

Source Selection Decision
For GSA Request for Quote (RFQ) DE-SOL-0006812
MOBIS (SINs 874-6)

1. Introduction

As the Contracting Officer for the General Support Services Contracts (GSSC), I am also acting as the Source Selection Official (SSO) for the selection of Mission Oriented Business Integrated Services (MOBIS) 874-6 (Acquisition Management Support) Task Order.

A Selection Panel was established to solicit and evaluate quotes. Each offeror's quote included a technical proposal which included Labor Categories and Qualifications as well as Past Performance and Price/Rate quote for statement of work (SOW). The Panel included:

(b)(6) (Panel Chair, Voting Member and Contract Specialist), (b)(6) (Panel Voting Member, Contract Specialist), (b)(6) (Cost/Price Analyst), and (b)(6) (Attorney).

In reaching my decision, I received and reviewed the final selection panel evaluation report from the Panel and conferred with Panel members to fully understand the contents of its evaluation. In addition, I reviewed the contents of the offerors' proposals. Exercising my independent judgment, I select Federal Acquisition Consultants, Inc. (FACI) for award.

2. Description of Acquisition

The United States Department of Energy (DOE) Richland Operations Office (RL), Hanford Site in Richland, WA requested quotes to establish one task order under the General Services Administration (GSA) Federal Supply Schedule (FSS) from small business concerns that hold the Mission Oriented Business Integrated Services (MOBIS) Special Item Numbers (SINs) 874-6 (Acquisition Management Support). The solicitation was set aside only for small business concerns in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 8.405-5. The North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Code for the acquisition was 541611.

3. Solicitation and Submission of Quotes

On April 16, 2014, I requested quotes from six GSA FSS MOBIS small business concerns that were provided the RFQ via email to reasonably ensure that quotes would be received from at least three offerors that could fulfill the requirement (FAR 8.405-3(b)(2)(v)(B)). An additional offeror requested the RFQ and provided a quote. All quotes received were fairly considered (FAR 8.405-3(b)(2)(vi)). All of the offerors included in this report were responsive to the RFQ requirements.

After the RFQ was provided, DOE-RL received seven questions about various aspects of the RFQ from prospective offerors. All questions were answered using Amendments to the solicitation and provided to potential offerors via email. None of the questions resulted in any change to the requirements of the RFQ. Timely quotes were received from three offerors

on April 25, 2014, at 4:30pm, pst. After reviewing the quotes, all were deemed to be responsive to the RFQ.

Quotes were received from the following:

MOBIS (SINs 874-6)

(b)(3):41 U.S.C 253,(b)(5)

Federal Acquisition Consultants, Inc.
20 F Street NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20002
204-328-3360

(b)(3):41 U.S.C 253,(b)(5)

Named Subcontractor: (b)(3):41 U.S.C 253,(b)(5)

4. Evaluation Procedures

Section 6, Quotation Instructions and Evaluation Factors, provided proposal instructions to the Offerors concerning the type and depth of information necessary for DOE-RL to conduct an informed evaluation. The Selection Panel performed a comprehensive evaluation of the proposals against the evaluation criteria set forth in the RFQ.

DOE-6016, "Basis for Award," describes DOE-RL's intent to award to the responsible offeror(s) whose quote is responsive to the Solicitation and determined to be the best value and most advantageous to the Government. Selection of the best value to the Government will be achieved through a process of evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of each offeror's quote in accordance with the evaluation factors in the Solicitation.

In determining the best value to the Government, Technical Capability (Labor Category and Qualifications, Relevant Experience, and Past Performance), and Price are approximately equally weighted. The Government will assess what the strengths and weaknesses between or among competing technical quotes indicate from the standpoint of (1) what the difference might mean in terms of anticipated performance; and (2) what the evaluated price/rates to the Government would be to take advantage of the difference.

Price/rates for statement of work SOWs will be reviewed separately from the technical capability criterion cited above, based upon the best-value to the government. In accordance with FAR 8.405-2(d), the ordering activity is responsible for determining total price reasonableness.

