

UNITED STATES ARMY  
COMMUNICATIONS-ELECTRONICS COMMAND



FORT MONMOUTH, NEW JERSEY

**DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A**  
Approved for public release  
Distribution Unlimited


**ADVANCE PLANNING  
BRIEFING FOR INDUSTRY  
“BEST VALUE ACQUISITION SYMPOSIUM”**

OCEAN PLACE HILTON RESORT AND SPA  
JANUARY 24, 1996

19960304 000

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 1

# DISCLAIMER NOTICE



THIS DOCUMENT IS BEST QUALITY AVAILABLE. THE COPY FURNISHED TO DTIC CONTAINED A SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF COLOR PAGES WHICH DO NOT REPRODUCE LEGIBLY ON BLACK AND WHITE MICROFICHE.



REPLY TO  
ATTENTION OF

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY  
HEADQUARTERS, US ARMY COMMUNICATIONS-ELECTRONICS COMMAND  
AND FORT MONMOUTH  
FORT MONMOUTH, NEW JERSEY 07703-5000



Office of the Commanding General

Ladies and Gentlemen:

On behalf of the Communications-Electronics Command (CECOM) and The Army's Command and Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence and Electronic Warfare (C4IEW) and Sensors Team, I am pleased to present these proceedings of the Advance Planning Briefing for Industry (APBI) entitled "Best Value Acquisition Symposium." The objective of this publication is to provide industry with a thorough understanding and update on the Best Value proposal evaluation and source selection process at CECOM.

I trust that this conference will aid you in your attempt to provide acceptable proposals as well as demonstrate the significance of using Best Value procedures for securing quality products and services for tomorrow's Army.

I welcome your participation in our APBI program.

Sincerely,

Gerard P. Brohm  
Major General, U.S. Army  
Commanding

## NOTICE

This publication contains the briefings presented during this Advance Planning Briefing for Industry (APBI). Following the APBI, you may obtain a Proceedings Book for a minimum fee by contacting the Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC). The telephone number is (800) 225-3842 (Option 5).

We hope that the above publication proves beneficial to your long-range planning efforts. If you have any additional questions and/or suggestions, please contact the Program Analysis and Evaluation Directorate, AMSEL-PE-OD, ATTN: Mari Aufseeser, (908) 532-5054.

## DISCLAIMER

The use of trade names in this report does not constitute official endorsement of any products. This report may not be cited for purpose of advertisement.

The information provided is accurate as of the time of publication, and may be subject to change.

THE OVERALL CLASSIFICATION  
OF THIS PUBLICATION IS  
UNCLASSIFIED

**ADVANCE PLANNING BRIEFING FOR INDUSTRY**

**“BEST VALUE ACQUISITION SYMPOSIUM”**

JANUARY 24, 1996  
OCEAN PLACE HILTON RESORT AND SPA  
LONG BRANCH, NEW JERSEY

MEETING CHAIRMAN  
MR. EDWARD G. ELGART  
DIRECTOR, C4IEW ACQUISITION CENTER  
CECOM

**AGENDA**

**WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 24, 1996**

- 0700           REGISTRATION
- 0800           ADMINISTRATIVE REMARKS  
Ms. Kathleen S. Davis  
Chief, Special Projects/TILO Branch
- 0810           WELCOMING REMARKS  
MG Gerard P. Brohm  
Commanding General, CECOM
- 0825           OPENING REMARKS  
Mr. Edward G. Elgart  
Director, C4IEW Acquisition Center, CECOM
- BEST VALUE PROCESS AT CECOM
- 0840           ROLES IN BEST VALUE  
Mr. John Goodbody  
Chief, Aviation/Space Systems Division  
C4IEW Acquisition Center, CECOM
- 0855           DISCRIMINATORS  
Mr. Thomas Carroll  
Attorney Advisor  
Legal Office, CECOM
- 0910           EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS  
Mr. Emerson Keslar  
Procurement Analyst  
Project Manager, MILSTAR (Army)
- Mr. David Jimenez  
Test Engineer  
Project Manager, MILSTAR (Army)

1000 QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

1010 BREAK

1030 PERFORMANCE RISK ANALYSIS GROUPS (PRAG)  
Ms. Wendy McCutcheon  
Chief, Space Communications Branch  
C4IEW Acquisition Center, CECOM

1045 DEBRIEFINGS  
Mr. Lawrence Asch  
Contracting Officer  
C4IEW Acquisition Center, CECOM

1105 ORAL PRESENTATIONS  
Mr. Joseph Brady  
Contracting Officer  
C4IEW Acquisition Center, CECOM

1135 QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD

1145 LUNCH

1300 COMMUNICATIONS  
Mr. Edward G. Elgart  
Director, C4IEW Acquisition Center, CECOM

1320 FY96 BEST VALUE JOBS

Mr. Eugene Boyle  
Chief, Contracts Branch  
Research, Development and Engineering Center, CECOM

Mr. Donald Damstetter  
Chief, Business Management Division  
PEO, Intelligence and Electronic Warfare

Mr. Robert Lehnes  
Deputy PEO, Communications Systems  
PEO, Command, Control and Communications Systems

Mr. Marc Gietter  
Electronic Engineer, Power Sources Team  
Logistics and Readiness Center, CECOM

1405 BREAK

1425 MOCK SOURCE SELECTION - COMPARING THE PROPOSALS  
AND SELECTING THE WINNER

Mr. Mark Sagan  
Chief, Procurement Law Division  
Legal Office, CECOM

Mr. Ronald Gibson  
Electronics Engineer  
Product Integrity and Production Engineering Directorate, CECOM

Ms. Wendy McCutcheon  
Chief, Space Communications Branch  
C4IEW Acquisition Center, CECOM

Mr. Joseph M. Simpson  
Price/Cost Analyst  
C4IEW Acquisition Center, CECOM

1530

BREAK

1535

MOCK SOURCE SELECTION - ANNOUNCING THE WINNER  
MG Gerard P. Brohm  
Commanding General, CECOM

1550

EXECUTIVE PANEL

MG Gerard P. Brohm  
Commanding General, CECOM

MG William H. Campbell  
PEO, Command, Control and Communications Systems

BG David R. Gust  
PEO, Intelligence and Electronic Warfare

Mr. Edward G. Elgart  
Director, C4IEW Acquisition Center, CECOM

Mr. Robert F. Giordano  
Director, Research, Development and Engineering Center, CECOM

Ms. Kathryn Hoener  
Chief Counsel, Legal Office, CECOM

1620

CLOSING REMARKS  
MG Gerard P. Brohm  
Commanding General, CECOM

## CONTENTS

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| WELCOMING REMARKS .....   | 1    |
| OPENING REMARKS .....   | 5    |
| <b>BEST VALUE PROCESS AT CECOM</b> .....  | 11   |
| ROLES IN BEST VALUE.....  | 13   |
| DISCRIMINATORS.....   | 31   |
| EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS .....   | 41   |
| PERFORMANCE RISK ANALYSIS GROUPS (PRAG).....                                      | 101  |
| DEBRIEFINGS .....   | 157  |
| ORAL PRESENTATIONS .....  | 193  |
| COMMUNICATIONS.....   | 201  |
| FY96 BEST VALUE JOBS .....  | 217  |
| MOCK SOURCE SELECTION - COMPARING THE PROPOSALS AND<br>SELECTING THE WINNER ..... | 237  |
| MOCK SOURCE SELECTION - ANNOUNCING THE WINNER.....                                | 265  |
| CLOSING REMARKS .....   | 269  |
| EXECUTIVE PANEL .....   | 273  |
| SYMPOSIUM PARTICIPANTS .....  | 275  |

# WELCOMING REMARKS

MG GERARD P. BROHM

COMMANDING GENERAL  
CECOM

# NOTES

# OPENING REMARKS

MR. EDWARD G. ELGART

DIRECTOR  
C4IEW ACQUISITION CENTER  
CECOM

# C4IEW ACQUISITION CENTER



**BEST VALUE DOES NOT  
EQUAL LOWEST PRICE**

**77% OF FY95 NEGOTIATED BEST  
VALUE ACQUISITION AWARDED TO  
TECHNICALLY SUPERIOR OFFEROR**

# NOTES


# BEST VALUE PROCESS AT CECOM

# **ROLES IN BEST VALUE**

**MR. JOHN GOODBODY  
CHIEF, AVIATION/SPACE DIVISION  
C4IEW ACQUISITION CENTER**


**UNCLASSIFIED**


# SOURCE SELECTION IN THE FORT MONMOUTH COMMUNITY




TEAM  
FORT MONMOUTH

# SOURCE SELECTION PROCESS







# WHO ARE THESE PEOPLE?



# ROLES ON A FORMAL SOURCE SELECTION



# TYPICAL SOURCE SELECTION ORGANIZATION




# **SOURCE SELECTION EVALUATION BOARD (SSEB)**

## ***RESPONSIBILITIES***

- ❖ **EVALUATES EACH PROPOSAL**
- ❖ **SEPARATE PANEL FOR EACH FACTOR**
- ❖ **PANELS INCLUDE SUBJECT MATTER EXPERTS**
- ❖ **REPORTS FINDINGS TO SSAC**

# TYPICAL SOURCE SELECTION ORGANIZATION




# **ADVISORS - GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBILITIES**

- ❖ **PROVIDE ADVICE AND COUNSEL TO THE SSA,  
SSAC AND SSEB AS NEEDED**
- ❖ **NOT “MEMBERS” OF THE SSAC OR SSEB  
“ CONTRACT TEAM” -**
  - ✓ **PREPARES RFP**
  - ✓ **CONDUCTS DISCUSSIONS WITH OFFERORS**
  - ✓ **PREPARES FINAL CONTRACT**

# **ADVISORS - NON- GOVERNMENT RESPONSIBILITIES**

- ❖ **FURNISH EXPERT ADVICE IN SPECIFIC AREAS  
(TO SSEB ONLY)**
- ❖ **NOT “MEMBERS” OF THE SSAC OR SSEB**
- ❖ **USE REQUIRES APPROVAL AND NOTICE TO  
THE OFFERORS**

# TYPICAL SOURCE SELECTION ORGANIZATION




# **SOURCE SELECTION ADVISORY COUNCIL (SSAC)**

## **RESPONSIBILITIES**

- ❖ **ASSISTS THE SSA THROUGHOUT THE SOURCE SELECTION PROCESS**
- ❖ **REVIEWS AND ANALYZES SSEB FINDINGS**
- ❖ **COMPARES PROPOSALS TO GOVERNMENT'S REQUIREMENTS**
- ✓ **ASSURES CONSISTENCY AMONG PANELS' REVIEWS**
- ✓ **CHECKS AND BALANCE IN EVALUATION**
- ✓ **OFFERORS ARE NOT IDENTIFIED BY NAME**
- ❖ **REPORTS FINDING TO THE SSA**

