

**Enclosure to LCE Newport Beach – IT, Inc. (LCE) Letter
Noncompliance Memorandum**

Concerning the LCE proposal submission, the General, Sample Task Orders (STOs), Technical/Management (TM), Cost/Price, and Past Performance proposal volumes do not adhere to the RFP Section L.4 submission requirements. In particular, LCE's proposal is deficient because it does not properly and fully complete each required volume of the RFP as described below and adherence to the RFP requirements would require a major rewrite of each submitted proposal volume.

Volume I – General. The LCE Volume I submission fails to adhere to the RFP requirements and is incomplete. Specifically, contrary to RFP Section L.4, which requires specific information, the LCE proposal does not provide a list of acronyms and abbreviations, does not consistently adhere to the font size and type requirement, does not consistently number pages or paragraphs, does not properly label each hard copy binder and CD, does not single cross-reference table, and does not provide key information such as LCE's DCAA point of contact. Additionally, LCE failed to provide teaming agreements, which prevented the Government from understanding and assessing the offeror's team. LCE failed to acknowledge all RFP amendments; therefore, there is insufficient information to determine whether LCE understands the RFP amendments. Lastly, LCE did not fully address the Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) requirement; as a result, the Government was unable to determine if LCE understands what constitutes an OCI or potential OCI.

Volume II – STO (Evaluation Factor 1). The LCE Volume II submission fails to adhere to the RFP requirements and is incomplete. Contrary to the RFP Section L.5, which requires specific information, the LCE proposal does not provide a response to both STO 1 and STO 2. The work breakdown structure proposed does not provided detail to the fifth level or enough detail that labor hours and performing offeror labor categories can be identified. Additionally, there is insufficient information in the material list provided in LCE's proposal to determine if the offeror understands the technical requirements of the STOs and how the systems are to be used in the experimentation and prototyping tasks. Moreover, the proposal does not provide sufficient information to determine the offeror understanding of the analysis of alternatives (AOA) process in military capability development. In summary, the information provided in LCE's proposal is insufficient to determine if the offeror understands the scope of work to be performed.

Volume III – TM (Evaluation Factor 2). The LCE Volume III submission fails to adhere to the RFP requirements and is incomplete. Contrary to the RFP Section L.5, which requires specific information, the LCE's proposal does not provide recent and relevant examples of the team's capability to perform any of the thirteen RFP scope of work performance requirements described in Tables L-2 and L-3 of the RFP. Additionally, LCE's proposal failed to address the facilities available to perform manufacturing or its ability to perform system testing.

**Enclosure to LCE Newport Beach – IT, Inc. (LCE) Letter
Noncompliance Memorandum**

Volume IV – Cost/Price (Evaluation Factor 3). The LCE Volume IV submission fails to adhere to the RFP requirements and is incomplete. Contrary to the RFP Section L.5, which requires specific information, as listed below the LCE proposal does not provide sufficient information to conduct a cost analysis.

- Proposal provided insufficient information to determine whether LCE proposed on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis;
- Proposal is mislabeled as Volume IV, Small Business Participation and contains Small Business Participation information (which is not a requirement) with minimal cost and pricing data;
- Proposal does not provide proposed costs for STO 2;
- Proposal submission does not include any proposals from identified major subcontractors;
- Proposal does not include CAGE and DUNS codes; fiscal year; adequacy of systems (accounting, purchasing, estimating, etc.); disclosure of any exceptions to terms and conditions; basis of estimate for direct labor, escalation, and indirect rates; identification of direct labor, escalation, and indirect rates used in the development of proposed costs; identification of fee; identification of use of Government furnished items; identification of cognizant DCAA and DCMA points of contact; and substantiating data for direct labor, escalation, and indirect rates are not provided;
- Proposal does not provide a comprehensive proposal for STO 1; and
- Proposal STO 1 cost worksheet is not completed based on instructions in RFP or Attachment 2c – STO Cost Worksheet, and proposed amounts for travel and ODC costs exceed the STO specified amounts for these cost elements.

Volume V – Past Performance (Evaluation Factor 4). The LCE Volume V submission fails to adhere to the RFP requirements and is incomplete. Specifically, contrary to the RFP Section L.5, which requires specific information, the LCE proposal does not provide a Summary History Performance Matrix, does not include copies of past performance questionnaires, and exceeds the past performance citations allowed for the prime offeror. Under Section 2, Detailed Performance, LCE's proposal submission contains ten past performance references which exceeded the allowable citations for the prime offeror. There were no submittals for major subcontractors. Of the ten references submitted that include descriptions, the past performance is for VTC equipment, integration or operation for short periods of time. None of these are relevant to the D3I effort. Three of the ten past performance references are not recent because

**Enclosure to LCE Newport Beach – IT, Inc. (LCE) Letter
Noncompliance Memorandum**

they are older than the established five years (per RFP Section L.5, Volume V Section 2 recent is defined as “efforts that have been performed within the past five years from RFP issuance date”).

-END OF DOCUMENT-