

Department of Energy

National Nuclear Security Agency Logistics Services Most Efficient Organization

A-76 Post-Award Validation and Verification Review



DECEMBER 2005

Office of Security and Safety Performance Assurance

Table of Contents

1.0 INTRODUCTION

2.0 RESULTS

3.0 CONCLUSIONS

Appendix A: Supplemental Information

Appendix B: Lexicon

Appendix C: Documentation Matrix

Attachment 1: A-76 Cost Comparison: In-House vs. Contract or ISSA Performance

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The President has tasked all government operations with creating the most efficient and effective organizations possible. The A-76 Competitive Sourcing (A-76) process, established in the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-76 and implemented via the Department of Energy (DOE) Competitive Sourcing Program Operating Guidelines, is one of the tools DOE is using to achieve economy, improve quality and productivity, and deliver better products and services for lower cost. The A-76 process provides a fair, standardized system of competition between existing government operations, commercially available private entities, and publicly reimbursable organizations to ensure the government is using the most efficient organization for all tasks that are not “inherently governmental.”

On June 10, 2004, the DOE A-76 Competitive Sourcing Official designated the Director, Security and Safety Performance Assurance (SSA), as the Department’s A-76 Independent Verification and Validation Official. The role of the Independent Verification and Validation Official is to perform post-award reviews to verify that the service provider is implementing the commercial activity in accordance with the winning bid; the Department is implementing the A-76 process and performing oversight of the service provider in accordance with applicable guidelines; and actual cost savings against the estimates developed during the A-76 feasibility study of the commercial activity. In order to ensure a true picture of performance is captured, these reviews are to be performed after 1 year of performance by the winning organization.

SSA conducted a post-award validation and verification review of the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Logistics Services service provider, a government-led Most Efficient Organization (MEO); and associated DOE oversight organization, i.e., Continuing Government Activity (CGA), from October –December 2005. The MEO won the award in May 2004 and was fully operational by October 2004.

Overall results indicate that, except for staffing issues experienced within the transition period, the MEO and CGA are complying with their respective requirements as prescribed in the A-76 process and the particulars of this commercial activity. In addition, the MEO is operating well within the costs proposed.

Background

The NNSA Logistics Services is operated / managed by an MEO service provider comprised of 17 personnel working out of the NNSA Service Center, located in Albuquerque, NM. The organizational title of the MEO is the Property and Space Management Center (PSMC) for NNSA. PSMC provides personal and real property management oversight of NNSA offices and NNSA Management and Operation Contractors located at various locations throughout the western United States, i.e., Livermore, CA; Los Alamos, NM; Albuquerque, NM; Las Vegas, NV; Kansas City, MO; and Amarillo, TX. Limited support to the Y-12 National Security Complex is provided in the area of vehicle management. In addition PSMC supports the facilities maintenance and management, conducts space management, and performs the supply operations and management for NNSA Service Center direct operations.

PSMC won the competition for this commercial activity on May 21, 2004. Phase-in activities began in June 2004 and were completed in early October 2004. PSMC has been in full operation since that time.

Overseeing the operations of PSMC is the continuing government activity CGA which is comprised of 5 Federal employees from the original NNSA Logistics Services organization. The CGA retains ultimate management control and approval of the logistics support services performed by the MEO (PSMC). By memo dated June 6, 2001, subject "Organizational Property Management Officer's Authority," the regulatory authority and responsibility of the Organizational Property Management Officer to establish and administer the personal property management program is set forth. The Organizational Property Management Officer functions as the contracting officer representative / quality assurance evaluator for PSMC requirements under the Performance Work Statement.

Objectives

The primary objectives of this review were to:

1. Determine implementation of the agency tender by PSMC in accordance with the Performance Work Statement including performing work within scope, adherence to performance standards, staffing, quality control, corrective actions, and phase-in.
2. Review the conduct of the CGA regarding post award actions, phase-in, and development and implementation of the quality assurance surveillance plan.
3. Determine if the work is being performed in accordance with the In-House Cost Estimate, accounting for changes in mission and/or scope of work, inflation, and wage rate adjustments.

Focus and Scope

The focus of this review was the NNSA Logistics Services managed by PSMC and the associated CGA. The scope of the review included a detailed review of PSMC and CGA documentation (see Appendix C) and interviews with key personnel from both organizations conducted at the NNSA Service Center in Albuquerque, NM. No interviews or records review activities were conducted at any other NNSA location.

