

**Source Selection Statement for the
Research Facilities & Engineering Support Services (RF&SS) Contract
National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA)
Neil A. Armstrong Flight Research Center (NASA-AFRC)**

On March 27, 2014, I, the Source Selection Authority (SSA), along with other key officials of the NASA-AFRC, met with the members of the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed to evaluate proposals in response to the RF&ESS solicitation NND12374119R. The RF&ESS solicitation anticipates awarding a Cost-Plus-Award-Fee (CPAF) contract. The solicitation, as revised during discussions, included a phase-in period from July 1-31, 2014; a base period of performance from August 1, 2014, through July 31, 2015; Option 1 from August 1, 2015, through July 31, 2016; Option 2 from August 1, 2016, through July 31, 2017; Option 3 from August 1, 2017, through July 31, 2018; and Option 4 from August 1, 2018, through July 31, 2019.

The RF&ESS contract provides support for three (3) primary areas of the Mission Information and Test Systems Directorate (Code M):

- The Dryden Aeronautical Test Range (DATR), formerly known as the Western Aeronautical Test Range (WATR), which supports and enables flight research operations and low earth-orbiting missions;
- The Research Aircraft Integration Facility (RAIF), which ensures high-fidelity flight simulations enhance the quality, quantity, and feasibility of research objectives; and
- The Consolidated Information Technology Center (CITC), which ensures that information technology (IT) services are designed, managed, and utilized to support NASA-AFRC , formerly known as NASA-Dryden Flight Research Center (DFRC), priorities.

Procurement History

In accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 5.2, “Synopsis of Proposed Contract Actions,” the RF&ESS effort was synopsised on the Federal Business Opportunities (FBO) website and was thereafter placed on the NASA Acquisition Internet Service (NAIS) business opportunities website on February 1, 2012. On February 15, 2012, NASA issued a Request for Proposals (RFP) as a total small business set-aside under North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Code 541712, Research and Development in the Physical, Engineering, and Life Sciences (except Aircraft), with a size standard of 1,500 employees.

Two (2) challenges were received by the Small Business Administration’s (SBA) Office of Hearing and Appeals (OHA) regarding NAICS Code 541712. The first challenge was received before formal issuance of the RFP. This challenge was found premature and subsequently dismissed. The second challenge, received after the RFP was issued, was considered timely and reviewed by the SBA OHA. Amendment 1 to the RFP was issued on May 31, 2012, staying the RFP pending outcome of the NAICS Code challenge. Amendment 2 to the RFP was issued on July 10, 2012, suspending the RFP proposal due

date. On July 10, 2012, the decision from the SBA OHA was received, ordering NASA to change the NAICS Code from 541712 to 541513, Computer Facilities Management.

On July 31, 2012, Amendment 3 to the RFP was issued changing the NAICS Code from 541712 to 541513. On November 15, 2012, an updated synopsis was posted on FBO and NAIS identifying the acquisition as a total small business set-aside under NAICS Code 541513, with a size standard of \$25.5 million dollars in average annual receipts over a three year period.

On December 6, 2012, a protest was filed with the Court of Federal Claims (CoFC) alleging the SBA OHA's decision was arbitrary and capricious. On December 10, 2012, Amendment 4 of the RFP was issued notifying offerors that a pre-award bid protest had been filed with the CoFC. On March 29, 2013, CoFC issued a decision denying the protest. On April 11, 2013, Amendment 5 of the RFP was issued, posting the CoFC's final decision.

On May 3, 2013, Amendment 6 of the RFP was issued. This amendment, issued under NAICS Code 541513, replaced the original RFP in its entirety and posted responses to questions received from the initial RFP issuance. On May 16, 2013, a Pre-proposal/Pre-Bid Conference was held. On June 7, 2013, Amendment 7 of the RFP was issued, extending the proposal due date to July 9, 2013. On June 12, 2013, Amendment 8 of the RFP was issued, posting responses to questions received and replacing the amended RFP in its entirety.

On June 28, 2013, Amendment 9 was issued, responding to a late question regarding the requirement of a Government Approved Purchasing System. On July 2, 2013, a protest was filed with the Government Accountability Office (GAO) regarding the requirement of a Government Approved Purchasing System, which was denied on September 17, 2013. The proposal due date remained July 9, 2013.

The RFP required that proposals be divided into three (3) volumes. The three volumes were: Volume I – Mission Suitability; Volume II – Cost; and Volume III – Experience and Past Performance. All volumes were due by July 9, 2013, at 12:00 PM PDT (noon). Four (4) offerors submitted timely proposals in response to the RFP: Aerospace Facilities Support, LLC (AFSL); InuTeq, LLC (InuTeq); New Directions Technologies, Inc. (NDTI); and Saalex Solutions, Inc. (Saalex).

