

**Source Selection Statement
Center Maintenance, Operations, and Engineering (CMOE)
RFP: NNL13458016R**

Background

The purpose of the CMOE contract is to procure a comprehensive maintenance, operations, and engineering (MOE) program and services to ensure facilities are fully operational and safe for NASA Langley Research Center (LaRC) to carry out its mission now and in the future. The contract will be a hybrid contract consisting of a core component (Core) for sustaining services and an Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) component.

The CMOE Request for Proposals (RFP) specified that the selection 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 Core component will be Cost-Plus-Award-Fee (CPAF) and the IDIQ component will be a mix of Firm-Fixed-Price (FFP) and CPAF. The phase-in period will be FFP. The potential period of performance will be 10-years, consisting of a 1-year, 8-month base period; eight 1-year options; and one 4-month option. The phase-in period is 3 months.

Market research was accomplished by posting a Sources Sought Notice/Request for Information combination on the FedBizOpps (Federal Business Opportunities) website on March 2, 2012. An industry site visit was held on April 17, 2012 at NASA LaRC before the completion of the strategy for this effort as a means to ensure industry had an early opportunity to tour the LaRC facilities and allow for a better understanding of the Center's MOE environment. The site visit was attended by 35 companies. Upon completion of the site visit, the attending companies were invited to have one-on-one discussions with members of the Government Procurement Development Team (PDT); 27 companies participated in the one-on-one discussions. A Procurement Strategy Meeting was held on August 16, 2012 at NASA Headquarters, Washington, DC and the procurement strategy was subsequently approved. A synopsis of the approved strategy was posted on the FedBizOpps website on August 17, 2012. The procurement was conducted as a full and open competition under NAICS code 561210, Facility Support Services, Size Standard of \$35.5 million. A Draft Request for Proposals (DRFP) was issued on December 12, 2012 for comments from industry. On January 17, 2013, a Pre-Proposal Conference was conducted at NASA LaRC with 33 companies attending, including small and large businesses and independent consultants, with 7 companies participating in one-on-one discussions with members of the Government Source Evaluation Board (SEB).

The final RFP was released on February 11, 2013. The final RFP had a proposal response date of March 28, 2013 and a request for Past Performance Proposals (Volume III) to be submitted by March 13, 2013. Subsequently, two amendments followed: Amendment 1 was issued on February 28, 2013 updating responses to industry questions and comments on the solicitation, notifying Offerors of updates to files and additions of files contained in the Bidders Library, and amending several solicitation documents. Amendment 2 was issued on March 12, 2013 updating responses to industry questions and comments on the solicitation and amending a solicitation document.

The following companies responded to the RFP by the due date of March 28, 2013:

- CSC Applied Technologies, LLC (CSC)
- Fluor Federal Solution, LLC (Fluor)
- Jacobs Technology Inc. (Jacobs)
- Langley Technical Services, LLC (LaTS)

Evaluation Factors

The appointed SEB conducted an evaluation of proposals received in response to the RFP. The evaluation was conducted in accordance with the evaluation factors contained in Section M of the RFP. The RFP set forth the following three evaluation factors:

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

The RFP stated a best value trade-off process would be used in making the source selection and that the contract would be awarded to the Offeror that can perform the contract in a manner most advantageous to the Government, all factors considered. The RFP also stated that it was anticipated that award would be made without discussions. In addition, the RFP stated that the Source Selection Authority (SSA) would make an integrated assessment of each offer and comparatively evaluate competing offers, considering input from the SEB. The SSA would consider adjectival ratings and point scores assigned by the SEB; however, the SSA would base selection on substantive proposal differences that are reflected by the adjectival ratings and point scores as opposed to basing selection on mere differences in ratings or scores. Each evaluation factor was approximately equal in importance, and Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, were significantly more important than Cost/Price.

Factor 1 – Mission Suitability

The Mission Suitability Subfactors and their weights are as follows:

- Subfactor 1 - Management (MGMT) 450 points
 - MGMT 1 - Electronic Contract Management System (ECMS)
 - MGMT 2 - Requirement Dynamics
 - MGMT 3 - Recruiting, Retaining, Motivating, and Incentivizing Employees
 - MGMT 4 - Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI) and Personal Conflicts of Interest (PCI)
 - MGMT 5 - Management Plan
- Subfactor 2 - Technical (TECH) 450 points
 - TECH 1 - Enhancements, Innovations, and Approaches to Reducing Total Cost of Ownership
 - TECH 2 - Programmatic Risk
 - TECH 3 - Maintenance
 - TECH 4 - Operations
 - TECH 5 - Engineering
- Subfactor 3 - Small Business Utilization (SB) 100 points
 - Small Business Subcontracting
 - Commitment to Small Businesses

The SEB used the following adjectival and numerical ratings from NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.305 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 overall 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 three subfactors was the only overall rating for Mission Suitability.

Definitions: The definitions used for classification of findings are 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.

The definitions for Strength and Significant Strength are not in the FAR, however, the following definitions 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 does not provide for adjectival ratings or numerical scores under the Cost/Price Factor; however, the RFP provides evaluation language within Section M, as follows:

“In accordance with FAR 15.404-1(b), the Government will conduct a price analysis by evaluating the prices proposed in response to this solicitation. Specifically, the evaluations will include, but are not limited to, comparing the prices proposed in response to this solicitation, comparing the proposed prices to historical prices for the same or similar items purchased by the Government, and comparing the proposed prices to the independent Government cost estimate.

Furthermore, in accordance with FAR 15.404-1(d), the Government will conduct cost realism analysis by independently reviewing and evaluating specific elements of each Offeror's proposed cost estimate to determine whether the estimated proposed cost elements are realistic for the work to be performed; reflect a clear understanding of the requirements; and are consistent with the unique methods of performance and materials described in the Offeror's mission suitability responses. The Government will derive a probable cost, which is determined by adjusting each Offeror's proposed cost, and fee when appropriate, to reflect any additions or reductions in cost elements to realistic levels based on the results of the cost realism analyses performed. The probable cost may differ from the proposed cost and will reflect the Government's best estimate of each Offeror's proposal. The probable cost will be used for the purposes of evaluation to determine the best value."

Factor 3 – Past Performance

Under the Past Performance Factor the SEB assessed each Offeror's record 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 in dollars per year, content, and complexity to the requirements in this solicitation, as well as the recency and duration of the past performance."

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. Subsequently, a Past Performance Committee (PPC) was appointed to assist the SEB in evaluating each Offeror's past performance. The SEB and PPC conducted the evaluation of proposals in accordance with Section M of the RFP. The SEB and PPC began their evaluation upon receipt of the Past Performance Volumes (Volume III), which were received from the Offerors prior to the proposal due date. The PPC reviewed each Offeror's Past Performance Proposal, all of the past performance questionnaires, and information obtained from the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) as applicable. To determine work content pertinence, the PPC reviewed each contract that each Offeror submitted by comparing the description of the contract within the Offeror's past performance proposal to the work (by SOW area) in the CMOE SOW. The PPC also reviewed the past performance information to determine size and complexity pertinence for each Offeror. The PPC then assigned a recommended overall pertinence rating for each Offeror based on an integrated assessment of the size, work content (SOW area ratings) and complexity for each Offeror. The SEB also conducted its own review of the Past Performance Proposals and considered the PPC's integrated pertinence assessments along with the PPC's assessments of the Offeror's performance ratings in assigning an overall past performance confidence level based on the definitions in the NFS.

Upon receipt of the Technical Proposals (Volume I) and the Business Proposals (Volume II), the SEB conducted an initial review of each Volume, with the Cost/Price Analyst providing a review of the Factor 2 – Cost/Price proposal information, 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. All proposals were found to be acceptable and warranted a full evaluation.

The SEB members performed a detailed individual review of each Offeror's Technical Proposal and documented strengths and weaknesses for each Mission Suitability subfactor. The SEB consultants also 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, calculating a point score for each subfactor by multiplying the assigned percentage score and the available points, then summing the subfactor point scores to derive the overall Mission Suitability point score in accordance with NFS 1815.305.

The SEB reviewed each Offeror's Business proposal to determine whether the costs proposed were reasonable, realistic and consistent with the technical approach. The cost proposals were assessed to ensure compliance with the Cost/Price evaluation factor. The SEB provided the results of its review to

the Cost/Price Analyst who incorporated the results into the detailed analysis of the Offeror's cost proposals.

