SOURCE SELECTION STATEMENT
FOR THE
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT & COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT (IMCS) CONTRACT

On June 12, 2008, I, as the designated Source Selection Authority (SSA), along with other senior officials of the John F. Kennedy Space Center (KSC), met with the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed to evaluate proposals for award of the Information Management and Communication Support (IMCS) Contract at KSC. Relevant portions of the SEB's evaluation of proposals, and my decision on selection of the successful offeror are set forth in this Source Selection Statement.

PROCUREMENT DESCRIPTION

The IMCS Contract is the primary means of obtaining information technology and communications services to support operations at KSC. These services will be delivered across the entire geographical area of KSC, encompassing over 140,000 acres and 15,000 civil service and contractor employees, as well as certain off site locations identified in the contract. Additionally, the IMCS contract provides select services for the Department of Defense.

Most of the information and communications services that will be provided by IMCS presently are provided by the Kennedy Information & Communications Support (KICS) Contract. KICS was awarded as a small business set-aside with a performance period ending on September 30, 2008. In addition, certain elements of the Joint Base Operations Support Contract (JBOSC), the Checkout Assembly and Payload Processing (CAPPS) and the USAF Range Technical Services (RTS) contracts also have been incorporated into the IMCS contract.

The services provided under IMCS include voice, imaging, and data communications; server operations; application and web development; writing, printing, publishing, and reproduction; and KSC library management. The IMCS requires the contractor to plan, design, implement, maintain, operate, sustain, and provide life cycle management for all of these services to ensure the highest availability, integrity, and security of information and communications.

The development of the IMCS Request for Proposals (RFP) commenced with the appointment of a Procurement Development Team (PDT) on February 16, 2007. The PDT prepared an acquisition strategy, conducted market research, developed a draft solicitation for industry comment, met with industry representatives, and conducted an Industry Day briefing on July 18, 2007 that was attended by 96 participants. The PDT also determined, with the concurrence of the Small Business Administration (SBA), that an adequate number of small business concerns existed to allow the IMCS contract to be a total small business set-aside with a NAICS code of 517110 and size standard of 1,500 employees.

Following the PDT's review and consideration of industry comments on the draft IMCS solicitation, and the final approval of its acquisition strategy, the IMCS RFP was issued on September 13, 2007, seeking proposals for a Cost plus Award Fee service contract, with Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (ID/IQ) and Firm Fixed Priced (FFP) components. A contract deviation also was approved by the NASA Associate Administrator for Procurement, authorizing an IMCS contract period of performance of nine-years, consisting of a base period of five years followed by four one year options.

Just prior to release of the IMCS RFP, the SSA appointed the SEB to evaluate proposals received in response to the solicitation. During the course of the procurement, a total of eight RFP amendments were issued by the Contracting Officer to provide responses to questions and comments submitted by offerors regarding the RFP, as well as to incorporate other minor changes into the RFP.

In response to the IMCS RFP, nine proposals were timely received on or before the due date of November 13, 2007 from the following companies:

a.) Aerodyne Industries
b.) Abacus Technology
c.) Aleut Global Services
d.) Arcata Associates
e.) ASRC Aerospace Corporation
f.) C&C International Computers & Consultants
g.) INDUS Corporation
h.) Tessada & Associates
i.) Yang Enterprises

EVALUATION PROCESS

The RFP prescribed three evaluation factors, namely, Cost, Mission Suitability, and Past Performance, which were to be evaluated using the applicable procedures, adjectival ratings, definitions, and percentile ranges specified in the RFP, FAR 15 subpart 3, and NFS 1815 subpart 3. The RFP advised offerors of the relative importance of these factors stating:

> All evaluation factors other than Cost, when combined, are approximately equal to Cost. The Mission Suitability factor is more important than the Past Performance factor.

