

**Source Selection Statement
Langley Information Technology Enhanced Services (LITES) II
RFP: NNL15ZB1001R**

Background

The purpose of the LITES II contract is to procure IT support services in the areas of science and engineering applications, Center infrastructure applications not included in IT Infrastructure Integration Program (I³P) scope, data center support, business management applications support, and IT project management support.

The LITES II Request for Proposals (RFP) specified that the selection will result in award to the Offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government based on the evaluation of Mission Suitability, Cost/Price, and Past Performance evaluation factors. The contract will be an Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract with the ability to issue Firm Fixed Price (FFP) (CLIN 001) task orders. The contract also includes a Cost Reimbursement (No Fee) line item for other direct costs (ODCs) associated with travel, equipment and other miscellaneous ODCs (CLIN 002).

Market Research was conducted that included a Sources Sought Notice posted on FedBizOpps on May 19, 2014 with a response date of June 9, 2014. A Procurement Strategy Meeting was held on September 17, 2014 at Langley Research Center and the procurement strategy was subsequently approved. The procurement was conducted as a full and open competition. A Draft Request for Proposal (DRFP) was issued on December 1, 2014 for comments from industry and a Pre-Solicitation Conference was held on December 9, 2014.

The final RFP was released on February 6, 2015. The final RFP had a proposal response date of March 9, 2015 and a request for Past Performance Proposals (Volume III) to be submitted by February 26, 2015. Subsequently, three amendments followed: Amendment 1 was issued on February 24, 2015 making minor editorial corrections to the solicitation documents and updating responses to industry questions and comments. Amendment 2 was issued on February 25, 2015 extending the response date to March 11, 2015 and request for Past Performance Proposals to March 3, 2015. Amendment 3 was issued on March 6, 2015 clarifying font size for Cost/Price Form submission and updating responses to industry questions.

The following companies responded to the RFP by the due date of March 11, 2015:

- CACI-ISS Inc. (CACI)
- DB Consulting Group Inc. (DB Consulting)
- Jacobs Technology Inc. (Information Solutions Group) (Jacobs)
- Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) (Government Solutions Segment (CO116))
- Stinger Ghaffarian Technologies (SGT)
- SRA International Inc. (SRA)

Evaluation Factors

The appointed Source Evaluation Board (SEB) conducted an evaluation of proposals received in response to the RFP. The evaluation was conducted in accordance with the evaluation factors contained in Section M of the RFP. The Offerors were evaluated in alphabetical order. The RFP set forth the following three evaluation factors:

Factor 1: Mission Suitability

Factor 2: Cost/Price

Factor 3: Past Performance

The RFP stated a best value process would be used in making the source selection and that the contract would be awarded to the Offeror that can perform the contract in a manner most advantageous to the Government, all factors considered. The RFP also stated that it was anticipated that award would be made without discussions. In addition, the RFP stated that the Source Selection Authority (SSA) would make an integrated assessment of each offer and comparatively evaluate competing offers, considering input from the SEB. The SSA would consider adjectival ratings and point scoring assigned by the SEB and evaluated cost/price; however, the SSA would base selection on substantive proposal differences that are reflected by the ratings and point scores as opposed to basing selection on mere differences in ratings or scores, as well as evaluated cost/price. Each evaluation factor was essentially equal in importance, and Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, were significantly more important than Cost/Price.

Factor 1 – Mission Suitability

The Mission Suitability Subfactors and their weights were as follows:

- Subfactor 1 - Understanding the Requirement and Technical Approach (URTA) 450 points
 - URTA 1 - Approach for performing the technical requirements
 - URTA 2 – Risks and approach to risk mitigation
 - URTA 3 – Approach for remaining on the forefront of IT Technologies and services and proactively sharing this knowledge to benefit LaRC and the Agency
- Subfactor 2 – Management Approach (MA) 450 points
 - MA 1 – Approach for managing the contract
 - MA 2 – Contract Start-up
 - MA 3 -- Recruiting, retaining, motivating, training employees
- Subfactor 3 - Small Business Utilization (SB) 100 points
 - Small Business Subcontracting
 - Commitment to Small Businesses

The SEB used the following adjectival and numerical ratings from NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.305 in its evaluation of the Mission Suitability Factor:

ADJECTIVAL RATING	DEFINITIONS	PERCENTILE RANGE
Excellent	A comprehensive and thorough proposal of exceptional merit with one or more significant strengths. No deficiency or significant weakness exists.	91-100
Very Good	A proposal having no deficiency and which demonstrates over-all competence. One or more significant strengths have been found, and strengths outbalance any weaknesses that exist.	71-90
Good	A proposal having no deficiency and which shows a reasonably sound response. There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both. As a whole, weaknesses not off-set by	51-70

	strengths do not significantly detract from the Offeror's response.	
Fair	A proposal having no deficiency and which has one or more weaknesses. Weaknesses outbalance any strengths.	31-50
Poor	A proposal that has one or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses that demonstrate a lack of overall competence or would require a major proposal revision to correct.	0-30

Adjectival ratings and percentile scores were assigned, and points calculated by multiplying the percentile score by the number of available points, for each Mission Suitability Subfactor. Adjective ratings were not assigned at the Factor level; the sum of the points assigned for the three subfactors was the only overall rating for Mission Suitability.

Definitions: The definitions used for classification of findings are as follows:

Deficiency: is a material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.

Weakness: means a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Significant Weakness: in the proposal is a flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

The definitions for Strength and Significant Strength are not in the FAR, however, the following definitions were used:

Strength: An aspect of the proposal that increases the probability of successful contract performance.

Significant Strength: An aspect of the proposal that appreciably increases the probability of successful contract performance.

Factor 2 – Cost/Price

The RFP did not provide for adjectival ratings or numerical scores under the Cost/Price Factor; however, the RFP provided evaluation language within Section M, as follows:

“NASA will evaluate the Firm Fixed Price (FFP) CLIN 001. NASA will perform a price analysis (ref: FAR 15.404-1(b)). Specifically, NASA’s price analysis will include, but may not be limited to, comparing all prices proposed for CLIN 001 and CLIN 002 and comparing each total proposed price to the Independent Government Cost Estimate to determine price reasonableness.

NASA will evaluate the cost-reimbursement [no-fee] CLIN 002. NASA will perform a cost realism analysis (ref: FAR 15.404-1(d)). Because NASA has already provided the direct costs each Offeror shall propose for CLIN 002, the cost realism analyses to be performed will be limited to evaluating the realism of each Offeror’s proposed indirect costs for CLIN 002. In

accordance with FAR 15.404-1(d)(2)(i) & (ii), the probable cost for CLIN 002 may differ from the proposed cost if NASA determines [based on its cost realism analysis] that the proposed cost is unrealistic for the work to be performed; the probable cost shall be used for the purposes of evaluation to determine the best value. In order for NASA to perform its cost realism analyses, Offerors are required to submit Information Other than Cost or Pricing Data pursuant to FAR 15.403-3. Finally, NASA will perform a price analysis by comparing all prices proposed for CLIN 002.

