

**Selection Statement**

1. The Acquisition

This procurement provides for configuration management services, computerized maintenance management development/system support services, and high-pressure system recertification services for facilities at NASA LaRC.

This procurement is a Cost-Plus-Incentive-Fee type contract with a two year base period and three one year options, totaling a maximum five year period of performance. This effort will be converted from a level-of-effort to a performance based contract with an incentive fee plan. In addition, a 15% Small Business (SB) goal and 10% Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB) goal, based on total contract value, has been incorporated.

A Draft Request for Proposals (DRFP) was issued on March 5, 1999. There was no pre-solicitation conference. A final Request for Proposals (RFP) was issued on April 6, 1999. Proposals were received from five (5) offerors on or prior to the May 24, 1999 deadline.

The five (5) offerors are identified below:

<b>Offerors:</b>
AlliedSignal Technical Services Corporation (ATSC)
Duke Engineering & Services (DE&S)
DynCorp Information & Enterprise Technology (DI&ET)
Hernandez Engineering, Inc. (HEI)
Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC)

2. Evaluation Procedures –

- (a) The evaluation procedures for this procurement are identified under section M of the solicitation. Those procedures were used by the agency's Source Evaluation Team (SET) to evaluate the proposals received in response to the RFP.
- (b) Section M provided that proposals would be evaluated against three factors: (1) Mission Suitability, (2) Cost, and (3) Past Performance, with each factor given equal weight.
- (c) The Mission Suitability factor was further divided into four subfactors: (1) Understanding of the Requirement and Approach; (2) Management Approach; (3) SDB Participation in the SIC Major Groups; and (4) Cost Realism. The first three subfactors were to be scored by the SET on a scale totaling 1000 points, while evaluation of the fourth subfactor, i.e., cost realism,

could result in a deduction of up to 300 points. If a cost realism adjustment of the cost proposal was less than 5%, no adjustment was made to the Mission Suitability Score.

(d) The numerical weights assigned to the subfactors are indicative of the relative importance of those evaluation areas. The weights were utilized only as a guide. The possible adjective ratings that could be assigned were "Excellent," "Very Good," "Good," "Fair" and "Poor."

(e) The Section M procedures were followed throughout the evaluation process.

3. Expert consultants were appointed to review certain portions of the proposals; i.e., ISO 9001, Computerized Maintenance Management System (CMMS), Configuration Management (CM) and Management. The consultants provided written evaluations of the proposals in accordance with the evaluation plan and met with the SET to elaborate on their evaluations. A Cost/Price Analyst from the Office of Procurement was utilized for Factor 2, Cost.

4. Upon completion of the evaluation, the SET's findings were summarized in a report and presented to the Contracting Officer on August 4, 1999. The Contracting Officer, in conjunction with the SET, determined that discussions would not be necessary in order for the Source Selection Authority to make a selection. Section L of the solicitation indicated the Government intended to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with offerors.

5. On August 10, 1999, the SET provided me, and other cognizant ex-officio members of the SET, with a written and oral report of their findings.

6. I have carefully reviewed the facts presented in the evaluation report and discussed with the SET the technical merits and comparative strengths and weaknesses of each proposal. The evaluation findings are summarized below.

7. Unacceptable Proposals – There were no unacceptable proposals.

8. Late Proposals – There were no late proposals.

9. Results of the Mission Suitability Evaluation – Set forth below in order of ranking (high to low) is a summary of the findings related to the Mission Suitability factor for the five offerors:

HEI \_\_\_\_\_ Very Good

The evaluation of the HEI mission suitability proposal resulted in an adjective rating of Very Good. There were six major strengths and no major weaknesses. HEI received two major strengths for its Configuration Management approach, two major strengths for its Recertification approach, and two major strengths

under the subfactor for Management approach in connection with its proposed employee benefits package. HEI also received several strengths and no weaknesses in connection with its proposed approach for SDB participation in Major SIC Groups. Overall, HEI demonstrated a thorough understanding of the SOW and proposed appropriate skills to perform the work. Apart from the major strengths and weaknesses, HEI received a total of ten minor strengths and four minor weaknesses.

SAIC Very Good

The evaluation of the SAIC mission suitability proposal resulted in an adjective rating of Very Good. There were three major strengths and one major weakness. SAIC received one major strength for its Configuration Management approach, one major strength for its Recertification approach and one major strength under the subfactor for Management approach in connection with its proposed employee benefits package. Overall, SAIC demonstrated a thorough understanding of the SOW and proposed appropriate skills to perform the work. SAIC received one major weakness in connection with its failure to meet SB/SDB goals. It received one minor strength for its SDB participation in Major SIC Groups, but also a minor weakness for failing to include a SDB in SAIC Group 8711. Apart from the major strengths and weaknesses, SAIC received a total of eighteen minor strengths and twelve minor weaknesses.

DI&ET Good

The evaluation of the DI&ET mission suitability proposal resulted in an adjective rating of Good. DI&ET received five major strengths and one major weakness. One major strength was related to its Configuration Management approach, and four major strengths related to its Recertification approach. Overall, DI&ET demonstrated a good understanding of the SOW but did not identify an appropriate or adequate skill mix for all positions. It received one major weakness because its proposal provided limited subcontracting information and did not contain a Subcontracting Plan. It also received two minor strengths for its proposed SDB participation strategy for Major SIC Groups, and a minor weakness for SDB past performance. Apart from the major strengths and weaknesses, DI&ET received a total of twelve minor strengths and thirteen minor weaknesses.

