

2.0 MANAGEMENT APPROACH

XYZ Company proposes a performance based service oriented solution that includes systems analysis, integration, and program management skills necessary to manage the development and operations of the AGENCIES's mission critical systems. To ensure we meet the program objectives, XYZ Company is providing its own highly qualified employees and as well as teaming with Subcontractor B to ensure staffing and continuity of operations at the highest level. XYZ Company will use industry best practices along with lessons learned from Subcontractor B to lead and manage the requirements of this contract.

For **Task 1**, we are providing two subject matter experts with over 33 years comprehensive knowledge in integrated security guard management sufficient to plan, implement and manage a broad spectrum of security guard support for systems and equipment relating to AGENCIES theories and applications.

For **Task 2**, we are providing one subject matter expert with over 18 years' experience in conducting management analysis functions for security systems and other technical and managerial processes, automated and non-automated. Our employee has knowledge of security roles related to security guard management functions along with an understanding of security programs and processes.

For **Task 3**, we are providing two staff members with over 13 years of comprehensive knowledge in integrated security guards to manage a broad spectrum of security guard support for systems and equipment. Our employee has knowledge of Federal Acquisition Regulations and DoD Contract rules and regulations, a thorough understanding of the organization and function of AGENCIES as well as a proficiency in security applications.

Our approach is – provide the best security guards, management analysts, administrative support staff and subject matter experts available, and ensure quality by managing the project in adherence with requirements set forth in the PWS along with the implementation of quality controls that support completed and prepared IWA standards or instructions with at least 98 percent of the time with no greater than 2 percent error. In addition, deliverables will be monitored to maintain a level of timeliness resulting in delivery on or ahead of schedule at least 99 percent of the time and meeting IAW correspondence standards or instruction at a level of 100 percent for the time with no error rate.

The XYZ COMPANY management team will consist of one Project Manager (PM), who is responsible for managing work schedules, deliverables, performance measurement goals and serving as the single point of contact for the Contracting Officer and COTR. The program manager (PM) will periodically review tasks and ensure timely response and quality staffing so all risks are minimized and quality performance standards are maintained throughout the tenure of this program.

Our process for managing the business operations and resource management needs of the AGENCIES is as follows:

Program Management Process

Focus on defining the scope and risk factors to achieve the performance objectives

Program Management Methodology

An integrated suite of defined process and techniques learned from past performances, specifically with AGENCIES

Security Guard Manager | Program Management Tools/Systems

Tools, including quality assurance, program scheduling, and internal XYZ COMPANY policies and procedures

Program Phases

Develop a program that is phased to ensure quality and to evaluate risks, review metrics and adjust at key points throughout the program

Contractor Management

As prime contractor and leader of the integrated team, XYZ COMPANY will oversee the work of all team members including our subcontractor. Our project organization provides clear lines of authority and communication. The Program Manager will receive contractual direction and guidance from the Contracting Officer and COTR. The Program Manager will be accountable for all aspects of the contract and will manage any issues frequent formal and informal communication. We will maximize proactive processes that will prevent problems, and will be prepared to take corrective action whenever called for by the situation at hand. Oversight and monitoring of the daily operations will be the responsibility of the Program Manager.

The Program Manager will be available during normal duty hours and will be reachable by cell phone 24/7 to meet with contracting staff to address urgent or emergency matters.

Staffing Plan

We are poised to immediately staff the positions required for this contract.

Our staffing plan is as follows:

Name	Labor Category	Hours Per Year	Firm
	Program Manager	480 hours	XYZ COMPANY
	Security Guard Manager	4160 hours	XYZ COMPANY
	Security Guard Analyst III (1)	2080	Subcontractor B

XYZ QUALITY CONTROL PLAN

XYZ is committed to providing our clients with consistently high-quality products and services. Our commitment to quality performance is demonstrated by our development of, rigorous adherence to, integrated Quality Assurance (QA) processes and standards. This establishes a framework by which the planning and managing of resources and work becomes a disciplined, repeatable process. Our successful application these practices and measures has provided project visibility, repeatable processes that form a baseline for the continuous improvement in achieving specific, documented, and realistic goals.