# TYPICAL SOURCE SELECTION ORGANIZATION



# **SOURCE SELECTION AUTHORITY (SSA) RESPONSIBILITIES**

- ❖ **IN CHARGE OF THE ENTIRE SOURCE SELECTION PROCESS**
- ❖ **APPROVES THE SOURCE SELECTION PLAN (SSP) AND THE SOLICITATION (RFP)**
- ❖ **APPOINTS THE SSAC AND SSEB CHAIR**
- ❖ **APPROVES THE CONTRACTING OFFICER'S DECISION TO ELIMINATE ANY OFFEROR FROM COMPETITIVE RANGE**
- ❖ **MAKES THE FINAL SOURCE SELECTION DECISION**

# **SECURITY OF SOURCE SELECTION PROCESS**

- ❖ **SEPARATE**
  - ✓ **OFF SITE FACILITY**
  - ✓ **INDEPENDENT "CHAIN OF COMMAND"**
  - ✓ **DEDICATED EVALUATORS**
- ❖ **PROTECT INFORMATION AND DOCUMENTATION**
  - ✓ **USE OF SAFES**
  - ✓ **LIMITED ACCESS TO MATERIAL**
  - ✓ **ESTABLISH SOLICITATION SPECIFIC LIBRARY**
- ❖ **CERTIFICATIONS**
  - ✓ **NON DISCLOSURE**
  - ✓ **CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

# NOTES

# **DISCRIMINATORS**

**THOMAS D. CARROLL  
ATTORNEY-ADVISOR  
CECOM LEGAL OFFICE**

**UNCLASSIFIED**

# **BASIS FOR AWARD**

- ❖ **EVERY COMPETITIVE SOLICITATION HAS A  
“BASIS FOR AWARD”**
  - ✓ **THE BASIC RULE USED TO DETERMINE THE  
WINNER**
  
- ❖ **THREE COMMON TYPES:**
  - ✓ **LOWEST RESPONSIVE RESPONSIBLE BID  
LOWEST COST/PRICE ACCEPTABLE  
PROPOSAL**
  - ✓ **“BEST VALUE”**

# DEFINITION

## ❖ BEST VALUE

- ✓ ANY BASIS FOR AWARD WHICH STATES THAT FACTORS IN ADDITION TO COST/PRICE WILL BE CONSIDERED IN SOME RELATIVE ORDER OF IMPORTANCE TO DETERMINE THE WINNING PROPOSAL.

# **EFFECT ON ACQUISITION**

- ❖ **ALLOWS THE GOVERNMENT THE DISCRETION TO DETERMINE WHICH PROPOSAL OFFERS THE BEST CHANCE OF SUCCESSFULLY MEETING THE SOLICITATION'S REQUIREMENTS**
- ✓ **LOWEST COST/PRICE PROPOSAL DOES NOT NECESSARILY WIN**
- ✓ **THE GOVERNMENT MAY DECIDE THAT ADVANTAGEOUS ASPECTS OF A PARTICULAR PROPOSAL ARE WORTH THE EXTRA MONEY IT WILL COST**

# **BAD NEWS**

**POOR SELECTION AND QUALITY OF  
EVALUATION FACTORS IS ONE OF THE  
MAJOR PROBLEMS IN BEST VALUE  
SOURCE SELECTION**

# **GOOD NEWS**

**THE NUMBER AND QUALITY OF THE  
EVALUATION FACTORS IS THE DRIVING  
ELEMENT IN STREAMLINING THE BEST  
VALUE SOURCE SELECTION PROCESS**

# WHAT SHOULD BE EVALUATED

- ❖ PROPOSAL vs CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS
- ❖ EVALUATION vs CONFIRMATION
- ❖ CONTRIBUTE VALUE
- ❖ DISTINGUISH AMONG OFFERORS
- ❖ FACTS vs PROMISES

# NOTES

# **Evaluation of Proposals**


**Mr. Emerson Keslar**

**Mr. David Jimenez**

**Project Manager, Milstar (Army)**


**UNCLASSIFIED**

# Planning, Implementing & Executing the Evaluation Strategy




**Establishing and Documenting a Plan for  
Selecting a Source**

# Planning, Implementing & Executing the Evaluation Strategy




- Structuring the Solicitation to Effectively Communicate: Requirements/Objectives, Selection Factors/Subfactors & Their Relative Importance & Methodology for Evaluating Proposals

# Planning, Implementing & Executing the Evaluation Strategy




Evaluating the Offers on the basis of the Source Selection Plan and the Evaluation Factors and Subfactors in the Solicitation

# Planning, Implementing & Executing the Evaluation Strategy




Comparing the advantages, disadvantages, risks, and price or most probable costs of the offers

# Planning, Implementing & Executing the Evaluation Strategy




**Deciding which combination, in accordance with solicitation criteria, represents "Best Value"**

# Planning, Implementing & Executing the Evaluation Strategy




## Documenting the Lessons Learned for Benefit of Future Source Selections

# Source Selection as Part of the Acquisition Process



# **Planning for the Best Value Source Selection**

- **Early Acquisition Planning**
- **Tailored to Each Program**
- **Lessons from the Past**
- **Understanding the Customer**  
*“The Soldier”*
- **Continued Market Research & Industry Communications**
- **Recognizing Acquisition Cultural Changes**



# Best Value

## A Shift in Emphasis

### PAST

- Defense Contractors
- Build to Print/Mil SPEC
- Manage to MIL-STDs
- Detailed Oversight
- Lowest Price Sources
- Risk Avoidance

### FUTURE


- More commercial sources
- Performance SPECS
- Best Business Practices
- Reduced Gov't Oversight
- Alternative Approaches
- Take Reasonable Risks
- Partnering



Cultural Change

# Planning

Understanding Those Areas Important to The Program



# **The Source Selection Plan**


- **Serves as a Charter for the Source Selection Organization**
  - **Defines Roles & Responsibilities**
  - **Organizational Structure**
  - **Procurement Integrity**
- **Defines Approach for Soliciting and Evaluating Proposals**

# **The Source Selection Plan**

**(Continued)**

- **Describes Evaluation Factors & Subfactors, Their Relative Importance and Methodology Used to Evaluate Proposals**
  - **Rating System**
- **Guide for the Source Selection Officials**
- **Plans & Schedules for Achieving Source Selection Milestones**

# Organization & Roles on a Formal Source Selection



**EVALUATES**

**COMPARES**


**DECIDES**

# Methodology

- **Proposals are evaluated against the Government's requirement and "rated" in a way that presents a clear picture of the relative merits of each proposal for Best Value decision**
- **Common Rating Methodologies**
  - **Adjectival**
  - **Narrative**
  - **Color Coding**
  - **Numerical Score**
- **Fort Monmouth uses Adjectival Ratings supported by Narrative Statements for all factors except cost/price**
  - **Color Coding is also used to depict adjectival ratings**

# Establishing and Documenting a Plan for Selecting a Source

Source  
Selection  
Plan



RFP

Section M  
Evaluation  
Factors  
for  
Award

Section L  
Instructions,  
Conditions,  
and Notices  
to Offerors

Proposal Submission  
Requirements and  
Evaluation Factors for  
Award Taken from  
Source Selection Plan  
and Used for RFP  
Sections L & M

# **Section M - Evaluation Factors for Award**

- **States the Basis Upon Which the Government Will Make the Best Value Decision**
- **Consists of Three Parts:**
  - **Basis of Award**
  - **Factors & Subfactors to Be Evaluated**
  - **Evaluation Approach**

# **Basis of Award**

- **Describes the Basic Rule the Governme nt will use to Determine a Winner**

# Basis of Award

(Continued)

## **Example:**

**BASIS FOR AWARD.** Any award to be made will be based on the best overall, i.e. **best value**, proposal that is determined to be the most beneficial to the Government with appropriate consideration given to the following **evaluation factors** - Technical, Price, Performance Risk Logistics, and Small Business & Small Disadvantaged Business Subcontracting Plan (SBSDBSP) - in **descending order of importance**. The Price and Performance Risk factors combined are more important than the Technical factor. The Performance Risk factor is significantly more important than either the Logistics factor or the SBSDBSP factor. Offerors are cautioned that the award may not be made to the lowest price offeror.

# **Evaluation Factors**

## **What are They?**

**Areas that will be evaluated**

- **Based on objectives/requirements**
- **Depend on the specific nature of each acquisition**
- **Derived from an understanding of market conditions**

# **Evaluation Factors**


## **Why are they important?**

- **Provide a means of discriminating among proposals and offerors**
- **Help distinguish best value offer**
- **Help ensure customer's requirements will be satisfied**

# **Evaluation Factors & Subfactors In Section M**

- **Listed in Descending Order of Importance**
- **All Evaluation Factors & Subfactors that will be considered in Making the Selection & Their Relative Importance**
- **The Factors/Subfactors, their Relative Order of Importance and Evaluation Criteria are to Clearly Reflect the Government's Need and Facilitate the Preparation of Proposals**


# Evaluation Factors General Guidelines






# Developing Evaluation Factors

## Major Steps



# Discriminators



|               |                     |
|---------------|---------------------|
| Ktr Rep&Maint | Past Performance    |
| Training      | Plant Capability    |
| Logistics     | Design Approach     |
| Personnel     | Product Description |

- Distinguish Capability of Offerors
- Tailored for each acquisition
- Discriminators = Product + Market

# **Cost/Price Evaluation Considerations**

- **Competition in Contracting Act (CICA) Requires Price or Cost to the Government be Included as an Evaluation Factor in Every Source Selection**
- **Importance between Cost or Price and the Non-Cost Factors Must be Reflected in the Solicitation**
- **Cost Related Considerations are Contract Type Dependent**
  - **Reasonableness**
  - **Materially Unbalanced**
  - **Cost Realism**

# **Cost Realism**

- **Used to determine the ultimate most probable cost to the Government**
- **Used in Cost Type Contract Evaluation**
- **Serves several purposes:**
  - **Verifies the Offerors understanding of requirements**
  - **Assesses the degree the cost proposal accurately reflects the approach and risk assessments made in the technical proposal**
  - **Assesses the degree the cost included in the cost proposal accurately represents work effort included in the technical proposal**

# **Cost Realism**

## **(Continued)**

- **Government develops best estimate of cost from offerors proposed approach**
- **If this estimate is higher than offeror's cost, the offeror's proposed figure is adjusted upward for purposes of evaluation only**
- **Only upward adjustments**
- **Notification is included in the solicitation that proposed costs may be adjusted for evaluation purposes only based on the results of the cost realism assessment**

# **Section M**

## **Evaluation Approach**

### **CRITERIA**

- “Yardsticks” or “Standards” for Each Factor and Subfactor
- Used as a Measurement Guide for Proposal Evaluation
- May be Qualitative or Quantitative

# Developing Criteria

- Can apply to several factors/subfactors or can be unique
- Factors/subfactors usually have several criteria used for evaluation

## Requirement

- Statement of Objective

## Evaluation

### Factors

- Consistent
- Independent
- Relevant
- Limited in Number

## Criteria

- Used Consistently between evaluators
- Derived from factors
- Approved by SSA

# Criteria Examples

- **Understanding of the Requirements.** The extent to which the proposal demonstrates a clear understanding of all technical features involved in solving the problems and meeting or exceeding the requirements. The extent to which uncertainties are identified and satisfactory resolutions are proposed. Offerors are warned that a proposal found to be unrealistic in terms of technical, integration, and schedule commitments will be considered as indicative of a lack of understanding.