The Contracting Officer carefully reviewed the facts presented in the initial findings and discussed the findings with the SEB. The RFP states the Government anticipates award will be made without discussions, [ref. RFP provision at FAR 52.215-1(f)(4) and RFP provision L.14] and based on the initial findings of the SEB, it was evident that the potential for an award without discussions existed. Therefore, no Competitive Range was determined and the SEB met with me, the Source Selection Authority, on August 7, 2013 to present its findings.

Evaluation Findings

Factor 1 – Mission Suitability

Set forth below is a summary of the Mission Suitability Findings for the Offerors:

CSC

CSC received a Mission Suitability score of 703. CSC's proposal included Significant Strengths, Strengths, Weaknesses and a Significant Weakness as summarized below.

Subfactor 1, Management

CSC received an adjectival rating of Good for Subfactor 1.

Electronic Contract Management System (ECMS)

CSC received a Strength for its approach to meeting the ECMS requirements for the Core work of the contract through its ECMS requirements traceability matrix and its proposed web-based COTS ECMS that maximizes the utilization of the existing LaRC Maximo for entering, managing and reporting technical, schedule, funding, and cost data under the Core portion of the contract. CSC proposed to utilize tools to initiate and track all Core work which will increase the likelihood of consistency in Core data for the CMOE program as well as a more streamlined system with fewer interface/possible breakage points. CSC also received a Strength for its integrated approach to managing and reporting technical, schedule, funding, and cost data. CSC demonstrated its understanding of the importance of emphasizing and integrating the facility management aspects of the contract through inclusion of an operational status module in its ECMS.

CSC received a Significant Weakness for not demonstrating an ECMS capable of managing and reporting technical, schedule, funding, and cost data for work initiated under the IDIQ requirements and for not adequately demonstrating an ability to have the ECMS fully operational before the contract base period start date. CSC's approach presents a high risk and may require a financial commitment and upgrade to the existing Maximo system at LaRC as a condition for an ECMS to be fully operational and compliant with the requirements of SOW Section 0.5 before the contract base period start date.

CSC received a Weakness for not adequately addressing some of the ECMS requirements identified in SOW Section 0.5. Examples include: not adequately detailing the ability to run the software in a virtualized environment or support role-based accounts; not adequately identifying the type of Operating System or database server needed; not adequately detailing whether or not it will follow applicable IT Security and Network requirements; and not providing an adequate description of the ability of the software suite to adhere to the required interoperability and authentication standards.

Requirement Dynamics

CSC received a Significant Strength for its decision making and resource management scheduling tool for quickly, efficiently, and cost effectively adapting to changing missions, requirements, priorities, workload, and funding fluctuations. The tool will allow for real-time decision making based on changes to the CMOE effort as well as provide insight and alternate outcomes/solutions (what-if scenarios) resultant from requirements dynamics/changes. This tool will be beneficial in managing the complex balance between maintenance and operations to help ensure all priorities are met without adversely impacting the mission, especially when unexpected situations occur that require factual data and viable alternatives for decision making.

CSC received a Weakness for its proposed virtual training approach for operations to maintain necessary skills to adapt to changing missions and requirements. The approach does not recognize the need for complementary hands-on training required in order to achieve certification to operate a research facility. CSC also received a Weakness for not adequately addressing its approach for performing work and maintaining necessary skills during periods that may require immediate ramp-down of requirements. Finally, CSC received a Weakness for not adequately describing the integration and alignment required to support the entire Revitalization Plan and does not demonstrate it can successfully support the implementation of the Revitalization Plan.

Recruiting, Retaining, Motivating, and Incentivizing Employees

The SEB had no findings in this area.

Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI) and Personal Conflicts of Interest (PCI)

CSC received a Weakness for not adequately describing the methods it will utilize to identify and avoid or mitigate OCIs or PCIs and for failing to identify or discuss protection of Government sensitive information. CSC also received a Weakness for its reactive versus proactive approach to PCI disclosures by employees. Additionally, CSC received a Weakness for not discussing the potential impaired objectivity OCI that exists with its potential work under the LaRC Information Technology Enhanced Services (LITES) contract in performing the IT management for the Maximo system. Finally, CSC received a Weakness for placing the burden on the Contracting Officer to notify CSC of any potential OCIs for IDIQ work it performs under the contract, contrary to the requirements of contract Section H.2.

Management Plan

CSC received a Strength for its decision making process that gives full authority to the Program Manager (PM), allowing the PM to immediately decide the proper course of action without potential delays resulting from the need for corporate office approval. CSC also received a Strength for its commitment to supporting the LaRC revitalization effort and marketing and utilization of excess facility capacity through the establishment of an advisory board. The board allows for access to a variety of experts to provide ideas/concepts as well as implementation support to these two critical efforts at LaRC. Finally, CSC received a Strength for its approach for tracking and evaluating its performance against LaRC's performance requirements, goals, and objectives. This includes utilizing an approach for identifying and resolving cross-cutting performance issues as they arise as well as monitoring proposed corrective actions to ensure a successful outcome.

CSC received a Weakness for not demonstrating an adequate approach and methodology to effectively collect and respond to customer requested services. CSC proposed utilizing an integrated scheduler tool that requires a Maximo upgrade to be implemented through another LaRC Contractor and may require a

financial commitment as a condition for its proposed work schedule approach. CSC does not provide a plan to ensure work can be scheduled and processed in a deconflicted and resource integrated manner if such an upgrade is not a viable option. CSC also received a Weakness for an organizational structure that fragments aspects of operational and maintenance work. This approach does not support the proposed integrated approach to operations and could result in stovepiped management and the need for additional coordination between organizational branches. Finally, CSC received a Weakness for not demonstrating an adequate approach and methodology to effectively collect and respond to customer requested services for all areas of the SOW. This includes a work control process that is cumbersome and manually oriented (as opposed to automated); not providing a consistent method by which to request services under the Core and IDIQ portions of the contract; and relying on manual processing of the information from the customer to the resultant work tracking system.

Subfactor 2, Technical

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

Enhancements, Innovations, and Approaches to Reducing Total Cost of Ownership

CSC received a Strength for its data initiative that will increase data integrity across the contract [including supporting the Reliability Centered Maintenance (RCM) process], increase productivity and efficiency in performing the work, help identify possible critical system failures before they occur, and will reduce workforce costs associated with the improved productivity and efficiency. CSC also received a Strength for its staffing initiative approaches. These approaches will increase Contractor ownership, introduce efficiencies by applying current practices and techniques, and incorporate RCM principles. These approaches will also assist in knowledge capture and reduce training costs and disruption to operations. Additionally, CSC received a Strength for its material management initiative approaches. The proposed approaches will increase efficiency in both the purchase and distribution of the materials, will reduce material and workforce costs, and will enable the workforce to devote more time to the job and less time performing administrative work. Finally, CSC received a Strength for its initiative to enhance calibration methods. The proposed approach will reduce calibration time, increase the operational availability and reliability of the facilities, and reduce workforce costs associated with the improved productivity and efficiency.

CSC received a Weakness for proposing aspects of its technology initiative that are already requirements contained in the CMOE contract. Furthermore, CSC proposes to upgrade LaRC's current version of Maximo to add a module that LaRC's version of Maximo already contains. CSC also received a Weakness for proposing to perform several of its proposed enhancements, innovations, and total cost of ownership reduction approaches as IDIQ task orders to be awarded sometime after contract award and its inconsistent application of which initiatives are included in the Core effort versus the IDIQ effort as well as the cost impacts of the initiatives. The inconsistent approach and approach to perform some of these items as IDIQ task orders increases the technical and financial risk to the Government and requires a financial commitment from the Government of an indeterminate amount.

Programmatic Risk

CSC received a Strength for its sound technical understanding of the requirements demonstrated by its identification, prioritization, and explanation of significant programmatic risks. CSC identified risks that are directly relevant to issues that are currently ongoing at LaRC and represent items that, if not addressed/mitigated, will result in adverse impacts. The proposed approach for managing each risk will be beneficial by reducing the probability that the identified risks will occur.

Maintenance

CSC received a Strength for its approach to implementing an RCM Program at LaRC that included an integrated team approach and training resulting in lower costs for operability, maintainability, and reliability. CSC also received a Strength for proposing to make use of its company RCM expertise to share RCM concepts, ideas, best practices, and lessons learned, all without additional cost.