Enhance the quality of service and deliverables

It is XYZ's philosophy to provide our clients with high quality products and services. We encourage a strong commitment to quality performance through the development of, and rigorous adherence to quality control standards. XYZ monitors and enforces conformance with QC plans for all deliverables we produce. Our QC plan ensures that deliverables satisfy contractual agreements, meet or exceed quality standards, and are developed in accordance with approved processes. We use a closed-loop corrective activity procedure that compares our actual deliverable generation process against predefined XYZ standards.

The baseline XYZ Performance QC Plan includes the Contract Manager team performing quality assessment reviews to ensure adherence to all policies, procedures, and standards. This method verifies that a project is progressing in step-by-step tasks, and validates that all products are being delivered in accordance with acceptance criteria. XYZ has developed detailed QC procedures that specify use of our methods for deliverable products, and include a summary of the quality factors to be assessed, the specific methods used, and the participants involved in each activity.

XYZ conducts QC and technical oversight reviews to ensure the quality of deliverables. We develop monthly Progress Reports and fiscal tracking. We also conduct periodic progress conversations with the client. XYZ Contract Manager will:

- Ensure timely and accurate completion of deliverables
- Manage the budget and hours to ensure accurate and effective financial tracking
- Conduct internal meetings, as necessary, with the project team
- Perform a thorough quality assurance review of all contract and non-contract draft and final deliverables
- Draft monthly progress reports that accurately record the following:

Tasks in contract	Status of personnel and projected staffing plans
Narrative describing work completed	Statement of progress made
Narrative describing problems addressed or to be addressed	Total accumulated hours and costs on the contract to date
Number of hours worked by the XYZ personnel and all associated costs incurred	

- Maintain copies of all deliverables and submit and record signed receipts to document receipt and acceptance of deliverables by the client

Quality Assurance/Quality Control Procedures

Activity/Product	Quality Factors	QA/QC Methods Used	Participants
Deliverable Development			
Implementation Plan, and Analysis or Evaluation Reports	Correctness, Integrity, Testability, Maintainability	Walkthroughs Quality Assessment Reviews	Contract Manager, Client Representatives
Briefings	Correctness, Efficiency	Walkthroughs Management Control Reviews	Contract Manager, Government Participants
Management Oversight			
Walk-through Reports	Maintainability	Management Control Reviews	Contract Manager
Work Plans	Correctness	Management Control Reviews Quality Assessment Reviews	Contract Manager
Status Reports	Maintainability	Management Control Reviews	Contract Manager
Application of Standards	Correctness, Testability	Quality Assessment Reviews	Contract Manager

XYZ's highest priority is customer satisfaction and being responsive to the customer's needs. It is XYZ's practice to consistently provide our clients with high quality products and services. We emphasize communication to ensure the client is apprised of progress made and that the client's needs are met. XYZ initiates meetings or teleconferences with the client organization as needed to review progress and to flag any anticipated problems. Throughout the contract, XYZ will maintain close contact with the client to ensure that work progresses in a timely and cost-efficient manner.

Implementation and Enforcement of Quality Assurance Measures

XYZ's schedule and cost monitoring approach has been successfully implemented on previous projects. We use such techniques as comprehensive internal financial reporting, careful validation of all reported costs, and regular review cycles. The Contract Manager develops task estimates that clearly define the activities to be performed. The tasks, associated labor estimates, and external commitments required to complete those activities are independently reviewed by XYZ Senior Managers to reduce the risk of over-or-under-estimation of effort estimates, review schedules, and QA activities.

Identification of Deficiencies in Quality Services

The XYZ Team involves all Team members in planning, monitoring, and performing work according to plan. At regular meetings (at least monthly), participants identify the work performed; the issues and resolutions made; future plans for work; and anticipated issues and budget requirements, dependencies, and action item for the next bi-weekly period. Progress in terms of meeting each task's critical path will be closely monitored by the Contract Manager also, allowing for early detection and correction of any critical path issues.

