

**SOURCE SELECTION STATEMENT
FOR
SOLUTIONS FOR ENTERPRISE WIDE PROCUREMENT (SEWP) V
CATEGORY B, GROUP C**

On March 5, 2015, I convened with other officials from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (“NASA”), Goddard Space Flight Center (“GSFC”) and NASA Headquarters to hear the Source Evaluation Board (“SEB”) present its proposal evaluation findings for the Solutions for Enterprise-Wide Procurement (SEWP) V competitive procurement. My decision on selection of the successful offerors for **Category B, Group C** is set forth in this statement, and supersedes my selection statement dated October 1, 2014.

PROCUREMENT DESCRIPTION

The SEWP V procurement is for a Government-wide Agency Contract (“GWAC”) to provide Information Technology (“IT”) products, services, and solutions to the entire Federal sector. This procurement activity is the fifth iteration of SEWP, and is a follow-on to the SEWP IV contracts. The principal purpose of the SEWP V contracts is to provide state-of-the-art computer technologies, high-end scientific and engineering processing capabilities, peripherals, and network equipment. SEWP V will continue to provide a Government-wide capability to gain access to leading edge IT; provide direct access to IT products and services that are aligned with high-end technical requirements; optimize productivity through utilization of powerful computer systems, state of the art supporting peripherals and software on standardized but customizable systems; and ensure the availability of reliable and affordable IT to Federal agencies.

The goal of the SEWP V RFP is to provide NASA and other Federal agencies with the widest range of IT product solutions. Specifically, the SEWP V Statement of Work (“SOW”) states the acquisition objectives as: (1) to have hardware and software available to address an increasingly difficult, complex, and changing set of NASA-specific scientific and engineering problems while also providing IT product-based solutions to assist all Federal Agencies in meeting their IT needs; (2) to assist the Government in minimizing incompatibilities and maximizing strategic decision making across the IT infrastructure; (3) to provide NASA with a wide range of IT, communications, audio-visual and related hardware, software and product based services to support, interconnect, and enhance NASA’s scientific and engineering capabilities, recognizing that to promote and stimulate vendor competitiveness, SEWP V contractors must provide access and/or support to the widest possible variety of appropriate companies; and (4) to utilize innovative procurement transactions and processes to facilitate processes that will place a minimal administrative burden on the customer, contractor, and the Government. SOW C.1.1.3 further emphasizes the importance of competition under SEWP V in providing customers the best value when acquiring products and services, stating:

Overall, this consolidated effort will provide the Government with hardware, software, Audio-Visual products and related services that represent the best overall value to the Government in fulfilling its mission. Further, this effort will minimize the Government's administrative costs, and provide the ability to fulfill our users' needs in a timely manner. Because the scientific and engineering requirements depend on interoperability and standards, combined with the broad base of commonality among requirements, functions, and available COTS solutions, it is assumed that overlap will exist between contracts and across groups. Additionally, any overlap will ensure that end-users will have access to appropriate and complete solutions to meet their varied requirements. Therefore, no single contract will have exclusive rights to provide any given technology nor will end-users be confined in their choice of contracts they utilize. The end-user's decisions will be based on a Best Value and Fair Opportunity determination as required in FAR 16.505(b).

This acquisition was conducted under Federal Acquisition Regulation ("FAR") Part 12, incorporating source selection procedures in FAR Part 15, including use of the trade-off process described in FAR 15.101-1, as appropriate. The RFP notified offerors that the Government intended to evaluate proposals and award contracts without discussions.

This procurement will result in multiple, Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity ("IDIQ") contract awards, under which the Government may issue Firm Fixed Price ("FFP") delivery orders for commercial items. The contracts will have a five-year base ordering period and one five-year option period. The minimum amount of supplies or services that shall be ordered is \$25.00 with a maximum value of \$20 Billion for each contract.

The SEWP V RFP provided for multiple competition groups. Each group had specific requirements and functional tasks associated with the products and services offered within that group. There were two full and open competitions and three small business set-aside competitions as detailed below:

Category A, Computer Systems/Servers – NAICS 334111 with a size standard of 1,000 employees

- Group A: Computer Based Systems (Full and Open Competition)

Category B, Complementary Products – NAICS 541519 with a size standard of 150 employees

- Group B: Mass Storage Devices (Service Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business ("SDVOSB") Set-Aside)
- Group B: Mass Storage Devices (Historically Underutilized Business Zones ("HUBZone") Small Business Set-Aside)
- Group C: Server Support Devices / Multi-Functional Devices (Small Business Set-Aside)

- Group D: Networking / Security /Video and Conference Tools (Full and Open Competition)

This source selection statement addresses my decision for Category B, Group C: Server Support Devices / Multi-Functional Devices.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The evaluation was conducted in accordance with the source selection procedures identified in FAR 15.3 and NASA FAR Supplement (“NFS”) 1815.3, and the SEWP V RFP evaluation criteria. The RFP defined the evaluation factors as Management/Technical Approach, Price, and Past Performance. Past Performance was evaluated on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis. The RFP specified the relative order of importance of the remaining evaluation factors as follows:

The Management/Technical Approach Factor is approximately equal in importance to the Price Factor.

The RFP provided that each offeror’s Management/Technical Approach proposal would be evaluated and point scored. This procedure required the Government to evaluate proposals under each subfactor, identifying Significant Strengths, Strengths, Significant Weaknesses, Weaknesses, and Deficiencies; to assign an adjectival rating for each subfactor based on the findings; to determine a percentile score for each subfactor; and to calculate a total Management/Technical Approach Factor point score using the weighted sum of subfactor scores. The Management/Technical Approach Factor consisted of the following three subfactors with points assigned as indicated:

1. Excellence of Proposed Systems (Subfactor A)	300 points
2. Offeror's Support and Commitment (Subfactor B)	250 points
3. Management Plan (Subfactor C)	<u>450 points</u>
	Total: 1000 points

The RFP notified offerors of the areas that would be evaluated under each subfactor. For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the RFP described how the Government would evaluate offerors’ proposed systems; the breadth and depth of proposed available components; the extent to which offerors exceeded minimum specifications; and how other features proposed by offerors enhanced suitability for the group and supported Government initiatives and policies. For Subfactor B, Offeror’s Support and Commitment, the RFP addressed how the Government would evaluate offerors’ commitment to supply chain diversity and offerors’ proposed plans for providing post award support and service. Finally, for Subfactor C, the RFP explained how the Government would evaluate offerors’ approaches to program management and data interchange.

Regarding the Price Factor, the RFP stated that a price analysis would be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(1) to ensure that the Government paid a fair and

reasonable price. The RFP also stated that price would be evaluated in accordance with the provided pricing model and would not be point scored.

Within the Past Performance Factor, the RFP provided that each offeror's recent and relevant past performance history for ongoing or completed contracts within three years of the proposal due date would be evaluated on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis. Under this factor, an offeror with relevant and acceptable performance information within three years of the proposal due date would be evaluated as "Acceptable." An offeror with no relevant record of past performance would also be evaluated as "Acceptable." An offeror would be evaluated as "Unacceptable," and therefore would not be eligible for contract award, if its relevant past performance history within three years of the proposal due date reflected significant adverse performance issues.

