Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20585

APR 23 2009

CERTIFIED MAIL

PAI Corporation
Attn: Ms. Kimberlee Davis
116 Milan Way
Oak Ridge, TN 37830

Dear Ms. Davis:

This letter is in response to your request for information that you sent to the Department of Energy (DOE), number 2009-000193, made pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 U.S.C. 552. You requested information on the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) decision document regarding RFP Number DE-RP01-08HS07014, Security Related Technical Support Services for the U.S. Department of Energy Office of Health, Safety and Security (HSS).

We have completed our search and review of the requested document and the information you requested is being provided to you with certain information withheld pursuant to Exemption 4 of the FOIA, 5 U.SC. 552 (b)(4), and Exemption 6 of the FOIA, 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(6).

Exemption 4 protects "trade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from a person and is privileged or confidential." Information that is required to be submitted by a person is "confidential" for purposes of Exemption 4 if disclosure is likely to either: (1) impair the Government's ability to obtain necessary information in the future or (2) cause substantial harm to the competitive position of the person from whom the information was obtained. Portions deleted from the documents enclosed contain "commercial" or "financial" information that relates to business activities. Labor rates and other specific cost information have been deleted as they refer specifically to proprietary information relating to costs, resource allocation and expert personnel. In addition, proprietary business strategy, organization information and confidential client information has also been redacted. The release of rates of specific employees and costs of specific services would disclose the firm's organizational structure and its approach to analyzing and responding to various requirements. Disclosure of the information would also reveal the firm's capabilities, available resources and methods of allocating them. Such information would give competitors an advantage in the future by providing insight on resources available to the submitter and the method used to respond to a solicitation. The release of confidential client information would also cause substantial harm to the firm's competitive position. For these reasons the information is being withheld.

Printed with soy ink on recycled paper

To the extent permitted by law, the DOE pursuant to Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Section 1004.1, will make available records that it is authorized to withhold under the FOIA when it determines that such disclosure is in the public interest. The discretionary disclosure of the information withheld under Exemption 4 could constitute a violation of the Trade Secret Act, 18 U.S.C. 1905, unless its release is otherwise authorized by law. Since there is no DOE regulation or statutory authority currently in effect that constitutes an "authorization by law" for the release of the information falling within Section 1905, discretionary release of the material exempt under Exemption 4 is prohibited.

The exemption also protects the interest of both the government and submitters of information. Its existence encourages submitters to voluntarily furnish useful commercial or financial information to the government and it correspondingly provides the government with an assurance that such information will be reliable.

Exemption 6 protects "personnel and medical files and similar files the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Under Exemption 6, portions deleted from the documents enclosed contain identities of the key personnel of the contractor. The individuals named in these documents have a significant privacy interest in the personal information about them contained therein in order to be free from unwanted solicitations or contact. This information is not information which is relative to the operations of the agency or the federal government, the core purpose for which the FOIA was enacted. Since no public interest relative to the core purpose of FOIA would be served by disclosure of these individuals' personal information, and since there is a viable privacy interest which would be threatened by such disclosure, Exemption 6 authorizes the withholding of this material.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 1004.7 (b)(2), I am responsible for the determination to withhold the information under Exemption 4 and Exemption 6.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 1004.8, you may challenge the determination to withhold information from the responsive documents by submitting a written appeal to the Director, Office of Hearings and Appeals, L'Enfant Plaza Building, U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20585-1615. You should submit the appeal within thirty (30) calendar days of receipt of this determination. The written appeal, including the envelope, must clearly indicate that a Freedom of Information Act appeal is being made. The appeal also must contain all the elements required by 10 CFR 1004.8.

The costs incurred to process the request were $28.16. The Department will be requesting payment for this charge under a separate letter.

I appreciate the opportunity to assist you. If you have any questions, please contact Phyllis Morgan at (202) 287-1504.