Demonstrate that the Quality Control Plan Complements the Government Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan

The procedures developed will come together as an interconnected, quality system to manage and perform effectively and consistently on the contract. Each process has normally been defined in the Government Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan. Our Quality Control Plan uses the defined performance requirements/metrics, and describes procedures to produce the desired results. Performance measures are captured and compared to the requirements, taking corrective active action if a problem exists or is anticipate, and modifying or establishing new policies and procedures, enabling the process to be responsive to changing customer needs and improvement opportunities.

Lessons learned throughout each process are captured and used to improve or processes. These are the major steps of the XYZ Process Improvement Activity process:

- **Identify Improvement Opportunities.** Start with an established, institutionalized process, and identify opportunities for improvement
- **Develop an Improvement plan.** Develop a Process Improvement Plan for implementing and testing the improvement(s). Begin by selecting those improvement activities to be undertaken. Identify an approach for implementing and testing the improvement. Identify what will determine success.
- **Implement the Improvements.** The planned improvements are implemented. The Contract Manager will establish a baseline, and capture metrics in accordance with the plan to measure the effects of improvement.
- **Monitor the Improvements.** Evaluate the results of the improvement activity. Modify the approach if the anticipated results are not achieved, and test again. If improvement is not achieved, the improvement may be deferred or abandoned.
- **Standardize and Continue to Assess.** As process improvements are realized, standardized on the improved process. Return to the first procedure for additional improvements.

Less formal improvements will also be introduced on an ongoing basis, as required. This includes minor changes or enhancements to procedure documents or standards.

**SOURCE SELECTION STATEMENT FOR THE
OFFICE OF HUMAN RESOURCES SERVICES
RFP XXN7863333**

On March 9, 2006, I along with other senior officials met with the Source Evaluation Committee (SEC) appointed to evaluate proposals.

PROCUREMENT DESCRIPTION

I appointed the members of the SEC which included three representatives from the Office of Human Resources, the SEC Chairman from the Office of Personnel Directorate, and the Contracting Officer from the Office of Procurement. To aid in the evaluation, the SEC appointed technical advisors with expertise in appropriate disciplines in order to provide any necessary assistance. The SEC utilized this information in conjunction with the predetermined evaluation factors and subfactors in formulating its assessment of the strengths and weaknesses for each Offeror.

The Request for Proposals (RFP) was released on October 10, 2005. The RFP required the Offerors to provide the necessary management and personnel to provide humans services support.

This effort will be performed under a Cost Reimbursable Mission Services Contract with both cost and performance incentives. Additionally, task orders may be issued for PWS 8.0 on an indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity (IDIQ) basis. The contract consists of a one-year base period with four one-year options.

Two amendments were issued to the RFP:

Amendment No. 1 was released on October 18, 2005, and provided Offerors with answers to written questions received in response to the RFP, as well as revisions to the RFP. These revisions included, (1) an extension of the Offeror's Volume II Past Performance data and the Past Performance Questionnaires from

October 24th to October 31, 2006, (2) changed the Attachment L-1 Cost Forms and (3) changed Attachment L-3, Section A: General Information, Paragraph (e) first sentence, from “...(based on an August 2006 projection...” to “...(based on an October 2006 projection...”.

Amendment No. 2 was released on November 16, 2005, and deleted Attachment J-3, Wage Determination No. 2005-2007, Revision No. 1, dated: 09/19/2006 and replaced it with Attachment J-3, Wage Determination No.: 2005-2007, Revision No.: 2, dated: 11/02/2006.

The Government designated this procurement as a 100 percent 8(a) Set-Aside under Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 19.8. On November 13, 2005, proposals were received from the following 8(a) companies:

Barbara Consultants, Inc. (CSCI) XX Consulting Group, Inc.

Fission Company, Inc.

