

**Source Selection Statement  
for the  
Integrated Mission Operations Contract II (IMOC II)  
National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA)  
Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center (JSC)  
Solicitation Number NNJ13ZBR004R**

On June 27, 2014, I, along with other key officials of NASA-JSC, met with the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed to evaluate proposals submitted in response to the IMOC II solicitation. I made my selection decision at this meeting.

**PROCUREMENT HISTORY**

The Integrated Mission Operations Contract II (IMOC II) provides support and products for spaceflight operations capability development and execution for the Johnson Space Center (JSC) Mission Operations Directorate (MOD), the International Space Station Program (ISSP), including the Avionics and Software Office (OD), and the JSC Flight Crew Operations Directorate (FCOD). This includes support to mission preparation (Plan), crew, flight controller, instructor, and analyst training (Train), and real-time mission execution (Fly) activities related to exploration operations and the International Space Station operations. Operations capability development support is required from the contractor as NASA defines operations requirements associated with the emerging options for the exploration initiatives and potential new programs, including but not limited to the Multi-Purpose Crew Vehicle Program, the Space Launch Systems Program, the Lunar Precursor Robotic Program, the Human Research Program, the Exploration Technology Program, the Commercial Crew and Cargo Programs, and advanced technology and research.

IMOC II is the follow-on contract to IMOC and is a single award Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Cost-Plus-Award-Fee (CPAF) contract. The maximum contract value of IMOC II is \$1.31 billion for a nine (9)-year ordering period consisting of a five (5)-year base period (October 1, 2014 to September 30, 2019) with two, two (2)-year options (October 1, 2019 to September 30, 2021 and October 1, 2021 to September 30, 2023). There is also a 61 day firm-fixed-price phase-in period prior to contract start from August 1, 2014 to September 30, 2014.

On July 26, 2013, the Contracting Officer (CO) released the draft IMOC II Request for Proposal (RFP). The final RFP was released on September 25, 2013. The procurement was conducted as a full and open competition in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 15, *Contracting by Negotiation*. The entire proposal was originally due by November 12, 2013 but the due date for receipt of proposals was later extended to December 18, 2013. Timely submitted proposals were received from the following companies (listed in alphabetical order):

Barrios Technology, Ltd.  
16441 Space Center Boulevard, Suite B-100  
Houston, Texas 77058

The Boeing Company  
13100 Space Center Blvd  
Houston, Texas 77059

ERC, Inc.  
308 Voyager Way, Suite 200  
Huntsville, Alabama 35806

SGT, Inc.  
7701 Greenbelt Road, Suite 400  
Greenbelt, MD 20770

## EVALUATION PROCEDURES

As provided in provision M.3, *Evaluation Factors For Award*, of the IMOC II RFP:

The Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible Offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government. This procurement shall be conducted utilizing a combination of mission suitability, past performance and cost/price evaluation factors. The lowest price proposals may not necessarily receive an award; likewise, the highest technically rated proposals may not necessarily receive an award.

Of the three evaluation factors, mission suitability and past performance when combined are significantly more important than cost. Mission suitability is more important than past performance. Past performance is more important than cost.

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposal using the factors and sub-factors shown below.

In accordance with provision M.5, *Mission Suitability Factor*, each proposal received a mission suitability score based on the following sub-factors and associated numerical weights.

<b>Mission Suitability Sub-Factors</b>	<b>Points</b>
Management and Staffing Approach	500
Technical Approach	400
Small Business Participation	100 *
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1000</b>

\* Small Business offerors receive full 100 points

In accordance with section M.6, *Past Performance Factor*, each Offeror was assigned a level of confidence rating. The past performance evaluation assessed the Offeror's ability to fulfill the solicitation requirements with emphasis on the technical and management areas in Section L. 24.4 Volume II-Past Performance for the contract. The past performance evaluation considered each Offeror's demonstrated record of performance in supplying the requirements of this solicitation that met the user's needs. The Offerors' past performance records were examined for recent and relevant past performance to determine their ability to perform the required work. In accordance with the RFP, the SEB considered information submitted by the Offerors, information obtained by the SEB team based on communications with listed references, as well as data independently obtained from other government and commercial sources.

Past Performance was evaluated for each offeror using the following levels of confidence ratings: Very High Level of Confidence, High Level of Confidence, Moderate Level of Confidence, Low Level of Confidence, Very Low Level of Confidence, and Neutral.