# Criteria Examples

(Continued)

- **Feasibility of Approach.** The extent to which the proposed approach is workable and the end result is achievable within the proposed schedule. The extent to which successful performance is contingent upon untried and unproven devices and techniques. The extent to which the approach defined and described in the proposal demonstrates and ensures that contract performance will not be adversely impacted.
- **Completeness.** The extent to which all solicitation requirements have been considered, defined and satisfied.


# **Section L - Instructions, Conditions and Notices to Offeror**

- **Tells Offerors What Information to Submit in Their Proposals**
- **Evaluation Factors/Subfactors Outlined in Section M have a Corresponding Instruction in Section L**
- **Only Information Required to Evaluate Proposals Against the Evaluation Criteria**
- **Describes Content, Format & Scope of Information Requested**


# Solicitation/Proposal Consistency

Should Not Be Conflicts Among  
Solicitation Components


Section C  
- Spec  
- SOW




Section B  
Clins/Slins



Section M  
Eval Factors  
For Award



Section L  
Proposal  
Submission



Proposal

- Pricing Tables
- Cross Reference  
Matrices
- Industry Comments  
on Draft RFPs

# **Section L**

## **Issues and Considerations**

- **Electronic Submission**
- **Page or No Page Limitations**
- **Classified Information**
- **Annex (Plans) - Reducing number required for proposal submission**
- **Cross Reference Matrices**
- **Hours, Labor Mix and Rationale used for Cost Realism Analysis**

# **Section L**

## **Issues and Considerations**

**(Continued)**

- **Price / Cost Information:**
  - **Price / Cost Segregated from Non-Cost Factors**
  - **Required Cost and Pricing Data**
  - **Information Required under T&M**
  - **Pricing Tables**


# **Section L**

## **Issues and Considerations**

**(Continued)**

- **Specific Proposal Information Necessary to Allow Evaluation of the Factors / Subfactors:**
  - **Examples: Design Information, Test Results, Life Cycle Costs, Small Business Plans, Supportability Information**
- **Oral Presentations - Guidelines For**
- **Product Demonstration Requirements**
- **Only Information Required for Selection as Opposed to Evaluating Every Government Requirement**
  - **Perry Directives having Tremendous Implications Here**

# The Evaluation Process



# **Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) Functions**

- **Evaluator Training and Preparation**
- **Initial Evaluations**
- **Support to Contracting Officer Discussions**
- **Interim Evaluations**
- **Final Evaluations**
- **Support to Contracting Officer Debrief**
- **Lessons Learned**

# **SSEB Training / Preparation**

- ***Training***
- **Prior to receipt of proposals**
- **Subjects:**
  - **Requirement**
  - **RFP**
  - **Source Selection Plan**
  - **Source selection process**
- **Tools:**
  - **Briefings by Government advisors**
  - **Videotape**
  - **Manuals**
  - **Regulations**

# **SSEB Training / Preparation**

**(Continued)**

- ***Security***
- **Protect information**
- **Avoid conflict of interest**
- **Certifications**
  - **“Nondisclosure / Conflict of Interest”**
  - **“Procurement Integrity”**
- **Insulate organization:**
  - **Separate facilities**
  - **Temporary change in member’s duty station**
  - **Separate “Chain of Command”**


# **Evaluation Principles**

- **Maintain Integrity of Process**
- **Evaluate Proposals Against Criteria**
- **Evaluate All Factors**
- **Adhere to the Source Selection Plan**

# The SSEB Evaluation

## INITIAL EVALUATION


- Rollup evaluation of all individual evaluators, culminating in Factor & Subfactor ratings and narrative support
- Completed prior to initiation of discussions



# The SSEB Evaluation

## INTERIM EVALUATION


- Update of Initial Report
  - Identifies how ratings have changed and why
- Addresses each Factor & Subfactor
- Completed prior to another round of discussions or BAFO request



# The SSEB Evaluation

## FINAL EVALUATION

- Final update of all prior reports
- Prepared after BAFOs evaluated



# **The SSEB Evaluation**

## **Each Evaluation Report (Initial, Interim & Final)**

### **Includes:**

- **A matrix showing rating given to each factor & subfactor**
- **List of deficiencies, advantages & disadvantages**
- **Narrative explanation documenting evaluation results**

# **Advantages**

- **Aspect of a Proposal that Conveys the Feasibility and Provides the Government with High Confidence in the Approach**
- **Some Examples:**
  - **Sufficient Design Margins**
  - **Improved Performance Characteristics**
  - **Improved (MTBF, MTTR, Support Plans)**
  - **Contingency Plan to Ensure Schedule Achievement**

## **Disadvantages**

- **Aspect of a proposal that is not a deficiency, but detracts or lowers the merit of a proposal (ambiguity, omission, clarification). Low level of confidence in approach.**
- **Some Examples:**
  - **Design has Manufacturing Difficulties**
  - **Non-Standard Interfaces**
  - **Human Factor Constraints**
  - **Lack of Rationale to Support Decisions or Approach**
  - **Safety Hazards**
  - **Schedule Risky**
  - **Insufficient Task Windows in Contractor Master Schedule**

# **Deficiencies**

**That part of an offeror's proposal which would not satisfy the Government's (minimum) requirements (FAR 15.601)**


- **4 Primary Sources of Proposal Deficiencies:**
  - **Fails to meet minimum requirements**
  - **Presents unacceptably high risk**
  - **Omits data needed to evaluate**
  - **Approach yields undesirable performance**

# Competitive Range Determination

An assessment of the relative competitiveness of all offerors, one against the other

- Considers cost/price as well as technical and other salient features
- Contracting Officer makes determination with SSA concurrence
- Determines Who Has a Reasonable Chance to Receive an Award
  - Prevents Additional Bid & Proposal Costs
  - A Continuous Process

# Discussions



# **Items for Negotiations (IFNs)**


- **Generated During Evaluation**
- **Some Primary Reasons**
  - **A Question for Ambiguity, Omission, Clarification**
  - **A Question Because an RFP Requirement Has Not Been Met**
- **Gives Offerors Opportunity to Clarify Issues, Correct Deficiencies in Proposals**
- **Does Not Transfuse or Level**

# **Best and Final Offers (BAFOs)**

- **FAR 15.611 sets forth the ground rules**
- **Issuance of the request concludes discussions**
- **Request should be in writing**
- **Issued to all offerors still in the competitive range**
- **Common cut-off date for receipt of BAFOs**
- **Request must allow a reasonable time for submission**

# **Best and Final Offers (BAFOs)**

**(Continued)**




**Changes / revisions are not expected and if they are made, the changes / revisions must be adequately explained and supported**

# **The Best Value Decision**


- **Based on Comparative Analysis of Proposals**
- **Consistent with Stated Evaluation Criteria**
- **Considers Whether or Not Perceived Benefits are Worth Any Price Premiums**
- **Decision is Made Making Trade-offs**

# The Source Selection Decision Document

- Consistent with the stated evaluation criteria
- Based on comparison of proposals' merits (advantages, disadvantages and risks)
- Explains why selected offeror represents the best value
- Shows rational basis for decision



**The Best Value Decision is Judgmental**



# Summary

- **Cannot Overemphasize Communications**
- **Comment on all Sections of the RFP (Including Sections L & M) using the Electronic Bulletin Board**
- **Don't Assume all RFPs are Alike**
- **Respond to all Solicitation requirements**
- **Best Value Decision is Made in Accordance with Basis of Award**
- **Understand the Results of the Source Selection**
- **Put Forth Your Best Proposal from the Start**
- **Caution Against Changing Proposals During BAFO**

# NOTES

# **PERFORMANCE RISK ANALYSIS GROUPS (PRAG)**

**MS. WENDY MCCUTCHEON  
CHIEF, SPACE COMMUNICATIONS BRANCH  
C4IEW ACQUISITION CENTER**

**UNCLASSIFIED**

# **BACKGROUND**

- ❖ **POOR CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE**
- ❖ **NO CONTRACTOR ACCOUNTABILITY**
- ❖ **GOOD PERFORMERS NOT REWARDED**
- ❖ **GOOD PROPOSAL WRITING VS. ACTUAL PERFORMANCE**

# **DEFINITIONS**

## **PERFORMANCE RISK ANALYSIS GROUP (PRAG)**

A GROUP OF EXPERIENCED GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL APPOINTED TO ASSESS PERFORMANCE RISK. AT CECOM THE PRAG OPERATES AS A GROUP WITHIN THE SSB AND REPORTS THROUGH THE SSB CHAIRPERSON TO THE SSAC. EACH AMC CONTRACTING ACTIVITY IS RESPONSIBLE FOR DETERMINING THE APPROPRIATE COMPOSITION AND STRUCTURE OF ITS PRAG, RELATIVE TO THE SIZE, NATURE, AND COMPLEXITY OF A PARTICULAR ACQUISITION.

