

**SOURCE SELECTION STATEMENT
FOR
PROGRAM MANAGEMENT SUPPORT SERVICES (PMSS)
(SOLICITATION NUMBER: NNC13ZMB014J)**

On October 30, 2013, I met with the members of the Source Evaluation Committee (SEC) appointed to evaluate proposals submitted in response to the Program Management Support Services (PMSS) Solicitation NNC13ZMB014J. Several other key officials of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) John H. Glenn Research Center (GRC) also attended the meeting. During this meeting, the SEC presented its findings to me. We discussed those findings to assure that I had a full understanding of the SEC's evaluation. This Source Selection Statement summarizes the SEC's findings, reflects my independent judgment concerning those findings, and sets forth my selection decision.

PROCUREMENT HISTORY

This procurement provides program management support services to NASA GRC. The type of support to be provided includes:

- Program/Project Integration
- Integrated Project Planning and Control
- Standing Review Boards
- Program/Project Management Support
- Technical Earned Value Management (EVM) Support

The PMSS is an Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract with Firm Fixed Price (FFP) task orders. The base period of this acquisition is two years, with three 1-year options. The aggregate value of FFP task orders issued under this contract shall not exceed a maximum of \$9,600,000.00 for the base period plus option periods of performance.

A sources sought notice was issued on September 13, 2012. A draft request for proposal (RFP) was issued on May 24, 2013, followed by an Industry Day on June 6, 2013, with 27 potential offerors in attendance. The final RFP was issued on July 9, 2013, as a small business Historically Underutilized Business Zone (HUBZone) set-aside. Subsequently, two amendments to the solicitation were issued.

A synopsis of the major procurement milestone dates in the PMSS procurement is as follows:

Major Procurement Milestones	Date Completed
Final RFP Issued	07/09/2013
Amendment 1 Released	07/09/2013
Amendment 2 Released	07/10/2013
Evaluations Complete	09/25/2013
Presentation to Source Selection Authority (SSA)	10/30/2013

Eleven proposals were received on August 8, 2013, from the following offerors:

Applied Systems & Technology Transfer (AST2)

Caduceus

Canvas Incorporated

Danas Technology

FWG Solutions (FWG)

M & M Technical Services

Mind Safety Management

Prairie Quest

Pythia

Summit Technologies & Solutions, Inc.

TJ Fact

EVALUATION PROCESS AND CRITERIA

An initial review of the proposals was conducted to determine acceptability of the proposals in accordance with NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Supplement (NFS) 1815.305-70, "Identification of Unacceptable Proposals." As stated in the RFP, unacceptable proposals would be eliminated from further evaluation. The RFP divided the proposals into four volumes: Volume I – Technical Proposal (Technical Considerations); Volume II – Past Performance Proposal; Volume III – Cost Proposal; and Volume IV – Model Contract. All proposals were initially reviewed by the contracting officer for compliance with the terms and conditions of the solicitation, including page limitation, small business HUBZone set-aside, and proposal volumes. TJ Fact did not provide Volume II – Past Performance Proposal in accordance with RFP Paragraph L.11 Volume II – Past Performance Proposal.

TJ Fact was eliminated from further consideration because its proposal was incomplete. TJ Fact will be notified that their proposal was unacceptable. Proposals for the remaining 10 offerors were made available to the voting members of the SEC.

The RFP included three evaluation factors: Technical Acceptability, Past Performance, and Cost/Price. Proposals were evaluated first for technical acceptability, which was rated either as “Acceptable” or “Not Acceptable.” Technical acceptability had six subfactors: (1) Technical Staffing and Management; (2) Proximity of Service; (3) Organizational Conflicts of Interest; (4) Limitation of Future Contracting; (5) Continuity of Service; (6) Quality Management and Assurance. Proposer needed to be technically acceptable in all six areas to be considered technically acceptable for Volume I – Technical Proposal evaluation. Proposals that were not rated as technically acceptable were to be eliminated from further consideration.

All Volume I technical proposals that were evaluated as “Acceptable” against the Technical Acceptability evaluation factor were evaluated against the Past Performance and Cost/Price evaluation factors. The past performance evaluation assesses the degree of confidence the government had in the offeror’s ability to fulfill the solicitation requirements for the contract while meeting schedule, budget, and performance quality constraints. The past performance evaluation considered each offeror’s demonstrated record of performance in supplying the requirements of this solicitation that meet the user’s needs. The offeror’s past performance record was examined for recent and relevant past performance to determine its ability to perform the required work. The past performance of major subcontractors was also evaluated. Relevancy was based on the size, scope and complexity of the projects being evaluated for past performance. In assessing relevance, the government considered the degree of similarity in size (in dollars per year), work content, and complexity to the requirements in this solicitation. Contract past performance that exhibited all or most of the specific types of work contained in the Statement of Work (SOW) was considered more relevant than contracts with only some or few of the types of work contained in the SOW.