WS Company, Inc.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The proposals were evaluated in accordance with the procedures prescribed by FAR Part 15. The Government evaluated the proposals in two general steps:

Step One – An initial evaluation was performed to determine if all information had been provided and the Offeror had made a reasonable attempt to present an acceptable proposal. No proposal was determined to be unacceptable.

Step Two – All acceptable proposals were evaluated against the three evaluation factors contained in the RFP. Based on this evaluation, the Government had the option to utilize one of the following methods: (1) Make selection and award without discussions; or (2) conduct discussions with each Offeror determined to be in the competitive range and afford them the opportunity to revise their proposals, and then make selection.

Selection and award is in accordance with the “Best Value Tradeoff” technique delineated in FAR Part 15.101-1. A tradeoff process is appropriate when it may be in the best interest of the Government to consider award to other than the lowest priced Offeror or other than the highest technically-rated Offeror. This

process permits tradeoffs among cost or price and non-cost factors thereby allowing the Government to accept other than the lowest priced proposal. The perceived benefits of the higher priced proposal shall merit the additional cost, and the rationale for tradeoffs shall be documented in accordance with FAR Part 15.406.

The RFP prescribed three evaluation factors considered essential in an offer: Mission Suitability, Cost, and Past Performance. Offerors were advised that the three factors were essentially equal in importance.

The three evaluation factors were described as follows:

Mission Suitability: The proposals were analyzed for the excellence of the work to be performed, including management and technical subfactors, as well as proposal risk. Mission Suitability consisted of three subfactors, and each subfactor received both an adjectival rating and a numerical score:

Management and Technical Approach (500 points)
Staffing and Total Compensation Plan (400 points)
Safety, Health and Environmental (100 points)

Overall, each Offeror could receive a total of 1000 points and a commensurate adjectival rating in Mission Suitability. The applicable adjective ratings were “Excellent,” “Very Good,” “Good,” “Fair,” and “Poor.” The definitions for the adjective ratings and percentile ranges are set forth in the FAR Supplement and contained in the Evaluation Plan.

Cost: The proposed costs were evaluated for reasonableness and completeness of all cost components for the base period, all option periods. The cost factor was evaluated to determine whether the proposed cost was reasonable and/or complete/realistic, and to ensure all Performance Work Statement (PWS) requirements were reflected in the cost proposal. The evaluation addressed the sum of the resources, skill mix, and labor categories required to realistically conduct the Services requirements, as proposed by the Offeror. The Government derived an evaluated cost to accomplish the IDIQ effort for the base year and each option year, by applying a SEC predetermined skill mix and allotment of hours to the quoted fully burdened labor rates as proposed by the Offeror. Unrealistic or unreasonable costs and inconsistencies between the Mission Suitability volume and the Cost volume were assessed as a proposal risk.

Past Performance: Includes the overall corporate past performance of the Offeror and any proposed subcontractors or teaming partners, on comparable or related procurement or project efforts. Emphasis was given to the extent of the direct experience and quality of past performance on previous contracts that were highly relevant to the effort defined in the PWS. Past Performance is not

numerically scored; however, an adjectival rating was assigned. The applicable adjective ratings were “Excellent,” “Very Good,” “Good,” “Fair,” and “Poor” and “Neutral” is set forth in Section M of the RFP.

DISPOSITION AND EVALUATION OF INITIAL PROPOSALS

All offers received were determined to be acceptable and were evaluated consistent with the criteria identified in the RFP. The initial findings of the Source Evaluation Board were presented to me, the Source Selection Authority (SSA), on January 29, 2006. Based on these findings, I determined that award on initial proposals was not appropriate and that Offerors, Fission Company and WS Company were in the competitive range and Offerors CSCI and XX Corporation were not in the competitive range.

By letters dated January 31, 2007, both XX Corporation and CSCI were advised that their proposals were not in the competitive range and no proposal revisions would be accepted for further consideration.