CSC received a Weakness for not demonstrating an adequate approach for implementing RCM strategies and methods that are required by NPR 8831.2 and for not adequately describing its Condition Based Maintenance approach and how it will be utilized at LaRC.

Operations

CSC received a Significant Strength for its approach to maximizing the utilization of LaRC research facilities. CSC's marketing initiative clearly demonstrates its understanding of the current challenges facing the Center in attracting and retaining customer work and the challenges to maximizing facility utilization. CSC's proposed marketing approach should significantly increase and maximize facility utilization at the Center.

CSC received a Strength for its approach to maximizing productivity and utilization of LaRC research facilities through its use of a simulation program. The approach will reduce the effort and time involved in planning and increase the accuracy of estimating facility requirements.

Engineering

CSC received a Strength for its approach to applying systems engineering principles and practices that demonstrates its recognition of the importance of designing for operability, maintainability, and reliability. CSC's approach emphasized the importance of utilizing various mechanisms and the significance of involving the maintenance and operations functional areas early and throughout the design process.

Subfactor 3, Small Business Utilization

CSC received an adjectival rating of Fair for Subfactor 3.

Small Business Subcontracting

CSC received a Weakness for not providing a Small Business Subcontracting Plan consistent with the requirements of FAR 19.704, Subcontracting Plan Requirements, and the Small Business Subcontracting Plan RFP requirements. Examples include: calculating subcontracting goals based on the proposed value for the Core portion of the contract only and not including the value of the IDIQ ceiling values [Core and IDIQ value equals Total Contract Value (TCV)] in accordance with RFP Provision L.16, Subfactor 3; and inconsistency regarding whether one of its proposed subcontractors is a Small Business or a Small Disadvantaged Business.

Commitment to Small Businesses

The SEB had no findings in this area.

Fluor

Fluor received a Mission Suitability score of 723. Fluor's proposal included a Significant Strength, Strengths, Weaknesses and a Significant Weakness as summarized below.

Subfactor 1, Management

Fluor received an adjectival rating of Good for Subfactor 1.

Electronic Contract Management System (ECMS)

Fluor received a Strength for its approach to meeting the ECMS requirements through its proposed web-based integrated solution utilizing COTS products. Fluor's proposed ECMS provides an integrated solution that will efficiently and effectively manage and consolidate all work for the Core and IDIQ portions of the contract into a single, user-friendly system. Fluor proposed an ECMS that is fully-operational as of the base period of performance start date, which provides a low-risk solution to the Government.

Fluor received a Weakness for not adequately describing how its proposed ECMS will utilize and interface with Maximo when entering, managing, and tracking work under the Core portion of the contract. Fluor did not provide adequate details of its approach to determine if its Task Order system will manage both Core and Task Order work and what role the Maximo system plays in Core and Task Order work.

Requirement Dynamics

Fluor received a Strength for its approach to using corporate reachback in support of all contract-related work. Fluor proposed a capability to efficiently and cost-effectively access subject matter experts, lessons-learned databases, best practices, and other tools real-time to respond to the critical needs of the Center in an effective manner. Fluor also received a Strength for proposed management tools and processes to maximize the application of the Annual Service Plan (ASP) for quickly, efficiently, and cost effectively adapting to changing missions, requirements, priorities, workload, and funding fluctuations.

Fluor received a Weakness for not demonstrating an adequate approach for providing alignment and maintaining integration between its operations, maintenance, and engineering program and LaRC's Revitalization Plan that is required to support the implementation of the Revitalization Plan. Fluor also received a Weakness for not adequately addressing its approach for performing work and maintaining necessary skills during periods that may require immediate ramp-down of requirements.

Recruiting, Retaining, Motivating, and Incentivizing Employees

Fluor received a Significant Weakness for not demonstrating an adequate strategy for recruiting, retaining, motivating, and incentivizing qualified personnel through aspects of its total compensation plan for exempt employees. Examples include: weekly work hour requirements that utilize uncompensated overtime and that is discrepant with its proposed significant subcontractor; and its handling of time off and holiday time. Fluor's compensation approach for its exempt employees appreciably increases the risk of adverse mission impact by not providing a compensation plan that attracts the needed talent.

Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI) and Personal Conflicts of Interest (PCI)

Fluor received a Strength for a sound OCI screening process that uses up-to-date databases of all active contracts to screen for potential OCIs. Fluor also received a Strength for its training system for both prime and subcontractor employees.

Fluor received a Weakness for not addressing PCIs in the comprehensive overview of its process for identifying conflicts. Fluor also received a Weakness for not adequately addressing effective techniques to avoid or mitigate impaired objectivity OCIs. While Fluor placed great emphasis on the use of firewalls, which may be an effective mitigation for access to information OCIs, they are not effective for impaired objectivity OCIs.

Management Plan

Fluor received a Strength for its decision making process that gives full authority to the PM, allowing the PM to immediately decide the proper course of action without potential delays resulting from the need for corporate office approval. Fluor also received a Strength for its management plan and systems approach to managing, tracking, and evaluating performance under the CMOE contract. The proposed organizational structure effectively aligns with the CMOE SOW, fosters efficiency in responding to both routine and non-routine work, and allows for the proposed cross-utilization of the workforce. The management plan incorporates advisory committees and a diverse set of tools and IT systems that will allow Fluor to effectively and efficiently manage performance.

Fluor received a Weakness for not adequately describing its approach and methodology to collect and respond to customer requested services for all areas of the SOW. Fluor proposed a framework for responding to customer requests but did not adequately detail how it will collect and respond to customer requested services.

Subfactor 2, Technical

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

Enhancements, Innovations, and Approaches to Reducing Total Cost of Ownership

Fluor received a Strength for its initiative for optimizing maintenance practices. Fluor proposed utilizing a disciplined and systematic approach to assessing the entire maintenance program to reduce Preventive Maintenance work orders, increase maintenance labor productivity, and optimize material availability. This approach will result in lower contract costs and increased reliability. Fluor also received a Strength for its proposed advisory council which will provide a different perspective on CMOE activities and will identify technology and management approaches and improvements.

Programmatic Risk

Fluor received a Strength for its sound technical understanding of the requirements demonstrated by its identification of significant programmatic risks. Fluor identified risks that are directly relevant to issues that are currently ongoing at LaRC and represent items that, if not addressed/mitigated, will result in adverse impacts. The proposed approach for managing each risk will be beneficial by reducing the probability that the identified risks will occur.

Fluor received a Weakness for its lack of prioritization of the most significant programmatic risks and for not adequately explaining the probability (likelihood) and impact and severity (consequence) of the risks.

Maintenance

Fluor received a Significant Strength for its comprehensive, proactive maintenance focused approach to implementing an RCM Program at LaRC. Fluor demonstrated an understanding of an effective RCM program through its description of the various monitoring activities required and its comprehensive and integrated approach to implementing an improved RCM program at LaRC. Fluor proposed tying back to the contract-required ASP as an implementing tool to demonstrate cost effectiveness in addition to proactively plan and implement the program. This value-added approach will reduce the risk of failure and the higher costs typically associated with a more reactive maintenance program and create a more transparent and effective maintenance program.

Operations

Fluor received a Strength for its approach to address issues with and maximize facility operational readiness and productivity. Examples of its approach include: use of an approach to enhance data quality and provide systematic continuous improvement; and use of a corporate process and tool to maximize facility operational readiness and productivity.

Fluor received a Weakness for not adequately demonstrating specific approaches to maximizing the availability and utilization of LaRC research facilities. Instead, Fluor primarily provided an overview of the operational requirements of the contract as stated in the SOW. Fluor's description of the interfaces within its overall approach was unclear and lacked cohesion.

Engineering

Fluor received a Strength for its design approach that embodies systems engineering principles and enhances operability, maintainability, and reliability. Fluor proposed utilizing a structured facilities requirements process that includes a comprehensive and Fluor-specific management tool and incorporates the wide range of requirements that need to be addressed in facility project planning.

Subfactor 3, Small Business Utilization

Fluor received an adjectival rating of Good for Subfactor 3.

Small Business Subcontracting

Fluor received a Strength for proposing a small business subcontracting goal which exceeds the contract overall goal of 25% and its approach to meeting this goal.

Commitment to Small Businesses

Fluor received a Strength for its commitment to small businesses through its established participation in Mentor Protégé programs and the inclusion of one of its protégés as a subcontractor partner for the CMOE effort.

Jacobs

Jacobs received a Mission Suitability score of 881. Jacobs' proposal included Significant Strengths, Strengths, and Weaknesses as summarized below. There were no Significant Weaknesses.