For the Cost/Price evaluation, the Government performed price analysis and cost analysis, to include a cost realism analysis in accordance with FAR 15.305, *Proposal Evaluation*, FAR 15.404, *Proposal Analysis*, and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.305, *Proposal Evaluation*, in order to ensure that the final agreed to prices are fair and reasonable. As part of the cost realism analysis, the Government assessed the Offeror's proposed direct labor rates and resources (labor and non-labor) and developed a probable cost estimate for the five Task Orders (TO DA-1, TO DI-1, TO DM-1, TO DO-1, and TO-DX-1). This evaluation of the cost factors resulted in a probable cost which may differ from the proposed cost and reflects the Government's best estimate of the cost of any contract that is most likely to result from the Offeror's proposal.

## **EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS**

### ***Evaluation of Initial Proposals***

All four proposals were determined to be acceptable and were evaluated in accordance with FAR Part 15 and NFS Part 1815 as well as the criteria stated in the RFP. The results of the initial evaluation were presented to the Source Selection Authority (SSA) at a Competitive Range meeting on April 8, 2014. The results from the Competitive Range meeting are summarized below.

#### **Barrios**

**Under the Mission Suitability factor**, Barrios received a total point score of 720 out of 1000 points. Barrios received one (1) significant strength, six (6) strengths, one (1) significant weakness, and seven (7) weaknesses.

**Under the Management and Staffing Approach subfactor**, Barrios received an adjectival rating of "Very Good." Barrios received one (1) significant strength, five (5) strengths, one (1) significant weakness, and four (4) weaknesses.

**Under the Technical Approach subfactor**, Barrios received an adjectival rating of "Good." Barrios received zero (0) significant strengths, one (1) strength, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and three (3) weaknesses.

**Under the Small Business Utilization subfactor**, Barrios received an adjectival rating of "Excellent." Barrios received no findings and had full credit for this subfactor since they are a small business.

**Under the Past Performance factor**, Barrios and its teammate's contracts provided relevant and recent past performance which is very highly pertinent to the IMOC II contract. Barrios received a confidence rating of "Very High."

**Under the Cost/Price factor**, adjustments to the proposed cost were made for skill mix and resources related to weaknesses identified under the management and technical approach for the task orders. Furthermore, adjustments were made for incumbent labor rates, non-labor resources and other premium pay.

## Boeing

**Under the Mission Suitability factor,** Boeing received a total point score of 513 out of 1000 points. Boeing received zero (0) significant strengths, eight (8) strengths, three (3) significant weaknesses, and eleven (11) weaknesses.

Under the Management and Staffing Approach subfactor, Boeing received an adjectival rating of "Fair." Boeing received zero (0) significant strengths, six (6) strengths, two (2) significant weaknesses, and seven (7) weaknesses.

Under the Technical Approach subfactor, Boeing received an adjectival rating of "Good." Boeing received zero (0) significant strengths, two (2) strengths, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and three (3) weaknesses.

Under the Small Business Utilization subfactor, Boeing received an adjectival rating of "Fair." Boeing received zero (0) significant strengths, zero (0) strengths, one (1) significant weakness, and one (1) weakness.

**Under the Past Performance factor,** Boeing and its teammate's contracts provided relevant and recent past performance which is very highly pertinent to the IMOC II contract. Boeing received a confidence rating of "Very High."

**Under the Cost/Price factor,** adjustments to the proposed cost were made for skill mix and resources related to weaknesses identified under the management and technical approach for the task orders. Furthermore, adjustments were made for incumbent labor rates and other premium pay.

## ERC

**Under the Mission Suitability factor,** ERC received a total point score of 372 out of 1000 points. ERC received one (1) significant strength, five (5) strengths, four (4) significant weaknesses, and twelve (12) weaknesses.

Under the Management and Staffing Approach subfactor, ERC received an adjectival rating of "Fair." ERC received one (1) significant strength, five (5) strengths, two (2) significant weaknesses, and nine (9) weaknesses.

Under the Technical Approach subfactor, ERC received an adjectival rating of "Poor." ERC received zero (0) significant strengths, zero (0) strengths, two (2) significant weaknesses, and three (3) weaknesses.

Under the Small Business Utilization subfactor, ERC received an adjectival rating of "Excellent." ERC received no findings and had full credit for this subfactor since they are a small business.

