Selection Statement
For
NASA HQ Multimedia Division Television and Web Support Services
RFP NNH12358588R

On May 23, 2013, I, along with key senior officials from NASA Headquarters and NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC), met with the Evaluation Team appointed to evaluate proposals in connection with the NASA HQ Multimedia Division Television and Web Support Services procurement. A full briefing of the results of the evaluation conducted by the team was presented to me, resulting in my source selection decision.

Procurement Description and History

The principal purpose of this procurement is to provide production, operational and television support for NASA Television, a multi-channel digital television service based at NASA Headquarters. In addition, the required services include master control operations, writing for news, features and social media, audio and video editing, graphic design, voice-overs, equipment maintenance, repair, technical system design, database management, digital video library management, television and editing system maintenance and digital television and satellite engineering support. Services include:

1. NASA Home Page
2. Management and Support Functions
3. Daily Facility Operations and Support
4. NASA Television Production
5. NASA Television Engineering
6. NASA Television Facility UpKeep (Repair, Service and Maintenance
7. Internet Design and Production Services

This competition is a Small Business set-aside, NAICS 517110 (Wired Telecommunications Carriers). This effort will be performed under a Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee (CPFF) Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) type contract, with a five year effective ordering period, without options.

The proposals, in response to this procurement, contained written documentation and 10 minutes of videotape. No changes to the written documentation or videotape were permitted after proposal delivery.

A synopsis of the major procurement milestone dates in the NASA HQ Multimedia Division Television and Web Support Services procurement is as follows:

Major Procurement Milestones	Date Completed
Request for Proposal (RFP) Released	06/29/2012
Proposals Received	09/06/2012
SSA Presentation/Selection	05/23/2013

Eight RFP amendments were issued for this procurement. Amendment 1, issued June 29, 2012, to correct the due date on the SF30, which was August 13, 2012. Amendment 2, issued July 26, 2012, changed the due date of the proposal from August 13, 2012 to August 27, 2012, as well as, made minor changes to Attachment B. Amendment 3, issued August 1, 2012 revised Exhibit 16, Past Performance Questionnaire. Amendment 4, issued August 8, 2012, changed page limitation for L.12(b)(1), deleted the last sentence in M.2.2, revised SOW to incorporate on call support 365 days a year 24 hours a day 7 days a week, revised SOW Section 5.4.2 – replacing reference to Attachment B with reference to Attachment C and revised the SOW elements in Section IV of the past performance questionnaire. Amendment 5, issued August 22, 2012, changed the due date of the proposal from August 27, 2012 to September 4, 2012, as well as revised RFP L.17(a) paragraph 7 and revised SOW Section 5.4.1(e) regarding video and audio on the web. Amendment 6, issued August 27, 2012, incorporated Clause I.17 Providing Accelerated Payment to Small Business Subcontractors; revised Section L.12(a)(2); revised L.16(2)(a) paragraph 2; Attachment B is revised to reflect CY as Calendar Year; and revised the significant sub percentage to Exhibits 2 Rep Task Order 1 and Rep Task Order 2. Amendment 7, issued September 4, 2012 changed the due date of the proposal from September 4, 2012 to September 6, 2012. Amendment 8, issued May 2, 2013, revised RTO2 and deleted Exhibit 8 - Travel by RTO - RTO #2, this amendment had a due date of May 9, 2013.

Evaluation Procedures

The evaluation was conducted in accordance with FAR 15.3, "Source Selection," and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.3, "Source Selection," and the NASA Multimedia Division Television and Web Support Services RFP evaluation criteria. The RFP provided that the factors used for evaluation of the proposals are Mission Suitability, Cost, and Past Performance. Section M.2.3 of the RFP specified the relative order of importance of the evaluation factors:

"The Cost/Price Factor is significantly less important than the combined importance of the Mission Suitability Factor and the Past Performance Factor. As individual factors, the Cost/Price Factor is approximately equal to the Mission Suitability Factor which is approximately equal to the Past Performance Factor."