CSCI was advised they received a “Fair” rating for the Mission Suitability Factor with one significant strength, eight significant weaknesses, and several other strengths and weaknesses. They received a “Neutral” Past Performance rating and was, therefore, evaluated neither favorably nor unfavorably. Their Mission Suitability Factor was rated lower than the proposals determined to be within the competitive range. Both their proposed and most probable cost was highest among all proposals received.

XX Corporation was advised they received a “Fair” rating for the Mission Suitability Factor with one significant strength, seven significant weaknesses, and several other strengths and weaknesses. They received a “Good” Past Performance rating. Their Mission Suitability Factor was rated lower than the proposals determined to be within the competitive range. Both their proposed and most probable costs were higher than those determined to be in the competitive range.

By letters dated January 31, 2006, both Fission Company and WS Company were advised of the opening of discussions and provided with their respective weaknesses and clarifications identified during the evaluation of their proposals. The letters established February 8, 2006, as the due date for all written responses. Accordingly, February 12th, was established by the drawing of lots, as the date for oral discussions with WS Company, and February 13th, was established as the date for oral discussions with Fission Company. Oral, written, and telephonic discussions continued with both firms throughout the period of February 12, through February 21, 2006.

On February 21, 2006, a letter requesting Final Proposal Revisions (FPRs) was sent to Fission Company and WS Company with a due date for receipt of FPRs on

February 26, 2007. Subsequently, these final proposals were evaluated consistent with the criteria identified in the RFP.

Evaluation of Final Proposal Revisions

As a result of the discussion process and the Final Proposal Revisions, both Offerors, determined to be finalists, increased their Mission Suitability numerical scores. Fission Company eliminated all but one of its Mission Suitability weaknesses and increased its Mission Suitability adjectival rating to Very Good. WS Company eliminated all weaknesses and increased their Mission Suitability adjectival rating to Excellent. The Past Performance adjectival rating for both Offerors did not change. In addition, both Offerors revised their Cost Proposals based upon discussions. The final evaluation results of the FPRs are summarized below.

Fission Company, Incorporated

In the Mission Suitability factor, Fission Company received an overall adjectival rating of Very Good. Fission Company had no deficiencies, 5 significant strengths, 10 strengths and 1 weakness. (Fission Company generated one weakness and strength as a result of the discussions/FPR process.)

Under the Management and Technical Approach subfactor, Fission Company received an adjectival rating of Very Good. Fission Company received 1 significant strength, 9 strengths, and no weakness or significant weakness. These findings are summarized as follows:

Significant Strength: 1

Fission Company provides a thorough approach to accomplishing the requirements of the various Organizational and Leadership Development Programs. They offer an extensive list of course offerings for leadership development and offer facilitators certified in several different development tools. Additionally, Fission Company provides a complete analysis of how they will perform follow-up assessment for Organizational Development interventions.

Strengths: 9

As a result of discussions, and FPR, Fission Company proposed a highly efficient and effective management structure. Fission Company proposed three working team leads, covering all functional areas of the Office of Personnel.

Fission Company proposed a very good quality plan. Fission Company identified their management approach for PWS procedures in relation to the recognition of potential problems and proactive problem avoidance.

Fission Company demonstrates a very good understanding of the DRD requirements including property management, financial management, safety and health, and information technology security. Fission Company details the development and execution of each DRD.

Fission Company's cost control plan is detailed and shows Fission Company has a very good understanding of methodologies and approach required for controlling the cost in a Government cost contract. This will result in Fission Company's ability to estimate, manage, control, track and report costs.

Fission Company demonstrated a very good understanding of the risk associated with the management and technology portion of this requirement. Fission Company's list of risks and mitigation for each risk demonstrates a thorough understanding of the risks associated with this type of requirement.

Fission Company's communication approach is comprehensive and detailed, including control of communications internally among the Prime and Subcontractors and externally among the Prime, Subcontractors, and OHC.

Fission Company provides a very detailed description of how they will perform the functions related to the Executive Resources Program.

Fission Company proposed a strong approach to the development of a Strategic Workforce Assessment Plan, which is a basic element of workforce strategic planning.