**Under the Past Performance factor,** ERC and its teammate's contracts provided relevant and recent past performance which is highly pertinent to the IMOC II contract. ERC received a confidence rating of "High."

**Under the Cost/Price factor,** adjustments to the proposed cost were made for skill mix and resources related to weaknesses identified under the management and technical approach for

the task orders. Furthermore, adjustments were made for incumbent labor rates and other premium pay, and to correct an error in the proposed fee dollar amount.

## SGT

**Under the Mission Suitability factor**, SGT received a total point score of 842 out of 1000 points. SGT received six (6) significant strengths, three (3) strengths, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and ten (10) weaknesses.

Under the Management and Staffing Approach subfactor, SGT received an adjectival rating of "Very Good." SGT received four (4) significant strengths, two (2) strengths, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and six (6) weaknesses.

Under the Technical Approach subfactor, SGT received an adjectival rating of "Very Good." SGT received one (1) significant strength, one (1) strength, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and three (3) weaknesses.

Under the Small Business Utilization subfactor, SGT received an adjectival rating of "Excellent." SGT received one (1) significant strength, zero (0) strengths, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and one (1) weakness.

**Under the Past Performance factor**, SGT and its teammate's contracts provided relevant and recent past performance which is very highly pertinent to the IMOC II contract. SGT received a confidence rating of "Very High."

**Under the Cost/Price factor**, adjustments to the proposed cost were made for skill mix and resources related to weaknesses identified under the management and technical approach for the task orders. Furthermore, adjustments were made for incumbent labor rates, offsite facility costs, non-labor resources and other premium pay.

### *Competitive Range Determination*

Based on the findings from the SEB, it was determined that award on the initial proposals was not appropriate, and a competitive range of the most highly rated proposals was established in accordance with the evaluation procedures described above. The most highly rated proposals are Barrios and SGT. On April 8, 2014, I concurred with the CO's determination and I authorized the Board to proceed with discussions leading to the submission of Final Proposal Revisions for the two Offerors.

### *Discussions and Evaluation of Final Proposal Revisions (FPR)*

Barrios and SGT were informed of their inclusion in the competitive range by letters dated April 11, 2014. Oral discussions were held separately with the offerors in the competitive range on May 2, 2014 and May 5, 2014. Discussions were closed on May 14, 2014. FPRs were timely received from both offerors on May 23, 2014.

## Barrios

**Under the Mission Suitability factor,** Barrios received a total point score of 793 out of 1000 points. The significant weakness was adequately resolved. Five (5) of the weaknesses were adequately resolved. However, two (2) weaknesses were not adequately addressed. Barrios received one (1) significant strength, six (6) strengths, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and two (2) weaknesses.

Under the Management and Staffing Approach subfactor, Barrios received an adjectival rating of “Very Good.” Barrios received one (1) significant strength, five (5) strengths, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and one (1) weakness. The SEB assessed Barrios a significant strength for excellent understanding of the recruiting, staffing, and retention of certified personnel requirements, and also outstanding methodologies by which to seek out individuals to hire. The SEB assessed a strength for Barrios’ thorough knowledge of MOD culture, complexities, and integration challenges, proposing an effective management team, and demonstrating commitment to Management and Administrative cost control. The SEB assessed a second strength for Barrios’ thorough understanding of MOD’s specialized training and certification processes. The SEB assessed a third strength for Barrios’ Total Compensation Plan which has many robust features that will likely be attractive to potential employees, contribute to higher employee retention, and reduce the likelihood of loss of skills. The SEB assessed a fourth strength for Barrios’ thorough and detailed Phase-In Plan and Schedule. The SEB assessed a fifth strength for Barrios’ very effective and complete safety program. Although Barrios addressed the majority of the issues identified in the initial proposal’s weakness, the SEB assessed that a weakness still remained due to total compensation plan inconsistencies and lack of clarity in one of the subcontractor’s proposals.

Under the Technical Approach subfactor, Barrios received an adjectival rating of “Good.” Barrios received zero (0) significant strengths, one (1) strength, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and one (1) weakness. The SEB assessed a strength for Barrios’ very good technical understanding of the technical task orders. The SEB assessed a weakness remaining in Barrios’ proposal which was not adequately resolved. The skill mix proposal is inconsistent with the proposed incumbent capture rate.

Under the Small Business Utilization subfactor, Barrios received an adjectival rating of “Excellent.” Barrios received no findings and had full credit for this subfactor since they are a small business.