After receipt of proposals on July 9, 2013, the SEB conducted an initial review of the proposals to determine acceptability in accordance with NASA FAR Supplement 1815.305-70, Identification of Unacceptable Proposals. Additionally, the SEB conducted a records check through the System for Award Management (SAM) to ensure all offerors had an active registration, there were no active exclusions, and the offeror's Representations and Certifications were complete and current. A record check was conducted to ensure offerors were compliant with Equal Employment Opportunities Compliance and VETS 100 Compliance.

Verification was made that all offerors were classified as small businesses under NAICS Code 541513, with a size standard of \$25.5M average annual receipts. A review of the information provided in each offeror's Ostensible Subcontracting Appendix was conducted to ensure that the Limitation of Subcontracting parameters were addressed.

A review was conducted to confirm that all proposals were in compliance with the page limitations as specified in the RFP. Excess pages were removed and returned to offerors prior to evaluation being performed.

RFP Section M, "Evaluation Factors for Award," Provision M.2, "Evaluation Approach" stated that, "The Government will select the best overall offer, based upon the three evaluation factors. Award will be made to the offeror who is deemed responsible in accordance with the FAR, and whose proposal (including responses to any Government-provided scenarios) conforms to the solicitation's requirements and is judged to represent the best value to the Government."

RFP Section M outlined three evaluation factors – Mission Suitability (Provision M.3.1), Cost (Provision M.3.2) and Experience and Past Performance (Provision M.3.3).

RFP Provision M.3.1 divided the Mission Suitability factor into four (4) subfactors used to assess the ability of each offeror to provide and administer the requirements of the Performance Work Statement (PWS). Each proposal received a Mission Suitability score based on a 1,000 point scale. The Mission Suitability subfactors were evaluated with the following maximum numerically weighted scores:

• Management Approach	500 points
• Technical Approach	300 points
• Safety and Health	100 points
• Phase-In and Phase-Out	<u>100 points</u>
Total Points Available	1,000 points

The above weights reflect the relative importance of each subfactor. The SEB evaluated and rated Mission Suitability subfactors using the following adjectival ratings identified in NASA FAR Supplement 1815.305(a)(3)(A): Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, and Poor.

The SEB evaluated and rated Experience and Past Performance using the following levels of confidence: Very High, High, Moderate, Low, Very Low, and Neutral. The SEB also considered the following data sources in its evaluation of each offeror's overall Experience and Past Performance:

- Narrative provided by the offeror in Volume III, Experience and Past Performance
- Government Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS)
- Completed Past Performance Questionnaires submitted by the offeror's customers on work similar to RF&ESS

The Experience and Past Performance evaluation was an assessment of confidence in the offeror's ability to perform the solicitation requirements based upon the offeror's and major subcontractor's relevant performance under previously awarded contracts. Current and relevant performance had greater impact in the assessment than less recent and less relevant performance. "Recent" was defined as contracts in which work was performed during the five (5) years preceding issuance of the amended solicitation on May 3, 2013. "Relevant" was defined as contracts having significant technical or cost similarity, association or other relationship with the effort and/or contract type described in this RFP. Additionally, for Experience and Past Performance, RFP Section M.3.3 defined major subcontractor as performing over 20% of the effort.

A cost realism analysis was conducted by the SEB in accordance with FAR 15.404-1(d), NFS 1815.305, and Section M.3.2 of the RFP to ensure that a fair and reasonable price is paid by the Government and to assess the reasonableness and realism of the proposed costs as aligned with the proposed Mission Suitability subfactor responses. For evaluation purposes, the cost realism analyses were based on a process of independently reviewing and evaluating specific elements of each offeror's proposed cost estimate to determine whether the estimated proposed cost elements are realistic for the work to be performed; reflect a clear understanding of the requirements; and are consistent with the unique methods of performance and materials described in the offeror's Mission Suitability proposal. The probable cost was determined by adjusting the offeror's proposed cost through a cost realism analysis; the proposed fee was not adjusted in accordance with Section M of the RFP. All contract year costs including options were totaled; probable cost adjustments were applied to arrive at a total probable cost of doing business with the offeror. In accordance with RFP Section M.3.2, proposed fees were evaluated for reasonableness and for the extent they will provide sufficient performance incentive. The status of the offeror's and major subcontractor's systems was included in the cost evaluation. Evidence of an approved accounting system at time of proposal submission was required. Additionally, for purposes of the Cost Volume, major subcontractors are defined as those subcontractors having a total contract value equal to, or greater than, \$5 million (at any tier) for the inclusive effort, or a total contract value equal to, or greater than, 20% of the prime's proposed total contract value. Minor subcontractors are defined as those subcontractors having a total contract value less than \$5 million for the inclusive effort, as defined in RFP Section L.16(C)(1)(i).