5. Evaluation Results

Volume 1, Offer and Other Documents

After completion of the review of Volume 1 in the Selection Panel Report (Section III), the Contracting Officer determined that all quotes were complete and responsive to the RFQ Volume 1 requirements by the time of award.

Volume 2, Technical Quote

The Selection Panel evaluated and rated adjectivally each quote according to the evaluation factors listed in Section 6 of the RFQ. The adjectival ratings in order from worst to best were: Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Good, and Excellent, as defined the Selection Panel Report, Section V. The Selection Report included a table, shown below, summarizing the evaluation results.

Factor	(b)(3):41 U.S	FACI	
Technical Capability			
Relevant Experience	(b)(5)		
Labor Category/ Qualifications			
Past Performance			

(b)(3):41
U.S.C 253,
U.S.C

Volume 3, Price Proposal

The price proposal was not point scored or adjectivally rated. DOE-RL performed a price evaluation, and price was considered in the overall evaluation of quotes in determining the best value to the Government, in accordance with Section 6 of the RFQ. Based upon the price review, price analyst concluded that all offerors have a basic understanding of the solicitation requirements.

6. Comparative Assessment of Quotes

I am satisfied that the Selection Panel's evaluation of proposals was rigorous, thorough, and compliant with the established evaluation criteria and applicable procedures. The Selection Panel provided me with an extensive evaluation of each offeror's technical proposal and the Cost/Price Analyst provided a report of the price proposals for my best value analysis and selection decision. In addition, I reviewed the offerors' quotes and consulted with the Selection Panel members as necessary.

The following represents my comparative analysis of the offerors' proposals, beginning with the Technical Evaluation Factors: Technical Capability was divided into three areas: Relevant Experience, Labor Category and Qualifications, and Past Performance.

The Selection Panel evaluated each area's strengths and weaknesses separately. For evaluation factor, **Relevant Experience**, the Selection Panel evaluated what each offeror has done under other recent contracts based on performing general support services similar in type, scope, and complexity to Section 1 – Description of Services. For this criterion, the Selection Panel rated FACI and (b)(5) (b)(3):41 I agree

(b)(3):41
U.S.C 253,
U.S.C

(b)(3):41
U.S.C 253,
U.S.C

with the Panel's evaluation and adjectival rating assignments.

As set forth in the Panel Report, FACI received a rating of (b)(5) FACI had (b)(5)

(b)(5)

(b)(5)

(b)(5) FACI (b)(5) received a rating of (b)(3):41

(b)(5) (b)(3):41 U.S.C 253,

(b)(5)

(b)(5) had (b)(5) received a (b)(3):41

rating of (b)(5) (b)(3):41 had (b)(5) U.S.C 253,

(b)(5)

(b)(5)

(b)(5) had (b)(5) (b)(3):41

(b)(5) U.S.C 253,

(b)(5)

I have considered the evaluation for each offeror and the relative merits of the evaluations for Relevant Experience. I find that FACI (b)(5)

(b)(3):41
U.S.C 253,

For evaluation factor, **Labor Categories and Qualifications**, the Selection Panel evaluated each offeror's proposed labor category and associated qualifications based on appropriateness to the statement of work. For this criterion, the Selection Panel rated FACI (b)(5) (b)(3):41 U.S.C 253, I agree with the Panel's evaluation and adjectival rating assignments.

As set forth in the Selection Panel Report, FACI received a rating of (b)(5) FACI has

(b)(5)

(b)(5)

(b)(5) FACI also (b)(5)

(b)(5)

(b)(5) FACI had (b)(5)

(b)(5)

(b)(5) FACI (b)(5) received (b)(3):41

(b)(5) had (b)(5) U.S.C 253,

(b)(5) (b)(3):41

(b)(5) U.S.C 253,

(b)(5)

(b)(5) received a rating of (b)(3):41

(b)(5) (b)(5) U.S.C 253,

(b)(5)

(b)(5) had (b)(5)

(b)(5)

(b)(5) (b)(3):41 U.S.C. 253
(b)(5)

I have considered the evaluation for each offeror and the relative merits of the evaluations for Labor Categories and Qualifications. I find that FACI has a significant advantage over

(b)(3):41 U.S.C. 253, (b)(5)