A performance confidence rating was assessed at the overall factor level for past performance after evaluating aspects of the offeror’s recent and relevant past performance. The SEC used the following definitions to assess the overall level of confidence in the offeror’s ability to fulfill the solicitation requirements for the contract while meeting technical, schedule, cost, management, and other contract requirements:

Very High Level of Confidence: The offeror’s relevant past performance is of exceptional merit and is very highly pertinent to this acquisition; indicating exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner; very minor (if any) problems with no adverse effect on overall performance. Based on the offeror’s performance record, there is a very high level of confidence that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

High Level of Confidence: The offeror’s relevant past performance is highly pertinent to this acquisition; demonstrating very effective performance that would be fully responsive to contract requirements with contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical

manner for the most part with only minor problems with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the offeror's performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Moderate Level of Confidence: The offeror's relevant past performance is pertinent to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Low Level of Confidence: The offeror's relevant past performance is at least somewhat pertinent to this acquisition, and it meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements.

Very Low Level of Confidence: The offeror's relevant past performance does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas which adversely affect overall performance. Based on the offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Neutral: In the case of an offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance [see FAR 15.305(a) (2) (ii) and (iv)].

A price analysis and a cost analysis, to include a cost realism analysis and cost confidence level, were performed in accordance with FAR 15.305 Proposal Evaluation, FAR 15.404 Proposal Analysis, and NFS 1815.305 Proposal Evaluation to ensure that the final agreed to prices were fair and reasonable. The contract price analysts on the SEC completed a cost realism analysis of each proposal that was determined to be technically "Acceptable." The results of the government's cost/price evaluation were presented to the SSA for consideration in making the source selection. The proposed cost/price and probable cost/price for all years inclusive of completion form and IDIQ requirements were included in the results of the evaluation.

In Section M of the RFP, the government stated that it may award a contract based on the initial offers received without discussions of such offers. Accordingly, each offeror was cautioned to submit its initial proposal to the government using the most favorable terms from price and technical standpoint.

For those offerors determined to be technically acceptable, a trade-off process (see FAR 15.101-1) will be performed between past performance and price factors, not technical considerations. Past performance and price factors were to be of essentially equal importance.

EVALUATION OF INITIAL PROPOSALS

Proposals Determined Technically Unacceptable or Unacceptable Due to Incomplete Pricing

After the technical acceptability evaluation was complete, the proposals from DANAS, Mind Safety, and Pythia were determined to be technically unacceptable and were not evaluated further. The DANAS did not adequately address Technical Acceptability subfactors 1, 2, 5, and 6. Mind Safety did not adequately address Technical Acceptability subfactors 1, 2, 4, and 6. Pythia did not adequately address Technical Acceptability subfactors 1 and 2.

In addition, as a result of the cost/price evaluation, two proposals, from Caduceus and M & M Technical Services, Inc., were determined to be incomplete and unacceptable due to their failure to submit required pricing data sufficient to permit the government to evaluate the price for the IDIQ undefined portion of the work. These proposals were eliminated from further consideration.

The proposals of Applied Systems & Technology Transfer (AST2), Canvas, FWG Solutions, Prairie Quest, and Summit Technologies & Solutions, Inc. adequately addressed all six Technical Acceptability subfactors and were determined to be acceptable. As a result, these five proposals were evaluated against the Past Performance and Cost/Price evaluation factors.

Past Performance

Prairie Quest received a past performance confidence rating of “Neutral.” Prairie Quest has demonstrated limited relevant past performance pertinent to this acquisition. Prairie Quest’s proposal demonstrates strong familiarity with Information Technology (IT) related Configuration Management/Data Management; however, this experience is not in the context of program/project control plans (PQC). Although the subcontractor’s experience had relevancy, the level of participation proposed for the subcontractor was so minimal that, even if it were considered, it did not affect Prairie Quest’s past performance evaluation. Based on the Prairie Quest Team’s total past performance, there is such limited relevant past performance, that the SEC determined a “Neutral” level of confidence to be appropriate.

Canvas received a past performance confidence rating of “High.” Canvas has demonstrated relevant past performance on multiple contracts that are highly pertinent to this acquisition demonstrating very effective performance. The Canvas proposal demonstrates substantial program project integration past performance in a military missile and weapon system context within a multiorganization, multicontractor environment, which is considered highly pertinent to our procurement. DB Consulting, a major subcontractor, has relevant past performance that is highly pertinent to this acquisition. Based on the Canvas team’s total past performance, the relevant past performance with associated effective contract performance, there is a “High” level of confidence.

