

**SOURCE SELECTION STATEMENT
FOR THE
CENTERWIDE OFFICE OF HUMAN CAPITAL SUPPORT SERVICES**

RFP NNM06158583R

On March 9, 2007, I along with other senior officials of the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center (MSFC) met with the Source Evaluation Committee (SEC) appointed to evaluate proposals in connection with the Centerwide Office of Human Capital Support Services requirement.

I. PROCUREMENT DESCRIPTION

I appointed the members of the SEC which included three representatives from the Office of Human Capital Directorate, the SEC Chairman from the Office of Strategic Analysis and Communications Directorate, and the Contracting Officer from the Office of Procurement. To aid in the evaluation, the SEC appointed technical advisors with expertise in appropriate disciplines in order to provide any necessary assistance. The SEC utilized this information in conjunction with the predetermined evaluation factors and subfactors in formulating its assessment of the strengths and weaknesses for each Offeror.

The Request for Proposals (RFP) for the Centerwide Office of Human Capital (OHC) Support Services was released on October 10, 2006. The RFP required the Offerors to provide the necessary management and personnel to provide support in the following areas:

- Organization and Leadership Development
- Workforce Strategy and Planning
- Academic Affairs
- Training and Incentives
- Employee Services and Operations

This effort will be performed under a Cost Reimbursable Cost Plus Incentive Fee Mission Services Contract with both cost and performance incentives. Additionally, task orders may be issued for PWS 8.0 on an indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity (IDIQ) basis. The contract consists of a one-year base period with four one-year options.

Two amendments were issued to the RFP:

Amendment No. 1 was released on October 18, 2006, and provided Offerors with answers to written questions received in response to the RFP, as well as revisions to the RFP. These revisions included, (1) an extension of the Offeror's Volume II Past Performance data and the Past Performance Questionnaires from

October 24th to October 31, 2006, (2) changed the Attachment L-1 Cost Forms by deleting “Human Resources Support” and “Education Programs Coordinator” as labor categories and changed “Program Support Specialist (Training)” to “Program Support Specialist (Incentives)”, and (3) changed Attachment L-3, Section A: General Information, Paragraph (e) first sentence, from “...(based on an August 2006 projection...” to “...(based on an October 2006 projection...”.

Amendment No. 2 was released on November 16, 2006, and deleted Attachment J-3, Wage Determination No. 2005-2007, Revision No. 1, dated: 09/19/2006 and replaced it with Attachment J-3, Wage Determination No.: 2005-2007, Revision No.: 2, dated: 11/02/2006.

The Government designated this procurement as a 100 percent 8(a) Set-Aside under Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 19.8. On November 13, 2006, proposals were received from the following 8(a) companies:

Carter Safety Consultants, Inc. (CSCI)
688 Discovery Drive
Huntsville, AL 35806

DB Consulting Group, Inc. (DB)
8403 Colesville Road, 10th Floor
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Media Fusion, Inc.
4951 Century Street
Huntsville, AL 35816

Will Technology, Inc.
4835 University Square, Suite 19
Huntsville, AL 35816

II. EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The proposals were evaluated in accordance with the procedures prescribed by FAR Part 15 and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Part 1815. The Government evaluated the proposals in two general steps:

Step One – An initial evaluation was performed to determine if all information had been provided and the Offeror had made a reasonable attempt to present an acceptable proposal. No proposal was determined to be unacceptable.

Step Two – All acceptable proposals were evaluated against the three evaluation factors contained in the RFP. Based on this evaluation, the Government had the option to utilize one of the following methods: (1) Make selection and award without discussions; or (2) conduct discussions with each Offeror determined to be in the competitive range and afford them the opportunity to revise their proposals, and then make selection.