# **DEFINITIONS (CONT)**

## **PERFORMANCE RISK -**

**A CONFIDENCE MEASURE THAT ASSESSES AN OFFEROR'S RECORD AS WELL AS THAT OF ITS MAJOR SUBCONTRACTOR(S), OF PAST AND CURRENT PERFORMANCE IN ORDER TO DETERMINE THE OFFEROR'S ABILITY TO PERFORM THE SOLICITATION'S REQUIREMENTS. PERFORMANCE RISK IS ASSESSED BY THE PRAG.**

# **DEFINITIONS OF PERFORMANCE RISK**

## ***LOW RISK -***

**LITTLE DOUBT EXISTS, BASED ON THE OFFEROR'S  
PERFORMANCE RECORD, THAT THE OFFEROR CAN  
PERFORM THE PROPOSED EFFORT.**

## ***MODERATE RISK -***

**SOME DOUBT EXISTS, BASED ON THE OFFEROR'S  
PERFORMANCE RECORD, THAT THE OFFEROR CAN  
PERFORM THE PROPOSED EFFORT.**

# **DEFINITIONS OF PERFORMANCE RISK (CONT)**


## ***HIGH RISK -***

**SIGNIFICANT DOUBT EXISTS, BASED ON THE OFFEROR'S  
PERFORMANCE RECORD, THAT THE OFFEROR CAN  
PERFORM THE PROPOSED EFFORT.**


## ***UNKNOWN RISK -***

**NO RELEVANT PERFORMANCE RECORD IDENTIFIABLE.  
EQUATES TO NEUTRAL RATING HAVING NO  
POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE EVALUATION SIGNIFICANCE.**

# PRAG OPERATION



# HOW IS PRAG CONDUCTED?




❖ **SOURCE SELECTION PLAN**

✓ **GOVERNMENT DECISION TO  
EVALUATE PERFORMANCE  
RISK**

✓ **GOVERNMENT ASSIGNS  
WEIGHT TO PERFORMANCE  
RISK FACTOR**



# HOW IS PRAG CONDUCTED? (CONT)




## ❖ PAST PERFORMANCE SURVEY PREPARATION

- ✓ TAILORED TO THE INDIVIDUAL PROCUREMENT
- ✓ QUESTIONS DESIGNED FOR:
  - ★ PROCURING CONTRACTING OFFICER
  - ★ ADMINISTRATIVE CONTRACTING OFFICER
  - ★ PRODUCT ASSURANCE
  - ★ PROJECT MANAGER
  - ★ GOVERNMENT ENGINEER

SEE APPENDIX FOR SAMPLE SURVEY

# HOW IS PRAG CONDUCTED? (CONT)



## ❖ SOLICITATION


✓SECTION L

SEE APPENDIX

✓SECTION M




# INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED BY THE OFFERORS



- ❖ INCLUDE RELEVANT COMMERCIAL CUSTOMERS
- ❖ DISCUSS CONTRACT PROBLEMS AND RESOLUTION
- ❖ INFORMATION IS CURRENT AND ACCURATE
- ❖ LIST ANY POCs THAT SHOULD BE CONTACTED

# HOW IS PRAG CONDUCTED?



- ❖ **REVIEW EACH OFFEROR'S PAST PERFORMANCE VOLUME**
- ❖ **CONTACT AMC'S CENTRAL DATABASE FOR OTHER POSSIBLE GOVERNMENT CONTACTS**
- ❖ **REVIEW OTHER RELEVANT RECENT CONTRACTS**

# AMC DATA BASE CONTAINS

GOVERNMENT POINTS OF CONTACT

CONTRACTOR NAME

CONTRACTOR ADDRESS

CONTRACTOR CAGE

CONTRACTOR DUNS

# **AMC DATA BASE CONTAINS (CONT)**

**CONTRACT NUMBER**

**PLACE OF PERFORMANCE**

**PROGRAM TITLE**

**LIFE CYCLE PHASE**

**AMC DATA BASE DOES NOT  
CONTAIN**

**ANY POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE  
INFORMATION**

**JUDGMENTAL DATA**


# **CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE REPORT**

- ❖ **FAR SUBPART 42.15**
- ❖ **EVALUATE CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE**
  - ✓ **INTERIM ASSESSMENTS**
  - ✓ **FINAL ASSESSMENTS**
- ❖ **MUST INCLUDE INPUTS FROM**
  - ✓ **TECHNICAL OFFICE**
  - ✓ **CONTRACTING OFFICE**
  - ✓ **USERS**
- ❖ **ASSESSMENTS WILL BE PROVIDED TO CONTRACTORS**
  - ✓ **COMMENTS**
  - ✓ **REBUTTALS**
  - ✓ **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

# **CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE REPORT (CONT)**


- ❖ **CONTRACTOR RESPONSE RETAINED WITH FILE**
- ❖ **EVALUATIONS MARKED “SOURCE SELECTION  
INFORMATION”**
- ❖ **EVALUATIONS RELEASED TO ONLY GOVERNMENT  
PERSONNEL**
- ❖ **ASSESSMENT CURRENT FOR 3 YEARS AFTER  
CONTRACT COMPLETION**

# HOW IS PRAG CONDUCTED?




- ❖ **CONTACT GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL AND INTERVIEW THEM REGARDING THE CONTRACTS UNDER THEIR COGNIZANCE**
- ❖ **ISSUE ITEMS FOR NEGOTIATION (IFNS) REGARDING ANY NEGATIVE, UNCLEAR, OR INCOMPLETE INFORMATION DISCOVERED DURING THE PRAG EVALUATION**

# HOW IS PRAG CONDUCTED? (CONT)




- ❖ **PRAG EVALUATION INCLUDES:**
  - ✓ **SOURCES OF PERFORMANCE DATA**
  - ✓ **RELEVANCY OF DATA TO PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS**
  - ✓ **RECENCY OF THE DATA**
  - ✓ **PERFORMANCE RISK ASSESSMENT FOR EACH OFFEROR'S PROPOSAL**

# HOW IS PRAG CONDUCTED? (CONT)



- ❖ **SUPPORTING RATIONALE FOR EACH PERFORMANCE RISK ASSESSMENT**
- ❖ **ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES FOR EACH OFFEROR**
- ❖ **ANY OTHER MATTERS DEEMED RELEVANT**
- ❖ **THE PRAG REPORT IS PROVIDED TO THE SSEB CHAIRMAN**

# HOW IS PRAG CONDUCTED? (CONT)




❖ **EACH PERFORMANCE RISK ASSESSMENT**

**WILL CONSIDER:**

✓ **POSITIVE PAST AND CURRENT  
PERFORMANCE**

✓ **NEGATIVE PAST AND CURRENT  
PERFORMANCE**

# HOW IS PRAG CONDUCTED? (CONT)



## **DECISION**

**SSA CONSIDERS THE PERFORMANCE RISK FACTOR IN  
CONJUNCTION WITH ALL EVALUATION FACTORS IN  
MAKING THE AWARD DECISION**

# **PRAG BENEFITS/SUMMARY**

- ❖ **BETTER AWARD DECISIONS**
- ❖ **ENHANCE NEGOTIATIONS AND CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION**
- ❖ **INCENTIVIZE THE CONTRACTOR TO BETTER PERFORMANCE NOW**
- ❖ **BUILDING GOVERNMENT NETWORKING CAPABILITY**
- ❖ **BETTER PRODUCT - INCREASED CUSTOMER SATISFACTION**

# **SAMPLE SECTION L SOLICITATION PROVISION**

## **PERFORMANCE RISK –**

**THE OFFEROR SHALL SUBMIT A DESCRIPTION OF ITS  
GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS (ALL PRIME AND MAJOR  
SUBCONTRACTS RECEIVED DURING THE PAST 3-5 YEARS)  
WHICH ARE IN ANY WAY SIMILAR TO THE EFFORTS  
REQUIRED BY THE SOLICITATION.**

# **SAMPLE SECTION L SOLICITATION PROVISION**

- 1. CONTRACTOR'S CAGE OR DUNS NUMBER**
- 2. PLACE OF PERFORMANCE**
- 3. GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING ACTIVITY, ADDRESS,  
AND TELEPHONE NUMBER**
- 4. PROCURING CONTRACTING OFFICER'S NAME AND  
TELEPHONE NUMBER**
- 5. GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING ACTIVITY TECHNICAL  
REPRESENTATIVE/COR AND TELEPHONE NUMBER**

# **SAMPLE SECTION L SOLICITATION PROVISION**

**6. GOVERNMENT CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION  
ACTIVITY, AND THE NAME AND TELEPHONE NUMBER  
OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE CONTRACTING OFFICER**

**7. CONTRACT NUMBER**

**8. CONTRACT TYPE**

**9. AWARDED PRICE/COST**

**10. FINAL OR PROJECTED FINAL, PRICE/COST**

**APPENDIX**

# **SAMPLE SECTION L SOLICITATION PROVISION**

- 11. ORIGINAL DELIVERY SCHEDULE**
- 12. FINAL OR PROJECTED FINAL, DELIVERY SCHEDULE**
- 13. NARRATIVE EXPLANATION OF EACH CONTRACT AND ITS RELEVANCY TO REQUIRED EFFORT**
- 14. LIST OF ALL TERMINATED CONTRACTS WITHIN THE LAST 3-5 YEARS**
- 15. INFORMATION REQUESTED IN PARAGRAPHS 1-14, ABOVE FOR TEAM MEMBERS/MAJOR SUBCONTRACTORS**

**APPENDIX**

# **SAMPLE SECTION M SOLICITATION PROVISION**

- **PERFORMANCE RISK FACTOR -**

**DURING THE SOURCE SELECTION PROCESS, THE GOVERNMENT WILL ASSESS THE RELATIVE RISKS ASSOCIATED WITH EACH OFFEROR'S PROPOSAL. IT IS IMPORTANT TO NOTE THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN PROPOSAL RISK AND PERFORMANCE RISK.**

**SAMPLE SECTION M  
SOLICITATION  
PROVISION  
(CONT)**

**• PERFORMANCE RISKS -**

**ARE THOSE ASSOCIATED WITH AN OFFEROR'S  
ABILITY TO PERFORM THE SOLICITATION'S  
REQUIREMENTS AS INDICATED BY THE OFFEROR'S  
(INCLUDING TEAM MEMBERS/MAJOR SUBCONTRACTORS)  
RECORD OF PAST AND CURRENT PERFORMANCE.  
RISK IS ASSESSED BY THE PRAG.**

**SAMPLE SECTION M  
SOLICITATION  
PROVISION  
(CONT)**

**• PROPOSAL RISKS -**

**ARE THOSE ASSOCIATED WITH AN OFFEROR'S  
PROPOSED APPROACH IN MEETING THE  
GOVERNMENT'S REQUIREMENTS. PROPOSAL  
RISK IS ASSESSED BY THE TECHNICAL  
EVALUATION AND IS INTEGRATED INTO THE  
RATING OF THE TECHNICAL FACTOR.**

# **SAMPLE SECTION M SOLICITATION PROVISION (CONT)**

**THE GOVERNMENT WILL CONDUCT A PERFORMANCE RISK ASSESSMENT BASED UPON THE OFFEROR'S (INCLUDING TEAM MEMBERS/MAJOR SUBCONTRACTORS) CURRENT AND PAST RECORD OF PERFORMANCE AS IT RELATES TO THE PROBABILITY OF SUCCESSFUL ACCOMPLISHMENT OF THE REQUIRED EFFORT.**

**SAMPLE SECTION M  
SOLICITATION PROVISION  
(CONT)**

**WHEN ASSESSING PERFORMANCE RISK, THE  
GOVERNMENT WILL FOCUS ITS INQUIRY INTO THE  
OFFEROR'S RECORD OF PERFORMANCE AS IT  
RELATES TO ALL SOLICITATION REQUIREMENTS,  
INCLUDING COST, SCHEDULE, AND PERFORMANCE.**

