AWARD DECISION DOCUMENT - TRADEOFF

(PROFESSIONAL SERVICES)

# INTRODUCTION

The objective for the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ procurement is to obtain a support Contractor that will provide professional services to the FAA in the areas of engineering support, logistics, software integration and maintenance, training, operations research and analysis, requirements development and analysis, and business and material management.

# background

The FAA has a requirement for professional services covering such areas as engineering support, logistics, training, operations research and analysis, requirements development and analysis, and business and material management.

# SOURCE SELECTION ROLES AND Responsibilities

***[Reference to source evaluation plan for the names and roles of source evaluation team.]***

# SUMMARY OF INFORMATION

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Service Organization |  |
| Procurement Request Number |  |
| Procurement Request Received |  |
| Competition Type |  |
| Period of Performance |  |
| Option Periods |  |
| Scope of Work | Insert Type of Services (i.e., Professional Support Services |
| NAICS Codes | Insert NAICS Code(s) |
| Product Service Code | Insert Product Service Code |
| Independent Government Cost Estimate |  |
| CFO Ceiling Value |  |
| Solicitation Number |  |
| Type of Solicitation | Insert Type of Solicitation (i.e., Competition/Set-Aside, etc.) |
| Draft Statement of Work Released |  |
| Solicitation Issued |  |
| Solicitation Closed |  |
| Number of Proposals Received |  |
| Offeror 1 | Offeror A |
| Offeror 2 | Offeror B |
| Offeror 3 | Offeror C |
| Proposed Successful Offeror |  |
| Contract Number | DTFAWA-D-XXXX |
| Award Value |  |

# COMPLIANCE

###### CFO Approval Requirements. Per AMS T3.2.1.4, the CFO has approval authority over all proposed procurement actions of $15 million or more. The CFO approved the procurement on *[Date]*.

###### Business Determination. A determination for the Use of Options (AMS T3.2.4.A.9) was approved by Contracting Officer on May 31, 2020. (Contract File, Section-Pre-Award Planning, Tab 3g). A justification for the Use of Time-and-Materials/Labor Hour (AMS T3.2.4.A.6) was approved COCO on *[Date].*

###### Source Selection Evaluation Plan. The Source Selection Evaluation Plan was documented in the file and provided to the Source Selection Team (TET) via training by Contracting Officer. Each Technical Evaluator received the proposals and prepared an Individual Evaluator Worksheet. The TET then met and came to a consensus rating for each evaluation factor and prepared the Consensus Evaluator Worksheet. A Consensus Evaluation Report and Award Decision Memorandum was prepared and submitted to the Source Selection Official, Jane Doe, for final review and approval *on [Date]* Awarded Offeror C. (Contract File, Section-Pre-Award Planning, Tab 31).

###### Non-Inherently Governmental and Critical Functions. In accordance with AMS T.3.8.2, a Determinations Assessment of Contractor Support Services was completed for this acquisition by [Name]. (Contract File, Section I, Tab E.17). This memo determined that the work being performed under the proposed Statement of Work is closely associated inherently governmental functions, as defined by AMS Subpart 7.5. As a result, all of the activities will be closely monitored by federal employees and in all cases; the information gathered by the contractor will be submitted by the contractor to the Government for evaluation and modification.

###### Accounting System. Cost Accounting Standards are designed to achieve uniformity and consistency in the measurement, assignment, and allocation of costs to Government contracts. In order to determine whether Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) apply to an acquisition, AMS T.3.2.3, Cost and Price Methodology/2. CAS (a) was reviewed. After the review, it was determined the CAS applies.

# CONTRACT TYPE

The proposed single award IDIQ contract will include terms and conditions allowing for issuance of firm-fixed-priced or time-and-materials/labor hour task orders. Time-and-material/labor-hour task orders will only be issued when it is not possible to estimate accurately the extent or duration of the work or to anticipate costs with any reasonable degree of confidence. Such task orders will be justified in accordance with AMS Section T3.2.4 Types of Contracts.