Selection and award is in accordance with the “Best Value Tradeoff” technique delineated in FAR Part 15.101-1. A tradeoff process is appropriate when it may be in the best interest of the Government to consider award to other than the lowest priced Offeror or other than the highest technically-rated Offeror. This

process permits tradeoffs among cost or price and non-cost factors thereby allowing the Government to accept other than the lowest priced proposal. The perceived benefits of the higher priced proposal shall merit the additional cost, and the rationale for tradeoffs shall be documented in accordance with FAR Part 15.406.

The RFP prescribed three evaluation factors considered essential in an offer: Mission Suitability, Cost, and Past Performance. Offerors were advised that the three factors were essentially equal in importance.

The three evaluation factors were described as follows:

Mission Suitability: The proposals were analyzed for the excellence of the work to be performed, including management and technical subfactors, as well as proposal risk. Mission Suitability consisted of three subfactors, and each subfactor received both an adjectival rating and a numerical score:

- A. Management and Technical Approach (500 points)
- B. Staffing and Total Compensation Plan (400 points)
- C. Safety, Health and Environmental (100 points)

Overall, each Offeror could receive a total of 1000 points and a commensurate adjectival rating in Mission Suitability. The applicable adjective ratings were "Excellent," "Very Good," "Good," "Fair," and "Poor." The definitions for the adjective ratings and percentile ranges are set forth in the NASA FAR Supplement and contained in the OHC Evaluation Plan.

Cost: The proposed costs were evaluated for reasonableness and completeness of all cost components for the base period, all option periods. The cost factor was evaluated to determine whether the proposed cost was reasonable and/or complete/realistic, and to ensure all Performance Work Statement (PWS) requirements were reflected in the cost proposal. The evaluation addressed the sum of the resources, skill mix, and labor categories required to realistically conduct the Centerwide OHC Support Services requirements, as proposed by the Offeror. The Government derived an evaluated cost to accomplish the IDIQ effort for the base year and each option year, by applying a SEC predetermined skill mix and allotment of hours to the quoted fully burdened labor rates as proposed by the Offeror. Unrealistic or unreasonable costs and inconsistencies between the Mission Suitability volume and the Cost volume were assessed as a proposal risk.

Past Performance: Includes the overall corporate past performance of the Offeror and any proposed subcontractors or teaming partners, on comparable or related procurement or project efforts. Emphasis was given to the extent of the direct experience and quality of past performance on previous contracts that were highly relevant to the effort defined in the PWS. Past Performance is not

numerically scored; however, an adjectival rating was assigned. The applicable adjective ratings were “Excellent,” “Very Good,” “Good,” “Fair,” and “Poor” and “Neutral” is set forth in Section M of the RFP.

III. DISPOSITION AND EVALUATION OF INITIAL PROPOSALS

All offers received were determined to be acceptable and were evaluated consistent with the criteria identified in the RFP. The initial findings of the Source Evaluation Board were presented to me, the Source Selection Authority (SSA), on January 29, 2007. Based on these findings, I determined that award on initial proposals was not appropriate and that Offerors, Media Fusion and Will Technology were in the competitive range and Offerors CSCI and DB were not in the competitive range.

By letters dated January 31, 2007, both DB and CSCI were advised that their proposals were not in the competitive range and no proposal revisions would be accepted for further consideration.

CSCI was advised they received a “Fair” rating for the Mission Suitability Factor with one significant strength, eight significant weaknesses, and several other strengths and weaknesses. They received a “Neutral” Past Performance rating and was, therefore, evaluated neither favorably nor unfavorably. Their Mission Suitability Factor was rated lower than the proposals determined to be within the competitive range. Both their proposed and most probable cost was highest among all proposals received.

DB was advised they received a “Fair” rating for the Mission Suitability Factor with one significant strength, seven significant weaknesses, and several other strengths and weaknesses. They received a “Good” Past Performance rating. Their Mission Suitability Factor was rated lower than the proposals determined to be within the competitive range. Both their proposed and most probable costs were higher than those determined to be in the competitive range.