Mission Suitability Factor

The team conducted an independent Mission Suitability evaluation of each proposal in accordance with the criteria set forth in the solicitation. The evaluation team evaluated the final proposals and met as a group to discuss the findings. The evaluation team came to a consensus on its findings. The proposals were evaluated by classifying the proposal findings in each subfactor as "Strengths", "Weaknesses", "Significant Strengths", "Significant Weaknesses", or "Deficiencies" per the definitions in the RFP, Section M.3. After determining the findings for each evaluation subfactor, the team determined an overall adjectival rating for the Mission Suitability factor by applying the adjectives to the consensus findings for Mission Suitability. For the Mission Suitability Factor, adjective Ratings of "Excellent", "Very Good", "Good", "Fair", or "Poor" were assigned.

Cost Evaluation Factor

The proposed costs were assessed to determine reasonableness and cost realism in accordance with the RFP, Section L.16 and Section M.4. The evaluation was conducted in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(1) and NFS 1815.305(a)(1)(B). Both the "proposed and probable cost" reflects the offeror's proposed fee amount. The proposed fee amount was not adjusted in any probable cost assessments.

For cost, a significant subcontractor is defined as any subcontract that is expected to exceed 25% of a proposed Representative Task Order (RTO) estimate.

The cost was not numerically or adjectivally scored.

Past Performance Evaluation Factor

Past performance was evaluated based on FAR Part 15 and the evaluation criteria in the RFP, Section M.5. All past performance references needed to meet the "recent" and minimum average annual cost/fee expenditures criteria for both prime contractor references and significant subcontractor references in order to be evaluated. A "recent" Contract is a Contract that is ongoing or completed less than 3 years prior to issuance of the RFP. For a prime Contractor's Contract reference(s) to be considered at least minimally "relevant", it needed to meet/exceed an average annual cost/fee incurred of at least $300,000. For a significant subcontractor's Contract reference(s) to be considered at least minimally "relevant", it needed to meet/exceed an average annual cost of at least 10% of that portion of this procurement that the subcontractor is proposed (or estimated) to perform.

Past contracts were evaluated in terms of relevancy and the contractor's performance. The degree of relevance (ie. Very Highly Relevant, Highly Relevant, Relevant, or Minimally Relevant) was based on size, content and/or complexity. Content and/or complexity were more important than size in the evaluation of relevance. The performance evaluation (ie. Very High Performance, High Performance, Moderate Performance, Low Performance, Very Low Performance) was based primarily on customer satisfaction and/or government performance databases. Offerors without a record of "recent" and "relevant" past performance, or for whom a record of past performance is unavailable, would have received a "Neutral" rating.

Past Performance was not numerically scored, but was assigned an overall adjectival Level of Confidence Rating of "Very High Level of Confidence", "High Level of Confidence", "Moderate Level of Confidence", "Low Level of Confidence", "Very Low Level of Confidence", or "Neutral" in accordance with the RFP, Section M.5. Each offeror's adjectival overall Level of Confidence rating included both the "relevance" component and the "performance" component of each of the past contracts considered. The overall Level of Confidence was determined by the consensus of the evaluation team voting members and reflected a subjective evaluation of the information contained in the offeror's past performance written narrative, customer questionnaires, and other references.

Competition Summary

On September 6, 2012, eight (8) timely proposals were received from the following companies: Dynetics, Innovative Technologies, Inc. (ITI), K-Mar Industries (KMAR), Media Fusion, Omnitec Solutions (Omnitec), Team People, Towne Group, Inc., and Xtreme Concepts Systems. The team performed an initial evaluation to determine if each offeror had provided all the information required by the

solicitation. As a result of this review, the proposal submitted by Xtreme Concepts Systems was determined to be unacceptable and therefore eliminated from the competition on February 14, 2013.