EVALUATION PROCESS

NASA's Source Selection Authority ("SSA") for this procurement appointed the SEB, comprised of members from appropriate disciplines, to evaluate all proposals against the detailed evaluation criteria contained in the RFP. NASA issued the RFP on August 16, 2013. During the course of the procurement, the Contracting Officer ("CO") issued 12 amendments. Within Category B, Group C, NASA received 95 proposals. Of these, NASA eliminated 14 proposals for being unacceptable, while one offeror withdrew its proposal. The following 80 proposals were acceptable and fully evaluated:

- A&T Marketing, Inc. (A&T)
- Abba Technologies, Inc. (Abba)
- ABM Federal Sales, Inc. (ABM)
- Accelera Solutions, Inc. (Accelera)
- Ace Technology Partners, LLC (Ace Technology)
- Advanced Computer Concepts, Inc. (ACC)
- Affigent, LLC (Affigent)
- Akira Technologies, Inc. (Akira)
- Alliance Technology Group (Alliance)
- AlphaSix Corporation (AlphaSix)
- Alvarez & Associates, LLC (Alvarez)
- American Wordata, Inc. (AWordata)
- Anacapa Micro Products, Inc. (Anacapa)
- AS Global Corporation (AS Global)
- Better Direct, LLC (Better Direct)
- Blue Tech, Inc. (Blue Tech)
- Capital Supply, Inc. (CSI)
- Carolina Advanced Digital, Inc. (Carolina)
- Cartridge Technologies, Inc. (CTI)
- Chandler Automated Systems, Inc., dba Vigilant Technologies (Vigilant)
- Coast to Coast Computer Products, Inc.(Coast)
- Computer Marketing Associates, Inc. (CMA)
- Convergence Technology Consulting, LLC (Convergence)
- Copper River Information Technology, LLC (Copper River)
- CounterTrade Products, Inc. (CTP)
- CSP Enterprises, LLC (CSP)
- Cynergy Professional Systems, LLC (Cynergy)
- DASNet Corporation (DASNet)
- DiSys Solutions, Inc. (DiSys)
- Dynamic Computer Corporation (Dynamic Computer)
- Dynamic Systems, Inc. (Dynamic Systems)
- En Pointe Gov., Inc. (En Pointe)

- Enterprise Technology Solutions, Inc. (ETSI)
- Fastech, Inc. (Fastech)
- FCN, Inc. (FCN)
- Federal Tech Solutions, Inc. (FTSI)
- FedStore Corporation (FedStore)
- Four Points Technology, Inc. (Four Points)
- Four, Inc. (Four)
- GC Micro (GC Micro)
- GMC Tek, LLC (GMC Tek)
- Government Acquisitions, Inc. (GAI)
- GovPlace, Inc. (GovPlace)
- HMS Technologies, Inc. (HMS)
- Integration Technologies Group, Inc. (ITG)
- Knowledge Information Solutions, Inc. (KISI)
- Lyme Computer Solutions, Inc. (LCS)
- M&A Technology, Inc. (M&A)
- M2 Technology, Inc. (M2)
- MA Federal, Inc., dba iGov (iGov)
- Marshall Communications Corporation (Marshall)
- MCP Computer Products, Inc. (MCP)
- Mercom, Inc. (Mercom)
- NCS Technologies, Inc. (NCS)
- New Tech Solutions, Inc. (New Tech)
- Norseman Defense Technologies (Norseman)
- Optivor Technologies, LLC (Optivor)
- PetroSys Solutions, Inc., dba PSI Technology (PSI)
- Phoenix Data Security, Inc. (Phoenix)
- Red Hawk IT Solutions, LLC (Red Hawk)
- Red River Computer Co., Inc. (Red River)
- Seeds of Genius (Seeds)
- Spectrum Systems, LLC (Spectrum)
- Sterling Computers Corporation (Sterling)
- Storsoft Technology Corporation (Storsoft)
- Strategic Communications, LLC (Strategic)
- Swish Data Corporation (Swish)
- Sword and Shield Enterprise Security (SSES)
- Sysorex Government Services, Inc. (Sysorex)
- Technology Solutions Provider, Inc. (TSPi)
- Thundercat Technology, LLC (Thundercat)
- Transource Services Corporation (Transource)
- Tribalco, LLC (Tribalco)
- Unistar-Sparco Computers, Inc. (Unistar-Sparco)
- VAE, Inc. (VAE)
- Victory Global Solutions, Inc. (Victory)
- Video & Telecommunications, Inc. (VTI)
- Walker and Associates, Inc. (Walker)
- Wildflower International, Ltd. (Wildflower)
- York Telecom Corporation (Yorktel)

The SEB reviewed each offeror's Management/Technical Approach proposal, reached consensus on findings; rated and scored each subfactor; applied the established numerical weights; and determined an overall Management/Technical Approach score for each proposal. In evaluating Past Performance, the SEB relied on performance data provided in the proposal and in Government past performance databases to determine whether each offeror's past performance was Acceptable or Unacceptable. Finally, the SEB analyzed

each offeror's proposed price to determine whether it was fair and reasonable. The primary tool utilized for price analysis was comparison of prices as described in FAR 15.404-1(b)(2)(i). Offerors' overall proposed total prices were compared against one another and the SEB reviewed outlying prices to ensure fairness and reasonableness.

The SEB completed its initial evaluation of proposals and documented its findings in written reports and a presentation to me on September 17, 2014. I made my original selection decision for Category B, Group C on October 1, 2014. Following announcement of the selection, multiple unsuccessful offerors filed bid protests with the United States Government Accountability Office ("GAO") and with NASA. In response to these protests, NASA took corrective action by re-evaluating aspects of offerors' proposals under the Management/Technical Approach factor and the Price factor. This effort resulted in revised Management/Technical approach findings, updated ratings and scores, and revised price analysis documentation. On March 2, 2015, the SEB provided its revised written evaluation reports to me. On March 5, 2015, the SEB presented me an overview of its corrective action and its summary evaluation results.

MANAGEMENT/TECHNICAL APPROACH EVALUATION FACTOR

As described above, the SEB provided me with a detailed written report containing its findings. These findings are summarized below in order of offeror ranking, based on total Management/Technical Approach points, from high to low:

Optivor Technologies LLC:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Optivor Technologies' proposal as Very Good. Within this Subfactor, Optivor Technologies' proposal received the following findings: a Significant Strength for the full complement of all categories and substantial depth of product offerings in the Available Components Tab; and a Strength for proposing a number of desirable features and product elements that exceed minimum requirements.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Optivor Technologies' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Optivor Technologies' proposal received a Strength for a thorough approach to supply chain management that included risk analysis demonstrating insight into key supply chain issues.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Optivor Technologies' proposal as Good. Optivor Technologies received a Strength for its comprehensive and well-defined Program Management plan.