RFP Provision M.4, "Weighting and Scoring" provided:

Mission Suitability and Past Performance (when combined) are significantly more important than Cost. Of the three evaluation factors, Mission Suitability is more important than Cost and Past Performance, which are approximately equal in importance.

In accordance with FAR Part 15, "Contracting by Negotiation," NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Part 1815, the RFP, and the approved evaluation plan, the SEB evaluated each proposal on the basis of Mission Suitability, Experience and Past Performance, and Cost, with the objective of achieving the best value for the Government. The SEB presented the results of the initial evaluation to me on December 16, 2013. At that time, the

Contracting Officer recommended three proposals be considered within the competitive range: InuTeq, NDTI, and Saalex. AFSL was not among the most highly rated proposals and, therefore, was excluded from the competitive range.

I concurred with the Contracting Officer's recommendation and authorized the SEB to proceed with discussions leading to the submission of final proposal revisions (FPRs) with the three offerors in the competitive range.

Accordingly, the SEB invited and held written discussions with the three offerors included in the competitive range. The SEB gave each offeror the opportunity to correct, clarify, substantiate, or confirm the contents of its respective proposal and to submit the FPR, as well as a signed model contract reflecting the offeror's intent to be bound contractually. The SEB received the FPRs and signed model contracts from all three offerors by the due date of March 7, 2014.

After considering the results of the FPRs, the SEB presented their findings to me as the SSA on March 27, 2014. I have reviewed the detailed findings of the SEB and I agree with the SEB's findings and adopt them in their entirety.

Findings

Mission Suitability Evaluation

InuTeq, LLC

The SEB assigned InuTeq's proposal an overall Mission Suitability score of 840 out of a maximum 1,000 points for a corresponding adjectival rating of Very Good. InuTeq has two (2) significant strengths, twelve (12) strengths, no weaknesses, no significant weaknesses, and no deficiencies across the four (4) subfactors.

Management Approach

Under the Management Approach subfactor, InuTeq has an adjectival rating of Very Good. InuTeq has one significant strength, six (6) strengths, no weaknesses, no significant weaknesses, and no deficiencies.

InuTeq has a significant strength under the soundness of their organizational structure for its relationship to their parent company, Arctic Slope Regional Corporation (ASRC), and their proposed teaming arrangement with subcontractor Arcata Associates, Inc. The arrangement provides considerable availability of corporate resources, IT core competency expertise, staffing of support positions through InuTeq's corporate office, access to enterprise level recruiting tools and full-time recruiters, and a thorough understanding of the current RF&ESS environment.

InuTeq has six (6) strengths. The first strength is for the autonomy of the program manager to make decisions. This will enable rapid decision-making and responsiveness in

a dynamic environment. The second strength is for offeror's proposed metrics tracking and reporting system, providing the Government with visibility and situational awareness to effectively monitor contract performance. The third strength is for the proposed use of a Customer Satisfaction Improvement Plan (CSIP). This formal plan will provide proactive opportunities for service improvement and increase customer satisfaction. The fourth strength is for the proposed use of Operating Level Agreements (OLAs) in addition to Associate Contractor Agreements (ACAs), demonstrating a sound understanding of the nuances associated with working in a complex, multi-contract environment. The use of OLAs will clarify roles and responsibilities of the individual contracts, ensuring gaps are addressed without impacting services. The fifth strength is for InuTeq's corporate management procedures appraised as Capability Maturity Model Integration (CMMI) Level 3. The level of rigor for corporate management practices will ensure the contractor is consistently delivering quality services. The sixth strength is for the contractor's Government-Approved Purchasing System. In accordance with the RFP, this requirement is evaluated as a strength.

Technical Approach

Under the Technical Approach subfactor, InuTeq has an adjectival rating of Very Good. InuTeq has one significant strength, five (5) strengths, no weaknesses, no significant weaknesses, and no deficiencies.