By letters dated January 31, 2007, both Media Fusion and Will Technology were advised of the opening of discussions and provided with their respective weaknesses and clarifications identified during the evaluation of their proposals. The letters established February 8, 2007, as the due date for all written responses. Accordingly, February 12th, was established by the drawing of lots, as the date for oral discussions with Will Technology, and February 13th, was established as the date for oral discussions with Media Fusion. Oral, written, and telephonic discussions continued with both firms throughout the period of February 12, through February 21, 2007.

On February 21, 2007, a letter requesting Final Proposal Revisions (FPRs) was sent to Media Fusion and Will Technology with a due date for receipt of FPRs on

February 26, 2007. Subsequently, these final proposals were evaluated consistent with the criteria identified in the RFP.

IV. Evaluation of Final Proposal Revisions

As a result of the discussion process and the Final Proposal Revisions, both Offerors, determined to be finalists, increased their Mission Suitability numerical scores. Media Fusion eliminated all but one of its Mission Suitability weaknesses and increased its Mission Suitability adjectival rating to Very Good. Will Technology eliminated all weaknesses and increased their Mission Suitability adjectival rating to Excellent. The Past Performance adjective rating for both Offerors did not change. In addition, both Offerors revised their Cost Proposals based upon discussions. The final evaluation results of the FPRs are summarized below.

Media Fusion, Incorporated

In the Mission Suitability factor, Media Fusion received an overall adjective rating of Very Good. Media Fusion had no deficiencies, 5 significant strengths, 10 strengths and 1 weakness. (Media Fusion generated one weakness and strength as a result of the discussions/FPR process.)

Under the Management and Technical Approach subfactor, Media Fusion received an adjective rating of Very Good. Media Fusion received 1 significant strength, 9 strengths, and no weakness or significant weakness. These findings are summarized as follows:

Significant Strength: 1

Media Fusion provides a thorough approach to accomplishing the requirements of the various Organizational and Leadership Development Programs. They offer an extensive list of course offerings for leadership development and offer facilitators certified in several different development tools. Additionally, Media Fusion provides a complete analysis of how they will perform follow-up assessment for Organizational Development interventions.

Strengths: 9

As a result of discussions, and FPR, Media Fusion proposed a highly efficient and effective management structure. Media Fusion proposed three working team leads, covering all functional areas of the Office of Human Capital.

Media Fusion proposed a very good quality plan. Media Fusion identified their management approach for PWS procedures in relation to the recognition of potential problems and proactive problem avoidance.

Media Fusion demonstrates a very good understanding of the DRD requirements including property management, financial management, safety and health, and information technology security. Media Fusion details the development and execution of each DRD.

Media Fusion's cost control plan is detailed and shows Media Fusion has a very good understanding of methodologies and approach required for controlling the cost in a Government cost contract. This will result in Media Fusion's ability to estimate, manage, control, track and report costs.

Media Fusion demonstrated a very good understanding of the risk associated with the management and technology portion of this requirement. Media Fusion's list of risks and mitigation for each risk demonstrates a thorough understanding of the risks associated with this type of NASA requirement.

Media Fusion's communication approach is comprehensive and detailed, including control of communications internally among the Prime and Subcontractors and externally among the Prime, Subcontractors, and OHC.

Media Fusion provides a very detailed description of how they will perform the functions related to the Executive Resources Program.

Media Fusion proposed a strong approach to the development of a Strategic Workforce Assessment Plan, which is a basic element of workforce strategic planning.

Media Fusion had an effective local autonomy plan as defined by the RFP by giving the Program Manager authority to negotiate and sign modifications, and every team member is headquartered or has a presence in Huntsville to ensure real time decisions and support of the Program Manager.

Under the Staffing and Total Compensation Plan subfactor, Media Fusion received an adjective rating of Very Good. Media Fusion received 3 significant strengths, 1 strength, no significant weaknesses, and 1 weakness. These findings are summarized as follows:

Significant Strengths: 3

Media Fusion demonstrates an excellent understanding of the PWS staffing requirement by providing a thorough analysis of the risk and mitigation for the transition plan. Also, Media Fusion proposes an effective phase-in strategy with a freeze on modifications during the transition.

