SOURCE SELECTION STATEMENT
Langley Administrative, Media, and Professional Services (LAMPS)
Request for Proposal (RFP) NNL11383762R

PROCUREMENT BACKGROUND

The LAMPS contract will provide professional support services, media services, and administrative support services to various organizations, programs, and projects throughout NASA Langley Research Center (LaRC) as specified in individual task orders. The support services include, but are not limited to, the following: (1) Professional Support Services (Financial/resource program analysis, procurement, technical editing, public affairs, education, library, interpreter (oral and sign language), Subject Matter Expert (SME), proposal development, Independent Cost Estimate (ICE)); (2) Media (Photography, graphics, video, printing and duplication); and (3) Administrative Support (Secretarial, administrative, and event coordination).

The LAMPS procurement will result in award to the Offeror who presents the best value to the Government based on the evaluation of Mission Suitability, Cost/Price, and Past Performance evaluation factors. The contract type is an Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Task Order contract with a Cost Reimbursable (No-Fee) contract line item. The period of performance will be five years from the effective date of award.

A Procurement Strategy Meeting was held on April 13, 2011 at LaRC and the Procurement Strategy was subsequently approved. The procurement was conducted as a set-aside under the Small Business Administration's 8(a) program. Market research was accomplished by posting a Sources Sought Notice on FedBizzOpps (Federal Business Opportunities) website on February 14, 2011. A Draft Request for Proposal (DRFP) was issued on June 3, 2011 for comments from industry. A Pre-Solicitation Conference was conducted via WebEx on June 14, 2011.

The RFP was issued on July 8, 2011 with a proposal response date of August 9, 2011 and a request for the Past Performance Proposals (Volume III) to be submitted early by July 25, 2011.

The following companies responded to the RFP by the due date of August 9, 2011:

Alutiiq Diversified Services, LLC (Alutiiq)
C&C International Computers and Consultants, Inc. (C&C)
Crewestone Technologies, Inc. (Crewestone)
GenTech Partners Joint Venture (GenTech)
Logical Innovations, Inc. (Logical)
LOGMET
Smart Data Solutions d/b/a SDSE, LLC (SDSE)
Strategic Operational Solutions Inc. (STOPSO)

EVALUATION FACTORS

The RFP set forth the following three evaluation factors:

Factor 1: Mission Suitability
Factor 2: Cost/Price
Factor 3: Past Performance

The RFP stated the contract would be awarded to the Offeror that can perform the contract in a manner most advantageous to the Government, all factors considered. In addition, the RFP stated that the Source Selection Authority (SSA) will make an integrated assessment of each offer and comparatively evaluate competing offers, considering input from the Source Evaluation Board (SEB), which rated Mission Suitability and Past Performance and evaluated Cost/Price in accordance with Section M. Each evaluation factor was essentially equal in importance, and all evaluation factors other than Cost/Price, when combined, were significantly more important than Cost/Price.

Factor 1: Mission Suitability

The RFP specified the adjectival ratings, definitions and percentile ranges in accordance with NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.305 and stated that these would be used in the evaluation of the Mission Suitability Subfactors.

The Mission Suitability Subfactors and their weights are as follows:

Subfactor 1: Management (MGMT) 600 points
- MGMT 1 – Management Approach and Organizational Structure
- MGMT 2 – Recruitment, Retention, and Continuity of Services
- MGMT 3 – Phase-In Plan

Subfactor 2: Understanding the Requirement and Technical Approach (URTA) 400 points
- URTA 1 – Approach to Representative Task Orders (RTOs)
- URTA 2 – Understanding of Technical Risks

The SEB used the following adjectival and numerical ratings from NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.305(a)(3)(A) in its evaluation of the Mission Suitability Factor:

ADJECTIVAL RATING	DEFINITIONS	PERCENTILE RANGE
Excellent	A comprehensive and thorough proposal of exceptional merit with one or more significant strengths. No deficiency or significant weakness exists.	91-100
Very Good	A proposal having no deficiency and which demonstrates over-all competence. One or more significant strengths have been found, and strengths outbalance any weaknesses that exist.	71-90
Good	A proposal having no deficiency and which shows a reasonably sound response. There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both. As a whole, weaknesses not off-set by strengths do not significantly detract from the Offeror's response.	51-70
Fair	A proposal having no deficiency and which has one or more weaknesses. Weaknesses outbalance any strengths.	31-50
Poor	A proposal that has one or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses that demonstrate a lack of overall competence or would require a major proposal revision to correct.	0-30

Adjective ratings and percentile scores were assigned, and points calculated by multiplying the percentile score by the number of available points, for each Mission Suitability Subfactor. Adjective ratings were not assigned at the Factor level; the sum of the points assigned for the two subfactors was the only overall rating for Mission Suitability.

Definitions:
The SEB used the following definitions to develop its findings:

The definition for Deficiency, Weakness, and Significant Weakness are defined in FAR Part 15.001 as follows:

> Deficiency is a material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.
>
> Weakness means a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
>
> Significant Weakness in the proposal is a flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Strength and Significant Strength are not defined in the FAR; however, the following definitions from M.2(e) of the RFP were used:

> Strength: An aspect of the proposal that increases the probability of successful contract performance.
>
> Significant Strength: An aspect of the proposal that appreciably increases the probability of successful contract performance.