Applied Systems & Technology Transfer (AST2) has received a past performance confidence rating of “Moderate.” One of the principal owners of AST2 is experienced in leading large multiproject activities that are relevant and pertinent to this acquisition for the Department of Defense, Department of Energy, and Department of Homeland Security. The major subcontractor had very highly pertinent past performance for a limited number of SOW elements. It has provided experts to program/project support to staff standing review boards, special panels, and ad hoc reviews. It has past performance that is relevant to the majority of the SOW elements. There were no Contractor Performance Assessment Report (CPAR) data available to evaluate the prime contractor and/or AST2 company partners. Based on the AST2 team’s total past performance with associated effective contract performance, there is a “Moderate” level of confidence.

The FWG has received a past performance confidence rating of “Moderate.” The FWG’s experience on software implementation is somewhat pertinent to this acquisition. The past performance of the individuals associated with FWG: (1) One of FWG’s personnel has deep experience in IT related project management that is somewhat pertinent to this acquisition. (2) Another has experience in leading a military training wing that is pertinent to this acquisition. However, there were no past performance questionnaires or CPAR data available for evaluation of FWG or its owners. The major subcontractor has performed highly pertinent work for NASA Headquarters and NASA Langley Research Center. The subcontractor’s work is associated with most of the SOW elements. Although the majority of the effort appears to be in accounting analysis and performance areas including internal controls, this experience is easily applied to Project Planning and Control (PP&C) and some of the analysis needed. Based on the FWG team’s total past performance with associated effective contract performance, there is a “Moderate” level of confidence.

Summit Technologies & Solutions, Inc. received a past performance confidence rating of “Very High.” The Summit team has experience that is highly pertinent to this acquisition. The PP&C work for Orbital Science, the integrated cost schedule and risk baselines for the Crew Exploration Vehicle Launch Abort System and Pad Abort I test is very relevant. The experience of the major

subcontractor on the International Space Station Program Integration contract (Johnson Space Center) and the Program Analysis and Control contract (Goddard Space Flight Facility) is relevant and pertinent to this acquisition. Summit has demonstrated a relevant past performance on multiple contracts that is highly pertinent to this acquisition indicating exemplary performance in a timely and efficient manner. Based on the Summit team's total past performance with associated effective contract performance, there is a "Very High" level of confidence.

Cost/Price

In addition to the past performance, the five technically acceptable proposals were evaluated on cost/price.

For each offeror, the cost evaluation was conducted in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(1), FAR 15.404, NFS 1815.305(a)(1)(B) and (a)(3)(B), and NFS 1815.404.

For each offeror, the proposed labor rates were evaluated for reasonableness for the IDIQ contract.

For each offeror, the total proposed price was evaluated; phase-in, base, options, and extension. The total price of all five offerors is determined to be fair and reasonable.

The price evaluation results were presented to the SSA by the SEC team's contract price analyst.

The following table provides the rating results for each offeror for total price:

Offeror	Total Price Rating
Applied Systems & Technology Transfer	Highest
Canvas	2 nd Highest
FWG Solutions	3 rd Highest
Prairie Quest	2 nd Lowest
Summit Technologies & Solutions	Lowest

Cost/price was not given an adjectival rating but was evaluated for omissions and compared with other offerors.

Decision

In its oral presentation, the SEC presented its findings for the five offerors which were determined to be technically acceptable. I was also provided with an explanation as to why six proposals had been determined to be unacceptable – three for technical unacceptability and three for submitting incomplete cost/price or past performance proposals. I questioned the SEC

concerning the elimination of these proposals from further consideration, and I am satisfied that they were properly excluded. I was also presented with the technical findings of the SEC concerning the offerors who had been determined to be technically acceptable. Based on my review of those findings, I agree that the SEC did a thorough technical evaluation and that these five proposals are technically acceptable.

I also carefully questioned the SEC concerning its evaluation of past performance and cost/price. The SEC presentation was thorough and well organized. I am satisfied that the SEC did an effective evaluation of both factors, and I accept the SEC's findings.

In making my selection decision, I am bound by the RFP's announced evaluation methodology, with past performance and cost/price being the only two factors to be considered once an offeror has been determined to be "Technically Acceptable." These two factors are of essentially equal importance.

I find that no "trade-off" analysis between those two factors is necessary here because the lowest (by a meaningful margin) priced offeror is also the offeror with the highest rated past performance. As set forth in the findings above, the Summit team has shown exemplary past performance that is timely and efficient on work that is highly pertinent to this acquisition. Its offer also has a price/cost advantage over the other offerors. Since Summit Technologies and Solutions, Inc. has the most highly rated past performance and the lowest cost/price of all the "Technically Acceptable" offerors, I select that company for award of the contract to provide Project Management Support Services to the NASA Glenn Research Center.



Gregory L. Robinson
Deputy Director, Glenn Research Center
Source Selection Authority