Sincerely,

Craig C. Ashline, Procurement Analyst
Office of Headquarters Procurement Services
Corporate Services Division

Enclosure

FOIA Number FOIA-2009-000193 for
Source Selection Statement
DE-RP01-08HS07014

Information Withheld

Page 4
Proposed Subcontractor and Consultant names

Page 6
Each Offeror's Total Proposed Labor, Total Proposed ODC, Total Proposed Base Fee, and Total Proposed Award Fee

SOURCE SELECTION STATEMENT

Request for Proposal Number DE-RP01-08HS07014

Security Related Technical Support Services for the U. S. Department of Energy's (DOE) Office of the Health, Safety and Security (HSS)

INTRODUCTION

I was designated as Source Selection Official (SSO) for the purpose of selecting a contractor to provide security related technical and administrative support services for the Office of Health, Safety and Security (HSS). The support required is to develop, manage, and implement policies and procedures, specifically in the following areas: (1) Personnel Security, (2) Assessment and Integration Support, (3) Field Assistance Support, (4) International Safeguards and Physical Protection Support, (5) Materials Control and Accountability (MC&A) Support, (6) Planning and Technology Development, (7) Technical and Operations Security Support, (8) Security Analytical and Technical Support Services, (9) Administrative Support Services.

A single time and material, labor-hour, base fee and performance award fee type contract is anticipated. A Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC) was established to evaluate the technical proposals that were received in response to Request for Proposal (RFP) Number DE-RP01-08HS07014. The Contracting Officer and TEC conducted a review of the cost proposals. I have reviewed the TEC Report, Technical Evaluation of Cost Proposals Report, Evaluation of Volume III Cost Proposal Report, and Evaluation of Volume I Report, and have been briefed by the TEC and the Contracting Officer regarding the evaluation of the proposals submitted. Exercising my independent judgment of the overall strengths and weaknesses of the proposals, I select Protection Strategies Incorporated (PSI) as the offeror that provided the proposal most advantageous to the Government. This document provides the rationale for my selection decision.

BACKGROUND

HSS was established in 2006, and is comprised of eleven program offices that have a broad range of responsibilities in the areas of independent oversight, security policy, security-related technical assistance, security training, operations of certain facilities, and emergency management.

HSS is responsible for the development, promulgation, and evaluation of security programs, and the independent oversight of safeguards and security; cyber security; emergency management; and environment, safety, and health programs throughout the Department. HSS develops and assists in the implementation of strategies, policies, and technology pertaining to the protection of national security and other critical assets entrusted to the Department. HSS also provides information and analysis regarding the

effectiveness, vulnerabilities, and trends of the Department's security, safety, and other programs and functions of interest to Departmental senior management and other stakeholders.

DESCRIPTION OF THE ACQUISITION

HSS is primarily responsible for developing strategies and policies governing the protection of national security and other critical assets entrusted to the Department of Energy. The purpose of this acquisition is to select a contractor to assist HSS in performing the following functions:

- Manage security operations for DOE facilities in the national capitol area.
- Manage the DOE Safeguards and Security Technology Development Program.
- Develop policies designed to protect national security and other critical assets entrusted to DOE.
- Develop and analyze Department-wide safeguards and security policy and standards designed to protect national security and other critical assets.
- Develop, promulgate, and interpret policies, procedures, and guidance to identify information that must be classified or controlled under statute or Executive order to protect the national security, to ensure the effective operation of the Government, or to protect the privacy interests of individuals.
- Establish and implement a comprehensive security program to protect DOE Headquarters facilities, personnel, and classified and sensitive matter from dissident, terrorist, foreign intelligence, criminal, and insider threats in a cost effective and efficient manner.
- Provide analytical support to senior HSS management present at the Emergency Operations Center during a security related emergency management exercise/incident.
- Establish and maintain direct liaison with federal, state, and local law enforcement organizations for the receipt and analysis of domestic threat information.
- Ensure the efficient and effective training of security and information personnel throughout DOE.
- Maintain real-time, reliable and complete information on DOE nuclear materials that are subject to special control and accounting procedures on inventory domestically as well as transferred abroad.
- Develop policy and guidance for the program of foreign visits and assignments to the Department's laboratories and other facilities.
- Ensure that all documents prepared at DOE Headquarters are properly marked to identify the level and category of protected information they contain (if any) and ensure that all documents the Department prepares for public release contain no information requiring protection under applicable statutes, regulations, and Executive orders.

This competitive acquisition is 100% set-aside for small business under NAICS Code 541690, with a size limit standard of $6.5 million. The period of performance consists of

a 24-month base period, plus three 12-month option periods for a five-year period of performance.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

The approved Rating Plan set forth the technical criteria that were included in Section M.4, Evaluation Criteria – Technical, of the RFP. The table below summarizes the evaluation criteria and identifies the relative weights of each technical criteria and total points available.