The evaluation of Mission Suitability was to determine how well the offeror understood the requirements of the RFP, including proposed approaches to meeting the requirements and resources proposed to implement that approach. The RFP further identified three subfactors which were to be weighted and considered in evaluating Mission Suitability as follows:

Management	500 points
Technical	400 points
Safety and Health	100 points
Total Mission Suitability	1000 points

Under the procedures established in the RFP and the applicable regulations, the SEB was to evaluate Mission Suitability proposals under each subfactor to identify strengths, significant strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, deficiencies, or uncertainties requiring clarification. As a result of these findings, the SEB assigned an adjectival rating and point score/percentile ranking for each subfactor, as well as an overall adjectival rating and point score for Mission Suitability using the following adjective ratings and percentile ranges:

Excellent: 91 – 100

Very Good: 71 – 90

Good: 51 – 70

Fair: 31 – 50

Poor: 0 - 30

With regard to the Management subfactor, the RFP described in detail the items that would be evaluated, including management approach, staffing and total compensation, IMCS contract phase-in plan, program transition, risk management, financial management, property management, contract award fee, and technical performance management. The RFP also described in detail the items that would be evaluated under the Technical subfactor, namely, technical approach, technical risk management, operation of current systems and services, improving service levels and efficiencies, maintenance, sustaining engineering, systems engineering, integration of Maximo into work processes, and mission suitability scenarios. Finally, with regard to the Safety & Health subfactor, the RFP described how the Government would evaluate each offeror's approach to implementing safety and health requirements and providing a safe and healthy work environment.

With regard to the Past Performance factor, the RFP advised offerors that recent and relevant performance of work similar in size, content, and complexity to the IMCS requirements would be evaluated. The RFP further provided that the past performance of each offeror's subcontractors would be evaluated. Past performance was to be evaluated using the following adjectival ratings as they are defined in the RFP: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair/Satisfactory, Poor/Unsatisfactory, or Neutral.

Finally, with regard to the Cost/Price Factor, the RFP advised offerors that the Government would perform both a cost analysis and a cost realism analysis to determine whether proposed costs are realistic for the work to be performed, reflect a clear understanding of the IMCS requirements, and are consistent with the various elements of the offeror's proposal. The RFP also advised that the Government would develop a probable cost for each proposal, taking into account the above described analyses, and would make a level of confidence determination (high, medium, or low) for the probable cost assessment. Moreover, a structured approach was set forth in the RFP, in accordance with the provisions of NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(B), to adjust the offeror's overall Mission Suitability score based on the degree of cost realism. Point adjustments to the Mission Suitability score were to be made when the percentage difference between the proposed and probable cost exceeded increments of +/- 5 percent.

Pursuant to the Source Evaluation Plan for this acquisition, the SEB conducted all evaluations using the above described evaluation criteria. In conducting the evaluations, the SEB utilized evaluators in appropriate disciplines to provide specific expertise needed in the evaluation process. SEB evaluators were assigned to evaluate the offerors' proposals in their specific areas of expertise and provided findings and requests for clarifications to the SEB committees. The SEB utilized committee assessments in determining findings. Using the analyses of the evaluators as reported in the committee assessments, the predetermined evaluation criteria, and their own findings, the SEB identified and assessed strengths and weaknesses and rated and scored each proposal as discussed above. In addition to the evaluation of the factors and subfactors identified above, the SEB ensured all solicitation requirements established by the RFP were met. Additionally, as part of the evaluation process, the SEB analyzed each offeror's administrative data which was comprised of financial information related to the capability to perform a contract of this magnitude, the model contract, acceptance of contract terms and conditions, and contract representations and certifications.

INITIAL EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS, COMPETITIVE RANGE DETERMINATION, & DISCUSSIONS

Utilizing the above-described evaluation process, the SEB conducted an initial evaluation of the nine proposals received. The resulting mission suitability rating, past performance rating, and cost evaluation of each offeror's proposal provided the basis for making a competitive range determination. Pursuant to FAR 15.306(c)(1), the Contracting Officer, with the concurrence of the SSA, determined that three offerors were within the competitive range. The three offerors and their respective subcontractor teams are as follows:

Abacus Technology

Subcontractor: Analex Corporation
Subcontractor: Raytheon Technical Services

ASRC Aerospace Corporation
Subcontractor: ITT
Subcontractor: Booz Allen Hamilton

Tessada & Associates
Subcontractor: Science Applications International Corp.
Subcontractor: Verizon
Subcontractor: Bionetics Photo Services
Subcontractor: Craig Technologies, Inc.

