V-751-20048
Sol. # 1-41-1100.1015

SELECTION OF CONTRACTOR
FOR
SCIENTIFIC COMPUTING OPERATIONS, MAINTENANCE, AND
COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES

On June 18, 1993, I, along with certain Center officials who have responsibilities related to this procurement, met with the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed to evaluate proposals to provide the Center with Scientific Computing Operations, Maintenance, and Communications (SCOMAC) services. The Board's presentation consisted of the procurement history, the evaluation procedures, and the results of the evaluation of the proposals submitted.

DESCRIPTION OF THE REQUIREMENT

The Procurement

The Scientific Computing Operations, Maintenance, and Communications (SCOMAC) services contract will provide contracted services in support of the Langley Research Center's Central Scientific Computing Complex (CSCC), communication networks, and selected distributed computing systems. The contractor will be required to furnish all personnel, facilities, services, equipment, supplies, and materials (other than specifically identified government-furnished items) necessary to perform the services described in the Statement of Work (SOW). These services may be summarized as:

CSCC Equipment Operation. The operation of supercomputers, mid-range computers, workstations, graphics devices, and supporting equipment in the CSCC. This includes: powering up and down equipment; staffing the Operations Control Office; scheduling and dispatching work; monitoring equipment performance; keeping records of performance and use; establishing, improving, and documenting operational procedures; managing file storage systems and tape libraries; and maintaining proper levels of supplies.

Operating Systems Support. The installation and maintenance of operating systems as provided by the computer manufacturers or as modified for use at LaRC. This includes: installing and testing routine operating system upgrades; developing, implementing, and verifying special features and interfaces as required at LaRC; tracking down and correcting (or notifying OEM's and providing work-arounds for) problems caused by the operating systems; providing means for analyzing performance and accounting for the use of the various systems; consulting with users; and keeping Government and operations personnel apprised of new features and procedures.

Facility Management Support. This includes: managing the CSCC access control system; monitoring CSCC environmental systems; and maintaining equipment layout drawings.

CSCC Systems Maintenance. The maintenance, on a prioritized basis, of equipment and associated operating systems which are itemized in Appendix A of the SOW. This includes: performing preventive maintenance; responding to system malfunctions and performing remedial maintenance; installing Field Change Orders (FCO's) recommended by OEM's; documenting all maintenance activities; providing all spare parts; and maintaining an inventory and availability database of spare parts.

Communication Networks. The administration, engineering, maintenance, and operation of the Center's voice, data, and video communication networks. This includes: performing corrective and preventive maintenance on a continuous basis; installing and relocating network equipment; installing and repairing network cabling; providing engineering and systems analysis support; purchasing material and equipment required to maintain and upgrade the networks; managing the day-to-day operation of the communication networks; and providing help to users and response to problems noted by users.

LaRC-Distributed Computing and Data Reduction Support. The administration, operation, and programming of selected computing facilities distributed throughout the Center. This includes: managing user accounts and files, maintaining system files and software; and developing and maintaining local software and procedural documentation. In support of data reduction activities, it includes: developing and maintaining computer programs for data acquisition, data reduction, and display of results; developing translators to provide information exchange between dissimilar platforms; and consulting with LaRC researchers in the data acquisition and data reduction aspects of the preparation of technical reports.

New Technology Support. The analysis of technology trends and provision of recommendations to be used in LaRC's long-range planning process; and the provision of recommendations for continuously improving day-to-day operations.

Documentation. The preparation and maintenance of comprehensive records for software programs, equipment operation, and equipment maintenance. This includes: operational procedures, user information, performance statistics, computer programs, and configuration drawings.

Period of Performance and Option Periods

The initial contract period will be 2 years, followed by a 2-year priced-option period, a 3-year priced-option period, and six 1-month priced-option periods for a total of 7 1/2 years.

Level of Effort (LOE)

The contractor will be required to furnish up to 641,370 direct labor hours for the initial contract period, 647,500 hours for the first (2-year) option period, 971,250 hours for the second (3-year) option period, and 26,563 hours for each of the final six (1-month) option periods, for a total of 2,419,498 direct labor hours. In addition, at the Government's option, the contractor may be required to furnish an additional level of effort up to 178,125 hours in the initial contract period, 288,750 in the first option period, 660,000 in the second option period, and 20,000 in each of the final six option periods, for a total of 1,246,875 additional direct labor hours.

Provision of Systems Maintenance

The contractor will be required to provide maintenance, at a fixed charge, for equipment (hardware and environmental control systems) and software that is itemized by Contract Line Item Number (CLIN) in Appendix A of the SOW. A systems maintenance price pool of $35,000,000 has been included to provide for additions of equipment and software over the 7 1/2-year period.

Procurement Approach

A cost-plus-award-fee contract will be negotiated with the successful offeror. Provisions will be made for the evaluation of the Contractor's performance in several areas and award of fee will be based on this performance. This will provide incentives to assure the quality, timeliness, and efficiency of the work as well as effective business management practices. The majority of support will be furnished as specified levels of effort. The hardware and software maintenance support will be provided on a priced-line-item basis.