Factor 2: Cost/Price

The RFP did not provide for adjectival ratings or numerical scores under the Cost/Price Factor; however, the RFP provided evaluation language within Section M, as follows:

> NASA will evaluate the Firm Fixed Price (FFP) Contract Line Item Number (CLIN) 1. NASA will perform a price analysis (ref: FAR 15.404-1(b)). Specifically, NASA's price analysis will include, but may not be limited to, comparing all ceiling prices proposed for CLIN 1 and comparing each proposed price to the Independent Government Cost Estimate.
>
> NASA will evaluate the cost-reimbursement (no-fee) CLIN. NASA will perform a cost realism analysis (ref: FAR 15.404-1(d)). Because NASA has already provided the direct costs each Offeror shall propose for CLIN 2, the cost realism analyses to be performed will be limited to evaluating the realism of each Offeror's proposed indirect costs for CLIN 2. In accordance with FAR 15.404-1(d)(2)(i) & (ii), the probable cost for CLIN 2 may differ from the proposed cost if NASA determines (based on its cost realism analysis) that the proposed cost is unrealistic for the work to be performed; the probable cost shall be used for the purposes of evaluation to determine the best value. In order for NASA to perform its cost realism analyses, Offerors are required to submit Information Other than Cost or Pricing Data pursuant to FAR 15.403-3. Finally, NASA will perform a price analysis by comparing all prices proposed for CLIN 2.
>
> NASA will verify each Offeror's compliance with Wage Determination (WD) and Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) requirements, as well as Limitations on Subcontracting. Consequently, Offerors are required to submit Information Other than Cost or Pricing Data pursuant to FAR 15.403-3.

Factor 3: Past Performance

Under the Past Performance Factor, the SEB assessed each Offeror's record (to include the record of significant subcontractors) of performing services that are similar in size, content, and complexity to the requirements of the solicitation. Specifically, the RFP stated that "each of the adjective ratings below has a performance component and a pertinence component. The

Offeror must meet the requirements of both components to achieve a particular rating. In assessing pertinence, the Government will consider the degree of similarity in size, content, and complexity to the requirements in this solicitation, as well as how current/recent the past performance is."

Rating Definitions:
The SEB used the following confidence level ratings to evaluate the Past Performance Factor (NFS 1815.305):

Very High Level of Confidence: The Offeror's relevant past performance is of exceptional merit and is very highly pertinent to this acquisition; indicating exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner; very minor (if any) problems with no adverse effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

High Level of Confidence: The Offeror's relevant past performance is highly pertinent to this acquisition; demonstrating very effective performance that would be fully responsive to contract requirements with contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part with only minor problems with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Moderate Level of Confidence: The Offeror's relevant past performance is pertinent to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Low Level of Confidence: The Offeror's relevant past performance is at least somewhat pertinent to this acquisition, and it meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements.

Very Low Level of Confidence: The Offeror's relevant past performance does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas which, adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Neutral: In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance [see FAR 15.305(a)(2)(ii) and (iv)].

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Prior to issuance of the RFP, an SEB was appointed to conduct an evaluation of proposals received in response to the RFP. The SEB conducted the evaluation of proposals in accordance with Section M of the RFP. The SEB began its evaluation upon receipt of the Past Performance Volumes (Volume III), which were received from the Offerors prior to the proposal due date. The SEB members reviewed each Offeror's Past Performance Proposal, all of the past performance questionnaires, and information obtained from the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS). The SEB considered all the performance and pertinence findings in assigning an adjectival rating for each Offeror as defined in the RFP. The pertinence findings consist of an integrated assessment of the relevance to LAMPS of the size, content (as compared to the LAMPS Performance Work Statement (PWS)) and complexity of the contracts submitted by each Offeror. To determine work content relevance, the SEB compared the description of the contracts within the Offeror's past performance proposal to the work (by PWS area) in the LAMPS PWS. For size and complexity relevance, the SEB compared the size and complexity of each contract submitted to the LAMPS contract. The SEB then assigned an overall pertinence rating for each Offeror. The SEB then considered the overall pertinence rating along with the SEB's assessment of the Offeror's performance ratings to assign an overall past performance confidence level based on the definitions in the NFS and the RFP.

Upon receipt of the Technical Proposal (Volume I) and the Business Proposal (Volume II), the SEB conducted an initial review of each Technical Proposal and the Cost/Price Analyst reviewed the Business Proposals to determine if any were unacceptable proposals as defined in NASA FAR Supplement 1815.305-70. The Contract Specialist reviewed each model contract, applicable terms and conditions, and Representations and Certifications for each Offeror. Immediately following receipt of proposals, it appeared that all proposals were acceptable and warranted a full evaluation. However, C&C was subsequently removed from further consideration, thus a full evaluation was not conducted on C&C's proposal. On November 28, 2011, the Contracting Officer informed C&C that its proposal was removed from further consideration.