For **Past Performance**, the Panel evaluated the offerors' compliance with technical requirements and performance standards for previous relevant work. Offerors' were required to provide at least one, but no more than three, contacts that can provide relevant past performance information from recent experience. The Selection Panel received information from references for each offeror. For this criterion, the Selection Panel rated each offeror as

(b)(5):41 U.S.C. 253, (b)(5) received a rating of (b)(5)

(b)(5) FACI received rating of (b)(5)

(b)(5) (b)(5):41 U.S.C. 253, (b)(5)

I have considered the evaluation for each offeror and the relative merits of the evaluation for Past Performance. I find that no offeror had an advantage and there is no discriminator between the offerors.

Consideration of Technical Proposals

I agree with the Selection Panel's technical evaluation as documented in the Selection Panel Report and summarized in the above table. I find that overall, Federal Acquisition Consultants, Inc. quote was (b)(5)

(b)(3):41 U.S.C. 253, (b)(5)

(b)(5):41 U.S.C. 253, (b)(5)

(b)(5) FACI's (b)(5)

I conclude that the relative merits of FACI's overall (b)(5)

(b)(3):41 U.S.C. 253, (b)(5) With each category being approximately equal, FACI (b)(5) (b)(3):41 U.S.C. 253, (b)(5)

(b)(5) (b)(5)

(b)(3):41
U.S.C 253,
(b)(7)(F)

(b)(5) (b)(5)

Consideration of Price Proposals

As set forth in the RFQ, the offerors' price proposals were not point scored or adjectively rated. Because GSA had already determined that the rates for services offered at hourly rates under schedule contracts are fair and reasonable, the Cost/Price Analyst performed an overall price reasonableness evaluation in accordance with 8.405-2(d), including considering the level of effort and the mix of labor proposed to perform the task. The Cost/Price Analyst evaluated the price proposals for reasonableness, including applicable discounts, and provided me with an independent price evaluation.

FACI (b)(4),(b)(5) FACI
(b)(4),(b)(5)
(b)(4),(b)(5) FACI (b)(5)
FACI (b)(4),(b)(5)
(b)(4),(b)(5) The FACI quote for the statement of work was \$1,405,045.39, and the price is considered reasonable.

(b)(3):41
U.S.C 253,
(b)(7)(F)

(b)(5) (b)(3):41
(b)(5) U.S.C 253,
(b)(5) proposed (b)(3):41
(b)(5) U.S.C 253,
(b)(5)

(b)(3):41
U.S.C 253,
(b)(7)(F)

(b)(5) (b)(5)
(b)(5)
(b)(5) (b)(5)

(b)(5):41
U.S.C 253,
(b)(7)(F)

(b)(5) (b)(5) (b)(3):41
(b)(5) U.S.C 253,
(b)(5) (b)(5)
(b)(5)

(b)(3):41
U.S.C 253,
(b)(7)(F)

(b)(5) (b)(5)
(b)(5) (b)(5)
(b)(5)

(b)(3):41
U.S.C 253,
(b)(7)(F)

(b)(5) Without further explanation, it appears that (b)(5) (b)(3):41
(b)(5) U.S.C 253,
Therefore, the (b)(5) (b)(5) (b)(3):41
(b)(5) U.S.C 253,
(b)(5)

(b)(3):41
U.S.C 253,
(b)(7)(F)

After reviewing the Cost/Price Analyst report and each offeror's estimates for the SOW, I agree that FACI submitted a (b)(5) (b)(3):41
and (b)(5) U.S.C 253,
(b)(5)

**Selection Panel Evaluation of
Quotes Submitted In Response to
Request for Quotation (RFQ)
DE-SOL-0006812
MOBIS (SIN 874-6)**

I. EVALUATION

1. The Selection Panel (SP) included: (b)(6) (Panel Chairperson, Contract Specialist), (b)(6) (Panel Voting Member, Contract Specialist), (b)(6) (Cost/Price Analyst), and (b)(6) (Attorney).

The United States Department of Energy, Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) Procurement Division requires general support services (GSS) contractors for acquisition management cost/price analysis support at the Hanford Site in Richland, Washington. DOE-RL will utilize the General Services Administration (GSA) Federal Supply Schedule (FSS) for one task order against the Mission Oriented Business Integrated Services (MOBIS) acquisition management support (special item number (SIN) 874-6).

