

**BEST VALUE DECISION DOCUMENT
SDDC IT SUPPORT SERVICES (SITSS)
USTRANSCOM/TCAQ-D
RFQ HTC711-19-Q-D024**

I. As the Source Selection Authority for this acquisition, I have determined the quote submitted by DecisionPoint Corporation provides USTRANSCOM the overall best value. This selection was made based upon the evaluation factors established in the Request for Quote (RFQ) HTC711-19-Q-D024, my comparative assessment of the acceptable quotes submitted in response to the RFQ, the Source Selection Evaluations Team’s evaluation (See Attachments 3 and 4), and the capabilities of DecisionPoint to successfully fulfill the Government’s requirements.

II. Basis for Award. This RFQ was solicited as a 100% Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business (SDVOSB) set-aside. IAW FAR 8.405-2, orders placed against multiple award contracts are not subject to the competition requirements in Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 6 and the policies in FAR Subpart 15.3; however, IAW FAR 8.405-2(c)(3), each qualified SDVOSB vendor under the Federal Supply Schedule was given the opportunity to submit a quote. IAW the RFQ, it is the Government’s intent to award a firm-fixed price (FFP) task order against GSA IT Schedule 70 to a schedule contractor in order to successfully provide support for the SITSS requirement for the US Army Surface Deployment and Distribution Command (SDDC) at Scott AFB, IL.

The Government selected the best overall offer based upon an integrated assessment of Price, Technical Capability, and Past Performance using the process outlined in the RFQ. This report fully documents the results of the evaluations of each offeror and a comparative analysis of (b) (6) (b) (6) that were rated Technically Acceptable. (b) (6) tes criteria: Price; Technical Capability, to include the sub-factors of Technical Approach and Staffing Approach; and Past Performance. Consistent with the evaluation criteria, Technical Capability was evaluated on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis; Past Performance was evaluated on a basis approximately equal to Cost or Price considerations. Price was evaluated, but not rated. The RFQ included FAR 52.217-8, Option to Extend Services; therefore, the Total Proposed Price took into account the 6-month extension of services period.

III. Receipt of Quotes. The RFQ with evaluation criteria and Performance Work Statement (PWS) was posted IAW FAR 8.405-2 on GSA e-Buy on 10 April 2019. Vendors were solicited under GSA Federal Supply Schedule IT 70, Category 132-21, North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code 541512, Computer Systems Design Services. The RFQ was subsequently amended four times prior to receipt of quotes. Eleven timely quotes were received prior to the closing date of 24 May 2019.

	VENDOR	SIZE
1.	(b) (6)	(b) (4)
2.	(b) (6)	(b) (4)
3.	(b) (6)	(b) (4)

4.	(b) (6)	(b) (4)
5.	(b) (6)	
6.	(b) (6)	
7.	DecisionPoint Corporation (DecisionPoint)	SDVOSB
8.	(b) (6)	(b) (4)
9.	(b) (6)	
10.	(b) (6)	
11.	(b) (6)	

IV. General Compliance. Upon receipt of proposal, a compliance check was completed to ensure vendors met the requirements of the RFO. All quotes submitted complied with the requirements of the RFQ with the exception (b) (6)

The quote provided by (b) (6) (b) (6) not compliant with the requirements of the RFQ. In accordance with the RFQ, the schedule contractor shall have a valid SECRET Facility Clearance Level (FCL) at the time of quote submission. The prime contractor's Commercial and Government Entity (CAGE) code that is to be associated with the contract award document shall be the same CAGE code associated with the FCL. The prime contractor cannot use another branch, division, or subsidiary CAGE code to satisfy the FCL requirement. Block 6 of the DD Form 254 shall have the prime contractor's information, to include their CAGE code, which shall match the CAGE code submitted on the RFO (Attachment 1) (b) (6) (b) (6) (b) (6) (b) (6)

V. Quote Evaluation. Evaluation began with the lowest priced offeror being evaluated by the Source Selection Evaluation Team (SSET). The table below lists the members of the Source Selection Evaluation Team.

