SELECTION STATEMENT
FOR
GODDARD UNIFIED ENTERPRISE SERVICES AND TECHNOLOGY (GUEST)

On November 23, 2009, I, along with key senior officials at NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center (GSFC), met with the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed to evaluate proposals in connection with the Goddard Unified Enterprise Services and Technology (GUEST) procurement.

Procurement Description and History

The principle purpose of the GUEST procurement is to provide safe and secure integrated Information Technology (IT) solutions to the GSFC IT Business Infrastructure, all while improving operational efficiencies and reliability for the GSFC workforce. The GUEST Procurement encompasses all phases of IT project implementation including design and development, integration, operations, maintenance, sustaining engineering, data administration, system administration, and management. As such, the successful GUEST Contractor will be responsible for the development, integration, and management of IT infrastructure and systems for GSFC in the areas of information systems management, system administration, network design, business infrastructure, and application development.

As a result of this 8(a) competitive procurement, it is the intent of the Government to award a Fixed-Price-Incentive, Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract. The contract will have an effective ordering period of five years from the award date of the contract. The minimum amount of supplies or services that will be ordered during the effective ordering period of this contract is $2,000,000, while the maximum amount of supplies or services that may be ordered during the effective ordering period of this contract is $229,000,000. The contract contains a 30 calendar day phase-in period which is expected to commence upon contract award.

A synopsis of the major procurement milestone dates in the GUEST procurement follows:

Major Procurement Milestones	Date Completed
Request For Proposal (RFP) Released	08/22/2008
Proposals Due	10/16/2008
Competitive Range Determination	06/16/2009
Final Proposal Revisions (FPR) Received	10/07/2009
SSA Presentation/Selection	11/23/2009

Four RFP amendments were issued. Amendment One, issued on September 1, 2008, revised portions of Sections L and M. This Amendment also revised Attachment C, Exhibit C and Clause B.4 of the RFP and extended the proposal due date until October 9, 2008. Amendment Two, issued on October 2, 2008, revised portions of the Mission Suitability Management Approach Subfactor instructions. Amendment Three, issued on October 7, 2008, extended the proposal due date until October 16, 2008 and removed Statement of Objective (SOO) provision 6.7. Amendment Four, discussed below, was issued on September 17, 2009.

Evaluation Procedures

The evaluation was conducted in accordance with FAR 15.3, "Source Selection," and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.3, same subject. The RFP stated that the factors used for evaluation are Mission Suitability, Price, and Past Performance. The RFP specified the relative order of importance of the evaluation factors as follows:

> "The Price Factor is significantly less important than the combined importance of the Mission Suitability Factor and the Past Performance Factor. As individual factors, the Price Factor is less important than the Mission Suitability Factor, but more important than the Past Performance Factor."

The RFP established that only the Mission Suitability Factor would be assigned a numerical score in the evaluation process. The Mission Suitability Factor was based on a 1,000-point scale using the following four (4) subfactors:

	Points
Subfactor A - Technical Approach/Performance Work Statement (PWS)	400
Subfactor B - Representative Task Orders (RTO's)	300
Subfactor C - Management Approach	250
Subfactor D - Safety and Health	50
TOTAL	1,000

The Mission Suitability Factor was evaluated using the adjectival rating definitions and percentile ranges in NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(A). The maximum points available for each subfactor were multiplied by the assessed percent for each subfactor to derive the score for the particular subfactor. For example, if a subfactor had a possible 200 points and received a percent rating of 80, then the score for the subfactor is 160 points.

The SEB conducted an independent Mission Suitability evaluation of each proposal in accordance with the criteria set forth in the solicitation. Once all findings were documented and checked for vertical and horizontal consistency, the SEB met and reached consensus on adjectival ratings and percentile ratings for each of the subfactors. Each percentile rating was then applied to the available points for the respective subfactor to determine the score for that subfactor. Then, the individual subfactor scores were summed to determine the overall Mission Suitability scoring.