Each SEB member performed a detailed review of the remaining Offerors' Technical Proposals and documented strengths and weaknesses for each Mission Suitability Subfactor. The SEB consultants independently reviewed specific areas of each proposal relevant to the factor for which they possess subject matter expertise and provided input to the SEB voting members for consideration. After completion of the individual evaluations for each subfactor, the SEB convened to discuss individual Findings and to develop consensus on strengths and weaknesses for each of the Offerors. The SEB then reviewed the Findings for each Offeror to ensure that all proposals were evaluated consistently and objectively. Upon completion of the evaluation of all subfactors for all Offerors, the SEB assigned adjectival ratings and percentage scores to each subfactor based on the consensus findings, and then assigned a point score for each subfactor to derive the overall Mission Suitability score in accordance with NFS 1815.305.

The SEB, in concert with the Cost/Price Analyst, reviewed each Offeror's Business Proposal to determine whether the cost/price proposal was reasonable, realistic and consistent with the technical approach. The Cost/Price Analyst assessed the cost/price proposals to ensure compliance with the Cost/Price evaluation factor. The SEB provided the results of its review of the Business Proposals to the Cost/Price Analyst who incorporated those results into the detailed analysis of the Offeror's cost/price proposals.

The Contracting Officer carefully reviewed the facts presented in the initial findings and discussed the findings with the SEB. In accordance with FAR 52.215-1(f)(4), the Contracting Officer determined that, based on the SEB's initial findings, discussions would be required and award without discussions could not be made. The Contracting Officer also determined that the LOGMET and STOPSO proposals were not among the most highly rated proposals and excluded them from the competitive range. A competitive range of the most highly rated proposals (Alutiiq, Crewestone, GenTech, Logical, and SDSE) was established in accordance with FAR 15.306(c).

On December 8, 2011, the Contracting Officer notified Alutiiq, Crewestone, GenTech, Logical, and SDSE that their proposals were included in the competitive range. Discussion questions were issued on December 8, 2011 to each of the five Offerors providing them with an opportunity to address weaknesses identified as a result of the evaluation process described above. Where needed, additional discussion questions were issued on January 12, 2012 to address responses to prior discussion questions. All responses were reviewed and evaluated by the SEB.

Final Proposal Revisions were requested on January 20, 2012 with a response date of January 24, 2012.

EVALUATION FINDINGS

Factor 1: Mission Suitability

Set forth below is a summary of the final Mission Suitability Findings for the five Offerors in the competitive range:

Alutiiq

Alutiiq received a Mission Suitability score of 478. Alutiiq's final proposal evaluation contained a strength, weaknesses, and significant weaknesses, as summarized below. There were no significant strengths.

Subfactor 1 – Management (MGMT)

Alutiiq received an adjectival rating of Fair for Subfactor 1.

Management Approach and Organizational Structure
Alutiiq received a Strength for proposing an experienced and qualified person responsible for the overall performance of the LAMPS contract. Alutiiq's proposed Program Manager (PM) has eleven years of experience as a contract program manager with one year of experience on a contract encompassing services commensurate with LAMPS.

Recruitment, Retention, and Continuity of Services
Alutiiq received a Weakness for not adequately describing its approach for ensuring continuity of services during personnel absences due to sickness, leave, and voluntary or involuntary termination from employment such that disruption to mission accomplishment is minimal. Though Alutiiq's proposal provided a mapping of labor categories for cross-training, cross-utilization and backfilling for planned and unplanned absences, Alutiiq did not provide supporting information on how this cross-training would be accomplished throughout the PWS labor categories and how it would be accomplished for continuity of services.

Phase-In Plan
Alutiiq received a Significant Weakness for not presenting a complete process for responding to Task Order (TO) requests in the phase-in period. The proposal addressed the initiation of task planning for TOs and identified a plan to hire the incumbent Business Manager who will be directly responsible for receiving and responding to all TOs during Phase-in without providing adequate detail of the process to accomplish these TO responses while still managing the current contract.

Alutiiq also received a Weakness for not adequately identifying risks associated with all significant phase-in activities. Alutiiq identified numerous specific phase-in risks. However, its detailed phase-in schedule lists various other significant phase-in activities, but did not identify the risks associated with these phase-in activities.

Subfactor 2 - Understanding the Requirement and Technical Approach (URTA)

Alutiiq received an adjectival rating of Fair for Subfactor 2.

Approach to Representative Task Orders – RTO 1 Administrative Support
Alutiiq received a Weakness for not adequately describing its approach for cross-training, cross-utilization and backfilling positions as indicated in its proposed staffing table. Although Alutiiq mentions a number of strategies, Alutiiq did not provide adequate implementation details of its approach.

Approach to Representative Task Orders – RTO 2 Media Services
Alutiiq received a Weakness for its incomplete technical approach to support a one-stop-shop for the Media Services Center. Alutiiq's approach focused on the customer interface of a single point of entry for work control and did not adequately integrate the media services to create a seamless customer support operation and to remove redundancy. Without an

adequate approach to implement a one-stop-shop, Alutiiq did not provide an adequate plan for initiating, transitioning to, and operating a virtual one-stop-shop for media support services.

Understanding of Technical Risks
Alutiiq received a Significant Weakness for not adequately identifying the significant technical risks and not adequately addressing the management of the risks inherent in performing the requirements in the Performance Work Statement (PWS) and Representative Task Orders (RTOs). Although Alutiiq identified some technical performance risks, Alutiiq did not identify inherent significant technical risks specific to LAMPS that would demonstrate technical understanding of the PWS and RTOs.