This solicitation is set aside only for small business concerns in accordance to Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 8.405-5. The North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Code for this acquisition is 541611.

DOE-RL anticipates awarding a five-year (1 year base and 4 one-year options) firm fixed-price contract for the period of August 19, 2014, through August 18, 2019, if the option years are exercised. This procurement is to be set-aside for small business using the GSA FSS.

2. The RFQ stated:

The following criteria were used to evaluate the offerors' quotes:

Offer and Other Documents

The offeror's compliance with the quote instructions as outlined in Offer and Other Documents Volume 1 (such as format and content) will be reviewed for completeness.

Technical Evaluation Factors

The following areas were evaluated as part of the Technical Quote. Any price/rate information was not evaluated as part of the Technical Quote.

- Technical Capability:
 - Relevant Experience: Experience pertains to what the offeror has done under other, recent contracts. DOE-RL will evaluate the Offeror's relevant experience in

performing support services similar in type, scope, and complexity to Section 1 Description of Services.

- **Labor Category and Qualifications:** As part of this evaluation, the offeror's labor category and associated qualifications shall be evaluated based on appropriateness to the statement of work.
- **Past Performance:** The Government will evaluate the offeror's overall business relations and compliance with contract terms and conditions and technical requirements and performance standards for previous and present work. The performance standards to be evaluated include: (a) Quality of Service, (b) Schedule, (c) Cost Control, and (d) Business Relations (e) Customer Satisfaction. Consideration will be given to how the offeror met completion dates, including interim deliverables or milestones such as periodic technical and business reports, and completion of valid customer direction. The information requested by this Solicitation, together with information that may be available to the Department of Energy, from other Government agencies, and from non-government organizations will be considered in the evaluation. An offeror with no relevant past performance will be evaluated neutrally.

Basis for Award

DOE-RL intends to award to the responsible offeror (s) whose quote is responsive to the Solicitation and determined to be the best value and most advantageous to the Government. Selection of the best value to the Government will be achieved through a process of evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of each offeror's quote in accordance with the evaluation factors in the Solicitation.

In determining the best value to the Government, Technical Capability (Labor Category and Qualifications, Relevant Experience, and Past Performance), and Price are approximately equally weighted. The Government will assess what the strengths and weaknesses between or among competing technical quotes indicate from the standpoint of (1) what the difference might mean in terms of anticipated performance; and (2) what the evaluated price/rates to the Government would be to take advantage of the difference.

Price/rates for the Statement of Work will be reviewed separately from the technical capability criterion cited above, based upon the best-value to the government. In accordance with FAR 8.405-2(d), the ordering activity is responsible for determining total price reasonableness.

3. The following rating methodology was used for the Government's best value analysis:
 - A. **Excellent.** Quote demonstrates a thorough understanding of requirements and approach that demonstrates a high likelihood of success. The quote contains at least one significant strength or multiple strengths and no weaknesses.

- B. **Good.** Quote demonstrates an understanding of requirements and its approach demonstrates a likelihood of success. Quote strengths outweigh any identified weaknesses.
- C. **Satisfactory.** Quote demonstrates acceptable understanding of requirements and approach that meets performance or capability standards. The quote identifies few, if any strengths and few, if any weaknesses, or an offsetting balance of strengths and weaknesses.
- D. **Unsatisfactory.** Quote fails to meet performance or capability standards. Requirements can only be met with major changes to the quote. The quote identifies at least one significant weakness or multiple weaknesses that outweigh any strengths. The response indicates an inability to meet the required performance standards.

Definitions:

- A. **Strength.** A feature or benefit in the quote that increases the likelihood of successful contract performance. A "significant strength" in the quote is a feature or benefit that appreciably increases the likelihood of successful contract performance.
- B. **Weakness.** A flaw or aspect of the quote that increases the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance. A "significant weakness" is a flaw or aspect of the quote that appreciably increases the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance.

II. QUOTATION INFORMATION

Quotes were received from the companies listed below.