Sterling Computers Corporation:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Sterling Computers' proposal as Very Good. Within this Subfactor, Sterling Computers' proposal received the following findings: a Significant Strength for the full complement of all categories and substantial depth of product offerings in the Available Components Tab; and a Strength for proposed technology and accompanying analyst support across the scope of SEWP.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Sterling Computers' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Sterling Computers' proposal received a Strength for a thorough approach to supply chain management that included risk analysis demonstrating insight into key supply chain issues.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Sterling Computers' proposal as Good. Sterling Computer did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Wildflower International, Ltd.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Wildflower International's proposal as Very Good. Within this Subfactor, Wildflower International's proposal received the following findings: a Significant Strength for the full complement of all categories and substantial depth of product offerings in the Available Components Tab; and a Strength for proposed technology and accompanying analyst support across the scope of SEWP.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Wildflower International's proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Wildflower International's proposal received a Strength for a thorough approach to supply chain management demonstrating insight into key supply chain issues.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Wildflower International's proposal as Good. Wildflower International did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Affigent, LLC:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Affigent's proposal as Excellent. Within this Subfactor, Affigent's proposal received the following findings: a Significant Strength for the full complement of all categories and substantial depth of product offerings in the Available Components Tab; a Strength for its accessibility and

environmental and energy programs that further Government initiatives and policies; and a Strength for proposed technology and accompanying analyst support across the scope of SEWP.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Affigent's proposal as Good. Affigent did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Affigent's proposal as Good. Affigent did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Integration Technologies Group, Inc. (ITG):

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Integration Technologies Group's proposal as Excellent. Within this Subfactor, Integration Technologies Group's proposal received the following findings: a Significant Strength for the full complement of all categories and substantial depth of product offerings in the Available Components Tab; a Strength for proposing a number of desirable features and product elements that exceed minimum requirements; and a Strength for environmental and energy programs that further Government initiatives and policies.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Integration Technologies Group's proposal as Good. Integration Technologies Group did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Integration Technologies Group's proposal as Good. Integration Technologies Group did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

ThunderCat Technology, LLC:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated ThunderCat Technology's proposal as Excellent. Within this Subfactor, ThunderCat Technology's proposal received the following findings: a Significant Strength for the full complement of all categories and substantial depth of product offerings in the Available Components Tab; a Strength for proposing a number of desirable features and product elements that exceed minimum requirements; and a Strength for proposed technology and accompanying analyst support across the scope of SEWP.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated ThunderCat Technology's proposal as Good. ThunderCat Technology did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated ThunderCat Technology's proposal as Good. ThunderCat Technology did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Tribalco, LLC:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Tribalco's proposal as Excellent. Within this Subfactor, Tribalco's proposal received the following findings: a Significant Strength for the full complement of all categories and substantial depth of product offerings in the Available Components Tab; a Strength for proposing technologies that include an architectural process that can bring together the full extent of SEWP's scope; and a Strength for its accessibility and environmental and energy programs that further Government initiatives and policies.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Tribalco's proposal as Good. Tribalco did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Tribalco's proposal as Good. Tribalco did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Dynamic Systems, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Dynamic Systems' proposal as Excellent. Within this Subfactor, Dynamic Systems' proposal received the following findings: a Significant Strength for the full complement of all categories and substantial depth of product offerings in the Available Components Tab; and a Significant Strength for its substantial expertise in integrating assistive technology and for its environmental programs that further Government initiatives and policies.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Dynamic Systems' proposal as Good. Dynamic Systems did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Dynamic Systems' proposal as Good. Dynamic Systems did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Cynergy Professional Systems LLC:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Cynergy Professional Systems' proposal as Very Good. Within this Subfactor, Cynergy Professional Systems' proposal received a Significant Strength for the full complement of all categories and substantial depth of product offerings in the Available Components Tab.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Cynergy Professional Systems' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Cynergy Professional Systems' proposal received a Strength for reducing supply chain risk both internally and through standards work.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Cynergy Professional Systems' proposal as Good. Cynergy Professional Systems did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

FCN Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated FCN's proposal as Very Good. Within this Subfactor, FCN's proposal received the following findings: a Significant Strength for the full complement of all categories and substantial depth of product offerings in the Available Components Tab; and a Strength for proposing a number of desirable features and product elements that exceed minimum requirements.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated FCN's proposal as Good. FCN did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated FCN's proposal as Good. FCN did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Red River Computer Co., Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Red River Computer's proposal as Very Good. Within this Subfactor, Red River Computer's proposal received the following findings: a Significant Strength for the full complement of all categories and substantial depth of product offerings in the Available Components Tab; and a Strength for proposing a number of desirable features and product elements that exceed minimum requirements.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Red River Computer's proposal as Good. Red River Computer did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Red River Computer's proposal as Good. Red River Computer did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Federal Resources Corporation, dba AS Global Corporation:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Federal Resources Corporation's proposal as Very Good. Within this Subfactor, Federal Resources Corporation's proposal received the following findings: a Significant Strength for the full complement of all categories and substantial depth of product offerings in the Available Components Tab; and a Strength for its proposed technology including its demonstrated understanding of future computing technologies.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Federal Resources Corporation's proposal as Good. Federal Resources Corporation did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Federal Resources Corporation's proposal as Good. Federal Resources Corporation did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

GovPlace, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated GovPlace's proposal as Very Good. Within this Subfactor, GovPlace's proposal received the following findings: a Significant Strength for the full complement of all categories and substantial depth of product offerings in the Available Components Tab; and a Strength for its proposed technology including its architectural approach to systematic integration based on specific customer requirements to achieve synergy and innovative solutions.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated GovPlace's proposal as Good. GovPlace did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated GovPlace's proposal as Good. GovPlace did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

CounterTrade Products, Inc. (CTP):

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated CounterTrade Products' proposal as Very Good. Within this Subfactor, CounterTrade Products' proposal received the following findings: a Significant Strength for the full complement of all categories and substantial depth of product offerings in the Available Components Tab; and a Strength for its accessibility programs that further the Government's section 508 policies and initiatives.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated CounterTrade Products' proposal as Good. CounterTrade Products did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated CounterTrade Products' proposal as Good. CounterTrade Products did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Four Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Four Inc.'s proposal as Very Good. Within this Subfactor, Four Inc.'s proposal received a Significant Strength for the full complement of all categories and substantial depth of product offerings in the Available Components Tab.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Four Inc.'s proposal as Good. Four Inc. did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Four Inc.'s proposal as Good. Four Inc. did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

GMC Tek, LLC:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated GMC Tek's proposal as Very Good. Within this Subfactor, GMC Tek's proposal received a Significant Strength for the full complement of all categories and substantial depth of product offerings in the Available Components Tab.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated GMC Tek's proposal as Good. GMC Tek did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated GMC Tek's proposal as Good. GMC Tek did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Blue Tech, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Blue Tech's proposal as Very Good. Within this Subfactor, Blue Tech's proposal received a Significant Strength for the full complement of all categories and substantial depth of product offerings in the Available Components Tab.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Blue Tech's proposal as Good. Blue Tech did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Blue Tech's proposal as Good. Blue Tech did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

FedStore Corporation:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated FedStore's proposal as Very Good. Within this Subfactor, FedStore's proposal received a Significant Strength for the full complement of all categories and substantial depth of product offerings in the Available Components Tab.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated FedStore's proposal as Good. FedStore did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated FedStore's proposal as Good. FedStore did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Government Acquisitions, Inc. (GAI):