NASA will evaluate each Offeror's Total Compensation Plan for its ability to attract and retain competent employees. The plan shall be compliant with FAR 52.222-46, Evaluation of Compensation for Professional Employees, and NFS 1852.231-71, Determination of Compensation Reasonableness."

Factor 3 – Past Performance

Under the Past Performance Factor the SEB assessed each Offeror's record of performing services that are similar in size, content, and complexity to the requirements of the solicitation and assigned pertinence and performance ratings to develop the confidence level. Pursuant to the NFS 1815.305(a)(2), the SEB did not assign strengths and weaknesses to Past Performance evaluations.

Specifically, the RFP stated that:

"NASA will evaluate each Offeror's current/recent record (including the record of any subcontractors, but not the past performance of individuals who are proposed to be involved in the required work), of performing services or delivering products that are similar in size to the total contract value of this solicitation (in dollars per year for prime contractor), and similar in complexity (for prime contractor) to the requirements of this solicitation. NASA will evaluate the relevance of the content of the past performance of the Prime for each PWS section identified in Section L.17, paragraph a) 8. NASA will also evaluate the relevance of the content of the past performance of each subcontractor to the PWS sections each is identified to perform in Section L.17, paragraph a) 8."

"Each of the adjective ratings below has a 'performance' component and a 'pertinence' component. The Offeror must meet the requirements of both components to achieve a particular rating. In assessing pertinence, the Government will consider the degree of similarity in size in dollars per year, content, and complexity to the requirements in this solicitation, as well as the recency and duration of the past performance."

Rating Definitions

The SEB used the following confidence level ratings to evaluate the Past Performance Factor (NFS 1815.305(a)(2)(A)):

Very High Level of Confidence: The Offeror's relevant past performance is of exceptional merit and is very highly pertinent to this acquisition, indicates exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner and very minor (if any) problems with no adverse effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more significant strengths exist. No significant weaknesses exist.)

High Level of Confidence: The Offeror's relevant past performance is highly pertinent to this acquisition; demonstrating very effective performance that would be fully responsive to contract

requirements. Offeror's past performance indicates that contract requirements were accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part, with only minor problems that had little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more significant strengths exist. Strengths outbalance any weakness.)

Moderate Level of Confidence: The Offeror's relevant past performance is pertinent to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance. Performance was fully responsive to contract requirements; there may have been reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both.)

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

Very Low Level of Confidence: The Offeror's relevant past performance does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action was required in one or more areas. Performance problems occurred in one or more areas which, adversely affected overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. (One or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses exist.)

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

Evaluation Procedures

Prior to issuance of the RFP, an SEB was appointed by the SSA to conduct an evaluation of proposals received in response to the RFP. The SEB conducted the evaluation of proposals in accordance with Section M of the RFP. The SEB began their evaluation upon receipt of the Past Performance Volumes (Volume III), which were received from the Offerors prior to the proposal due date. The SEB reviewed each Offeror's Past Performance Proposal, all of the past performance questionnaires, and information obtained from the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) as applicable. To determine work content pertinence, the SEB reviewed each Offeror's submitted contracts, comparing the scope of work to the scope of work in the LITES II Performance Work Statement (PWS) Sections 3.0, 4.0, 5.0, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, and 6.6. The SEB also reviewed the past performance information to determine size and complexity pertinence for each Offeror (Prime only). The SEB then reviewed the Technical Proposals (Volume I) for each Offeror to determine which entity (Prime and/or Subcontractor) is proposed to do each section of the PWS. The SEB then assigned an overall pertinence rating for each Offeror based on an integrated assessment of the size, work content (PWS Section ratings) and complexity for each Offeror. The SEB collected and reviewed performance information on all Offerors and subcontractors and assigned an overall performance rating for each Offeror. The SEB then assigned an overall past performance confidence rating for each Offeror, based on the performance and pertinence ratings. Upon receipt of the Technical Proposals (Volume I) and the Business Proposals (Volume II), the SEB conducted an initial review of each Volume, with the Cost/Price Analyst providing a review of the

Factor 2 – Cost/Price proposal information, to determine if any were unacceptable proposals as defined in NASA FAR Supplement 1815.305-70. The Contract Specialist reviewed each model contract, applicable terms and conditions, and Representations and Certifications for each Offeror. All proposals were found to be acceptable and warranted a full evaluation.

The SEB members performed a detailed individual review of each Offeror’s Technical Proposal and documented strengths and weaknesses for each Mission Suitability Subfactor. After completion of the individual evaluations for each subfactor, the SEB convened to discuss individual findings and to develop consensus on strengths and weaknesses for each of the Offerors. This process of individual review and then meeting to develop consensus findings was repeated for each Offeror. The SEB also agreed on assigning “significant” findings when applicable. The SEB then reviewed the findings for each Offeror to ensure that all proposals were evaluated consistently and objectively. Upon completion of the evaluation of all subfactors for all Offerors, the SEB assigned adjectival ratings and percentage scores to each subfactor based on the consensus findings, calculating a point score for each subfactor by multiplying the assigned percentage score and the available points, then summing the subfactor point scores to derive the overall Mission Suitability point score in accordance with NFS 1815.305.

The SEB reviewed each Offeror’s Business proposal to determine whether the prices/costs proposed were reasonable, realistic and consistent with the technical approach. The price/cost proposals were assessed to ensure compliance with the Cost/Price evaluation factor. The SEB provided the results of its review to the Cost/Price Analyst who incorporated the results into the detailed analysis of the Offeror’s price/cost proposals.

The Contracting Officer carefully reviewed the facts presented in the initial findings and discussed the findings with the SEB. The RFP stated the Government anticipated award would be made without discussions, [ref. RFP provision at FAR 52.215-1(f)(4) and RFP provision L.14] and based on the initial findings of the SEB, it was evident that the potential for an award without discussions existed. Therefore, no Competitive Range was determined and the SEB met with me, the Source Selection Authority, on July 7, 2015 to present its findings.

Evaluation Findings

Factor 1 – Mission Suitability

Set forth below is a summary of the Mission Suitability Findings for the Offerors:

CACI

CACI received a Mission Suitability score of 620. CACI’s proposal included Strengths and Weaknesses as summarized below.

Subfactor 1, Understanding the Requirement and Technical Approach (URTA)

CACI received an adjectival rating of Good for Subfactor 1.

Approach for performing the technical requirements (URTA 1)

CACI received a Strength for its understanding of the technical requirements for Section 5.0 of the Performance Work Statement (PWS) by describing its technical approach of building applications including an approach which lays the ground work for a hybrid virtual/physical machine architecture and eventual migration to private and/or public cloud.

