

**SELECTION STATEMENT
FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL TEST AND INTEGRATION SERVICES**

On December 20, 2007, I along with senior officials at Goddard Space Flight Center met with members of the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) to hear their findings based on the evaluation of proposals for the Environmental Test and Integration Services (ETIS) solicitation.

PROCUREMENT DESCRIPTION AND HISTORY

This full and open competitive procurement will produce a contract to provide environmental test and integration services for the Applied Engineering and Technology Directorate at Goddard Space Flight Center for a five-year ordering period. Under this effort, the Contractor shall provide environmental test and integration services including structural dynamics testing, electromagnetic testing, space simulation testing, optical services, thermal blankets, and facility maintenance. The resultant contract will be a cost plus award fee, indefinite delivery, indefinite quantity (IDIQ) type contract.

A Draft Request for Proposal (RFP) was issued on October 12, 2006, for industry comments. The Final RFP was released November 14, 2006. Subsequently, nine amendments followed to make changes to the solicitation: (1) Amendment 1 (issued November 29, 2006) removed the scheduling requirement from Subfactor B; (2) Amendment 2 (issued December 1, 2006) reflected an update to NPR 8715.3 and corrected administrative errors in Exhibit 8 RTO; (3) Amendment 3 (issued December 13, 2006) increased the page limitation for the Mission suitability Volume from 75 pages to 85 pages; (4) Amendment 4 (issued on December 14, 2006) extended the proposal due date to December 22, 2006, and changed the Financial Reporting deliverable due date; (5) Amendment 5 (issued on March 13, 2007) revised Exhibit 8 (Representative Task Order (RTO)), Sections L and M, Mission Suitability page limitation, and Attachment C (Financial Management reporting); (6) Amendment 6 (issued on March 27, 2007) revised Section L, Revised Exhibit 8 (RTO), corrected administrative errors, and revised the proposal due date to April 20, 2007; (7) Amendment 7 (issued April 10, 2007) corrected administrative errors and extended the proposal revision due date to April 27, 2007; (8) Amendment 8 (issued April 18, 2007) extended the proposal revision due date to May 21, 2007; and (9) Amendment 9 (issued September 5, 2007) established instructions, page limitations and the due date of the Final Proposal Revision (FPR) as well as clarified the Government Cost Model and updated clauses.

Three proposals were received from the following contractors:

Analex Corporation 2677 Prosperity Avenue, Suite 400 Fairfax, VA 22301	Jacobs Technology Inc. 600 William Northern Blvd., PO Box 884 Tullahoma, TN 37388	ManTech Corporation 12015 Lee Jackson Highway Fairfax, VA 22033
---	--	---

The initial evaluation results were presented to me, the Source Selection Authority (SSA), on August 13, 2007. Discussions took place on August 27, 28, and 29, 2007, and final revised proposals were due on September 26, 2007. Final evaluations commenced on September 27, 2007, and were completed on December 19, 2007.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES & PROCESS

The evaluation was conducted in accordance with the source selection procedures identified in Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Subpart 15.3 and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Subpart 1815.3. The SEB procedures contained in NFS 1815.370 were also applied.

The RFP defined the evaluation factors as Mission Suitability, Cost, and Past Performance. The RFP specified the relative order of importance of the evaluation factors as follows: "The Cost Factor is significantly less important than the combined importance of the Mission Suitability Factor and the Past Performance Factor. As individual factors, the Cost 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 evaluation factor would be point scored in the evaluation process. The Mission Suitability factor consisted of the following sub-factors with assigned points as indicated:

Mission Suitability Sub-Factors	Points
Sub-factor A – Reserved	0
Sub-factor B – RTO and Understanding the Requirements of the SOW	500
Sub-factor C - Management Plan	300
Sub-factor D - Safety & Health Plan	150
Sub-factor E – Small Disadvantaged Business Participation	50
TOTAL	1,000

Prior to the issuance of the RFP, the SEB developed detailed evaluation criteria and the numerical scoring system for Mission Suitability as delineated above. The RFP explained the evaluation procedures, and specifically described the evaluation factors and sub-factors, provided the Mission Suitability numerical scoring scheme and specified the criteria to be used in the evaluation.

As NASA's Source Selection Authority for this procurement, I appointed the SEB, along with a team of technical consultants and business/management analysts, comprised of members from appropriate disciplines, to assist in proposal evaluation. The SEB assessed the strengths and

weaknesses of each proposal and adjectivally rated and point scored the proposals for each Mission Suitability sub-factor.