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Government Acquisitions' proposal as Very Good. Within this Subfactor, Government Acquisitions' proposal received the following findings: a Significant Strength for the full complement of all categories and substantial depth of product offerings in the Available Components Tab; a Strength for its proposed technology including architectural features that will prepare Government customers for next-generation technology; and a Weakness for inadequately providing information on its capabilities in support of accessibility and energy conservation.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Government Acquisitions' proposal as Good. Government Acquisitions did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Government Acquisitions' proposal as Good. Government Acquisitions did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Walker and Associates, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Walker and Associates' proposal as Very Good. Within this Subfactor, Walker and Associates' proposal received the following findings: a Significant Strength for the full complement of all categories and substantial depth of product offerings in the Available Components Tab; a Weakness for its lack of a comprehensive narrative technical description beyond the technical aspects of the minimum mandatory items; and a Weakness for inadequately providing information on its capabilities in support of accessibility and energy conservation.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Walker and Associates' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Walker and Associates' proposal received a Strength for reducing supply chain risk both internally and through standards work.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Walker and Associates' proposal as Good. Walker and Associates did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

New Tech Solutions, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated New Tech Solutions' proposal as Very Good. Within this Subfactor, New Tech Solutions' proposal received the following findings: a Significant Strength for the full complement of all categories and substantial depth of product offerings in the Available Components Tab; and a Weakness for inadequately providing information on its capabilities in support of accessibility and energy conservation.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated New Tech Solutions' proposal as Good. New Tech Solutions did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated New Tech Solutions' proposal as Good. New Tech Solutions did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Norseman Defense Technologies:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Norseman Defense Technologies' proposal as Very Good. Within this Subfactor, Norseman Defense Technologies' proposal received the following findings: a Significant Strength for the full complement of all categories and substantial depth of product offerings in the Available Components Tab; and a Weakness for inadequately providing information on its capabilities in support of accessibility and energy conservation.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Norseman Defense Technologies' proposal as Good. Norseman Defense Technologies did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Norseman Defense Technologies' proposal as Good. Norseman Defense Technologies did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Lyme Computer Solutions, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Lyme Computer Solutions' proposal as Very Good. Within this Subfactor, Lyme Computer Solutions' proposal received the following findings: a Significant Strength for the full complement of all categories and substantial depth of product offerings in the Available Components Tab; a Strength for its proposed technology including a comprehensive narrative on the synergistic effects of its overall design and architecture; a Strength for proposing a number of desirable features and product elements that exceed minimum requirements; and a Weakness for inadequately providing information on its capabilities in support of accessibility and energy conservation.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Lyme Computer Solutions' proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Lyme Computer Solutions' proposal received a Weakness for inadequately providing information on its own policies and procedures to support the critical area of supply chain risk management.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Lyme Computer Solutions' proposal as Good. Lyme Computer Solutions did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Strategic Communications, LLC:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Strategic Communications' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Strategic Communications' proposal received the following findings: a Strength for the good depth and breadth of proposed Available Components; and a Strength for environmental and energy programs that further Government initiatives and policies.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Strategic Communications' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Strategic Communications' proposal received a Strength for reducing supply chain risk both internally and through standards work.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Strategic Communications' proposal as Good. Strategic Communications did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Copper River Information Technology, LLC:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Copper River Information Technology's proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Copper River Information Technology's proposal received the following findings: a Strength for its proposed technology across the scope of SEWP including state-of-the-art and leading-edge technology that promotes portability and interoperability; and a Strength for environmental and energy programs that further Government initiatives and policies.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Copper River Information Technology's proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Copper River Information Technology's proposal received a Strength for reducing supply chain risk both internally and through standards work.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Copper River Information Technology's proposal as Good. Copper River Information Technology did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Swish Data Corporation:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Swish Data's proposal as Very Good. Within this Subfactor, Swish Data's proposal received the following findings: a Strength for its proposed technology including its discussion of its advanced architectural features and the synergistic effects of its overall design; a Strength for the

good depth and breadth of proposed Available Components; and a Strength for proposing a number of desirable features and product elements that exceed minimum requirements.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Swish Data's proposal as Good. Swish Data did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Swish Data's proposal as Good. Swish Data did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Convergence Technology Consulting, LLC:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Convergence Technology Consulting's proposal as Very Good. Within this Subfactor, Convergence Technology Consulting's proposal received the following findings: a Strength for its proposed technology across the scope of SEWP and its analyst support; a Strength for the good depth and breadth of proposed Available Components; and a Strength for proposing a number of desirable features and product elements that exceed minimum requirements.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Convergence Technology Consulting's proposal as Good. Convergence Technology Consulting did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Convergence Technology Consulting's proposal as Good. Convergence Technology Consulting did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Seeds of Genius:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Seeds of Genius' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Seeds of Genius' proposal received a Strength for its proposed technology that is beneficial to the Government in terms of integrated solutions and utilizing technology in an overall architectural concept.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Seeds of Genius' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Seeds of Genius' proposal received a Strength for reducing supply chain risk both internally and through standards work.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Seeds of Genius' proposal as Good. Seeds of Genius did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Four Points Technology, LLC:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Four Points Technology's proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Four Points Technology's proposal received the following findings: a Strength for its proposed technology including its emphasis on advanced technology, product selection and storage architecture; and a Strength for the good depth and breadth of proposed Available Components.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Four Points Technology's proposal as Good. Four Points Technology did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Four Points Technology's proposal as Good. Four Points Technology did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Accelera Solutions, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Accelera Solutions' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Accelera Solutions' proposal received the following findings: a Strength for the good depth and breadth of proposed Available Components; and a Strength for proposing a number of desirable features and product elements that exceed minimum requirements.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Accelera Solutions' proposal as Good. Accelera Solutions did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Accelera Solutions' proposal as Good. Accelera Solutions did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

CSP Enterprises, LLC:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated CSP Enterprises' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, CSP Enterprises' proposal received the following findings: a Strength for the good depth and breadth of proposed Available Components; and a Strength for proposing a number of desirable features and product elements that exceed minimum requirements.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated CSP Enterprises' proposal as Good. CSP Enterprises did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated CSP Enterprises' proposal as Good. CSP Enterprises did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Spectrum Systems, LLC:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Spectrum Systems' proposal as Very Good. Within this Subfactor, Spectrum Systems' proposal received the following findings: a Significant Strength for the full complement of all categories and substantial depth of product offerings in the Available Components Tab; and a Strength for its accessibility programs that further section 508 policies and initiatives.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Spectrum Systems' proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Spectrum Systems' proposal received a Weakness for inadequately providing information on its own policies and procedures to support the critical area of supply chain risk management.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Spectrum Systems' proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Spectrum Systems' proposal received a Weakness for inadequately providing information regarding the reconciliation of its internal system with the SEWP database of record.

