

**Selection Decision Document  
Task Order Request for Proposal Solicitation #70QS0219F00003023**

I have conducted a comparative analysis of the quotes and conducted a tradeoff. [REDACTED] proposal provides the best value based on the evaluation factors listed in the solicitation.

The table below summarizes the evaluation outcomes:

|            | Phase I                                   | Phase II  |                   |
|------------|---|---|-------------------|
|            | Factor 1<br>Demonstrated Prior Experience | Factor 2<br>Management, Planning, and Technical Execution | Factor 3<br>Price |
| [REDACTED] | High Confidence                           | Some Confidence   | [REDACTED]        |
| [REDACTED] | High Confidence                           | High Confidence   | [REDACTED]        |
| [REDACTED] | High Confidence                           | Low Confidence  | [REDACTED]        |

Note 1: The solicitation indicates that Factors 1, 2, and 3 are in descending order of importance.

Note 2: For the Factors 1 and 2, the rating indicates the technical evaluation team’s consensus that the Government has High/Some/Low confidence that the offeror understands the requirement, proposes a sound approach, and will be successful in performing the contract.

Although this decision is my independent decision, I used reports and analyses prepared by others. Specifically, I reviewed the following:

- Factor 1, Consensus Evaluation Worksheet, [REDACTED]
- Factor 1, Consensus Evaluation Worksheet, [REDACTED]
- Factor 1, Consensus Evaluation Worksheet, [REDACTED]
- Factor 2, Consensus Evaluation Worksheet, [REDACTED]
- Factor 2, Consensus Evaluation Worksheet, [REDACTED]
- Factor 2, Consensus Evaluation Worksheet, [REDACTED]
- Factor 3, Price Analysis Worksheet, [REDACTED]
- Factor 3, Price Analysis Worksheet, [REDACTED]
- Factor 3, Price Analysis Worksheet, [REDACTED]

After reviewing these reports, I met with the technical evaluation team and the price evaluation team. I asked a few questions to understand their process. Specifically, I asked what decision criteria they used to differentiate Factor 2 and asked them to clarify the variation between [REDACTED] pricing and both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED].

For Factor 1, I consider all three offers to be substantially equal. They all received the same confidence rating, and all three had findings that both raised and lowered the expectation of success. Nothing in particular stands out to me, and this factor is not a discriminator in my decision.

For Factor 2, I found [REDACTED] offer to be superior to both [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] offers. In particular, I noted [REDACTED] strong key personnel team and their clear understanding of the NRMC's mission and challenges. In addition, [REDACTED] approach to risk methodology development is in alignment with current NRMC understanding. Finally, [REDACTED] presented a forward-thinking approach to the NRMC mission. [REDACTED]

I am concerned about [REDACTED] their key personnel can provide to the effort. Specifically, there appeared single points of failure with the data lead serving as key for two tasks and the program manager being too instrumental to the team's success. In addition, their response to questions regarding data, tools, and capability development relied on previous experience which was already evaluated in phase one and they did not discuss how they relate to the support of NRMC requirements.

I am also concerned about the [REDACTED] presented. Team dynamics were not collaborative and there was not demonstrated expertise for the planning and program management leads. In addition, [REDACTED] presentation of [REDACTED] prioritization overly relied on stakeholder input and did not include an analytic framework or a clear link to data analysis.

For Factor 3, [REDACTED] has the lowest price, followed by [REDACTED] and then [REDACTED]. I noted a marked gap between [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] and noted that [REDACTED]s and [REDACTED] prices are within [REDACTED] percent of each other.

In making my decision, I first compared [REDACTED] to [REDACTED]. I appreciate [REDACTED] lower price, but also note that price is the least important factor. In my opinion, the benefit of [REDACTED] offer for Factor 2 merits the additional cost, and subsequently I rank [REDACTED] as providing better value than [REDACTED].

I then compared [REDACTED] to [REDACTED]. Because I see [REDACTED] offer as superior to [REDACTED] offer for Factor 2 (per the notes above), [REDACTED] offer is technically-superior to [REDACTED]s; it is also lower-priced. I rank [REDACTED] as providing better value than [REDACTED].

[REDACTED]s offer provides the best value in this procurement. I select [REDACTED] for task order award.

The RFQ included text under the heading "Exchanges with Best-Suited Contractor." Before making award, and without telling [REDACTED] that it is the apparently successful offer, I want the contracting officer to try to negotiate a price reduction with [REDACTED] without changing technical performance or any other terms and conditions. That is, I want the contracting officer to make [REDACTED] best offer even better. However, whether or not the contracting officer is successful, award should be made to [REDACTED].

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED], Selecting Official  
[REDACTED] National Risk Management Center

09/22/2019

Date