Regarding the Cost Factor, the cost evaluation was conducted in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(1); NFS 1815.305(a)(1)(B) and (C); and RFP clause M.5 – Cost Evaluation Factor. Additionally, the SEB assessed the reasonableness of the proposed costs and conducted a cost realism analysis. The cost realism analysis was used to determine the probable cost for the entire five-year ordering period.

The Past Performance evaluation was conducted in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(2) and NFS 1815.305(a)(2). Within the Past Performance factor, an Offeror, along with its teaming partner(s) and/or significant subcontractor(s), were evaluated in a variety of technical and business areas. The SEB considered both the relevance of the previous work to ETIS and the Offeror's performance of that work. The Past Performance factor was not point scored. To assist in evaluating the Past Performance factor, the RFP provided the following ratings: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, Poor, and Neutral.

The Mission Suitability findings and associated ratings and scores, the proposed and probable cost assessments, and the Past Performance ratings were presented to me as the Source Selection Authority.

MISSION SUITABILITY EVALUATION

The Analex Corporation (Analex), Jacobs Technology, Inc. (Jacobs), and ManTech Corporation (ManTech) proposals all received an overall adjectival rating of "Very Good." Analex and Jacobs each received essentially the same Mission Suitability Score, and both of their scores are higher than ManTech's score.

The substance of the SEB's evaluation of Mission Suitability for each proposal follows:

Analex Corporation

Subfactor B – RTO and Understanding Requirements of the SOW

Under Subfactor B, the Analex proposal received seven significant strengths, four strengths and one weakness, and a subfactor rating of "Excellent." The significant strengths identified were, as follows: (1) The Offeror provides an exceptionally thorough response to the Thermal Blankets subtask. The overall technical approach presented in the narrative write-up provides excellent insight into the tasks/processes of the Offeror's implementation plan. In addition, the Offeror's staffing plan provides a very realistic breakdown of the skill mix required to accomplish the objectives; (2) The Offeror has proposed an exemplary and very thorough response to the project support problem for the Optical Integration subtask. The overall discussion in all aspects of this subtask was excellent. The Offeror provides a very thorough discussion of the various fields of study, including gravity effects, structural deformation, issues with cleanliness and contamination, and temperature and pressure effects; (3) The Offeror provides an exceptionally

thorough response for the Recertification subtask that demonstrates a superior technical approach. The proposal lists all the applicable requirements documents indicating that the Offeror has a thorough understanding of the requirements; (4) The Offeror's response for the Advanced Manufacturing Branch Support subtask provides a highly comprehensive technical approach for fabrication and planning. The Offeror also provides an exceptionally thorough understanding of the associated schedule and staffing requirements; (5) The Offeror demonstrates a superior understanding of the Electrical Cable Harness Fabrication subtask by providing a very thorough technical approach. The Offeror also describes a comprehensive mix of skills and staffing plan to accomplish the task in an efficient manner; (6) The Offeror's approach to the Mechanical Integration subtask is extremely thorough and accurate, demonstrating the Offeror's excellent understanding of mechanical integration. The Offeror also does an outstanding job identifying mechanical integration technical challenges and associated resolutions to the challenges; and (7) The Offeror provides an exemplary and very thorough response to the Integration and Test Engineering Support subtask. The Offeror provides a very thorough technical approach for the design, fabrication and proof testing of the lifting sling and the integration of ETIS-1 onto the GammaSat Observatory.

The strengths identified were, as follows: (1) The Offeror demonstrated thoroughness and merit in their response to the Computer Systems Management subtask by providing a detailed and accurate understanding of the GSFC procedures and processes, and then implementing them in a detailed manner; (2) The Offeror provides a detailed Safety Plan subtask response describing their approach for ensuring that safety requirements are satisfied for Subtasks 1 through 13. The Offeror proposes a safety approach that emphasizes safety lessons-learned from GSFC, KSC, GRC, JSC and MSFC support operations; (3) The Offeror presents a comprehensive approach for the Contamination Control and Cleanroom Operations subtask; and (4) The Offeror provides a good response to the Environmental Test subtask by thoroughly demonstrating their understanding of the requirements and by presenting a detailed approach.

The weakness identified was, as follows: The Offeror's proposed approach to staff quality assurance personnel for the Management Subtask is inadequate for Subtasks 4 and 13. Also, staffing for Subtask 10 is too high and resulted in a cost realism adjustment. Staffing for Subtask 14 used inappropriate skill mix, also resulting in a cost realism adjustment.