Crewestone

Crewestone received a Mission Suitability score of 714. Crewestones's final proposal evaluation included a significant strength and strengths as summarized below. There were no significant weaknesses or weaknesses.

Subfactor 1 – Management (MGMT)

Crewestone received an adjectival rating of Good for Subfactor 1.

Recruitment, Retention, and Continuity of Services
Crewestone received a Strength for its sound management approach to attract, recruit, hire, and retain qualified personnel. Crewestone's management approach contained an incentive/recognition program that includes an annual bonus for sustained professional performance exceeding normal performance requirements and spot bonuses for nominal awards for immediate recognition. Crewestone also included a provision for grandfathering incumbent employees' years of service to LaRC.

Phase-In Plan
Crewestone received a Strength for its sound phase-in plan that included a management and staffing approach, the transition of task performance, and a communication plan. Crewestone's management and staffing approach for phase-in identified a Task Order Management Lead who will track the status of all Task Plans and ensure that all Task Order responses are timely. Their phase-in plan for the transition of task performance and phase-in activities included a Readiness Review with adequate schedule reserve, which provides time to resolve lingering issues discovered in the review. The effective communication plan included multiple modes of communications designed to promote timely information flow between the Contractor and the Government as well as between the Contractor and its potential new employees.

Subfactor 2 - Understanding the Requirement and Technical Approach (URTA)

Crewestone received an adjectival rating of Very Good for Subfactor 2.

Approach to Representative Task Orders – RTO 1 Administrative Support
Crewestone received a Significant Strength for its comprehensive approach for cross-training, cross-utilization and backfilling positions, which included the identification of backup personnel; the development of work process handbooks; development of a skills inventory; and employee development.

GenTech

GenTech received a Mission Suitability score of 654. GenTech's final proposal evaluation contained strengths as summarized below. There were no significant strengths, significant weaknesses, or weaknesses.

Subfactor 1 – Management (MGMT)

GenTech received an adjectival rating of Good for Subfactor 1.

Management Approach and Organizational Structure
GenTech received a Strength for its effective structured approach for the day-to-day management of the total contract through the use of an automated system tool that is ISO compliant which will facilitate consistency in the management approach. GenTech's approach supports an effective process for staffing decisions to meet task order requirements, to aid in metric collection and monitoring, and to support efficiency in the task order process.

In addition, GenTech received a Strength for proposing an experienced and qualified person responsible for the overall performance of the LAMPS contract. The proposed Program Manager (PM) has eleven years of experience as a contract program manager with one year of experience on a contract encompassing services commensurate with LAMPS.

Recruitment, Retention, and Continuity of Services
GenTech received a Strength for its sound management approach to attract, recruit, hire, certify, train, and retain qualified personnel by exhibiting an investment in employee education, certification, and advancement. GenTech proposed use of the ManTech University for LAMPS team members for additional professional, administrative, and information technology training which fosters retention and increases career-broadening opportunities for employees. GenTech also proposed the additional investment of tuition reimbursement funding, performance-based bonuses, and merit-based pay increases to enhance the level of qualified personnel and help attract and retain the most qualified personnel.

Subfactor 2 - Understanding the Requirement and Technical Approach (URTA)

GenTech received an adjectival rating of Good for Subfactor 2. There were no significant strengths, strengths, weaknesses, or significant weaknesses for GenTech under Subfactor 2.

Logical

Logical received a Mission Suitability score of 920. Logical's final proposal evaluation contained significant strengths and strengths as summarized below. There were no significant weaknesses or weaknesses.

Subfactor 1 – Management (MGMT)

Logical received an adjectival rating of Excellent for Subfactor 1.

Management Approach and Organizational Structure
Logical received a Significant Strength for proposing a highly qualified and experienced person responsible for the overall performance of the LAMPS contract. Logical's proposed Program Manager (PM) has six years of experience as a program manager on a contract encompassing services commensurate with LAMPS. The proposed PM also has 12 years experience as Executive Vice President/Project Manager with management experience of both resources and contracts for media, public affairs services, and education and outreach programs. The proposed PM's education includes a BA and an MA in relevant fields. The proposed PM also held leadership roles in professional associations and participated in leadership teams.

Recruitment, Retention, and Continuity of Services
Logical received a Strength for its flexible and effective approach to ensure continuity of services during personnel absences. Logical outlined an approach that each employee is assigned a primary responsibility with at least one backup area of responsibility in similar skill sets. Logical presented possible staffing scenarios for both short and long-term requirements and outlined strategies to cover those lapses.

In addition, Logical received a Strength for its effective approach to attract, recruit, hire, train, and retain certified and qualified personnel. The proposed approach to attract, recruit, and hire qualified employees included a wide range of hiring strategies and incentives to increase the probability of attracting and recruiting viable candidates for employment. The proposed approach to train qualified and certified personnel includes training in standard practices, which are included in an Employee Handbook for future reference; training plans tailored to employees and their job levels and required certifications; and resource guides for easy reference on the job.