Media Fusion's proposed Project Manager is highly qualified and has 10+ years of management experience.

Media Fusion's proposed Team Lead for Organizational Development is a significant strength. This person has more than 15 years of directly related experience in organizational development work with federal employees, with the past six years as a supervisor of 12 - 25 employees. Her efforts were recently recognized by the Army Aviation and Missile Command receiving a significant award for their organizational development activities.

Strengths: 1

Media Fusion proposes various incentive approaches which will encourage high performance. Additionally, Media Fusion states rewards will be provided for team performance rather than individual performance. This incentive would be conducive to creating a team atmosphere among the Prime and Subcontractors.

Weaknesses: 1

One of Media Fusion's Subcontractors failed to document in the FPR the resolution of the clarification regarding the amount employees pay per pay period for health insurance.

In the Safety, Health, and Environmental subfactor, Media Fusion received an adjective rating of Excellent. Media Fusion received 1 significant strength. This finding is summarized as follows:

Significant Strengths: 1

Media Fusion's proposed SHE Plan was very comprehensive and addressed all requirements thoroughly. Media Fusion also proposed an annual corporate SHE audit and PM quarterly inspections. This demonstrated a thorough understanding of all safety requirements.

In the Past Performance factor, Media Fusion received 1 strength which resulted in the adjective rating of Good. This finding is summarized as follows:

Strengths: 1

A strength was the contract size, type, and scope of all contracts reviewed for Past Performance were moderately comparable and relevant to the OHC requirement, and the overall Past Performance questionnaire on the contracts ratings ranged from excellent to excellent plus.

In the Cost factor, Media Fusion proposed a total cost of \$24,890,884 for the Mission Services portion of the contract as delineated in the RFP. Media Fusion's fee was slightly higher than Will Technology's fee. The Government derived an evaluated cost to accomplish the IDIQ effort for the base year and each option year, by applying a SEC predetermined skill mix and allotment of hours to the quoted fully burdened labor rates as proposed by the Offeror. The Government evaluated Media Fusion's cost for the IDIQ effort to be \$1,882,376. Therefore Media Fusion's total proposed costs for Mission Services and IDIQ efforts are \$26,773,260. Media Fusion's phase-in costs were \$64,000. The SEC determined the proposed cost was reasonable, complete, and ensured that all PWS requirements were reflected in the cost. The only area of adjustment for most probable cost was the application of the general and administrative ceiling rate as required by the RFP. Thus, the SEC determined Media Fusion's most probable cost for the base year and all option years is \$26,926,452. After completing the most probable cost adjustment, the SEC gave Media Fusion a High cost confidence rating.

Will Technology, Incorporated

In the Mission Suitability factor, Will Technology received an overall adjective rating of Excellent. Will Technology had no deficiencies, 4 significant strengths, 8 strengths, no weaknesses or significant weaknesses. Will Technology generated 1 additional strength as a result of the discussions/FPR process.

Under the Management and Technical Approach subfactor, Will Technology received an adjective rating of Excellent. Will Technology received 2 significant strengths, 3 strengths and no weaknesses or significant weaknesses. These findings are summarized as follows:

Significant Strengths: 2

Will Technology's proposal is comprehensive and thorough in describing Will Technology's approach to meeting all aspects of the PWS requirements. There is a high confidence in their understanding and ability to accomplish the contract requirements.

The efficiency and effectiveness of the Will Technology's management structure was determined to be a significant strength. Will Technology proposes a Team Lead for the two organizational elements with the largest concentration of contractor personnel. The proposed leads are working team leads contributing to the mission performance.

Strengths: 3

Will Technology's cost control plan is detailed and shows that Will Technology has a very good understanding of methodologies and approach required for controlling the cost in a Government cost contract. This will result in the Will Technology's ability to estimate, manage, control, track and report costs.