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Points
Criterion 1: Technical Approach	25%	250
Criterion 2: Business Management Plan	20%	200
Criterion 3: Personnel Capability	35%	350
Criterion 4: Past Performance	10%	100
Criterion 5: Experience	10%	100
TOTAL	100%	1,000

The RFP further provided that Cost/Price Proposals would be neither point scored nor adjectively rated, but evaluated for completeness, reasonableness, and if deemed necessary, price realism.

The RFP states that DOE intends to award one contract to the responsible Offeror whose proposal is responsive to the Solicitation and determined to be the best value and most advantageous to the Government. In determining the best value to the Government, the Technical Evaluation Criteria are significantly more important than the Evaluated Price. The Government is more concerned with obtaining a superior Technical proposal than making an award at the lowest Evaluated Price. However, the Government will not make an award at a price premium it considers disproportionate to the benefits associated with the evaluated superiority of one Technical proposal over another. The Government will assess whether the strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies between or among competing technical proposals indicate technical superiority from the standpoint of (1) what the difference might mean in terms of anticipated performance; and (2) what the evaluated price to the Government would be to take advantage of the difference.

SOLICITATION

Request for Proposal Number DE-RP01-08HS07014 was issued on October 5, 2007, via the Department of Energy's Industry Interactive Procurement System (IIPS). Amendment Number 001, dated November 1, 2007, was issued to provide responses to questions received as of October 15, 2007. The closing date for receipt of proposals was November 14, 2007.

SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS

On November 14, 2007, the following six (6) offerors submitted proposals in response to this RFP via IIPS:

Prime	Proposed Subcontractors/Consultants
1. ANASEC Consulting, LLC (ANASEC)	Subcontractors: [redacted] Consultants: [redacted]
2. Gregg Protection Services Inc. (GPS)	Subcontractors: [redacted]
3. Gaver Technologies Inc. (GTI)	Subcontractors: [redacted] Consultant: [redacted]
4. Protection Strategies Incorporated (PSI)	No Subcontractor Proposed Consultants: [redacted]
5. Synergy-Kingfisher, LLC (SK)	Subcontractors: [redacted]
6. Systematic Management Services, Inc. (SMS)	No Subcontractor/Consultant Proposed

The initial RFP proposal acceptance period expired May 14, 2008. A request was submitted to each offeror on May 9, 2008 to extend proposals through August 29, 2008. A second extension request was submitted to each offeror on August 15, 2008, to extend proposals through October 31, 2008. All of the offerors agreed to the extension requests in writing. The current validity period expires October 31, 2008.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

The TEC Report was submitted to the Contracting Officer on August 8, 2008. The TEC evaluated the Technical Proposals in accordance with the solicitation and Rating Plan. The following table illustrates the overall rating guidelines utilized by the TEC for evaluation of technical proposals:

RATING GUIDELINES FOR TECHNICAL PROPOSALS	
TOTAL SCORE	ADJECTIVAL RATING
900-1,000	OUTSTANDING
800-899	GOOD
500-799	ACCEPTABLE
200-499	INADEQUATE
0-199	UNACCEPTABLE

The TEC evaluated and scored each proposal according to the technical evaluation criteria listed in Section M.4 of the solicitation. The TEC, in developing its consensus ratings, used a rating point system of 10 (Outstanding), 8 (Good), 5 (Acceptable), 2 (Inadequate) and 0 (Unacceptable). Based on the strengths and weaknesses, numerical scores were established by consensus of the TEC and the related numerical scores were converted to the points set forth in the rating plan. For example, if a point score of 8 was assigned for the Technical Approach it would be divided by the total possible points of 10 based on the rating point system for this criterion and then multiplied by the total available points for this criterion of 250 points (based on the weighting of 25% as stated in the RFP) resulting in 200 points being assigned for this criterion. Additionally, the TEC completed a technical evaluation of the cost proposals and submitted it to the Contracting Officer on August 29, 2008. The evaluation of Volumes I and III was performed by the Contracting Officer.