Phase-In Plan

Logical received a Significant Strength for its detailed and comprehensive phase-in approach including management and staffing, a detailed process for responding to task order requests, and a sound communication plan. This detailed, structured phase-in plan included activities beginning before contract award and continuing through contract start. The management and staffing approach included an experienced phase-in manager. Logical included a detailed process for working task orders from request through approval, which facilitates timely initiation of performance of the task orders at contract start. The extensive communication plan included multiple complementary methods of two-way communication with, and providing information to, potential employees. The phase-in schedule concludes with multiple Readiness Reviews.

Subfactor 2 - Understanding the Requirement and Technical Approach (URTA)

Logical received an adjectival rating of Excellent for Subfactor 2.

Approach to Representative Task Orders – RTO 1 Administrative Support

Logical received a Significant Strength for its comprehensive and detailed approach for cross-training, cross-utilization, and backfilling by position. Logical's approach included developing and documenting procedures tailored to each organization with focused cross-training elements spanning across the secretarial and administrative duties. The proposal also identified each secretarial and administrative assistant position by organization and the person responsible for backfilling those positions. The approach included elements to ensure the employees have the training and skills necessary to support the approach for cross-training, cross-utilization, and backfilling.

Approach to Representative Task Orders – RTO 2 Media Services

Logical received a Strength for its sound technical approach for a non-disruptive transition from the current media services into a one-stop-shop for media services that is based on historical utilization data, customer input, decision points, target dates, and alternative paths to full capability. Logical also included a logical workflow process for the implementation of the one-stop-shop, which balances customers' needs and the efficiency of the process.

Understanding of Technical Risks

Logical received a Strength for its effective approach for managing risks inherent in performing the requirements. Logical's approach to manage the Performance Work Statement (PWS) and Representative Task Order (RTO) risks identified the appropriate significant technical risks and involved all employees in the continuous identification of additional risks.

SDSE

SDSE received a Mission Suitability score of 610. SDSE's final proposal evaluation contained strengths and a weakness as summarized below. There were no significant strengths or significant weaknesses.

Subfactor 1 – Management (MGMT)

SDSE received an adjectival rating of Good for Subfactor 1.

Management Approach and Organizational Structure
SDSE received a Strength for proposing an experienced and qualified person responsible for the overall performance of the LAMPS contract. The proposed Program Manager (PM) has eleven years of experience as a contract program manager with one year of experience on a contract encompassing services commensurate with LAMPS. The proposed PM has also received various relevant performance awards.

Recruitment, Retention, and Continuity of Services
SDSE received a Strength for its sound management approach to attract, recruit, hire, and retain qualified personnel to meet all contract requirements. The proposed approach included meeting with the incumbent contractor and taking proactive steps to address hiring challenges. The proposal described a hiring process for the secretarial positions that will improve the quality of secretarial position hires. Also, the proposal described an incentive program for the employees of a profit sharing bonus.

Phase-In Plan
SDSE received a Weakness for not adequately describing its process for responding to task order requests and an inadequate risk mitigation approach for responding to task orders in the phase-in period. Although the proposal included some milestones for the task order process within the phase-in schedule, the proposal did not provide sufficient details on the schedule for responding to task order requests. The proposal also identified executing 10 – 15 Task Orders within 60 days as a Phase-in Risk but provided an inadequate mitigation approach.

Subfactor 2 - Understanding the Requirement and Technical Approach (URTA)

SDSE received an adjectival rating of Good for Subfactor 2.

Approach to Representative Task Orders – RTO 2 Media Services
SDSE received a Strength for its proposed technical approach for Representative Task Order 2 (RTO 2) to support a one-stop-shop for the Media Services Center that included an effective approach to technology infusion. Ideas for technology improvements will be shared among employees. These activities will maintain technology currency, enhance media services capabilities, and improve efficiencies.

The following table summarizes Mission Suitability ratings:

Offeror	Total Score	Subfactor 1 (MGMT)	Subfactor 2 (URTA)
Alutiiq	478	Fair	Fair
Crewestone	714	Good	Very Good
GenTech	654	Good	Good
Logical	920	Excellent	Excellent
SDSE	610	Good	Good

Factor 2: Cost/Price

The SEB and Cost/Price analyst performed an analysis of the proposed prices to assess price reasonableness for CLIN 1 and cost realism for CLIN 2 and to determine whether the Offerors demonstrated a clear understanding of the requirement and could perform the contract for the below stated cost/price. A summary of the total overall evaluated cost/price by ranking is shown in the table below:

Offeror	Total Overall Evaluated Cost/Price
Alutiiq	2nd
Crewestone	4th
GenTech	3rd
Logical	5th (Highest)
SDSE	1st (Lowest)

Based on the analysis and in accordance with FAR 15.402, the Contracting Officer determined that the Offerors' proposed prices are fair and reasonable based on the spread from the highest proposed cost/price to the lowest proposed cost/price, comparison of the proposed costs/prices to the Independent Government Cost Estimate, the Cost/Price Report from the Cost/Price Analyst, the SEB evaluation, and the fact that adequate price competition was obtained. No probable cost adjustments under CLIN 2 were needed for any of the five Offerors; therefore, for each Offeror there is no difference between its proposed price and its evaluated price.

Factor 3: Past Performance

The SEB evaluated the Offeror's past performance records in accordance with M.3 of the RFP. The SEB considered each Offeror's (to include significant subcontractors) record of performing contracts similar in size, content and complexity to the LAMPS requirement.