Report Layout

Section 2 of this report provides an overall discussion of the results of the review based on the stated objectives. Section 3 provides overall conclusions and recommendations. Appendix A provides supplemental information, including review team make-up. Appendix B provides definitions and explanations of the various terms used throughout this report. Appendix C provides a review of the documentation requested / reviewed. Attachment 1 contains a worksheet summary of the MEO cost analysis.

2.0 RESULTS

2.1 Implementation of the Agency Tender by PSMC.

As part of the bid submission in response to the request for quotation, PSMC was required to develop an agency tender detailing its technical offer (technical approach, personnel, quality control plan, and phase-in plan). The agency tender provides the basis of management operations regarding organizational, staffing, and administrative activities of PSMC, as well as technical requirements to support real property management oversight, support the oversight of the personal property program, support the facilities maintenance and management for NNSA Service Center direct operations, conduct space management for NNSA Service Center direct operations, and perform the supply operations and management for NNSA Service Center direct operations. Performance and general requirements, i.e., quality control and use of government furnished equipment, software and systems, and furnished materials and supplies are included in the technical offer.

The phase-in plan identifies a transition timeline and actions to be implemented to transition from the incumbent government organization to the successful winner of the competition. In accordance with the phase-in plan, PSMC was to begin full performance of all requirements identified in the Performance Work Statement within 60 calendar days of the contract award. During phase-in, PSMC was to establish a Project Management Office; work with the NNSA Service Center human resources office to recruit and hire necessary personnel; obtain all required certifications; participate in joint inventories and sign for government furnished property; develop and submit any required deliverables; attend post-award meetings, as required; accomplish any required training to support the Performance Work Statement, as outlined in Section 3, *Performance Objectives and Measures*; update standard operating procedures for the personal property and real property functional areas covered under the Performance Work Statement; and create drafts of standard operating procedures for the facility-related functional areas, as needed, for the successful performance of PSMC to fully perform the requirements contained in the Performance Work Statement.

The award was issued to PSMC on May 21, 2004. Phase-in was to commence on June 2 and be completed by August 1, 2004. Information provided by the transition team lead showed there were 7 FTEs available to staff the 17 MEO positions; 10 vacant positions were announced. The CGA extended the phase-in period 2 additional months due to delays associated with filling positions (e.g., advertising, interviewing, hiring, relocating) in PSMC. The delays in filling positions were beyond the control of PSMC as the positions are required to be filled through the NNSA Service Center human resources office. The extensions were granted verbally and were not formalized with the contracting officer through the Letter of Obligation. This was a result of the CGA not fully understanding their role during the transition period. The CGA maintained responsibility for the Performance Work Statement requirements during the phase-in period. The first monthly "Work Accomplished Report" issued by the PSMC Project Manager on November 9, 2004 indicated PSMC was fully operational on October 4, 2004. A review of PSMC personnel records indicated that 10 FTEs were in place by that time; all identified positions were not filled until May 2005.

All required phase-in deliverables, including training, obtaining certifications, performance of inspections and inventories, and revisions of standard operating procedures were completed after the full force date. In the “Monthly Work Accomplished Report” dated November 9, 2004, the PSMC Project Manager noted the following: “On October 4, 2004, 3 of the PSMC new hires reported in and the formal stand up of the PSMC was announced. Since the PSMC was immediately tasked to commence performance of the Performance Work Statement, the Project Manager and Program Specialist were unable to devote full time to the orderly process outlined in the Phase-in Plan. Therefore, the actual requirements of Section 8 of the Performance Work Statement will be accomplished as time permits.” No waivers or extensions were sought or apparently required. Information provided in interviews with PSMC and CGA personnel indicates that phase-in activities were completed, as required. Documentation supports the data gathered during interviews indicating when the training was given, duration of training, and subject matter covered. Training on the “Safety and Security Plan” was initially conducted starting in October 2004, and periodically afterwards. A course in “Personal Property Management” was presented in November 2004. Ongoing training was completed by PSMC personnel as training spaces and funds permitted (e.g., “Processing Demilitarized (DeMil) Equipment” in August 2005). The Performance Work Statement requirements for certification were met in staffing PSMC with Industrial Property Management Specialists. Inspections and inventories completed by December 2004. Standard operating procedure revisions were initiated in March 2005. The desk reference “*Guide for Oversight of NNSA Management & Operating Contractors*” was issued on September 22, 2005.