**Under the Past Performance factor,** Barrios did not provide any updated past performance information. Therefore, the final evaluation is the same as the initial evaluation; Barrios and its teammate’s contracts provided relevant and recent past performance which is very highly pertinent to the IMOC II contract. Barrios received a confidence rating of “Very High.”

**Under the Cost/Price factor**, adjustments to the proposed cost were made for skill mix related to a weakness identified under the technical approach for the technical task orders. Furthermore, adjustments were made for incumbent labor rates, labor rate escalation and other premium pay.

### SGT

**Under the Mission Suitability factor**, SGT received a total point score of 918 out of 1000 points. Eight (8) of the weaknesses were adequately resolved. However, two (2) weaknesses were not adequately addressed. SGT received six (6) significant strengths, three (3) strengths, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and two (2) weaknesses.

Under the Management and Staffing Approach subfactor, SGT received an adjectival rating of "Excellent." SGT received four (4) significant strengths, two (2) strengths, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and one (1) weakness. The SEB assessed a significant strength for SGT's excellent in-depth understanding of the MOD culture and environment, proposing an outstanding senior leadership team, and demonstrating commitment to overall management and administrative cost control that incentivizes all subcontractors. The SEB assessed a second significant strength for SGT's outstanding understanding of MOD's specialized certification and operational concepts, and demonstrated understanding by strategically recognizing needs for critical skills and expertise that MOD will require in the future.

The SEB assessed a third significant strength for SGT's excellent understanding of the myriad of details and challenges associated with recruiting, staffing, and retaining certified personnel and outstanding methodologies by which to seek out individuals to hire. The SEB assessed a fourth significant strength for SGT's deep and comprehensive understanding of the inherent Phase-In challenges and requirements, outstanding and detailed illustration and narrative of the details required, and innovative proposals for employee capture. The SEB assessed a strength for SGT's total compensation benefits that will increase the likelihood of achieving incumbent employee capture and encouraging employee retention. The SEB assessed a second strength for SGT's effective and wide ranging Safety and Health approach. The SEB assessed SGT a weakness remaining in SGT's proposal which was not adequately resolved regarding total compensation plan inconsistencies between the team companies.

Under the Technical Approach subfactor, SGT received an adjectival rating of "Very Good." SGT received one (1) significant strength, one (1) strength, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and one (1) weakness. The SEB assessed a significant strength for SGT demonstrating a comprehensive understanding of the magnitude and complexity of the SOW requirements including the integration responsibilities and the integrated support services. The SEB assessed a strength for SGT demonstrating a detailed and highly developed understanding of the task order requirements. The SEB assessed a weakness remaining in SGT's proposal which was not adequately resolved. The skill mix proposed for technical task orders is inconsistent with the proposed incumbent capture rate.

Under the Small Business Utilization subfactor, SGT received an adjectival rating of “Excellent.” SGT received one (1) significant strength, zero (0) strengths, zero (0) significant weaknesses, and zero (0) weaknesses. The SEB assessed a significant strength for exceeding the recommended goals in each of the seven small business categories, exceeding the recommended Small Business goal, establishing binding teaming arrangements with each of their small business teammates, and demonstrating a strong commitment to their small business teammates by entering a Mentor Protégé Agreement with a proposed subcontractor.

**Under the Past Performance factor**, SGT did not provide any updated past performance information. Therefore, the final evaluation is the same as the initial evaluation; SGT and its teammate’s contracts provided relevant and recent past performance which is very highly pertinent to the IMOC II contract. SGT received a confidence rating of “Very High.”

**Under the Cost/Price factor**, adjustments to the proposed cost were made for skill mix related to a weakness identified under the technical approach for the technical task orders. Furthermore, adjustments were made for incumbent labor rates and other premium pay.

### ASSESSMENT

My decision is based on selecting the proposal offering the best overall value to the Government in accordance with the RFP’s stated criteria for award. I reviewed the SEB evaluation and I fully considered the findings the SEB presented to me. I posed a variety of questions, solicited the views of the SEB members and my advisers, expressed my own views, dispositioned all other questions, and then made the selection. I commended the SEB on their comprehensive and detailed evaluation of the two very strong proposals remaining in the competitive range. The selection of either proposal promised a high likelihood of successful contract performance. I made a comparative assessment of the two proposals based on the evaluation factors in the solicitation – mission suitability, past performance, and cost/price. In comparing the two proposals consistent with the RFP, I considered mission suitability and past performance when combined, to be significantly more important than cost; mission suitability more important than past performance; and past performance more important than cost. I considered the factors, and found true discriminators between proposals, particularly in the area of mission suitability.