SUMMARY EVALUATION RESULTS OF TECHNICAL AND COST PROPOSALS

A summary of the TEC's evaluation of the each offeror's technical proposal is provided below ranked in descending order of overall technical and adjectival rating in the following table:

	Technical Approach	Business Management Plan	Personnel Capability	Past Performance	Experience	Total Evaluated Score	Overall Adjectival Rating
	Criterion 1	Criterion 2	Criterion 3	Criterion 4	Criterion 5		
Max. Points	250	200	350	100	100	1,000	
PSI	200	100	280	100	80	760	Acceptable
ANASEC	125	100	175	80	80	560	Acceptable
SK	200	100	70	100	80	550	Acceptable
GPS	125	100	70	80	80	455	Inadequate
SMS	50	40	175	50	80	395	Inadequate
GTI	50	100	70	80	20	320	Inadequate

The Contracting Officer evaluated the price proposals for completeness and reasonableness in accordance with the solicitation criterion in Section M.5 of the solicitation. The RFP instructed the offerors to propose a not-to-exceed price for all five years. The total price was calculated by applying the fully-burdened hourly rate established in accordance with the RFP instructions to the level of effort by labor category specified in the RFP. The offerors did not propose any material deviations

from the solicitation instructions for the specified labor hour requirements, labor categories, and dollar pool for Other Direct Costs specified in the RFP. The offerors' total proposed price consisting of direct labor and other direct costs for all five years is listed below from highest to lowest followed by the DOE evaluated price in the following table.

Offeror	Total Proposed Labor	Total Proposed ODC's	Total Proposed Base Fee	Total Proposed Award Fee	Total Proposed Price	Total DOE Evaluated Price
ANASEC	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	$49,750,464	$49,750,393
PSI	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	$47,164,116	$48,400,979
SK	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	$46,627,485	$47,093,495
GPS	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	$42,776,242	$42,776,351
SMS	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	$36,944,423	$36,960,408
GTI	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	$30,417,041	$30,416,933

COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSALS

The TEC and Contracting Officer performed an extensive evaluation and analysis of the Offerors' technical and cost proposals in accordance with the RFP as documented in TEC Technical and Cost Reports. I have read the TEC Report, Technical Evaluation of Cost Proposal Report, and Evaluation of Volume III and discussed the TEC's and Contracting Officer's evaluation results with the TEC members and the Contracting Officer. I consider the evaluation and findings of the TEC and the Contracting Officer, as presented in the TEC Report, to be thorough and consistent with the established evaluation criteria and the rating plan.

The following represents my comparative analysis of the offerors' technical proposals. As stated in the rating plan for this solicitation, any proposal receiving a score of less than 499 points would be evaluated as Inadequate or Unacceptable. Out of a possible 1,000 points, GPS received a total overall score of 455 points, SMS received a total overall score of 395 points, and GTI received a total overall score of 320 points, resulting in an overall adjectival rating of Inadequate for these three proposals.

GPS was rated Inadequate in one of the five evaluation criteria, Personnel Capability, which accounts for 35% of the evaluation criteria, and is the most important of the technical criteria. GPS received a score of only 70 points out of 350 points in this criterion. Three of the four key personnel proposed did not meet the position qualification requirements. Additionally, the offeror's proposal and supplemental documentation for key individuals contained conflicting and inconsistent information. The prevalence of unsupported qualifications indicates an inability to staff the contract with qualified and experienced personnel capable of accomplishing the requirements of the Performance Work Statement (PWS).

The DOE evaluated price for GPS of $42,776,351 is $7,027,651 (14.2%) lower than the Independent Government Estimate (IGCE) of $49,804,002. GPS's proposed labor

category rates (28 out of 30) were evaluated as competitive and reasonable by the Contracting Officer in the Evaluation of Volume III – Cost Proposal. This reflects a potentially acceptable level of costing based on the evaluated price. However, GPS's technical proposal demonstrates an inability to provide the requisite experienced and qualified personnel necessary for successful performance. As a result, GPS was rated Inadequate for the most important of the technical criteria, which resulted in an overall technical score which is also considered Inadequate.

SMS was rated Inadequate in two of the five technical criteria, Technical Approach and Business Management Plan, which account for almost half (45%) of the evaluation criteria. SMS's proposal did not demonstrate an understanding of PWS requirements or provide a feasible or effective approach to accomplish the PWS task areas. The overall quality of the proposal was questionable, incomplete and reflected poor quality control.