The contract will consist of a five-year base award IDIQ contract with two (2) one-year option periods. Task Orders (TO)s may be issued at any time during the base and/or option period. In particular, TO awards issued against this contract will be placed using the procedures described in Section G, Contract Administration Data. The types of TOs issued against the IDIQ may be Time and Materials (T&M), Labor-Hour (L-H), and Firm Fixed Price (FFP) in accordance with AMS Section T3.2.4 Types of Contracts and as set forth in Section G, Contract Administration Data, and Section I, Contract Clauses.

# SUMMARY OF KEY DOCUMENTS

1. SIR and all Amendments
2. Source Evaluation Pan
3. Independent Government Cost Estimate (Contract File, Section-Pre-Award Planning, Tab 3)
4. Technical Evaluation Report (Contract File, Section-Pre-Award Planning, Tab 31)
5. Paivers. track buy american k (use of analytics to track endor certifications are not required when this waiver applies, effecirice Evaluation Report
6. Determination of Responsibility, DOT-4220.1 (Contract File, Section-Pre-Award Planning, Tab 37)
7. Apparent Successful Offeror’s proposal (Contract File, Section-Pre-Award Planning, Tabs 35-36)

# PROCUREMENT SITUATION

1. Procurement Planning: Market Survey report completed by COR and Contract Specialist. (Contract File, Section-Pre-Award Planning, Tab 3b)
2. Previous Buy History: This action was previously awarded to Company ***[Contract Number(s)]***; which expires on ***[Date]***.
3. Government Property/Facilities: The FAA will ***[Information if applicable as needed in support of this contract]***.
4. Unique Features: ***[Information if applicable].***
5. Protests: ***[Information if applicable].***

# OTHER INFORMATION

1. Evaluation Factors: See SIR Sections L and M (Contract File, Section-Pre-Award Planning, Tab 30.
2. Evaluation Results: Contract File, Section-Pre-Award Planning, Tab 31
3. Price Evaluation Report: Contract File, Section-Pre-Award Planning, Tab 44a
4. Equal Employment Opportunity Compliance: Contract File, Section-Pre-Award Planning, Tab 38
5. Best Value Analysis: ***[Trade Off memo]*** Contract File, Section-Pre-Award Planning, Tab 44

# SUMMARY of OFfers

The Government received ***X*** responses to the SIR and ***X*** responses were received after the deadline. The responses received are as follows:

Table 1: List of Offerors’ Information

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Offeror Names | | | |
| Offeror Name | Offeror A | Offeror B | Offeror C |
| Address |  |  |  |
| Business Size | Insert Business Size | Insert Business Size | Insert Business Size |

# EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS

The basis for award will be the best value to the Government based on consideration of price and non-price factors listed below. The Government’s source selection decision will be based on the following six evaluation factors, listed in order of descending importance:

1. Technical Qualifications (Volume I);
2. Management Approach (Volume II);
3. Past Performance (Volume IV);
4. Small Business (SB) and Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB) Participation (Volume V);
5. Price (Volume III); (Not Rated), and
6. Miscellaneous (Volume VI); (Not Rated)

The non-price factors are listed in descending order of importance. Any sub factors are of equal importance to each other. The non-price factors, when combined, are more important than price. As the difference among Offerors in the non-price evaluation results decreases, the Price Proposal evaluation results become more important.

The Small Business Subcontracting Plan (Volume V) ***[Large Businesses Only]*** evaluation results are used to establish the Offeror’s commitment to the participation of Small Businesses in the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_contract; they are not factored into the Best Value trade-off. Volume VI (Miscellaneous) is not evaluated and also has no bearing on the Best Value trade-off.

For review and evaluation of the price proposal, each proposal was reviewed to determine whether it included all required pricing information, pricing details align with summary pricing tables; prices are consistent with described pricing methodology and are traceable to the requirements set forth in Section L.6.2 and L.6.3. Completeness was determined based on the information requested in Section L.6.2.3. In accordance with Section M.6, the FAA will evaluate Volume III, Parts A and B for reasonableness in accordance with AMS Policy 3.2.3.2 and AMS Procurement Guidance T3.2.2.3. Per Section M.6.3.1, the Price Proposal will be evaluated, but not ranked or scored. In evaluating the Price Proposal, the FAA will use a Total Evaluated Price (TEP), which includes the base and all option periods. The TEP will be the sum of:

1. The proposed fully- burdened government site labor rates for each category multiplied by the historical hours for each labor category provided by the FAA in Attachment J-7. (Please note that for labor categories in Attachment J-7 without hours, those rates will be reviewed for reasonableness and realism but will not be included as part of the TEP); and
2. CLINs with FAA provided Not-to-Exceed (NTE) amounts.