Written and oral discussions were held with the three offerors in the competitive range during the period of March 19 through May 2, 2008, focusing on the weaknesses, significant weaknesses, and uncertainties requiring clarifications that the SEB had identified during the initial evaluation of mission suitability and cost. After discussions concluded, Final Proposal Revisions (FPRs) were timely submitted on May 16, 2008, including executed proposed model contracts. Again using the above-described evaluation process, the SEB conducted a final evaluation of the offerors' FPRs and reported its findings to the SSA as discussed below.

FPR MISSION SUITABILITY EVALUATIONS

The evaluation of FPRs resulted in increased Mission Suitability scores for all three offerors, and no scoring adjustments for cost realism were necessary. As no weaknesses, significant weaknesses or uncertainties requiring clarifications were found to remain in any of the offerors' final Mission Suitability proposals, the SEB's report to the SSA focused on the offerors' strengths and significant strengths. The final Mission Suitability proposals were rated and ranked by the SEB in descending order as follows:

1. Abacus Technology (Very Good)
2. ASRC Aerospace Corporation (Very Good)
3. Tessada & Associates (Good)

Abacus Technology

Under the Mission Suitability - Management subfactor, the SEB found that Abacus had no remaining weaknesses, one significant strength, and six strengths in its FPR. The significant strength resulted from Abacus' proposal for a comprehensive management approach and integrated systems with Maximo that provide detailed and real-time visibility into program, technical financial, and scheduling status. Abacus also incorporated workforce flexibility to accommodate surges and workload fluctuations.

The six strengths in Abacus' FPR under the Management subfactor included (1) an innovative continuous process improvement and configuration management strategies, (2) an innovative approach to organizing engineering into centralized organization, (3) a

comprehensive analysis of risks, (4) comprehensive approach to training, (5) a comprehensive program transition approach with resource flexibility, and (6) beneficial phase-in orientation activities.

Based on the above described findings, the SEB rated Abacus' proposal under the Management subfactor as very good, and it was scored at the high end of the very good range.

Under the Mission Suitability - Technical subfactor, the SEB found that Abacus had no remaining weaknesses and two strengths in its FPR. These strengths included: (1) a comprehensive approach to meeting operational requirements while upgrading systems, and (2) an innovative approach to measuring, analyzing, and improving existing service levels. Based on these findings, the SEB rated Abacus' proposal under the Technical subfactor as good, and it was scored at the very high end of the good range.

Under the Mission Suitability - Safety and Health subfactor, the SEB found that Abacus' proposal was acceptable with no strengths or significant strengths noted. Accordingly, the SEB rated Abacus' proposal under the Safety and Health subfactor as good, and it was scored in the middle of the good range.

ASRC Aerospace Corporation

Under the Mission Suitability – Management subfactor, the SEB found that ASRC had no remaining weaknesses, one significant strength, and five strengths in its FPR. The significant strength resulted from ASRC's proposal for a comprehensive application of government-furnished Maximo to establish work flows and interfaces to business systems. Additionally, ASRC proposed certain corporate funded tools for field technicians, as well as detailed maintenance records for trending and analysis.

The five strengths in ASRC's FPR under the Management subfactor included (1) an innovative approach to organizing engineering into a centralized organization, (2) utilization of on-site available personnel resources to support surge activities, (3) an innovative approach to providing workforce flexibility, (4) beneficial phase-in orientation activities, and (5) a commitment regarding ISO.

Based on the above described findings, the SEB rated ASRC's proposal under the Management subfactor as very good, and it was scored near the high end of the very good range.

