

SELECTION OF CONTRACTOR
FOR
RECERTIFICATION AND CONFIGURATION
MANAGEMENT SERVICES

On May 25, 1994, I met with the Source Evaluation Committee (SEC) appointed to evaluate proposals to provide Recertification and Configuration Management Services. The SEC's presentation consisted of the procurement history, the evaluation procedures used, and the results of the evaluation.

PROCUREMENT DESCRIPTION

The objective of this procurement is to provide in-service inspection of LaRC's structural and high pressure fluid systems and configuration management of the documents identified as vital to the safe operation of LaRC facilities. The required services are a continuation of those currently being performed under contract NAS1-18870 for Recertification and Configuration Management Support Services.

Originally, the RFP specified a 5-year period of performance commencing March 1, 1994, and included six 1-month option periods. However, the Associate Administrator for Procurement issued a directive on April 29, 1994, requiring the Centers to limit the initial period of all new support service contracts to one year. Accordingly, the contract will include an initial contract period of one year and options to extend the contract term for four 1-year periods and six 1-month periods, for a total potential period of performance of 5 1/2 years. The contract start date was delayed by 4 months, from March 1, 1994, until July 1, 1994, due to a protest that was lodged by GPS Technologies, Inc. with the General Accounting Office (GAO). The protest was denied by the GAO on May 10, 1994.

The Contractor will be required to furnish 51 work-years during the initial period, 46 work-years for each of the four 1-year option periods, and 46 work-months for the six 1-month option periods. In addition, at the Government's option, the Contractor may be required to furnish additional level-of-effort, up to 4 work-years during the initial period, 8 work-years during the first option period, 12 work-years during the second option period, 16 work-years during the third option period, 20 work-years during the fourth option period, and 20 man-months for each of the final six 1-month option periods.

SOURCES

The RFP was released on July 27, 1993, to approximately 54 firms. Fourteen firms attended the Pre-proposal Conference held at LaRC on August 10, 1993. Proposals were received from the following five firms:

Ebasco Services, Inc., Norcross, GA
 Energy Services Group, Williamsburg, VA
 GPS Technologies, Inc., Columbia, MD
 M. Rosenblatt & Sons, Inc., Newport News, VA
 Technology Applications, Inc., Alexandria, VA

EVALUATION PROCESS

Prior to issuance of the RFP, the Procurement Officer appointed an SEC to conduct an evaluation of proposals received in response to the solicitation. The Evaluation Plan was approved by the Source Selection Official on August 11, 1993. The RFP and Evaluation Plan specified the following evaluation factors:

- Mission Suitability
- Cost
- Relevant Experience and Past Performance
- Other Considerations

The Mission Suitability subfactors and assigned weights were set forth in the Evaluation Plan and RFP as follows:

<u>Subfactor</u>	<u>Weight</u>
a. Technical Approach	40%
b. Phase-in, Staffing, and Continuing Personnel Management	15%
c. Total Compensation Plan	15%
d. Key Personnel and Organization	30%

The RFP and the Evaluation Plan stated that the above numerical weights are indicative of the relative importance of those evaluation areas and that the weights would be used as a guide. This plan was followed by the SEC in their evaluation of the proposals received.

The Evaluation Plan and RFP stated that the Mission Suitability subfactors would be scored and that the Cost, Relevant Experience and Past Performance, and Other Considerations would be evaluated but not scored. In addition, the Evaluation Plan and RFP stated that in the selection of a Contractor for negotiations leading to contract award, Mission Suitability, Cost, Relevant Experience and Past Performance and Other Considerations would be of essentially equal importance; however, within Factor 2, Cost, the costs associated with the options for the additional level-of-effort and the six 1-month option periods may be considered of less significance than the costs for the 5-year base period (including phase-in).

Five firms submitted timely proposals. The SEC evaluated the proposals in accordance with the approved Evaluation Plan, specifically using the standard evaluation procedures set forth in Attachment A of the Plan.

The SEC reviewed each proposal to identify any patently unacceptable proposals. The Contracting Officer was notified that all proposals warranted further review. Each voting member then independently evaluated the Mission Suitability proposals, (Volume I) for each offeror in alphabetical order, noting strong/weak points and assigning adjective ratings for each Mission Suitability subfactor. Committee consensus strong and weak points and consensus adjective ratings were then developed for each subfactor. The SEC then scored each proposal in accordance with the Evaluation Plan.

Business Proposals (Volume II) were subsequently reviewed and analyzed, after which appropriate adjustments were made to the Mission Suitability findings.

The results of the SEC's initial evaluation were presented to the Contracting Officer on December 7, 1993. The SEC, in conjunction with the Contracting Officer, determined that two firms had a reasonable chance of being selected for award and should be included in the Competitive Range. This decision was based on the firms' superior Mission Suitability ratings of "Excellent" or "Very Good", reasonable costs, Relevant Experience and Past Performance ratings of "Excellent", and Other Considerations of "Excellent" or "Very Good". The two firms included in the Competitive Range were:

Ebasco Services, Inc.
Technology Applications, Inc.