Although not included in the TEP, the FFP CLINs must be reviewed for reasonableness, as required by AMS Policy 3.2.3.2, which states the CO must make a determination that prices are fair and reasonable based on price analysis and, if necessary, cost analysis. Price analysis is the review of price without evaluating separate cost elements and profit/fee, and is required for all pricing actions. Cost analysis is the review of the individual cost elements and profit. Price analysis is the preferred method for evaluating competitive proposals.

The Program Management and Lease (Facility) Costs will be included in the Best Value Tradeoff decision.

Each of the offerors proposals were reviewed to ensure compliance with the instructions outlined in SIR Section L. The results of that compliance check can be found at in Contract File, Section-Pre-Award Planning, Tab 30.

Summary of Proposed Prices

Table 2: Total Evaluated Price in Accordance with Sections L & M of the SIR

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Offerors | Labor | Other Direct Costs (ODCs) | Total |
| A |  |  |  |
| B |  |  |  |
| C |  |  |  |

***\* ODC’s amounts are plug numbers provided by the Government in the SIR.***

Table 3: Proposed Lease Costs for Each Offeror

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Lease Costs | **A** | **B** | **C** |
|  |  |  |

Table 4: Proposed Program Management Costs for Each Offeror

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program Management Costs | A | B | C |
|  |  |  |

The full Price Evaluation Report is located in Contract File, Section-Pre-Award Planning, Tab 31. The Price Evaluation Team (PET) completed the price evaluation review in accordance with SIR Sections L and M. For the evaluation of the Total Evaluated Price (TEP) the PET’s findings are as follows:

Offeror C

Offeror C’s overall proposed price, including the prices not included in the TEP, was determined to be reasonable. Offeror A did not state any assumptions or exceptions to the SIR.

Offeror C

Offeror C’s overall proposed price, including the prices not included in the TEP, was determined to be reasonable. The proposed labor rates are not included in the TEP (see page X of the price report) are considered realistic. The CO conducted price/cost realism analysis as prescribed in Section M. ***The most important assumption by Offeror C is (Insert Offeror Assumptions and Deviations)***

Offeror C

Offeror C’s overall proposed price, including the prices not included in the TEP, was determined to be reasonable. The proposed labor rates not included in the TEP are considered realistic. Offeror C did not state any assumptions or exceptions to the SIR.

All proposed were found reasonable with noted assumptions in Offeror C’s price proposal; which if accepted by the Government have serious cost implications that have not been quantified by the offeror in their price proposal.

# Summary of Proposal Evaluation

The final proposal evaluation consensus and price report are located in Contract File, Section-Pre-Award Planning, Tab 31.

The proposal evaluation consensus ratings are as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Offeror** | **Factor 1 Insert Factor Title** | **Factor 2 Insert Factor Title** | **Factor 3**  **Insert Factor Title** | **Factor 4**  **Insert Factor Title** |
| A |  |  |  |  |
| B |  |  |  |  |
| C |  |  |  |  |

# Small Business (SB) and Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB) Participation

Offeror B is a small business and was not required to submit a small business subcontracting plan..

Offeror A and Offeror C are large businesses and they have been validated by reviewing the System for Acquisition Management (www.sam.gov) and the Small Business Administration’s Dynamic Small Business Search. Per the instructions in the SIR, only large businesses were required to complete Small Business Subcontracting Plans. The Offers’ responses demonstrated viable small business subcontracting plans that meet the specified subcontracting goals and the AMS content requirements.