SOURCES

The Request for Proposals (RFP) was provided to approximately 150 firms. The preproposal conference on December 16, 1992, was attended by 41 firms. The following companies, listed with major subcontractors, submitted proposals:

Boeing Computer Support Services, Inc., Vienna, VA
Analytical Services and Materials, Inc.
Diversified Engineering, Inc.

Computer Sciences Corporation, Applied Technology Division, Falls Church, VA
I-NET, Inc.

Hughes STX Corporation, Lanham, MD
International Business Systems, Inc.
United International Engineering, Inc.

Loral Systems Company, Akron, OH
Science and Technology Corporation
Technology Applications, Inc.

RMS Support Services, Landover, MD
Eastern Computers, Inc.
Sverdrup Technology, Inc.

Sterling Software, Systems and Scientific Division, Palo Alto, CA
DynCorp Meridian
INTECS International, Inc.
Victoria International, Ltd.

Unisys Government Systems, Inc., Systems Support Operation, McLean, VA
Century Technologies, Inc.
Grumman Technical Services
VIGYAN, Inc.

EVALUATION PROCESS

The RFP set forth the following four evaluation factors:

Mission Suitability
Cost
Relevant Experience and Past Performance
Other Considerations

Overall, in the selection of a Contractor for negotiation leading to contract award, Mission Suitability, Cost, Relevant Experience and Past Performance, and Other Considerations were of essentially equal importance.

The Mission Suitability subfactors and the weights assigned to each of those subfactors were listed as follows:

Subfactor 1 - Organization	15%
Subfactor 2 - Phase-in, Initial Staffing, and Continuing Personnel Management	20%
Subfactor 3 - Professional Compensation Plan	15%
Subfactor 4 - Operations Plan	35%
Subfactor 5 - Qualifications and Availability of Key Personnel	15%

The Other Considerations factor was comprised of the following four subfactors:

Subfactor 1 - Subcontracting Plan for Small Business and Small Disadvantaged Business Concerns
Subfactor 2 - Financial Condition and Capability
Subfactor 3 - Facility
Subfactor 4 - Contract Terms and Conditions

Prior to the issuance of the RFP, the Board developed a detailed evaluation plan, including a numerical and adjectival scoring system for the Mission Suitability subfactors. In addition, the plan stated that the SEB would evaluate but not score Cost, Relevant Experience and Past Performance, and Other Considerations, ultimately assigning the latter two factors an adjective rating to reflect the results of that evaluation.

The Board followed the SEB procedures given in the NASA Source Evaluation Handbook, NHB 5103.6B, and the Evaluation Plan. The results of the Board's initial evaluation were presented to the Contracting Officer on May 3, 1993. The Contracting Officer, in conjunction with the SEB, determined that two firms had a reasonable chance of being selected for award and should remain in the competitive range. This decision was based on the firms' superior Mission Suitability ratings of "Very Good;" reasonable costs; Relevant Experience and Past Performance ratings of "Excellent," and Other Considerations of "Excellent" or "Very Good." The two (2) firms in the competitive range were:

Computer Sciences Corporation, Applied Technology Division
Unisys Government Systems, Inc., Systems Support Operation

The unsuccessful offerors were informed in writing that their proposals were no longer being considered for contract award.

The Board then prepared questions for each offeror in the competitive range and forwarded them to the firms with letters of invitation for oral discussions. Subsequent to the conduct of written and oral discussions with the two companies, they were requested to submit any revisions to their proposals by a common cut-off date.

The revised proposals were reviewed and evaluated, following the same procedures used in the initial evaluation, and adjustments were made to the initial evaluation findings. The Board's pricing consultants, in consultation with the SEB, prepared probable cost estimates of the two proposals.

EVALUATION RESULTS
Proposals Not in Competitive Range

Boeing Computer Support Services, Inc. (Boeing). The Boeing proposal was the highest cost proposal received. Boeing received a rating of "Good" under the Mission Suitability Factor and was rated "Very Good" under the Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor. Under the Other Considerations Factor, its proposal was considered "Good."

Hughes STX Corporation (Hughes). The Hughes proposal was the second highest cost proposal received and its rating under the Mission Suitability Factor was "Fair." Under Relevant Experience and Past Performance, Hughes was rated "Good." Under the Other Considerations Factor, its proposal was considered "Very Good."

Loral Systems Company (Loral). The Loral proposal was the third lowest cost proposal received, and rated "Good" on the Mission Suitability Factor. Additionally, while its Relevant Experience and Past Performance were also rated "Good," Loral received a rating of "Fair" on the Other Considerations Factor.

RMS Support Services (RMS). The RMS proposal was the second lowest cost proposal and rated "Good" under the Mission Suitability Factor. In evaluating Relevant Experience and Past Performance, the SEB rated RMS as "Very Good." In "Other Considerations," , however, its proposal was rated "Fair."