Findings and Evaluation

Mission Suitability Factor

The following summary chart provides the adjectival ratings for each offeror for the Mission Suitability Factor:

	Offeror						
	Dynetics	**ITI**	**KMAR**	**Media Fusion**	**Omnitec**	**Team People**	**Towne Group**
Mission Suitability	Poor	Excellent	Fair	Fair	Very Good	Poor	Fair

Mission Suitability Factor

The evaluation results for each Mission Suitability Subfactor for Dynetics, ITI, KMAR, Media Fusion, Omnitec, Team People and Towne Group are as follows:

Dynetics:

Overall rating for Mission Suitability is "Poor."

Subfactor A: Technical Approach, The Dynetics proposal received zero (0) significant strengths, one (1) strength, and zero (0) weaknesses, two (2) significant weaknesses, and zero (0) deficiencies.

Dynetics' Strength #1 in Subfactor A- The Dynetics proposal demonstrates a solid plan for conducting preventative and regularly scheduled maintenance for all government equipment associated with delivering television and web services from the NASA television facility.

Dynetics' Significant Weakness #1 in Subfactor A – The proposed approach of using Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) which may not be available, and without having first conducted a site survey, adds potential risk as the proposed GFE may not meet the requirements for producing this event.

Dynetics' Significant Weakness #2 in Subfactor A –The offeror's staffing approach for RTO2 in the area of graphics design is inadequate and appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. The impact of this is that NASA.gov or NASA Television content, or both, will not be available to the agency's primary target audience because of short-term priority conflict.

Subfactor B: Management Approach, The Dynetics proposal received zero (0) significant strengths, zero (0) strengths, one (1) weakness, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and zero (0) deficiencies.

Dynetics' Weakness #1 in Subfactor B - The Dynetics proposed Safety and Health Plan does not adequately discuss the approach to be used for emergency preparedness and contingency planning that addresses fire, explosion, inclement weather, environmental releases, etc.

ITI

Overall rating for Mission Suitability is "Excellent."

Subfactor A: Technical Approach, The ITI proposal received one (1) significant strength, zero (0) strengths, and zero (0) weaknesses, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and zero (0) deficiencies.

ITI's Significant Strength #1 in Subfactor A- The ITI proposal Quality Assurance Plan (QAP) provides a detailed and extensive description of their quality performance measures that demonstrates a strong approach for safe, effective and accountable operations. The offeror's quality assurance plan provides a detailed description of how employees will achieve maximum efficiency while providing audio and video services for NASA television and the web. The offeror lays out specific steps for evaluating and implementing standard operating procedures and other plans for continuous improvement. The offeror's approach toward quality assurance appreciably enhances the potential for successful management of this contract.

Subfactor B: Management Approach, The ITI proposal received one (1) significant strength, zero (0) strengths, zero (0) weaknesses, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and zero (0) deficiencies.

ITI's Significant Strength #1 in Subfactor B - The ITI proposal describes a detailed and comprehensive contingency plan that includes detailed actions, processes, and redundancies to effectively manage potential production delays as well as partial and catastrophic system failures that will help ensure reliable performance of the NASA Television multichannel distribution system. The offeror's approach appreciably enhances the potential for successful performance of the contract and provides additional value to the government.

KMAR

Overall rating for Mission Suitability is "Fair."

Subfactor A: Technical Approach, The KMAR proposal received one (1) significant strength, zero (0) strengths, and zero (0) weaknesses, one (1) significant weakness, and zero (0) deficiencies.

KMAR's Significant Strength #1 in Subfactor A- The KMAR proposal provides a strong approach to carrying out the requirements of RTO1 that includes a number of valuable pre- and post- production elements. This detailed and comprehensive plan significantly enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

KMAR's Significant Weakness #1 in Subfactor A - In their proposal, the offeror lists tasks they will undertake, without descriptions of their processes, or philosophy or conceptual ideas for improving the

home page or innovating for the future. The lack of specific information on plans and processes appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor B: Management Approach, The KMAR proposal received zero (0) significant strengths, zero (0) strengths, zero (0) weaknesses, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and zero (0) deficiencies.