Subfactor 1 - Management (MGMT)

Jacobs received an adjectival rating of Very Good for Subfactor 1.

Electronic Contract Management System (ECMS)

Jacobs received a Strength for its proposed performance dashboard approach that will allow real-time visualization of work performance data and provide both the Government and the Contractor the information needed to effectively manage the contract. Jacobs also received a Strength for its proposed integrated portal solution and targeted training approach. Jacobs' proposed web-based and role-based system provides an integrated solution utilizing Maximo to the maximum extent practical and will efficiently and effectively manage and consolidate all Core and IDIQ work on the contract into a single, user-friendly system.

Jacobs received a Weakness for not adequately describing its approach to managing and reporting all work under the Core and IDIQ portions of the contract using its proposed ECMS. Jacobs does not clearly state it will manage and report IDIQ and Core reactive work in Maximo that is yet to be approved or not approved. By only managing and reporting the approved work in Maximo, the Government loses the ability to manage and report all requested work to ensure it has the full picture of maintenance requirements. Jacobs also received a Weakness for proposing an implementation schedule based on its estimate of an October 1, 2013 award date with implementation work for its ECMS beginning prior to the solicitation stated phase-in start date of November 1, 2013. As Jacobs includes implementation work for its ECMS prior to November 1, 2013, the Government cannot ascertain whether Jacobs would have a fully operational ECMS as of the base period of performance start date required by the solicitation.

Requirement Dynamics

Jacobs received a Significant Strength for its comprehensive approach to quickly, efficiently, and cost effectively adapt to changing missions, requirements, priorities, workload, and funding fluctuations through its recognition of the requirements dynamics in performing the CMOE contract. The use of multiple approaches for workforce management will facilitate quick ramp-up or ramp-down of the workforce depending on the workload situation. These approaches will ensure LaRC requirements (steady state or requiring immediate ramp-up or ramp-down) can be met quickly while minimizing additional risk, cost, and extended schedules resultant from delays in Contractor resource increases or decreases. These approaches also will allow Jacobs to maintain the necessary skills required with minimal negative impacts to the workforce, while meeting the CMOE requirements without the added cost associated with a static workforce in times when such skills are not immediately required.

Jacobs received a Strength for its approach for providing alignment and maintaining integration between its operations, maintenance, and engineering program and LaRC's Revitalization Plan through its proposed dedicated revitalization activity lead at a high level in its management. This approach will ensure Jacob's day-to-day activities are aligned with the LaRC Revitalization Plan (including use of its proposed integrated schedule) as well as ensuring CMOE activities directly supporting the Center's revitalization efforts will be effectively executed and managed by individuals knowledgeable of the Plan. Furthermore, this approach will reduce the risk associated with the anticipated changes resulting from execution of the Revitalization Plan (e.g., reduced infrastructure) and its impacts on the Center and the CMOE contract personnel supporting its implementation.

Recruiting, Retaining, Motivating, and Incentivizing Employees

Jacobs received a Strength for its total compensation plan which is integrated with its significant subcontractor to ensure employees classified in identical labor categories and performing identical services are comparably compensated. Jacobs also received a Strength for its proposed human resource and compensation management program that included multiple employee incentives and a formal employee feedback mechanism.

Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI) and Personal Conflicts of Interest (PCI)

Jacobs received a Strength for placing responsibility for screening OCIs at senior levels within the corporation and through use of a working group composed of personnel from multiple functions within the CMOE Team. This approach increases confidence that OCIs and PCIs will be identified proactively and effectively across all Business Units of Jacobs and by all members of the Jacobs team. Jacobs also received a Strength for an approach that includes training and refresher training on PCIs for all personnel, not just those who are covered employees, and use of a comprehensive audit program to ensure compliance with the OCI and PCI provisions of the CMOE contract.

Jacobs received a Weakness for not adequately addressing the potential OCIs presented by its teammates. Jacobs draws a broad no-conflict conclusion to two specifically identified potential OCIs, but does not adequately support this conclusion by specific facts. Jacobs also received a Weakness for not addressing methods it will utilize to avoid or mitigate impaired objectivity OCIs.

Management Plan

Jacobs received a Strength for its management plan and its approach to collect and respond to customer requested services. Jacobs proposed an efficient structure that effectively aligns with the CMOE SOW and an innovative office that will ensure focus on integrated workflow and control for both Core and IDIQ work. The proposed organizational structure provides a cost-effective approach to managing the contract and developing a high-fidelity integrated project plan/schedule while reducing the performance risk typically associated with integrating the work on a contract like CMOE. Jacobs also received a Strength for its decision making process that gives full authority to the PM, allowing the PM to immediately decide the proper course of action without potential delays resulting from the need for corporate office approval.

Jacobs received a Weakness for its approach to tracking and evaluating its performance against the Government's performance requirements, goals, and objectives. The proposed use of a survey at the beginning of each award fee period to gauge customer expectations and requirements could add confusion and conflict with the actual written requirements of the contract and with the expectations and areas for focus that result from the formal award fee process.

Subfactor 2 - Technical (TECH)

Jacobs received an adjectival rating of Excellent for Subfactor 2.

Enhancements, Innovations, and Approaches to Reducing Total Cost of Ownership

Jacobs received a Strength for its initiative designed to tailor specific project requirements and reviews to the actual risk level of the project as opposed to taking a "one-size-fits-all" approach. This concept is expected to reduce the overall time and cost required to complete a project and fosters a more effective and efficient method for executing all maintenance, operations, and engineering activities under the

CMOE contract. Jacobs also received a Strength for its innovative method to integrate not only the CMOE contractual activities, but all Vibrant Transformation to Advance LaRC (ViTAL)-related/affected activities (both NASA and Contractor) to ensure a more effective and efficient method to operating and maintaining the Center. Additionally, Jacobs received a Strength for its approach to formalizing knowledge capture quickly and in a format that can be efficiently utilized when needed. Furthermore, the use of technology as an aid will increase productivity and efficiency in performing the work and will reduce workforce costs associated with the improved productivity and efficiency.

Further, Jacobs received a Strength for its proposed approach for certifications and for an enhanced integrated OME schedule. The certifications will enhance maintenance and reliability by enabling a strategic awareness and maintaining up-to-date technical expertise. The proposed integrated OME schedule will reduce the risk of conflicts in the execution of all maintenance, operations, and engineering activities under the CMOE contract. Jacobs also received a Strength for demonstrating a unique approach in its proposed resource management and training initiative. The initiative utilizes an engineering pool of highly specialized skills relevant to the skills required for CMOE and provides a unique opportunity to manage resources primarily in times of workload ebb by taking advantage of similar highly specialized skills. The initiative also provides access to a relevant state-of-the-art training program that will enhance capabilities while reducing training costs. Finally, Jacobs received a Strength for its proposed approach to increasing efficiency in both the purchase and distribution of tools and reducing material and workforce costs during the life of the contract. This approach will enable the workforce to devote more time to the job and less time performing administrative work.

Jacobs received a Weakness for not providing an adequate approach for its initiative to enhance the productive labor year for exempt employees, its effects on the workforce and contract performance, and how the estimated cost savings were established.

Programmatic Risk

Jacobs received a Strength for its sound technical understanding of the requirements demonstrated by its identification, prioritization, and explanation of significant programmatic risks. Jacobs identified risks that are directly relevant to issues that are currently ongoing at LaRC and represent items that, if not addressed/mitigated, will result in adverse impacts. The proposed approach for managing each risk will be beneficial by reducing the probability that the identified risks will occur.

Maintenance

Jacobs received a Significant Strength for its comprehensive, proactive maintenance focused approach to implementing an RCM Program at LaRC. Jacobs demonstrated an understanding through an effective proposed approach to supplement its RCM program. This tailored approach is a streamlined and cost efficient version of more rigorous and costly traditional RCM approaches used by industry and is based on a working knowledge of the various types of equipment that will be maintained. The approach will help ensure the Center's critical facilities are properly and proactively maintained in a timely and effective manner, thus reducing the risk of unscheduled downtime (and adverse mission impact) due to system breakage and failure. This approach also reduces the higher costs typically associated with a more reactive maintenance program.