# **SAMPLE SECTION M SOLICITATION PROVISION (CONT)**

**A SIGNIFICANT ACHIEVEMENT, PROBLEM, OR LACK OF RELEVANT DATA IN ANY ELEMENT OF THE WORK CAN BECOME AN IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION IN THE SOURCE SELECTION PROCESS. THEREFORE, OFFERORS ARE REMINDED TO INCLUDE ALL RELEVANT PAST EFFORTS INCLUDING DEMONSTRATED CORRECTIVE ACTIONS, IN THEIR PROPOSAL.**

# **SAMPLE SECTION M SOLICITATION PROVISION (CONT)**

**OFFERORS ARE CAUTIONED THAT IN CONDUCTING THE PERFORMANCE RISK ASSESSMENT, THE GOVERNMENT MAY USE DATA PROVIDED BY THE OFFERORS IN ITS PROPOSAL AND DATA OBTAINED FROM OTHER SOURCES. OFFERORS ARE REMINDED THAT WHILE THE GOVERNMENT MAY ELECT TO CONSIDER DATA OBTAINED FROM OTHER SOURCES, THE BURDEN OF PROVING GOOD PAST PERFORMANCE RESTS WITH THE OFFERORS.**

SAMPLE PRAG SURVEY

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION - CCC CONTRACTS

1. Contract Number:
2. Contractor (Name, Address and Zip Code):
3. Type of Contract: Negotiated \_\_\_\_\_ Sealed Bid \_\_\_\_\_  
Fixed Price: \_\_\_\_\_ Cost Reimbursement: \_\_\_\_\_  
Other (Specify): \_\_\_\_\_
4. Complexity of Work: Difficult \_\_\_\_\_ Routine \_\_\_\_\_
5. Description and location of Work: (Attached additional pages as necessary.)
  
6. Contract Amount: \_\_\_\_\_  
Status: Active: \_\_\_\_\_ Complete: \_\_\_\_\_
7. Date of Award: \_\_\_\_\_  
Contract Completion Date (Including Extentions): \_\_\_\_\_
8. Type and Extent of Subcontracting: (Attach additional pages as necessary.)
  
9. Name, Address and Telephone Number of the Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR):

A separate record must be completed for all contracts awarded the competing organization within the past five years. A Performance Evaluation document will be submitted to the COTR for completion and used to evaluate your organization's past performance.

APPENDIX

**PERFORMANCE EVALUATION OF CONTRACT  
(Check Appropriate Box)**

| <u>Performance Elements</u>         | <u>Outstanding</u> | <u>Satisfactory</u> | <u>Unsatisfactory</u> |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| 1. Quality of Work                  |                    |                     |                       |
| 2. Timely Performance               |                    |                     |                       |
| 3. Effectiveness of Management      |                    |                     |                       |
| 4. Compliance with Labor Standards  |                    |                     |                       |
| 5. Compliance with Safety Standards |                    |                     |                       |
| 6. Handling Staff Integrity Issues  |                    |                     |                       |
| 7. Facility Maintenance & Repair    |                    |                     |                       |
| 8. Personnel Management Practices   |                    |                     |                       |
| 9. Overall Evaluation               |                    |                     |                       |

**EVALUATED BY**

A. Organization:

B. Name and Title:

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

7. Remarks on outstanding performance: Provide data supporting this observation. (Continue on separate sheet if needed.)

8. Remarks on unsatisfactory performance: Provide data supporting the observation. (Continue on separate sheet if needed.)

Note: If verbal telephonic response received, complete the following:

Information obtained by: \_\_\_\_\_  
Printed Name
Signature

BUSINESS MANAGEMENT PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

I. CONTRACT IDENTIFICATION

- A. CONTRACTOR \_\_\_\_\_
- B. CONTRACT NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_
- C. CONTRACT TYPE \_\_\_\_\_
- COMPETITIVE { } YES { } NO
- FOLLOW-ON { } YES { } NO
- D. PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE \_\_\_\_\_

ESTIMATED FEE TOTAL  
COST VALUE

FIRM FIXED PRICE

- E. INITIAL CONTRACT COST \_\_\_\_\_
- F. CURRENT CONTRACT COST \_\_\_\_\_
- G. PRODUCT DESCRIPTION  
AND/OR SERVICE PROVIDED \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

III. AGENCY IDENTIFICATION

- A. NAME \_\_\_\_\_
- B. DESCRIPTION \_\_\_\_\_
- C. GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION  
OF SERVICES UNDER THIS  
CONTRACT, I.E. LOCAL,  
NATIONWIDE, WORLDWIDE \_\_\_\_\_
- D. NUMBER OF LOCATIONS  
SERVICED BY THIS  
CONTRACT \_\_\_\_\_

IV. EVALUATION

A. PERFORMANCE HISTORY

1. To what extent did the contractor adhere to contract delivery schedules?

- Considerably surpassed minimum requirements...{ } 4
- Exceeded minimum requirements.....{ } 3
- Met minimum requirements.....{ } 2
- Less than minimum requirements.....{ } 1

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. To what extent did the contractor submit required reports and documentation in a timely manner?

Considerably surpassed minimum requirements. { } 4  
Exceeded minimum requirements..... { } 3  
Met minimum requirements..... { } 2  
Less than minimum requirements..... { } 1

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

3. To what extent were the contractor's reports and documentation accurate and complete?

Considerably surpassed minimum requirements. { } 4  
Exceeded minimum contractual requirements... { } 3  
Met minimum requirements..... { } 2  
Less than minimum requirements..... { } 1

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

4. To what extent was the contractor able to solve contract performance problems without extensive guidance from government counterparts?

Considerably successful..... { } 4  
Generally successful..... { } 3  
Little success..... { } 2  
No success..... { } 1

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

5. To what extent did the contractor display initiative in meeting requirements?

Displayed considerable initiative.....{ } 4  
Displayed some initiative.....{ } 3  
Displayed little initiative.....{ } 2  
Displayed no initiative.....{ } 1

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

6. Did the contractor commit adequate resources in timely fashion to the contract to meet the requirement and to successfully solve problems?

Provided abundant resources.....{ } 4  
Provided sufficient resources.....{ } 3  
Provided minimal resources.....{ } 2  
Provided insufficient resources.....{ } 1

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

7. To what extent did the contractor submit change orders and other required proposals in a timely manner?

Considerably surpassed minimum requirements.{ } 4  
Exceeded minimum requirements.....{ } 3  
Met minimum requirements.....{ } 2  
Less than minimum.....{ } 1

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

8. To what extent did the contractor respond positively and promptly to technical directions, contract change orders, etc.?

Considerably surpassed minimum requirements. { } 4  
Exceeded minimum requirements.....{ } 3  
Met minimum requirements.....{ } 2  
Less than minimum requirements.....{ } 1

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

---

9. To what extent was the contractor's maintenance and problem tracking/reporting documentation timely, accurate, and of appropriate content?

Considerably surpassed minimum requirements..{ } 4  
Exceeded minimum requirements.....{ } 3  
Met minimum requirements.....{ } 2  
Less than minimum requirements.....{ } 1

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

---

10. To what extent was the contractor effective in interfacing with the Government's staff?

Extremely effective.....{ } 4  
Generally effective.....{ } 3  
Generally ineffective.....{ } 2  
Extremely ineffective.....{ } 1

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

---

B. TERMINATION HISTORY

11. Has this contract been partially or completely terminated for default or convenience?

Yes             Default             Convenience  
 No

If yes, explain (e.g., inability to meet cost, performance, or delivery schedules). \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

12. Are there any pending terminations?

Yes             No

If yes, explain and indicate the status. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

C. EXPERIENCE HISTORY

13. How effective has the contractor been in identifying user requirements?

Extremely effective.....{ } 4  
Generally effective.....{ } 3  
Generally ineffective.....{ } 2  
Extremely ineffective.....{ } 1

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

14. What level of integration experience has the contractor demonstrated in the reconfiguration of government owned software, commercial software, and government furnished hardware?

- Considerable surpass minimum experience.....{ } 4
- Exceeded minimum experience.....{ } 3
- Met minimum experience requirements.....{ } 2
- Less than minimum experience.....{ } 1

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

---

15. To what extent was the maintenance and problem reporting/tracking documentation produced by the contractor's efforts satisfactory to the users?

- Considerably surpassed minimum requirements..{ } 4
- Exceeded minimum requirements.....{ } 3
- Met minimum contractual requirements.....{ } 2
- Less than minimum requirements.....{ } 1

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

---

16. To what extent did the contractor coordinate, integrate, and provide for effective subcontractor management?

- Considerably surpassed minimum requirements....{ } 4
- Exceeded minimum requirements.....{ } 3
- Met minimum requirements.....{ } 2
- Less than minimum requirements.....{ } 1

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

---

17. To what extent did the contractor provide timely technical assistance, both on-site and off-site, when responding to problems encountered in the field?

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Considerably surpassed minimum requirements....{ | } 4 |
| Exceeded minimum requirements.....{              | } 3 |
| Met minimum requirements.....{                   | } 2 |
| Less than minimum requirements.....{             | } 1 |

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

---

18. To what extent did the contractor achieve effective logistics support, i.e. replacement parts, personnel, etc.?

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Considerably surpassed minimum requirements...{ | } 4 |
| Exceeded minimum requirements.....{             | } 3 |
| Met minimum requirements.....{                  | } 2 |
| Less than minimum requirements.....{            | } 1 |

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

---

19. To what extent did the contractor provide quality replacement parts?

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Considerably surpassed minimum requirements...{ | } 4 |
| Exceeded minimum requirements.....{             | } 3 |
| Met minimum requirements.....{                  | } 2 |
| Less than minimum requirements.....{            | } 1 |

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

---

20. To what extent did the contractor meet the repair/response times in the contract?

|   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| Considerably surpassed minimum requirements.... | { | } | 4 |
| Exceeded minimum requirements.....              | { | } | 3 |
| Met minimum requirements.....                   | { | } | 2 |
| Less than minimum requirements.....             | { | } | 1 |

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

---

21. Did this contract include a Help Desk?

{ } Yes            { } No

If yes, to what extent was the contractor responsive to users contacting the Help Desk for assistance?

|   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| Considerably surpassed minimum requirements.. | { | } | 4 |
| Exceeded minimum requirements.....            | { | } | 3 |
| Met minimum requirements.....                 | { | } | 2 |
| Less than minimum requirements.....           | { | } | 1 |