Media Fusion

Overall rating for Mission Suitability is "Fair."

Subfactor A: Technical Approach, The Media Fusion proposal received zero (0) significant strengths, two (2) strengths, and zero (0) weaknesses, two (2) significant weaknesses, and zero (0) deficiencies.

Media Fusion's Strength #1 in Subfactor A- The Media Fusion proposal has an innovative approach in RTO2 to leveraging social media for maximum exposure, use and audience reach relevant to the critical elements in Sections 3.2, 5.9 and RTO 2.

Media Fusion's Strength #2 in Subfactor A- The Media Fusion proposal to add a new technical capability will help develop new audiences and will be beneficial to future archiving and extending the life and usefulness of NASA's extensive library of historical and ongoing products.

Media Fusion's Significant Weakness #1 in Subfactor A – The Media Fusion proposal failed to provide a cohesive plan of how they would complete the requirements of RTO1. They fail to explain an approach for covering the event with timelines, milestones and/or deliverables. The offeror's approach does not provide a plan that marries the creative and technical elements into a production that supports NASA's communications mission and appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Media Fusion's Significant Weakness #2 in Subfactor A – The Media Fusion proposal's personnel approach relies too heavily on staffing from its corporate offices instead of having employees onsite who would build specialized skills and institutional knowledge and maintain the continuity required for sustained successful television production. This approach appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor B: Management Approach, The Media Fusion proposal received zero (0) significant strengths, one (1) strength, zero (0) weaknesses, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and zero (0) deficiencies.

Media Fusion's Strength #1 in Subfactor B - The Media Fusion proposal approach thoroughly describes the methods or techniques to be used to systematically identify hazards within the workplace. The offeror's Safety and Health Plan identifies the methods they will use to assure that the investigations and reporting of mishaps including corrective actions will be implemented to prevent reoccurrence.

Omnitec

Overall rating for Mission Suitability is "Very Good."

Subfactor A: Technical Approach, The Omnitec proposal received one (1) significant strength, zero (0) strengths, and one (1) weakness, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and zero (0) deficiencies.

Omnitec's Significant Strength #1 in Subfactor A- The Omnitec proposal provides a strong approach to the critical element of SOW Section 3.2 of design and technical management of NASA.gov. The offeror demonstrates a depth of knowledge, expertise and ideas to effectively manage the web page and innovate for its continued dynamic evolution, which appreciably enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Omnitec's Weakness #1 in Subfactor A - Omnitec's staffing approach to RTO 1 is inefficient, would leave NASA Headquarters under staffed, and increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor B: Management Approach, The Omnitec proposal received zero (0) significant strengths, zero (0) strengths, zero (0) weakness, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and zero (0) deficiencies.

Team People

Overall rating for Mission Suitability is "Poor."

Subfactor A: Technical Approach, The Team People proposal received zero (0) significant strengths, zero (0) strengths, and zero (0) weaknesses, one (1) significant weakness, and one (1) deficiency.

Team People's Significant Weakness #1 in Subfactor A- The Team People proposal response to RTO 2 lacks details of how they would carry out the required tasks and simply repeats the RTO requirements without adding information on how they will perform the work. This response does not demonstrate the offeror can perform the required tasks, and appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Team People's Deficiency #1 in Subfactor A – The Team People proposal did not provide an approach for the functions associated with the design and technical services elements of NASA's home page critical element. Of the functions described in the statement of work, the offeror only acknowledges a few generically and failed to address several significant elements of SOW 3.2.9 and 5.9 in its technical proposal. The offeror's unresponsiveness on this wide range of fundamental requirements puts the government at great risk of not completing large aspects of its work and the material failure increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.

Subfactor B: Management Approach, The Team People proposal received zero (0) significant strengths, one (1) strength, one (1) weakness, one (1) significant weakness, and zero (0) deficiencies.

Team People's Strength #1 in Subfactor B - The Team People proposal approach thoroughly describes the methods or techniques to be used to systematically identify hazards within the workplace.