GC Micro Corporation:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated GC Micro's proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, GC Micro's proposal received a Strength for the good depth and breadth of proposed Available Components.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated GC Micro's proposal as Good. GC Micro did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated GC Micro's proposal as Good. GC Micro did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Fastech, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Fastech's proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Fastech's proposal received a Strength for the good depth and breadth of proposed Available Components.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Fastech's proposal as Good. Fastech did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Fastech's proposal as Good. Fastech did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Anacapa Micro Products, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Anacapa Micro Products' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Anacapa Micro Products' proposal received the following findings: a Strength for proposing a number of desirable features and product elements that exceed minimum requirements; a Strength for proposing in-house resources to support the development of custom solutions and configuration of systems for purposes of demonstration of cloud and storage solutions; and a Weakness for inadequately providing information on its capabilities in support of accessibility and energy conservation.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Anacapa Micro Products' proposal as Good. Anacapa Micro Products did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Anacapa Micro Products' proposal as Good. Anacapa Micro Products did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Victory Global Solutions, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Victory Global Solutions' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Victory Global Solutions' proposal received a Strength for its advanced architectural features and for its analyst support.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Victory Global Solutions' proposal as Good. Victory Global Solutions did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Victory Global Solutions' proposal as Good. Victory Global Solutions did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

M2 Technology, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated M2 Technology's proposal as Good. M2 Technology did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated M2 Technology's proposal as Good. M2 Technology did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated M2 Technology's proposal as Good. M2 Technology did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Alvarez & Associates, LLC:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Alvarez & Associates' proposal as Good. Alvarez & Associates did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Alvarez & Associates' proposal as Good. Alvarez & Associates did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Alvarez & Associates' proposal as Good. Alvarez & Associates did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Ace Technology Partners, LLC:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Ace Technology Partners' proposal as Good. Ace Technology Partners did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Ace Technology Partners' proposal as Good. Ace Technology Partners did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Ace Technology Partners' proposal as Good. Ace Technology Partners did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

VAE, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated VAE's proposal as Good. VAE did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated VAE's proposal as Good. VAE did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated VAE's proposal as Good. VAE did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Unistar-Sparco Computers, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Unistar-Sparco Computers' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Unistar-Sparco Computers' proposal received the following findings: a Strength for its environmental and energy programs that further Government initiatives and policies related to the environment and energy conservation; and a Weakness for its lack of a comprehensive narrative technical description beyond the technical aspects of the minimum mandatory items.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Unistar-Sparco Computers' proposal as Good. Unistar-Sparco Computers did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Unistar-Sparco Computers' proposal as Good. Unistar-Sparco Computers did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

ABM Federal Sales, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated ABM Federal Sales' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, ABM Federal Sales' proposal received the following findings: a Strength for proposing a number of desirable features and product elements that exceed minimum requirements; and a Weakness for its lack of a comprehensive narrative technical description beyond the technical aspects of the minimum mandatory items.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated ABM Federal Sales' proposal as Good. ABM Federal Sales did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated ABM Federal Sales' proposal as Good. ABM Federal Sales did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Marshall Communications Corporation:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Marshall Communications' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Marshall Communications' proposal received the following findings: a Strength for proposing a number of desirable features and product elements that exceed minimum requirements; and a Weakness for inadequately providing information on its capabilities in support of accessibility and energy conservation.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Marshall Communications' proposal as Good. Marshall Communications did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Marshall Communications' proposal as Good. Marshall Communications did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Abba Technologies, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Abba Technologies' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Abba Technologies' proposal received the following findings: a Strength for the good depth and breadth of proposed Available Components; a Strength for proposing a number of desirable features and product elements that exceed minimum requirements; a Weakness for its lack of a comprehensive narrative technical description beyond the technical aspects of the minimum mandatory items; and a Weakness for inadequately addressing capabilities in support of accessibility and energy conservation.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Abba Technologies' proposal as Good. Abba Technologies did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Abba Technologies' proposal as Good. Abba Technologies did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

American Wordata, Inc. (AWdata):

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated American Wordata's proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, American Wordata's proposal received a Weakness for inadequately addressing capabilities in support of accessibility.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated American Wordata's proposal as Good. American Wordata did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated American Wordata's proposal as Good. American Wordata did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

DasNet Corporation:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated DasNet's proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, DasNet's proposal received a Weakness for inadequately addressing capabilities in support of accessibility and energy conservation.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated DasNet's proposal as Good. DasNet did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated DasNet's proposal as Good. DasNet did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

AlphaSix Corporation:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated AlphaSix's proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, AlphaSix's proposal received the following findings: a Weakness for its lack of a comprehensive narrative technical description beyond the technical aspects of the minimum mandatory items; and a Weakness for inadequately addressing capabilities in support of energy conservation and environmentally friendly products and services, on the range and types of third party software products available in the commercial marketplace, and on documentation.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated AlphaSix's proposal as Good. AlphaSix did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated AlphaSix's proposal as Good. AlphaSix did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Alliance Technology Group:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Alliance Technology's proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Alliance Technology's proposal received a

Strength for its demonstrated technological leadership based on its in-house labs and analysts focused on emerging technologies.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Alliance Technology's proposal as Good. Alliance Technology did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Alliance Technology's proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Alliance Technology's proposal received a Weakness for inadequately providing information regarding the reconciliation of its internal system with the SEWP database of record.

Computer Marketing Associates, Inc. (CMA):

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Computer Marketing Associates' proposal as Good. Computer Marketing Associates did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Computer Marketing Associates' proposal as Good. Computer Marketing Associates did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Computer Marketing Associates' proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Computer Marketing Associates' proposal received a Weakness for inadequately providing information regarding the reconciliation of its internal system with the SEWP database of record.

HMS Technologies, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated HMS Technologies' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, HMS Technologies' proposal received a Weakness for inadequately providing information on its capabilities in support of accessibility and energy conservation.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated HMS Technologies' proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, HMS Technologies' proposal received the following findings: a Weakness for inadequately providing information regarding augmenting vendor teaming relations; and a Weakness for inadequately providing information regarding post award support and service.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated HMS Technologies' proposal as Good. HMS Technologies did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

NCS Technologies, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated NCS Technologies' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, NCS Technologies' proposal received a Weakness for its lack of a comprehensive narrative technical description beyond the technical aspects of the minimum mandatory items.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated NCS Technologies' proposal as Good. NCS Technologies did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated NCS Technologies' proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, NCS Technologies' proposal received a Weakness for inadequately providing information on its planned program management approach to the contract.

MA Federal, Inc. dba iGov.com:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated MA Federal's proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, MA Federal's proposal received a Weakness for inadequately providing information on its capabilities in support of accessibility and environmental and energy conservation.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated MA Federal's proposal as Good. MA Federal did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated MA Federal's proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, MA Federal's proposal received a Weakness for inadequately providing information on its planned program management approach to the contract.