PSMC was not staffed in accordance with the amended personnel plan contained in the agency tender. Amendment 001 to the Letter of Obligation, dated July 1, 2004, modified the original proposed staffing distribution for PSMC as follows: 2 realty specialists and 3 engineering technicians were replaced by 5 industrial property management specialists, and a general engineer by an engineering technician. Information provided during interviews with the CGA indicated that the transition team reviewed PSMC’s technical approach and felt the amended staffing distribution would better meet the requirements of the Performance Work Statement. No grade changes were proposed therefore there was no financial impact to the Government. Two administrative support assistants were not hired as indicated in the personnel plan. Information provided in an interview with the PSMC Project Manager indicated that insufficient work existed to justify filling these positions. The duties for these positions have been absorbed by other PSMC personnel. In addition, personnel records indicate a supply technician, proposed at a 0.5 FTE level in the PSMC personnel plan, is operating at a full-time level. Information provided during the interview with the PSMC Project Manager indicates there is sufficient work to justify this action. Neither the PSMC Project Manager nor CGA indicated that a revision to the Letter of Obligation would be initiated to account for the current MEO staffing.

Information gathered during interviews and visit to the NNSA Service Center and data reviewed from PSMC files and reports indicates PSMC was meeting the scope of work general requirements, i.e., supporting real property management oversight, supporting oversight of the personal property program, supporting facilities maintenance and management for NNSA Service Center direct operations, performing space management for NNSA Service Center direct operations, and performing supply operations and management for NNSA Service Center direct operations.

The Performance Work Statement requires development and implementation of a quality control plan that establishes an inspection system; a method for identifying and preventing deficiencies; a customer complaint feedback system for correction of validated complaints; methods of direct and indirect communications with the Government regarding performance; and retention of inspection records. PSMC quality control is ensured through a well-developed and implemented work review process. A copy of the quality control plan was provided by the CGA. To ensure conformance to the Performance Work Statement requirements and prevent deficiencies, work products are developed by individual PSMC team leads, directed to the PSMC Project Manager for initial review, and forwarded to the PSMC program specialist for quality control. Evidence was provided to show that work products and deliverables are inspected, reviewed and approved by the PSMC and CGA prior to release. Over 100 hardcopy files and electronic records were pulled during the review. A customer feedback system was also developed and implemented by PSMC. The second monthly "Work Accomplished Report" issued by the PSMC Project Manager on December 13, 2004, indicated the PSMC program specialist had developed and distributed the form entitled "NNSA Logistics Services Customer Comment Feedback." Information provided during interviews with the PSMC Program Manager and contracting officer representative / quality assurance evaluator indicated the system had been implemented and no customer complaints have been lodged against PSMC for the period reviewed.

Information gathered during the site visit indicated the CGA and PSMC conduct biweekly meetings to discuss service, product quality, and customer satisfaction issues. A performance appraisal system was implemented by PSMC Project Manager to ensure that PSMC personnel are effectively performing the work requirements and meeting the established performance standards identified in Technical Exhibit 3-2, *Performance Requirements Summary*, of the Performance Work Statement. Information provided in interviews with the PSMC Project Manager, PSMC Program Specialist, contracting officer representative / quality assurance evaluator, and other CGA personnel indicated PSMC personnel had met or exceeded all of the required standards.

Ongoing communication and continuous process improvement were observed to be a positive attribute of the CGA and PSMC. PSMC personnel work in small teams, with back-ups identified, and attend biweekly status review meetings with the CGA. A Gantt chart detailing the required activities, timelines, deadlines, and deliverables was developed by PSMC personnel and is posted prominently in the work area. PSMC has developed and implemented a file labeling system to maintain organization of the hardcopy correspondence and records. PSMC is meeting the requirement to provide monthly status reports to the Contracting Office, as evidenced by review of 12 monthly workload reports and accompanying cover letters.

Except for the phase-in and staffing issues identified, the requirements identified in the agency tender appear to have been implemented and PSMC appears to be meeting all performance requirements in accordance with the Performance Work Statement.

