assigned for its demonstrated ability to resolve unexpected problems and its relevant technical experience in the majority of SOW elements with Past Performance Questionnaire ratings of Excellent and Very Good.

#### **C1Ames**

The evaluation of C1Ames's Past Performance resulted in a Very High Level of Confidence. One (1) Significant Strength and no other Strengths were identified. The Significant Strength was assigned for its excellent experience performing services and delivering products that are similar in size, content, and complexity to the current acquisition, and its demonstrated ability to perform effectively during fluctuations in workload.

#### **Zero Waste Solutions**

The evaluation of Zero Waste Solutions' Past Performance resulted in a Moderate Level of Confidence. No Significant Strengths and one (1) Strength were identified. The Strength was assigned for the Offeror's relevant past experience in certain functional requirements in the scope of work, and its achievement of high Past Performance scores in the performance of these areas.

### **Mission Suitability Factor**

The following addresses the Mission Suitability findings for the four Offerors. As stated above, no deficiencies were assigned in Mission Suitability for any of the Offerors.

#### **Akima**

The Akima Mission Suitability proposal received 888 points (out of a possible 1000 points)—the highest score among the Offerors.

In the Management Approach Sub-factor, Akima received an adjectival rating of Excellent, with a numerical score of 380 points (out of a possible 400 points). Four (4) Significant Strengths, two (2) Strengths, no Weaknesses, and no Significant Weaknesses were identified. The four Significant Strengths were assigned for: (1) the Offeror's proposed lean organizational structure, scalable workforce, autonomous management, and outstanding task order execution plan; (2) its sound and effective approach to staffing and Key Personnel; (3) its demonstrated sound and thorough understanding of the SOW requirements including proposed efficiencies and the skill mix necessary to perform the work successfully; and (4) its sound, appropriate, and comprehensive Phase-In Plan. The two Strengths were assigned for: (1) its proposed strategies in maximizing staffing efficiencies; and (2) its excellent and comprehensive discussion of its Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) Avoidance Plan.

In the Technical Understanding Sub-factor, Akima received an adjectival rating of Excellent with a numerical score of 333 points (out of a possible 350 points). Four (4) Significant Strengths, one (1) Strength, no Weaknesses, and no Significant Weaknesses were identified. The four Significant Strengths were assigned for: (1) the Offeror's demonstrated expert understanding of potential risks for each specific service listed in the SOW, and its sound approaches to minimizing the impacts of those risks; (2) its numerous innovative approaches to conducting the work; (3) its excellent Task Order Execution Plan; and (4) its extensive overall understanding of each Contract Task Order requirement, and its proposed innovative, effective, and efficient approaches to conducting the work. The one Strength was assigned for its proposed approach to keep abreast of current policies and procedures, and to ensure that appropriate licensing and certifications are in place.

In the Safety and Health Plan Sub-factor, Akima received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 175 points (out of a possible 250 points). No Significant Strengths, two (2) Strengths, no Weaknesses, and no Significant Weaknesses were identified. The two Strengths were assigned for: (1) the Offeror's comprehensive response to the management of safety and health hazards; and (2) its innovative procedure for encouraging the reporting of hazards.

#### **CMTI/Olympus**

The CMTI/Olympus Mission Suitability proposal received 526 points (out of a possible 1000 points)—the second lowest score among the Offerors.

In the Management Approach Sub-factor, CMTI/Olympus received an adjectival rating of Fair with a numerical score of 160 points (out of a possible 400 points). No Significant Strengths, one (1) Strength, four (4) Weaknesses, and no Significant Weaknesses were identified. The Strength was assigned for the Offeror's effective approach to Phase-In and use of Key Personnel. The four Weaknesses were assigned for: (1) its proposed lines of authority are unclear; (2) its policy regarding continuation of work when conflicts and uncertainties arise is inefficient; (3) its proposed management processes are confusing and ambiguous; and (4) its mitigation plan, and its approach to managing fluctuations in requirement, schedule, and budget, are inadequate.

