

**Source Selection Statement
Langley Geospatial Support Services (GSS)
RFP: NNL15ZB1004R**

Background

The Langley GSS contract procures development and delivery of Geospatial products and services for LaRC and their GSS partners. This solicitation includes requirements to operate, maintain, and update the current LARC GSS and associated data and web tool suite at NASA LaRC and also provide recurring and one-time specific geospatial product and service deliverables. Additional requirements include continuing the operation of existing capabilities and development, support, and analysis for enterprise class Geospatial solutions and deliverables. Finally compliance with Langley Research Center Quality Management Procedures is required.

The Langley GSS Request for Proposals (RFP) specified that the selection will result in award to the Offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government based on evaluating Mission Suitability, Price, and Past Performance evaluation factors. The contract will be an Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract with the ability to issue Firm Fixed Price (FFP) task orders.

Market Research was conducted that included a Sources Sought Notice posted on FedBizOpps on December 19, 2014, with a response date of January 12, 2015. A Procurement Strategy Meeting was held on April 14, 2014, at Langley Research Center and the procurement strategy was subsequently approved. It was determined this procurement would be conducted as a small business HUBZone set-aside. A Draft Request for Proposal was issued on May 22, 2015, for comments from industry and a Pre-Solicitation Conference (Industry Day) was held on June 3, 2015.

The Final RFP was released on June 22, 2015. The final RFP had a proposal response date of July 23, 2015, and a request for Past Performance Proposals to be submitted two weeks after issuance of the final RFP. Subsequently, four amendments followed:

Amendment 1 was issued on June 29, 2015 to provide responses to questions received on the final RFP and to incorporate some edits to the solicitation.

Amendment 2 was issued on July 6, 2015 making minor revisions to provision L.6 and L.15, and updating Attachment VII, Questions and Answers.

Amendment 3 was issued on July 16, 2015, revising L.15, and updating Attachment III, Price Forms, and Attachment VII, Questions and Answers.

Amendment 4 was issued after closing on September 9, 2015, to (i) revise the proposal acceptance period (SF 33, Item 12) and (ii) to revise the Anticipated Award Date.

The following Offerors responded to the RFP by the due date of July 23, 2015:

- Aerial Data Services Inc. (ADS)
- American Infotech Solutions Inc. (AIS)
- Barbaricum LLC (Barbaricum)
- Dynamix Corporation (Dynamix)
- Marstell-Day LLC (Marstell-Day)
- Midland GSS JV (Midland)
- Pro West & Associates Inc. (PWA)

- Soundway Consulting Inc. (Soundway)
- Synergy Software Design (SSD)
- VSolvit, LLC (VSolvit)

Evaluation Factors

The appointed Source Evaluation Board (SEB) evaluated proposals received in response to the RFP. The evaluation was conducted in accordance with the evaluation factors in Section M of the RFP. The Offerors were evaluated in alphabetical order. The RFP set forth the following three evaluation factors:

Factor 1: Mission Suitability

Factor 2: Price

Factor 3: Past Performance

The RFP stated a best value 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 scoring assigned by the SEB and price; however, the SSA would base selection on substantive proposal differences reflected by the ratings and point scores as opposed to basing selection on mere differences in ratings or scores and evaluated price. In the selection of a Contractor for contract award, Mission Suitability, Price, and Past Performance, will be of approximately equal importance. All evaluation factors other than Price, when combined, are significantly more important than Price.

Factor 1 – Mission Suitability

The SEB evaluated the ten Offerors' Technical Proposals for Mission Suitability in response to this solicitation in accordance with NFS 1815.3.

The SEB evaluated the technical approach for performing the Year 1 GSS Task Order identified as Attachment VIII of the RFP. The following was evaluated:

Roles and Responsibilities

The SEB evaluated the roles and responsibilities of the prime and any subcontracted work. In addition, the SEB evaluated the offeror's approach to initial staffing of the task, including number of personnel.

Management

The SEB evaluated the following:

- a. Description of overall management philosophy related to strategic vision for next generation GSS that will be pursued;
- b. Approaches to 1) integration of existing technologies, 2) pursuing new technologies and 3) configuration management, and
- c. Implementation approaches for the following major statement of work elements: surveying and measurement technology and spatial and relational database technology, including Building Information Model (BIM).

Risks

Identification of risks and mitigation approaches – The SEB evaluated if the identified risks comprehensively and accurately recognize the risks to successful performance of the contract and the effectiveness of the offeror's mitigation approach to each identified risk. In addition, the offeror's approach to avoid, neutralize, or mitigate each such risk during contract performance will be evaluated. One example of such a risk is technology change.

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

Adjectival ratings and percentile scores were assigned, and points calculated by multiplying the percentile score by the number of available points to obtain a Mission Suitability numerical score.

Definitions: The definitions used for classification of findings are :

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 – Price

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

The Government will conduct a price analysis by evaluating the Year 1 Task Order 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 and comparing the proposed prices to the independent Government cost estimate. The fully-burdened rates proposed in response to this solicitation will also be compared and evaluated for reasonableness.

The Government will evaluate each Offeror's Total Compensation Plan for its ability to attract and retain competent employees. The plan shall be compliant with FAR 52.222-46, Evaluation of Compensation for Professional Employees.

The Government may also consider performance risks which are apparent from the price analysis and Total Compensation Plan in making its source selection decision.

In accordance with FAR Part 15, any proposal may be rejected if the Contracting Officer determines in writing that it is unreasonable as to price. The Price Proposal evaluation will not be adjectivally rated or numerically scored.

Factor 3 – Past Performance

Under the Past Performance Factor, the SEB assessed each Offeror's record of performing services similar in size, content, and complexity to the requirements of the solicitation and assigned pertinence and performance ratings to develop the confidence level. Pursuant to NFS 1815.305(a)(2), the SEB did not assign strengths and weaknesses to Past Performance evaluations.

Specifically, the RFP stated that:

NASA will evaluate each offeror's current/recent record (including the record of any significant subcontractors, but not the past performance of individuals who are proposed to be involved in the required work), of performing services or delivering products that are similar in size, content, and complexity to the requirements of this solicitation. The Government will evaluate the past performance of the prime and each significant subcontractor considering the amount and type of work each firm is proposed to perform. The confidence rating assigned to Past Performance as listed below will reflect consideration of information contained in the proposal, past performance evaluation input provided through customer questionnaires, and data NASA obtains from other

sources. Offerors without a record of relevant past performance, or for whom information on past performance is not available, shall receive a neutral rating Past Performance Rating. The confidence ratings set forth below will be used to evaluate the Past Performance factor for each offeror.

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 recentness and duration of the past performance.