Under the Mission Suitability - Technical subfactor, the SEB found that ASRC had no remaining weaknesses and three strengths in its FPR. These strengths included: (1) an approach to track and present preparedness data, (2) enhanced service delivery standards, and (3) an innovative approach to phase-out. Based on these findings, the SEB rated ASRC's proposal under the Technical subfactor as good, and it was scored in the upper half the good range.

Under the Mission Suitability - Safety and Health subfactor, the SEB found that ASRC's proposal was acceptable with no strengths or significant strengths noted. Accordingly, the SEB rated ASRC's proposal under the Safety and Health subfactor as good, and it was scored in the middle of the good range.

Tessada & Associates

Under the Mission Suitability – Management subfactor, the SEB found that Tessada had no remaining weaknesses and four strengths in its FPR. The four strengths included (1) an innovative outreach strategy for IMCS customers, (2) a comprehensive analysis of potential risks, (3) advantageous phase-in activities, and (4) an effective corporate policy to improve quality. Based on these findings, the SEB rated Tessada's proposal under the Management subfactor as good, and it was scored near the high end of the good range.

Under the Mission Suitability - Technical subfactor, the SEB found that Tessada had no remaining weaknesses and one strength in its FPR. This strength included a beneficial IT Strategic Plan for achieving new initiatives and infusing new technologies. Based on these findings, the SEB rated Tessada's proposal under the Technical subfactor as good, and it was scored in the upper half the good range.

Under the Mission Suitability - Safety and Health subfactor, the SEB found that Tessada's proposal was acceptable with no strengths or significant strengths noted. Accordingly, the SEB rated Tessada's proposal under the Safety and Health subfactor as good, and it was scored in the middle of the good range.

FPR PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Abacus Technology

The SEB found that Abacus and its subcontractors had demonstrated very effective past performance of work similar to the IMCS Contract in content and complexity, although the cited performance was not similar in size. Moreover, Abacus and its subcontractors had past work experience in approximately 92% of the services that would be provided under IMCS. The SEB also found that feedback from Abacus' references and the NASA Past Performance Database demonstrated that the Abacus team's past performance was fully responsive to contract requirements and was accomplished in a timely, efficient , and economical manner. Based on Abacus' performance record, the SEB has confidence that Abacus would successfully perform the IMCS Contract. As a result of this evaluation, the SEB rated Abacus' past performance as good. But for Abacus' lack of experience in work similar in size to IMCS, the SEB would have rated Abacus as very good.

ASRC Aerospace Corporation

The SEB found that ASRC and its subcontractors had demonstrated very effective past performance of work similar to the IMCS Contract in content, complexity, and size,

although ASRC had no demonstrated experience with labor unions. Moreover, ASRC and its subcontractors had past work experience in all of the services that would be provided under IMCS. The SEB also found that feedback from ASRC's references and the NASA Past Performance Database demonstrated that the ASRC team's past performance was fully responsive to contract requirements and was accomplished in a timely, efficient , and economical manner. Based on ASRC's performance record, the SEB has a high level of confidence that ASRC would successfully perform the IMCS Contract. As a result of this evaluation, the SEB rated ASRC's past performance as very good.

Tessada & Associates

The SEB found that Tessada and its subcontractors had demonstrated very effective past performance of work similar to the IMCS Contract in content, complexity, and size. Moreover, Tessada and its subcontractors had past work experience in approximately 96% of the services that would be provided under IMCS. The SEB also found that feedback from Tessada's references and the NASA Past Performance Database demonstrated that the Tessada team's past performance was fully responsive to contract requirements and was accomplished in a timely, efficient , and economical manner. Based on Tessada's performance record, the SEB has a high level of confidence that Tessada would successfully perform the IMCS Contract. As a result of this evaluation, the SEB rated Tessada's past performance as very good.