# PAst Performance

The Contracting Officer conducted an evaluation of the past performance information received for each offeror in accordance with Section L of the SIR. Past performance summaries and questionnaires revealed no detrimental information. Each Offeror’s record of past performance indicates there is very little risk associated with receiving quality products, timely services and full contract performance. Past performance surveys and each Offeror’s experience indicates the Offeror will meet or exceed the requirements of the contract. Each Offeror has demonstrated recent experience with projects of similar size, scope and complexity. Past Performance submissions were found ACCEPTABLE for all Offerors.

# Best value analysis

This acquisition is being conducted in accordance with the FAA’s Acquisition Management System (AMS) and will utilize the Best Value Approach for selecting an Offeror for an award. The Best Value Approach is a method of selecting the proposals based on identifying the offer representing the greatest value to the Government as determined by the combined outcomes of the individual volume ratings and their relative order of importance as defined in Section X of the SIR. This approach provides the opportunity for a technical/price trade-off and does not require that the awards be made to either the Offeror submitting the highest rated technical proposal or the Offeror submitting the lowest prices, although the ultimate award decision may be to either of these Offerors. All proposals were evaluated for compliance with the terms, conditions and requirements set forth by the SIR.

For this solicitation, the non-price factors are more important than cost or price. Based on the comparative analysis of proposals received against all source selection criteria, the proposal submitted by Offeror C represents the best value to the Government. The selection was based upon the factors and sub-factors established in the solicitation and the comparison of the strengths, weaknesses, and risks of the proposals submitted in response to the solicitation. The best value analysis in its entirety is located in the Contract File, Section-Pre-Award Planning, Tab 44.

In recommending the award of the contract to Offeror C, a ***Determination of Responsibility*** per AMS T.3.2.2.7 has been completed and the results are as follows:

* + 1. Past Performance: Offeror C’s past performance has been evaluated. The Contracting Officer conducted an evaluation of the past performance received in accordance with Section L of the SIR. Past performance summaries and questionnaires revealed no detrimental information. The Offeror’s record of past performance indicates there is very little risk associated with receiving quality products, timely services, and full contract performance. Past performance surveys and the Offeror’s experience indicate the Offeror will meet or exceed the requirements of the contract. The Contractor has demonstrated recent experience with projects of similar size, scope and complexity and is found ACCEPTABLE. This evaluation is reflected in the consensus evaluation report. See Contract File Tab – 31
    2. System for Award Management: Offeror C is not on the list of excluded parties as of ***[Date]***
    3. EEO Compliance/OFCCP Clearance (IAW AMS 3.6.2.1 & T3.6.2):Offeror C is not listed in the OFCCP’s national pre-award registry as of (Insert Date). A Pre-award Clearance request was issued on (Insert Date) *See Contract, Pre Award Planning, File Tab – 37.*
    4. Financial Condition: The Dun and Bradstreet (DNB) report indicates that Offeror C has a clear financial history and condition. The report did not reveal any adverse information that would make a negative impact on making the award to Offeror C. A copy of the DNB report can be found in the Volume VI-Miscellaneous of their Procurement proposal.
    5. Accounting System: Offeror C accounting system has been reviewed under Defense Contract Audit Agency. The accounting and timekeeping system adequate per DMCA letter dated ***[Date]*** (reference--*DCAA Audit Report NO. Date)*
    6. DOT Form 4220-1 Determination of Prospective Contractor Responsibility: *See Contract, Pre Award Planning, File Tab – 37.*
    7. Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS): A check of FAPIIS was completed (Insert Date). The check found no negative information that precludes Offeror C from the contract award. *See Pre Award Planning, File Tab – 37.*

# Recommendation

It is hereby recommended that award be made to **Offeror C** with a total award ceiling of **$[Total Amount]** (inclusive of all options/ordering periods). In accordance with the evaluation criteria established in the Source Selection Plan/Evaluation Guide and the SIR, the proposal from **Offeror C** represents the best value to the Government. In accordance with AMS Policy 3.2.3.2 and AMS Procurement Guidance T3.2.3 costs are considered to be fair and reasonable.

The final contract document and associated attachments will be routed for separate review and approval.

**Prepared by:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| Contracting Officer, AAQ-XXX |  | Date |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |
| AAQ Branch Chief, AAQ-XXX |  | Date |

Attachments

# Offeror Proposals

# See EDOCS for all referenced documents in this decision document