Team People's Weakness #1 in Subfactor B - The Team People proposal was for a 12 month period of performance that cannot fulfill the requirements. The RFP required a 24 month period of performance. The number of labor hours would not sufficiently cover the work that is needed.

Team People's Significant Weakness #1 in Subfactor B - The Team People proposal approach for staffing NASA Television fails to adequately staff the contract for sustained successful television operations. The proposed strategy does not provide the appropriate skill mix.

Towne Group

Overall rating for Mission Suitability is "Fair."

Subfactor A: Technical Approach, The Towne Group proposal received one (1) significant strength, zero (0) strength, and zero (0) weaknesses, one (1) significant weakness, and zero (0) deficiencies.

Towne Group's Significant Strength #1 in Subfactor A- The Towne Group proposal demonstrates deep knowledge of the operational needs of a complex website. They show their grasp of website needs, responsive design, and how they will reduce risks to the Government by thinking ahead and planning for a dynamic and evolving website. Their approach appreciably enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

Towne Group's Significant Weakness #1 in Subfactor A – The Towne Group proposal provides no detail on an overall plan, approach, or what they hope to achieve or how they will add creative value to the product. The approach to the coverage of this event limits value and usability, and misses an opportunity to inform and communicate NASA's work on robotics with the audience of this program. The offeror's approach to risk management of this RTO is also inadequate. The offeror's approach to accomplishing this representative task order appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Subfactor B: Management Approach, The Towne Group proposal received zero (0) significant strengths, zero (0) strengths, one (1) weakness, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and zero (0) deficiencies.

Towne Group's Weakness #1 in Subfactor B - The Safety and Health Plan does not adequately discuss the approach to be used for emergency preparedness and contingency planning that addresses fire, explosion, inclement weather, environmental releases, etc., for this contract.

Cost Factor

The following summarizes the proposal evaluation for the Cost Factor:

Dynetics

Dynetics had the 2nd lowest proposed cost and lowest probable cost of all offerors. The evaluation team made no cost adjustments to the Dynetics proposal. Dynetics offered the 3rd lowest phase-in price.

ITI

ITI had the 3rd highest proposed and probable cost of all offerors. The evaluation team made no cost adjustments to the ITI proposal. ITI offered the lowest phase-in price.

KMAR

KMAR had the 4th lowest proposed cost and the 3rd lowest probable cost of all offerors. The evaluation team made no cost adjustments to the KMAR proposal. KMAR offered the 5th lowest phase-in price.

Media Fusion

Media Fusion had the 3rd lowest proposed cost and the 2nd lowest probable cost of all offerors. The evaluation team made no cost adjustments to the Media Fusion proposal. Media Fusion offered the 2nd lowest phase-in price.

Omnitec

Omnitec had the highest proposed cost and the 2nd highest probable cost of all offerors. The evaluation team made downward probable cost adjustments to RTO1 and RTO2. The RFP required offerors to complete Attachment B "not to exceed" bid rates for pricing all RTOs. The offeror's proposal used the phase-in direct labor rates instead of the "not to exceed rates" proposed in their Attachment B submittal. Omnitec offered the highest phase-in price.

Team People

Team People had the lowest proposed cost and the 4th lowest probable cost of all offerors. The evaluation team made probable cost adjustments to RTO1 and RTO2. The downward probable cost adjustment made to RTO1 corrected a calculation error and added in unaccounted for travel expenses. The upward adjustment made to RTO2 corrected for a disparity in the offeror's proposed RTO2 period of performance versus the RTO requirements. Team People offered the 4th lowest phase-in price.

Towne Group

Towne Group had the 2nd highest proposed cost and the highest probable cost of all offerors. The evaluation team made no cost adjustments to the Towne Group proposal. Towne Group had the second highest phase-in price.

Past Performance Factor

The following table summarizes the Level of Confidence ratings for the Past Performance factor. One offeror received a "Very High", five offerors received a "High" and one offeror received a "Moderate" rating based on past performance contained in the offeror's and significant subcontractor's past performance written narrative, customer questionnaires, and other references.