In assessing performance, the Government will make an assessment of the offeror's overall performance record. The Government will evaluate the offeror's past performance record for meeting technical, schedule, cost, management, occupational health, safety, security, overall mission success, subcontracting goals, and other contract requirements. Isolated or infrequent problems that were not severe or persistent, and for which the offeror took immediate and appropriate corrective action, may not reduce the offeror's confidence rating. On the other hand, confidence ratings will be reduced when problems were within the contractor's control and were significant, persistent, or frequent, or when there is a pattern of problems or a negative trend of performance.

Rating Definitions

The SEB used the following confidence level ratings to evaluate the Past Performance Factor (NFS 1815.305(a)(2)(A)):

Very High Level of Confidence: The Offeror's relevant past performance is of exceptional merit and is very highly pertinent to this acquisition, indicates exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner and 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. Offeror's past performance indicates that contract requirements were accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part, with only minor problems that had 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. Performance was fully responsive to contract requirements; there may have been 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. Offeror achieved adequate results; there may have been 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 was required in one or more areas. Performance problems occurred in one or more areas which, adversely affected 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, a SEB was appointed by the SSA to evaluate proposals received in response to the RFP. The SEB evaluated proposals in accordance with Section M of the RFP. The SEB began their evaluation upon receipt of the Past Performance Volumes (Volume III), which were received from some of the Offerors prior to the proposal due date. The SEB 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 SEB reviewed each Offeror's submitted contracts, comparing the scope of work previously performed to the scope of work in the GSS Statement of Work as well as year one task. The SEB also reviewed the past performance information to determine size and complexity pertinence for each Offeror (prime and significant subcontractor only). The SEB then reviewed the Technical Proposals for each Offeror to determine which entity (prime and/or subcontractor) is proposed to perform various sections of the statement of work. The SEB then assigned an overall pertinence rating for each Offeror based on an integrated assessment of the size, content, and complexity for each Offeror. The SEB collected and reviewed performance information on all Offerors and significant subcontractors, and assigned an overall performance rating for each Offeror. The SEB then assigned an overall past performance confidence rating for each Offeror, based on the performance and pertinence ratings.

Upon receipt of the Technical and the Business Proposals, the SEB initially reviewed each Volume, with the Price Analyst providing a review of the Factor 2 Price proposal information, to determine if any were unacceptable proposals as defined in NASA FAR Supplement 1815.305-70. Each model contract, applicable terms and conditions, and Representations and Certifications for each Offeror were reviewed and all proposals were acceptable and warranted a full evaluation.

The SEB members performed a detailed individual review of each Offeror's Technical Proposal per the RFP section L.14. Factor I Mission Suitability. After completion of the individual evaluations, the SEB convened to discuss and develop the individual findings for each of the Offerors. Having an individual review and then meeting to develop consensus findings was repeated for each Offeror. The SEB also agreed on assigning "significant" findings when applicable. 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 Offerors, the SEB assigned adjectival ratings and percentage scores based on the consensus findings to derive the overall Mission Suitability point score in accordance with NFS 1815.305.

The SEB reviewed each Offeror's price proposal to determine whether the prices proposed were reasonable, realistic and consistent with the technical approach. The price proposals were assessed to ensure compliance with the Price evaluation factor. The SEB provided the results of its review to the Price Analyst who incorporated the results into the analysis of the Offeror's price proposals.

The Contracting Officer carefully reviewed the facts presented in the initial findings and discussed the findings with the SEB. The RFP stated the Government anticipated award would be made without discussions as stated in RFP provisions 52.215-1, Instructions to Offerors- Competitive Acquisition and L.15 and based on the initial findings of the SEB, 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 September 18, 2015, to present its findings.

Evaluation Findings

Factor 1 – Mission Suitability

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

Offeror	Adjective Rating	Score
Aerial Data Services	Good	660
American Infotech Solutions	Fair	370
Barbaricum, LLC	Fair	470
Dynamix Corp	Poor	270
Marstell-Day LLC	Good	650
Midland GSS JV	Excellent	940
Pro West and Associates	Fair	420
Soundway Consulting Inc.	Fair	350
Synergy Software Design	Fair	470
VSolvit LLC	Good	700

The following is each Offeror's findings as presented to me. All significant strengths, strengths, significant weaknesses and weaknesses are listed below.

Offeror #1: Aerial Data Services

Adjective rating: Good / 660

Roles and Responsibilities:

The Offeror was assigned a strength for their thorough understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the prime and subcontract work and their approach to initial staffing of the contract including the number of personnel needed to perform the GSS contract. The Offeror describes numerous reach-back capabilities of the prime and subcontractors which are located throughout the United States. Having access to these additional resources can potentially prevent delays in providing products and services. The overall approach demonstrates the capability to fully staff and execute all facets of the contract.

The Offeror was assigned a weakness due to their approach to split the Project Manager/Programmer as part of their staffing approach which is not adequate concerning the

roles and responsibilities. The Offeror indicates they will hire incumbent personnel including the manager. However, if the incumbent manager is not hired, the Offeror proposes a 75% - 25% split between the prime and subcontractor for this position. The manager position is described in the business proposal only referencing the 75% - 25% split between the prime and subcontractor. The Offeror's staffing approach does not explain how a 75%-25% split across the prime and subcontractor would be managed.

Management:

The Offeror was assigned a strength for its approach to configuration management in detail addressing the requirement for the Configuration Management and Maturity Integration for Services (CMMI-SVC) key elements of: baselines, track and control changes, and establish integrity. The Offeror indicates utilization of reach-back capability to provide certified Lead Appraisers to implement and validate their Configuration Management Program. The Offeror's proposal demonstrates their knowledge of the structured processes and resources that would provide configuration management.

The Offeror was assigned a strength for its implementation approaches of survey and measurement technology to perform the GSS contract. The Offeror describes measurement processes for validation of ground (or geodetic) control monuments, and defines the approach for verification of the LaRC Geodetic Network and establishing coordinates for the LaRC base station relocation in year one of the task. This approach allows successful relocation of the base station and enables a complete and accurate integration (network solution) within the LaRC Geodetic Network in year one of the contract.

While the Offeror did address several key elements of survey and measurement technology in the statement of work (SOW) as indicated above, they were assigned a weakness as they did not address: spatial data collection for plant and building interiors, marking nor stakeout of locations for facilities and utility systems. Further, they did not address utilizing high precision measurements systems such as Optical Total Station (OTS) with Integrated Survey nor Digital Level for precision data collection within and around facilities.