Jacobs received a Strength for its planning process which involves the customer and stakeholder in further refining system prioritizations to ensure optimal use of resources. This process will balance risk by effectively identifying critical and noncritical systems and applying appropriate maintenance methodologies. Jacobs also received a Strength for its proposed approach to performing Condition-Based Monitoring by utilizing existing systems to allow for real-time and continuous monitoring. This approach

will identify and address potential failures sooner thereby improving the availability and reliability of the equipment. Finally, Jacobs received a Strength for its proposed employee training techniques that include use of various tools to capture LaRC specific maintenance activities, which is expected to reduce training and maintenance costs over time.

Operations

Jacobs received a Strength for proposing to establish a team to evaluate technologies currently in use at targeted facilities and suggest enhancements/added capabilities to improve productivity and/or data quality. The team will ensure LaRC research facilities are keeping pace with and implementing state-of-the-art technologies to further the Center's research capabilities. Jacobs also received a Strength for proposing to establish an additional test planning tool to thoroughly investigate all aspects of the customer's test entry to ensure best value. The test planning tool allows for the infusion of new techniques and technology. Finally, Jacobs received a Strength for its proposed operator-maintainer concept. This approach will reduce downtime by performing routine maintenance more efficiently and will identify problems sooner so they can be addressed before becoming a major issue. This approach facilitates cross-utilization of the workforce in times of reduced facility utilization as these individuals will have the ability to perform maintenance activities (in either their "home" facility or another facility) until facility utilization increases.

Engineering

Jacobs received a Strength for its approach to applying systems engineering principles and practices that demonstrates its recognition of the importance of designing for operability, maintainability, and reliability and the importance of involving the maintenance and operations functional areas early and throughout the design process. Jacob's approach includes a variety of techniques and a certification program that is supported by its management structure and leads to integrated processes and products.

Subfactor 3 – Small Business Utilization (SB)

Jacobs received an adjectival rating of Good for Subfactor 3.

Small Business Subcontracting

Jacobs received a Strength for proposing a small business subcontracting goal which exceeds the contract overall goal of 25% and its approach to meeting this goal.

Commitment to Small Businesses

Jacobs received a Strength for its commitment to small businesses through its established participation in Mentor Protégé programs and the planned participation of three of its protégés for the CMOE effort.

LaTS

LaTS received a Mission Suitability score of 701. LaTS' proposal included a Significant Strength, Strengths, Weaknesses and a Significant Weakness as summarized below.

Subfactor 1, Management

LaTS received an adjectival rating of Good for Subfactor 1.

Electronic Contract Management System (ECMS)

LaTS received a Strength for its integrated solution, interfacing with existing systems, such as Maximo, that will efficiently and effectively manage and consolidate all work for the Core and IDIQ work on the contract into a single, user-friendly system. LaTS proposed an ECMS that is fully operational before the contract base period of performance start date, which provides a low-risk solution to the Government. LaTS also received a Strength for its approach to meeting the IT requirements and standards, including IT Security and networking requirements, which demonstrates a sound understanding of the NASA IT environment and will reduce the risk of implementation and compliance. The proposed budget module will facilitate alignment between the system and the NASA budgeting and funding data.

Requirement Dynamics

LaTS received a Strength for its approach to quickly, efficiently, and cost effectively adapt to changing missions, requirements, priorities, workload, and funding fluctuations through its dynamic resource model. The proposed model provides an integrated solution that incorporates the ASP and utilizes the proposed ECMS, including an integrated master schedule, when performing work, managing resources, and maintaining necessary skills during periods that may require immediate ramp-up, ramp-down, or reallocation of resources.

LaTS received a Weakness for its limited view on cross-utilizing the workforce as an approach to quickly, efficiently, and cost effectively adapt to changing missions, requirements, priorities, workload, and funding fluctuations. LaTS limits its ability to cross-utilize the entire workforce and limits its cross-utilization approach only to unplanned workload increases. Not applying its approach to all employees increases the risk of insufficient resources for performing work and maintaining necessary skills during periods that may require immediate ramp-up, ramp-down, or reallocation of resources.

Recruiting, Retaining, Motivating, and Incentivizing Employees

LaTS received a Weakness for its approach to using the Contracting Officer to identify "critical-skill incumbent employees" for transition to LaTS. This approach does not demonstrate an adequate strategy for recruiting, retaining, motivating, and incentivizing qualified personnel.

Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI) and Personal Conflicts of Interest (PCI)

LaTS received a Strength for its approach to using an offsite computer infrastructure for its business systems that will not be connected to NASA furnished computers, reducing the risk of inadvertent transfer of sensitive NASA information to LaTS' computer systems. LaTS also received a Strength for its approach to training and refresher training for its employees. This approach includes a requirement that also applies to employees leaving the employment of LaTS or its team members.

LaTS received a Significant Weakness for its approach to identifying, mitigating and/or avoiding OCIs. LaTS fails to adequately assess the potential risks for various types of conflicts that may arise as a result of the activities and contracts of its parent companies. LaTS states that its structure as a "standalone entity" ensures there are no OCIs for it as the Prime Contractor. Its assessment of the potential risk for various types of conflicts fails to adequately address the parent corporations participating in the LLC, and whether this structure properly insulates the LLC from potential conflicts of the parents. Because of the overlapping management structure with a parent company, LaTS' assertion that it will operate independently, without an explanation of how its independence can or will be maintained, leave unresolved concerns regarding potential OCIs of the parents being imputed to LaTS.

LaTS received a Weakness for not demonstrating an adequate approach to identifying, mitigating and/or avoiding OCIs that may arise under this contract with respect to work its subcontractors will perform under the CMOE contract. LaTS implies there could be potential conflicts of interest with a significant subcontractor and then merely states it will review work assigned to the subcontractor, which has already been proposed to perform certain areas of work for CMOE. In addition, LaTS provides no explanation to support its assessment that no OCI risks exist for another subcontractor's work and it is not clear whether that work creates the potential for OCIs under the CMOE contract. LaTS also received a Weakness for not demonstrating an adequate approach to identifying, mitigating and/or avoiding OCIs that may arise under this contract with respect to an impaired objectivity OCI that may be present with respect to work its significant subcontractor will perform under the CMOE contract and the work it is performing on a separate contract. Additionally, LaTS received a Weakness for not demonstrating an adequate approach for complying with the requirements associated with the limitations on future contracting resulting from its or its subcontractors' performance of the contract requirements. Finally, LaTS received a Weakness for not demonstrating an adequate approach to meeting the contract requirements for identifying, mitigating and/or avoiding PCIs that may arise under this contract nor does it demonstrate an adequate approach for identifying, mitigating and/or avoiding personal conflicts for "covered employees" performing acquisition functions closely associated with inherently governmental functions under the contract.

Management Plan

LaTS received a Strength for its approach to tracking and evaluating its performance against LaRC's performance requirements, goals, and objectives. This includes developing measurable metrics in connection with the development and management of the ASP process and centrally managing these metrics using custom dashboards in the ECMS. This approach will be effective in developing metrics that are pertinent to the current performance period and will allow for effective identification and resolution of performance issues as they arise.

Subfactor 2, Technical

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

Enhancements, Innovations, and Approaches to Reducing Total Cost of Ownership

LaTS received a Weakness for not demonstrating a complete understanding of the CMOE requirements through its proposed certification enhancement. The CMOE contractor does not perform work that is subject to the standard proposed (hence no requirement in the CMOE contract regarding such certification/compliance). LaTS does not adequately detail the need or importance of the enhancement and applying such a rigorous standard has the potential to increase costs. LaTS also received a Weakness for not providing an adequate description of each proposed enhancement, innovation, and total cost of ownership reduction approach and how it specifically impacts the performance and cost of the specific portions of the contract and/or cost to operating and maintaining the Center, any assumptions and the rationale for these assumptions, and the technical and risk impacts of the proposed approaches.

Programmatic Risk

LaTS received a Strength for its sound technical understanding of the requirements demonstrated by its identification, prioritization, and explanation of significant programmatic risks. LaTS identified risks that are directly relevant to issues that are currently ongoing at LaRC and represent items that, if not addressed/mitigated, will result in adverse impacts. The proposed approach for managing each risk will be beneficial by reducing the probability that the identified risks will occur.