InuTeq has a significant strength for their proposed comprehensive and flexible personnel resource plan. The offeror's proposal evidenced its capability to retain 99% of the incumbent's RF&ESS staff. The personnel resource plan demonstrated efficient personnel management, including a back-up staffing plan, succession planning, employee growth and development, and a formal cross-utilization plan by Work Breakdown Structure (WBS). The thorough and detailed personnel resource plan ensures continuity of high quality services, reduction of single points of failure, development of a more knowledgeable, skilled and motivated workforce, creates a highly collaborative and innovative work environment, improves response time to evolving mission support efforts, and provides maximum utilization of resource capacity.

InuTeq has five (5) strengths. The first strength is for their proposed sharing of 7.5% of their award fee, which will motivate and retain a high quality staff. The second strength is for the proposed innovative idea of installing High Definition (HD) cameras on the Radar pedestals. This proposed improvement will reduce the need for separate operations and maintenance personnel to provide another HD video source. The third strength is for the proposed innovative idea of upgrading one of the radar models. This upgrade will reduce maintenance costs and increase cost recovery opportunities. The fourth strength is for the proposed use of "wikis," a collaborative forum to stimulate innovations and ideas, enhance communication, and share information among personnel. The fifth strength is for the proposed innovative idea of providing X-band or Ku-band Satellite Communications (SATCOM) support for Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs), enhancing the Center's capability and marketability to attract new external projects and increase cost recovery opportunities.

Safety and Health

Under the Safety and Health subfactor, InuTeq has an adjectival rating of Good. InuTeq has no significant strengths, no strengths, no weaknesses, no significant weaknesses, and no deficiencies. The offeror's Safety and Health plan meets the Government's requirements.

Phase-In / Phase-Out

Under the Phase-In / Phase-Out subfactor, InuTeq has an adjectival rating of Good. InuTeq has no significant strengths, one strength, no weaknesses, no significant weaknesses, and no deficiencies.

InuTeq has one strength for its proven Phase-In approach, led by an experienced Phase-In team, ensuring a smooth transition with minimal disruption of current operations.

New Directions Technologies, Inc. (NDTI)

The SEB assigned NDTI's proposal an overall Mission Suitability score of 731 out of a maximum 1,000 points for a corresponding adjectival rating of Very Good. NDTI has one significant strength, eight (8) strengths, no weaknesses, no significant weaknesses, and no deficiencies across the four subfactors.

Management Approach

Under the Management Approach subfactor, NDTI has an adjectival rating of Good. NDTI has six (6) strengths, no significant strengths, no weaknesses, no significant weaknesses, and no deficiencies.

The first strength is for NDTI's strategic teaming partnership with subcontractor URS. URS is a partner on a multi-million dollar local range services and operations contract, located on Edwards Air Force Base. NDTI's teaming partner will provide tie-in to a very large, qualified and diverse company for surge and short term support, while also precluding the subcontractor from recruiting personnel from the RF&ESS contract. The second strength is for the autonomy of the program manager to make decisions. This will enable rapid decision-making and responsiveness in a dynamic environment. The third strength is for NDTI's proposed use of the Enterprise Solutions Platform Twenty-First Century (ESP21) tool. Use of this multi-disciplinary tool enables metrics tracking and reporting, providing the Government with visibility and situational awareness to effectively monitor contract performance. The fourth strength is for the proposed Key Personnel candidates. The complement will bring extensive knowledge and expertise to AFRC in all core areas of the RF&ESS PWS. The fifth strength is for the contractor's ISO 9001:2008 certification. In accordance with the RFP, this requirement is evaluated

as a strength. The sixth strength is for the contractor's Government-Approved Purchasing System. In accordance with the RFP, this requirement is evaluated as a strength.

Technical Approach

Under the Technical Approach subfactor, NDTI has an adjectival rating of Very Good. NDTI has one significant strength, one strength, no weaknesses, no significant weaknesses, and no deficiencies.

NDTI has a significant strength for their proposed sharing of up to 26% of their award fee, which will greatly contribute to motivation and retention of a high quality staff.

NDTI has one strength for its proposed plan for temporary staff augmentation, ensuring short-notice labor will be readily available to enable mission success.

Safety and Health

Under the Safety and Health subfactor, NDTI has an adjectival rating of Good. NDTI has no significant strengths, no strengths, no weaknesses, no significant weaknesses, and no deficiencies. The offeror's Safety and Health plan meets the Government's requirements.

Phase-In / Phase-Out

Under the Phase-In / Phase-Out subfactor, NDTI has an adjectival rating of Good. NDTI has no significant strengths, one strength, no weaknesses, no significant weaknesses, and no deficiencies.

NDTI has one strength for its proposed use of a two-team approach during Phase-In: a team for technical transition and one for business and personnel transition, ensuring a smooth transition with minimum disruption of current operations.