Subfactor C - Management Plan

Under Subfactor C, the Analex proposal received two significant strengths, four strengths, and one weakness, and a subfactor rating of "Excellent." The significant strengths identified were, as follows: (1) The Offeror presents an extremely well-planned, comprehensive and detailed phase-in plan that provides for a smooth transition and demonstrates a superb ability to assume full contract responsibility; and (2) The Offeror proposes several bonus programs that greatly enhance the potential for successful contract performance. The Offeror proposes a superior approach to using award fee and other bonuses as an incentive to maximize overall employee morale and performance.

The strengths identified were, as follows: (1) The Offeror proposes a good system to process task orders and to manage multiple ongoing tasks; (2) The Offeror provides a good approach to

mitigating contractual risks and interfacing with Government personnel; (3) The Offeror has demonstrated a robust fringe benefits package which will aid in the recruiting and retention of employees; and (4) The Offeror demonstrated a comprehensive Mission Assurance Plan.

The weakness identified was, as follows: The Offeror's proposed fringe benefits policies for Location Allowance and Severance Pay were not adequately addressed or corrected and will have an adverse impact on the Offeror's recruiting and retention of employees.

Subfactor D - Safety & Health Plan

Under Subfactor D, the Analex proposal received one strength, and a subfactor rating of "Good." The strength identified was, as follows: The Offeror has demonstrated a comprehensive Safety and Health Plan for ETIS that exceeds requirements.

Subfactor E – Small Disadvantaged Business Participation

Under Subfactor E, the Analex proposal received one strength, and a subfactor rating of "Good." The strength identified was, as follows: The Offeror proposes a considerable amount of the IDIQ Maximum Ordering Value for Small Disadvantaged Businesses.

Jacobs Technology Inc.

Subfactor B – RTO and Understanding Requirements of the SOW

Under Subfactor B, the Jacobs proposal received three significant strengths, one strength and three weaknesses, and a subfactor rating of "Excellent." The significant strengths identified were, as follows: (1) The Offeror provides an exceptionally detailed response to the Thermal Blankets subtask. The comprehensive technical approach is clearly presented and demonstrates the various steps of blanket fabrication; (2) The Offeror provides an exceptionally proactive and thorough approach to the Safety subtask. The Offeror describes an outstanding "Safety Excellence Program."; and (3) The Offeror demonstrates an exceptional understanding and a very comprehensive technical approach for the Electrical Cable Harness subtask. The Offeror demonstrates superior competence in electrical cable harness fabrication.

The strength identified was, as follows: The Offeror's response to the Facility Engineering, Acquisition or Modification subtask is thorough.

The weaknesses identified were, as follows: (1) The Offeror failed to demonstrate a comprehensive technical approach to the Integration and Test Support subtask, by failing to provide personnel for integration of the ETIS-1 instrument onto the GammaSat Observatory; (2) The Offeror failed to demonstrate an adequate technical approach to management for subtasks 1, 4, 12 and 13 as part of the Quality Assurance and Management Subtask; and (3) The Offeror failed to demonstrate an adequate Configuration Management staffing plan for Subtask 3, as part of the Quality Assurance and Management Subtask.

Subfactor C - Management Plan

Under Subfactor C, the Jacobs proposal received five significant strengths and three strengths, and a subfactor rating of “Excellent.” The significant strengths identified were, as follows: (1) The Offeror presented an exceptional and comprehensive phase-in plan that provides a staffing plan commensurate to the phase-in plan activities; (2) The Offeror has an excellent approach to mission assurance. The Offeror states that they will leverage existing procedures to design a robust Quality Management System (QMS) for the ETIS contract. The Offeror also stated that they will obtain ISO 9001:2000 certification for their integrated ETIS operations team within nine months of contract start; (3) The Offeror proposes an exceptional Total Compensation Plan. The Offeror’s approach to Total Compensation includes Incumbent Benefit Recognition, Spot Bonus and Performance Award Fee Sharing; (4) The Offeror proposes superior innovations that are a benefit to the Government. The Offeror has demonstrated a superior plan to implement several innovative programs as part of their organizational structure, policies, procedures and practices; and (5) The Offeror has demonstrated an exceptional fringe benefits package which will aid recruiting and retention of employees.

The strengths identified were, as follows: (1) The Offeror proposes a good approach to managing workload variability; (2) The Offeror proposes a corporate process initiative that increases the likelihood that quality services are provided; and (3) The Offeror proposes a good task order management system to respond quickly and efficiently to the requirements of this procurement.

