

SAMPLE DECISION DOCUMENT 2

This procurement was conducted under FAR Subpart 8.4, *Federal Supply Schedules*. I am both the contracting officer and the selecting official.

I have determined that the [PROCUREMENT SHORT NAME] quote by [D] provides the best overall value to the government. I made this selection based on the factors established in the RFQ and a comparative evaluation completed by the Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC) (see TEC Consensus Report dated 09/16/2019).

I personally observed each of the oral presentations, and also observed the TEC as it conducted its consensus evaluation. The TEC evaluated each of the quoters for the non-price factors, and through a comparative evaluation, identified which quoter was most advantageous to the Government for each of those factors. I agree with and fully adopt the TEC's findings as my own. The table below summarizes the evaluation results. A check (✓) indicates the quote that was found to be most advantageous for each factor.

	[A]	[B]	[C]	[D]	[E]
Factor 1: Price	✓ \$3.3M	\$4.2M	\$4.2M	\$4.6M	\$4.7M
Factor 2: Betterment Promises				✓	
Factor 3: Technical Approach				✓	
Factor 4: Experience in Technical Approach				✓	

Note: The prices shown for Factor 1 are total evaluated prices, including the FAR 52.217-8 option (see price evaluation report dated 09/16/2019).

As shown in the table, [A] is most advantageous for the price factor, and [D] is the most advantageous for each of the three non-price factors. The RFQ indicated that each factor was of approximately equal importance, and all non-price factors when combined are significantly more important than price.

In performing my comparative analysis for the tradeoff, I first considered [A] and [D]. I appreciate [A]'s lower price for Factor 1. However, I also appreciate [D]'s greater technical merit for the non-price factors. For Factor 2, I see value in [D]'s proposed establishment of an Agile Innovation Council and access to a mission innovation lab. Each of [D]'s betterments aligned to the specific requirements within the Performance Work Statement (PWS) and provided a strong delineation as to the value the Government would receive from the promise and the manner in which the proposed betterment exceeded the governments stated requirements. Additionally, [D]'s betterments are consistent with the technical approach delivered during the oral presentation. I find the betterments offered by [D] to be superior to those offered by [A]. For Factor 3, [D] provided thorough details on how they would accomplish the objectives and tasks detailed in the PWS, and demonstrated a collaborative approach to answering the oral presentation questions, an approach which could be leveraged within the [PROGRAM] environment to build trust and confidence within the [PROGRAM] team itself, and with associated stakeholders external to [PROGRAM]. This contributes to my confidence in [D]. Additionally, [D] highlighted many avenues to promote

innovation in accordance with [PROGRAM]'s new software architecture patterns and multi-cloud services, and provided concrete examples of how the processes described from a strategic level could then be decomposed into work streams for implementation within [PROGRAM] to provide efficiencies and potential cost savings. These approaches give me high confidence in [D], higher than I have for [A]. For Factor 4, [D] provides greater technical merit than [A]. The experience detailed by [D]'s team regarding implementation of similar requirements provides evidence of the company's ability to realize the objectives and tasks detailed in the PWS. [D]'s partnering agreements with Booz Allen provide extensive experience in successfully setting up planning teams within DHS that align with the requirements of [PROGRAM]. Additionally, [D] proposed an alignment council that brings experienced senior technologists and government leaders together to provide recommendations to the program. This is a great reach back asset to better understand industry and government IT trends, and will elucidate how those recommendations can better [PROGRAM]. Considering all four factors combined, [D]'s quote provides better value than [A]'s quote. The benefits of [D]'s quote, compared to [A]'s, merits its higher price.

Next, I considered [B] and [C]. Both of these quotes are higher-priced than [A] and lower-technically-rated than [D]. As mentioned above, I agree with the TEC's finding that [D] is more advantageous than both [B] and [C] for each of the non-price factors. I need not conduct a tradeoff comparing [B] and [C] to [A] as I have already found [D] to provide better value than [A].

With regard to [B], I appreciate the positive findings that were noted in the TEC report for [B], such as their highlighted experience conducting current work with the Transportation Security Agency (TSA) in standing up a Lean Agile Center of Excellence and infrastructure experience with Customs and Border Patrol (CBP). However, I am particularly concerned that [B] did not tailor their technical approach to specific aspects of the PWS and that they displayed only minimal experience in delivery. [D]'s approach gives me more confidence than [B]'s approach.

With regard to [C], I appreciate the positive findings that were noted in the TEC report for [C], such as their extensive experience with eProcessing and ELIS, and that [C] is an AWS Certified Partner. However, I am particularly concerned that [C] did not clearly address all of the questions asked, and the responses did not clearly align to the requirements outlined in the PWS. [D]'s approach gives me more confidence than [C] approach.

Considering all four factors combined, [D] provides better value and gives me more confidence than [B] and [C]. The benefits of [D]'s quote, compared to [B]'s and [C]'s quotes, merits its higher price.

Finally, I note that [D]'s quote is lower-priced and higher-technically-rated than [E]'s quote. A tradeoff analysis between these two quotes is not needed, as lower-priced and higher-technically-rated demonstrates best value.

[D] provides the best value for this procurement. I checked SAM to verify that [D] is not excluded. I will award the task order to this firm.

/s/ Contracting Officer