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

---

22. If there was a Help Desk, were users able to make contact with the Help Desk personnel on their first attempt?

|   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| Always able on the first attempt.....         | { | } | 4 |
| More often than not on the first attempt..... | { | } | 3 |
| Rarely able on the first attempt.....         | { | } | 2 |
| Never on the first attempt.....               | { | } | 1 |

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

---

23. Were the Help Desk personnel courteous and responsive?

- Always courteous and responsive.....{ } 4
- Usually courteous and responsive.....{ } 3
- Rarely courteous and responsive.....{ } 2
- Never courteous and responsive.....{ } 1

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

---

24. Were user questions resolved in a timely manner?

- Always resolved in a timely manner.....{ } 4
- Usually resolved in a timely manner.....{ } 3
- Rarely resolved in a timely manner.....{ } 2
- Never resolved in a timely manner.....{ } 1

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

---

25. How technically qualified were the Help Desk personnel?

- Extremely qualified.....{ } 4
- Satisfactorily qualified.....{ } 3
- Minimally qualified.....{ } 2
- Technically deficient.....{ } 1

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

---

26. How satisfied are you with the contractor's Help Desk problem escalation procedures?

Extremely satisfied.....{ } 4  
Satisfactorily satisfied.....{ } 3  
Minimally satisfied.....{ } 2  
Unsatisfied.....{ } 1

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

27. How technically qualified were the maintenance personnel?

Extremely qualified.....{ } 4  
Satisfactorily qualified.....{ } 3  
Minimally qualified.....{ } 2  
Technically deficient.....{ } 1

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

D. COST MANAGEMENT

28. To what extent did the contractor meet the proposed cost estimates?

Less than estimated cost.....{ } 4  
Comparatively equal to estimate.....{ } 3  
Exceeded the costs.....{ } 2  
Considerably surpassed estimate.....{ } 1

Comment: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

NARRATIVE SUMMARY

Use this section to explain additional information not included above.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

## CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE REPORT INSTRUCTIONS

- Block 1: Insert contractor name and address, identify which division is being evaluated, if appropriate. This information should match that provided on the DD350.
- Block 2: Contract number of the effort being evaluated.
- Block 3: The value of the contract (basic plus options) at the time the evaluation is prepared.
- Block 4: Contract award date and date of the last scheduled delivery under the contract.
- Block 5: Type of contract and method of award. (i.e. competitive CPFF).
- Block 6: Description of requirement. This should match the description in the acquisition plan supporting the contract award.
- Block 7: Assign a performance evaluation adjectival rating from the charts on the following pages and the evaluation must be supported with factual data and observations.
- Block 8: If appropriate, list key personnel, the dates of their assignments to the contract effort, and the effect those individuals had upon the evaluations assigned above.
- Block 9: If you could award follow-on contract to any offeror of your choice would you award the contract to this offeror? Why?
- Block 10: The person responsible for establishing the requirement should complete this block.
- Block 11: Any comments or rebuttal the contractor provides must be reduced to writing.
- Block 12: The contractor's point of contact signature.
- Block 13: Insert the final CECOM evaluation here, after considering any contractor rebuttal of the initial evaluation that was provided within the 30 day comment period.
- Block 14: After the final evaluation is assigned, the contracting officer shall sign the evaluation form.

## EVALUATION GUIDELINES

The assessment of contractor performance shall be consistent with any other evaluation provided under the contract (i.e. award fee evaluations).

DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION CATEGORIES:

QUALITY OF PRODUCT OR SERVICE(Q):

- Compliance with contract requirements
- Accuracy of contractor reports
- Appropriate personnel assigned to perform the work on contract
- Technical excellence

COST CONTROL(C):

- Within budget(over/under target cost)
- Accuracy and quality of billings
- Relationship of negotiated costs to actuals
- Cost effectiveness

Timeliness of Performance(T):

- Met any established interim milestones
- Responsive to technical direction
- Completed on-time including contract close-out activities to date
- No liquidated damages assessed

Customer Satisfaction(S):

- Effective management

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE REPORT

Final       Interim(for the period \_\_\_\_\_ through \_\_\_\_\_)

1. Contractor Name, Address and Phone and Cage Code
2. Contract Number:
3. Contract Value:
4. Contract Award Date:  
Contract Completion Date:
5. Type of Contract:
6. Description of Requirement and FSC:
7. Contractor Performance Evaluation:



10. Requiring Activity POC Name: Signature:

Phone and Office Symbol: Date:

11. Did the contractor provide a rebuttal to this evaluation:  
[ ]Yes [ ]No If so, attach it.

12. Name of Contractor Reviewer: Signature:

Phone and Office Symbol: Date:

13. Final Evaluation after consideration of any rebutting statements provided within 30 days by the contractor.

Quality Cost Control Timeliness Customer Satisfaction

14. Contracting Officer Name: Signature:

Address and Telephone: Date:

- Businesslike correspondence
- Responsive to contract requirements
- Prompt notification of problems
- Reasonable/cooperative
- Flexible
- Proactive
- Effective contractor-recommended solutions
- Followed through with socio/economic provisions of the contract

#### EVALUATION ADJECTIVAL RATINGS:

Unsatisfactory: Q: Nonconformances are compromising the achievement of contract requirements, despite attempts by DOD personnel to resolve the deficiencies.  
C: Cost issues are compromising performance of contract requirements.  
T: Delays are compromising the achievement of contract requirements, despite attempts by DOD personnel to resolve the deficiencies.  
S: Response to inquires, technical/service/administrative issues is not effective and responsive.

Poor: Q: Nonformances require attempts by DOD personnel to resolve the deficiencies and ensure achievement of contract requirements.  
C: Cost issues require attempts by DOD personnel to resolve the deficiencies and ensure achievement of contract requirements.  
T: Delays require attempts by DOD personnel to resolve the deficiencies and ensure achievement of contract requirements.  
S: Response to inquiries, technical/service/administrative issues is marginally effective and responsive.

- Fair:
- Q: Nonconformances require minor efforts by DOD personnel to ensure achievement of contract requirements.
  - C: Cost issues require minor efforts by DOD personnel to ensure achievement of contract requirements.
  - T: Delays require minor efforts by DOD personnel to ensure achievement of contract requirements.
  - S: Response to inquiries, technical/service/administrative issues is somewhat effective and responsive.
- Good:
- Q: Nonconformances do not impact achievement of contract requirements.
  - C: Cost issues do not impact achievement of contract requirements.
  - T: Delays do not impact achievement of contract requirements.
  - S: Response to inquiries, technical/service/administrative issues is usually effective and responsive.
- Excellent:
- Q. There are no quality problems.
  - C. There are no cost issues.
  - T. There are no delays.
  - S. Response to inquiries, technical/service/administrative issues is effective and responsive.

# NOTES

# **DEBRIEFINGS**

**MR. LAWRENCE ASCH  
CONTRACTING OFFICER  
C4IEW ACQUISITION CENTER**

**UNCLASSIFIED**

# **AGENDA**

- ❖ **PURPOSE OF A DEBRIEFING**
  - ❖ **WHO IS ENTITLED TO A DEBRIEFING?**
  - ❖ **WHEN IS A DEBRIEFING CONDUCTED?**
  - ❖ **WHO ATTENDS A DEBRIEFING?**
  - ❖ **PREPARATION FOR A DEBRIEFING**
  - ❖ **WHAT CANNOT BE DISCLOSED**
  - ❖ **RATIONAL FOR AWARD DECISION**
  - ❖ **DEBRIEFING THE UNSUCCESSFUL OFFEROR**
- FASA FAR REVISIONS IAW FAC 90-31**

# **PURPOSE OF A DEBRIEFING**

- ❖ **PREPARE BETTER, MORE COMPETITIVE PROPOSALS IN FUTURE**
- ❖ **EXPLAIN AWARD DECISION**
- ❖ **INSTILL CONFIDENCE IN PROCESS**
- ❖ **REDUCE MISUNDERSTANDINGS**

# WHO IS ENTITLED TO A DEBRIEFING?

❖ WHEN AWARD BASED ON COMPETITIVE  
PROPOSALS

❖ UNSUCCESSFUL OFFEROR

❖ AWARDEE

# **WHEN IS A DEBRIEFING CONDUCTED?**

- ❖ **UNSUCCESSFUL OFFEROR MUST REQUEST -  
W/IN 3 DAYS OF NOTIFICATION OF AWARD**
- ❖ **DEBRIEFING MUST BE CONDUCTED W/IN 5  
DAYS OF REQUEST**
- ❖ **PRE-AWARD**
  - ✓ **NOT REQUIRED BY REGULATION**

# **WHO ATTENDS A DEBRIEFING?**

- ❖ **CONTRACTING OFFICER CHAIRS THE DEBRIEFING**
- ❖ **GOVERNMENT DEBRIEFING TEAM MUST CONSIST OF KNOWLEDGEABLE PERSONNEL**
- ❖ **DON'T PLACE LIMITATIONS ON NUMBER OF DEBRIEFED OFFEROR PERSONNEL**
- ❖ **INDUSTRY ENCOURAGED TO HAVE APPROPRIATE MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL ATTEND**

# EVALUATION SUMMARY WIDGET

## FACTORS

ABC CO.

DEF CO.

## TECHNICAL

ACCEPTABLE  
Yellow

OUTSTANDING  
BLUE

## COST \$M

\$48.82

\$52.32

## PERFORMANCE RISK

MODERATE  
Yellow

LOW  
Blue

# PREPARATION FOR A DEBRIEFING

- ❖ ADVISE ALL SSEE PARTICIPANTS OF THEIR DUTIES TO CONDUCT DEBRIEFINGS AT THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS
- ❖ PREPARE THE EVALUATION DOCUMENTATION AS IF IT WERE TO BE PRESENTED TO THE UNSUCCESSFUL OFFEROR AT THE DEBRIEFING
- ❖ BEGIN PREPARATION FOR THE DEBRIEFING BEFORE AWARD
- ❖ CONDUCT DRY-RUN

# **WHAT CANNOT BE DISCLOSED**

- ❖ **NO MAGIC FORMULA. READ SECTION M!**
- ❖ **NO POINT-BY-POINT COMPARISONS OF THE DEBRIEFED OFFEROR'S PROPOSAL WITH THE OTHER PROPOSALS**
- ❖ **MAY NOT DISCLOSE INFORMATION THAT IS EXEMPT FROM RELEASE UNDER FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT (FOIA) (PROPRIETARY INFORMATION)**
- ❖ **PREAWARD DEBRIEF COMPETITION AND SOURCE SELECTION SENSITIVE; INFORMATION MUST BE SAFEGUARDED**

# **FASA FAR REVISIONS**

**(FAC 90-31)**

- ❖ **Requires within three days of contract award, notification to unsuccessful offerors that a contract has been awarded and to allow electronic transmission of notification (Implementation FAR 2.101 and 15.1002)**
- ❖ **Allows offerors to request a debriefing within three days of receipt of notice of award and requires agencies to the maximum extent practicable to conduct the debriefings within five days (Implementation FAR 15.1002, 15.1004, 36.304)**