Offeror	Past Performance (Level of Confidence)
Dynetics	High
ITI	High
KMAR	Moderate
Media Fusion	High
Omnitec	Very High
Team People	High
Towne Group	High

Source Selection Decision

I have reviewed the Evaluation Team's May 23, 2013 presentation and have carefully considered the detailed findings presented therein. In addition to reading the findings and supporting details, I solicited and considered the views of all of the attendees from the presentation, including key senior officials from NASA HQ and GSFC who have responsibility related to this acquisition.

In determining which proposal offered the best value to NASA, I referred to the relative order of importance of the three evaluation factors as specified in the RFP:

> "The Cost/Price Factor is significantly less important than the combined importance of the Mission Suitability Factor and the Past Performance Factor. As individual factors, the Cost/Price Factor is approximately equal to the Mission Suitability Factor which is approximately equal to the Past Performance Factor."

My selection was based on a comparative assessment of each proposal against the evaluation factors.

Overall, I determined the findings presented by the evaluation team, as documented in the presentation slides and the cost reports, to be reasonable and valid for purposes of making a selection decision. The evaluation presented by the team provided a clear understanding of the differences in the Mission Suitability, the Cost Evaluation, and the Past Performance factors between the proposals of all offerors.

Regarding the Mission Suitability factor, I reviewed the findings associated with all the Offerors and I agree with the SEB's assignment of Significant Strengths and Strengths based on the relative benefit and value of the various proposal features. The team's overall evaluation of proposals under the Mission Suitability factor resulted in ITI being the most highly rated proposal. ITI's "Excellent" rating was substantially higher than the Mission Suitability ratings of Dynetics, KMAR, Media Fusion, Team People and Towne Group, which all received either "Fair" or "Poor" ratings. I noted that ITI's Mission Suitability proposal was one rating level higher than Omnitec's "Very Good" Mission Suitability rating.

As I further examined the Mission Suitability subfactors (A: Technical Approach and B: Management Approach), I concluded the ITI proposal clearly distinguished itself. It was the only offeror to receive an "Excellent" adjectival rating and to receive 2 significant strengths with no weaknesses, significant weaknesses or deficiencies. Under Technical Approach, ITI received a significant strength for demonstrating an exceptional and detailed understanding of all of the areas of the Statement of Work through its Quality Assurance Plan (QAP). The QAP demonstrated a strong approach for safe and effective operations that included detailed mechanisms for holding employees accountable for quality assurance and specific procedures to achieve continuous improvement in operations.

Under Management Approach, ITI received a second significant strength for a detailed and comprehensive contingency plan that includes detailed actions, processes, and redundancies to effectively manage potential production delays as well as partial and catastrophic system failures. The plan included processes that will help ensure reliable performance of the NASA Television multichannel distribution system, as well specific, detailed procedures that demonstrated that ITI can properly manage the contract's 24/7 on-air requirements.

Within Mission Suitability, Omnitec was the only other offeror within one rating level of ITI. I carefully considered and compared Omnitec's Mission Suitability findings with ITI's. Omnitec received its significant strength for a strong approach to critical SOW element 3.2, which is design and technical services for NASA.gov. Omnitec demonstrated a depth of knowledge, expertise, and ideas for NASA's web site. Omnitec's approach included a thorough approach to social media, core web site technology, and anticipating future needs. Omnitec also received one weakness under subfactor A for an approach to RTO #1 that overstaffed the event thereby leaving the NASA Headquarters understaffed and increasing the risk of unsuccessful performance.

Overall, I concluded that ITI was clearly superior to Omnitec under Mission Suitability. ITI distinguished itself from Omnitec under both subfactors. Under Subfactor A, ITI received one significant strength as compared to Omnitec's one significant strength and one weakness. Whereas both offerors received Subfactor A significant strengths which both greatly enhance the potential for successful contract performance (i.e., ITI's strong Quality Assurance Plan and Omnitec's strong technical approach to NASA.gov), ITI distinguished itself from Omnitec because of Omnitec's weakness for a staffing approach for RTO #1 versus ITI's no finding in this area. Under Subfactor B, ITI again distinguished itself from Omnitec by receiving one significant strength for its contingency plan to ensuring the reliable performance of NASA Television in contrast to Omnitec's zero findings.