In accordance with the RFP Section M.5, "PRICE EVALUATION FACTOR", a price analysis was conducted in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(1). This analysis was done to ensure that a "fair and reasonable" price is paid by the Government. The SEB evaluated the extent to which Offeror's proposed prices indicated a clear understanding of the RTO's and reflected a sound approach to satisfying those objectives. In addition to proposed target prices for each RTO, the Government's Maximum Cost Exposure, which is comprised of the proposed ceiling price for each RTO, phase-in price (if any), and onsite GSFC facility expense, was presented in accordance with the RFP. Resource realism was considered within the Mission Suitability Factor.

In accordance with RFP Section M.6, "PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FACTOR", an evaluation was conducted of each Offeror's record (including the record of significant

subcontractors) of performing services similar in size, content, and complexity to the requirements of this solicitation in terms of relevancy and performance. The Past Performance factor was not assigned a numerical score, but was assigned an adjectival level of confidence rating of Very High, High, Moderate, Low, Very Low, or Neutral. Each adjectival level of confidence rating has a "relevance" component and "performance" component. The overall level of confidence rating assigned to Past Performance reflected a subjective evaluation of the information contained in the Offeror's past performance written narrative; past performance evaluation input provided through customer questionnaires; and other references.

On October 16, 2008, seven timely proposals were received from the following companies:

ASRC Primus
Odyssey Marketing Group, Inc.
InterImage
ActioNet
DB Consulting Group, Inc.
SP Systems, Corp.
DKW Communications, Inc.

On March 27, 2009, the proposal submitted by Odyssey Marketing Group, Inc. was determined to be unacceptable and therefore eliminated from the competition.

A full briefing of the results of the initial evaluation conducted by the SEB, as well as the Contracting Officer's competitive range determination, was presented to me on June 16, 2009. The Contracting Officer determined that the proposals submitted by ASRC Primus, ActioNet, and DB Consulting were the most highly rated proposals and therefore were included in the competitive range. I concurred with this determination.

On June 19, 2009, the Contracting Officer sent written notices to ASRC Primus, ActioNet and DB Consulting Group, Inc, notifying each Offeror that they were included in the Competitive Range, and that the Government intended to enter into discussions. On June 30, 2009, letters were sent to ASRC Primus, ActioNet and DB Consulting citing the weaknesses and significant weakness in their technical proposals and other items for clarification. In order to facilitate the discussions, the SEB requested written responses by July 14, 2009; however, the Offerors' responses were delayed to August 12, 2009, due to a pre-award protest by one of the Offerors excluded from the competitive range. The protest was subsequently withdrawn.

Discussions were held in person and took place from September 1-3, 2009. The SEB stressed that the goal of discussions was to ensure that the Offerors had a better understanding of the GUEST requirements and the SEB's assessment of their proposal. In addition, the SEB stressed that any proposed changes discussed during discussions needed to be incorporated into the FPR in order to be evaluated and reiterated the need for consistency between PWS, Technical Approach and RTO's as required by the RFP. The SEB advised the Offerors that it would not identify how to specifically change/update their proposals. The SEB encouraged all Offerors to submit their most competitive pricing in their FPR submission.

On September 15, 2009, the SEB met for a follow-up discussion with all Offerors in the competitive range. The follow-up discussion was to inform the Offerors of potential changes to the GUEST requirement and to get feedback on the impact of those changes.

On September 17, 2009, a letter was sent to ASRC Primus, ActioNet and DB Consulting to close discussions and include Amendment Four which provided FPR instructions and changes to the GUEST RFP. This Amendment revised and updated contract clauses, clarified Section 9.2 of the Statement of Objectives and updated RFP Section L instructions. Three timely FPR's were received on October 7, 2009.

The SEB completed its evaluation of the proposals on November 9, 2009, and documented its findings in a written report. The SEB reported its findings to me on November 23, 2009.

SEB Findings and Evaluation

The following chart provides the adjective rating results for each offeror, by subfactor:

	ASRC Primus	**ActioNet**	**DB Consulting**
SUBFACTOR A - Technical Approach & PWS	Very Good	Fair	Very Good
SUBFACTOR B - RTO's	Good	Fair	Good
SUBFACTOR C - Management Approach	Excellent	Good	Good
SUBFACTOR D - Safety and Health	Good	Good	Good

Mission Suitability:

The evaluation results for the Mission Suitability Factor for ASRC Primus, ActioNet, and DB Consulting are as follows:

ASRC Primus:

Under Subfactor A, the ASRC Primus proposal received one (1) significant strength, two (2) strengths and four (4) weaknesses for a subfactor rating of "Very Good".