Risks: No findings

Offeror #2: American Infotech Solutions Adjective rating: Fair / 370

Roles and Responsibilities:

The Offeror was assigned a weakness as they did not demonstrate an adequate understanding of roles and responsibilities of the prime and subcontract work and their approach to initial staffing of the contract including the number of personnel to perform the GSS contract. While the Offeror states they have executed a commitment letter for the on-site project manager (page 4), the Offeror does not describe what elements of work the prime and subcontractors are responsible for, nor identify the number of personnel assigned to the prime or subcontractor. Further, the Offeror does not address the GSS RFP requirement to staff the 80% of the personnel on-site. Without this information, it is not possible to verify that the proposed staffing is adequate.

Management:

The Offeror was assigned a significant weakness as they did not demonstrate an adequate understanding for the implementation approaches of survey and measurement technology to

perform the GSS contract. The Offeror did not address key elements of survey and measurement technology in the SOW such as: spatial data collection for plant and building interiors, marking or stakeout of locations for facilities and utility systems, utilizing high precision measurements systems such as: Real Time Kinematic (RTK), Global Positioning System (GPS), OTS with Integrated Survey, or utilizing Digital Level for precision data collection within and around facilities. Also, the Offeror did not discuss the LaRC Geodetic Network set forth in year one Task Order. The narrative provides no indication the Offeror could complete the objective in moving the base station within the schedule and performance criteria defined in the year one task order.

The Offeror was assigned a weakness for their approach to configuration management does not address the requirement for the CMMI-SVC key elements of: baselines, track and control changes, and establish integrity.

The Offeror was assigned a weakness as they did not demonstrate an adequate understanding for the implementation approaches of BIM to perform the GSS contract. The proposal did not address BIM, nor mention key elements such as: AutoDesk®Revit® files, storing them on the Clarity Server, nor standardizing the data in a Construction-Operations Building Information Exchange (COBie) format to allow bulk upload or update of files.

Risks:

The Offeror was assigned a strength for their risk analysis as they identified appropriate risks and mitigation approaches and included a table with: 1) failure to achieve retention goals of incumbent LITES contractor personnel and includes the mitigation strategy of reach-out to incumbent personnel prior to proposal submittal; and 2) a risk of technology change with a mitigation strategy of partner corporate reach back and employee training plans.

Offeror #3: Barbaricum LLC

Adjective rating: Fair / 470

Roles and Responsibilities:

The Offeror was assigned a significant weakness as they did not demonstrate an adequate understanding of roles and responsibilities of the prime and subcontract work and their approach to initial staffing of the contract including the number of personnel needed to perform the GSS contract. The Offeror does not describe the functional distribution of work for either the prime or its subcontractors. Further, there are no references made to indicate the number of personnel available for contract performance, although the Offeror's proposal describes deploying their "Recruiter, Director of Operations, and Partner of the firm" to facilitate personnel transition for contract start up. Additionally, the Offeror does not address the GSS RFP requirement to staff the manager and 80% of the personnel on-site. Without this information, it is not possible to verify that the proposed staffing approach is adequate.

Management:

The Offeror was assigned a strength for their understanding of implementation approaches for spatial and relational database technology. The Offeror provides a detailed database administration plan that addressed performance tuning of the integrated environment for Oracle and Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI) databases. As a result, the databases managed by the Contractor would be fully optimized and accurate providing current GSS products and services.

The Offeror was assigned a strength for their approach to configuration management which details an implementation for the CMMI-SVC key elements of: baselines, track and control changes, and establish integrity. The proposal describes the different data models that would be documented and tracked and a standard to identify the current version (page 5). Further, the narrative detailed the emergency and routine procedure paths to allow for categorizing and prioritizing changes or updates.

Risks: No findings

Offeror #4: Dynamix Corp

Adjective rating: Poor / 270

Roles and Responsibilities:

The Offeror was assigned a significant weakness as they did not demonstrate an adequate understanding of roles and responsibilities of the prime and subcontract work and their approach to initial staffing of the contract including the number of personnel needed to perform the GSS contract. The Offeror does not identify the functional distribution of work for either the prime or its subcontractors. The prime only identified the total number of personnel. Further, the Offeror does not address the GSS RFP requirement to staff 80% of the personnel and manager on-site. Without this information, it is not possible to verify that the proposed staffing approach is adequate.

Management:

The Offeror was assigned a weakness as they did not demonstrate an adequate understanding relating to the strategic vision for next generation GSS. The Offeror proposes a consolidation of Information Technology operations (page 3), but does not indicate what data or systems would be affected, or that the proposed approach would be modeled and integrated in a test environment for functionality and reliability prior to implementation. The hardware and software consolidation mentioned is done without detailing products or services affected and how a consolidation would be of benefit without a decrease in the capability or availability of the products and services currently provided within the GSS environment (as described in the RFP background information).

The Offeror was assigned a significant weakness as they did not demonstrate an adequate understanding for the implementation approaches of survey and measurement technology. The Offeror did not demonstrate how the use of Baker's patented and proprietary Geolink® GPS/GIS mapping System software would align or integrate with the current LaRC GSS Trimble/ ESRI-based environment. The Offeror did not discuss the LaRC Geodetic Network set forth in year one Task Order. Also, the narrative provides no indication the Offeror could complete the objective in moving the base station within the schedule and performance criteria defined in the year one task order. Further, the Offeror did not address key elements such as: spatial data collection for plant and building interiors, marking or stakeout of locations for facilities and utility systems, or utilizing high precision measurements systems such as: RTK, GPS, OTS with Integrated Survey, or Digital Level for precision data collection within and around facilities. It is unclear how the survey and measurement technology requirements for year one task order would be met.

The Offeror was assigned a weakness as they did not demonstrate an adequate understanding of implementation approaches to BIM. The Offeror describes using their subcontractor's approach in BIM (and their guide for best practices) referencing the US Army Corps of Engineer's Spatial Data Standards for Facilities Infrastructure and Environment and also

Architectural Engineering Construction Computer Aided Design standards. However this approach does not address the GSS contract's key elements of BIM such as: AutoDesk® Revit® files management, or standardizing the data format to COBie standards for bulk upload or update of files. Further, the Clarity storage environment is not addressed in the areas relating to: BIM, integrating existing technologies, or pursuing new technologies. Last, the Offerors' proposal of integrating Tririga® and BIM is not compatible with the current operational GSS environment at LaRC (as described in Exhibit A, SOW, background information). It is unclear how the BIM requirements for year one task order would be met.

