

AWARD DECISION DOCUMENT

Based upon final consensus reached for Phase I, the TET recommended the following three (3) quoters for participation in Phase II:

- Company A
- Comp B
- Comp C

August 13, 2019: The Contracting Officer sent the down select notification letter to each of the seven (7) quoters. The four (4) lower-rated quoters were asked to provide a response by August 16, 2019, indicating whether or not they wished to participate in Phase II. Each of the four (4) responded that they did not wish to participate in Phase II; the Government then indicated that upon award, each quoter would be given an informal feedback session.

Company A, Comp B, and Comp C each acknowledged that they would like to participate in Phase II.

August 21, 2019: The Contracting Officer sent a letter to each of the invited Phase II quoters with instructions on providing their Phase II response (Volume II: Oral Presentation and Volume III: Price Proposal) as well logistical details of the oral presentation date, time and location. In accordance with Section L.10 of the RFQ, the Government requested a list of participants for the presentation. The RFQ stated that a minimum three (3) participants would be permitted.

Phase II

Submissions for Phase II are the Oral Presentation (Volume II) and the Business and Pricing Volume (Volume III). The criteria for Phase II are listed in descending importance, as follows:

- Factor 5: Oral Presentation – Proposed Solution
- Factor 5: Price

Factor 5 – The oral presentation was considered significantly more important than price per section M.1 of the solicitation.

Oral presentations took place on September 3 and September 4, 2019. In accordance with section L.10 of the RFQ, each quoter presented for 60 minutes, followed by a fifteen-minute break for the Government to caucus. The second hour was an interactive dialogue session between the TET and the quoter's team, in which the TET raised pertinent questions in regard to the content of the quoter's presentation. Upon conclusion of the dialogue, the quoter's team departed, and the TET began a discussion of the merits of each quoter's presentation so as to reach a consensus, and culminating in a single assigned Confidence Rating for each quoter. The table below summarizes the final Criteria 5 rating for each Phase II Quoter:

Row No.	Offeror	Phase II Rating
1	Company A.	Some
2	Comp B	Some
3	Comp C	High

Company A – Phase II

Confidence Rating: Some

For Phase II, Comp A received a rating of Some Confidence. Although there were some areas of the oral presentation which raised expectations for success, Company A did not instill confidence with several of their answers in the Q&A portion of the oral presentation. The TET noted two of the three participants were from Company A's Teaming Partner XYZ, and that those two participants responded to all key questions of a technical nature. The TET came to the conclusion that XYZ would be doing the clear majority of the work, which the TET determined to present a risk of the new solution failing should XYZ terminate their teaming agreement. In addition, Company A's answer demonstrated that they perhaps did not fully understand the security concerns of the solution, as well as the difference between managing a system for other related areas. Company A was unable to answer a question asked about XXXX, which deals with DHS Security compliance requirements. In addition, Company A proposed housing the solution on the on XXXX, and was not sure how to, or possibly unable to, XXXXXXXX. These aspects of the presentation did not instill confidence in the TET and thus a rating of some confidence was given.

In summation, Comp A addressed each of the four (4) required Phase II Factor 5 evaluation elements. Nevertheless, they did not receive a confidence rating of High because of the issues cited above, which lowered the overall expectation of success. The Government determines that this would introduce a level of risk that may lead to an unacceptable level of performance.

Comp B – Phase II

Confidence Rating: Some

For Phase II, Comp B received a rating of Some Confidence. During the oral presentation, the demonstration of the solution left something lacking, as they did not represent the full requirements of the XXX Solution as identified in the SOW. To the TET, their proposed solution seemed almost like a test-version for development at a later, undisclosed date and lacked the robustness the TET was looking for. Comp B talk about data migration suggested that DHS may need to provide a higher level of intervention than previously anticipated. The TET considered Comp B to lack an understanding of REDACTED. The TET determined that Comp B's solution did not have an intuitive user interface.

Although Comp B provided a good value, in that their overall technical approach and solution is not prohibitively expensive, the solution appears to be a prototype, with no finished, polished product in mind. There is a medium risk of hurdles arising during the course of the contract.

In summation, Comp B addressed each of the four (4) required Phase II Factor 5 evaluation elements. Nevertheless, they did not receive a confidence rating of High because of the issues cited above, which lowered the overall expectation of success. The Government determines that this would introduce a level of risk that may lead to an unacceptable level of performance.

Comp C – Phase II

Confidence Rating: High

For Phase II, Comp B received a rating of High Confidence. During their oral presentation, Comp B instilled high confidence for the TET. The TET determined Comp B’s demonstration to be technically superior above the other proposed solutions, and the level of professionalism is high. The TET identified fewer aspects which lowered the expectation of success in Comp C than the other two Phase II quoters. The TET noted Comp C’s unfamiliarity with the DHS workflow processes, and the TET indicated Comp C did not have a full understanding of contracts. Nevertheless, the TET was satisfied with Comp C’s presentation, and the same could not be said for the other quoters’ presentations.

Comp C demonstrated the ability provide the highest-quality of service, and the Government cannot overlook this benefit because the future holds uncertain conditions such as cloud migration. The TET determined that Comp C presented a lower risk of failing to overcome obstacles which may arise during the performance of the contract.