Fission Company had an effective local autonomy plan as defined by the RFP by giving the Program Manager authority to negotiate and sign modifications, and every team member is headquartered or has a presence in Kilmarnock to ensure real time decisions and support of the Program Manager.

Under the Staffing and Total Compensation Plan subfactor, Fission Company received an adjective rating of Very Good. Fission Company received 3 significant strengths, 1 strength, no significant weaknesses, and 1 weakness. These findings are summarized as follows:

Significant Strengths: 3

Fission Company demonstrates an excellent understanding of the PWS staffing requirement by providing a thorough analysis of the risk and mitigation for the transition plan. Also, Fission Company proposes an effective phase-in strategy with a freeze on modifications during the transition.

Fission Company's proposed Project Manager is highly qualified and has 10+ years of management experience.

Fission Company's proposed Team Lead for Organizational Development is a significant strength. This person has more than 15 years of directly related experience in organizational development work with federal employees, with the past six years as a supervisor of 12 - 25 employees. Her efforts were recently recognized by the Army Command receiving a significant award for their organizational development activities.

Strengths: 1

Fission Company proposes various incentive approaches which will encourage high performance. Additionally, Fission Company states rewards will be provided for team performance rather than individual performance. This incentive would be conducive to creating a team atmosphere among the Prime and Subcontractors.

Weaknesses: 1

One of Fission Company's Subcontractors failed to document in the FPR the resolution of the clarification regarding the amount employees pay per pay period for health insurance.

In the Safety, Health, and Environmental subfactor, Fission Company received an adjective rating of Excellent. Fission Company received 1 significant strength. This finding is summarized as follows:

Significant Strengths: 1

Fission Company's proposed SHE Plan was very comprehensive and addressed all requirements thoroughly. Fission Company also proposed an annual corporate SHE audit and PM quarterly inspections. This demonstrated a thorough understanding of all safety requirements.

In the Past Performance factor, Fission Company received 1 strength which resulted in the adjective rating of Good. This finding is summarized as follows:

Strengths: 1

A strength was the contract size, type, and scope of all contracts reviewed for Past Performance were moderately comparable and relevant to the OHC requirement, and the overall Past Performance questionnaire on the contracts ratings ranged from excellent to excellent plus.

In the Cost factor, Fission Company proposed a total cost of \$24,890,884 for the Mission Services portion of the contract as delineated in the RFP. Fission Company's fee was slightly higher than WS Company's fee. The Government derived an evaluated cost to accomplish the IDIQ effort for the base year and each option year, by applying a SEC predetermined skill mix and allotment of hours to the quoted fully burdened labor rates as proposed by the Offeror. The Government evaluated Fission Company's cost for the IDIQ effort to be \$1,882,376. Therefore Fission Company's total proposed costs for Mission Services and IDIQ efforts are \$26,773,260. Fission Company's phase-in costs were \$64,000. The SEC determined the proposed cost was reasonable, complete, and ensured that all PWS requirements were reflected in the cost. The only area of adjustment for most probable cost was the application of the general and administrative ceiling rate as required by the RFP. Thus, the SEC determined Fission Company's most probable cost for the base year and all option years is \$26,926,452. After completing the most probable cost adjustment, the SEC gave Fission Company a High cost confidence rating.

WS Company, Incorporated

In the Mission Suitability factor, WS Company received an overall adjective rating of Excellent. WS Company had no deficiencies, 4 significant strengths, 8 strengths, no weaknesses or significant weaknesses. WS Company generated 1 additional strength as a result of the discussions/FPR process.

Under the Management and Technical Approach subfactor, WS Company received an adjective rating of Excellent. WS Company received 2 significant strengths, 3 strengths and no weaknesses or significant weaknesses. These findings are summarized as follows:

Significant Strengths: 2

WS Company's proposal is comprehensive and thorough in describing WS Company's approach to meeting all aspects of the PWS requirements. There is a high confidence in their understanding and ability to accomplish the contract requirements.