Maintenance

LaTS received a Significant Strength for its comprehensive, proactive maintenance focused approach to implementing an RCM Program at LaRC. LaTS demonstrated an understanding of an effective RCM program through its proposed RCM process and use of the best-suited Predictive Testing and Inspection (PT&I) technologies that will reduce the risk of failure while reducing the higher costs typically associated with a more reactive maintenance program. The proposed RCM process will also be utilized to assess the existing maintenance job plans (during phase-in) in developing the overall RCM approach, provide an RCM training and certification program, and enhance the critical spares strategy for the Center. LaTS proposed tying back to the contract-required ASP as an implementing tool to demonstrate cost effectiveness, in addition to proactively plan and implement the program. This value-added approach will reduce the risk of failure and the higher costs typically associated with a more reactive maintenance program and create a more transparent and effective maintenance program.

Operations

LaTS received a Strength for its approach to maximizing the operational readiness of LaRC research facilities by performing an independent inventory and calibration practice review and providing recommendations for process improvements and excessing inventory. This approach demonstrates LaTS' understanding of the current issues with the Measurement and Test Equipment (M&TE) environment at the Center and has the potential to improve M&TE efficiency while reducing costs of the overall program.

LaTS received a Weakness for not adequately demonstrating specific approaches to maximizing the availability, productivity, and utilization of LaRC research facilities. Instead, LaTS primarily provided an overview of the operational requirements of the contract as stated in the SOW.

Engineering

LaTS received a Strength for its design approach that embodies systems engineering principles and enhances operability, maintainability, and reliability. LaTS stressed the significance of utilizing an engineering team with RCM experience and involving the maintenance and operations functional areas early and throughout the engineering design process. LaTS proposed utilizing historical data to ensure systems are operational by providing necessary redundancy in design and ensures the facility layout is considered when completing all designs.

Subfactor 3, Small Business Utilization

LaTS received an adjectival rating of Good for Subfactor 3.

Small Business Subcontracting

LaTS received a Strength for proposing a small business subcontracting goal which exceeds the contract overall goal of 25% and its approach to meeting this goal.

Commitment to Small Businesses

LaTS received a Strength for commitment to small businesses through its established participation in Mentor Protégé programs and the goal to solidify its current draft Protégé agreement with one of its proposed subcontractors for the CMOE effort.

Factor 2, Cost/Price

The SEB and Cost/Price analyst performed an analysis of the proposed prices to assess price reasonableness and cost realism, to determine whether the Offerors demonstrated a clear understanding of the requirement and could perform the contract for the stated cost. In accordance with FAR 15.402, the Contracting Officer has determined that the Offerors’ proposed prices are fair and reasonable based on the comparison of the proposed prices (before and after incorporating the probable cost adjustments for the Core), comparison of the proposed prices to the Independent Government Estimate (IGE) (includes comparing the proposed prices to historical prices for the same or similar items purchased by the Government since estimate is based, in part, on historical data/costs), comparison of the proposed IDIQ rates, and the fact that adequate price competition was obtained.

A summary of the overall probable cost/fee for each Offeror is shown in the table below:

Offeror	Probable Cost/Fee (Lowest to Highest)
CSC	3 rd
Fluor	1 st (Lowest)
Jacobs	2 nd
LaTS	4 th (Highest)

CSC

Based on the cost realism analysis and SEB review of CSC’s cost proposal, cost realism adjustments totaling \$23.7M were made to CSC’s proposed cost. Labor escalation was increased using escalation factors forecasted by Global Insight and overhead costs that were omitted by CSC were added using CSC’s most recent Forward Pricing Rate Proposal (FPRP). Other Direct Costs (ODCs) were also increased as a result of correcting math errors in CSC’s proposal and costs were increased due to CSC’s assumption for facility closures (Langley Aerothermodynamic Laboratory and Transonic Dynamics Tunnel) in its cost estimate, which is inconsistent with the RFP’s Attachment 7, Workload Data. CSC’s proposed cost/fee was below the IGE, but the probable cost/fee was above the IGE.

In addition, the SEB had concerns regarding the lack of a detailed Basis of Estimate (BOE) to support proposed costs in a majority of technical sections and inconsistency regarding which innovations are and are not priced into contract (for all innovations) based on Mission Suitability and Cost/Price areas.

Fluor

Based on the cost realism analysis and SEB review of Fluor’s cost proposal, a cost realism adjustment totaling \$15.8M was made to Fluor’s proposed cost to increase labor escalation using escalation factors forecasted by Global Insight. Fluor’s proposed cost/fee and probable cost/fee were below the IGE.

In addition, the SEB had concerns regarding the lack of a detailed BOE to support proposed costs in a majority of technical sections; its compensation assumptions for the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and exempt workforce; inconsistency in the phase-in price proposed versus the amount in the cost narrative; estimating higher labor rates for identical labor categories (exempt personnel) under IDIQ versus the Core for four labor categories; and including numerous IDIQ labor categories that are clearly out of scope/highly unlikely to ever be utilized under the CMOE contract.

Jacobs

Based on the cost realism analysis and SEB review of Jacobs’ cost proposal, a cost realism adjustment totaling \$18.3M was made to Jacobs’ proposed cost to increase labor escalation using escalation factors forecasted by Global Insight. Jacobs’ proposed cost/fee and probable cost/fee were below the IGE.

In addition, the SEB had concern regarding the lack of support for some BOE assumptions and proposed costs.

LaTS

Based on the cost realism analysis and SEB review of LaTS’ cost proposal, cost realism adjustments totaling \$33.6M were made to LaTS’ proposed cost. LaTS’ Instrument-Measurement and Test Equipment (M&TE) estimate was increased to ensure LaTS’ estimated cost reflects its proposed approach (i.e., LaTS states it will use a specific subcontractor for this work in its Mission Suitability proposal, but this subcontractor does not appear in the cost proposal) and labor escalation was increased using escalation factors forecasted by Global Insight. ODCs were also increased due to increasing the proposed Hampton Business License Tax resulting from other probable cost adjustments and a \$700K math error (overstated total cost due to formula error) was corrected in LaTS’ proposal. LaTS’ proposed cost/fee was below the IGE, but the probable cost/fee was above the IGE.

In addition, the SEB had concerns regarding the lack of a detailed BOE to support proposed costs in a majority of technical sections and inclusion of IDIQ rates for overtime, which is not permitted by the contract.

Factor 3, Past Performance

The SEB evaluated the Offerors’ past performance records in accordance with Section M.3 of the RFP. The SEB considered the records of performing contracts similar in size, content and complexity to the CMOE requirement. Both the performance records and the pertinence of the experience were evaluated. A confidence rating was assigned in accordance with NFS 1815.305.

Offeror	Pertinence Rating (size/content/complexity)	Performance Rating	Level of Confidence
CSC	Highly Pertinent (VHP/P/VHP)	Exceptional	High
Fluor	Pertinent (VHP/P/P)	Very Good	Moderate
Jacobs	Very Highly Pertinent (VHP/HP/VHP)	Exceptional	Very High
LaTS	Highly Pertinent (VHP/P/VHP)	Very Good	High

VHP = Very Highly Pertinent	P = Pertinent	NP = Not Pertinent
HP = Highly Pertinent	SP = Somewhat Pertinent	

CSC

The SEB assigned a confidence rating of High to CSC's Past Performance, Factor 3. CSC presented a total of six references for past performance, which included four contracts for CSC and two for CSC's significant subcontractor. For Size Pertinence, CSC received a Very Highly Pertinent rating as CSC's largest referenced contract well exceeded the Government estimated CMOE annual average. For Overall Work Content Pertinence as compared to the CMOE SOW, CSC received a Pertinent rating as all SOW areas were satisfactorily covered, but all lacked supporting detail or had items that were not addressed. Most SOW areas were rated as Pertinent with two areas rated as Highly Pertinent. For Complexity Pertinence, CSC received a rating of Very Highly Pertinent as CSC has managed contracts performing a wider range of services/disciplines with greater interdependence between functions compared to the CMOE contract. CSC has experience with numerous research facilities, including wind tunnels, with similar complexity and more diversity compared to the CMOE supported facilities. Furthermore, CSC has demonstrated experience in balancing workload and staffing for both a Core and IDIQ contract. Performance ratings across the referenced contracts ranged from Very Good to Exceptional with the majority of the ratings being Exceptional. The overall performance rating is Exceptional. Therefore, CSC's Overall Pertinence rating of Highly Pertinent and Overall Exceptional Performance rating resulted in a High Level of Confidence for the Past Performance factor.