The ASRC Primus proposal received a significant strength for its proposed approach to concept of operations for GUEST which demonstrated an excellent integrated enterprise approach to delivering, managing, and operating GUEST services. The ASRC Primus proposal demonstrated insight and understanding of the current GSFC IT environment that would enhance the provisioning of IT services to GSFC. The proposed ASRC Primus Enterprise Service Desk would be located at an off-site facility and would provide similar GUEST Enterprise Customer Support Services to other Federal Agencies, all while benefiting GSFC by capitalizing on industry best practices already implemented. Moreover, ASRC Primus' off-site facility is already certified ISO/IEC 20000 and CMMI Level 5, well ahead of the RFP requirements of achieving ISO/IEC 20000 certification within two years of contract award. The proposed web-based GUEST

information dashboard would unify the view of the GUEST services for the government monitors and customers of ITCD, while enhancing Government insight into IT services to ensure customer expectations are achieved. The technical approaches proposed by ASRC Primus provide a greatly enhanced potential for successful performance of the government objectives.

The ASRC Primus proposal received its first strength for its strong commitment to risk-based program and project management. The ASRC Primus proposal received its second strength for its demonstrated appreciation and understanding of the complex Goddard IT environment through assessment of the current ITCD service providers. The ASRC Primus proposal received four (4) weaknesses in Subfactor A. The ASRC Primus proposal received its first weakness because it did not provide a complete set of Service Level Agreements (SLA's) and associated performance metric descriptions for SOO 8.0 (Solutions for Enterprise-Wide Procurement Program (SEWP) Support). The ASRC Primus proposal received its second weakness because the proposed PWS target metrics for Patch Management were inconsistent with metrics cited in their proposed RTO. The ASRC Primus proposal received its third weakness because it did not adequately describe the purpose and associated processes for one of the performance metrics for status updates for the Enterprise Service Desk. Finally, the ASRC Primus proposal received its fourth weakness because there was an inconsistency between their PWS and Risk Management Plan.

Under Subfactor B, the ASRC Primus proposal received one (1) strength and one (1) weakness for a subfactor rating of "Good". The ASRC Primus proposal received a strength because in response to RTO 4 – "Application Development and Sustaining Engineering", it proposed the use of certain tools which provide better results and insight into their application development processes. The ASRC Primus proposal received a weakness in Subfactor B for proposing SLA's and performance metrics that differ between their proposed PWS and RTO 2 – "Enterprise Patch Management".

Under Subfactor C, the ASRC Primus proposal received one (1) significant strength for a subfactor rating of "Excellent". The ASRC Primus proposal received this significant strength as a result of the significant advantages offered by its proposed management tool set, as well as its extensive description of how this tool set would be implemented on the GUEST contract. This tool set, the ASRC Primus Task Order Management System (ATOMS), features an integrated, web-accessible suite of applications which perform technical and management automation of a wide-range of functions and provides the mechanism for staffing tasks. The functions include web-based access for management staff from any location, task processing, and financial management. It also provides electronic and automated interfaces to other enterprise business systems and tools; access to corporate, contract, project and task level databases; and customized collaboration sites for projects and tasks on contract. Several features of the ATOMS would significantly improve both contractor and government efficiency. The Offeror's implementation of ATOMS, infused with their management methodology, would significantly benefit the government. Task planning and execution oversight are automated, reducing budget, schedule and technical risks to the government.

Under Subfactor D, the ASRC Primus proposal received no findings for a subfactor rating of "Good".