The efficiency and effectiveness of the WS Company's management structure was determined to be a significant strength. WS Company proposes a Team Lead for the two organizational elements with the largest concentration of contractor personnel. The proposed leads are working team leads contributing to the mission performance.

Strengths: 3

WS Company's cost control plan is detailed and shows that WS Company has a very good understanding of methodologies and approach required for controlling the cost in a Government cost contract. This will result in the WS Company's ability to estimate, manage, control, track and report costs.

WS Company's proposal demonstrates a thorough understanding of the requirements for processing and dispositioning Senior Executive requirements and the role of the Executive Resource Program Support to provide quality products and services.

Every team member is headquartered or has a presence in Huntsville to ensure real time decisions and support of the Program Manager.

Under the Staffing and Total Compensation Plan subfactor, WS Company received an adjective rating of Excellent. WS Company received 2 significant strengths, 4 strengths, and no weaknesses or significant weaknesses. These findings are summarized as follows:

Significant Strengths: 2

WS Company's proposed Program Manager is highly qualified and has 6 years' experience in managing the current contract and 10+ years of supervisory experience.

WS Company proposed an Organization Development Team Lead who is highly qualified, and has in excess of 10 years of relevant experience with 4 years of supervisory experience.

Strengths: 4

WS Company's risk mitigation during Phase-In was determined to be a strength. WS Company proposes to retain 100% of the incumbent employees. This would reduce the risks associated with the transition from one contract to another.

WS Company has a compensation plan that is very comparable with the Subcontractor's compensation plan. This potentially reduces the risk of morale and management issues and will increase the potential to retain employees.

WS Company proposes various incentive approaches which will encourage high performance and retention of employees (e.g. merit based incentives, awards and recognition programs, and an annual training stipend for each employee). This policy encourages the training and development of personnel for better performance.

WS Company proposed a Team Lead for Academic Affairs who is qualified and has in excess of 10 years of highly relevant experience with the past 5 years as a Team Lead for the current contract.

In the Safety, Health, and Environmental subfactor, WS Company received an adjective rating of Good. WS Company received 2 strengths. These findings are summarized as follows:

Strengths: 2

WS Company's proposed SHE plan was comprehensive and addressed requirements thoroughly.

As a result of discussions and the FPR; WS Company provided a very thorough and comprehensive analysis of office safety risks and mitigations.

In the Past Performance factor, WS Company received 1 significant strength and 1 weakness which resulted in the adjective rating of Very Good. WS Company's findings are summarized as follows:

A significant strength was WS Company's Subcontractor's current contract was highly relevant in type, size, and scope to the OHC requirement. Additionally, ATTI's contract with the Army Center was moderately comparable and relevant to the OHC requirement. The overall Past Performance questionnaire ratings on these contracts ranged from excellent to excellent plus.

A weakness was the Lost Time Case rate for ATTI Contracts F AS8- 867 and AFAH78770 exceeded the national average.

In the Cost factor, WS Company proposed a total cost of \$24,513,730 for the Mission Services portion of the contract as delineated in the RFP. WS Company's fee was slightly lower than Fission Company's fee. The Government derived an evaluated cost to accomplish the IDIQ effort for the base year and

each option year, by applying a SEC predetermined skill mix and allotment of hours to the quoted fully burdened labor rates as proposed by the Offeror. The Government evaluated WS Company cost for the IDIQ effort to be \$1,962,760. Therefore WS Company's total proposed costs for Mission Services and IDIQ efforts are \$26,476,490. WS Company's phase-in costs were \$20,000. The SEC determined the proposed cost was reasonable, complete, and ensured that all PWS requirements were reflected in the costs. There was no adjustment from WS Company's proposed cost to the most probable cost. After determining that the proposed and most probable costs were equal, the SEC gave WS Company a High cost confidence rating.