# FASA FAR REVISIONS (FAC 90-31) - CONTINUED

- ❖ Specifies minimum requirements for content of debriefings to include:
  - ✓ A summary of the rationale for award
  - ✓ The overall ranking of all offerors when any ranking was developed by the agency during the source selection
  - ✓ For acquisitions of commercial end items, the make and model of the item to be delivered by the successful offeror
  - ✓ The debriefing shall not include point-by-point comparison of the debriefed offeror's proposal with those of other proposals. Moreover, debriefing shall not reveal any information exempt from release under the Freedom of Information Act.
  - ✓ The debrief should answer reasonable responses to relevant questions about source selection procedures contained in the solicitation and applicable regulations
  - ✓ (Implementation FAR 15.1004, 36.607 and 52.215-16)

**DEBRIEFING THE  
UNSUCCESSFUL OFFEROR**

**WIDGET SOURCE SELECTION**

**ABC DEBRIEF**

**January 24, 1996**


# **BASIS FOR AWARD WIDGET**

**Award will be based on the best overall (i.e. best value) proposal that is determined to be the most beneficial to the Government, with appropriate consideration given to the three (3) major evaluation factors: Technical, Cost and Performance Risk. The Technical Factor is more important than the other factors combined. Cost is equal in importance to the Performance Risk Factor.**

# **BASIS FOR AWARD WIDGET**

**To receive consideration for award, a rating of no less than “acceptable” must be achieved for the Technical Factor and each of the five (5) subfactors under the Technical Factor. Offerors are cautioned that award may not necessarily be made to the lowest cost offeror.**

# FORMAL SOURCE SELECTION STRUCTURE - WIDGET



OPTEC

US Army Signal Center

AMSAA

NSA

MIT - Lincoln Lab

Johns Hopkins - APL

USAF

Project Manager

CECOM

# FACTORS WIDGET

❖ TECHNICAL

❖ COST

❖ PERFORMANCE RISK

# TECHNICAL FACTOR

# **TECHNICAL SUBFACTOR IMPORTANCE - WIDGET**

- **SUBFACTORS**
  - Design Approach
  - Test Approach
  - Engineering Management
    - (Includes Small Business and Small Disadvantaged Business Subcontracting Plan)
  - Reliability Program
  - Supportability
  
- **IMPORTANCE**
  - The subfactors are in descending order of importance. Design Approach is more important than Test Approach and Engineering Management combined. Test Approach and Engineering Management combined are more important than Reliability Program and Supportability combined. Reliability Program is equal in importance to Supportability.

# TECHNICAL FACTOR ADJECTIVAL RATINGS AND DEFINITIONS

## ADJECTIVAL RATINGS

## DEFINITIONS

OUTSTANDING  
(BLUE)

A UNIQUE APPROACH WHICH SATISFIES THE GOVERNMENT'S REQUIREMENTS, WITH EXTENSIVE DETAIL TO INDICATE HOW THE APPROACH IS NOT ONLY FEASIBLE BUT DESIRABLE AND WHICH SHOWS A THOROUGH UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROBLEM WITH A LOW RISK IN MEETING THE GOVERNMENT'S REQUIREMENTS.

GOOD  
(GREEN)

AN APPROACH WHICH SATISFIES THE GOVERNMENT'S REQUIREMENTS, WITH ADEQUATE DETAIL TO INDICATE THE FEASIBILITY OF THE APPROACH AND AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROBLEM, AND WITH A LOW TO MODERATE DEGREE OF RISK IN MEETING THE GOVERNMENT'S REQUIREMENTS.

ACCEPTABLE  
(YELLOW)

AN APPROACH WHICH SATISFIES THE GOVERNMENT'S REQUIREMENTS, WITH MINIMUM DETAIL TO INDICATE THE FEASIBILITY OF THE APPROACH AND AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROBLEM, AND WITH A MODERATE TO HIGH DEGREE OF RISK IN MEETING THE GOVERNMENT'S REQUIREMENTS.

SUSCEPTIBLE \*  
(PINK)

AN APPROACH WHICH AS PROPOSED, CANNOT BE RATED "ACCEPTABLE" BECAUSE OF MINOR ERRORS, OMISSIONS, OR DEFICIENCIES WHICH ARE CAPABLE OF BEING CORRECTED WITHOUT A MAJOR REWRITE OR REVISION OF THE PROPOSAL.

UNACCEPTABLE  
(RED)

MAJOR ERRORS, OMISSIONS, OR DEFICIENCIES WHICH INDICATE A LACK OF UNDERSTANDING OF THE PROBLEM; A PROPOSED APPROACH BASED ON UNTRIED AND UNPROVED DEVICES OR TECHNIQUES; OR AN APPROACH WHICH CANNOT BE EXPECTED TO MEET REQUIREMENTS OR INVOLVES A VERY HIGH RISK; AND ANY OF THE ABOVE CONDITIONS CANNOT BE CORRECTED WITHOUT A MAJOR REWRITE OR REVISION OF THE PROPOSAL.

\* CAUTION: THIS RATING MUST NOT BE CARRIED IN THE EVALUATION REPORTS WRITTEN AFTER THE RECEIPT AND EVALUATION OF THE BEST AND FINAL OFFERS (BAFOs). THIS IS BECAUSE ONCE THE BAFOs HAVE BEEN RECEIVED, ERRORS, OMISSIONS AND DEFICIENCIES ARE NO LONGER "CAPABLE OF CORRECTION". IN EFFECT, THE OFFEROR HAS NO FURTHER OPPORTUNITY TO CURE ITS ERRORS, OMISSIONS OR DEFICIENCIES. IF A RATING CANNOT BE RAISED TO "ACCEPTABLE" OR BETTER AS A RESULT OF THE BAFO, IT MUST BE LOWERED TO "UNACCEPTABLE".

# **TECHNICAL FACTOR DESIGN APPROACH**

- ❖ **ADVANTAGES:**
  - ✓ **DESIGN PROVIDES 1.7 dB MARGIN**
  - ✓ **DEMODULATION RESULTS IN A .3 dB IMPROVEMENT**
  - ✓ **SYNTHESIZER LOW RISK AND EFFECTIVE**
  - ✓ **EXPERIENCE WITH SATELLITE**
  - ✓ **ELECTRONIC SCAN FEED ELIMINATES POWER LOSS**
  - ✓ **WEIGHT MARGIN OF 984 LBS**
  - ✓ **TERMINAL CAN BE DEMOUNTED FROM HMMWV WITHOUT LIFTING EQUIPMENT**
  - ✓ **LOW DATA RATE (LDR) PROTOCOL EXPERIENCE**
  - ✓ **30 INCH HEIGHT MARGIN**

# **TECHNICAL FACTOR DESIGN APPROACH (CONT)**

## **❖ DISADVANTAGES:**

- ✓ **ANTENNA POINTING AND TRACKING MODERATE TO HIGH RISK**
- ✓ **TRANSMITTER HIGH RISK WITHIN PRIME POWER PROPOSED**
- ✓ **INSUFFICIENT POWER TO TRACK IN 60 MPH WINDS**
- ✓ **CHANGES REQUIRED TO BASELINE DESIGN TO SUPPORT DAMA**
- ✓ **MINIMAL DETAIL CONCERNING DAMA**
- ✓ **OPERATOR INTERFACE NOT COMMON WITH OTHER OPERATOR INTERFACES**

**RATING - ACCEPTABLE**

# TECHNICAL FACTOR TEST APPROACH

## ❖ ADVANTAGES

- ✓ USE VALIDATED BRASSBOARD TERMINAL TO VALIDATE LDR PORTION OF SATELLITE SIMULATOR (SAT-SIM)
- ✓ BIT ERROR RATE (BER) CAN BE TESTED SEPARATELY ON THE U/L AND D/L

## ❖ DISADVANTAGES:

- ✓ SAT-SIM DEVELOPMENT SCHEDULE (16 MONTHS) IS OPTIMISTIC, CONSIDERING NO EXISTING CAPABILITY OR EXPERIENCE DEVELOPING SATELLITE SIMULATORS
- ✓ SAT-SIM IS NOT SCRIPT OR DATA BASE DRIVEN. MAKES TESTING LABOR INTENSIVE.

**RATING - ACCEPTABLE**

# TECHNICAL FACTOR ENGINEERING MANAGEMENT

## ❖ ADVANTAGES:

- ✓ PROVIDED A DETAILED RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN IDENTIFYING THE CRITICAL AREAS FOR INTENSIVE MANAGEMENT.
- ✓ WILL PERFORM A MANUFACTURING REVIEW AT THE END OF DEVELOPMENT WITH GOVERNMENT PARTICIPATION.

## ❖ DISADVANTAGES: NONE

**RATING - GOOD**

# **TECHNICAL FACTOR RELIABILITY PROGRAM**

## **❖ ADVANTAGES:**

✓ ENVIRONMENTAL STRESS SCREENING

## **❖ DISADVANTAGES:**

✓ OPTIMISTIC RELIABILITY GROWTH RATE (.40)

**RATING - ACCEPTABLE**

# TECHNICAL FACTOR SUPPORTABILITY PROGRAM

## ❖ ADVANTAGES:

- ✓ IR&D PROTOTYPE WILL ENHANCE EARLY DEVELOPMENT AND INTEGRATION OF LOGISTICS AND MANPRINT
- ✓ SUPPORTABILITY EXPERIENCE
- ✓ PALLET ASSEMBLY MOUNTED/DISMOUNTED USING RETRACTABLE ROLLER ASSEMBLIES AND STABILIZATION LEGS

## ❖ DISADVANTAGES: NONE

**RATING - GOOD**

# TECHNICAL FACTOR SUMMARY WIDGET

**SUBFACTORS**

**DESIGN APPROACH**

ACCEPTABLE  
YELLOW

**TEST APPROACH**

ACCEPTABLE  
YELLOW

**ENGINEERING MGT**

GOOD  
GREEN

**RELIABILITY PROGRAM**

ACCEPTABLE  
YELLOW

**SUPPORTABILITY**

GOOD  
GREEN

**FACTOR RATING**

ACCEPTABLE  
YELLOW

# COST FACTOR

# **COST EVALUATION WIDGET**

❖ **COST FACTOR EVALUATION CONSIDERED  
THE FOLLOWING**

✓ **COST PLUS INCENTIVE FEE (CPIF)**

✓ **TIME & MATERIAL**

✓ **TOTAL EVALUATED COST INCLUDES THE  
MOST PROBABLE COST OF THE CPIF  
EFFORT PLUS THE ESTIMATED TIME AND  
MATERIAL CEILING**