Saalex Solutions, Inc. (Saalex)

The SEB assigned Saalex's proposal an overall Mission Suitability score of 676 out of a maximum 1,000 points for a corresponding adjectival rating of Good. Saalex has no significant strengths, nine (9) strengths, no weaknesses, no significant weaknesses, and no deficiencies across the four subfactors.

Management Approach

Under the Management Approach subfactor, Saalex has an adjectival rating of Good. Saalex has no significant strengths, five (5) strengths, no weaknesses, no significant weaknesses, and no deficiencies.

The first strength is for the autonomy of the program manager to make decisions. This will enable rapid decision-making and responsiveness in a dynamic environment. The second strength is for the offeror's proposed use of web-based tools for metrics tracking and reporting, providing the Government with visibility and situational awareness to effectively monitor contract performance. The third strength is for the proposed Key Personnel candidates. The complement will bring extensive knowledge and expertise to AFRC in all core areas of the RF&ESS PWS. The fourth strength is for the contractor's ISO 9001:2008 certification. In accordance with the RFP, this requirement is evaluated as a strength. The fifth strength is for the contractor's Government-Approved Purchasing System. In accordance with the RFP, this requirement is evaluated as a strength.

Technical Approach

Under the Technical Approach subfactor, Saalex has an adjectival rating of Good. Saalex has no significant strengths, four (4) strengths, no weaknesses, no significant weaknesses, and no deficiencies.

The first strength is for its proposed plan for temporary staff augmentation, ensuring short-notice labor will be readily available to enable mission success. The second strength is for Saalex's proposed sharing of 5% of their award fee, which will motivate and retain a high quality staff. The third strength is for the proposed use of Saalex's certified climbing instructors to train and recertify employees, saving time and cost using this resource. The fourth strength is for the proposed use of \$25K annually for the creation of an emerging technologies initiative, focusing attention on improvement and innovation.

Safety and Health

Under the Safety and Health subfactor, Saalex has an adjectival rating of Good. Saalex has no significant strengths, no strengths, no weaknesses, no significant weaknesses, and no deficiencies. The offeror's Safety and Health plan meets the Government's requirements.

Phase-In / Phase-Out

Under the Phase-In / Phase-Out subfactor, Saalex has an adjectival rating of Good. Saalex has no significant strengths, no strengths, no weaknesses, no significant weaknesses, and no deficiencies. The offeror's Phase-In / Phase-Out plan meets the Government's requirements.

Experience and Past Performance Evaluation

InuTeq, LLC

The SEB assigned InuTeq's proposal a Past Performance Level of Confidence rating of Very High. InuTeq has one significant strength, two (2) strengths, no weaknesses, no significant weaknesses, and no deficiencies.

- 8 InuTeq has one significant strength under the Experience and Past Performance factor. InuTeq's major subcontractor, Arcata Associates, Inc., received very good to excellent ratings for contract performance in a \$210M Cost-Plus-Award-Fee contract with the NASA Dryden Flight Research Center. Additionally, Arcata received multiple awards from NASA and DFRC as Small Business Prime Contractor of the Year. The work under this contract is directly relevant to the entire RF&ESS PWS, providing routine service in all core areas.

InuTeq has two (2) strengths under the Experience and Past Performance factor. The first strength was for InuTeq's excellent ratings in contract performance of a \$39M Firm-Fixed-Price/Level-of-Effort contract with the Department of Labor, Office of Worker's Compensation Program. The work under this contract is directly relevant to the IT portion of the RF&ESS PWS. The second strength is for InuTeq's exceptional ratings in contract performance of a \$36M Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee contract with NASA Langley Research Center. As identified in the RFP, work performed under a similar contract type (cost-reimbursement) would be considered relevant in the Experience and Past Performance factor.

NDTI

The SEB assigned NDTI's proposal a Past Performance Level of Confidence rating of Moderate. NDTI has no significant strengths, four (4) strengths, no weaknesses, no significant weaknesses, and no deficiencies.

NDTI has four (4) strengths for this factor. The first strength is for NDTI's excellent ratings in contract performance for a \$25M Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee contract with the Naval Surface Warfare Center Port Hueneme. The work under this contract is directly relevant to the IT portion of the RF&ESS PWS. The second strength is for excellent ratings in contract performance for an \$8.4M Firm-Fixed-Price subcontract with TYBRIN Corporation at Naval Air Warfare Center Weapons Division. The work under this subcontract is directly relevant to the IT and Simulation portions of the RF&ESS PWS. The third strength is for major subcontractor INQU's excellent ratings in contract performance for a \$3M Time-and-Materials subcontract with Jacobs Technology at NASA Dryden Flight Research Center. The work under this subcontract is directly relevant to the IT portion of the RF&ESS PWS. The fourth strength is for major subcontractor INQU's excellent ratings in contract performance for a \$47M Firm-Fixed-Price, Award-Fee sharing subcontract with Jacobs Technology at the Air Force Test

Center. The work under this subcontract is directly relevant to the Range, IT, and Simulation portions of the RF&ESS PWS.