Will Technology's proposal demonstrates a thorough understanding of the requirements for processing and dispositioning Senior Executive requirements and the role of the Executive Resource Program Support to provide quality products and services.

Every team member is headquartered or has a presence in Huntsville to ensure real time decisions and support of the Program Manager.

Under the Staffing and Total Compensation Plan subfactor, Will Technology received an adjective rating of Excellent. Will Technology received 2 significant strengths, 4 strengths, and no weaknesses or significant weaknesses. These findings are summarized as follows:

Significant Strengths: 2

Will Technology's proposed Program Manager is highly qualified and has 6 years experience in managing the current contract and 10+ years of supervisory experience.

Will Technology proposed an Organization Development Team Lead who is highly qualified, and has in excess of 10 years of relevant experience with 4 years of supervisory experience.

Strengths: 4

Will Technology's risk mitigation during Phase-In was determined to be a strength. Will Technology proposes to retain 100% of the incumbent employees. This would reduce the risks associated with the transition from one contract to another.

Will Technology has a compensation plan that is very comparable with the Subcontractor's compensation plan. This potentially reduces the risk of morale and management issues and will increase the potential to retain employees.

Will Technology proposes various incentive approaches which will encourage high performance and retention of employees (e.g. merit based incentives, awards and recognition programs, and an annual training stipend for each employee). This policy encourages the training and development of personnel for better performance.

Will Technology proposed a Team Lead for Academic Affairs who is qualified and has in excess of 10 years of highly relevant experience with the past 5 years as a Team Lead for the current contract.

In the Safety, Health, and Environmental subfactor, Will Technology received an adjective rating of Good. Will Technology received 2 strengths. These findings are summarized as follows:

Strengths: 2

Will Technology's proposed SHE plan was comprehensive and addressed requirements thoroughly.

As a result of discussions and the FPR; Will Technology provided a very thorough and comprehensive analysis of office safety risks and mitigations.

In the Past Performance factor, Will Technology received 1 significant strength and 1 weakness which resulted in the adjective rating of Very Good. Will Technology's findings are summarized as follows:

A significant strength was Will Technology's Subcontractor's (ASRI's) current contract was highly relevant in type, size, and scope to the OHC requirement. Additionally, ASRI's contract with the Army Technical Test Center was moderately comparable and relevant to the OHC requirement. The overall Past Performance questionnaire ratings on these contracts ranged from excellent to excellent plus.

A weakness was the Lost Time Case rate for ASRI Contracts NAS8-02047 and DAAH01100CR170 exceeded the national average.

In the Cost factor, Will Technology proposed a total cost of \$24,513,730 for the Mission Services portion of the contract as delineated in the RFP. Will Technology's fee was slightly lower than Media Fusion's fee. The Government derived an evaluated cost to accomplish the IDIQ effort for the base year and

each option year, by applying a SEC predetermined skill mix and allotment of hours to the quoted fully burdened labor rates as proposed by the Offeror. The Government evaluated Will Technology's cost for the IDIQ effort to be \$1,962,760. Therefore Will Technology's total proposed costs for Mission Services and IDIQ efforts are \$26,476,490. Will Technology's phase-in costs were \$20,000. The SEC determined the proposed cost was reasonable, complete, and ensured that all PWS requirements were reflected in the costs. There was no adjustment from Will Technology's proposed cost to the most probable cost. After determining that the proposed and most probable costs were equal, the SEC gave Will Technology a High cost confidence rating.

V. DECISION

Immediately following the SEC presentation on March 9, 2007, I met in executive session with the key senior advisors, all of whom heard the presentation and were familiar with the RFP. These advisors included representatives from the Office of Human Capital, Office of the Chief Financial Officer, Office of Chief Counsel, and the Office of Procurement. I solicited and considered their views in reaching my decision. With respect to the process and findings, we concluded that the evaluation plan was followed, and the evaluation of the proposals was comprehensive, thorough, and well-documented.