2.2 Conduct of the CGA.

Solicitation documentation relevant to the A-76 competition is required to be maintained by the CGA in the event of appeals or post-award reviews. The documentation to be maintained

includes the request for quotation, performance work statement, and cost comparison form. The complete set of up-to-date solicitation documentation, including amendments to the Letter of Obligation, was provided by the CGA to the review team in a timely manner upon request.

The phase-in plan required a transition team, consisting of a team lead, a contracting officer, human resources advisor, and functional experts, be established to provide leadership and guidance throughout the phase-in period. The transition team lead is required to request additional support from the Government to resolve any issues threatening a successful completion of the phase-in, as necessary. The PSMC Project Manager and quality assurance evaluator are required to join the transition team upon appointment.

The CGA did establish a transition team during the phase-in period. The Manager, Management and Operating Support Department, at the NNSA Service Center assumed the role of team lead. Information gathered during interviews with the team lead indicated minimal involvement by the contracting officer in phase-in activities. The human resources advisor was acknowledged as being very active in posting vacancy announcements and filling positions in the residual organization and PSMC. Information gathered shows the CGA maintained responsibility for performance of the Performance Work Statement requirements during the phase-in period.

The CGA extended the phase-in period 2 additional months due to delays associated with filling positions that were beyond the control of PSMC. Although this was an appropriate action, the extensions were granted verbally and were not formalized with the contracting officer through the Letter of Obligation.

The A-76 process requires the CGA to maintain and implement a quality assurance surveillance plan. The quality assurance surveillance plan is designed to assist the CGA to monitor the performance of service provided by the service provider. It contains a general overview of quality assurance methodology, Government responsibilities, a definition of non-conformance with quality requirements, and remedies available to the Government; quality assurance requirements; quality assurance methods; and quality assurance surveillance schedules. The quality assurance surveillance plan provides the quality assurance evaluator an effective and systematic method for surveying selected functions described in the Performance Work Statement as well as assisting the quality assurance evaluator understand the significance of each requirement and its associated assurance procedure.

The quality assurance surveillance plan for this A-76 study was provided by the CGA for review. The plan indicates that the contracting office representative functions as the quality assurance evaluator. Under the quality assurance surveillance plan, the CGA employs 2 approaches for its quality assurance, i.e., inspections and customer complaints. Review of PSMC workload records indicated quality assurance evaluator inspection and approval. Of 41 management and operating contractor records examined in the personal property management file, only 1 had no approval signature (BWXT Pantex, 3rd Quarter, September 26-28, 2005, Measure 5.1 "Increase in % Reutilization of Excess"). A note to file indicated that PSMC did not concur with the contractor self-assessment rating and was awaiting further information. As noted previously, all customer complaints and associated resolution are reported to the contracting officer representative / quality assurance evaluator for quality assurance monitoring. Information provided during

interviews with the PSMC Project Manager and contracting officer representative / quality assurance evaluator indicated the system had been implemented and no customer complaints have been lodged against PSMC for the period reviewed.

Examination of quarterly objectives matrix reports for management and operating contractors revealed the CGA developed and implemented a validation tracking sheet, appraisal documentation template, and an internal performance measurement system. This internal tracking tool allows the NNSA Service Center to readily assess performance measures that have been validated by the PSMC, the quarter in which they were validated, and the relative performance rating on each. In addition, the Organizational Property Management Officer has developed an approval stamp and process to clearly delineate those reports that have been approved by the CGA. Review of 41 management and operating contractor files and over 145 records in the real property log, title transfer, domestic and foreign loans, and Facility Information Management System areas indicated the CGA has implemented a system for tracking, monitoring, and approving PSMC products.

The quality assurance surveillance plan requires annual performance assessments of the PSMC by the contracting officer representative / quality assurance evaluator. Information provided during the site visit and through interviews of the PSMC Project Manager and CGA personnel showed the first annual report was under development and the Performance Work Statement requirements were met by PSMC for the base year.