In evaluating the relevance of size, the SEB considered the degree of similarity in size of contracts submitted to the size of the LAMPS contract; however, in determining an overall rating for size, the SEB considered the prime contractor's past performance to be most significant.

In considering content, the SEB combined the PWS areas into three specific areas: administrative services (PWS 4.1 and 4.2), professional services (PWS 4.3 through 4.13), and media services (PWS 4.14). The SEB assigned a content rating to each specific area and assessed these ratings to assign an overall content rating.

In considering complexity, the SEB considered a number of factors that included, but were not limited to, the range of the scope of the work to be performed (e.g. administration, professional, media); diversity and size of customer base; and whether the team member performed as a prime or subcontractor for the relevant contract.

Both the pertinence (size, content, and complexity) and the "performance" records of each Offeror were evaluated. A confidence rating was then assigned in accordance with Section M (M.3 C.) of the RFP and NFS 1815.305.

Offeror	Pertinence Rating (size/content/complexity)	Performance Rating	Level of Confidence
Alutiiq	Highly Pertinent (HP/HP/HP)	Exceptional	High
Crewestone	Pertinent (SP/P/HP)	Exceptional	Moderate
GenTech	Very Highly Pertinent (VHP/HP/VHP)	Exceptional	Very High
Logical	Pertinent (SP/HP/P)	Exceptional	Moderate
SDSE	Highly Pertinent (VHP/P/VHP)	Exceptional	High

VHP = Very Highly Pertinent HP = Highly Pertinent
P = Pertinent SP = Somewhat Pertinent

Alutiiq: The SEB assigned an overall confidence rating of "High".

For *Size* Relevance, Alutiiq received a Highly Pertinent rating primarily because Alutiiq's largest referenced contract had an estimated annual value of a little more than one-third of the LAMPS annual government estimate. For *Content* Relevance as compared to the LAMPS PWS, Alutiiq received an overall rating of Highly Pertinent, based on ratings of Very Highly Pertinent for the administrative services PWS areas, Pertinent for the professional services PWS areas, and

Highly Pertinent for the media services PWS area. For *Complexity* Relevance, Alutiiq received a rating of Highly Pertinent based primarily on the prime's references with contributions from a significant subcontractor. Considering size, content, and complexity, Alutiiq received an Overall Pertinence rating of Highly Pertinent.

For Overall Performance, Alutiiq was assigned a rating of Exceptional.

Alutiiq's Overall Pertinence rating of Highly Pertinent and Overall Performance rating of Exceptional resulted in a High Level of Confidence for the Past Performance factor.

Crewestone: The SEB assigned an overall confidence rating of "Moderate".

For *Size* Relevance, Crewestone received a Somewhat Pertinent rating primarily because Crewestone's largest referenced contract had an estimated annual value of less than 10% of the LAMPS annual government estimate. For *Content* Relevance as compared to the LAMPS PWS, Crewestone received an overall rating of Pertinent, based on ratings of Highly Pertinent for the administrative services PWS areas, Somewhat Pertinent for the professional services PWS areas, and Highly Pertinent for the media services PWS area. For *Complexity* Relevance, Crewestone received a rating of Highly Pertinent based primarily on the prime's references with contributions from a significant subcontractor. Considering size, content, and complexity, Crewestone received an Overall Pertinence rating of Pertinent.

For Overall Performance, Crewestone was assigned a rating of Exceptional.

Crewestone's Overall Pertinence rating of Pertinent and Overall Performance rating of Exceptional resulted in a Moderate Level of Confidence for the Past Performance factor.

GenTech: The SEB assigned an overall confidence rating of "Very High".

For *Size* Relevance, GenTech received a Very Highly Pertinent rating primarily because GenTech's largest referenced contract had an estimated annual value of approximately the same size as the LAMPS annual government estimate. For *Content* Relevance as compared to the LAMPS PWS, GenTech received an overall rating of Highly Pertinent, based on ratings of Highly Pertinent for the administrative services PWS areas, Pertinent for the professional services PWS areas, and Very Highly Pertinent for the media services PWS area. For *Complexity* Relevance, GenTech received a rating of Very Highly Pertinent, primarily because they have experience in contracts with a wide range of PWS areas. Considering size, content, and complexity, GenTech received an Overall Pertinence rating of Very Highly Pertinent.

For Overall Performance, GenTech was assigned a rating of Exceptional.

GenTech's Overall Pertinence rating of Very Highly Pertinent and Overall Performance rating of Exceptional resulted in a Very High Level of Confidence for the Past Performance factor.

Logical: The SEB assigned an overall confidence rating of "Moderate".

For *Size* Relevance Logical received a Somewhat Pertinent rating primarily because Logical's largest referenced contract had an estimated annual value of less than 10% of LAMPS annual government estimate. For *Content* Relevance as compared to the LAMPS PWS, Logical received an overall rating of Highly Pertinent, based on ratings of Somewhat Pertinent rating for the administrative services PWS areas, Highly Pertinent for the professional services PWS areas, and Very Highly Pertinent for the media services PWS area. For *Complexity* Relevance, Logical received a rating of Pertinent, primarily because the prime has experience in contracts with a limited range of PWS areas. Considering size, content, and complexity, Logical received an Overall Pertinence rating of Pertinent.