MOBIS (SIN 874-6)

(b)(3):41 U.S.C 253

Federal Acquisition Consultants, Inc.
20 F Street NW, Suite 700
Washington D.C. 2002-6705
202-328-3360

(b)(3):41 U.S.C 253

III. RESPONSIVENESS DETERMINATION

As requested in the RFQ and stated in DOE-6011 Electronic Submission of Quotes, quotes (hereinafter referred to as offeror's *quotes*) were to be submitted to the DOE-RL electronically, via email. Six GSA FSS MOBIS small business concerns were provided the RFQ via email to reasonably ensure that quotes would be received from at least three offerors that could fulfill the requirement (FAR 8.405-3(b)(2)(v)(B)). All quotes received were fairly considered (FAR 8.405-3(b)(2)(vi)). All of the offerors included in this report were responsive to the RFQ requirements.

IV. CONFLICT OF INTEREST

In accordance with DOE-6013 Quote Preparation Instructions – Offer and Other Documents – Volume 1, award from this RFQ will be subject to the Organizational Conflicts of Interest provisions in accordance with the disclosure requirements of DEAR 952.209-8 and Offeror will be required to complete DOE-3016 Organizational Conflict of Interest Management Plan.

At this time, there is no apparent conflict of interest that would preclude making an award to any of the potential offerors.

V. RESULTS OF EVALUATION

Where elements of the Offeror's quotation did not rise to a strength or fall to a weakness, they were considered satisfactory and were not discussed further in this report.

Technical Evaluation Factors

The Selection Panel reviewed the quotes to evaluate the offerors' technical approach and found the following strengths and weaknesses applicable to the Technical Approach criteria.

A. Technical Capability – Relevant Experience

(b)(3):41
U.S.C 253

[redacted] was given a rating of [redacted]

Significant Strengths

[redacted]

Strengths

[redacted]

(b)(5)

Weaknesses

(b)(5)

Significant Weaknesses

(b)(5)

FACI was given a rating of (b)(5)

Significant Strengths

(b)(5)

Strengths

(b)(4),(b)(5)

Weaknesses

(b)(5)

Significant Weaknesses

(b)(5)

(b)(3):41
U.S.C 253,
41 CFR

_____ was given a rating of (b)(5)

Significant Strengths

(b)(5)

Significant Weaknesses

(b)(5)

FACI was given a rating of (b)(5)

Significant Strengths

(b)(5)

Strengths

(b)(4),(b)(5)

Weaknesses

(b)(5)

Significant Weaknesses

(b)(5)

(b)(3):41
U.S.C 253,
(b)(5)

_____ was given a rating of (b)(5)

Significant Strengths

(b)(5)

Strengths

(b)(5)

Weaknesses

(b)(5)

Significant Weaknesses

(b)(5)

C. Past Performance

(b)(3):41
U.S.C 253,
(b)(5)

_____ was given a rating of (b)(5)

(b)(5)

Significant Strengths

(b)(5)

Strengths

(b)(5)

Weaknesses

(b)(5)

Significant Weaknesses

(b)(5)

FACI was given a rating of (b)(5)

(b)(4),(b)(5)

(b)(4),(b)(5)

Significant Strengths

(b)(5)

Strengths

(b)(5)

(b)(5)

Weaknesses

(b)(5)

Significant Weaknesses

(b)(5)

(b)(3):41
U.S.C 253,
(b)(5)

_____ was given a rating of (b)(5)

(b)(5)

Significant Strengths

(b)(5)

Strengths

(b)(5)

Weaknesses

(b)(5) [Redacted]

Significant Weaknesses

(b)(5) [Redacted]

VI. SUMMARY

MOBIS (SIN 874-6)

(b)(3):41
U.S.C 253,
(b)(7)(F)

Factor		FACI	
Technical Capability			
*Relevant Experience	(b)(5)		
*Labor Category/Quals			
*Past Performance			

(b)(3):41
U.S.C 253,
(b)(7)(F)

VII. SIGNATURES

(b)(6) [Redacted Signature]

Contract Specialist

(b)(6) [Redacted Signature]

Contract Specialist

5/21/14
Date

5/21/14
Date