CACI received a Strength for its approach for applying consistent enterprise architecture and implementation and operational best practices across tasks including an approach for standard documentation, plans and operating procedures for regular hardware maintenance, and backup and preservation of system and file data.

CACI received a Strength for its understanding of the technical requirements by describing its approach to applying consistent enterprise architecture and implementation and operational best practices across tasks including an approach to manage Center-wide changes across tasks and an approach to reduce system incompatibilities in dependent systems.

CACI received a Weakness for not adequately demonstrating an understanding of the requirements by not adequately describing an approach for operating and maintaining LaRC's current storage system in its technical approach to meet the requirements for large scale data storage and retrieval system described in Section 6.3 of the Performance Work Statement.

Risks and approach to risk mitigation (URTA 2)

The SEB had no findings.

Approach for remaining on the forefront of IT technologies and services and proactively sharing this knowledge to benefit LaRC and the Agency (URTA 3)

CACI received a Strength for its proposed approach to proactively applying state of the art technology and state of the marketplace technology which included the development of a strategic plan and transformation roadmap to serve as a basis for modifying LaRC's enterprise architecture and introduce new technology.

CACI received a Strength for its strategy for continuous training and education of employees to incorporate technical knowledge across the Center.

Subfactor 2, Management Approach

CACI received an adjectival rating of Good for Subfactor 2.

Approach for managing the contract (MA 1)

The SEB had no findings.

Contract start-up (MA 2)

The SEB had no findings

Recruiting, retaining, motivating, training employees (MA 3)

CACI received a Strength for its approach to recruit and retain incumbent employees by working with its teammates to ensure comparable compensation packages and included incentives for hiring and retention.

CACI received a Strength for its approach to staffing the contract to ensure timely and quality performance and effective employee recruitment including an internal and external recruiting process with dedicated recruiting resources for both the prime and each subcontractor.

Subfactor 3, Small Business Utilization

CACI received an adjectival rating of Fair for Subfactor 3.

Small Business Subcontracting

CACI received a Weakness for not providing a Small Business Subcontracting Plan consistent with its plan to utilize small business. The Small Business Plan total contract cost to be subcontracted to small businesses was not calculated correctly and was inconsistent with the Business proposal, Cost Form 4. Further, large businesses were identified to perform work in specific SOW sections, however, those costs were not represented in the Small Business proposal.

Commitment to Small Businesses

CACI received a Strength for its established procedures for a mentor-protégé program and identified “high technology” subcontractors that are members of the program.

CACI received a Strength for its established small business outreach plan that is robust and utilizes various approaches to reach qualified small businesses.

DB Consulting Group (DB)

DB received a Mission Suitability score of 507. DB’s proposal included Strengths, Weaknesses, and a Significant Weakness as summarized below.

Subfactor 1, Understanding the Requirement and Technical Approach (URTA)

DB received an adjectival rating of Fair for Subfactor 1.

Approach for performing the technical requirements (URTA 1)

DB received a Strength for its operational best practices across tasks with its documentation of backup and recovery procedures for system administration (PWS Section 3.0) and database administration (PWS Section 4.0) which are reviewed and audited, thereby enhancing the security of information and providing a second level review to ensure compliance.

DB received a Strength for its approach to applying operational best practices across tasks by incorporating the use of application management practices rooted in its Capability Maturity Model Integration (CMMI) accreditation. Based on this accreditation, DB maintains corporate level databases for maintaining quality and compliance of work products to which all employees have access. Current and critical information are shared at regularly scheduled meetings with Program Managers and also with employees.

Risks and approach to risk mitigation (URTA 2)

DB received a Weakness for not adequately describing an effective approach to avoid, neutralize, or mitigate risks associated with IT continuity of operations. The Offeror's approach to implement and test a robust Continuity of Operations Plan, based on other similar plans, and to continually improve the plan did not provide adequate details to demonstrate the effectiveness of the Continuity of Operations Plan.

DB received a Significant Weakness for not adequately describing an effective approach to avoid, neutralize, or mitigate risks associated with IT security. The Offeror identified a risk for the inability to meet Center IT security requirements and did not address any specific risks associated with the operation of IT systems or the support of the Center IT security operations in PWS Section 6.5.

Approach for remaining on the forefront of IT technologies and services and proactively sharing this knowledge to benefit LaRC and the Agency (URTA 3)

DB received a Strength for its use of a corporate technology office and its local LITES II board which demonstrated an approach for remaining on the forefront of IT technologies and services and proactively sharing this knowledge for the benefit of LaRC and NASA.

Subfactor 2, Management Approach

DB received an adjectival rating of Good for Subfactor 2.

Approach for managing the contract (MA 1)

DB received a Strength for its Program Manager's résumé evidencing relevant education, extensive experience, and other notable qualifications including significant experience in technical work and managing IT contracts.

Contract Start-up (MA 2)

The SEB had no findings.

Recruiting, Retaining, Motivating, Training Employees (MA 3)

DB received a Weakness for not demonstrating an adequate approach for staffing the LITES II contract. The Offeror proposed an approach that creates a negative incentive for the Offeror to focus on hiring incumbents ahead of hiring qualified employees.

DB received a Weakness for a conflict in the proposal related to contract staff hiring authority between the program manager (PM) and the technical manager.

Subfactor 3, Small Business Utilization

DB received an adjectival rating of Good for Subfactor 3.

Small Business Subcontracting

DB received a Weakness for not including proposed subcontracting goals for two Small Business categories for one contract year which resulted in a calculation error for the Small Business subcontracting totals for the contract.

DB received a Weakness for its small business plan not meeting the requirements of FAR 19.704 because the Offeror did not provide assurance in its Small Business Plan that it will comply with a specific aspect of FAR 19.704.

Commitment to Small Businesses

The SEB had no findings.

Jacobs

Jacobs received a Mission Suitability score of 491. Jacobs' proposal included Strengths, Weaknesses and Significant Weaknesses as summarized below.

Subfactor 1, Understanding the Requirement and Technical Approach (URTA)

Jacobs received an adjectival rating of Poor for Subfactor 1.

Approach for performing the technical requirements (URTA 1)

Jacobs received a Significant Weakness for its technical approach for Section 6.5 of the Performance Work Statement; the approach did not demonstrate an understanding of the technical requirements. The Offeror's description of its approach paraphrased some of the requirements of the PWS and did not address important aspects of the LITES II requirements for support of the Center Information Security Officer (CISO).

Jacobs received a Significant Weakness for its technical approach to meet the requirements described in Section 3.0 of the Performance Work Statement (PWS) for System Administration, Section 4.0 for Database Administration, Section 5.0 for Application Management, Sections 6.1 and 6.2 for Air Traffic Operations Lab Support and Airspace and Traffic Operations Simulation Support, Section 6.3 for Large Scale Data Storage and Retrieval System, Section 6.4 for OCIO Data Services, and Section 6.6 for Administration Business Application Development and Support. The proposal did not adequately demonstrate an understanding of the technical requirements. In general, the Offeror's approach for performing these technical requirements paraphrased most of the requirements of the PWS without providing adequate technical details of the approach, focused on management approaches and included past performance information in lieu of providing an approach that demonstrated an understanding of the technical requirements.