ActioNet:

Under Subfactor A, the ActioNet proposal received two (2) strengths, four (4) weaknesses, and two (2) significant weaknesses for a subfactor rating of "Fair". The ActioNet proposal received its first strength for its proposed set of tools which provide the foundation for service delivery and implementation and enhancement of Information Technology Infrastructure Library (ITIL) processes. The ActioNet proposal received its second strength for its proposed use of an IT Security Manager with GUEST contract-wide authority and responsibility who reports directly to the GUEST Program Manager. The ActioNet proposal received four (4) weaknesses in this Subfactor. The ActioNet proposal received its first weakness because it did not discuss a Systems Requirements Review (SRR) in its Software Development Life Cycle (SDLC). The ActioNet proposal received its second weakness because it did not adequately address the objectives of the SOO 7.2 "Vulnerability Scanning". The ActioNet proposal received its third weakness because it did not adequately address the requirements of SOO 7.3 (Patch Management). Finally, the ActioNet proposal received its fourth weakness because the proposed SLA's and performance metrics lacked specific performance measures to ensure that its technical approach met GUEST Program IT service objectives.

The ActioNet proposal received two significant weaknesses under Subfactor A. The ActioNet proposal was received its first significant weakness because it was missing specific SLA's and performance metrics as required by section L.13.3 of the RFP. Specifically, the ActioNet proposal was missing specific SLA's and performance metrics for: SOO 6.2 "Systems Analysis Support"; SOO 6.6.3 "Property Management"; SOO 6.8.2 "Engineering Services"; SOO 7.4 "Incident Response and Resolution"; SOO 7.5 "Identity Management"; SOO 8.1 "Business Support"; SOO 8.2 "Financial Management Support"; SOO 9.3.2 "Transition Planning and Assessment"; and SOO 12 "Operational Constraints". The lack of specific SLA's and performance metrics did not allow the Government to assess whether the ActioNet proposed level of service met GUEST Program IT service objectives. This approach did not meet RFP requirements and appreciably increased the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. The ActioNet proposal received its second significant weakness because it did not provide adequate technical approaches for successful implementation of proposed SLA's and metrics for GUEST Program Objectives. The ActioNet proposed performance measures rely on the combination of task level metrics to determine overall GUEST success. By only focusing on SLA's and performance metrics for individual tasks, overall GUEST program objectives are not met. This approach poses technical performance risk in meeting the requirements of GUEST objectives and therefore increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Under Subfactor B, the ActioNet proposal received four (4) weaknesses for a subfactor rating of "Fair". The ActioNet proposal received its first weakness because it failed to propose performance metrics for target resolution times under RTO 1. The ActioNet proposal received a second weakness because it did not adequately address an understanding of future Agency IT initiatives for RTO 3 – "Data Center Services". The ActioNet proposal received a third weakness because it did not adequately identify the resources required for its Enterprise Service Call (ESC) Center to meet proposed Service Level Agreements and performance metrics for RTO 1 – Enterprise Service Call Center. Finally, the ActioNet proposal received a fourth weakness because it did not adequately address resources to perform Tier 2 and Tier 3 Support Services for RTO 3 – "Data Center Services" and RTO 4 – "Application Development and Sustaining Engineering".

Under Subfactor C, the ActioNet proposal received no findings for a subfactor rating of "Good".

Under Subfactor D, the ActioNet proposal received no findings for a subfactor rating of "Good".

DB Consulting:

Under Subfactor A, the DB Consulting proposal received one (1) significant strength, four (4) strengths and five (5) weaknesses for a subfactor rating of "Very Good".

The DB Consulting proposal received a significant strength because their proposal not only reflected an excellent understanding of future GSFC and Agency IT initiatives, but it described the impact of these initiatives on meeting GUEST Program objectives. The DB Consulting proposal recognizes the potential impacts of operations constraints listed in SOO 12.0 "Operational Constraints" and the NASA I^3P contracts in areas such as technical leadership, expert service desk services, and consolidation of services or applications due to Agency level contracts and Federal initiatives. In support of its approach, DB Consulting proposed the establishment of an on-site application test bed that would keep pace with Agency projects for identity authentication methods. This test bed is an innovation that would enable test and evaluation of existing and newly evolving products and would also support the integration of those products into the Center services environment. These approaches appreciably enhance the potential for successful contract performance by understanding the risks and impact of Agency IT initiatives on GUEST IT service delivery.