The Offeror was assigned a weakness as they did not demonstrate an adequate understanding for the implementation approaches of spatial and relationship database technology. While the Offeror identifies some generic characteristics of spatial data and relational databases, there is a lack of information regarding how the Offeror would manage LaRC spatial data in an ESRI environment. The Offeror's mention of ArcGIS Server is relevant, however the mention of the ArcIMS and ArcView application (page 6) illustrates the use of dated technology and a lack of familiarity and knowledge of the GSS spatial data environment of ESRI Portal at LaRC. There is no mention of an ability to manage existing interoperability of spatial and relational databases, nor proposed methods or techniques to enhance interoperability in the future.

Risks:

The Offeror was assigned a significant weakness as they did not demonstrate an adequate understanding of the risks and mitigation approaches to perform the GSS contract. While the Offeror's Risk Assessment Tool addresses a structured and methodical approach to mitigating risk, no specific risks or mitigations were identified. The Offeror identified no risks to successful performance of the contract. Since no risks were identified, the Offeror addressed no approach to avoid, neutralize, or mitigate risks. This failure to address was potentially because the Offeror exceeded the 8-page proposal limitation so a risk mitigation "sample" table was not evaluated.

Offeror #5: Marstell-Day LLC

Adjective rating: Good / 650

Roles and Responsibilities:

No findings

Management:

The Offeror was assigned a strength for their understanding of the approaches to integration of existing technologies as it applies to spatial and relational database technology requirements for the GSS contract performance. The Offeror's understanding of LaRC's spatial and non-spatial data as demonstrated by their references to ArcGIS Spatial Data Engine (SDE) on top of Oracle-based RDBMS indicates the Offeror can readily produce and deliver a model of existing data. Additionally, the Offeror would search for efficiencies, consolidate or streamline and advance the GSS suite of services.

The Offeror was assigned a significant weakness as they did not demonstrate an adequate understanding for the implementation approaches of survey and measurement technology. The Offeror did not address key elements such as spatial data collection for plant and building interiors, marking or stakeout of locations for facilities and utility systems, or utilizing high precision measurements systems such as: RTK, GPS, and Integrated Survey, nor Digital Level for precision data collection within and around facilities. The Offeror addressed no measurement guidelines and standards. There was no discussion relating to LaRC Geodetic Network or the base station move and the narrative provides no indication the Offeror could complete the

objective of moving the base station within the schedule and performance criteria defined in the task order.

Risks:

The Offeror was assigned a significant strength for their thorough understanding in stating the identification of risks and mitigation approaches to perform the GSS contract. The Offeror's risk analysis identified management and technology risks, mitigation strategy, impact, and the probability of occurrence for the risks listed. The Offeror's risk analysis matrix includes risks such as: 1) a risk of the loss of incumbent LITES contractor personnel and related knowledge; 2) a risk of a loss of servers and networks managed by others; and 3) software related risks: development, implementations and upgrades.

Offeror #6: Midland GSS JV

Adjective rating: Excellent / 940

Roles and Responsibilities:

The Offeror was assigned a significant strength for their thorough understanding of roles and responsibilities of the prime and subcontract work and their approach to initial staffing of the contract including the number of personnel needed to perform the GSS contract. The Offeror detailed the initial staffing to include the number of personnel (page 3). The proposal also includes the personnel structured by prime and subcontractor (page 3). The Offeror provided a proposed organization chart structured by logical functional areas of work: Operations, Development, and Survey. In addition, the offeror proposes a technical outreach approach that integrates existing technologies and evaluates the latest technology through a technology outreach team. These well-defined roles will provide a basis for a strategic management capability for NASA Langley GSS. Additionally, the Offeror has executed commitment letters for all incumbent personnel including the on-site project manager. This proposed approach prevents potential losses due to knowledge capture failures. Further, the Offeror details a plan to cross train personnel which would provide the ability to cross-utilize personnel to reduce one-deep skill set situations.

The Offeror was assigned a weakness as they did not clearly address the GSS RFP requirement to staff 80% of the personnel on-site. This element of their staffing approach is not complete.

Management:

The Offeror was assigned a strength for their thorough understanding of the overall management philosophy for strategic vision for next generation GSS. The Offeror proposed the development and delivery of a five year strategic plan within 90 days of award. The plan would guide next generation technologies outlining key drivers and recommendations that would address issues such as: improving work flows, multiplatform access, and cost savings by economies of scale with an end result of benefitting LaRC.

The Offeror was assigned a strength for their understanding for the implementation approaches for survey and measurement technology. The Offeror fully details the application of geodetic control for survey and measurement. Further, the Offeror addresses key elements such as spatial data collection for plant and building interiors, marking or stakeout of locations for facilities and utility systems, and utilizing high precision measurements systems such as: RTK, GPS and OTS for precision data collection within and around facilities.

The Offeror was assigned a strength for their implementation approaches of configuration management. The Offeror describes (page 6) its approach to configuration management by the use of Git and Concurrent Versioning System software. As a result, benefits would be gained in specific areas such as: data quality, schema change, source code, and management of software.

The Offeror was assigned a weakness for their approach to configuration management as it does not address the CMMI-SVC standard nor its elements of baselines, track and control changes, and establish integrity.

Risks:

The Offeror was assigned a significant strength for their understanding of risks and mitigation approaches. The Offeror's risk analysis matrix includes a comprehensive process Risk Informed Decision Making matrix. The Offeror includes a numerical scoring system to assess risks including the probability of occurrence and appropriate mitigations.

The table included risks such as: 1) loss of LITES contractor incumbent personnel and knowledge loss as the highest priority, with the mitigation of signed letters of commitment by all incumbent personnel; 2) priority shifts or changes in technology with acceptable mitigation strategies for both risks; and 3) reduction in contract dollar value with a mitigation to develop other IDIQ work to at least offset the reduced contract value.

Offeror # 7: Pro West & Associates

Adjective rating: Fair / 420

Roles and Responsibilities:

The Offeror was assigned a weakness as they did not adequately demonstrate an understanding of the prime and subcontractor roles and responsibilities. Although the Offeror describes the total number of personnel for staffing, the distribution of work between the prime and two significant subcontractors is not defined. Further, on-site leadership is not well defined since an on-site project manager or team lead is not mentioned. Finally, The Offeror does not address the contract requirement to staff the manager or 80% of the personnel on-site. Without this information, it is not possible to verify that the proposed staffing approach is adequate.

Management:

The Offeror was assigned a strength for their understanding of implementation approaches for overall management philosophy for strategic vision for next generation GSS. The Offeror demonstrates an understanding of technology and requirements based on extensive spatial and relational database proposed solutions. The proposal outlines people, processes, and tools in detail (page 3 and 4) and also explains how this will be a benefit at LaRC with emphasis on migration to any device (i.e. portable or hand held devices). Their high-level ESRI partnerships could prove beneficial in facilitating reach-back and access to emerging technologies.