Risks and approach to risk mitigation (URTA 2)

The SEB had no findings.

Approach for remaining on the forefront of IT technologies and services and proactively sharing this knowledge to benefit LaRC and the Agency (URTA 3)

Jacobs received a Strength for its approach for remaining on the forefront of IT technologies and services and proactively sharing this knowledge which included a strategy for continuous training and education of employees.

Jacobs received a Strength for its strategy for ensuring a staff experienced in the latest technologies with tools for employees to locate and share information with experts and colleagues in various technical areas.

Jacobs received a Strength for its approach for remaining on the forefront of IT technologies and services and sharing this knowledge to benefit LaRC and the Agency including a program for employees to resolve problems or improve processes.

Subfactor 2, Management Approach

Jacobs received an adjectival rating of Good for Subfactor 2.

Approach for managing the contract (MA 1)

Jacobs received a Strength for its Program Manager's résumé evidencing relevant education, extensive experience as a manager, and experience with managing software development.

Jacobs received a Strength for its approach for efficiently and effectively managing the contract to provide unity in the contract team.

Jacobs received a Weakness for inconsistency in its local organizational structure regarding task leads.

Contract Start-up (MA 2)

The SEB had no findings.

Recruiting, Retaining, Motivating, Training Employees (MA 3)

Jacobs received a Strength for its approach to staffing and methods that contribute to effective employee recruitment including a program that incentivizes referrals for certain staff positions.

Subfactor 3 – Small Business Utilization (SB)

Jacobs received an adjectival rating of Good for Subfactor 3.

Small Business Subcontracting

Jacobs received a Strength for proposing subcontracting goals which exceed the goals established for this procurement.

SAIC

SAIC received a Mission Suitability score of 808. SAIC's proposal included Significant Strengths and Strengths as summarized below.

Subfactor 1, Understanding the Requirement and Technical Approach (URTA)

SAIC received an adjectival rating of Excellent for Subfactor 1.

Approach for performing the technical requirements (URTA 1)

SAIC received a Strength for its understanding of the technical requirements by an overarching technical approach that included a pragmatic four step approach for introducing standardization in an evolutionary way to reduce cost while maintaining flexibility, and transforming the IT environment with new or emerging technologies that offer significant improvements in capabilities for performing LaRC's mission.

This four step approach for performing the technical requirements was consistently applied throughout the requirements described in Sections 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the Performance Work Statement (PWS).

SAIC received a Strength for its understanding of the technical requirements by describing its thorough, well balanced, and tailored technical approach for database administration (PWS Section 4). The approach included a standard configuration meeting security requirements, best practices, and specifying use of a default Data Center with deviations requiring a written waiver. The proposal also provided an approach to ensure that upgrades or configuration changes will not create conflicts and will improve the stability of applications using databases.

SAIC received a Strength for its understanding of the technical requirements in describing its flexible, scalable technical approach for application management (PWS Section 5.0). The approach included the use of a tool that will contain an inventory of all the applications in use, capturing comprehensive information to enable application maintenance and management.

SAIC received a Significant Strength for a thorough understanding of the technical requirements by describing its approach for PWS Section 3.0, 4.0, and 5.0 and its approach to applying consistent enterprise architecture and implementation, and operational best practices across tasks. Specifically, the Offeror demonstrated a thorough understanding and approach to the technical requirements of PWS Section 3.0 through its comprehensive description of the processes for operational system administration and an approach for each system and a plan to accommodate upgrades. In addition, the Offeror provided a comprehensive description of the processes and tools for performing database administration and its approach to establishing the right level of rigor for system testing related to PWS Section 4.0. Finally, the Offeror provided a comprehensive description of the processes and tools related to PWS Section 5.0 for performing application management and the methodical and organized approach to software development appropriate to the complexity, risk, and maturity of the project. The Offeror will apply standard processes across tasks where practical and feasible within LaRC's unique research environment.

Risks and approach to risk mitigation (URTA 2)

SAIC received a Significant Strength for its ability to identify the significant risks associated with the successful performance of the contract and approach to avoid, neutralize, or mitigate the risks associated with IT security, IT continuity of operations, and organizational conflicts of interests (OCIs). The Offeror proposed a thorough approach for identification and mitigation of specific IT security risks, specific Continuity of Operations risks, appropriate Organizational Conflicts of Interest risks, and other significant risks associated with maintenance of unique skills in the workforce and effectively working with large data sets.

Approach for remaining on the forefront of IT technologies and services and proactively sharing this knowledge to benefit LaRC and the Agency (URTA 3)

SAIC received a Strength for its approach for remaining on the forefront of IT technologies and proactively sharing this knowledge to benefit LaRC and NASA. Elements of this approach included: a dedicated resource to work with customers, subject matter experts, and industry partners; a significant number of methods for information sharing and collaboration; and projects to explore relevant IT technologies. The Offeror further proposed an approach to monitor coverage of each technology and identify skill gaps to ensure the staff remains on the forefront of technologies.

SAIC received a Strength for ensuring a staff experienced in the latest technology which included a multi-faceted approach with specific objectives to provide the staff training courses and an approach to

validate, test, and experiment with the new technologies. Additionally, the Offeror's approach included a variety of approaches to promote continuous learning and professional development.

Subfactor 2, Management Approach

SAIC received an adjectival rating of Good for Subfactor 2.

Approach for managing the contract (MA 1)

SAIC received a Strength for its Program Manager's résumé evidencing relevant education, relevant certifications, and numerous years of management and leadership experience.

SAIC received a Strength for its local organization structure that will support the efficient and effective management and performance of the LITES II contract requirements including clear identification of each manager's area of responsibility mapped to specific contract requirements.

Contract Start-up (MA 2)

SAIC received a Strength for its contract start-up plan that contained a detailed schedule, a description of all significant start-up activities, team members' key roles and responsibilities, and a proactive and unique approach for the task order approval process.

Recruiting, Retaining, Motivating, Training Employees (MA 3)

SAIC received a Strength for its approach for staffing the contract which included a method for succession planning and an innovative approach to staff retention specifically addressing a developmental path for more junior employees which aids employee retention.

Subfactor 3 – Small Business Utilization (SB)

SAIC received an adjectival rating of Good for Subfactor 3.

Small Business Subcontracting

SAIC received a Strength for its proposed subcontracting goals (overall subcontracting goals and individual subcontracting goals by small business category) for exceeding the goals established for this procurement.

Commitment to Small Business

SAIC received a Strength for its established procedures for participation in the Mentor Protégé program including many aspects which provide for training and assistance to potential Small Business partners.

SGT

SGT received a Mission Suitability score of 700. SGT's proposal included Strengths as summarized below.