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

The SEC then prepared questions for each offeror in the Competitive Range and forwarded them to the firms. Subsequent to the conduct of written 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 SEC's pricing consultant, in consultation with the SEC, prepared probable cost estimates for the two proposals.

EVALUATION RESULTS

Proposals Not in the Competitive Range

Energy Services Group (ESG) - ESG had the third lowest proposed cost of the five offerors and its Mission Suitability Factor was rated "Fair". ESG's Relevant Experience and Past Performance and Other Considerations Factors were rated "Good" and "Very Good", respectively.

GPS Technologies, Inc. (GPS) - GPS had the highest proposed cost of the five offerors and its Mission Suitability Factor was rated "Good". GPS's Relevant Experience and Past Performance and Other Considerations Factors were both rated "Very Good".

M. Rosenblatt & Sons, Inc. (MRS) - MRS had the second lowest proposed cost and its Mission Suitability Factor was rated "Fair". MRS's Relevant Experience and Past Performance and Other Considerations Factors were both rated "Good".

Proposals in the Competitive Range

Mission Suitability

Ebasco Services, Inc. (ESI) - ESI's proposal received an adjective rating of "Very Good" for the Mission Suitability Factor. ESI's numerical score increased as a result of information received via written discussions and BAFO's, although the adjective rating remained the same.

Their proposal contained major strengths in each of the subfactors. Their proposal included a well developed discussion of all aspects of the Statement of Work which established a complete understanding of all requirements. Ebasco proposed an extensive phase-in plan and an effective program for motivating and incentivizing employees to continuously improve performance and increase productivity. Ebasco's total compensation plan provided an attractive salary and fringe benefits package to recruit and retain qualified professional and nonprofessional employees. Ebasco proposed highly relevant corporate technical resources that could be brought to bear for this effort.

ESI's proposal also contained two major weaknesses. Under the Total Compensation subfactor, one of the company's fringe benefits did not meet RFP requirements. The second weakness involved the qualifications for one of the proposed key personnel.

Technology Applications, Inc. (TAI) - TAI's proposal received an adjective rating of "Excellent" for the Mission Suitability Factor. TAI's numerical score decreased as a result of information received via written discussions and BAFO's, although the adjective rating remained the same.

Their proposal contained major strengths in each of the subfactors. The proposal included a well developed discussion of all aspects of the Statement of Work which established a complete understanding of all requirements. TAI's phase-in plan afforded maximum contract continuity. TAI proposed an effective program for motivating and incentivizing employees to continuously improve performance and increase productivity. TAI's total compensation plan provided a very attractive salary and fringe benefits package to recruit and retain qualified professional and nonprofessional employees. TAI's proposed key personnel exceeded all RFP requirements regarding code, systems safety, and directly related technical management experience.

TAI's proposal also contained one major weakness. Under the Total Compensation subfactor, one of the company's fringe benefits did not meet RFP requirements.

Costs

The SEC 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 cost for both offerors in the Competitive Range in order to determine the probable cost to the Government.

Of the two firms in the Competitive Range, ESI proposed the lowest cost by a small margin. After evaluation of the proposed costs, the SEC determined that the probable cost for each offeror was lower than that proposed, although the relevant ranking did not change. In evaluating the proposals, the SEC determined that the total probable costs for both firms were essentially equal.

Relevant Experience and Past Performance

Both ESI and TAI received "Excellent" ratings for the Relevant Experience and Past Performance Factor. Both firms were determined to have extensive experience providing support in all areas of the recertification and configuration management task areas. Furthermore, reference checks revealed that both offerors have consistently provided excellent performance.

Other Considerations

The TAI proposal received an "Excellent" rating for the Other Considerations Factor. The ESI proposal received a "Very Good" rating. The TAI proposal provided for a greater percentage of subcontracting to small disadvantaged businesses than did the

ESI proposal. Both firms were determined to have adequate financial resources to perform the contract. Neither firm took exception to the contract terms and conditions. Finally, TAI's facility was determined to have adequate space for all personnel, while ESI's facility was determined to be minimally adequate due to crowded work spaces for two work groups.

SELECTION DECISION

After the SEC's presentation, I reviewed and assessed the Mission Suitability evaluation and noted that TAI's final Mission Suitability score was higher than that of ESI. Further, TAI's "Excellent" adjective rating for the Mission Suitability Factor was one rating higher than ESI's rating.

I noted that ESI's and TAI's final probable costs for the total contract were essentially equal and that both firms were rated "Excellent" for Relevant Experience and Past Performance.

Finally, I reviewed the SEC's assessment of the Other Considerations Factor that showed the TAI proposal to be superior.

I have concluded that the SEC performed its duties in accordance with the Evaluation Plan. I further conclude that the SEC's evaluation was comprehensive, objective, and fair.

Based on its superior Mission Suitability proposal, superior Other Considerations rating, equal rating for Relevant Experience and Past Performance, and essentially equal total probable cost, TAI is selected for the purpose of final negotiations leading to award of the Recertification and Configuration Management Services contract.

Rosemary C. Froehlich
Rosemary C. Froehlich
Source Selection Official

9-30-94
Date