Under the Cost factor, Dynetics offered the lowest probable cost by a substantial amount. Media Fusion, KMAR, and Team People were second, third, and fourth lowest, respectively. ITI had the fifth lowest (or third highest) proposed cost which was higher than Team People's by a significant margin. Omnitec was 2nd highest with a probable cost higher than ITI's by a significant margin. Finally, Towne Group was the highest offer with a proposed and probable cost that was higher than Omnitec's probable cost by a significant margin.

Of the only two offers that were competitive under Technical Approach (i.e., ITI and Omnitec), ITI offered the lower proposed and probable cost. Again, the probable cost margin between these two offerors is significant.

Under the Past Performance factor, Omnitec was rated "Very High". ITI, Dynetics, Media Fusion, Team People and Towne Group were rated "High." KMAR was rated "Moderate". Thus I concluded that Omnitec distinguished itself in this factor, with a past performance rating at least one level higher than all the other offerors (and one level higher than ITI).

In summary, ITI was the only offeror to receive an "Excellent" adjectival rating for Mission Suitability. In contrast, the Dynetics ("Poor"), KMAR ("Fair"), Media Fusion ("Fair"), Team People ("Poor") and Towne Group ("Fair") proposals each received one or more Significant Weaknesses (with Team People also receiving a deficiency) under Mission Suitability. Therefore, I did not consider these proposals to be competitive with ITI's and Omnitec's ("Very Good") Mission Suitability proposals.

While Dynetics, Media Fusion, KMAR, and Team People each offered substantially lower probable costs, I concluded that ITI's clear and significant margin of superiority under the Mission Suitability factor far outweighed the cost savings offered by all of these proposals in terms of value to the Government. Specifically, I find that ITI's strong quality assurance program which will help ensure safe, effective, and accountable media operations, and its contingency planning processes to ensure reliable performance of the NASA Television multi-channel distribution system are worth more to NASA in term of greatly enhanced potential for the successful performance of NASA media services than each of the significantly lesser rated Mission Suitability proposals and lower probable costs offered by Dynetics, Media Fusion, KMAR and Team People.

Finally, Dynetics, Media Fusion, KMAR, and Team People did not have an advantage over ITI or Omnitec in the Past Performance factor that could serve to distinguish their proposals. Therefore, I removed Dynetics, Media Fusion, KMAR, and Team People from further consideration.

Towne Group offered a substantially higher cost than ITI, and a much lower rated Mission Suitability proposal, and the same ("High") past performance rating as ITI. As it failed to distinguish itself under any of the subfactors, I also removed it from further consideration.

With only ITI and Omnitec remaining under consideration, I found that ITI's Mission Suitability proposal offered a clear technical and management advantage over Omnitec's proposal. Furthermore, the ITI proposal had an approximately 20% lower probable than Omnitec, and received a "High" Past Performance Level of Confidence as compared to Omnitec's "Very High" past performance rating. Taking into consideration all three approximately equally weighted evaluation factors, I find that ITI's superiority in Mission Suitability over Omnitec and significantly lower cost than Omnitec, more than outweigh Omnitec's one-level of confidence advantage in Past Performance. Based on the above, I conclude ITI's proposal offers the "best value" to the Government as it provides the only "Excellent" Mission Suitability, a "High" past performance rating, and a significant cost advantage over the only other technically competitive offer.

Based on the above, I select Innovative Technologies Incorporated, (ITI) for award of the NASA HQ Multimedia Division Television and Web Support Services Contract.

Delia B. Robey 6/11/2013

Delia B. Robey Date
Associate Chief for the Office of Headquarters Procurement