Saalex Solutions, Inc.

The SEB assigned Saalex's proposal a Past Performance Level of Confidence rating of Very High. Saalex has two (2) significant strengths, seven (7) strengths, no weaknesses, no significant weaknesses, and no deficiencies.

Saalex has two (2) significant strengths under the Experience and Past Performance factor. The first significant strength involves Saalex's major subcontractor, COLSA Corporation, receiving very good to excellent ratings for contract performance in a \$185M Cost-Plus-Incentive-Fee/Award-Fee contract with the NASA Marshall Space Flight Center (MSFC), Huntsville Operations Support Center. COLSA received MSFC's Small Business Prime Contractor of the Year. The work under this contract is directly relevant to the Range, Simulation and IT portions of the RF&ESS PWS.

The second significant strength involves Saalex's major subcontractor, COLSA Corporation, receiving exceptional ratings for contract performance in a \$239M Indefinite-Delivery/Indefinite-Quantity/Time-and-Materials contract with the Missile Defense Agency Advanced Research Center. The work under this contract is directly relevant to the Simulation and IT portions of the RF&ESS PWS.

Saalex has seven (7) strengths under the Experience and Past Performance Factor. The first strength is for Saalex receiving very good to exceptional ratings for contract performance in a \$1M Firm-Fixed-Price contract with Moody Air Force Base. The work under this contract is directly relevant to the Range portion of the RF&ESS PWS. The second strength is for Saalex receiving very good to exceptional ratings for contract performance in a \$2.3M Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee contract with the Naval Surface Warfare Center, Port Hueneme Division. As identified in the RFP, work performed under a similar contract type (cost-reimbursement) would be considered relevant in the Experience and Past Performance factor. The third strength is for Saalex's major subcontractor, COLSA Corporation, receiving very good to exceptional ratings for contract performance in a \$450M Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee contract with the Army Contracting Command. As identified in the RFP, work performed under a similar contract type (cost-reimbursement) and a cost similar value would be considered relevant in the Experience and Past Performance factor. The fourth strength is for Saalex's major subcontractor, COLSA Corporation, receiving exceptional ratings for contract performance in a \$240M Firm-Fixed-Price contract with the Air Force Air Armament Center. As identified in the RFP, work performed under a cost similar contract value would be considered relevant in the Experience and Past Performance factor. The fifth strength is for Saalex's major subcontractor, COLSA Corporation, receiving exceptional ratings for contract performance in a \$48M Cost-Plus-Award-Fee contract with NASA Marshall Space Flight Center. As identified in the RFP, work performed under a similar contract type (cost-reimbursement) would be considered relevant in the Experience and Past Performance factor. The sixth strength is for Saalex's major subcontractor, COLSA

Corporation, receiving exceptional ratings for contract performance in a \$35M Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee contract with Space and Naval Warfare Systems, Pacific. As identified in the RFP, work performed under a similar contract type (cost-reimbursement) would be considered relevant in the past performance factor. The seventh strength is for Saalex's major subcontractor, COLSA Corporation, receiving very good to exceptional ratings for contract performance in a \$19.8M Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee contract with Space and Naval Warfare Systems. As identified in the RFP, work performed under a similar contract type (cost-reimbursement) would be considered relevant in the Experience and Past Performance factor.

Cost Evaluation

The cost proposals were evaluated consistent with the evaluation criteria in RFP Provision M.3.2. Upon completion of the cost realism analysis, the SEB determined the Government's probable cost for each offeror was the proposed cost and presented these results to the SSA for consideration. Saalex's proposal was the lowest priced. InuTeq was the next lowest priced, slightly higher than Saalex. NDTI has the highest price of the three offerors, significantly higher than Saalex and InuTeq.

Selection Decision

Following the SEB presentation on March 27, 2014, I polled each SEB voting member to confirm that the process was consensus-based and that, indeed, each member concurred with the findings contained in the briefing. All members acknowledged full consensus. I thanked them for their respective time commitments and complimented them for their thorough, detailed, and rational findings.

I agree with each of the SEB's findings.