Fluor

The SEB assigned a confidence rating of Moderate to Fluor's Past Performance, Factor 3. Fluor presented a total of six references for past performance, which included four contracts for Fluor and two for Fluor's significant subcontractor. For Size Pertinence, Fluor received a Very Highly Pertinent rating as Fluor's largest referenced contract well exceeded the Government estimated CMOE annual average. For Overall Work Content Pertinence as compared to the CMOE SOW, Fluor received a Pertinent rating as all except one of the SOW areas were satisfactorily covered, but all lacked supporting detail or had items that were not addressed. Most SOW areas were rated as Pertinent with one area rated as Highly Pertinent and one area rated as Somewhat Pertinent. For Complexity Pertinence, Fluor received a rating of Pertinent as Fluor has managed contracts performing a wider range of services/disciplines with similar interdependence between functions compared to the CMOE contract. Fluor has experience with numerous research facilities with less complexity and diversity compared to the CMOE supported facilities. However, Fluor does not demonstrate experience in balancing workload and staffing for both a Core and IDIQ contract. Performance ratings across the referenced contracts ranged from Very Good to Exceptional with the majority of the ratings being Very Good. The overall performance rating is Very Good. Therefore, Fluor's Overall Pertinence rating of Pertinent and Overall Very Good Performance rating resulted in a Moderate Level of Confidence for the Past Performance factor.

Jacobs

The SEB assigned a confidence rating of Very High to Jacob's Past Performance, Factor 3. Jacobs presented a total of six references for past performance, which included four contracts for Jacobs and two for Jacob's significant subcontractor. For Size Pertinence, Jacobs received a Very Highly Pertinent rating as Jacob's largest referenced contract well exceeded the Government estimated CMOE annual average. For Overall Work Content Pertinence as compared to the CMOE SOW, Jacobs received a Highly Pertinent rating as all of the SOW areas were satisfactorily covered, but all lacked supporting detail or had items that were not addressed. Most SOW areas were rated as Highly Pertinent with one area rated as Very Highly Pertinent and one area rated as Pertinent. For Complexity Pertinence, Jacobs received a rating of Very Highly Pertinent as Jacobs has managed contracts performing a wider range of services/disciplines with greater interdependence between functions compared to the CMOE contract. Jacobs has experience with numerous research facilities, including wind tunnels, with similar complexity

and more diversity compared to the CMOE supported facilities. Furthermore, Jacobs has demonstrated experience in balancing workload and staffing for both a Core and IDIQ contract. Performance ratings for all of the referenced contracts were Exceptional. The overall performance rating is Exceptional. Therefore, Jacob's Overall Pertinence rating of Very Highly Pertinent and Overall Exceptional Performance rating resulted in a Very High Level of Confidence for the Past Performance factor.

LaTS

The SEB assigned a confidence rating of High to LaTS' Past Performance, Factor 3. LaTS presented a total of ten references for past performance, which included four contracts for LaTS and a total of six for LaTS' significant subcontractors (two for each of the three significant subcontractors). For Size Pertinence, LaTS received a Very Highly Pertinent rating as LaTS' largest referenced contract well exceeded the Government estimated CMOE annual average. For Overall Work Content Pertinence as compared to the CMOE SOW, LaTS received a Pertinent rating as all except one of the SOW areas were satisfactorily covered, but all lacked supporting detail or had items that were not addressed. Most SOW areas were rated as Pertinent, with one area rated as Highly Pertinent and one area rated as Somewhat Pertinent. For Complexity Pertinence, LaTS received a rating of Very Highly Pertinent as LaTS has managed contracts performing a wider range of services/disciplines with greater interdependence between functions compared to the CMOE contract. LaTS has experience with numerous research and development laboratory facilities with similar complexity and more diversity compared to the CMOE supported facilities. Performance ratings across the referenced contracts ranged from Satisfactory to Exceptional with the majority of the ratings being Very Good. The overall performance rating is Very Good. Therefore, LaTS' Overall Pertinence rating of Highly Pertinent and Overall Very Good Performance rating resulted in a High Level of Confidence for the Past Performance factor.

Basis for Selection

The SEB presented its findings to me on August 7, 2013, 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 Mission Suitability, I noted that Jacobs was the only Offeror to receive no Significant Weaknesses in any of the three subfactors.

Jacobs had a higher adjectival rating of Very Good for Subfactor 1, Management, compared to CSC's, Fluor's, and LaTS' adjectival rating of Good.

In Electronic Contract Management System (ECMS), I noted that there were no significant strengths in this area and that most Offerors had solutions that were COTS based and interfaced with Maximo. However, CSC received a significant weakness and its solution demonstrated the most risk in terms of having it ready by contract start. I also noted that LaTS was the only Offeror with no weaknesses. The other Offerors had a balance of strengths and weaknesses. Therefore, I conclude that LaTS has a marginally better proposal compared to the other Offerors in this area.

In Requirement Dynamics, I noted that CSC received a significant strength for its decision making and resource management scheduling tool, however its proposal also received a few weaknesses including its inadequate description of the integration and alignment required to support the LaRC Revitalization Plan. The Fluor proposal included a balance of strengths and weaknesses. However it was noted that one of the weaknesses was related to its approach for aligning with the LaRC Revitalization Plan. Jacobs had a

significant strength, a strength, and no weaknesses. The significant strength was for demonstrating a highly effective approach for managing the expected contract requirement fluctuations. In addition Jacobs received a strength for its sound approach to providing alignment and maintaining integration between its OME program and the LaRC Revitalization Plan. I also noted that LaTS received a strength and a weakness for its approach for handling fluctuations. Therefore, I conclude that Jacobs has an appreciably superior proposal compared to the other Offerors in this area.

In Recruiting, Retaining, Motivating, and Incentivizing Employees, I noted CSC received no findings. Fluor received a significant weakness for its strategy related to recruiting, retaining, motivating, and incentivizing employees. Jacobs was the only Offeror with strengths, including an integrated total compensation plan between the prime and its significant subcontractor and a sound strategy for recruiting, retaining, motivating, and incentivizing employees. I also noted Jacobs had no weaknesses. LaTS had a weakness related to its approach for hiring incumbent employees during contract phase-in. Therefore, I conclude that Jacobs has an appreciably superior proposal compared to the other Offerors in this area.

In Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI) and Personal Conflicts of Interest (PCI), I noted that CSC had several weaknesses and no strengths. The weaknesses were related to not adequately describing the methods to identify and avoid or mitigate OCIs or PCIs and for failing to identify or discuss protection of Government sensitive information; a reactive PCI approach; an inadequate approach to identifying and mitigating a conflict related to its work under an existing LaRC contract; and inappropriately putting the burden on the Contracting Officer to notify the Contractor about potential OCIs on IDIQ work. Fluor had strengths for a sound OCI screening process and its training system. I also noted that Fluor had weaknesses for not including PCIs in the screening process and an ineffective technique to avoid or mitigate impaired objectivity OCIs. Jacobs had a strength for an OCI working group and an effective OCI screening approach and a strength for its training and refresher training on PCIs. I further noted that Jacobs had weaknesses for its failure to adequately address potential OCIs and an inadequate approach with regard to addressing impaired objectivity OCIs. LaTS had a few strengths, a significant weakness, and several weaknesses. LaTS received strengths for its business systems that will not be connected to NASA furnished computers and for its approach to training and refresher training. LaTS also received a significant weakness for failing to assess the potential risks for various types of conflicts that may arise as a result of its relationship and managerial interfaces with its parent companies. I determined this finding was particularly noteworthy as there is a risk that this situation will adversely impact the ability of the Contractor to meet the requirements of the contract. In addition, I noted LaTS received other weaknesses related to OCI. Therefore, I conclude that CSC, Fluor, and Jacobs were essentially equal for the OCI/PCI area. LaTS posed significantly more risk than the other Offerors in this area.

In Management Plan, I noted CSC, Fluor, and Jacobs received strengths for their decision making process that gives full authority to the PM; CSC, Fluor, and LaTS received strengths for their approach to tracking and evaluating performance; and CSC and Fluor each received weaknesses for not demonstrating an adequate approach to effectively collect and respond to customer requested services. In addition, CSC received a strength for its establishment of an advisory board to support the LaRC revitalization effort and marketing and utilization of excess facility capacity and received a weakness for its fragmented organizational structure. In contrast to CSC, Fluor, and LaTS, I noted Jacobs received a weakness for its approach to tracking and evaluating its performance; and in contrast to CSC and Fluor, Jacobs received a strength for its approach to collect and respond to customer requested services. Overall, I did not note any discriminators in this area.