In the Technical Understanding Sub-factor, CMTI/Olympus received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 203 points (out of a possible 350 points). No Significant Strengths, one (1) Strength, two (2) Weaknesses, and no Significant Weaknesses were identified. The Strength was assigned for its proposed innovations and efficiencies across the SOW. The two Weaknesses were assigned because: (1) it did not provide a reasonable and effective approach to responding to task requests, planning work, and accomplishing requirements; and (2) it did not provide, in several instances, a sound, effective, or efficient task order plan.

In the Safety and Health Plan Sub-factor, CMTI/Olympus received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 163 points (out of a possible 250 points). No Significant Strengths, one (1) Strength, no Weaknesses, and no Significant Weaknesses were identified. The Strength was assigned for its sound and effective procedures for promoting accountability and identifying hazards in the workplace.

### **C1Ames**

The C1Ames Mission Suitability proposal received 672 points (out of a possible 1000 points)—the second highest score among the Offerors.

In the Management Approach Sub-factor, C1Ames received an adjectival rating of Very Good with a numerical score of 284 points (out of a possible 400 points). No Significant Strengths, three (3) Strengths, two (2) Weaknesses, and no Significant Weaknesses were identified. The three Strengths were assigned for: (1) the Offeror's effective organizational structure relating to local authority; (2) its innovative methods for recruitment and retention of existing staff; and (3) its proposed strong approach for maximizing staffing efficiencies and dealing effectively with workload fluctuations. The two Weaknesses were assigned for: (1) its organizational structure did not provide clear lines of authority between the prime and its subcontractors; and (2) it did not identify specific Phase-In risks or offer proposed mitigations for those risks.

In the Technical Understanding Sub-factor, C1Ames received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 238 points (out of a possible 350 points). One (1) Significant Strength, no Strengths, two (2) Weaknesses, and no Significant Weaknesses were identified. The Significant Strength was assigned for the Offeror's sound overall understanding of all the task order

requirements and proposed effective approach for completing the work. The two Weaknesses were assigned for: (1) the Offeror's identified risks are inadequate and risk mitigation strategies are missing or unclear when provided; and (2) it did not adequately address planning work and accomplishing task requirements.

In the Safety and Health Plan Sub-factor, C1Ames received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 150 points (out of a possible 250 points). No Significant Strengths, no Strengths, no Weaknesses, and no Significant Weaknesses were identified.

### **Zero Waste Solutions**

The Zero Waste Solutions Mission Suitability proposal received 453 points (out of a possible 1000 points)—the lowest score among the Offerors.

In the Management Approach Sub-factor, Zero Waste Solutions received an adjectival rating of Fair with a numerical score of 160 points (out of a possible 400 points). No Significant Strengths, one (1) Strength, two (2) Weaknesses, and one (1) Significant Weakness were identified. The Strength was assigned for the Offeror's sound and thorough Phase-In plan. The two Weaknesses were assigned for: (1) its approach to managing changes to requirements and budget fluctuations was neither sound nor effective; and (2) its approach to staffing was neither reasonable nor effective. The Significant Weakness was assigned for the Offeror's organizational structure which does not provide clear internal and external lines of authority and does not allow for efficient access to company resources.

In the Technical Understanding Sub-factor, Zero Waste Solutions received an adjectival rating of Fair with a numerical score of 123 points (out of a possible 350 points). No Significant Strengths, no Strengths, no Weaknesses, and two (2) Significant Weaknesses were identified. The two Significant Weaknesses were assigned for: (1) the Offeror did not identify critical and/or high risks to accomplishing specific services listed in each SOW section; and (2) its proposed staffing for the Contract Task Orders was not reasonable, appropriate, or effective.

In the Safety and Health Plan Sub-factor, Zero Waste Solutions received an adjectival rating of Good with a numerical score of 170 points (out of a possible 250 points). No Significant Strengths, one (1) Strength, no Weaknesses, and no Significant Weaknesses were identified. The Strength was assigned for the Offeror's sound and effective procedures for safety training and certification, and methods for encouraging the reporting of hazards.