NAME	OFFICE SYMBOL	PH	ER
(b) (6)	SDDC G6		(b) (6)
	SDDC G6		
	SDDC G6		

IAW with the RFQ, the Government ranked the quotes from lowest price to highest price based on the Total Proposed Price (TPP). The TPP was calculated by adding the total price of all option periods, and the total price for the 6-month extension of services. Pricing for the 6-month extension of services period was based on the final 6 months of the schedule contractor's final option period. The Base Period was not included in the calculation of the TPP.

	VENDOR	TPP
1.	(b) (6)	(b) (4)
2.		(b) (4)

3.	(b) (6)		(b) (4)
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.	DecisionPoint		\$14,229,532
8.	(b) (6)		(b) (4)
9.			
10.			
11.			

A. Technical Capability: Quotes were provided to the SSET in ascending order based on Price IAW the RFQ. After SSET’s initial evaluation of the ten (10) compliant quotes submitted in response to the RFQ, three (3) were found to be Acceptable or Reasonably Susceptible of Being Made Acceptable for sub-factor 1 and sub-factor 2. The following chart documents the results of Technical evaluations. For greater detail, see Attachment 3.

	VENDOR	TECHNICAL SUB-FACTOR 1 TECHNICAL APPROACH	TECHNICAL SUB-FACTOR 2 STAFFING APPROACH
1.	(b) (6)	(b) (6)	(b) (4)
2.	(b) (6)	(b) (6)	
3.	(b) (6)	(b) (6)	
4.	(b) (6)	(b) (6)	
5.	(b) (6)	(b) (6)	
6.	(b) (6)	(b) (6)	
7.	DecisionPoint	Acceptable	Reasonably Susceptible of Being Made Acceptable
8.	(b) (6)	(b) (6)	(b) (4)
9.	(b) (6)	(b) (6)	
10.	(b) (6)	(b) (6)	
11.	(b) (6)	(b) (6)	

B. Past Performance Evaluation:

IAW the RFQ, if the vendor’s Technical Capability was rated Acceptable or Reasonably Susceptible of Being Made Acceptable, that contractor’s past performance would be evaluated. The SSET evaluated the three (3) quotes whose Technical Capabilities were determined to be Acceptable or Reasonably Susceptible of Being Made Acceptable. The following chart documents the results of Past Performance evaluations. For greater detail, see Attachment 4.

	VENDOR	PAST PERFOR	CONFIDENCE
2.	(b) (6)		(b) (4)
7.	DecisionPoint		Substantial
10.	(b) (6)		(b) (4)

C. Interchange. Interchanges (Exchanges) were held with the two offerors found Technically Acceptable Reasonably Susceptible of being Made Acceptable with a Past Performance rating of (b) (6) and DecisionPoint. Both (b) (6) and DecisionPoint received

(b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)
The Government received final quotes from the two offerors with (b) (6) interchanges. (b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)

A summary of the ratings after Interchanges is shown below. For greater detail, see Attachment 5.

	VENDOR	TPP	TECHNICAL SUB-FACTOR 1 TECHNICAL APPROACH	TECHNICAL SUB-FACTOR 2 STAFFING APPROACH	PAST PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE
2.	(b) (6), (b) (4)	(b) (4)	(b) (4)	(b) (4)	(b) (4)
7.	DecisionPoint	\$14,229,532	Acceptable	Acceptable	Substantial
10.	(b) (6), (b) (4)	(b) (4)	(b) (4)	(b) (4)	(b) (4)

VI. Comparative Analysis. The proposal submitted by DecisionPoint represents the overall best value to the Government based on the criteria specified in the RFQ. DecisionPoint’s technical capability meets the Government’s requirements and they had a past performance confidence assessment rating of SUBSTANTIAL Confidence.

A. Past Performance. DecisionPoint received a past performance confidence assessment rating of SUBSTANTIAL CONFIDENCE, indicating the Government has a high expectation that the vendor will successfully perform the required effort. (b) (6), (b) (4)

(b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4) Past aires

are attached which support the ratings for each Offeror (See Attachment 4).