In making my selection decision, I first reviewed the relative importance of the three evaluation factors stated in the solicitation: Mission Suitability, Experience and Past Performance, and Cost. Mission Suitability and Experience and Past Performance, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost. Mission Suitability is more important than Cost and Past Performance. Cost and Past Performance are approximately equal in importance.

Mission Suitability consisted of four subfactors, with a relative ranking of importance and point value as follows:

- Management Approach - 500 points
- Technical Approach - 300 points
- Safety and Health - 100 points
- Phase-In / Phase-Out - 100 points

A total of 1,000 points was available for the Mission Suitability factor.

Under the Mission Suitability factor, I found the overall Mission Suitability scores are representative of the offerors' Mission Suitability proposals. Of the three offerors, InuTeq has a significantly higher rating (840 points) than the other two offerors, NDTI (731 points) and Saalex (676 points). I concurred with the score assigned to each offeror.

As evidenced by the weighting of the Mission Suitability subfactors, Management Approach was the most important subfactor. InuTeq was the only offeror of the three to have a significant strength in this subfactor and an adjectival rating of Very Good. InuTeq's significant strength consisted of substantial corporate backing in terms of financial, personnel, and federal contracting insight. InuTeq's parent corporation, ASRC Federal, utilizes a shared services approach for multiple administrative functions, such as human resources, finance, logistics, quality assurance, facilities, safety, and security, from which the offeror can leverage contract support to provide efficiencies and savings to AFRC. InuTeq's solid corporate support, coupled with a subcontractor that provides a thorough understanding of the current and dynamic RF&ESS environment, presents a synergistic teaming arrangement, which will greatly enhance the potential for successful contract performance. I did obtain an explanation from the SEB of the unique attributes of an Alaskan Native Corporation subsidiary prior to concurring with this SEB finding.

All offerors made an important commitment to the success of the contract by stating the local leadership team will have autonomy to run their respective operations with minimal corporate involvement. In addition, each offeror proposed an effective use of tracking and reporting metrics.

InuTeq's approach to Associate Contractor agreements contained another distinguishing attribute. The offeror proposed using Operating Level Agreements (OLAs) for the IT Infrastructure Integration Program (I3P) contracts to further define integration requirements and deliverable assignments. I3P is NASA's IT Infrastructure Integration Program, which transformed NASA's IT infrastructure services to an enterprise-based management and provisioning model. The scope of I3P is the consolidation and central management of many of the common IT services at the Agency level. These services consist of the Agency Consolidated End User Services (ACES), NASA Integrated Communications Services (NICS), Enterprise Service Desk (ESD), Enterprise Applications Service Technologies (EAST), and Web Enterprise Service Technologies (WESTPrime). The clear roles and responsibilities of each party will improve accountability across contract seams.

All three offerors have a strength for providing evidence of a Government-approved Purchasing System, an important resource in performance of the contract's requirements. Additionally, NDTI and Saalex both have a strength for evidence of ISO 9001:2008 certification, a requirement the RF&ESS contractor will need to obtain within 12 months of contract award.

Both NDTI and Saalex have strengths for their proposed Key Personnel. The resumes of the proposed candidates reflect significant breadth and depth of experience. I queried the Board to determine the extent to which the Key Personnel would benefit contract

performance. Although the presented candidates are highly qualified, the offerors' proposals did not demonstrate how all Key Personnel would use their specialized knowledge, expertise and abilities to greatly enhance successful RF&ESS contract performance.

Upon reviewing all findings in this subfactor, InuTeq's proposal was superior for Management Approach.

The second-most important Mission Suitability subfactor was for Technical Approach. InuTeq received the highest score for this subfactor, slightly higher than NDTI and significantly higher than Saalex. InuTeq and NDTI both had one significant strength in this subfactor, each receiving an adjectival rating of Very Good. InuTeq has the most strengths (5), compared to NDTI (1) and Saalex (4). Saalex does not have a significant strength in this subfactor, receiving an adjectival rating of Good.

Under the Technical Approach subfactor, InuTeq's proposal distinguished itself from both that of NDTI and Saalex by their exceptional personnel resource plan. Their comprehensive and flexible approach to back-up staffing and succession planning demonstrated a clear understanding of the importance of eliminating single-point failures in mission operations, preparing for contingency circumstances, and grooming and motivating the current and next generation workforce. Additionally, the offeror outlined a formal cross-training and cross-utilization plan, ensuring maximum use of resources, as well as providing a process to easily share knowledge and ideas across contract areas. I agreed with the SEB that this finding merited a significant strength, as the personnel resource plan will ensure continuity of high quality services, develop and motivate the contractor workforce, and maximize efficiency and use of labor resources.