DECISION

Immediately following the SEC presentation on March 9, 2007, I met in executive session with the key senior advisors, all of whom heard the presentation and were familiar with the RFP. These advisors included representatives from the Office of Personnel, Office of the Chief Financial Officer, Office of Chief Counsel, and the Office of Procurement. I solicited and considered their views in reaching my decision. With respect to the process and findings, we concluded that the evaluation plan was followed, and the evaluation of the proposals was comprehensive, thorough, and well-documented.

During the presentation, the senior advisors and I thoroughly questioned the SEC on a number of points. We noted that the discussion process was well utilized. WS Company was able to eliminate all of their Mission Suitability weaknesses as a result of discussions, and their Mission Suitability score increased in the final evaluation. Fission Company also eliminated all weaknesses, but then added a weakness because Fission Company failed to document in their FPR the resolution of a clarification during discussions. Fission Company's final score was also increased as a result of the discussion process.

The SEC's presentation indicated that in the Mission Suitability factor, WS Company had a slight advantage in the Management and Technical Approach subfactor, the most heavily weighted subfactor, and a significant advantage in the Staffing and Compensation Approach subfactor which is the next most heavily weighted subfactor. Fission Company had an advantage in the Safety, Health, and Environmental subfactor, the least weighted subfactor.

In a close analysis of the findings, I concluded that although the Mission Suitability adjectival ratings for these two firms were a whole rating apart, the findings under this factor were not necessarily as far apart as this adjectival difference might imply and this portion of this competition was closer than the presentation indicated. I was mindful that Fission Company had more total significant strengths and strengths than WS Company in the Mission Suitability factor, yet the SEC reasonably concluded that both the relative strength and

qualitative value of these strengths support the conclusion that WS Company has an advantage in this factor. An example of this difference in qualitative value is found in the first significant strength for the Management and Technical Approach subfactor for WS Company which stated that WS Company's proposal provided a "comprehensive and thorough ... approach to meeting all aspects of the PWS". In contrast, Fission Company had no such finding in all aspects of the PWS but instead was found to have a significant strength for providing a "thorough approach to accomplishing the requirements of the various Organizational and Leadership Development Programs" which is only one area of the PWS.

We next considered the Cost factor. Both Offerors adjusted their cost proposals in response to discussions, and the SEC assigned a High cost confidence to the Government's most probable cost of both Offerors. However, WS Company's proposed and most probable cost was less than Fission Company's proposed and most probable cost, respectively. WS Company maintains slightly lower indirect burdens and a lower proposed fee, which results in a cost advantage for them. Additionally WS Company provided more personnel under their proposed contract for a lower price. Also, the SEC reported that Fission Company's phase-in costs were \$64,000 while WS Company's were \$20,000. Fission Company's most probable cost was adjusted for G&A ceiling rates as required by the RFP and remained higher than WS Company's during the base year and four option years of the contract. As a result, selecting WS Company would result in savings to the Government of approximately \$450,000 over the five years of the contract.

In the Past Performance factor, the Fission Company Team received an adjectival rating of Good and WS Company received an adjectival rating of Very Good. A review of WS Company's Team past performance evaluations revealed one significant strength for excellent past performance on two contracts that were relevant or highly relevant to all areas described in the Mission Services portion of the PWS. WS Company received one weakness due to one of their teammates incurring one Lost Time Case (LTC) on each of two contracts, resulting in exceeding the national LTC rate in one year for each contract. A review of Fission Company's Team past performance evaluations revealed one strength due to demonstrated excellent past performance on three contracts that collectively were relevant to only three of the six areas described in the Mission Services portion of the PWS.

My advisors and I concluded that the SEC properly evaluated the Past Performance factor, and assigned the appropriate adjective rating to each Offeror. I concluded that WS Company had an advantage over Fission Company in the Past Performance factor.

After polling all of my advisors and obtaining their inputs, I concluded that WS Company, provided the best value selection for the Government based upon

their advantage when considering all three of the evaluation factors: Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost. While I determined that WS Company had only a very slight advantage in Mission Suitability, they have a clear advantage in Cost and Past Performance. Consequently, I select WS Company for award of the Human Resources Services Contract.

Asenderve Doe
Source Selection Authority

Date