Subfactor D - Safety & Health Plan

Under Subfactor D, the Jacobs proposal received two strengths, and a subfactor rating of “Good.” The strengths identified were, as follows: (1) The Offeror proposes commendable motivational safety programs; and (2) The Offeror’s Safety & Health Plan demonstrates a good approach to identifying, eliminating, or mitigating hazards.

Subfactor E – Small Disadvantaged Business Participation

Under Subfactor E, the Jacobs proposal received one significant strength, and a subfactor rating of “Very Good.” The significant strength identified was, as follows: The Offeror proposed to have their Small Disadvantage Business (SDB) teammates perform varied and complex work in every labor category except for the Program Manager.

ManTech Corporation

Subfactor B – RTO and Understanding Requirements of the SOW

Under Subfactor B, the ManTech proposal received four significant strengths, three strengths, three weaknesses, and one significant weakness, and a subfactor rating of “Very Good.” The significant strengths identified were, as follows: (1) The Offeror provides a superior response for the Blanket Fabrication subtask by demonstrating an innovative and detailed approach. The overall technical approach for blanket fabrication is clearly presented with 54 step-by-step details

supporting 14 separate activities; (2) The Offeror provides an exceptionally thorough response for the Recertification subtask that demonstrates a superior technical approach. The proposal lists the applicable requirements documents indicating that the Offeror has a thorough understanding of the requirements; (3) The Offeror demonstrated an excellent understanding of all referenced SOW WBS content for the Mechanical Integration subtask. A very thorough and logical flow of integration activities is provided; and (4) The Offeror proposes an excellent approach to the Test and Engineering Support subtask. The thoroughness and merit of the Offeror's response to Subtask 13 Integration and Test Engineering Support is outstanding.

The strengths identified were, as follows: (1) The thoroughness and merit of the Offeror's response to the Facility Engineering, Acquisition or Modification subtask, including technical approach, was good. The Offeror also identified a mitigation strategy for an asphyxiation risk; (2) The Offeror describes a sound and thorough technical approach for building cable harnesses; and (3) The Offeror exhibits good knowledge of vibration and acoustic testing of spaceflight hardware.

The weaknesses identified were, as follows: (1) The Offeror failed to provide adequate staffing levels to support their technical approach to custodial property management of the Government's optical equipment; (2) The Offeror failed to demonstrate an adequate staffing skill mix for the technical approach proposed for the management of Subtasks 3 and 6, and the implementation of the Offeror's proposed technical approach to property management; and (3) The Offeror proposed inadequate staffing of many key positions necessary to effectively manage the RTO, which results in increased cost, schedule and technical risk, and constitutes a proposal flaw that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

The significant weakness identified was, as follows: The Offeror failed to provide adequate staffing for contract management, management of the safety operations for the RTO, and administrative support to management.

Subfactor C - Management Plan

Under Subfactor C, the ManTech proposal received one significant strength, six strengths, and one weakness, and a subfactor rating of "Excellent." The significant strength identified was, as follows: The Offeror proposes a superior approach to Phase-in. The Offeror's superior Phase-In Plan significantly reduces the risk and problems of phase-in.

The strengths identified were, as follows: (1) The Offeror proposes a good approach for providing a qualified workforce to meet contract requirements; (2) The Offeror proposes a good task order and property management system; (3) The Offeror proposes a good approach to manage workload variability; (4) The Offeror proposes desirable benefits for part-time workers; (5) The Offeror's Integrated Knowledge Environment portal demonstrates a good way to manage the work associated with the contract; and (6) The Offeror proposes a robust total compensation plan.

The weakness identified was, as follows: The Offeror's Mission Assurance Plan is inadequate because it lacks completeness and the Offeror fails to demonstrate Mission Assurance Guidelines compliance.

Subfactor D - Safety & Health Plan

Under Subfactor D, the ManTech proposal received one significant strength, and a subfactor rating of "Very Good." The significant strength identified was, as follows: The Offeror's Safety and Health Plan has a very high probability for success because of a variety of employee safety programs and a high level of employee involvement.

Subfactor E – Small Disadvantaged Business Participation

Under Subfactor E, the ManTech proposal received one weakness, and a subfactor rating of "Good." The weakness identified was, as follows: The Offeror has failed to meet their SDB goals on the previous ETIS contract.