## **SELECTION DECISION OF THE SOURCE SELECTION AUTHORITY FOR LOGISTICS MANAGEMENT SERVICES**

### **Introduction**

FAR 15.308 Source Selection Decision states, "The source selection authority's (SSA) decision shall be based on a comparative assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria in

the solicitation. While the SSA may use reports and analyses prepared by others, the source selection decision shall represent the SSA's independent judgment. The source selection decision shall be documented, and the documentation shall include the rationale for any business judgments and tradeoffs made or relied on by the SSA, including benefits associated with additional costs. Although the rationale for the selection decision must be documented, that documentation need not quantify the tradeoffs that led to the decision."

I made my selection decision based on a comparative assessment of all proposals against all source selection criteria in the RFP. My selection decision represents my independent judgment. I carefully reviewed all of the SEC's findings to ensure a full understanding thereof. I did not simply count and compare the numbers of Significant Strengths, Strengths, Weaknesses, and Significant Weaknesses; rather, I considered the potential impact of the findings and their relevance to this proposed effort against the selection criteria prescribed in the RFP.

### **Assessment of the SEC's findings**

I carefully studied all of the findings of the SEC, and I concur with all of them. I am fully satisfied that the SEC conducted a thorough and cogent analysis of each of the proposals submitted and that their findings are appropriate and reasonable. As the SSA, I hereby adopt all of the findings of the SEC.

### **Selection**

To reiterate, Price is somewhat more important than Past Performance, and Past Performance is somewhat more important than Mission Suitability. All evaluation factors other than Price, when combined, are approximately equal to Price.

In accordance with FAR 15.101-1, Tradeoff Process, a tradeoff process is appropriate when it may be in the best interest of the Government to consider award to other than the Offeror with the lowest Price or the Offeror with the highest Mission Suitability rating. This process permits tradeoffs among Price and non-Price factors. Here, however, Akima offered the proposal with (1) the lowest Price, (2) the highest level of confidence rating attainable under the Past Performance Factor, "Very High," and (3) the highest Mission Suitability Score of 888. Therefore, a tradeoff among Price and non-Price factors is not germane to this particular source selection. Akima's proposal clearly represents the best value to the Government, from the perspective of each of the three evaluation Factors.

1. Price is the most important Factor in this procurement. Akima submitted the proposal with the lowest Price, and its Price was determined to be fair and reasonable.
2. Akima received a Very High Level of Confidence rating in Past Performance, with two Significant Strengths, which was more than any other Offeror. Its record of Past Performance supports the likelihood that Akima will successfully perform the required effort.

3. Akima submitted the best Mission Suitability proposal. Its Mission Suitability proposal received 216 more points than the next highest Offeror. It received a total of eight (8) Significant Strengths in Mission Suitability, split evenly between the two most important Sub-factors; in contrast, C1Ames received only one (1) Significant Strength in Mission Suitability, and the remaining two Offerors received none. Further, I find the content of Akima's eight (8) Significant Strengths to be compelling: Akima's proposed lean organizational structure, scalable workforce, and autonomous management will be efficient and responsive in an era of changing budgets and requirements; its outstanding task order execution plan, its sound and effective approach to staffing, and its demonstrated sound and thorough understanding of the SOW requirements, all will significantly increase the likelihood of successful performance of this contract; and its expert understanding of potential risks, and their mitigation, its extensive overall understanding of each Contract Task Order requirement, and its proposed innovative, effective, and efficient approaches to conducting the work, all reflect the high quality and superiority of Akima's Mission Suitability proposal.

The proposal submitted by Akima is outstanding, comprehensive, and robust, and will yield superior contract performance at the lowest proposed Price.

I select Akima Logistics Services for contract award.



James D. Alwyn  
Source Selection Authority