Subfactor 1, Understanding the Requirement and Technical Approach (URTA)

SGT received an adjectival rating of Good for Subfactor 1.

Approach for performing the technical requirements (URTA 1)

SGT received a Strength for its understanding of the technical requirements by its technical approach to meet the requirements of PWS Sections 3.0, 4.0, 5.0, and 6.0 with a proposed multi-purpose system for use across tasks. The use of this system will provide a consistent technical approach to system and application operation and maintenance by providing an integrated view of, and accessibility to, information for system administrators, database administrators, and application managers.

SGT received a Strength for its technical approach to applying consistent operational best practices across tasks through tools and methods for sharing knowledge, documented best practices, lessons learned, documentation and standard operating procedures for system administrators, and documentation for all database and application development and delivery.

SGT received a Strength for its technical approach to meet the requirements described in PWS Section 5.0, specifically the approach to application development is a Capability Maturity Model Integration (CMMI) audited process that applies appropriate rigor to requirements development and maintenance, software design review, software development review, and integration and testing.

SGT received a Strength for its technical approach to meet the technical requirement for PWS Section 4.0 which includes standardized methods to install database software and tools to increase availability and security. The approach included an approach to establishing new databases and migrating legacy databases.

Risks and approach to risk mitigation (URTA 2)

The SEB had no findings.

Approach for remaining on the forefront of IT technologies and services and proactively sharing this knowledge to benefit LaRC and the Agency (URTA 3)

SGT received a Strength for its approach for remaining on the forefront of IT technologies and services including an approach that enables the Offeror to evaluate new technologies and develop prototypes to support pilot projects using a streamlined software development approach. Additionally, the approach includes access to a variety of sources of knowledge shared with all contractor staff as well as LaRC personnel.

Subfactor 2, Management Approach

SGT received an adjectival rating of Good for Subfactor 2.

Approach for managing the contract (MA 1)

SGT received a Strength for its local organization structure for efficiently and effectively managing and performing the contract requirements utilizing a streamlined organizational structure with appropriate assignments of work requirements to personnel in the organization.

SGT received a Strength for its Program Manager's résumé with relevant education, relevant certifications, and experience in management and leadership.

Contract Start-Up (MA 2)

SGT received a Strength for its methods for initial staffing with qualified employees. These methods included incentives, a plan to anticipate staffing needs, and a strategy for incumbent retention.

Recruiting, Retaining, Motivating, Training Employees (MA 3)

SGT received a Strength for its effective employee recruitment, retention, productivity, and training including various training methods, career development, and incentives for continuing education. The Offeror's plan includes career development planning on a regular basis and an approach to ensure staff is qualified and current on certifications and remains on the forefront of technology.

SGT received a Strength for its approach for staffing the LITES II contract to ensure timely and quality performance to meet the requirements of the PWS. The Offeror's presented an approach which will increase efficiency and built-in depth and back-up capacity.

Subfactor 3 – Small Business Utilization (SB)

SGT received an adjectival rating of Good for Subfactor 3.

Small Business Subcontracting

SGT received a Strength for its proposed subcontracting goals (overall subcontracting goals and individual subcontracting goals by small business category) by exceeding the goals established for this procurement and an approach for reviewing underperforming goals.

Commitment to Small Business

SGT received a Strength for its participation in the Mentor Protégé (MP) program and identifying a specifically named protégé.

SRA

SRA received a Mission Suitability score of 532. SRA's proposal included Strengths, Weaknesses, and Significant Weaknesses as summarized below.

Subfactor 1, Understanding the Requirement and Technical Approach (URTA)

SRA received an adjectival rating of Fair for Subfactor 1.

Approach for performing the technical requirements (URTA 1)

SRA received a Weakness for not adequately demonstrating an understanding of the technical requirements of Section 6.4 of the Performance Work Statement. SRA provided an inadequate description of its technical approach for OCIO Data Services, including cloud adoption services.

SRA received a Weakness for not adequately demonstrating an understanding of the technical requirements of Section 3.0 of the Performance Work Statement. SRA provided an inadequate description of its technical approach to meet the requirements for system administration, with limited explanation of how it will meet the requirements.

SRA received a Weakness for its inadequate technical approach for Sections 4.1 through 4.4 of the Performance Work Statement which did not adequately demonstrate an understanding of the technical requirements for database administration.

SRA received a Significant Weakness for its technical approach for Sections 6.1 and 6.2 of the Performance Work Statement (PWS) which did not adequately demonstrate an understanding of the technical requirements. The Offeror included past performance information, general theory, and paraphrased the PWS requirements but did not adequately describe its technical approach for development, maintenance, and operation of the ATOL/ATOS.

Risks and approach to risk mitigation (URTA 2)

SRA received a Weakness for its approach to avoid, neutralize, or mitigate risks associated with IT continuity of operations and organizational conflicts of interests (OCIs). The Offeror did not address significant risks to IT continuity of operations for many systems and did not adequately address an approach to avoid, neutralize, or mitigate risks associated with IT continuity of operations. Furthermore, the Offeror did not identify any specific organizational conflicts of interests (OCIs) risks nor adequately address an approach to avoid, neutralize, or mitigate risks associated with OCIs.

Approach for remaining on the forefront of IT technologies and services and proactively sharing this knowledge to benefit LaRC and the Agency (URTA 3)

SRA received a Strength for its approach for remaining on the forefront of IT technologies and services which included proactively tracking technologies to ensure that the staff stays abreast of existing and future technologies.

SRA received a Strength for its approach for proactively applying state of the art technology and state of the marketplace technology to reduce redundant IT capabilities to better position LaRC for IT consolidation.

SRA received a Strength for its strategies for remaining abreast of emerging technologies, for training employees, and for ensuring a staff experienced in the latest technology and advancements in IT. Specifically, the Offeror provided tools for a variety of staff collaborations and lessons learned and a tool to assist in monitoring technical skills and training certifications.

Subfactor 2, Management Approach

SRA received an adjectival rating of Good for Subfactor 2.

Approach for managing the contract (MA 1)

SRA received a Strength for a tool for efficient and effective contract management to support program transparency and facilitate collaboration.

Contract Start-up (MA 2)

The SEB had no findings.

Recruiting, Retaining, Motivating, Training Employees (MA 3)

SRA received a Strength for its policies, procedures, and methods that contribute to effective employee recruitment, retention, productivity, and training. SRA specifically addressed employee performance development plans, training resources, and succession planning.

Subfactor 3 – Small Business Utilization (SB)

SRA received an adjectival rating of Good for Subfactor 3.

Small Business Subcontracting

SRA received a Strength for its proposed subcontracting goals (overall subcontracting goals and individual subcontracting goals by small business category) which exceeded the goals established for this procurement.

