

SELECTION OF CONTRACTOR
FOR
CONSOLIDATED LOGISTICS, ADMINISTRATIVE, SECURITY
AND SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION

On July 9, 1996, I met with the Source Evaluation Team (SET) appointed to evaluate proposals to provide Consolidated Logistics, Administrative, Security and Scientific Information Contract (CLASSIC). The SET's presentation consisted of the procurement history, evaluation procedures used, and the results of the evaluation.

PROCUREMENT DESCRIPTION

The objective of this procurement is to provide support services in the specified above areas of work to the NASA Langley Research Center (LaRC) beginning August 1, 1996, following the expiration of the current contract with Mason & Hanger Services Inc. The work to be performed by the successful offeror includes but is not limited to: logistics services including transportation, supply management and equipment management; administrative services including clerical support, and engineering drawing files/micrographics support; security including physical security and security administrative services; and scientific and information services including technical library support, visual and printing services.

A hybrid contract consisting of cost plus award fee, firm fixed price and delivery order provisions has been determined to be the most appropriate type for this procurement. The cost plus award fee and firm fixed price portions are tied to a performance-based statement of work with performance metrics. The delivery order provisions will apply to carpet installation and special ordering of security services e.g. special events, emergency requirements, and security system installations. The contract will have a 12-month initial period of performance followed by four 12-month option periods, for a total potential period of performance of 60 months.

The CLASSIC procurement was initiated by the Logistic Management Division. It is anticipated that Howard R. Puckett will serve as the Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR).

SOURCES

A Sources Sought was released August 25, 1994, seeking small and small disadvantaged businesses to furnish the necessary resources for the CLASSIC effort. Approximately 41 responses were received. Based on this response, a notice was released on January 1, 1995, in the Commerce Business Daily (CBD) which stated the Agency's intent to set aside this procurement for small

businesses. However, due to requirement and budget uncertainties within NASA, potential offerors were notified in the CBD on April 4, 1995, that the Government had suspended work on the RFP. Several changes occurred in the requirements during the suspension period, such as additional requirements for programmatic security support and projects records management and the expansion of correspondence management task. During the suspension period there were also numerous discussions between LaRC personnel and NASA Headquarters personnel, including the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization (Code K), regarding the procurement strategy. Based on the nature of the requirement, as well as the interest expressed by 8 (a) firms that were capable of supporting this effort, it was determined that the acquisition should be an 8 (a) set-aside. The Small Business Administration (SBA) accepted the CLASSIC requirement for competition in the 8 (a) program by letter dated July 12, 1995.

The CLASSIC Statement of Work (SOW) was released in July 1995 for comments from prospective offerors. The purpose of the draft SOW was to solicit industry comments and suggested improvements regarding the performance-based aspects of the SOW, e.g., performance metrics, historical data. Concurrent with the draft RFP release, a technical point-of-contact was designated to provide potential offerors the opportunity to discuss the current contract operations and enhance their understanding of the requirements. A technical library was also established to provide contractor access to CLASSIC documents.

A Request for Proposal (RFP) was issued on October 23, 1995, to approximately 400 firms. A preproposal conference and facility tour were held at LaRC on November 8, 1995, with approximately 80 firms represented. The initial date for receipt of offers was December 7, 1996. However, due to Government furloughs and changes made to the requirement, several extensions were made to the proposal due date. Proposals were received from the following 13 8 (a) businesses:

- Alrod Enterprises, Inc.
- Contract Services, Inc.
- Creative Management Technology, Inc.
- Fidelity Technologies Corp.
- Flex-Tech Professional Services, Inc.
- Garcia Consulting, Inc.
- Gemini Industries, Inc.
- LESCO, Inc.
- Management Technology Associates, Inc.
- NCI Information Systems, Inc.
- Space Mark, Inc.
- Uwohali, Inc.
- WREN, Inc.

EVALUATION PROCESS

Prior to the issuance of the RFP, I appointed an SET to conduct an evaluation of proposals received in response to the solicitation. The proposals submitted in response to this solicitation were evaluated using the Best Value Selection (BVS) procedures. The procedures were approved by me on September 25, 1995, and are covered in RFP Section M.

As stated in the RFP, Best Value Selection is based on the premise that, if all offerors are of approximately equal qualitative merit and relevant experience and past performance, award will be made to the one with the lowest proposed cost or Government-determined most probable cost. However, the Government may award to an offeror with higher cost if the offeror has higher rated qualitative merit and/or relevant experience and past performance, provided the cost differential is commensurate with the added value. Conversely, the Government may award to an offeror whose proposal has lower rated qualitative merit and/or relevant experience and past performance, if the cost differential between it and other proposals warrants doing so. Overall, in the selection of an offeror, cost, qualitative merit, and relevant experience and past performance will be of essentially equal importance.