I offer the following rationale to support my selection.

#### *Mission Suitability*

After reviewing the assessments of the two proposals with regard to Mission Suitability, I specifically noted that SGT received an “Excellent” (475) for its Management and Staffing Approach and a “Very Good” (344) for its Technical Approach, while Barrios received a “Very Good” (425) for its Management Approach, and “Good” (268) for its Technical Approach. The SEB’s adjectival results signaled to me that there might be a qualitative advantage to SGT in the Management and Staffing Approach and Technical Approach subfactors. There was no indication as to any advantage with either proposal regarding small business participation as both offerors were assessed an “Excellent” adjectival rating, with comparable scores (Barrios 100 and

SGT 99). I then noted the Significant Strengths, Strengths and Weaknesses assessed by the SEB. I did not take exception to the SEB assessment, except that I did note that I would have given SGT a score of 100 based on the significant strength assessed in the Small Business subfactor. While I considered all of the findings, as documented earlier in this decision memorandum, I will only address in depth those which I determined to be discriminators in my analysis in making my decision.

### *Mission Suitability - Management and Staffing Approach*

In comparing the relative value of the mission suitability findings for the Barrios and SGT proposals, I started with the management and staffing approach, and first considered the significant strengths. I noted that Barrios received one (1) significant strength and SGT received four (4) significant strengths for their respective management and staffing approaches.

I noted that both offerors received a significant strength in their staffing, recruitment, and retention approaches, and I agreed with the SEB's assessment in this area. Both Barrios and SGT proposed an excellent approach to meet the requirement to hire and retain the people with the right critical skills in support of mission operations in MOD.

I then noted the additional significant strengths received by SGT. SGT received significant strengths for its management approach, training and certification, and phase-in. The SEB explained that SGT went above and beyond the RFP requirements in its management approach due to SGT's outstanding proposed senior management team and innovative approaches to ensuring cost control. SGT proposed outstanding senior leadership team members, specifically, the Program Manager (over 25 years of comprehensive MOD experience), Deputy Program Manager (29 year of MOD government experience), and Business and Technical Integration Manager (25 years of MOD experience and in depth knowledge of the products, processes, and services required for this particular position on the leadership team), who are highly qualified and have extensive experience and expertise with NASA and MOD. I recognized that there was great value in having a leadership team composed of these individuals and each person was especially suited for the position for which they were proposed. Additionally, SGT proposed an innovative approach to incentivizing the senior leadership and subcontractors to control cost. It was notable that this approach was applicable across all subcontractors. In my mind, the proposed approach to cost control was realistic and results in a greater likelihood for successfully controlling cost during contract performance.

SGT also has an advantage in its training and certification processes, as SGT's proposal significantly demonstrates that training and certification of the IMOC II workforce is one of their highest priorities. Specifically, SGT demonstrates a perceptive understanding of not just the current needs of the MOD organization, but cognizance of future challenges by strategically recognizing the Government's needs for maintenance or development of critical skills, systems and vehicle expertise, training facility expertise, and training development and conduct expertise that would be requisite to support future programs with the appropriate lead time to ensure the skills are in place for successful mission conduct. I recognized value in the proposed approach as it demonstrates that SGT is strategically thinking about how the critical skills for IMOC II can be available for exploration.

I also noted that SGT has a substantial advantage in its phase-in approach. SGT demonstrates commitment to vigorously pursue and capture the incumbent workforce through use of multiple innovative proposals to maximize achieving its proposed capture rate. SGT proposes innovative methods to get early commitment of incumbent employees and achieving its proposed rate of capture of critical skilled incumbents at no cost to the Government. Additionally, SGT has proposed an aggressive phase-in schedule which has sufficient flexibility to complete phase-in despite potential schedule challenges. The proposed approach gave me great confidence in the likelihood of a seamless transition and start to IMOC II.

After reviewing the significant strengths, I moved on to analyze the strengths. I noted that Barrios received five (5) strengths and SGT received two (2) strengths in their respective management and staffing approaches. I took particular note of those in areas where SGT was assessed a significant strength and Barrios was assessed a strength in the management and staffing approach, namely, management approach, training and certifications, and phase-in. I questioned the SEB about their rationale for assessing the strength in those three findings.

