



Logistics A-76 Service Debriefing

- Introduction
- Background
- Evaluation Process
- Basis for Selection Decision



Introduction

- The debriefing will be presented in accordance with OMB Circular A-76 and Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.506, “Post Award Debriefing of Offerors”.
- The purpose of this debriefing is to provide the Agency Tender Official (ATO) and the directly affected employees (and their representatives) with the basis for the selection decision for the Headquarters Logistics Services A-76 competition.



Introduction

- The following information will be addressed during the debriefing by the Contracting Officer in accordance with FAR 15.506:
 - ✓ The Government's evaluation of the ATO's proposal.
 - ✓ The overall pre-COMPARE and COMPARE price of all proposals evaluated.
 - ✓ The overall ranking of the offerors.
 - ✓ A summary of the basis for the selection decision.



Introduction

- The following are prohibited from disclosure by FAR and will not be addressed during this debriefing:
 - ✓ A point-by-point comparison of the ATO's proposal with the LAI proposal.
 - ✓ Privileged, confidential, or proprietary information pertaining to the ATO and LAI proposals.
 - ✓ Information pertaining to the selection decision that has not already been provided by the Contracting Officer.



Background

- Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-270) (the "FAIR Act").
- The FAIR Act directs agencies to develop inventories of their commercial activities and to conduct cost comparisons to determine whether a commercial activity that is performed by a governmental source should instead be performed by a private-sector source.



Background

- The FAIR Act requires that Federal agencies must submit to OMB, each fiscal year, a list of all their activities that are not inherently governmental ("commercial activities") and that are performed by Federal employees. (FAIR Act, Section 2(a)).



Background

- In complying with the FAIR Act, agencies will implement the OMB Circular A-76, May 29, 2003, "Performance of Commercial Activities," which establishes Federal policy for the performance of recurring commercial activities.
- The Circular distinguishes between those agency activities that are commercial in nature and those that are inherently governmental.



Background

- As a result of the FAIR Act inventory, after completion of the timeframe for challenges/appeals of the inventory, agencies determine the activities and FTE's that will be subject to a public-private competition.
- As a result, the DOE senior management determined that logistics services at DOE Headquarters and the Albany Research Center would be subject to a public-private competition in accordance with the procedures prescribed in OMB Circular A-76.



Background

- DOE determined that the appropriate acquisition methodology for this competition would be to use the General Services Administration's Multiple Awards Schedule (MAS) program.
- The MAS program is governed by FAR 8.4, which are not among the acquisition processes authorized by OMB Circular A-76 for standard competitions.
- The DOE requested and received a deviation from OMB on May 6, 2004 to authorize use of FAR 8.4 procedures for this standard competition.



Background

- Proposals that were received pursuant to the initial solicitation were evaluated using a best value-technical/cost trade off evaluation process.
- In accordance with FAR 2.101 best value technical/cost tradeoff means "...the expected outcome of an acquisition that, in the Government's estimation, provides the greatest overall benefit in response to the requirement."
- Simply stated, the Offeror may propose a solution that may be of sufficient value to the DOE to off-set any price considerations.



Background

- The initial selection decision was contested by the ATO and Ms. Colleen Kelley, who was elected by the majority of the affected employees to serve as the Employee's Legal Agent.
- The Senior Procurement Executive (SPE) sustained a portion of the contests and directed the Contracting Officer to take corrective action.



Background

- The Contracting Officer responded to the SPE decision by revising the solicitation to implement an evaluation process based on a lowest price-technically acceptable (LPTA) methodology.
- The LPTA evaluation process requires an offeror to provide a technically acceptable offer that complies with the requirements of the Performance Based Statement of Work.
- The selection decision is based on the lowest-priced, technically acceptable proposal.



Background

- Proposals were received and evaluated under the revised solicitation from:
 - The ATO
 - Logistics Applications, Inc.



Background

Selected Service Provider:

Logistics Applications, Inc.
2760 Eisenhower Avenue, Suite 202
Alexandria, VA 22314



Evaluation Process

- The Contracting Officer and the Technical Evaluation Committee followed all source selection procedures prescribed in the revised solicitation, and with all applicable regulations and authorities.



Evaluation Process

- In accordance with the evaluation criteria set forth in the solicitation, both the ATO's and Logistics Applications, Inc.'s proposals were evaluated and determined to be technically acceptable (passing) by the Technical Evaluation Committee.
- Once the service provider's technical proposal is deemed acceptable (Passing) the selection of the service provider is based on the lowest COMPARE Computation price.



Evaluation Process

- The Contracting Officer verified the pricing data to ensure that the ATO's and LAI's cost estimates are calculated in accordance with Attachment C of OMB Circular A-76.
- The Contracting Officer entered the value of the LAI price proposal into COMPARE. The ATO's proposal was pre-loaded into COMPARE by the ATO as required by the Circular.



Basis for the Selection Decision

Definitions of Pricing Terms

- Direct productive labor hours (DPLH)
- Compare: This is the software utilized in accordance with the A-76 Circular to document the costs and complete the Standard Competition Form.
- Pre-COMPARE: This is the price of the offer as submitted without COMPARE software adjustments
- COMPARE Software Computation Price: This is the adjusted price as computed by the COMPARE software



Basis for the Selection Decision

Pre-Compare Price/Hours

Agency Tender

Pre-COMPARE Software Price	\$34,827,752 *
Direct Productive Labor Hours- Phase In	2,224
Direct Productive Labor Hours Regular Service	662,160
Total Direct –Productive Labor Hours	664,384
Based on the Total 64 month term	

Logistics Applications, Inc.

Pre-COMPARE Software Price	\$28,077,740**
Direct Productive Labor Hours- Phase In	9,360
Direct Productive Labor Hours Regular Service	659,280
Total Direct –Productive Labor Hours	668,640

* Does not include proposed Agency Tender security clearance and recruitment cost. ** Does not include LAI security clearance cost.

March 21, 2006



Basis for the Selection Decision

COMPARE Price/Hours

Agency Tender

COMPARE Software Computation Price	\$34,902,974*
Total Direct Productive Labor Hours	664,384
Based on the Total 64 month term	

Logistics Applications, Inc.

COMPARE Software Computation Price	\$32,672,695*
Total Direct Productive Labor Hours	668,640
Based on the Total 64 month term	

Includes proposed security clearances and recruitment
March 21, 2006



Basis for the Selection Decision

Compare Price Summary

Compare Software Computation Price Summary

Logistics Applications, Inc. COMPARE Price	\$32,672,695
--	--------------

Agency Tender COMPARE Price	\$34,902,974
-----------------------------	--------------

Logistics Application's COMPARE software price is \$2,230,279 less than the Agency tender's COMPARE price.



Basis for the Selection Decision

Ranking of Offerors

RANKINGS OF PROPOSALS

Ranking By Price Computation Price

Total 64 Month COMPARE price

1. Logistics Applications, Inc	\$32,672,695
2. Agency Tender	\$34,902,974

Pursuant to the evaluation criteria contained in solicitation, as amended, Logistics Applications, Inc. offered the technically acceptable lowest COMPARE price. Logistics Applications, Inc was selected by the Source Selection Official.



Basis for the Selection Decision

- The Source Selection Official approved and signed the results of the Standard Competition Form selecting LAI as the lowest-priced, technically acceptable proposal.