Qualitative merit relative to the offeror's technical proposal was determined by evaluating the degree to which the objectives of the Qualitative Evaluation Criteria (QEC's) were met or exceeded. The SET used the following QEC's to evaluate the technical proposals:

1. Your approach to ensuring uninterrupted and flexible contract operations from phase-in, through contract life, and potential phase-out in an environment characterized by shrinking budgetary resources. Include your approach for integrating any proposed subcontract/teaming arrangements.
2. Your approach to providing timely and responsive customer support.
3. Your approach to providing continual improvement in CLASSIC operations.
4. Your use of innovative approaches in performing the effort required by the Statement of Work. For Firm Fixed Price Security Support Services provide your approach for encouraging peak performance and discouraging nonperformance.
5. Your approach to developing and implementing effective safety procedures and practices, and ensuring that all contract tasks are performed in accordance with an approved Safety and Health Plan (Ref. Exh. A, Para. F).

6. Your approach for providing a professional and nonprofessional compensation plan (including use of uncompensated overtime by professionals) that promotes workforce continuity.

7. Your understanding of the requisite personnel qualifications and skills essential to the performance of all contract activities, and your approach to recruiting and retaining qualified and skilled personnel at all levels.

Thirteen business firms submitted timely proposals. The SET evaluated the proposals in accordance with the approved evaluation procedures set forth in Section M of the RFP. Initially, all voting members reviewed the proposals (technical and business) to identify any that were considered patently unacceptable. I was notified that three firms, Alrod Enterprises, Inc., Contract Services, Inc., and WREN, Inc., was determined to be patently unacceptable and the remaining proposals warranted further review. Concurrently, the cost consultant initiated a review of the business proposals.

At the completion of the patently unacceptable review, each Voting Member reviewed, in depth, each technical proposal to evaluate qualitative merit. Strengths and weaknesses and areas requiring discussion or clarification were noted using the individual rating sheets prepared for each QEC. The SET then met to collectively discuss each technical proposal and assign consensus strengths and weaknesses along with consensus adjective ratings for each QEC.

The SET analyzed each business proposal and received reports from the cost consultant. Impacts of the business proposal findings on QEC adjectives were discussed and changes were made where appropriate. Adjustments were made to proposed costs in some cases where auditors recommended such or when the SET determined such adjustments to be appropriate to arrive at a more likely cost for overall proposal value.

Relevant experience and past performance were reviewed by the SET, both from offeror-supplied information and from reference-supplied input. The SET assigned consensus adjective ratings for each offeror.

The results of the SET's initial evaluation were presented to me on April 5, 1996, and I determined the group of finalists to include Creative Management Technology, Inc., NCI Information Systems, Inc., Space Mark, Inc., and Uwohali, Inc. Two rounds of written discussions were conducted with the finalists, and each was afforded an opportunity to revise its proposal. Best and Final Offers (BAFO's) were received on July 3, 1996.

The revised proposals/BAFO's were reviewed using the same procedures used in the initial evaluation. As a result of this review some adjustments were made

to the initial evaluation findings for the finalists. The SET presented the updated findings to me on July 9, 1996. A summary of these findings follow:

The technical evaluation was based upon each offeror's response to the QEC's. Uwohali received a rating of Exceeds for all QEC's. Both CMT and NCI received 4 Exceeds and 3 Meets. Space Mark received 2 Exceeds, 4 Meets, and 1 Does Not Meet.

The cost evaluation was based upon each offeror's proposed cost and fee to perform the required effort. There was a 18 percent difference between the highest and lowest total proposed BAFO cost for the four offerors. The ranking (low to high) for proposed costs, including fee, was as follows:

NCI
Space Mark
Uwohali
CMT

In the area of relevant experience and past performance, all prime contractors proposed some level of subcontractor support for performing specific areas of the statement of work (SOW). Each contractor, both prime and subcontractor, was evaluated with regard to the relevant experience it possessed for performing its designated statement of work area. In addition, past performance evaluations were made for all prime contractors and subcontractors. Both CMT and NCI received a rating of Excellent for relevant experience and past performance, while both Space Mark and Uwohali received a rating of Satisfactory.

SELECTION DECISION

After the SET's presentation, I reviewed and assessed the evaluation findings of the SET. I noted that Space Mark had the fewest Exceeds ratings of all offerors and was the only offeror to receive a rating of Did Not Meet. I noted that one offeror, NCI, had a lower cost and two offerors, NCI and CMT, had higher REPP ratings. I therefore eliminated Space Mark from further consideration.

I then noted that NCI and CMT had the same QEC and REPP ratings; however, I also noted that CMT's cost were significantly higher than NCI's costs. I eliminated CMT from further consideration.

Finally, I noted that Uwohali received a rating of Exceeds for all QEC's, although I also noted that NCI had a lower cost and a higher REPP rating.

Based on its strong technical proposal (technical merit), excellent relevant experience and past performance, and lowest cost, I have determined that the

NCI BAFO provides the best overall value to the Government for this effort and is selected for the purpose of contract award.

I have concluded that the SET performed its duties in accordance with the approved evaluation procedures set forth in Section M of the RFP. I further conclude that the SET's evaluation was comprehensive, objective, and fair.

Panice H. Clark

Panice H. Clark
Source Selection Official

7/18/96
Date