Paragraph 5.7 of the quality assurance surveillance plan, "*Task Order or Letter of Obligation Communication*," requires all communication regarding questions or issues related to quality performance assurance and inspection be directed to the contracting officer or contracting officer designee. Information gathered during interviews with the CGA indicated that questions and/or correspondence relating to PSMC performance or Letter of Obligation administration had not been addressed in a consistent manner. The CGA attributes the difficulties to geographic separation of the contracting officer, located in Washington, D.C., and the NNSA Service Center in Albuquerque, NM, indicating that many Letter of Obligation administration questions could be best resolved by occasional face-to-face visits.

Except for not formalizing the extension of the phase-in period, the CGA appears to have met the requirements regarding post award actions, phase-in, and development and implementation of the quality assurance surveillance plan.

2.3 Conformance of Costs to the Agency / In-House Cost Estimate by PSMC.

As part of the bid submission in response to the request for quotation, PSMC was required to develop an estimated cost of government performance in accordance with A-76 guidelines. This estimate, the in-house cost estimate, is prepared by PSMC using the Office of Management and Budget approved COMPARE software system. The in-house cost estimate contains the estimated costs for PSMC personnel, materials and supplies, other specifically attributable costs, as well as any assumptions made PSMC.

Review of cost information provided by the CGA and PSMC indicates the cost bid for the phase-in period and base year was proposed as \$1,679,474. Information gathered from analysis of the MEO monthly workload reports and interviews with the PSMC Project Manager showed that the transition and other direct costs were \$1,674.92 and \$151,882.17, respectively. Adjustments were made to the bid proposal positions to take into account actual hiring dates, wage steps, and inflation. Analysis of the actual PSMC costs for phase-in period and base year was determined to be \$1,457,761, or \$221,713 lower than the estimated cost in COMPARE. The difference is attributed mostly to hiring actions. As indicated in previous sections of this report, 2 administrative support assistant positions were eliminated and 2 other positions were not filled until 2005.

3.0 CONCLUSIONS

Positive Program Attributes

A. PSMC has proactively developed and implemented sound management tools.

Examples of visual aids and organizational improvements were evident in the PSMC workplace. A Gantt chart is posted prominently and serves as a visual display of required activities and timing. PSMC also developed and implemented a file organization and labeling system that allows rapid retrieval and verification of work products. These actions go beyond the minimal requirements of the Performance Work Statement and have contributed to PSMC's ability to meet or exceed the requirements contained in the Performance Work Statement.

B. The CGA has proactively developed and implemented quality assurance program tools.

The CGA has exceeded the minimum requirements of the quality assurance surveillance plan in developing and implementing the management and operating contractor validation tracking sheets and an internal performance measurement system. These internal tracking tools allow the NNSA Service Center to readily assess performance measures that have been validated by the PSMC, the quarter in which they were validated, and the relative performance rating on each. In addition, CGA development and implementation of the approval stamp allows for easy approval verification of the management and operating quarterly reports.

Program Weaknesses

No program weaknesses were identified for the NNSA Logistics activity per se. The following issues identified pertain more to the A-76 process itself and therefore are more DOE A-76 program implementation lessons learned issues.

A. Lack of implementation guidance during phase-in.

The CGA transition team was uncertain as to how to proceed once the Letter of Obligation was issued. An example of this was the granting of an extension of the transition period via verbal authorization as opposed to a formal amendment of the Letter of Obligation. The CGA stated that the uncertainty was a result of the Contracting Officer being located in Washington, D.C.

The team lead recommends a “post contract conference” be held by the contracting office and transition team personnel to facilitate future phase-ins. It is recommended that the Office of Competitive Sourcing provide training to the agency tender official, contracting officer, and transition team members regarding responsibilities and authorities to include amendment of approved letters of obligation, contracts, performance work statements, etc.

B. Not enough time to recruit and hire employees.

When an incumbent organization wins the agency tender as an MEO, it is generally assumed that the MEO will have to reduce its staffing. However, during an A-76 study, employees not willing to wait it out, leave the organization to obtain employment somewhere else in the government or within the commercial sector. If the incumbent organization wins the bid as an MEO it could find itself needing to fill positions as opposed to cutting back on personnel. As an MEO, those positions are required to be filled through the government agency to which they belong. Currently phase-in plans stipulate a period of 60 days to recruit and hire employees. Depending upon the number and type of positions to fill, this may be an unrealistic expectation. This was the case for the NNSA Logistics MEO. At the time the MEO won the bid there were only 7 incumbent FTEs available to staff the MEO; leaving 10 positions to be filled. It was highly improbable to fill these positions within 60 days utilizing the DOE / NNSA personnel system. The transition team lead stated that a minimum of 90 days to 120 days would have been more realistic to account for the time needed to advertise, recruit, and hire new workers from outside the organization. It is recommended that consideration be given to extending the staffing requirements within the transition plan when an MEO needs to fill positions. Factors such as numbers and types of personnel needed and location of the work should all be taken into account.