Barrios was assessed a strength in management approach. While Barrios demonstrates a thorough knowledge of MOD culture, complexities and integration challenges, roles of Civil Service and contractor technical personnel, proposes an effective management team, and demonstrates commitment to Management and Administrative cost control, their senior leadership team did not provide the same level of expertise, experience, communication and innovation skills. Additionally, the Barrios proposed Management and Administrative cost control was not considered as consistent or effective as that proposed by SGT and noted in the significant strength in management approach.

Barrios was assessed a strength for its approach to training and certification. While Barrios' proposal was strong in the area of training and certification, it was more procedural than strategic. Barrios' proposal demonstrated a thorough understanding of MOD's specialized training and certification processes, products, and structure required to support their personnel who require certification to function in their roles in MOD. Barrios provides a process for the development of training which includes identification of requirements and objectives to create training flows before the development of training materials is started. SGT, however, distinguished itself in its ability to provide an approach which strategically goes above and beyond what was asked for in the RFP.

Barrios was assessed a strength for its approach to phase-in. Barrios proposed a process to identify and place priority on capture of all incumbents with critical skills early in the contract transition process. While Barrios' proposal was strong in this area, SGT proposed innovative approaches which in my mind will likely provide the best chance of capturing the incumbents.

Although there were additional strengths and weaknesses (both offerors had one (1) weakness), after reviewing the presentation and questioning the SEB, I concluded that these strengths and weaknesses did not affect my qualitative comparative assessment in this subfactor.

Comparing the two management and staffing approaches as a whole, I place higher relative value on specific elements of SGT's proposal, as noted. I determined that SGT's management and staffing approach was qualitatively superior to Barrios' otherwise strong management and staffing approach.

#### *Mission Suitability - Technical Approach*

Next, I performed a comparative assessment of the technical approach subfactor. I noted that SGT was assessed one (1) significant strength, while Barrios did not receive any significant strengths in technical approach. SGT demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of the magnitude and complexity of the IMOC II Statement of Work requirements including the internal and external integration responsibilities.

Although each offeror had one (1) strength and one (1) weakness assessed for their technical approach, I did not note any discriminators in any of the strengths or weaknesses.

Comparing the two technical approaches as a whole, I place higher relative value on SGT's significant strength for its demonstrated understanding. I determined that SGT's technical approach was qualitatively superior to Barrios'.

#### *Mission Suitability - Small Business Approach*

Next, I performed a comparative assessment of the small business approach. There were no clear discriminators in the Small Business assessment, as both offerors received an "Excellent" rating in the area of small business. I concluded that there were no qualitative differences between the offerors.

#### *Past Performance*

In reviewing the SEB assessment of the two proposals with regard to Past Performance, I noted the SEB assessed a level of confidence rating of "Very High Level of Confidence" for Barrios and SGT. There were no real discriminators that led me to find a qualitative difference between the offerors in Past Performance.

#### *Cost/Price*

In reviewing the SEB assessment of Cost/Price, I noted that SGT's probable cost was slightly lower than Barrios' probable cost. Both offeror's proposed cost/price was completed in accordance with the RFP instructions. In accordance with Section M, to ensure that the final agreed-to prices are fair and reasonable, the SEB performed price analysis and cost analysis to include a cost realism analysis in accordance with FAR 15.305. After performing the cost realism analysis, the SEB made adjustments to the proposed cost of both offerors as noted earlier in this decision memorandum.

## FINAL DECISION

In making my decision, I found that there were material discriminators in Mission Suitability which gave SGT a considerable qualitative advantage over Barrios. Additionally, SGT has a slightly lower probable cost. Both offerors received a Very High Level of Confidence rating for Past Performance.

Of the three evaluation factors, mission suitability and past performance when combined are significantly more important than cost. Mission suitability is more important than past performance. Past performance is more important than cost.

In accordance with the RFP which states that the Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the Offeror whose proposal represents the best value, I find that SGT, Inc. is the best value, and select it for award of the IMOC II contract. My selection decision is based solely on, and is wholly consistent with, the selection criteria and evaluation framework, including the relative importance of the evaluation factors and sub-factors as explained in the solicitation and supported by the SEB findings that I identified as relevant and material to my decision.

Integrated Mission Operations Contract II

Source Selection Statement

Signature Page

Melanie Saunders

Melanie Saunders  
Source Selection Authority

7-8-14

Date