The DOE evaluated price for SMS of $36,960,408 is $12,843,594 (25.8%) lower than IGCE of $49,804,002. SMS's proposed labor category rates (27 out of 30) were evaluated as competitive and reasonable by the Contracting Officer in the Evaluation of Volume III – Cost Proposal. This reflects a minimally acceptable level of costing based on the evaluated price. However, SMS's technical proposal demonstrates a lack of technical approach and business management skills to meet the PWS requirements, which resulted in an overall technical score of 395 points and represents a low level of performance expectation.

GTI was rated Inadequate in three of the five technical criteria, which account for 70% of the evaluation criteria: Technical Approach, Personnel Capability, and Experience. Its proposal fails to demonstrate an understanding of the PWS requirements; demonstrates an inability to provide key personnel that meet the RFP position qualification requirements; and, the offeror's experience is primarily in the field of Information Technology (IT), which demonstrates little to no experience in most of the PWS task areas. Moreover, GTI's price proposal contained several labor category rates that were not considered to be reasonable or competitive.

The DOE evaluated price for GTI of $30,416,933 is $19,387,069 (39%) lower than the Independent Government Estimate (IGCE) of $49,804,002, and is the lowest evaluated price of any of the offerors. Moreover, GTI's proposed labor category rates were consistently questioned (18 out of 30) and could not be considered reasonable or competitive. The Technical Evaluation of Volume III – Cost Proposal Report also indicates that GTI's cost proposal and many of its proposed category rates appear low when compared to historical knowledge and the other offeror's proposed rates. Additionally, GTI's cost proposal was deficient in providing complete cost information as required by the RFP for proposed subcontractors and consultants. As a result, GTI's proposed price represents a high risk for unsuccessful performance based on the evaluated price. Overall, both GTI's technical and cost proposal reflect a lack of understanding of the technical and price requirements necessary for adequate performance, as reflected by the total evaluated score of 320 points and Inadequate rating for three of the five technical criteria.

The DOE evaluated prices for GPS, SMS, and GTI were substantially lower than the DOE evaluated prices for PSI, ANASEC, and SK and represent a minimal performance expectation based on price. The offerors substandard technical scores and overall Inadequate adjectival rating also indicate a low level of performance expectation. The RFP states the technical evaluation is significantly more important than the price evaluation. In my judgment as the SSO, an offeror evaluated as Inadequate represents a low level of performance expectation and should not be selected for award. Accordingly, GPS, SMS and GTI should not be selected for award, and are eliminated from further consideration based upon their evaluated ratings of Inadequate.

As set forth in the rating plan, an offeror receiving a score of greater than 499 points but less than 799 points would be evaluated as Acceptable. Accordingly, PSI, ANASEC, and SK each received an overall adjectival rating of Acceptable as detailed below:

	Technical Approach	Business Management Plan	Personnel Capability	Past Performance	Experience	Total Evaluated Score	Overall Adjectival Rating
	Criterion 1	Criterion 2	Criterion 3	Criterion 4	Criterion 5		
Max. Points	250	200	350	100	100	1,000	
PSI	200	100	280	100	80	760	Acceptable
ANASEC	125	100	175	80	80	560	Acceptable
SK	200	100	70	100	80	550	Acceptable

Despite its Acceptable rating and second highest technical score of 560 points, I do not consider ANASEC to be the best value because it proposed the highest price of $49,750,464. Additionally, ANASEC's proposal is ultimately technically unacceptable because it failed to comply with the requirements of clause I.7 of the RFP, FAR 52.219-14 Limitation on Subcontracting. ANASEC did not meet the limitation on subcontracting requirement as it proposed to provide less than 50% of the cost of contract performance as the prime contractor. The Evaluation of Volume III fully documents ANASEC's failure to comply with the limitation on subcontracting requirements.

Comparative Analysis Between the Remaining Two Offerors - PSI and SK

A summary of the adjectival ratings by criterion and total rating, based on the point scores, is presented below for PSI and SK:

	Technical Approach	Business Management Plan	Personnel Capability	Past Performance	Experience	Total Adjectival Rating
	Criterion 1	Criterion 2	Criterion 3	Criterion 4	Criterion 5	
Offeror						
PSI	Good	Acceptable	Good	Outstanding	Good	Acceptable
SK	Good	Acceptable	Inadequate	Outstanding	Good	Acceptable