York Telecom Corporation (Yorktel):

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated York Telecom's proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, York Telecom's proposal received a Weakness for its lack of a comprehensive narrative technical description beyond the technical aspects of the minimum mandatory items.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated York Telecom's proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, York Telecom's proposal received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its ability to augment and enhance its vendor teaming relationships and implement procedures for supply chain risk reduction.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated York Telecom's proposal as Good. York Telecom did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

Sword & Shield Enterprise Security (SSES):

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Sword & Shield Enterprise Security's proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Sword & Shield Enterprise Security's proposal received a Weakness for inadequately providing information on its capabilities in support of energy conservation.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Sword & Shield Enterprise Security's proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Sword & Shield Enterprise Security's proposal received a Weakness for inadequately providing information on its own policies and procedures to support the critical area of supply chain risk management.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Sword & Shield Enterprise Security's proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Sword & Shield Enterprise Security's proposal received a Weakness for inadequately providing information on its data interchange approach to the contract.

Sysorex Government Services, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Sysorex Government Services' proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Sysorex Government Services' proposal received the following findings: a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address accessibility, environmental, energy conservation, technology life cycle and software support and documentation; and a Weakness for its lack of a comprehensive narrative technical description beyond the technical aspects of the minimum mandatory items.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Sysorex Government Services' proposal as Good. Sysorex Government Services did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Sysorex Government Services' proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Sysorex Government Services' proposal received a Weakness for inadequately providing information regarding the reconciliation of its internal system with the SEWP database of record.

Cartridge Technologies, Inc. (CTI):

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Cartridge Technologies' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Cartridge Technologies' proposal received the following findings: a Strength for its proposed technology including a Print Management Service providing a multiplicity of options for the Government to obtain multi-function Devices; and a Strength for its environmental and energy programs.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Cartridge Technologies' proposal as Good. Cartridge Technologies did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Cartridge Technologies' proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Cartridge Technologies' proposal received a Significant Weakness for inadequate information concerning its planned management approach.

DiSys Solutions, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated DiSys Solutions' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, DiSys Solutions' proposal received a Weakness for its lack of a comprehensive narrative technical description beyond the technical aspects of the minimum mandatory items.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated DiSys Solutions' proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, DiSys Solutions' proposal received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address supply chain risk management capabilities.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated DiSys Solutions' proposal as Fair. DiSys Solutions received a Weakness for inadequately providing information regarding the reconciliation of its internal system with the SEWP database of record.

Technology Solutions Provider, Inc. (TSPi):

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Technology Solutions Provider's proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Technology Solutions Provider's proposal received a Strength for its proposed technology including a Cloud solution that enables a cost effective on-premise private-hybrid cloud.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Technology Solutions Provider's proposal as Good. Technology Solutions Provider did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Technology Solutions Provider's proposal as Fair. Technology Solutions Provider received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its planned program management, data interchange and catalog replication approach that reflect the unique characteristics of the SEWP Program.

Video & Telecommunications, Inc. (VTI):

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Video & Telecommunications' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Video & Telecommunications' proposal received a Strength for its proposed technology including a Cloud solution that enables a cost effective on-premise private-hybrid cloud

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Video & Telecommunications' proposal as Good. Video & Telecommunications did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Video & Telecommunications' proposal as Fair. Video & Telecommunications received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its planned program management, data interchange and catalog replication approach that reflect the unique characteristics of the SEWP Program.

Chandler Automated Systems, Inc., dba Vigilant Technologies:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Chandler Automated Systems' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Chandler Automated Systems' proposal received a Strength its proposed technology including a Cloud solution that enables a cost effective on-premise private-hybrid cloud

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Chandler Automated Systems' proposal as Good. Chandler Automated Systems did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Chandler Automated Systems' proposal as Fair. Chandler Automated Systems received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its planned program management, data interchange and catalog replication approach that reflect the unique characteristics of the SEWP Program.

RedHawk IT Solutions, LLC:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated RedHawk IT Solutions' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, RedHawk IT Solutions' proposal received a Strength its proposed technology including a Cloud solution that enables a cost effective on-premise private-hybrid cloud

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated RedHawk IT Solutions' proposal as Good. RedHawk IT Solutions did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated RedHawk IT Solutions' proposal as Fair. RedHawk IT Solutions received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its planned program management, data interchange and catalog replication approach that reflect the unique characteristics of the SEWP Program.

Phoenix Data Security, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Phoenix Data Security's proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Phoenix Data Security's proposal received a Strength its proposed technology including a Cloud solution that enables a cost effective on-premise private-hybrid cloud

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Phoenix Data Security's proposal as Good. Phoenix Data Security did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Phoenix Data Security's proposal as Fair. Phoenix Data Security received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its planned program management, data interchange and catalog replication approach that reflect the unique characteristics of the SEWP Program.

MCP Computer Products, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated MCP Computer Products' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, MCP Computer Products' proposal received a Strength for its proposed technology including a Cloud solution that enables a cost effective on-premise private-hybrid cloud

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated MCP Computer Products' proposal as Good. MCP Computer Products did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated MCP Computer Products' proposal as Fair. MCP Computer Products received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its planned program management, data interchange and catalog replication approach that reflect the unique characteristics of the SEWP Program.

M&A Technology, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated M&A Technology's proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, M&A Technology's proposal received a Strength for its proposed technology including a Cloud solution that enables a cost effective on-premise private-hybrid cloud

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated M&A Technology's proposal as Good. M&A Technology did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated M&A Technology's proposal as Fair. M&A Technology received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its planned program management, data interchange and catalog replication approach that reflect the unique characteristics of the SEWP Program.

A&T Marketing, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated A&T Marketing's proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, A&T Marketing's proposal received a Strength for its proposed technology including a Cloud solution that enables a cost effective on-premise private-hybrid cloud

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated A&T Marketing's proposal as Good. A&T Marketing did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated A&T Marketing's proposal as Fair. A&T Marketing received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its planned program management, data interchange and catalog replication approach that reflect the unique characteristics of the SEWP Program.

Federal Tech Solutions, Inc. (FTSI):

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Federal Tech Solutions' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Federal Tech Solutions' proposal received a Strength for its proposed technology including a Cloud solution that enables a cost effective on-premise private-hybrid cloud

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Federal Tech Solutions' proposal as Good. Federal Tech Solutions did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Federal Tech Solutions' proposal as Fair. Federal Tech Solutions received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its planned program management, data interchange and catalog replication approach that reflect the unique characteristics of the SEWP Program.

StorSoft Technology Corp:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated StorSoft Technology Corp's proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, StorSoft Technology Corp's proposal received a Strength for its proposed technology including a Cloud solution that enables a cost effective on-premise private-hybrid cloud

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated StorSoft Technology Corp's proposal as Good. StorSoft Technology Corp did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated StorSoft Technology Corp's proposal as Fair. StorSoft Technology Corp received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its planned program management, data interchange and catalog replication approach that reflect the unique characteristics of the SEWP Program.

Akira Technologies, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Akira Technologies' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Akira Technologies' proposal received a Strength for its proposed technology including a Cloud solution that enables a cost effective on-premise private-hybrid cloud

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Akira Technologies' proposal as Good. Akira Technologies did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Akira Technologies' proposal as Fair. Akira Technologies received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its planned program management, data interchange and catalog replication approach that reflect the unique characteristics of the SEWP Program.