Appendix A: Supplemental Information

A.1 Review Team Management

Glenn S. Podonsky, Director, Office of Security and Safety Performance Assurance (SSA)
Lesley A. Gasperow, Director, Office of Resource Management, SSA

A.2 Review Team

A.2.1 Federal Team Members

Richard Updegrave, Director, Business Operations, Office of Resource Management, SSA

A.2.2 Contract Support (Abacus Technology Corp.)

Duane Curry
John McKivigan
Dale Caradonna
Tracy Hoppers

Appendix B: Lexicon

Agency Tender: The agency management plan submitted in response to a solicitation for a standard A-76 competition. The agency tender includes an MEO, agency cost estimate, MEO quality control plan, MEO phase-in plan, and copies of MEO subcontracts.

Continuing Government Activity (CGA): The CGA is the residual organization that is composed of inherently governmental functions or core activities outside the scope of the cost comparison. This organization exists regardless of the outcome of the cost comparison decision and may include functions such as Quality Assurance, contract administration, and command and control.

In-House Cost Estimate: The in-house cost estimate is the government's bid. It is based on the MEO service provider, which is developed during the Management Study. The staffing required to do the workload specified in the Performance Work Statement is the basis for the in-house cost proposal (estimate).

Most Efficient Organization (MEO): The staffing plan of the agency's bid, developed to represent the agency's most efficient and cost-effective organization. An MEO is required for a standard competition and may include a mix of government personnel and MEO subcontracts.

Office of Competitive Sourcing: An inherently governmental agency office responsible for the implementation of A-76 within the agency.

Performance Standard: Verifiable, measurable levels of service in terms of quantity, quality, timeliness, location, and work units. Performance standards are used in a performance-based performance work statement to (1) assess (i.e., inspect and accept) the work during a period of performance; (2) provide a common output-related basis for preparing private sector offers and public tenders; and (3) compare the offers and tenders to the performance work statement. The requiring activity's acceptable levels of service are normally stated in the performance work statement. The solicitation includes performance standards.

Performance Work Statement: A statement in the solicitation that identifies the technical, functional, and performance characteristics of the agency's requirements. The performance work statement is performance-based and describes the agency's needs (the "what"); not the specific method for meeting those needs (the "how"). The performance work statement identifies essential outcomes to be achieved, specifies the agency's required performance standards, and specifies the location, units, quality and timeliness of the work.

Post MEO Review: A Post-MEO review confirms that implementation of the MEO in accordance with the transition plan, establishes the MEO service provider's ability to perform the services of the performance work statement, and confirms the MEO service provider is operating within costs identified in the in-house cost estimate for resources including materials, supplies and total labor categories by grade and hours. Adjustments may be made for formal mission or scope of work changes.

Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan: The quality assurance surveillance plan documents methods used to measure performance of the service provider against the requirements in the performance work statement. The agency relies on the service provider to monitor daily performance using their own quality control plan, but retains the right to inspect all services. When the agency makes a performance decision, the agency re-evaluates and modifies the existing quality assurance surveillance plan, based upon the selected provider and the selected provider's accepted quality control plan.

Quality Control Plan: The quality control plan describes the internal staffing and procedures that the service provider will use to meet the quality, quantity, timeliness, responsiveness, customer satisfaction, and other service delivery requirements in the performance work statement.

Request for Quotation: The RFQ is the document prepared by the Government to solicit bids on the work activities under A-76 review.

Service Provider: The organization selected to perform the work identified in the request for quotation. The service provider may be either a government-led MEO or a commercial contractor.

Technical Approach: The technical approach identifies the methodology of the MEO service provider to meet the requirements of the performance work statement. It is prepared in accordance with Section L of the solicitation and depicts the MEO service provider's management, organizational, and administrative approach.