Sterling Software (Sterling). Sterling's cost proposal was at the mid point of the seven offerors. While Sterling's proposal was rated as "Very Good" in both the Relevant Experience and Past Performance and Other Considerations Factors, it was rated "Fair" for the Mission Suitability Factor.

Proposals in Competitive Range

Mission Suitability

Computer Sciences Corporation (CSC)

The proposal submitted by CSC received a rating of "Very Good" for the Mission Suitability Factor and received the higher numerical score of the two proposals in the competitive range. CSC's overall numerical score for this factor increased as a result of information provided as a part of written and oral discussions and Best and Final Offers (BAFO's), although the adjective rating remained the same.

The CSC proposal contained many major strengths. The proposal set forth a well-defined and highly effective organizational approach with clearly defined interfaces and responsibilities for both prime and subcontracted work. CSC demonstrated that it had an innovative approach for recruiting new personnel and a comprehensive plan for phase-in.

CSC's fringe benefits program for both professional and nonprofessional employees is attractive with several strengths. CSC's proposal for the subfactor *Operations Plan* showed a thorough understanding of the SOW with several major strengths.

The CSC proposal also contained two major weak points. The proposal failed to address two sub-areas of the SOW in its *Operations Plan*.

Unisys Government Systems, Inc. (Unisys)

The proposal submitted by Unisys also received a rating of "Very Good" for the Mission Suitability Factor. Unisys' numerical score for this Factor was slightly lower than CSC's score. Unisys' numerical score increased as a result of information received as a part of written and oral discussions and BAFO's, although the adjective rating remained the same.

The Unisys proposal contained many major strengths. In the area of *Key Personnel*, Unisys proposed personnel with excellent qualifications. As incumbent for a major portion of the SCOMAC effort, phase-in impact would be minimal. The Unisys fringe benefits program for both professional and nonprofessional employees is attractive with several strengths. The Unisys proposal showed several major strengths in individual areas of the *Operations Plan*.

The Unisys proposal also contained several major weak points. Under *Organization*, the proposal failed to present effective lines of supervision and did not provide for functional responsibilities of subcontractors. In the *Operations Plan*, the proposal showed six major weak points, primarily for answers to RFP technical questions.

Costs

The SEB evaluated the realism of proposed costs and the consistency of such proposed costs with other aspects of each proposal. Adjustments were made to the proposed costs submitted by both offerors in the competitive range in order to determine the probable cost to the Government of each of the proposals.

Of the two firms in the competitive range, CSC proposed the lowest total cost. After evaluation of the proposed costs, the SEB determined that the probable cost for both offerors was higher than that proposed, although the costs proposed by Unisys were only slightly lower than the probable cost. In evaluating the proposals, the SEB found that the Unisys total probable cost to the Government was higher than CSC's by a small margin.

Relevant Experience and Past Performance

Both CSC and Unisys received ratings of "Excellent" under the Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor. Both proposals reflected extensive experience in performing similar work. Further, reference checks confirmed that both offerors had histories of high quality performance.

Other Considerations

The CSC proposal received a rating of "Excellent" under the Other Considerations Factor. The Unisys proposal received a rating of "Very Good." Both offerors proposed suitable facilities and neither took exception to the contract terms and conditions. Based on the materials submitted to the SEB for evaluation, the Board determined that the *Financial Condition and Capability* for CSC was higher than that for Unisys. Additionally, since the RFP established minimum acceptable goals for subcontracting to small disadvantaged businesses, the SEB evaluated each offeror's response to meeting, or exceeding, those goals. The CSC proposal provided for a greater percentage of subcontracting to small disadvantaged businesses than the Unisys proposal.

SELECTION DECISION

Subsequent to the SEB's presentation, I met in executive session with a small group of Center officials who have responsibilities related to this procurement. They had also heard the presentation and had read the SEB's report. Their comments and observations were solicited during the course of our discussion.

We reviewed and assessed the Mission Suitability evaluation and noted that CSC had submitted a proposal superior to that of Unisys.

We reviewed the SEB's assessment of Relevant Experience and Past Performance and noted that both firms were rated equal. Evaluation of the Other Considerations Factor showed that CSC's proposal was superior based on its more aggressive pursuit of small disadvantaged business subcontracting and its financial condition and capability.

Finally, we discussed the comparative positions of the two proposals in the competitive range from the standpoint of cost, both as proposed and as adjusted by the SEB's probable cost assessment. We noted that CSC's proposed costs were lower and that the SEB's probable cost adjustments showed that CSC had the lowest total overall probable cost for SCOMAC by a small margin.

I have concluded that the Source Evaluation Board performed its duties in accordance with the policies and procedures set forth in NASA Handbook 5103.6B. I further conclude that the SEB's evaluation was comprehensive, objective, and fair.

Based on its superior Mission Suitability proposal, superior Other Factors rating, and lowest proposed and total probable costs, Computer Sciences Corporation is selected for the purpose

of final negotiations leading to award of the Scientific Computing Operations, Maintenance, and Communications Services Contract.

H. Lee Beach, Jr.
Deputy Director, NASA Langley Research Center
Source Selection Official

8/27/93
Date