COST/PRICE EVALUATION

As stated in Section M of the RFP, the Total Composite Contract (prime/sub) Loaded Rate for each Government Contract Direct Labor Category in Exhibit 1A was applied against an established Government direct labor hour pricing model. Cost realism analysis was performed on the overall proposed contract cost (Government Pricing Model, Exhibit 1A). The Contract Direct Labor Loaded Rates proposed in Exhibits 2A and 2B were evaluated for reasonableness. The cost realism analysis associated with the Government Pricing Model was not subject to a Mission Suitability point score adjustment.

In addition, a cost realism analysis was performed on the overall cost proposed for the RTO. The RTO's cumulative cost realism analysis results were subject to a Mission Suitability point score adjustment. The RFP stated that Mission Suitability scores would be downwardly adjusted based on the degree of cost realism based on a structured approach contained in RFP Provision M.3.3, Adjustment for Cost Realism.

After making these cost realism adjustments, the probable costs of the proposals were, from lowest probable cost to highest probable cost: Jacobs, Analex, and ManTech. In terms of the range of the probable costs, Jacobs was minimally lower than Analex, and ManTech was minimally higher than Analex.

A cost realism analysis was performed on the overall proposed cost which resulted in adjustments in determining the probable cost for all three offerors. A cost realism analysis was also performed on the overall cost proposed for the RTO. Cost realism adjustments were made to the skill mix and staffing levels of the RTO for Analex, Jacobs, and ManTech. These adjustments did not necessitate a reduction to any of the Mission Suitability scores.

PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

The SEB evaluated each Offeror's Past Performance, along with that of its teaming partner(s) and/or significant subcontractor(s). The evaluation assessed the relevance and overall performance record of the performance in the following areas: Technical Performance, Schedule Performance, Cost Performance, and Business Relations.

All three offerors received an overall rating of "Excellent," based on excellent and highly relevant past performance.

DECISION

During the course of the SEB's presentation, I solicited and considered the views of senior NASA/Goddard officials who heard the presentation and who have responsibilities related to this procurement. I considered the report and the presentation from the SEB along with the views of senior officials in making my decision.

Overall, the evaluation presented by the SEB resulted in an extremely competitive procurement, particularly between Analex and Jacobs, the two most highly rated offerors. ManTech was less competitive in the Mission Suitability factor and slightly less competitive in the Cost factor, which made them less competitive overall.

All three offerors received an overall Mission Suitability rating of "Very Good." The negligible difference in the scores of Analex and Jacobs results in a virtual tie between these two offerors; ManTech's score is lower by a small margin. In my judgment, the negligible difference in the Analex and Jacobs overall scores was an insufficient basis for a meaningful differentiation. However, Analex earned the highest rating in the RTO and Understanding the Requirements of the SOW subfactor, which was the most important subfactor.

I found Analex' strengths in the RTO and Understanding the Requirements of the SOW subfactor to be a compelling discriminator. Although both Jacobs and Analex received an Excellent adjective rating in this subfactor, I found that Analex displayed a far superior understanding of the requirements in the Statement of Work, as reflected by their technical response to the Representative Task Orders, they excelled in multiple areas critical to the contract. These areas include Thermal Blankets, Optics, Recertification, Fabrication/Planning, Harness, Mechanical Integration, Integration and Testing support, Information Technology systems, Safety Plan, Contamination Control, and Environmental Testing. Analex earned seven significant strengths, four strengths, and one weakness in this subfactor, which demonstrated their thorough depth and breadth of understanding. While Jacobs earned an Excellent rating in this subfactor, they did not excel across the broad areas of the SOW and RTOs as comprehensively as Analex. ManTech had a lower rating of Very Good for this critical subfactor.

While Analex had a minimal advantage in proposed cost and Jacobs had a minimal advantage in the probable cost, I found the cost differences to be too small to be a meaningful discriminator. I did not consider the minimal probable cost difference to be sufficient to outweigh the advantages

that I found with Analex in the technical areas, particularly since the Cost Factor is significantly less important than the combination of the Mission Suitability Factor and the Past Performance Factor. Past Performance ratings were equal among all offerors and I did not see any meaningful differentiation within this factor, so it did not impact my decision.

In view of the preceding discussion and the relative importance of the evaluation factors put forth in the RFP, I have concluded that the Analex proposal represents the best value to the Government. This was a highly competitive acquisition and my determination is based on the technical advantages within the Analex proposal that were cited above. Consequently, I have selected Analex Corp. for award of the Environmental Test and Integration Services contract.



Orlando Figueroa
Director of Applied Engineering
And Technology Directorate

January 8, 2008
Date