The DB Consulting proposal received four (4) strengths under Subfactor A. The DB Consulting proposal received its first strength for its integrated approach for all of the SOO's – which conveyed an understanding of ITIL and Service Oriented Architecture with clear examples and matrices. The DB Consulting proposal received its second strength for its innovative approach to automating data consolidation and analysis. This approach exceeded the Agency's requirements for monthly vulnerability scanning and improves the accuracy of vulnerability reports. The DB Consulting proposal received its third strength for its proposed automation approaches which would improve GSFC's IT security posture. The DB Consulting proposal received its fourth strength because it proposed a decision-making tool that would provide NASA better insight and reports of their performance metrics for GUEST program objectives. The DB Consulting proposal received five (5) weaknesses under Subfactor A. The DB Consulting proposal received its first weakness because it proposed a SEWP Customer Satisfaction performance rating that was not fully defined. The DB Consulting proposal received its second weakness because it did not propose adequate SLA and performance metrics for the GUEST Program Objectives SOO 5.3 "Leverage Existing GSFC IT Environment" and 5.6 "Support to Future Initiatives and Evolutions". The DB Consulting proposal received its third weakness for inconsistencies between the technical approach and its PWS in the areas of Tier 0 requirements, Service Coordination, and Organizational Level Agreement processes. The DB Consulting proposal received its fourth weakness because it proposed a reporting period measurement calculation that does not support its own proposed metric and did not adequately reflect the proposed requirement. Finally, the DB Consulting proposal received its fifth weakness because it provided incomplete performance metrics for data recovery.

Under Subfactor B, the DB Consulting proposal received no strengths or weaknesses, for a subfactor rating of "Good".

Under Subfactor C, the DB Consulting proposal received one (1) strength for a subfactor rating of "Good". The DB Consulting proposal received a strength for the proposed establishment of the GUEST Enterprise Management System (GEMS) through an integrated data architecture that would tie together tools/applications that GSFC currently uses to manage the IT environment.

Under Subfactor D, the DB Consulting proposal received no findings for a subfactor rating of "Good".

Price:

ActioNet proposed a Maximum Cost Exposure for all RTO's that was lower than ASRC Primus and DB Consulting.

ASRC Primus proposed a Maximum Cost Exposure for all RTO's that was lower than DB Consulting.

DB Consulting proposed the highest Maximum Cost Exposure for all RTO's when compared to ASRC Primus and DB Consulting.

Past Performance:

ASRC Primus:

The ASRC GUEST Team had three (3) contracts that were considered significantly relevant and three (3) contracts that were considered relevant. The performance ratings given in the survey responses were positive. The overall customer technical performance ratings for ASRC Primus and its proposed subcontractor team have been "very high" to "high". Based on ASRC Primus Team's relevant performance record, there is a very high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the GUEST effort.

ActioNet:

The ActioNet Team had two (2) contracts that were considered significantly relevant, one (1) considered relevant and two (2) that were considered minimally relevant. The performance ratings given in the survey responses were positive. The overall technical performance for ActioNet and its proposed subcontractor team was rated "very high" to "high" by their customers. Based on the ActioNet Team's relevant performance record, there is a very high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the GUEST effort.

DB Consulting:

The DB Consulting Team had four (4) contracts that were considered significantly relevant and one (1) that was considered relevant. The performance ratings given in the survey responses were positive. The overall technical performance for DB Consulting and its proposed subcontractor team was rated by their customers as "very high" to "high". Based on the DB Consulting Team's

relevant performance record, there is a very high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the GUEST effort.

Source Selection Decision

I have carefully reviewed both the SEB's November 23, 2009, Final Report and the Presentation. During the presentation, I considered the detailed findings the SEB presented. I noted that the SEB report and the accompanying Presentation further amplified each finding with extensive details. I solicited and considered the views of all of the attendees at the presentation, including key senior officials at GSFC. These key senior officials have responsibility related to this acquisition and understood the application of the evaluation factors set forth in the RFP.

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

> "The Price Factor is significantly less important than the combined importance of the Mission Suitability Factor and the Past Performance Factor. As individual factors, the Price Factor is less important than the Mission Suitability Factor, but more important than the Past Performance Factor."