FPR COST EVALUATIONS

Abacus Technology

The SEB found that the costs proposed by Abacus in its FPR were realistic for the work to be performed, reflected an understanding of the IMCS requirements, and were consistent with the various elements of Abacus' proposal. A small (less than 5%) probable cost adjustment was made to ensure incumbent wage rates were accurately captured, but no point adjustment to Abacus' mission suitability score was required. The SEB found a high level of confidence in Abacus' probable cost. The SEB also provided the SSA with a proposed cost and probable cost comparison chart which illustrated that Abacus had the lowest proposed and probable cost among the three offerors in the competitive range.

ASRC Aerospace Corporation

The SEB found that the costs proposed by ASRC in its FPR were realistic for the work to be performed, reflected an understanding of the IMCS requirements, and were consistent with the various elements of ASRC's proposal. A small (less than 5%) probable cost adjustment was made to ensure incumbent wage rates were accurately captured and a reduction in ASRC's costs also was applied for certain government furnished workstation services, but no point adjustment to ASRC's mission suitability score was required. The

SEB found a high level of confidence in ASRC's probable cost. The SEB also provided the SSA with a proposed cost and probable cost comparison chart which illustrated that ASRC had the highest proposed cost and the second highest probable cost among the three offerors in the competitive range.

Tessada & Associates

The SEB found that the costs proposed by Tessada in its FPR were realistic for the work to be performed, reflected an understanding of the IMCS requirements, and were consistent with the various elements of Tessada's proposal. A small (less than 5%) probable cost adjustment was made to ensure incumbent wage rates were accurately captured and a reduction in Tessada's cost also was applied for certain government furnished workstation services, but no point adjustment to Tessada's mission suitability score was required. The SEB found a high level of confidence in Tessada's probable cost. The SEB also provided the SSA with a proposed cost and probable cost comparison chart which illustrated that Tessada had the second highest proposed cost and the highest probable cost among the three offerors in the competitive range.

SOURCE SELECTION DECISION

At the conclusion of the SEB's presentation of the above discussed findings, I solicited additional comments or questions from the SEB participants and other senior management officials present. Following the presentation and question / comment period, I met with key officials to discuss my perception of the SEB's findings and, accordingly, the basis for my conclusion that the proposal submitted by Abacus Technology represents the best value to the Government.

I first note that, with regard to the three evaluation factors specified in the RFP (*i.e.,* Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost), all evaluation factors other than cost, when combined, are approximately equal in importance to the Cost factor and that the Mission Suitability factor is more important than the Past Performance factor. Using these evaluation factors, I conclude that Abacus' Mission Suitability proposal is somewhat better than ASRC's mission suitability proposal, and is substantially better than Tessada's Mission Suitability proposal. Abacus' comprehensive management approach and its approach to integrating systems with Maximo, evaluated as a significant strength by the SEB, when combined with the other strengths in Abacus' proposal, provide the best solution for meeting the IMCS requirements.

I also conclude that there is very little notable difference between the offerors in the Past Performance factor. As specifically noted by the SEB, Abacus has performed contracts similar in content and complexity, but not in size to the IMCS, and it narrowly missed a very good rating for that reason. ASRC has performed contracts similar in content, complexity, and size, but lacks in experience with labor unions, and it narrowly made a very good rating for that reason. Tessada's Past Performance, also was rated as very good. I find that all three offerors have similar past performance records, and that the

minor differences in Past Performance that exist, do not constitute a discriminator in this award decision.

Finally, with regard to the cost factor, I note that the SEB found that all three of the offerors' proposals satisfied the requirements of cost realism and price reasonableness, and that the probable cost adjustments made to the proposals were similar in nature. As the SEB's findings illustrate, Abacus' proposal remains the lowest cost to the Government. Accordingly, I find that Abacus' low cost, when combined with its somewhat better Mission Suitability proposal, and similar past performance represents the best value to the Government.

Based on the foregoing analysis, I select Abacus Technology for award of the IMCS Contract.

6/16/06

W. W. Parsons
Source Selection Authority
NASA/John F. Kennedy Space Center