Factor 2, Cost/Price

The SEB and Cost/Price Analyst performed an analysis of the proposed prices to assess price reasonableness and cost realism, to determine whether the Offerors demonstrated a clear understanding of the requirement and could perform the contract for the stated cost. In accordance with FAR 15.402, the Contracting Officer has determined that the Offerors’ proposed prices are fair and reasonable based on the comparison of the proposed prices and comparison of the proposed prices to the Independent Government Estimate (IGE) and the fact that adequate price competition was obtained. All Offerors’ proposed prices were below the IGE ranging from approximately 31% to 7%. All Total Compensation Plans were determined adequate and reasonable. No evidence of unbalanced prices were found.

A summary of the overall probable cost/fee for each Offeror is shown in the table below:

Offeror	Proposed Price
CACI	3 rd Highest
DB Consulting	Lowest
Jacobs	2 nd Lowest
SAIC	Highest
SGT	2 nd Highest
SRA	3 rd Lowest

CACI

Based on analysis of the labor rates of all Offerors, approximately 57% of all labor rates proposed by CACI were lower than the average rates of all competitors.

The SEB had concerns that the labor rates proposed by CACI would be able to retain or hire the appropriate skill levels needed to perform the enhanced IT services required for the LITES II contract, taking into account the TCP benefits.

DB Consulting

Based on the analysis of the labor rates of all Offerors, approximately 82% of all labor rates proposed by DB were lower than the average rates of all competitors.

The SEB had concerns that the labor rates proposed by DB would be able to retain or hire the appropriate skill levels needed to perform the enhanced IT services required for the LITES II contract, taking into account the TCP benefits.

Jacobs

Based on the analysis of the labor rates of all Offerors, approximately 86% of all labor rates proposed by Jacobs were lower than the average rates of all competitors.

The SEB had concerns that the labor rates proposed by Jacobs would be able to retain or hire the appropriate skill levels needed to perform the enhanced IT services required for the LITES II contract, taking into account the TCP benefits.

SAIC

Based on the analysis of the labor rates proposed by all Offerors, less than 2% of the labor rates (only two labor rates) proposed by SAIC were lower than the average rates for all competitors.

The SEB had no concerns that the labor rates proposed by SAIC would be able to retain or hire the appropriate qualified skill levels needed to perform the enhanced IT services required for the LITES II contract taking into account the TCP benefits.

SGT

Based on the analysis of the labor rates proposed by each Offeror, approximately 38% of all labor rates proposed by SGT were lower than the average rates for all competitors.

The SEB had no concerns that the labor rates proposed by SGT would be able to retain or hire the appropriate qualified skill levels needed to perform the enhanced IT services required for the LITES II contract taking into account the TCP benefits.

SRA

Based on a comparison of the labor rates proposed by each Offeror, approximately 84% of all labor rates proposed by SRA were lower than the average rates for all competitors.

The SEB had concerns that the labor rates proposed by SRA would be able to retain or hire the appropriate skill levels needed to perform the enhanced IT services required for the LITES II contract, taking into account the TCP benefits.

Factor 3, Past Performance

The SEB evaluated the Offeror teams’ (prime and subcontractors) past performance records in accordance with Section M.3 of the RFP. The SEB considered the records of performing contracts similar in size (prime only), content (prime and subcontractors), and complexity (prime only) to the LITES II requirement. Both the performance records and the pertinence of the experience were evaluated. A confidence rating was assigned in accordance with NFS 1815.305.

Offeror	Pertinence Rating (size/content/complexity)	Performance Rating	Level of Confidence
CACI	Highly Pertinent (VHP/HP/VHP)	Very Effective	High
DB Consulting	Highly Pertinent (VHP/HP/VHP)	Exceptional	High
Jacobs	Highly Pertinent (VHP/HP/VHP)	Exceptional	High
SAIC	Very Highly Pertinent (VHP/VHP/VHP)	Exceptional	Very High
SGT	Very Highly Pertinent (VHP/VHP/VHP)	Exceptional	Very High
SRA	Highly Pertinent (VHP/HP/VHP)	Exceptional	High

VHP = Very Highly Pertinent	P = Pertinent	NP = Not Pertinent
HP = Highly Pertinent	SP = Somewhat Pertinent	

CACI

The SEB assigned a confidence rating of High to CACI’s Past Performance, Factor 3. For Size Pertinence, CACI received a Very Highly Pertinent rating as CACI’s largest referenced contract well exceeded the Government estimated LITES II annual average. For Overall Content Pertinence, CACI was rated as HP. CACI received VHP and HP on most PWS Sections; however, one section was rated as NP. Therefore, the overall content rating was determined to be HP. For Complexity Pertinence, CACI received a rating of VHP as CACI demonstrated experience performing a wide range of services/functions similar in complexity to the LITES II requirements.

Performance ratings across the referenced contracts for the Prime were Excellent and Very Good. The preponderance of the subcontractors’ referenced contracts were rated as Very Good. The overall performance rating is Very Effective. Therefore, CACI’s Overall Pertinence rating of Highly Pertinent and Overall Very Effective Performance rating resulted in a High Level of Confidence for the Past Performance factor.

DB Consulting

The SEB assigned a confidence rating of High to DB’s Past Performance, Factor 3. For Size Pertinence, DB received a VHP rating as DB’s largest referenced contract well exceeded the Government estimated LITES II annual average. For Overall Content Pertinence DB was rated as HP. DB received a VHP and

HP for most PWS sections; however, DB received a P and SP rating in two sections. Therefore, the overall content rating was determined to be HP. For Complexity Pertinence, DB received a VHP as DB demonstrated experience performing a wide range of services/functions similar in complexity to the LITES II requirements.

Performance ratings across the referenced contracts for the Prime were rated as Excellent. The preponderance of the subcontractors' referenced contracts were rated as Excellent. The overall performance rating is Exceptional. Therefore, DB's Overall Pertinence rating of Highly Pertinent and Overall Exceptional Performance rating resulted in a High Level of Confidence for the Past Performance factor.

Jacobs

The SEB assigned a confidence rating of High to Jacob's Past Performance, Factor 3. For Size Pertinence, Jacobs received a VHP rating as Jacob's largest referenced contract well exceeded the Government estimated LITES II annual average. For Overall Content Pertinence Jacobs was rated as HP. Jacobs received VHP and HP for some PWS sections; however, Jacobs received two Ps and one SP rating. Therefore, the overall content rating was HP. For Complexity Pertinence, Jacobs received a rating of Very Highly Pertinent as Jacobs demonstrated experience performing a wide range of services/functions similar in complexity to the LITES II requirements.

Performance ratings for the Prime contracts were rated as Excellent. For the subcontractors, ratings were Very Good and Exceptional. The overall performance rating is Exceptional. Therefore, Jacob's Overall Pertinence rating of Highly Pertinent and Overall Exceptional Performance rating resulted in a High Level of Confidence for the Past Performance factor.