For Overall Performance, Logical was assigned a rating of Exceptional.

Logical's Overall Pertinence rating of Pertinent and Overall Performance rating of Exceptional resulted in a Moderate Level of Confidence for the Past Performance factor.

SDSE: The SEB assigned an overall confidence rating of "High".

For *Size* Relevance SDSE received a Very Highly Pertinent rating primarily because SDSE's largest referenced contract had an estimated annual value that is greater than the LAMPS annual government estimate. For *Content* Relevance as compared to the LAMPS PWS, SDSE received an overall rating of Pertinent, based on ratings of Pertinent for the administrative services PWS areas, Pertinent for the professional services PWS areas, and Very Highly Pertinent for the media services PWS area. For *Complexity* Relevance, SDSE received a rating of Very Highly Pertinent, primarily because they have experience in contracts with a wide range of PWS areas. Considering size, content, and complexity, SDSE received an Overall Pertinence rating of Highly Pertinent.

For Overall Performance, SDSE was assigned a rating of Exceptional.

SDSE's Overall Pertinence rating of Highly Pertinent and Overall Performance rating of Exceptional resulted in a High Level of Confidence for the Past Performance factor.

BASIS FOR SELECTION

The SEB presented its findings to me on February 9, 2012 and I am convinced that the SEB conducted a thorough, fair, and objective evaluation of all proposals in accordance with the established evaluation criteria in the RFP. I comparatively assessed the proposals against all evaluation factors and subfactors in the RFP. I also considered all factors, and their relative weights, in the selection of the Offeror that can perform the contract in a manner most advantageous to the Government.

In comparing the Offerors in the area of Mission Suitability, I first noted that the Alutiiq proposal received the lowest overall score for this Factor by a substantial margin, with a few Significant Weaknesses and several Weaknesses resulting in "Fair" ratings in both Subfactors. Because another proposal received a significantly higher Mission Suitability score, with the same Past Performance confidence rating and a lower price, the Alutiiq proposal could not represent the best value for award, and I no longer considered Alutiiq's proposal in my deliberations.

Reviewing the Mission Suitability findings for the remaining proposals, I noted that Logical's proposal received the highest score for this Factor with an adjectival rating of "Excellent" for each Subfactor based on several Strengths and a few Significant Strengths. Logical received Significant Strengths for its proposed Program Manager (PM); its phase-in approach; and its RTO 1 approach for cross-training, cross-utilization and backfilling by position. The demonstrated experience of Logical's proposed PM on work very similar to LAMPS would be of benefit to LaRC. Logical's phase-in approach would provide a benefit to LaRC through a detailed plan for working initial task orders during the important phase-in period. Logical's RTO 1 approach also has benefit to LaRC in contract performance by ensuring qualified and properly trained administrative personnel will be available to perform LAMPS requirements. I did not identify any significant discriminators for the Mission Suitability rating among the other Strengths in Logical's proposal.

Crewestone's proposal received the second-highest score for Mission Suitability due to a "Good" rating in Subfactor 1 and a "Very Good" rating in Subfactor 2. The "Very Good" rating in Subfactor 2 was largely based on a Significant Strength for Crewestone's comprehensive approach to cross-training, cross-utilization and backfilling the LAMPS administrative positions under RTO 1. This aspect of Crewestone's proposal would provide a benefit with regard to contract performance, as Crewestone's approach will help to establish and maintain proper training and preparation of the LAMPS administrative personnel. I did not identify any significant discriminators for the Mission Suitability rating among the other Strengths in Crewestone's proposal.

GenTech's proposal received the third-highest score for Mission Suitability and "Good" ratings in both Subfactors. GenTech received several Strengths for Subfactor 1, including a Strength for its approach to the day-to-day management of the total contract through an automated and integrated system tool. This Strength is noteworthy because this was the only proposal to receive a Strength for the approach to day-to-day management of the total contract as evaluated under the Management Subfactor. Due to the broad range of work required by the LAMPS PWS, as well as the size of the contract and the fact that many diverse LaRC organizations will rely on the LAMPS contractor for their administrative, professional and media needs, demonstrating the ability to successfully manage the total contract on a day-to-day basis is critical to determining best value for LaRC. For this reason, I consider the automated system tool proposed by GenTech, which will facilitate, among other things, scheduling, access to resource information, metric collection and monitoring, as well as the task order process, to provide a substantial benefit to LaRC.

SDSE's proposal received the fourth-highest score for Mission Suitability and "Good" ratings for both subfactors. SDSE received a few Strengths, as well as a Weakness for its approach to responding to task order requests and risk mitigation during phase-in. I did not identify any discriminators for the Mission Suitability rating among the Strengths in SDSE's proposal. The SEB informed me that the Weakness was identified in discussions, but that SDSE's response did not adequately address the risk to performance represented by this Weakness. Because SDSE's Weakness concerns its ability to address task orders during phase-in, which affects overall contract management and performance during an important contract phase, this Weakness presents a risk to LaRC under this Factor.

Next, I considered Factor 2, Cost/Price, for the remaining Offerors. All Offerors' costs/prices were determined to be fair and reasonable. Logical is the highest priced proposal with a price approximately 3% higher than Crewestone, 4% higher than GenTech, and 13% higher than SDSE. The next highest price proposal was from Crewestone, which was just slightly higher than GenTech and less than 10% higher than SDSE. GenTech is the second-lowest priced proposal, and is approximately 9% higher than SDSE, with SDSE as the lowest priced proposal.