The Offeror was assigned a strength for its approach to configuration management as they address the CMMI-SVC key elements of: baselines, track and control changes, and establish integrity. The Offeror proposed the use of Git in software configuration management and JIRA™ to automate and track the approval routing process.

The Offeror was assigned a weakness as they did not demonstrate an adequate understanding for the implementation approaches of survey and measurement technology. While the Offeror's

mention of using stationary and mobile LIDAR was germane, the potential gains or yields in using Baker's proprietary patented GeoLink® GPS/GIS mapping system software was not explained by the Offeror. Further, the Offeror did not explain how it would function within the current LaRC Trimble environment.

The Offeror was assigned a weakness as they did not demonstrate an adequate understanding for the implementation approaches of survey and measurement technology to perform the GSS contract. The proposal did not address key elements such as: spatial data collection for plant and building interiors, marking or stakeout of locations for facilities and utility systems, utilizing high precision measurements systems such as: RTK, GPS, OTS with Integrated Survey, or utilizing Digital Level for precision data collection within and around facilities.

Risks: No findings

Offeror #8: SoundWay Consulting, Inc. Adjective rating: Fair / 350

Roles and Responsibilities:

The Offeror was assigned a weakness as they did not demonstrate an understanding of roles and responsibilities. The contract requires a single on-site Project Manager/ Programmer to support multiple tasks. The Offeror proposed an off-site program manager and on-site task order managers spread between the prime and subcontractors depending on who is best qualified to manage a task.

Management:

The Offeror was assigned a significant weakness as they did not demonstrate an adequate understanding of the strategic vision for next generation GSS approaches. The Offeror describes a strategic vision which would employ a cloud technology such as Google that is not directly compatible with the LaRC ERSI environment as it impacts GSS products and services and also potentially degrades level of accuracy of these products. Initiatives to employ Google (Cloud) and open source solutions would require a significant change in basic structure of the current LaRC ERSI environment. Also the Offeror proposes an encrypted web-accessible portal for status reporting, artifact/deliverable storage, and collaboration. The approach is unclear since the GSS deliverables are developed and stored within the LaRC firewall. The Offeror did not clearly indicate why storage outside the LaRC firewall is proposed, necessary, or desirable. Further, doing so is not in accordance with the RFP requirements. Also, the proposal includes distribution of map books via TerraGo GeoPDFs and open source solutions; this is not directly compatible with the current LaRC Portal environment. Further, for these proposed technologies, the implementation phase is not addressed. No mention of tracking or modeling environments are proposed. There is no plan to run tests for the products or their integration in a test environment for functionality and reliability. The initiatives are presented by the Offeror without evaluating or detailing the potential constraints or drawbacks.

The Offeror was assigned a weakness as they did not demonstrate an adequate understanding for the implementation approaches of survey and measurement technology. The Offeror did not address key elements such as spatial data collection for plant and building interiors, marking or stakeout of locations for facilities and utility systems, or utilizing high precision measurements systems such as: RTK, GPS, and OTS with Integrated Survey for precision data collection within and around facilities. While the Offeror addresses moving the base station (page 5) within the schedule and performance criteria defined in the GSS contract, the calibration method is not

optimal, because it does not utilize a geodetic network solution so that the coordinates of the new location fits within the existing network.

The Offeror was assigned a weakness as they did not demonstrate an adequate understanding for the implementation approaches of BIM. The proposal did not address BIM, nor mention key elements such as: AutoDesk®Revit® files, storing them on the Clarity Server, or standardizing the data in a COBie format to allow bulk upload or update of files.

Risks: No findings

Offeror #9: Synergy Software Design

Adjective rating: Fair / 470

Roles and Responsibilities:

The Offeror was assigned a weakness as they did not demonstrate an adequate understanding of roles and responsibilities. The Offeror does not address the GSS RFP requirement to staff the project manager and 80% of the personnel on-site. In addition, the Offeror's proposal eliminates a specified resource, the Measurement Technology Specialist, without explaining how the responsibility would be addressed by the remaining staff in the other labor categories. While the Offeror mentions their agile approach, cross-training, and highly qualified personnel, they offered no specific details how they could satisfy the RFP requirements. Without this information, it is not possible to verify that the Offeror's staffing plan is adequate.

Management:

The Offeror was assigned a strength for its approach to configuration management in detail and addresses the requirement for the CMMI-SVC key elements of: baselines, track and control changes, and establish integrity. The Offeror proposes several software approaches to configuration management. Git is currently in use at LaRC and expanding their utility would be at little or no cost while achieving elements of configuration management.

The Offeror was assigned a significant weakness as they did not demonstrate an adequate understanding for the implementation approaches of spatial and relational database technology. The Offeror does not address applying GSS spatial data applications (such as ArcSDE) to maintain or enhance the interfaces between spatial and relational databases. The proposal only mentions routine database administration with no development or enhancement initiatives. The Offeror's mention of ArcGIS Server is relevant, however, proposing the Flex application illustrates the use of dated technology and a lack of familiarity and knowledge of the environment at LaRC (as described in the RFP background information). Further, the Offeror proposes capturing the 3D storm drain model in AutoDesk Civil 3D rather than providing the model in an ESRI-based environment as required by Exhibit A, SOW. Providing the model in AutoDesk Civil 3D is a sub-optimal approach, limiting the utility of the model and illustrates the lack of familiarity and knowledge of the GSS spatial data environment at LaRC (as described in the RFP background information).

Risks: No findings

Roles and Responsibilities:

The Offeror was assigned a significant weakness as they did not demonstrate an adequate understanding of roles and responsibilities of the prime and subcontract work and their approach to initial staffing of the contract, including the number of personnel needed to perform the GSS contract. The Offeror does not address its approach to initial staffing including number of personnel, nor does the Offeror clarify role and responsibilities among the prime and subcontractors. Additionally, the Offeror does not address the GSS RFP requirement to staff the project manager on-site nor 80% of the personnel on-site. Without this information, it is not possible to verify that the Offeror's proposed staffing is adequate. The technical proposal identifies possible subcontractors but none are reflected in the Business Proposal.

Management:

The Offeror was assigned a significant strength for its thorough understanding of spatial and relational database technology. The Offeror demonstrates the capability to enable spatial and relational data base interfaces and information exchanges. The gap analysis between ArcGIS and Maximo demonstrates the Offeror's familiarity with spatial and relations database exchanges as well as the GSS data environment at LaRC. The Offeror proposes evaluating ERSI's implementation of the recently developed Facilities Interior Space Data Model and determine if an existing data model can be used to increase the effectiveness and efficiencies of LaRC's spatial data. Additionally, the Offeror includes evaluation of ESRI's Diagrammer to develop the data model's Entity Relationship diagram and addresses a capability to extract-transmit-load data for cooperative data sharing among LaRC's GSS partners. Further, their recently licensed Space Optimization algorithm utilized at LaRC has the potential for additional capabilities relating to both spatial and relational databases.