In summary, in looking at all the areas of Subfactor 1, Management, LaTS provided a marginally better benefit in ECMS compared to other Offerors. Jacobs was superior in the area of Requirement Dynamics and the area of Recruiting, Retaining, Motivating, and Incentivizing Employees. For the OCI/PCI area, CSC, Fluor, and Jacobs were essentially equal and LaTS posed significantly more risk than the other

Offerors. Finally, under the Management Plan area, I found no discriminators between the Offerors. Based on my comparative assessment of the proposals, I determine the Jacobs proposal offers greater benefit for Subfactor 1 when compared to the other proposals.

For Subfactor 2, Technical, Jacobs had a higher adjectival rating of Excellent compared to CSC's, Fluor's, and LaTS' adjectival rating of Very Good.

In Enhancements, Innovations, and Approaches to Reducing Total Cost of Ownership, I noted CSC received strengths for its initiatives that will provide wide ranging benefits in the areas of data integrity, staffing, material management, and enhanced calibration. Detracting from these benefits, CSC received weaknesses for proposing initiatives that are already requirements contained in the CMOE contract and its inconsistent approach to performing some of these items as IDIQ task orders versus under the Core effort.

Fluor received strengths for its initiative that will provide benefit in the areas of optimizing maintenance practices and identifying technology and management approaches and improvements.

Jacobs received strengths for its initiatives that will provide wide ranging benefits in the areas of tailored project requirements, ViTAL integration, knowledge capture, certifications and integrated OME schedule, resource management and training, and logistics. Detracting from these benefits, Jacobs received a weakness for not providing an adequate approach for its initiative to enhance the productive labor year for exempt employees.

LaTS received a weakness for its proposed certification enhancement initiative as it did not adequately detail the need or importance of the initiative and because applying such a rigorous standard has the potential to increase costs. In addition, LaTS received a weakness for not providing an adequate description of each proposed enhancement, innovation, and total cost of ownership reduction approach and its impacts and risks.

Therefore, I conclude that both the CSC and Jacobs proposals provided wide ranging benefits in their proposed Enhancements, Innovations, and Approaches to Reducing Total Cost of Ownership. I also noted that Fluor provided initiatives with some benefit while LaTS only had weaknesses for this area. I determined CSC and Jacobs had superior proposals in this area compared to Fluor and LaTS. In comparing CSC and Jacobs, the benefits provided by Jacobs' initiatives were more wide ranging to those of CSC. Additionally, CSC did not fully incorporate all of its initiatives in its Core proposal, thus increasing the technical and financial risk to the Government. This aspect of CSCs proposal factored into my analysis of the relative merits of the proposals in this area.

In Programmatic Risk, I find that there were no significant strengths or significant weaknesses in this area and that all Offerors had a strength for identifying risks that are directly relevant to issues that are currently ongoing at LaRC and for the proposed approaches for managing each risk. However, Fluor received a weakness for its lack of prioritization of the most significant programmatic risks. Overall, I did not note any discriminators in this area.

In Maintenance, I noted Fluor, Jacobs, and LaTS each had a significant strength for their comprehensive, proactive maintenance focused approach to implementing an RCM Program at LaRC which will reduce the higher costs typically associated with a more reactive maintenance program. In comparison, CSC received a few strengths for its RCM program and also received a weakness in this area. Further, I noted that Jacobs received strengths across various aspects of the maintenance program that provided additional benefit. Therefore, I conclude that Jacobs provided greater benefit in the area of Maintenance considering its equally strong RCM program compared to Fluor and LaTS and stronger RCM program compared to CSC with the additional benefit of having strengths across various aspects of the maintenance program.

In Operations, I noted CSC received a significant strength for its marketing approach that will maximize the utilization of LaRC research facilities and a strength for its approach to maximizing productivity and utilization of LaRC research facilities through its use of a simulation program. CSC had no weaknesses. Fluor received a strength for its approach to maximize facility operational readiness and productivity through its approach to enhance data quality and provide systematic continuous improvement. However, Fluor received a weakness for not adequately demonstrating specific approaches to maximizing the availability and utilization of LaRC research facilities because it primarily provided an overview of the operational requirements of the contract as stated in the SOW. Jacobs received a few strengths for maximizing the availability, operational readiness, productivity, and utilization of LaRC research facilities that focused on operational improvements. Jacobs had no weaknesses in this area. LaTS received a strength for its approach to maximizing the operational readiness of LaRC research facilities by performing an independent inventory and implementation of improved calibration practices. However, LaTS received a weakness for not adequately demonstrating specific approaches to maximizing the availability, productivity, and utilization of LaRC research facilities because it primarily provides an overview of the operational requirements of the contract as stated in the SOW. Therefore, I conclude that both CSC and Jacobs provide greater benefit for the Operations area compared to Fluor and LaTS. CSC's strengths are focused more on a strong marketing approach for LaRC facilities, whereas Jacobs' strengths were focused more on operational improvements. I find the CSC and Jacobs proposals are essentially equal for this area.

In Engineering, I noted all Offerors each received a strength related to importance of a comprehensive systems engineering approach. None of the Offerors received a weakness. Overall, I did not note any discriminators in this area.

In summary, in looking at all the areas of Subfactor 2, Technical, Jacobs provided greater benefit in the area of Enhancements, Innovations, and Approaches to Reducing Total Cost of Ownership and the area of Maintenance. I find the CSC and Jacobs proposals essentially equal for the Operations area. There were no discriminators in the areas of Programmatic Risk and Engineering. Based on my comparative assessment of the proposals, I determine the Jacobs proposal offers greater benefit for Subfactor 2 when compared to the other proposals.

For Subfactor 3, Small Business, Fluor, Jacobs, and LaTS had an adjectival rating of Good and CSC had an adjectival rating of Fair. Fluor, Jacobs, and LaTS all received strengths for their proposed approaches to meeting the small business subcontracting goal and their commitment to small businesses. CSC was the only Offeror to receive a weakness and no strengths. I consider three of the four Offerors to provide similar benefit in this subfactor, which is not a discriminator.

Considering the three Mission Suitability subfactors, I find that overall, Jacobs provides a superior benefit compared to CSC, Fluor, or LaTS.

Regarding Factor 2, Cost/Price, all Offerors' proposed costs/fee were below the IGE but probable cost adjustments resulted in CSC and LaTS being above the Government estimate. I noted the Offerors' proposed costs/fee (along with the Government-provided IDIQ plug number and proposed Phase-in price) were within approximately 10% of each other and that the probable costs were within approximately 12% of each other. I also noted that there were concerns with all of the Offerors' proposals (as addressed above) that did not result in probable cost adjustments. Lastly, I have less concern with Jacobs' proposed costs as its basis of estimate is more comprehensive and resulted in concerns only for some assumptions as compared to the other Offerors' basis of estimate that resulted in concerns for a majority of the technical sections.

Regarding Factor 3, Past Performance, I noted that Jacobs had the highest overall pertinence rating, Very Highly Pertinent, compared to the other Offerors. I also noted that CSC and Jacobs both received Exceptional ratings for performance as compared to Very Good ratings for Fluor and LaTS. In summary, Jacobs received the highest confidence rating of Very High compared to CSC's and LaTS' confidence rating of High, and Fluor's confidence rating of Moderate.

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 recognizing that Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost/Price. I find that Jacobs provided superior benefit in Mission Suitability compared to CSC, Fluor, and LaTS. I also find that Jacobs can effectively perform this contract based on its demonstrated past performance. Jacobs' probable cost is \$760.5M. CSC's and LaTS' probable costs were higher than Jacobs' probable cost, while Fluor's probable cost was slightly lower than Jacobs' probable cost. Although Jacob's probable costs are slightly higher than the lowest Offeror's (Fluor's) probable cost, the combination of Jacob's superior mission suitability and past performance evaluations indicates that Jacobs has the greatest probability of meeting the requirements of the CMOE contract within its proposed price of \$742.2M. I find that the slightly higher probable cost associated with Jacobs' proposal is outweighed by the superior benefit associated with Jacobs' Mission Suitability relative to CSC, Fluor, and LaTS. Additionally, Jacobs' Past Performance proposal received a higher confidence rating than the other Offerors' Past Performance proposals. Therefore, I find that the selection of Jacobs is in the Government's best interest and provides the best value for the Government.

Accordingly, I hereby select Jacobs Technology Inc. (Jacobs) for award of the CMOE contract.



9/4/2013

Stephen G. Jurczyk
Source Selection Authority