Under the other offerors' personnel resource plans, NDTI and Saalex each received a strength for their comprehensive plan for temporary staff augmentation and for good reach back capability for both the prime- and subcontractor, respectively.

While all offerors proposed award fee sharing with their employees, and have strengths for doing so, NDTI has a significant strength for their escalated approach to sharing earned award fee. The generous band from 10% up to a potential 26% is an extraordinary proposed incentive technique for motivating and achieving buy-in from employees, which will likely result in exceptional contract performance and retention of a high quality staff.

In the area of practical application of proposed innovative methods and improvements, InuTeq has four (4) strengths, three (3) for proposed material changes to enhance the WATR's capability and marketability: HD camera installation, radar upgrade, and SATCOM support. Saalex has two (2) strengths in this area: the first for a commitment of funds to support research, studies and/or initiatives; and the second for a proposal to accomplish specialized employee training.

Upon reviewing all findings in this subfactor, InuTeq's proposal was the best for Technical Approach.

The next two Mission Suitability subfactors were for Safety and Health and Phase-In / Phase-Out, both equal in weight to each other, and much less important than Management Approach and Technical Approach. Comparatively, the Safety and Health and Phase-In /Phase-Out subfactors, among all offerors, were viewed by me equally. For the Safety and Health subfactor, each offeror submitted a Safety and Health Plan that met NASA's important safety objectives. None of the three offerors have significant strengths, strengths, significant weaknesses, weaknesses or deficiencies in this subfactor. All offerors have an adjectival rating of Good. Based on the SEB's evaluation that the Safety and Health approach for each offeror met the Government's requirements, I am confident all offerors could perform the contract requirements in a safe manner.

For the Phase-in / Phase-out subfactor, InuTeq and NDTI each have a strength, demonstrating the likelihood of a smooth contract transition and minimal disruption of current operations. All three offerors have an adjectival rating of Good for this subfactor. Based on my assessment, I have no concerns that disruptions will occur during contract transition.

In accordance with the evaluation criteria, Mission Suitability is more important than Cost and Past Performance. InuTeq's Mission Suitability proposal is superior for having higher scores in the two most important subfactors, Management Approach and Technical Approach. InuTeq's overall Mission Suitability score of 840 is 109 above that of NDTI (731) and 164 above that of Saalex (676).

I reviewed the individual findings of the Experience and Past Performance factor, and concur with the level of confidence rating for each offeror. InuTeq and Saalex both have a Very High Level of Confidence rating and NDTI has a Moderate Level of Confidence rating for this factor. Based on my assessment of the Experience and Past Performance findings, I have very high confidence that both InuTeq and Saalex could perform the contractual effort effectively and efficiently and moderate confidence that NDTI could perform the requirements of the contract.

In accordance with the evaluation criteria, Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost. Therefore, I determine that InuTeq's proposal, with the highest Mission Suitability score of 840 and an adjectival rating of Very Good, and the highest available Past Performance rating of Very High Level of Confidence, is superior for these two factors, when combined.

With regard to the Cost factor, I observed that Saalex's proposal is the lowest priced; InuTeq has the next lowest price, slightly higher than Saalex; and NDTI has the highest price of the three offerors. All proposals are less than the Independent Government Estimate. The proposed price is also the probable price for all proposals, so no upward or downward adjustments were made.

My decision involved a determination of which proposal represented the best value to the Government. I found that the Mission Suitability factor was the key discriminator in my selection decision. Upon weighing the findings within each factor and their relative importance, InuTeq had the superior Mission Suitability proposal, demonstrating the highest Management Approach and Technical Approach subfactor scores of all offerors. Additionally, I have a very high level of confidence InuTeq will be fully responsive to the contract requirements and successfully perform the contract effort based on their Past Performance. InuTeq's total proposed and probable contract cost of \$73,365,547 represents the best value to the Government. I find that the benefits in the Mission Suitability area, which would be realized by the Government in implementing InuTeq's proposal, significantly outweigh the modest difference in cost over the lowest priced proposal, submitted by Saalex. This trade-off reduces risks to the Government and increases the likelihood of successful contract performance. The superior Mission Suitability approach will ensure my organization continues to enable the advancement of Aeronautics, Science, Technology, and Exploration through flight by evolving efficient and effective mission, information, and test systems. Therefore, I find that InuTeq's proposal offers the best value to the Government.

Accordingly, I select InuTeq, LLC as the awardee.


Sean E. McMorrow
Source Selection Authority

5-7-2014
Date