Transition Plan: A written plan for the transition from the current organizational structure to MEO or commercial contractor service provider designed to minimize disruption, adverse impacts, capitalization, and startup requirements.

Workload Data: A section of the performance work statement that provides a projection of exactly what and how much work is to be performed. For example, the number of computers supported, the number of buildings in the organization, the number of personnel supported, the number of computer users on the network, the number of counties supported, and so on. The MEO service provider team can only use the workload data in the performance work statement. If not enough detail is provided, it is difficult to determine the minimum performance requirements.

Appendix C: Documentation Matrix

Documents Requested	Provided	Complete	Objectives	Comments
Solicitation documentation, including performance work statement and all modifications	Yes	Yes	1, 2, 3	
MEO service provider agency tender	Yes	Yes	1	
MEO service provider phase-in plan	Yes	Yes	1, 2, 3	
MEO service provider staffing plan	Yes	Yes	1, 2, 3	
MEO service provider technical approach	Yes	Yes	1, 3	
MEO service provider quality control plan	Yes	Yes	1, 2	
COMPARE costing documents, including cost comparison forms with all worksheets	Yes	Yes	3	
Position descriptions supporting the MEO service provider at the time the bid was submitted	Yes	Yes	1	
Post-MEO service provider award organizational staffing documents	Yes	Yes	1,2,3	
MEO service provider documentation of workload products and services produced during the performance period	Yes	Yes	1, 2	Very thorough and well-maintained.
CGA documentation of workload products and services produced during the phase-in period	Yes	Yes	1	
Facility Information Management System (FIMS) database	Yes	Yes	1	
CGA quality assurance surveillance plan	Yes	Yes	2	
Documentation of inspections performed by CGA quality assurance evaluator	Yes	Yes	2	
MEO service provider technical plan deliverables	Yes	Yes	1, 2	Very thorough and well-maintained.
Documentation regarding phase-in	Yes	Yes	1, 3	
MEO service provider monthly work reports, including work completed and costs incurred	Yes	Yes	1, 2, 3	An outstanding model.

ACTUAL NNSA MEO COST

(Includes full salaries with actual Grade and Step)

MEO Position	Grade	Step	Base	W/Fringe	Base Year %	Base Year Cost
Project Manager	GS14	07	\$98,926.00	\$131,423.19	100%	\$136,023.00
Program Specialist	GS09	07	\$48,545.00	\$64,492.03	100%	\$66,749.25
Administrative Support Assistant	GS06	06	\$34,724.00	\$46,130.83	96%	\$47,745.41
Realty Specialist	GS13	06	\$81,390.00	\$108,126.62	92%	\$111,911.05
Realty Specialist	GS13	03	\$74,413.00	\$98,857.67	88%	\$102,317.69
Realty Specialist	GS13	07	\$83,715.00	\$111,215.38	100%	\$115,107.92
Realty Specialist	GS11	02	\$50,578.00	\$67,192.87	100%	\$69,544.62
Industrial Property Management Specialist	GS13	05	\$79,064.00	\$105,036.52	88%	\$95,667.27
Industrial Property Management Specialist	GS12	01	\$58,665.00	\$77,936.45	100%	\$80,664.23
Industrial Property Management Specialist	GS11	07	\$53,459.00	\$71,020.28	100%	\$73,505.99
Industrial Property Management Specialist	GS11	07	\$58,735.00	\$78,029.45	100%	\$80,760.48
General Engineer	GS09	01	\$40,454.00	\$53,743.14	46%	\$25,587.11
Engineering Technician	GS09	01	\$40,454.00	\$53,743.14	38%	\$21,137.18
Engineering Technician	GS09	02	\$41,803.00	\$55,535.29	100%	\$57,479.02
Engineering Technician	GS09	02	\$41,803.00	\$55,535.29	100%	\$57,479.02
Engineering Technician	GS11	05	\$55,472.00	\$73,694.55	92%	\$76,273.86
Supply Technician	GS05	10	\$34,714.00	\$46,117.55	100%	\$47,731.66
TOTAL TRANSITION COST						\$1,674.92
OTHER DIRECT COSTS						\$151,882.17
TOTAL BASE YEAR COST						\$1,457,761.67
TOTAL MEO BID						\$1,679,474.00
DIFFERENCE						-\$221,712.33