DE&S Good

The evaluation of the DE&S mission suitability proposal resulted in an adjective rating of Good. DE&S received two major strengths and four major weaknesses. It received one major strength for its proposed Recertification approach and one for its ISO9001 planning strategy. Two major weaknesses were received in connection with its Configuration Management approach; one related to its

employee benefits package and the other for the lack of required information from major subcontractors. DE&S received minor strengths for its proposed SDB participation strategy in Major SIC Groups and a weakness for SDB past performance. Apart from the major strengths and weaknesses, DE&S received a total of nineteen minor strengths and twenty-one minor weaknesses.

ATSC Poor

The evaluation of the ATSC mission suitability proposal resulted in an adjective rating of Poor. ATSC received one major strength and seven major weaknesses. It received a major strength for its proposed auditing of CMMS. It received major weaknesses for its failure to propose appropriate skills to perform the work, its failure to submit required ISO 9001 procedures, and for the limited or complete lack of discussion related to several critical elements of work in the Configuration Management and Recertification areas. ATSC also failed to meet SDB/SB goals because SIC Major Groups, percentages and subcontractors were not identified. It did, however, receive a minor strength for SDB past performance. Apart from major strengths and weaknesses, ATSC received a total of ten minor strengths and nineteen minor weaknesses.

10. Cost realism adjustments were applied to 3 of the 5 offerors. The results of the cost realism adjustments did not affect the final rankings of the offerors. The resultant rankings remained as shown above.

11. Evaluation of the Cost/Price Factor- The SET's cost evaluation was based on the costs and incentive fee proposed by each offeror for the two year base period and the three priced option periods. Upward probable cost adjustments were made to the proposed prices of three offerors (ATSC, HEI and SAIC) and downward adjustments were made to the proposed prices of the remaining two offerors (DE&S and DI&ET). Cost adjustments, however, did not alter the final cost ranking of the proposed offerors. The ranking (lowest cost to highest) for both proposed and probable cost is as follows: HEI, followed by ATSC, SAIC, DI&ET and DE&S. The difference between the highest and lowest probable cost is 60%. The difference between the lowest and second lowest probable cost is 13%.

12. Evaluation of the Past Performance (PP) Factor – The SET's past performance evaluation was based on the Past Performance forms submitted by the offeror's customers, by narrative information submitted by the offerors and by checking customer references. There were twenty past performance criteria used by the SET in conducting the past performance evaluations.

ATSC Very Good

ATSC's overall past performance received an adjective rating of Very Good. Its past performance surveys on relevant contracts rated its performance

as excellent. It was ranked less than satisfactory in one category related to its accounting system. Its proposed subcontractor also achieved an excellent rating in the IT management area and demonstrated significant experience in CM and CMMS. Overall, ATSC and its subcontractor demonstrated experience in each of the twenty (20) past performance criteria evaluated by the SET.

DE&S                      Good

DE&S's overall past performance received an adjective rating of Good. The available past performance surveys on relevant contracts rated its performance from satisfactory to excellent. However, the SET did not have all necessary data for a full evaluation because certain sources identified by DE&S could not be contacted. Its proposed major subcontractor also did not provide past performance information. Because of the limited information made available, DE&S's overall past performance, including that of its subcontractor, could not be verified in all 20 areas evaluated by the SET. The information that was provided, however, was found by the SET to be sufficient for an assigned adjective rating of Good.

DI&ET                      Very Good

DI&ET's overall past performance received an adjective rating of Very Good. Its past performance surveys on relevant contracts rated its performance from satisfactory to excellent. DI&ET's proposed subcontractors were also found to have significant and relevant experience in the areas of work for which they were proposed and demonstrated relevant and satisfactory experience in all 20 areas evaluated by the SET.

HEI                              Very Good

HEI's overall past performance received an adjective rating of Very Good. Past performance surveys on relevant contracts rated its performance from satisfactory to excellent with moderate to significant relevant experience. The proposed major subcontractor also has moderate to significant relevant experience in the areas for which it was proposed. Overall, the HEI Team demonstrated relevant and satisfactory experience in all 20 areas evaluated by the SET.

SAIC                              Very Good

SAIC's overall past performance received an adjective rating of Very Good. Past performance surveys indicate SAIC has satisfactory to excellent performance on relevant contracts and relevant experience in 18 of the evaluated areas. Although SAIC's technical proposal and one past performance narrative both indicate that SAIC has relevant experience in the two remaining areas evaluated, the SET was unsuccessful in contacting the relevant personnel

necessary to confirm this information. The proposed major subcontractor also demonstrated significant experience in some of the work areas for which it was proposed, but minimal experience in other areas. Overall, the SET found that the SAIC Team had proven experience in 18 of the 20 evaluated past performance areas.

8. Basis for Selection – I have reviewed and assessed the evaluation findings. I noted that HEI had the highest Mission Suitability Factor score, and that HEI's proposal had no major weaknesses. I further noted that HEI, ATSC, DI&ET and SAIC all received an adjective rating of Very Good for the Past Performance evaluation factor. I then reviewed the comparative position of the proposals from the standpoint of Cost based on the SET's assessment. I noted that HEI had the lowest proposed and probable cost.

In making my decision, I considered all three factors equally. I concluded that HEI had the highest Mission Suitability Factor score, a Past Performance adjective rating of Very Good and the lowest proposed and probable cost, resulting in the HEI proposal being the most advantageous proposal to the Government, all factors considered. Therefore, HEI is selected for the purpose of contract award.

I am convinced the Source Evaluation Team conducted a thorough, fair, and objective evaluation of all proposals in accordance with the established evaluation plan.

  
Sandra S. Ray  
Source Selection Authority

8/30/99  
Date