Better Direct, LLC:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Better Direct's proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Better Direct's proposal received the following findings: a Weakness for its lack of a comprehensive narrative technical description beyond the technical aspects of the minimum mandatory items; and a Weakness for inadequately providing information relevant to Section 508 and energy conservation.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Better Direct's proposal as Fair. Better Direct's proposal received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its approach to augmentation of its vendor teaming relationships.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Better Direct's proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Better Direct's proposal received a Weakness for inadequately providing information on its planned management approach to the contract.

Transource Services Corp:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Transource Services' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Transource Services' proposal received a Weakness for its lack of a comprehensive narrative technical description beyond the technical aspects of the minimum mandatory items.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Transource Services' proposal as Good. Transource Services did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Transource Services' proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Transource Services' proposal received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its planned program management, data interchange and catalog replication approach.

Mercom Incorporated:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Mercom's proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Mercom's proposal received a Weakness for its lack of a comprehensive narrative technical description beyond the technical aspects of the minimum mandatory items.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Mercom's proposal as Good. Mercom did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Mercom's proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Mercom's proposal received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its planned program management, data interchange and catalog replication approach.

Carolina Advanced Digital, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Carolina Advanced Digital's proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Carolina Advanced Digital's proposal received the following findings: a Weakness for its lack of a comprehensive narrative technical description beyond the technical aspects of the minimum mandatory items; and a Weakness for inadequately providing information on its capabilities in support of accessibility and energy conservation.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Carolina Advanced Digital's proposal as Good. Carolina Advanced Digital did not receive any findings for this Subfactor.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Carolina Advanced Digital's proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Carolina Advanced Digital's proposal received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its planned program management, data interchange and catalog replication approach.

Dynamic Computer Corporation:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Dynamic Computer's proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Dynamic Computer's proposal received a Weakness for its lack of a comprehensive narrative technical description beyond the technical aspects of the minimum mandatory items.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Dynamic Computer's proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Dynamic Computer's proposal received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its ability to augment and enhance its vendor teaming relationships and implement procedures for supply chain risk reduction.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Dynamic Computer's proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Dynamic Computer's proposal received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its planned program management, data interchange and catalog replication approach.

Coast To Coast Computer Products, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Coast To Coast Computer Products' proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Coast To Coast Computer Products' proposal received the following findings: a Weakness for its lack of a comprehensive narrative technical description beyond the technical aspects of the minimum mandatory items; and a Weakness for inadequately providing information on its capabilities in support of accessibility and energy conservation.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Coast To Coast Computer Products' proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Coast To Coast Computer Products' proposal received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its ability to augment and enhance its vendor teaming relationships and implement procedures for supply chain risk reduction.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Coast To Coast Computer Products' proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Coast To Coast Computer Products' proposal received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its planned program management, data interchange and catalog replication approach.

Advanced Computer Concepts, Inc. (ACC):

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Advanced Computer Concepts' proposal as Good. Within this Subfactor, Advanced Computer Concepts' proposal received Weakness for its lack of a comprehensive narrative technical description beyond the technical aspects of the minimum mandatory items.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Advanced Computer Concepts' proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Advanced Computer Concepts' proposal received the following findings: a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address supply chain risk management capabilities; and a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address post award support and service.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Advanced Computer Concepts' proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Advanced Computer Concepts' proposal received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its planned program management, data interchange and catalog replication approach.

PetroSys Solutions, Inc. (PSI):

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated PetroSys Solutions' proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, PetroSys Solutions' proposal received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address accessibility, environmental, energy conservation, technology life cycle and software support and documentation.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated PetroSys Solutions' proposal as Fair. PetroSys Solutions' proposal received the following finding: a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its supply chain policies, procedures and practices and its ability to augment its vendor teaming relationships; and a Weakness for inadequately providing information on its post award support and service.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated PetroSys Solutions' proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, PetroSys Solutions received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its planned program management, data interchange and catalog replication approach.

Capitol Supply Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Capitol Supply's proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Capitol Supply's proposal received the following

findings: a Weakness for its lack of a comprehensive narrative technical description beyond the technical aspects of the minimum mandatory items; and a Weakness for inadequately providing information on its capabilities in support of accessibility and energy conservation.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Capitol Supply's proposal as Fair. Capitol Supply's proposal received the following finding: a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its supply chain policies, procedures and practices and its ability to augment its vendor teaming relationships; and a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its post award support and service.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Capitol Supply's proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Capitol Supply received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its planned program management, data interchange and catalog replication approach.

Knowledge Information Solutions, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Knowledge Information Solutions' proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Knowledge Information Solutions' proposal received a Weakness for its lack of a comprehensive narrative technical description beyond the technical aspects of the minimum mandatory items; and a Weakness for inadequately providing information on its capabilities in support of accessibility and energy conservation.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Knowledge Information Solutions' proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Knowledge Information Solutions' proposal received the following findings: a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address supply chain risk management capabilities; and a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address post award support and service.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Knowledge Information Solutions' proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Knowledge Information Solutions' proposal received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its planned program management, data interchange and catalog replication approach.

En Pointe Gov, Inc.:

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated En Pointe's proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, En Pointe's proposal received a Significant Weakness for

failing to adequately address accessibility, environmental, energy conservation, technology life cycle and software support and documentation; and a Weakness for its lack of a comprehensive narrative technical description beyond the technical aspects of the minimum mandatory items.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated En Pointe's proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, En Pointe's proposal received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address augmentation of its vendor teaming relationships.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated En Pointe's proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, En Pointe's proposal received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its planned program management, data interchange and catalog replication approach.

Enterprise Technology Solutions, Inc. (ETSI):

For Subfactor A, Excellence of Proposed Systems, the SEB rated Enterprise Technology Solutions' proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Enterprise Technology Solutions' proposal received a Significant Weakness for inadequately addressing accessibility, environmental, energy conservation, technology life cycle and software support and documentation.

For Subfactor B, Offeror's Support and Commitment, the SEB rated Enterprise Technology Solutions' proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Enterprise Technology Solutions' proposal received the following findings: a Significant Weakness for providing inadequate information regarding its ability to augment its vendor teaming relationships and how those relationships might enhance or inhibit Government accessibility to a range of products; and a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its post award support and service.

For Subfactor C, Management Plan, the SEB rated Enterprise Technology Solutions' proposal as Fair. Within this Subfactor, Enterprise Technology Solutions' proposal received a Significant Weakness for failing to adequately address its planned program management, data interchange and catalog replication approach.