In summation, Comp C addressed each of the four (4) required Phase II Factor 5 evaluation elements: They received a confidence rating of High because of the excellence in the oral presentation, which raised the overall expectation of success. The Government determines that Comp C has the lowest risk of an unacceptable level of performance.

In accordance with Section M.2, the Government may perform a comparative analysis (comparing quoter responses to one another) to select the quoter that is best suited to fulfill the requirements, based on the quoters’ responses to the factors outlined in this RFQ and their relative importance. In comparison to Company A and Comp B, Comp C is the option which was determined by the TET to provide an of expectation of high-level performance, whereas Company A and Comp B raised concerns with the TET as to whether the issues of the current solution can be resolved under the new solution.

Phase II: Volume III Price Proposal Evaluation

The quoters’ Volume III price proposals contained a proposed labor mix as well as the proposed labor rates for the base year, and Option Years 1, 2, 3 and 4. The table below gives the summary price breakdown for each quoter’s base year and option years, along with the Independent Government Cost Estimate:

Row No.	Offeror	Base	Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4	Total Price
1	Comp A	\$1,100,000.00	\$1,200,000.00	\$1,300,000.00	\$1,400,000.00	\$1,500,000.00	\$6,500,000.00
2	Comp B	\$1,200,000.00	\$1,300,000.00	\$1,400,000.00	\$1,500,000.00	\$1,600,000.00	\$7,000,000.00
3	Comp C	\$1,400,000.00	\$1,500,000.00	\$1,600,000.00	\$1,700,000.00	\$1,800,000.00	\$8,000,000.00
4	IGCE	\$1,400,000.00	\$1,400,000.00	\$1,400,000.00	\$1,400,000.00	\$1,400,000.00	\$7,000,000.00

The TET Chair reviewed each of the quoters’ proposed labor categories and labor mix and determined all 3 quoters to be acceptable. Each quoter also properly mapped their GSA

Schedule XX labor categories to the Government's internal labor categories as identified in the IGCE and Statement of Work.

Consistent with Section M.1 of the solicitation, all non-price evaluation criteria, when combined, were considered to be significantly more important than price. Comp C's price is higher than the second-highest offer (\$1M), and it is \$1M higher than the IGCE. Comp C's total price is \$1.5M higher than the lowest-priced proposal Comp A.

In conclusion, the Government determined that each quoter's total evaluated price was fair and reasonable due to price competition, in accordance with the price analysis techniques from FAR Part 15.404-1(b).

Exchanges with Best-Suited Contractor

After the September 10th receipt of the price quote, the Contracting Officer (serving as the selection official) selected Comp C as the apparently successful quoter as outlined in Section M.2 of the RFQ. The price quote was the last remaining Factor to be provided as all technical factors had already been evaluated and completed. Based on all technical evaluation factors and price (all factors 1 – 6), Company C is the apparent successful quoter. Section M.2 states that that once the Government determines the quoter that is the best-suited (i.e., the apparent successful quoter), the Government reserves the right to communicate with only that quoter to address any remaining issues, if necessary, and finalize a task order with that quoter. These could include technical and price. Because the determination had been made that Comp C's quote represented the best value, the Contracting Officer made the decision to approach Comp C for purposes of improving their total offered price. The Contracting Officer discussed Comp C's high rates in XX CLIN, and Comp C agreed to lower their total offered price by \$400,000 (5%).

VII. BEST VALUE TRADEOFF

Because there were two (2) quoters (Comp A and Comp b) that were lower priced than Comp C, a best value tradeoff analysis is required to be performed. The following information is provided citing the reasoning as to why Comp C represents a better overall value to the Government than Comp B and Comp A. I do appreciate the lower-priced quotes submitted by Company A and Comp C, but I also note that price is the least importance factor. In my opinion, the benefits of Comp's quote merit the additional costs

REDACTED TRADEOFF SUMMARY

In summation, when combining the technical merits of Comp C's technical proposal and their total offered price, Comp C's proposal both technical and price factors considered represents the best overall value to the Government.

VIII. AWARD RECOMMENDATION

Based on a comparative assessment of the proposals against all evaluation criteria and the aforementioned price/non-price factors rationale, the Contracting Officer has hereby determined that the following quoter's proposal represents the best value to the Government, price and other factors considered and hereby recommends award:

- Comp C

The following information provides an award recommendation synopsis for Company C.

Comp C received confidence ratings of High for Factor 1 – Technical Approach, as well as for Factor 5 – Oral Presentation. No other quoter received this rating for either of those criteria. Comp C demonstrated a strong and thorough understanding of the Statement of Work and the TET determined their proposed technical approach methodology to have potential in value-added benefits to the Government. The TET recommends that Comp C's represents the best value to the Government.

IX. AWARD DETERMINATION

Based upon the findings cited above, the Government has determined the total price offered by Comp C fair and reasonable. Comp C has met all RFQ labor category education and work experience requirements and their proposed labor mix is deemed acceptable by the TET and by the Contracting Officer. The proposed total number of hours is consistent with the IGCE, and based upon review of its proposal, the TET and the Contracting Office determine Comp C to be fully capable of successfully performing the requirements of the Statement of Work.

Signed by:

John Doe
Contract Officer

Date