The Offeror was assigned a strength for its understanding of integration of existing technologies. The proposal describes efforts to enhance Facilities Portal and change schema which will prove beneficial by increasing the ability to integrate data from geospatial and relational databases. The end result would be a GSS Portal environment with increased capabilities for LaRC.

The Offeror was assigned a strength for its approaches to configuration management in detail (page 3) and addresses the requirement for the CMMI-SVC key elements of: baselines, track and control changes, and establish integrity. The approach also includes several software approaches to configuration management relevant to LaRC. Git and JIRA™ are both currently in use at LaRC and expanding their utility would be at little or no cost while achieving elements of configuration management.

Risks: No findings

Factor 2, Price

The Government analyzed the proposed prices to assess price reasonableness and to determine whether the Offerors demonstrated a clear understanding of the requirement and could perform the contract for the price stated. Specifically, the evaluations included, but was not limited to, comparing the prices proposed in response to this solicitation and comparing the proposed prices to the independent Government cost estimate. The fully-burdened rates proposed in response to this solicitation were also compared and evaluated for reasonableness.

The table below reflects the prices from highest to lowest.

OFFEROR	PROPOSED PRICE
ADS	Highest
PWA	2 nd Highest
Barbaricum	3 rd Highest
Marstell-Day	4 th Highest
Soundway	5 th Highest
Midland	5 th Lowest (\$2,034,847)
AIS	4 th Lowest
Dynamix	3 rd Lowest
VSolvit	2 nd Lowest
SSD	Lowest

Factor 3, Past Performance

The SEB evaluated the Offeror teams' (prime and significant subcontractors) past performance records in accordance with Section M.2c of the RFP. The SEB considered the Offeror's records of previous or current contracts similar in size, content, and complexity to the GSS 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
Aerial Data Services Inc.	Pertinent (VHP/P/YES)	Exceptional	MODERATE
American Infotech Solutions	Pertinent (VHP/P/YES)	Exceptional	MODERATE
Barbaricum, LLC	Pertinent (VHP/P/YES)	Exceptional	MODERATE
Dynamix Corporation	Highly Pertinent (VHP/HP/YES)	Exceptional	HIGH
Marstell-Day LLC	Pertinent (VHP/P/YES)	Very Good	MODERATE
Midland GSS JV	Highly Pertinent (VHP/HP/YES)	Exceptional	HIGH
Pro West & Associates Inc.	Pertinent (VHP/P/YES)	Exceptional	MODERATE
Soundway Consulting, Inc.	Pertinent (VHP/P/YES)	Exceptional	MODERATE
Synergy Software Design	Pertinent (VHP/P/YES)	Exceptional	MODERATE
V-Solvit	Highly Pertinent (VHP/HP/YES)	Exceptional	HIGH

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

Aerial Data Services Inc.

The SEB assigned a confidence rating of Moderate for the Offeror's Factor 3, Past Performance. For overall Pertinence, a rating of Pertinent was assigned, where size, content, and complexity were reviewed. For size, ADS was rated Very Highly Pertinent based on three subcontractor references. For overall content, ADS was assigned a rating of Pertinent based on a Highly Pertinent for Spatial Data Management & Decision Support Environment, Somewhat Pertinent for Survey & Measurement Capabilities, Did Not Address for BIM Support, and a Highly Pertinent for Contract Management. For complexity, ADS was assigned a rating of "Yes" based on three of the nine past performance narratives were found to contain adequate references to work that warrants the Yes complexity rating.

For overall performance, ADS was rated Exceptional based on a preponderance of their references for the prime and the subcontractor. Therefore, the ADS Overall Pertinence rating of Pertinent and Overall Exceptional Performance rating resulted in a Moderate Level of Confidence for the Past Performance factor.

American Infotech Solutions Inc.

The SEB assigned a confidence rating of Moderate for the Offeror's Factor 3, Past Performance. For overall Pertinence, a rating of Pertinent was assigned, where size, content, and complexity were reviewed. For size, AIS was assigned a rating of Very Highly Pertinent based on both subcontractors having three Very Highly Pertinent ratings. For overall content, AIS was assigned a rating of Pertinent based on a rating of Highly Pertinent for Spatial Data Management & Decision Support, a rating of Did Not Address for Survey & Measurement Capabilities, a rating of Did Not Address for BIM Support, and rating of Very Highly Pertinent for Contract Management. For complexity, AIS was assigned a rating of "Yes" for the team. The prime had one complex narrative. The subcontractors, AS&M had one and CSC had three narratives rated complex.

For overall performance, AIS was rated Exceptional based on a preponderance of their references for the prime and the subcontractor. Therefore, the AIS Overall Pertinence rating of Pertinent and Overall Exceptional Performance rating resulted in a Moderate Level of Confidence for the Past Performance factor.

Barbaricum LLC

The SEB assigned a confidence rating of Moderate for the Offeror's Factor 3, Past Performance. For overall Pertinence, a rating of Pertinent was assigned, where size, content, and complexity were reviewed. For size, Barbaricum assigned a rating of Very Highly Pertinent based on both the prime and subcontractor having one reference rated Very Highly Pertinent. For overall content, Barbaricum was assigned a rating of Pertinent, based on a rating of Pertinent for Spatial Data Management & Decision Support Environment, a rating of Highly Pertinent for Survey & Measurement Capabilities, a rating of Did Not Address for BIM Support, and a rating of Highly Pertinent for Contract Management. For complexity, Barbaricum was assigned a rating of "Yes" for the team. The prime did not demonstrate complexity in their narratives, but the subcontractor demonstrated complexity in two of the three narratives.

For overall performance, Barbaricum was rated Exceptional based on a preponderance of their references for the prime and the subcontractor. Therefore the Barbaricum Overall Pertinence rating of Pertinent and Overall Exceptional Performance rating resulted in a Moderate Level of Confidence for the Past Performance factor.