PRICE EVALUATION FACTOR

The SEB determined that each offeror in Category B, Group C proposed a fair and reasonable price. The price differences among the proposals were primarily based on

different product offerings provided by offerors to meet the minimum mandatory items that were specified in the RFP. The order of offerors' overall price, from high-to-low, is as follows:

Marshall; Abba; Convergence; ETSI; Better Direct; En Pointe; DiSys; Victory; AlphaSix; HMS; Yorktel; VAE; Walker; SSES; Coast; DASNet; Wildflower; Copper River; Anacapa; CSI; Spectrum; Ace Technology; CTI; KISI; Mercom; Carolina; Sysorex; Strategic; iGov; Transource; Alliance; ACC; ABM; Fastech; NCS; FedStore; CTP; Dynamic Systems; Dynamic Computer; AWdata; Norseman; Alvarez; Blue Tech; Akira; GovPlace; PSI; GAI; Unistar-Sparco; Lyme; Tribalco; AS Global; CSP; Sterling; Storsoft; Thundercat; Swish; Cynergy; Accelera; FTSI; VTI; Vigilant; Red Hawk; Phoenix; MCP; M&A; A&T; GMC Tek; Seeds; Optivor; M2; New Tech; TSPi; Four Points; GC Micro; ITG; CMA; Four; Red River; Affigent; and FCN.

PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FACTOR

The SEB determined that each offeror in Category B, Group C had Acceptable Past Performance.

DECISION

Prior to the presentation, I reviewed the SEB's written evaluation reports for the Management/Technical Approach, Price, and Past Performance Factors. These reports were revised as part of the SEB's implementation of the corrective action. I understood the corrective action that the SEB took; the results of which were apparent to me when I read the revised evaluation reports. I noted that several of the offerors had fewer negative findings, resulting in improved ratings and scores. These reports replaced the SEB's original evaluation reports in their entirety and form the basis for my selection.

I carefully considered and understood the detailed Management/Technical Approach findings that the SEB documented as well as the resulting ratings and scores. I concluded that the SEB's revised evaluation of proposals was thorough and well-documented. Based on my review of the reports, the content of the presentation, and my discussions with the SEB and other NASA personnel present for the SEB's presentation, I generally agreed with the SEB's revised findings, adjectival ratings, and Management/Technical Approach scoring, as well as its evaluation results under the Price Factor. In limited instances, explained in detail below, my conclusions as to the degree of impact of certain findings on contract performance differed from the SEB's. Except as noted, I accepted the SEB's findings in their entirety.

During the presentation, I inquired as to the number of SEWP V contracts that would be necessary to support the anticipated volume of customers and orders under SEWP V, as well as the associated contract administration concerns or risks that may vary with the number of contract awards. The SEWP Program advised me that it had observed a

notable increase in the volume, size, and complexity of orders, resulting in a significant need for additional product offerings and contractors under SEWP V. In addition, the SEWP Program indicated that the number of SEWP IV contractors is no longer sufficient to provide ample competition and responsiveness for the current volume of orders. Under SEWP IV, some task order competitions have had little or no competition, which is undesirable both for NASA and other Federal agency customers. Though a greater number of contractors would increase the administrative management burden on the SEWP Program, the benefits of increased competition, especially in the small business areas, outweighs the program management detriment in terms of the need for increased contract oversight. Therefore, the SEWP Program had planned for and favored a significant increase in contract awards under SEWP V. The SEWP Program anticipated it could accommodate the increased oversight effort while retaining its agility and responsiveness to NASA and other Federal agency customers.

In reviewing the SEB's written evaluation reports, I noted that some of the lower-rated proposals within Group C contained Significant Weaknesses. During the presentation, I questioned the SEB regarding the impact of these Significant Weaknesses. The SEB indicated the Significant Weaknesses it found for Group C were primarily based on inadequately detailed information in the proposals (e.g., inadequate information regarding plans for augmenting vendor teaming arrangements, inadequate explanation of planned management approach). I considered the SEB's explanation, assessing the performance risk associated with these findings in the multiple-award, IDIQ context. Based on this discussion, and my own review of the findings, I concluded in each instance that an offeror's failure to provide sufficient details about its approach, while a concern, is a lesser performance risk to NASA than an unsuitable or otherwise problematic Management/Technical approach. In terms of impact on SEWP V performance, weaknesses based on a lack of adequate information are distinguishable from those indicating a fundamental misunderstanding of the requirements or otherwise demonstrating an inability to perform the work.

Thus, while I agree with the SEB that Significant Weaknesses were appropriately assessed, I have determined that these offerors are viable as prospective SEWP contract holders despite providing proposals without adequate detail in certain areas. This is especially true given NASA's procurement objective to promote vendor competitiveness and provide access to a wide range of IT goods and services across the Federal Government. I considered that inclusion of these offerors in the SEWP V contract would increase the overall benefit to the Government by expanding the field of competition in the resulting task ordering process.

After considering the SEB's evaluation materials and the information discussed during the presentation, I deliberated as to which proposals to select for award. In making this determination, I referred to those portions of the RFP relevant to my selection decision. The RFP provided for a best value selection based on the stated relative order of importance of the evaluation factors. Past Performance was evaluated on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis and all offerors have Acceptable Past Performance. The two remaining factors, Management/Technical Approach and Price, were of

approximately equal importance. I also noted that the RFP did not limit the total number of proposals that would be selected, but stated the Government’s intent to make multiple awards within each competition group.

I carefully reviewed the acquisition objectives stated in the RFP and recognized the need for a multitude of contractors offering a wide range of products and services to ensure the Agency’s acquisition objectives are met. I considered the appropriate number of awards to make, taking into account that a larger number of awards will result in a greater degree of available products and services and maximize price and technology competition to NASA and numerous other Government customers utilizing SEWP V to meet their IT needs. I concluded a large number of SEWP V contract awards will support the Government’s strategic decision making in meeting IT needs and promote vendor competitiveness.

Each proposal that was evaluated offered prices that the SEB determined to be fair and reasonable. I found the price differences among the proposals were primarily based on different product offerings that the offerors provided to meet the minimum mandatory items that were specified in the RFP. In reviewing the results of the SEB’s evaluation under the Management/Technical Approach Factor, I noted that each proposal evaluated was responsive to the RFP requirements and received ratings of “Fair” or higher across all subfactors. Thus, after weighing the relative merit of each proposal under the Management/Technical Approach Factor and the Price Factor, and considering the appropriate number of awards to make to under this multiple-award contract, as outlined above, I concluded that each of the following offerors’ proposals represented a best value to the Government:

- A&T; Abba; ABM; Accelera; Ace Technology; ACC; Affigent; Akira; Alliance; AlphaSix; Alvarez; AWordata; Anacapa; AS Global; Better Direct; Blue Tech; CSI; Carolina; CTI; Vigilant; Coast; CMA; Convergence; Copper River; CTP; CSP; Cynergy; DASNet; DiSys; Dynamic Computer; Dynamic Systems; En Pointe; ETSI; Fastech; FCN; FTSI; FedStore; Four Points; Four; GC Micro; GMC Tek; GAI; GovPlace; HMS; ITG; KISI; LCS; M&A; M2; iGov; Marshall; MCP; Mercom; NCS; New Tech; Norseman; Optivor; PSI; Phoenix; Red Hawk; Red River; Seeds; Spectrum; Sterling; Storsoft; Strategic; Swish; SSES; Sysorex; TSPi; Thundercat; Transource; Tribalco; Unistar-Sparco; VAE; Victory; VTI; Walker; Wildflower; and Yorktel.

Accordingly, I have selected these offerors for award of a SEWP V contract within Category B, Group C.



Dennis C. Vander Tuig
Source Selection Authority



Date