1. DecisionPoint

The Past Performance Confidence Assessment rating is based on recent and relevant past performance efforts. DecisionPoint (b) (4)

(b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)

(b) (6), (b) (4)

(b) (6), (b) (4)

(b) (6), (b) (4)

(b) (6), (b) (4)

Satisfactory.

(b) (6), (b) (4)

Based on their demonstrated performance, DecisionPoint was assigned a past performance confidence assessment rating of Substantial Confidence, meaning the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

2. (b) (6)

The Past Performance performance efforts. (b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)

(b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)

(b) (6), (b) (4)

(b) (6), (b) (4)

(b) (6), (b) (4)

(b) (6), (b) (4)

(b) (6), (b) (4)

(b) (6), (b) (4)

Based on their demonstrated performance, (b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)

B. Technical Capability (b) (4)

IAW the RFQ, "Once deemed acceptable, all quotes are considered technically equal."

	DecisionPoint	(b) (6)
SUBFACTOR		
Technical Approach	Acceptable	(b) (4)
Staffing Approach	Acceptable	

1. DecisionPoint

At the conclusion of interchanges, the SSET found DecisionPoint Acceptable in both Technical Subfactors. IAW the RFQ, the quote meets all requirements in the solicitation.

2. (b) (6)

At the conclusion of initial technical evaluation, (b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)

C. Price. The Government completed a price analysis IAW the RFQ to determine if the TPP was fair and reasonable based on the schedule contractor's quoted labor rates (as discounted), by comparing with other schedule contractors' quoted labor rates and any other price analysis technique determined necessary. In addition, the Government evaluated each Offeror's Total Proposed price by adding the total price of the base requirement, all option periods, and the total price for the 6-month Extension of Services (FAR Clause 52.217-8). The Government determined the pricing for the 6-month Extension of Services by using the unit prices proposed by each Offeror for the final option period.

1. DecisionPoint

DecisionPoint's Total Proposed Price of \$14,318,702 was the lower of the two quotes rated Technically Acceptable and was (b) (6), (b) (4)

(b) (6), (b) (4), (b) (6), (b) (4)

(b) (6), (b) (4) DecisionPoint's Total Proposed Price was determined to be fair and reasonable.

2. (b) (6)
(b) (6) Total Proposed Price of (b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)

VII. In conducting the final integrated assessment, it is my decision that the final quote submitted by DecisionPoint represents the best value to the Government, price and non-price factors considered. As stated in the RFQ, Technical Capability was evaluated on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis and Past Performance was evaluated on a basis approximately equal to Cost or Price considerations. Price was evaluated but not rated. (b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)

A. Comparison of DecisionPoint to (b) (6)

DecisionPoint received the highest Past Performance Confidence Assessment rating of SUBSTANTIAL Confidence. Based on DecisionPoint's performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform this requirement. (b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)

Ratings for Subfactor 1, Technical Approach and Subfactor 2, Staffing Approach were combined to reach the Technical Capability Rating. DecisionPoint received an Acceptable Technical Capability rating. (b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)

DecisionPoint's Total Proposed Price is \$14,318,701.76. (b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (4) As such, DecisionPoint's Total Proposed Price is (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)

DecisionPoint and (b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4) DecisionPoint provides a better value to the Government.

B. Price Fair and Reasonable. DecisionPoint's TPP (all option periods to include the 6-month extension and Government established amounts for Travel and Other Direct Costs (ODCs)) is \$14,318,702. (b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)

VIII. Based on the above, the Government will award DecisionPoint a task order, with firm-fixed price contract line items, in the amount of \$13,122,022.56 (b) (4)

(b) (4)

(b) (4)

(b) (4)
(b) (4)
(b) (4)

IX. DecisionPoint is registered in the System for Award Management (SAM). (b) (4)

(b) (6), (b) (4)
(b) (6), (b) (4)

(b) (6)
(b) (6)

Source Selection Authority

30 August 2019

Date: _____

Attachments:

1. General Compliance
2. Price Analysis
3. Technical Evaluation Documentation
 - a. DecisionPoint
 - b. EVS
4. Past Performance Evaluation Documentation
 - a. DecisionPoint
 - b. EVS
5. Interchanges
6. 190806 SAM/FAPIIS Printouts