SAIC

The SEB assigned a confidence rating of Very High to SAIC's Past Performance, Factor 3. For Size Pertinence, SAIC received a VHP rating as SAIC's largest referenced contract well exceeded the Government estimated LITES II annual average. For Overall Content Pertinence, SAIC was rated as VHP. SAIC received VHP for the majority of the PWS sections and most significant PWS sections. Therefore the overall content was rated as VHP. For Complexity Pertinence, SAIC received a rating of Very Highly Pertinent as SAIC demonstrated experience performing a wide range of services/functions similar in complexity to the LITES II requirements.

Performance ratings for the Prime were rated as Excellent. For the subcontractors the ratings were primarily Excellent and some Very Good. The overall performance rating is Exceptional. Therefore, SAIC's Overall Pertinence rating of Very Highly Pertinent and Overall Exceptional Performance rating resulted in a Very High Level of Confidence for the Past Performance factor.

SGT

The SEB assigned a confidence rating of Very High to SGT's Past Performance, Factor 3. For Size Pertinence, SGT received a VHP rating as SGT's largest referenced contract well exceeded the Government estimated LITES II annual average. For Overall Content Pertinence SGT was rated as VHP. SGT received VHP for all PWS sections. Therefore the overall content was rated as VHP. For Complexity Pertinence SGT received a rating of Very Highly Pertinent as SGT demonstrated experience performing a wide range of services/functions similar in complexity to the LITES II requirements. Performance ratings for the Prime were Excellent and Very Good. For the subcontractors' referenced contracts the preponderance were rated Excellent. The overall performance rating is Exceptional.

Therefore, SGT's Overall Pertinence rating of Very Highly Pertinent and Overall Exceptional Performance rating resulted in a Very High Level of Confidence for the Past Performance factor.

SRA

The SEB assigned a confidence rating of High to SRA's Past Performance, Factor 3. For Size Pertinence, SRA received a VHP rating as SRA's largest referenced contract well exceeded the Government estimated LITES II annual average. For Overall Content Pertinence SRA was rated as HP. SRA was rated VHP for some PWS sections; however, received one HP, two Ps and one SP. Therefore the overall content rating is HP. For Complexity Pertinence, SRA received a VHP as SRA demonstrated experience performing a wide range of services/functions similar in complexity.

Performance ratings across the referenced contracts, for the Prime contracts were rated as Excellent and Very Good. For the subcontractors' referenced contracts, the preponderance were rated as Excellent. The overall performance rating is Exceptional. Therefore, SRA's Overall Pertinence rating of Highly Pertinent and Overall Exceptional Performance rating resulted in a High Level of Confidence for the Past Performance factor.

Basis for Selection

I am convinced that the SEB conducted a thorough, fair, and objective evaluation of all proposals in accordance with the established evaluation criteria in the RFP. I comparatively assessed the proposals against all evaluation factors and subfactors in the RFP. I also considered all factors, and their relative weights, in the selection of the Offeror that can perform the contract in a manner most advantageous to the Government.

In comparing the Offerors in Mission Suitability, I noted that SAIC and SGT were the only Offerors to receive no Weaknesses or Significant Weaknesses in any of the three subfactors.

For Subfactor 1, Understanding the Requirement and Technical Approach, SAIC had an adjectival rating of Excellent compared to CACI, DB Consulting, Jacobs, SGT, and SRA's adjectival ratings of Good, Fair, Poor, Good, and Fair respectively.

In Approach for Performing the Technical Requirements - URTA 1, I noted SAIC had a significant strength for understanding the contract's technical requirements as evidenced by its approach for applying consistent enterprise architecture and implementation, and operational best practices across tasks for PWS Section 3.0, 4.0 and 5.0. SAIC's proposal provided a comprehensive description of their process for operational system administration, database tools and application management (with scaling rigor as appropriate) which also included the development of plans and schedules which appreciably increases the probability of successful contract performance.

In addition to the significant strength above, I also noted SAIC's strength for an approach to system improvements that will introduce standardization in an evolutionary manner and support transformation of LaRC's IT environment with new or emerging technologies. I noted SAIC had additional strengths for tools and approaches to enable application maintenance and database administration.

In the Offerors' approaches for performing the technical requirements, I noted SGT received multiple strengths that increased the probability for successful contract performance. These strengths were for systems, tools, and processes to standardize operational best practices, system operation and maintenance, software development, and database management. CACI also received strengths for its approaches for

performing the technical requirements of PWS 5 and best practices related to enterprise architecture; however, it had a weakness for meeting the requirements of the large scale data storage and retrieval system. I also noted that DB Consulting received strengths for operational best practices and no weaknesses but those strengths were not as beneficial to the Government as the strengths and significant strength noted in either the SGT or SAIC proposals. Jacobs and SRA both had significant weaknesses and no strengths for their approaches for performing the technical requirements. For URTA 1, in comparison to any other Offeror's proposal, SAIC's proposal demonstrated an overall superior understanding of the technical requirements through its technical approaches.

In Risks and Approach to Risk Mitigation - URTA 2, I noted that SAIC was the only Offeror to receive a significant strength for identification and mitigation of risks including IT security risks, Continuity of Operations risks, Organizational Conflicts of Interest risks, and other significant risks associated with the maintenance of unique skills in the LITES II workforce and the challenge of effectively working with the large data sets being collected during research experiments. SAIC's significant strength was unique among the Offerors and I agree it appreciably increases the probability for successful contract performance. For URTA 2, I also noted CACI, Jacobs, and SGT had no strengths or weaknesses. DB Consulting had a significant weakness related to IT security which concerned me because of the important role the LITES II contractor will have in IT security and the emphasis on IT security in the Federal Government. I noted SRA had a weakness for its approach to IT Continuity of Operations and Organizational Conflicts of Interest risks. Overall, I considered SAIC as having the superior proposal for its risk identification and approach to risk mitigation compared to the other Offerors.

In Approach for Remaining on the Forefront of IT Technologies and Services and Proactively Sharing this Knowledge to Benefit LaRC and the Agency - URTA 3, I noted that none of the Offerors received a significant strength and all Offerors had strengths with no weaknesses. All the Offerors had similar approaches related to staying on the forefront of IT technologies and services and proactively sharing this knowledge. However, I noted that SAIC's proposal had a strength regarding an approach to remain on the forefront of technology by monitoring each technology and identifying skill gaps. I considered this approach unique among the approaches for which the other Offerors received strengths.

For Subfactor 2, Management Approach, all Offerors had an adjectival rating of Good.

In considering Approach for Managing the Contract - MA 1, I noted CACI had neither strengths nor weaknesses. DB Consulting had a strength for the PM. I also noted that Jacobs had strengths for its PM and for its common chain of command but also a weakness for not adequately defining its local organization structure. I noted SAIC received no weaknesses and received a strength for its Program Manager (PM) and a strength for its local organization structure. I noted SGT received no weaknesses and a strength for its PM and a strength for its local organization structure. I noted that SRA received a strength for its approach for effectively managing the contract. Regarding the approach for managing the contract, I noted that the SAIC and SGT proposals had comparable findings and I considered both approaches as better than those of the other Offerors.