For Factor 3, Past Performance, I noted that the overall Past Performance factor ratings were derived from the SEB's rating of a pertinence and performance component to arrive at an overall confidence rating. All Offerors demonstrated overall Exceptional performance, so the differences in the confidence ratings were driven by the differences in the pertinence component of the Past Performance information evaluated.

GenTech received the highest possible rating of a "Very High Level of Confidence" based on the fact that the contracts were evaluated as being Very Highly Pertinent to the LAMPS requirement. I noted that SDSE received the next highest rating of "High Level of Confidence." This was primarily due to the fact that the content of the evaluated contracts for SDSE was merely Pertinent in the administrative and professional services areas of the PWS, which influenced SDSE's overall pertinence rating of Highly Pertinent. Logical received a "Moderate Level of Confidence" based largely on the fact that its largest contract evaluated was less than 10% of the LAMPS estimated annual value, which reduces my confidence that Logical has the requisite experience to successfully perform the substantially larger LAMPS contract. Crewestone, like Logical, has not performed contracts similar in size to LAMPS, as the size of the largest contract evaluated was also less than 10% of the LAMPS estimated annual value. Primarily for this reason, Crewestone also received an overall rating of "Moderate Level of Confidence" which raises similar concerns about Crewestone's ability to perform.

SOURCE SELECTION DECISION

In making the selection decision, I conducted an integrated assessment of each proposal and considered the relative weight of the evaluation factors as indicated within the RFP and that all factors other than cost/price, when combined, are significantly more important than cost/price.

For the comparative assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria, I first considered Logical. Logical was the highest rated proposal under Mission Suitability, as well as the highest priced proposal. Logical's Mission Suitability rating reflects a superior approach compared to the other Offerors, particularly with regard to the phase-in and cross-training, cross-utilization and backfilling of administrative positions under RTO 1. Logical's proposed PM also provides a benefit to LaRC, but only somewhat more than Alutiiq, GenTech, and SDSE, with the main difference being the number of years managing a contract similar to LAMPS. On Past Performance, Logical's proposal, along with Crewestone's, was the lowest rated of all Offerors based largely on the fact that Logical's relevant experience concerns contracts that are less than 10% of the LAMPS annual estimated value. As stated above, I am concerned that, due to the broad range of work required by the LAMPS PWS, as well as the size of the LAMPS contract and the fact that many diverse LaRC organizations will rely on the LAMPS contractor for their administrative, professional and media needs, this lack of demonstrated performance on contracts similar in size to LAMPS presents a significant risk to LaRC. As a result, when compared to GenTech, Logical's superior rating under the Mission Suitability factor, when offset by its substantially lower Moderate Level of Confidence under the Past Performance Factor, does not justify the higher price due to the presence of this significant risk. As a result, Logical's proposal does not represent the best value for LaRC.

I next considered Crewestone. Crewestone's price is slightly higher than GenTech, and Crewestone's proposal was rated slightly higher than GenTech under the Mission Suitability factor; however, Crewestone's proposal was also rated substantially lower than GenTech under Past Performance. Crewestone's Moderate confidence rating on Past Performance is based primarily on the fact that Crewestone's relevant experience concerns contracts that are less than 10% of the LAMPS annual estimated value. Like Logical, this lack of demonstrated performance on contracts similar in size to LAMPS presents a significant risk to LaRC. As a result, Crewestone's slightly higher Mission Suitability score, when offset by its substantially lower Past Performance confidence rating, does not justify the slightly higher cost of the Crewestone proposal. Therefore, Crewestone's proposal does not represent the best value for LaRC.

SDSE is the lowest price proposal, and received the second lowest Mission Suitability rating (ahead of Alutiiq) and second highest score on Past Performance (after GenTech) with a "High Level of Confidence." SDSE scored below GenTech under the Mission Suitability factor, with both Offerors receiving "Good" ratings under each subfactor. As discussed above, I consider the GenTech proposal's approach to day-to-day management of the total contract as a key discriminator and of substantial benefit to LaRC. In addition, SDSE's Weakness under the Mission Suitability factor presents substantial risk, because it deals with contract management

during phase-in. Because GenTech has a Strength in an area that cuts across the entire contract which I consider a strong indicator of successful performance, and because SDSE has a weakness in a key area that introduces risk of unsuccessful performance, GenTech's proposal is clearly superior to SDSE's under Mission Suitability. GenTech is also superior under the Past Performance Factor; the difference in the Confidence Level ratings for GenTech (Very High) and SDSE (High) demonstrates GenTech's experience level across the wide range of work required by the LAMPS PWS that is not matched by SDSE. As a result, when combined, the superior proposed Mission Suitability approach and very high level of confidence in Past Performance of GenTech more than offsets the 9% price difference between GenTech and SDSE.

Therefore, I find that the selection of GenTech's proposal is in the Government's best interest and provides the best value for the Government. Accordingly, I select GenTech for award of the LAMPS contract.

Cathy H. Mangum
Source Selection Authority

Date: 2-23-12