During the presentation, the senior advisors and I thoroughly questioned the SEC on a number of points. We noted that the discussion process was well utilized. Will Technology was able to eliminate all of their Mission Suitability weaknesses as a result of discussions, and their Mission Suitability score increased in the final evaluation. Media Fusion also eliminated all weaknesses, but then added a weakness because Media Fusion failed to document in their FPR the resolution of a clarification during discussions. Media Fusion's final score was also increased as a result of the discussion process.

The SEC's presentation indicated that in the Mission Suitability factor, Will Technology had a slight advantage in the Management and Technical Approach subfactor, the most heavily weighted subfactor, and a significant advantage in the Staffing and Compensation Approach subfactor which is the next most heavily weighted subfactor. Media Fusion had an advantage in the Safety, Health, and Environmental subfactor, the least weighted subfactor.

In a close analysis of the findings, I concluded that although the Mission Suitability adjectival ratings for these two firms were a whole rating apart, the findings under this factor were not necessarily as far apart as this adjectival difference might imply and this portion of this competition was closer than the presentation indicated. I was mindful that Media Fusion had more total significant strengths and strengths than Will Technology in the Mission Suitability factor, yet the SEC reasonably concluded that both the relative strength and

qualitative value of these strengths support the conclusion that Will Technology has an advantage in this factor. An example of this difference in qualitative value is found in the first significant strength for the Management and Technical Approach subfactor for Will Technology which stated that Will Technology's proposal provided a "comprehensive and thorough ... approach to meeting all aspects of the PWS". In contrast, Media Fusion had no such finding in all aspects of the PWS but instead was found to have a significant strength for providing a "thorough approach to accomplishing the requirements of the various Organizational and Leadership Development Programs" which is only one area of the PWS.

We next considered the Cost factor. Both Offerors adjusted their cost proposals in response to discussions, and the SEC assigned a High cost confidence to the Government's most probable cost of both Offerors. However, Will Technology's proposed and most probable cost was less than Media Fusion's proposed and most probable cost, respectively. Will Technology maintains slightly lower indirect burdens and a lower proposed fee, which results in a cost advantage for them. Additionally Will Technology provided more personnel under their proposed contract for a lower price. Also, the SEC reported that Media Fusion's phase-in costs were \$64,000 while Will Technology's were \$20,000. Media Fusion's most probable cost was adjusted for G&A ceiling rates as required by the RFP and remained higher than Will Technology's during the base year and four option years of the contract. As a result, selecting Will Technology would result in savings to the Government of approximately \$450,000 over the five years of the contract.

In the Past Performance factor, the Media Fusion Team received an adjectival rating of Good and Will Technology received an adjectival rating of Very Good. A review of Will Technology's Team past performance evaluations revealed one significant strength for excellent past performance on two contracts that were relevant or highly relevant to all areas described in the Mission Services portion of the PWS. Will Technology received one weakness due to one of their teammates incurring one Lost Time Case (LTC) on each of two contracts, resulting in exceeding the national LTC rate in one year for each contract. A review of Media Fusion's Team past performance evaluations revealed one strength due to demonstrated excellent past performance on three contracts that collectively were relevant to only three of the six areas described in the Mission Services portion of the PWS.

My advisors and I concluded that the SEC properly evaluated the Past Performance factor, and assigned the appropriate adjective rating to each Offeror. I concluded that Will Technology had an advantage over Media Fusion in the Past Performance factor.

After polling all of my advisors and obtaining their inputs, I concluded that Will Technology, provided the best value selection for the Government based upon

their advantage when considering all three of the evaluation factors: Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost. While I determined that Will Technology had only a very slight advantage in Mission Suitability, they have a clear advantage in Cost and Past Performance. Consequently, I select Will Technology for award of the Centerwide Office of Human Capital Support Services Contract at the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center.

Stephen P. Beale
Source Selection Authority

Date