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

Overall, the evaluation presented by the SEB provided a clear understanding of the differences in the Mission Suitability ratings of all Offerors. I accept the Mission Suitability findings of the SEB as reflected in the evaluation report. Both ASRC Primus and DB Consulting were rated favorably in the Mission Suitability Factor. ActioNet was rated much less favorably in Mission Suitability. Since the Mission Suitability Factor is the most heavily weighted factor in this solicitation, this made ActioNet far less competitive overall.

ASRC Primus received the highest overall Mission Suitability score. ASRC proposed valuable significant strengths under Subfactor A, Technical Approach/PWS, which was the most heavily weighted subfactor within Mission Suitability, and Subfactor C, Management Approach. Under Subfactor A, ASRC Primus demonstrated an excellent integrated enterprise approach to delivering, managing, and operating GUEST services. I found that this demonstrated that ASRC Primus's insight and understanding of the current GSFC IT environment will greatly enhance the provisioning of IT services to GSFC. Additionally, ASRC Primus' Enterprise Service Desk facility is already certified ISO/IEC 20000 and CMMI Level 5, which differentiates their proposal from the other Offerors and provides significant performance benefits while exceeding the RFP requirements. ASRC Primus also excelled in Subfactor C, Management Approach. ASRC Primus received a significant strength for their proposed management approach because of the proposed integrated, web-accessible suite of applications which perform technical and management automation of a wide-range of functions and provides the mechanism for staffing tasks. I found that the Offeror's implementation of ATOMS, infused with their management methodology, will significantly benefit the Government. In particular, the integration of resource, task order, risk and cost management tools provide enhanced insight across the entire GUEST Program. The ASRC Primus approach offers a significant advantage over the proposed management approach for

ActioNet and DB Consulting which resulted in ASRC Primus receiving the highest adjective rating of Excellent in the Management Approach Subfactor.

DB Consulting also received a high Mission Suitability score, which was somewhat lower than ASRC Primus, including a Very Good rating in Subfactor A, Technical Approach/PWS. Their proposal reflected an excellent understanding of future GSFC and Agency IT initiatives and the impact of these initiatives on meeting GUEST Program objectives. I believe that this appreciably enhances the potential for successful contract performance by understanding the risks and impact of Agency IT initiatives on GUEST IT service delivery. The ActioNet Mission Suitability score was significantly lower than both ASRC Primus and DB Consulting. While they were acceptable in many areas and their proposal included Strengths in some areas, they received no Significant Strengths and were significantly less competitive overall within the Mission Suitability Factor.

After reviewing Mission Suitability, I examined the proposed pricing for the RTO's. ActioNet had the lowest price (maximum cost exposure), followed by ASRC Primus, and DB Consulting had the highest price. Although, ActioNet had the lowest price for all RTO's, I did not find this price advantage to outweigh the significant Mission Suitability advantages offered by ASRC Primus and DB Consulting. This is supported by the RFP which stated that "The Price Factor is significantly less important than the combined importance of the Mission Suitability Factor and the Past Performance Factor".

Past performance, the third and final factor, did not result in a discriminator between ASRC Primus, DB Consulting and ActioNet, as they all received a "Very High" Level of confidence.

Based on the above, I found that ASRC Primus represented the best value to NASA by offering the highest Mission Suitability advantages and a competitive maximum cost exposure. While DB Consulting offered a technically competitive proposal, I found ASRC Primus' technical proposal to be superior, primarily based on their current ISO/IEC 20000 and CMMI Level 5 certifications and their Excellent rating in the Management Approach Subfactor. Because the Mission Suitability Subfactor was the most heavily weighted subfactor in the RFP, this area was the most important area in my selection decision. Additionally, ASRC Primus' maximum cost exposure was significantly lower than the maximum cost exposure of DB Consulting. Therefore, DB Consulting, with a lower Mission Suitability score and a higher maximum cost exposure, did not represent a better value than ASRC Primus. While ActioNet offered the lowest maximum cost exposure, this did not offset the significant Mission Suitability advantage offered by ASRC Primus.

Accordingly, I select ASRC Primus for award of the Goddard Unified Enterprise Services and Technology (GUEST) contract.

Judith N. Bruner

Judith N. Bruner
Source Selection Authority

12/9/09
Date