Dynamix Corporation

The SEB assigned a confidence rating of High for the Offeror's Factor 3, Past Performance. For overall Pertinence, a rating of Highly Pertinent was assigned, where size, content, and complexity were reviewed. For size, Dynamix was assigned a rating of Very Highly Pertinent, based on both subcontractors having three Very Highly Pertinent ratings. For content, Dynamix was assigned a rating of Highly Pertinent, based on the ratings from each of the four categories defined on the questionnaire: a rating of Highly Pertinent for Spatial Data Management & Decision Support Environment, a rating of Somewhat Pertinent for Survey & Measurement Capabilities, a rating of Pertinent for BIM Support, a rating of Very Highly Pertinent for Contract Management. For complexity, Dynamix was assigned a rating of "Yes" for the team. The prime and subcontractors had demonstrated complexity in their narratives in at least one case for each company.

For overall performance, Dynamix was rated Exceptional based on a preponderance of their references for both prime and the subcontractors. Therefore, the Dynamix Overall Pertinence rating of Highly Pertinent and Overall Exceptional Performance rating resulted in a High Level of Confidence for the Past Performance factor.

Marstell-Day LLC

The SEB assigned a confidence rating of Moderate for the Offeror's Factor 3, Past Performance. For overall Pertinence, a rating of Pertinent was assigned, where size, content, and complexity were reviewed. For size, Marstell-Day was assigned a rating of Very Highly Pertinent based on the subcontractor, Atkins, rated as Very Highly Pertinent on two of three references. For content, Marstell-Day was assigned a rating of Pertinent based on the ratings from each of the four categories defined on the questionnaire: a rating of Pertinent for Spatial Data Management & Decision Support Environment, a rating of Pertinent for Survey & Measurement Capabilities, a rating of Somewhat Pertinent for BIM Support, and a rating of Highly Pertinent for Contract Management. For complexity, Marstell-Day was assigned a rating of "Yes" for the team. The prime demonstrated complexity in one of three narratives.

For overall performance, Marstell-Day was rated Very Good based on a preponderance of their references for the prime and subcontractor. Therefore, the Marstell-Day Overall Pertinence rating of Pertinent and Overall Very Good Performance rating resulted in a Moderate Level of Confidence for the Past Performance factor.

Midland GSS JV

The SEB assigned a confidence rating of High for the Offeror's Factor 3, Past Performance. For overall Pertinence, a rating of Highly Pertinent was assigned, where size, content, and complexity were reviewed. For size, Midland was rated Very Highly Pertinent based on the subcontractor, Genex, rated as Very Highly Pertinent on one reference. For content, Midland was rated Highly Pertinent, based on a rating of Very Highly Pertinent for Spatial Data Management & Decision Support Environment, Very Highly Pertinent for Survey & Measurement Capabilities, Did Not Address for BIM Support, and Very Highly Pertinent for Contract Management. The subcontractor was found to have past performance in the areas of BIM and was rated Highly Pertinent; however, they were not proposed to do work in this category. As a result, the subcontractor BIM rating was not used in this evaluation. For complexity, Midland was rated "Yes" based on both the prime and subcontractor having adequate references to warrant the Yes complexity rating in five of their six narratives.

For overall performance, Midland was rated Exceptional based on a preponderance of their references for the prime and the subcontractor. Therefore, the Midland Overall Pertinence rating

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

Pro West & Associates Inc.

The SEB assigned a confidence rating of Moderate for the Offeror's Factor 3, Past Performance. For overall Pertinence, a rating of Pertinent was assigned, where size, content, and complexity were reviewed. For size, PWA was rated Pertinent based the subcontractor, GISi, rated as Very Highly Pertinent on two of three references. For content, PWA was rated Pertinent, based on a rating of Highly Pertinent for Spatial Data Management & Decision Support Environment, a rating of Somewhat Pertinent for Survey & Measurement Capabilities, a rating of Did Not Address for BIM Support, and a rating of Highly Pertinent for Contract Management. Based on the prime's business proposal, Michael Baker (MB) was found not to be a significant subcontractor. Therefore, the MB past performance information was not used in this evaluation. For complexity, PWA was rated "Yes" for the team. The prime was found not to have demonstrated complexity in their narratives, but the subcontractors did in three of their six narratives.

For overall performance, PWA was rated Exceptional based on a preponderance of the references for the prime and the subcontractor. Therefore, the PWA Overall Pertinence rating of Pertinent and Overall Exceptional Performance rating resulted in a Moderate Level of Confidence for the Past Performance factor.

Soundway Consulting Inc.

The SEB assigned a confidence rating of Moderate for the Offeror's Factor 3, Past Performance. For overall Pertinence, a rating of Pertinent was assigned, where size, content, and complexity were reviewed. For size, Soundway was rated Very Highly Pertinent based on two Thermopylae and two OG Systems references. For content, Soundway was rated Pertinent, based on the following ratings Pertinent for Spatial Data Management & Decision Support Environment, Somewhat Pertinent for Survey & Measurement Capabilities, Did Not Address for BIM Support, and Highly Pertinent for Contract Management. One subcontractor, OGS, had past performance references in relating to the area of Survey & Measurement and was initially rated Pertinent; however, OGS was not proposed to do work in this category. As a result, this category was rated Somewhat Pertinent based on work done by WadeLynn. For complexity, Soundway was rated "Yes" for the team based on two of the nine subcontractor past performance narratives.

For overall performance, Soundway was rated Exceptional based on a preponderance of references from the prime and the subcontractors. Therefore, the Soundway Overall Pertinence rating of Pertinent and Overall Exceptional Performance rating resulted in a Moderate Level of Confidence for the Past Performance factor.

Synergy Software Design

The SEB assigned a confidence rating of Moderate for the Offeror's Factor 3, Past Performance. For overall Pertinence, a rating of Pertinent was assigned, where size, content, and complexity were reviewed. For size, SSD was rated Very Highly Pertinent was based on the subcontractor, Critigen, rated as Very Highly Pertinent on two of three references. For content, SSD was rated Pertinent, based on the following ratings Pertinent for Spatial Data Management & Decision Support Environment, Somewhat Pertinent for Survey & Measurement Capabilities, Did Not Address for BIM Support, and Highly Pertinent for Contract Management. The prime, SSD, was found to have past performance in the area of Survey & Measurement, and was initially rated Somewhat Pertinent; however, they were not proposed to do work in this category. As a result, this category was rated Somewhat Pertinent based on work done by the

subcontractor, Critigen. For complexity, SSD was rated "Yes" for the team based on a Critigen past performance narrative.

For overall performance, SSD was rated Exceptional based on a preponderance of references from the prime and the subcontractors. Therefore, the SSD Overall Pertinence rating of Pertinent and Overall Exceptional Performance rating resulted in a Moderate Level of Confidence for the Past Performance factor.

