

Exchanges with the Best-Suited Contractor

As discussed in the Source Selection Decision Document (Attachment 3), [REDACTED] received the highest confidence in the heaviest weighted factors, provided a lower price than their closest competitor, Team [REDACTED], and was therefore considered the Best-Suited Contractor IAW section 4.4 of the FON. This verbiage allows the Government to make exchanges with the Best-Suited Contractor prior to making award. The Source Selection Authority (SSA) requested that contracting contact Team [REDACTED] and ensure the Offeror considered Appendix A to the SOW when developing their schedule, allowing for schedule and pricing changes if necessary, however, Team [REDACTED] is not required to make any changes. The SSA further stated that whether or not the Offeror changes are made to the schedule, award should be made to Team [REDACTED].

Without notifying them that they are the apparently successful Offeror, the Government contacted Team CompQsoft as directed in the Source Selection Decision Document (Attachment 3).

Team [REDACTED] provided a timely revised proposal on 01/28/2020, to include an additional [REDACTED] Full Time Employees (FTEs), better aligning with the 93 FTEs shown in Appendix A. The revised proposal can be found in Tab 17b of the contract file.

The PET analyzed Team [REDACTED] revised schedule compared to the current contract prices with escalation, and the movement of Help Desk Support to a professional workforce. To gauge a better estimate the PET applied a 3% escalation rate to the current contract price of \$47,799,386.39, and used the GSA CALC Tool to estimate the hourly wages for the Help Desk personnel as professional services, vice the current non-professional services. Attachment 5 details this comparison.

As stated in the Source Selection Decision Document located in Tab 24 of the contract file, I determined task order award to [REDACTED] (Team [REDACTED]), provides the best value to the Government. I requested that the Contracting Officer (KO) conduct exchanges with Team [REDACTED] as described in the Fair Opportunity Notice (FON), "Exchanges with Best Suited Contractor". Through the exchanges, the KO requested that the Offeror consider Appendix A to the Statement of Work (SOW). The KO also stated that the Government is aware that any changes to the schedule many affect pricing to which revised pricing would be accepted, but would like no other aspects of the proposal to be altered.

A timely revised proposal was received by Team [REDACTED] containing the following revisions:

Team [REDACTED]		
Labor Category Descriptions (Appendix A to the SOW)	Offeror's Original Proposed Staffing Levels	Offeror's Revised Proposed Staffing Levels
93	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

The changes in staffing levels directly align with the staffing levels noted in Appendix A of the SOW. The revision increased our already high confidence in the Offeror's ability to perform successfully against the contract. Additionally, the Offeror revised their price proposal as shown below:

Team [REDACTED]			
Original Total Evaluated Price	Revised Total Evaluated Price	Delta\$	Delta%
\$47,118,233.01	\$53,513,980.74	\$6,395,747.73	12%

Below is a snapshot of the overall ratings:

	Phase I		Phase II		
	Factor 1 Relevant Experience	Factor II Past Performance	Factor III Technical Capability	Factor IV Management Approach	Factor V Price (Including FAR 52.217-8)
Team [REDACTED]	High	Superior	High	High	\$53,513,980.74 (Revised Price)
Team [REDACTED]	High	Superior	Some	Some	\$47,936,412.36

Taking the revised pricing, the areas of increased or decreased confidence, as well as the confidence ratings and the weighting applied to factors I-IV into consideration, my original recommendation of award to Team [REDACTED] remains unchanged.