Both offerors received the same technical scores and adjectival ratings for four out of five evaluation criteria: Technical Approach, Business Management Plan, Past Performance and Experience. The sole criterion where the offerors evaluation was significantly different was for Personnel Capability, which is the most important of the evaluation criterion weighted at 35%. Personnel Capability was established as the most important evaluation criteria because it is critical to be able to successfully staff the contract in both key and non-key positions. It is essential to recruit and maintain a highly qualified staff from the initial transition and throughout the duration of the contract. Overall, PSI demonstrated a significantly better ability than SK to successfully provide a well-qualified key and non-key staff as evidenced by the disparity in how the key personnel for these offerors met the RFP criteria for those positions. PSI's evaluation for this criterion was substantially higher than SK's. PSI received an adjectival rating of Good for this criterion and received a score of 280 points out of a possible 350 points, whereas SK received an adjectival rating of Inadequate for this criterion and received a score of 70 points out of a possible 350 points.

Specifically, PSI proposes an experienced and well-qualified group of key personnel that meet or exceed the educational requirements, possess extensive and relevant experience, and offers a feasible plan for establishing its non-key personnel work force. The proposed key personnel for Project Manager, Senior Protective Forces Specialist and Senior Physical Security Systems Specialist all have extensive, valuable, and relevant experience as technical contributors and managers of DOE Safeguard & Security (S&S) activities, which corresponds to the S&S activities identified in the PWS. This experience increases the probability of an efficient and smooth transition of responsibilities. PSI also proposed qualified incumbent personnel for the non-key Psychiatrists/Psychologist labor category, which will further support a seamless transition of the responsibilities and duties for this position. The personnel capability described by PSI demonstrates the offeror's approach to establish and maintain qualified and experienced support staff throughout contract performance. PSI proposes to offer employment to incumbent personnel, but indicates that the offeror has 59 qualified replacement personnel available if needed. The only concern noted by the TEC was that only 12 of these employees reside within the DC metropolitan area, which could represent some staffing difficulty for PSI, if selected personnel elect not to relocate within the local commuting areas. Overall, PSI's proposal demonstrates an overall ability to provide and retain qualified and experienced personnel to successfully meet the requirement of the PWS.

On the other hand, SK has two significant weaknesses and two weaknesses for this criterion. Though the proposed key Personnel Security Specialist has extensive experience and meets or exceeds the requirements of the RFP for this position, the remaining three proposed key personnel do not satisfy the minimum education and experience requirements. Further, while SK proposed a secondary plan for new hires and placing employees in temporary duties if needed, it failed to fully demonstrate an ability to maintain a stable contract staff. The majority of SK's proposed personnel are outside of the DC area, and only one third of the SK team will have personnel readily available in the DC area. This could represent some difficulty for SK to successfully

staff the contract in a timely manner. Therefore, the personnel capability section of SK's proposal presents a low level of performance expectation.

The RFP informed offerors that the Government did not intend to hold discussions with offerors, and based upon the evaluation findings detailed above the Contracting Officer determined that discussions were not necessary.

COST/TECHNICAL TRADEOFF

As a result of the analysis above, I do not consider SK to be the best value to the Government. The DOE evaluated price for PSI was $48,400,979. The DOE evaluated price for SK was $47,093,495. Even though PSI had the higher DOE evaluated price of $48,400,979, the technical difference of 210 points (or 27.63%) more than outweighs the 2.8% price premium.

PSI's technical proposal is superior to that of SK's, and all other offerors, by a substantial margin, and its evaluated price is only 2.8% higher than SK's. Based on my review, the technical ratings are reflective of the relative superiority of PSI's proposal. The TEC report indicates a high expectation that PSI would perform the required security related technical and administrative support services for HSS in a competent and efficient manner. PSI has demonstrated a command of all technical requirements of the RFP. Therefore, the selection of PSI will result in a substantially higher probability of successful performance and significantly reduced risk of performance failure at an acceptable price.

SELECTION DECISION

Using the evaluation findings reported by the TEC and the Contracting Officer, and exercising my independent judgment of the overall strengths and weaknesses of the proposals, I find that the proposal from Protection Strategies Incorporated represents the best value to the Government, technical and price factors considered. PSI's proposal is technically superior, represents the lowest potential risk for failure, and provides the highest probability of success in performance of the PWS, at a reasonable price (including fee), and is therefore the most advantageous to the Government. Therefore, I select PSI for award of the contract for the acquisition of security related technical and administrative support services for HSS.

Lesley A. Gasperow
Source Selection Official

10/17/08
Date