VSolvit LLC

The SEB assigned a confidence rating of High for the Offeror's Factor 3, Past Performance. For overall Pertinence, a rating of Highly Pertinent was assigned, where size, content, and complexity were reviewed. For size, VSolvit was rated Very Highly Pertinent based on VSolvit being rated as Very Highly Pertinent on two of three references. For content, VSolvit was rated Highly Pertinent, based on the following ratings Very Highly Pertinent for Spatial Data Management & Decision Support Environment, Pertinent for Survey & Measurement Capabilities, Did Not Address for BIM Support and Very Highly Pertinent for Contract Management. For complexity, VSolvit was rated "Yes" based on two of three narratives with adequate references to warrant the Yes complexity rating.

For overall performance, VSolvit was rated Exceptional based on a preponderance of their references. Therefore, the VSolvit Overall Pertinence rating of Highly Pertinent and Overall Exceptional Performance rating resulted in a High Level of Confidence for the Past Performance factor.

SOURCE SELECTION DECISION

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 in the RFP and considered their relative weights in the selection of the Offeror that can perform the contract in a manner most advantageous to the Government.

In making the selection decision, I conducted an integrated assessment of each proposal and considered the relative weight of the evaluation factors as indicated in the RFP recognizing the three evaluation factors to be approximately equal in importance, with Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, significantly more important than Price.

Reviewing all the information, I find that Midland's proposal provides superior benefit in Mission Suitability compared to any other offeror. Of all the proposals, Midland was the only Offeror to demonstrate exceptional merit in Mission Suitability and to warrant an "Excellent" rating. The evaluation of Midland's proposal revealed a very strong proposal across the board. The SEB identified many strengths associated with Midland's Mission Suitability factor. Examples of their strengths I found particularly beneficial included their Significant Strength related to the understanding of roles and responsibilities, staffing approach, and the logical approach to manage the major functional areas of work. Also, Midland received a Significant Strength for its risk mitigation approach, combined with several additional strengths under the Mission Suitability factor that I feel will appreciably increase the probability of successful performance. The SEB identified only minor weaknesses which, as presented to me and as further delineated in the briefing, would not place the Government at elevated risk as there is little potential for disruption in services or degradation in performance. I find the Midland proposal to be advantageous over other offerors because of the significant strength received for Roles and

Responsibilities, multiple strengths in Management, and a significant strength for the thorough understanding of the risks and mitigation all of which appreciably increases the probability of successful performance. Additionally, Midland's past performance confidence rating was one of the three proposals to receive the highest awarded assessment of "High Level of Confidence." Consequently, Midland is positioned as a leader in two of the three evaluation factors. Finally, Midland's price of \$2,034,847 is firmly in the middle of the pricing of the ten offers.

Looking at the ten offers there are three offers with higher pricing that received Mission Suitability rating two levels (Fair) below Midland and have a Past Performance Confidence rating one level (Moderate Level of Confidence) below Midland. It is my determination that awarding to higher priced offers with significantly lower Mission suitability and lower Past Performance Confidence does not represent the best value to the Government and I will not further consider the proposals of Barbaricum, PWA, and Soundway for award.

Continuing in this analysis there are two offers with higher pricing that received Mission Suitability ratings one level (Good) below Midland and have a Past Performance Confidence rating one level (Moderate Level of Confidence) below Midland. Again, it is my determination that awarding to higher priced offers with lower Mission suitability and lower Past Performance Confidence does not represent the best value to the Government and I will not further consider the proposals of ADS and Marstell-Day for award. I additionally note that ADS' pricing is the highest priced offer at over 50% more than Midland's, making their proposal easy to determine it does not offer the Government the best value. Marstell-Day's price is less high but still represents a price premium that is not justified for an offer that is lower rated in both of the other evaluation factors.

In my assessment of SSD's proposal, I note the Mission Suitability rating two levels (Fair) below Midland and a Past Performance Confidence rating one rank (Moderate Level of Confidence) below Midland. This must be weighed against the substantially lower price of SSD's proposal, which is the lowest price offered. This price is substantially below the IGE, the next lowest offer, and the mean of all the offers. It is my determination that this low price and lower Mission suitability and Past Performance Confidence do not represent the best value to the Government and I will not further consider SSD's proposal for award.

In my assessment of Dynamix's proposal, I note the Mission Suitability rating three levels (Poor) below Midland and a Past Performance Confidence rating (High Level of Confidence) equal to Midland's rating. While Dynamix's price is slightly lower than Midland's price, the substantially lower Mission Suitability rating very clearly does not make this proposal the best value for the Government and I will not further consider Dynamix's proposal for award.

In my assessment of AIS' proposal, I note the Mission Suitability rating two levels (Fair) below Midland and a Past Performance Confidence rating one rank (Moderate Level of Confidence) below Midland's rating. While AIS' price is slightly lower than Midland's price, the substantially lower Mission suitability and lower Past Performance Confidence does not represent the best value to the Government and I will not further consider AIS' proposal for award.

Finally, in my assessment of VSolvit's proposal, I note the Mission Suitability rating was one level (Good) below Midland's rating. I also note that VSolvit's proposal was the second highest rated proposal for Mission Suitability with Midland receiving a Mission Suitability score/rating of 940/Excellent compared to VSolvit's 700/Good. VSolvit received the same Past Performance Confidence rating of High Level of Confidence as Midland. While VSolvit's price is slightly lower than Midland's price, I find the higher Mission suitability rating is worth the slightly higher price and represents the best value to the Government. Additionally, I note that I do find a minor

discriminator in the Past Performance that indicates to me that Midland's offer is the better value. The Past Performance Confidence rating for both offerors is based on their receiving an overall pertinence rating of "Highly Pertinent" and an "Excellent" rating for the performance component. Looking at the evaluated requirements that make up the overall pertinence rating, I found all to be rated the same for both offerors except for Survey and Measurement Capabilities. For this requirement, Midland received a rating of "Very Highly Pertinent" while VSolvit received a "Pertinent" rating. This provides me additional confidence that Midland's proposal provides the best value to the Government.

Based on my assessment of all proposals in accordance with the specified evaluation criteria, the tradeoff analysis clearly illustrates Midland's proposal offers the best value to the Government. Midland offered a superior technical and management approach that provides me confidence that they will be able to perform the contract work without any significant problems. Furthermore, Midland and its significant subcontractor Genex have proven past performance that provides me a high level of confidence they can successfully perform the contract requirements. Finally, I find Midland's price to be reasonable compared to the IGE and the other offerors. Therefore, I find Midland's proposal is the most advantageous to the Government. In making this decision I have considered the three evaluation factors to be approximately equal in importance, with Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, significantly more important than Price.

Accordingly, I hereby select Midland GSS Joint Venture for award of the GSS contract.



Richard T. Cannella
Source Selection Authority