In considering Contract Start-Up - MA 2, I noted that CACI, DB Consulting, Jacobs, and SRA received neither strengths nor weaknesses. I noted SAIC received no weaknesses and received a strength for its contract start-up plan. I noted that SGT also received no weaknesses and received a strength for initial staffing with qualified employees. I noted that SAIC and SGT had comparable findings for contract start-up and considered both approaches as better than those of the other Offerors.

In considering Recruiting, Retaining, Motivating, And Training Employees - MA 3, I noted that CACI had no weaknesses and had strengths for recruiting and retention. I also noted the DB Consulting proposal had weaknesses for its approach to staffing and hiring. Jacobs received no findings for MA 3.

SAIC received no weaknesses and received a strength for its succession planning and innovative approach to staff retention. SGT had no weaknesses and received strengths for its formal succession plan and career development strategies. I noted that SRA had no weaknesses and received a strength for a performance development plan, training plan, and succession plan. I considered the approaches of SAIC, SGT, and SRA as more favorable to the Government than the other Offerors' approaches.

In considering Small Business Subcontracting and Commitment to Small Business, I noted that CACI received strengths for its commitment to small business based on its mentor protégé program and outreach plan. However, CACI had a weakness relative to its small business subcontracting goals. I noted that DB Consulting had two weaknesses related to the Subcontracting Plan and no strengths. I also noted that Jacobs and SRA had no weaknesses and also received strengths for proposed small business goals. SAIC had no weaknesses and received strengths for its proposed subcontracting goals and its mentor protégé program. SGT had no weaknesses and had strengths for its proposed subcontracting goals and its mentor protégé program. When I compared all the Offeror's approaches, I found Jacobs, SAIC, SGT, and SRA were essentially equal, and those four superior to CACI and DB Consulting.

Regarding Factor 2 Cost/Price, I noted that every proposal was below the Independent Government Estimate. I also noted a correlation between Mission Suitability scores and the Cost/Price. The two Offeror's with the highest Mission Suitability scores also proposed the highest Cost/Price. Only the two highest price Offerors, SAIC and SGT, had no weaknesses and no significant weaknesses in Mission Suitability. I noted that the evaluated price variance between the two most highly rated technical proposals, SAIC and SGT, represented about a seven percent price difference. I also noted that the other four Offerors' prices appeared to be substantially lower than the Government estimate. Of all the proposals, I have considerably more confidence that SAIC's and SGT's proposed cost/prices will be sufficient to retain and hire the skilled technical expertise required to perform the enhanced IT services required by this contract.

Regarding Factor 3, Past Performance, I noted that SAIC and SGT had the highest overall pertinence rating among all the Offerors and both demonstrated the full breadth of experience necessary to perform the LITES II contract. I also noted that all Offerors received Exceptional ratings for performance with the exception of CACI which was rated as Very Effective. I noted SAIC and SGT received the highest confidence rating for Past Performance (Very High). The remaining Offerors (CACI, DB Consulting, Jacobs, and SRA) each received a confidence rating of High.

After comparatively assessing all the Offerors' strengths and weaknesses, cost/price, and past performance, I again closely assessed and compared the relative merits of the two highest rated proposals for Mission Suitability and Past Performance considering that, although they also represent the two highest priced proposals, both are well below the Government estimate and very competitive with each other. I considered the proposals from CACI, DB Consulting, Jacobs, and SRA as not as advantageous to the Government as the proposals from SAIC and SGT, taking into account the relative weight of the evaluation factors as set forth in the RFP, and recognizing that Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost/Price.

SOURCE SELECTION DECISION

In making the selection decision, I conducted an integrated assessment of each proposal and considered the relative weight of the evaluation factors as indicated in the RFP recognizing that Mission Suitability

and Past Performance, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost/Price. After a review of all the information, I find that SAIC's proposal provides superior benefit in Mission Suitability compared to CACI, DB Consulting, Jacobs, SGT, and SRA. Of all the proposals, SAIC was the only Offeror to demonstrate significant strengths in Mission Suitability and to warrant an Excellent rating for demonstrating a thorough and comprehensive approach for URTA. SAIC's understanding and approach for performing PWS Sections 3.0, 4.0, and 5.0 indicated a well-conceived, strategically integrated plan calculated to address LaRC IT services in a markedly better manner than any other Offeror. Similarly, SAIC's ability to identify the significant risks associated with successful performance of the contract, and its approach for avoiding, neutralizing, or mitigating those risks, demonstrated a more comprehensive awareness of real risks and a more effective approach for addressing risks than that proposed by any other Offeror. SAIC's description of its over-arching four-step approach for performing technical requirements demonstrated that SAIC possesses a comprehensive understanding of the contract's technical requirements and is better positioned than any other Offeror to provide the proactive and flexible IT service LaRC requires to move its IT mission forward for both current and future mission challenges. Regarding the Management Approach Subfactor of Mission Suitability, I note that both SGT and SAIC's proposals were rated Good (as were all the other Offerors'), and I note the SEB scored SGT's proposal slightly higher in numerical points, but I find no compelling discriminators for selection purposes among the SGT and SAIC Management Approach findings.

Regarding Past Performance, I find SAIC and SGT, the two proposals with the highest ratings for Mission Suitability, also have the highest confidence ratings among all the Offerors for Past Performance. After closely examining the Past Performance ratings of SAIC and SGT, I find no discriminators between them on the basis of Past Performance. I find that SAIC can effectively perform this contract based on its demonstrated past performance.

Regarding Cost/Price, I find that, of all the Offerors, only the two highest cost/price Offerors, SAIC and SGT, had no weaknesses and no significant weaknesses in Mission Suitability. I note that the price variance between the two most highly rated technical proposals (SAIC and SGT) was about 7%. Recognizing that Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost/Price, I considered the proposed cost/price against the value of SAIC's superior understanding and approach for performing the SOW tasks, and SAIC's identification and approach to address contract risks, as reflected in SAIC's higher Mission Suitability score. I find the higher cost/price associated with SAIC's proposal is outweighed by the superior benefit of SAIC's Mission Suitability and Past Performance relative to CACI, DB Consulting, Jacobs, and SRA. While I find the SAIC and SGT proposals essentially equal with regard to past performance, I find the higher cost/price of SAIC's proposal is outweighed by the superior benefit of SAIC's Mission Suitability as compared to SGT's Mission Suitability. I find SAIC's Cost/Price to be reasonable in the competitive environment of this procurement, especially considering the highly skilled technical expertise required for the LITES II contract. Therefore, I find SAIC's proposal is the most advantageous to the Government. In making this decision I have considered the three evaluation factors to be essentially equal in importance, with Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, significantly more important than Cost/Price.

Accordingly, I hereby select Science Application International Corporation (SAIC) for award of the LITES II contract.



David E. Bowles
Source Selection Authority