# **COST FACTOR**

❖ **PROPOSED COST OF \$47,958,871**

❖ **EVALUATED COST OF \$48,818,688**

# PERFORMANCE RISK ASSESSMENT

# PERFORMANCE RISK

## ❖ DATA

- ✓ OFFEROR'S LAST 3 YEARS OF RELEVANT PERFORMANCE TO ASSESS THE PROBABILITY OF SUCCESSFUL ACCOMPLISHMENT OF WIDGET IN A TIMELY AND COST EFFECTIVE MANNER

## ❖ SOURCES

- ✓ OFFEROR'S PROPOSAL
- ✓ GOVT REPS AT PROCURING AGENCY AND OFFEROR'S FACILITY
- ✓ AMC DATA BASE
- ✓ USAF DATA BASE (CPARS)
- ✓ FIELD DATA COLLECTION

## ❖ APPROACH

- ✓ CONSIDERED BOTH POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE PERFORMANCE
- ✓ USED DATA REASONABLY RELATED TO CONTRACT REQUIREMENT
- ✓ ASSURED DATA ACCURACY BY FOLLOW-UP
- ✓ ALLOWED OFFERORS TO REVIEW AND REBUT DATA

# PERFORMANCE RISK RATINGS

## RISK

## DEFINITION

**LOW  
(BLUE)**

**LITTLE DOUBT EXISTS, BASED ON THE OFFEROR'S PERFORMANCE RECORD, THAT THE OFFEROR CAN PERFORM THE PROPOSED EFFORT.**

**MODERATE  
(YELLOW)**

**SOME DOUBT EXISTS, BASED ON THE OFFEROR'S PERFORMANCE RECORD, THAT THE OFFEROR CAN PERFORM THE PROPOSED EFFORT.**

**HIGH  
(RED)**

**SIGNIFICANT DOUBT EXISTS BASED ON THE OFFEROR'S PERFORMANCE RECORD, THAT THE OFFEROR CAN PERFORM THE PROPOSED EFFORT.**

**UNKNOWN  
(WHITE)**

**NO RELEVANT PERFORMANCE RECORDS IDENTIFIABLE; EQUATES TO A NEUTRAL RATING HAVING NO POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE EVALUATION SIGNIFICANCE**

# PERFORMANCE RISK EVALUATION

- ❖ EVALUATED PAST CONTRACTS OF ABC CO. AND THEIR MAJOR SUBCONTRACTORS IN THE COST, SCHEDULE AND TECHNICAL AREAS
- ❖ PRIME CONTRACTS EVALUATED/ ADVANTAGES/ DISADVANTAGES LISTED
- ❖ MAJOR SUBCONTRACTORS EVALUATED/ ADVANTAGES/DISADVANTAGES LISTED
- ❖ OVERALL PERFORMANCE RISK OF ABC CO. AND THEIR SUBCONTRACTORS WAS MODERATE BASED ON PAST PERFORMANCE

# EVALUATION SUMMARY

## WIDGET

FACTORS

ABC CO.

DEF CO.

TECHNICAL

ACCEPTABLE  
Yellow

OUTSTANDING  
BLUE

COST \$M

\$48.82

\$52.32

PERFORMANCE RISK

MODERATE  
Yellow

LOW  
Blue

# NOTES

# **ORAL PRESENTATIONS**

**MR. JOSEPH BRADY  
CONTRACTING OFFICER,  
COMMAND TECHNICAL SERVICES BRANCH  
C4IEW ACQUISITION CENTER**

**UNCLASSIFIED**

# **CECOM 'S GOAL**

- ❖ **ALL NEW COMPETITIVE REQUIREMENTS  
WILL UTILIZE ORAL PRESENTATIONS IN  
BEST VALUE SCENARIOS**
- ❖ **PAPERLESS EXERCISE - SOLICITATION  
THROUGH RECEIPT OF PROPOSAL**

# **BENEFITS FROM THE USE OF ORAL PRESENTATIONS**

- ❖ **STREAMLINE ACQUISITION PROCESS**
- ❖ **REDUCE COSTS/MANPOWER  
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE GOVERNMENT**
- ❖ **REDUCE COSTS/MANPOWER  
REQUIREMENTS FOR INDUSTRY**
- ❖ **FACILITATE A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF  
EACH CONTRACTOR'S OFFER**
- ❖ **GOVERNMENT WILL BE BETTER PREPARED  
TO EXECUTE THE CONTRACT UPON AWARD**

# **CECOM'S ORAL PRESENTATIONS TO DATE**

- ❖ **JOINT SURVEILLANCE TARGET ATTACK RADAR  
(JSTARS)**
- ❖ **SECURE MOBILE ANTI-JAM RELIABLE  
TERMINAL (SMART-T)**
- ❖ **C3 TEST EVALUATION & INTEGRATION  
OMNIBUS**

# **CECOM'S CURRENT PLANNED ORAL PRESENTATIONS**

- ❖ **LONG RANGE ADVANCED SCOUT SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM (LRAS3)**
- ❖ **TRI-BAND TACTICAL TERMINALS PRODUCTION (SOFTACS/STAR-T) (ORAL PRESENTATION FOR LOGISTICS SUPPORTABILITY ONLY)**
- ❖ **SECURE MOBILE ANTIJAM RELIABLE TACTICAL TERMINAL PRODUCTION**
- ❖ **INTERNAL COMMERCIAL INTRUSION DETECTION SYSTEMS (ICIDS)**

# **WHAT HAPPENS TODAY WILL DETERMINE THE FUTURE...**

- ❖ **EXPAND USE OF ORAL PRESENTATIONS**
- ❖ **ENCOURAGE COMMENTS**
- ❖ **DEVELOP LESSONS LEARNED**
- ❖ **FOUNDATION FOR FUTURE ACQUISITION  
STREAMLINING**

# NOTES

# **COMMUNICATIONS**

**EDWARD G. ELGART  
DIRECTOR  
C4IEW ACQUISITION CENTER**

**UNCLASSIFIED**

# **BEST VALUE SYMPOSIUM**



**“EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION  
CONTRIBUTES TO  
BEST VALUE”**

**OPPORTUNITIES  
FOR  
INDUSTRY AND GOVERNMENT  
COMMUNICATIONS**


**IN**

**PRE-SOLICITATION PHASE**

**SOLICITATION PHASE**


**PROPOSAL PHASE**

**AWARD PHASE**



# PRE-SOLICITATION PHASE

**“THE GOAL IS A MORE EFFICIENT  
SOLICITATION PACKAGE”**



# PRE-SOLICITATION PHASE


**“EARLY INDUSTRY INVOLVEMENT  
IS THE KEY”**

- ❖ **MARKET SURVEYS - CBD**
- ✓ **HEADS UP TO INDUSTRY**
- ✓ **CANVASS THE CONTRACTING  
COMMUNITY**
- ✓ **BEWARE OF OVERSELLING  
CAPABILITY (BE REALISTIC)**
- ✓ **ANNUAL APBI**



# **PRE-SOLICITATION PHASE (CONT)**

- ❖ **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (EBB)**
- ✓ **INDUSTRY'S FIRST OPPORTUNITY TO OFFER SUGGESTIONS AND ASK QUESTIONS**
- ✓ **FOCUS SOLICITATION ON INTERESTED CONTRACTORS**



# PRE-SOLICITATION PHASE (CONT)

- ❖ PRE-SOLICITATION CONFERENCE
  - ✓ UTILIZED TO DEVELOP AND IDENTIFY INTERESTED SOURCES
  - ✓ CONTRACTOR REQUESTS INFORMATION
  - ✓ INDUSTRY ASKS QUESTIONS, GOVERNMENT EXPLAINS




# PRE-SOLICITATION PHASE (CONT)



- ❖ **DRAFT SOLICITATION (EBB)  
STREAMLINING TOOL**
- ✓ **GOVERNMENT LOOKING FOR  
CONSTRUCTIVE INPUT**
- ✓ **RESPONSES CAREFULLY ANALYZED**
- ✓ **WHEN APPLICABLE, CHANGES WILL  
BE INCORPORATED TO RFP**
- ✓ **USUALLY NO IMPACT TO EVALUATION  
FACTORS**


# SOLICITATION PHASE

**GOAL: CLEAR, MEANINGFUL PROPOSALS  
IN 30 DAYS FOR MOST RFPS**




# SOLICITATION PHASE

- ❖ ISSUE RFP
- ❖ PRE PROPOSAL CONFERENCE  
(STREAMLINING TOOL)
- ✓ USED IN TECHNICALLY COMPLEX  
REQUIREMENTS
- ✓ TO EXPLAIN AND CLARIFY



# PROPOSAL PHASE

- ❖ ORAL PRESENTATIONS
- ❖ ITEMS FOR NEGOTIATIONS (IFNS)
- ❖ FACE TO FACE NEGOTIATIONS
- ❖ PAGE LIMITATIONS




# **AWARD PHASE**

## **❖ DEBRIEFINGS**

- ✓ DON'T LEAVE THE DEBRIEF WITH UNANSWERED QUESTIONS**
- ✓ USE THE DEBRIEF TO LEARN MORE ABOUT THE GOVERNMENT'S RATIONALE FOR AWARD AND TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF FUTURE PROPOSALS**
- ✓ HAVE APPROPRIATE MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL ATTEND**

**THE GOVERNMENT, IN PARTNERSHIP  
WITH INDUSTRY, SHARES THE COMMON  
GOAL: OPEN COMMUNICATIONS TO  
IMPROVE BUSINESS PRACTICES AND  
STREAMLINE THE ACQUISITION  
PROCESS**



# NOTES

**FY96**  
**BEST VALUE JOBS**

**UNCLASSIFIED**

**RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT  
AND ENGINEERING CENTER**

**BEST VALUE OPPORTUNITIES**

**EUGENE BOYLE  
CHIEF, CONTRACT BRANCH  
RDEC**

# **RDEC BEST VALUE OPPORTUNITIES**

**TITLE:** MULTIPLEXER INTEGRATION AND DCSS  
AUTOMATION SYSTEM (MIDAS)

**OBJECTIVE:** PROVIDE SWITCHING, MULTIPLEXING, PATCHING,  
COMSEC/TRANSEC INTERFACE AND TEST  
FUNCTIONS FOR SATELLITE SYSTEMS

**KEY MILESTONES:** ELECTRONIC BULLETIN BOARD, NOV 95  
RFP, MAR 96  
TEST OF PRODUCTION QUALITY UNIT, MAY 96  
AWARD, OCT 96

**EST VALUE:** \$40M

**TECH POC:** JOHNNY NG (908) 532-9783 EXT 5432

**CONT. POC:** ANDREW DELLOMO (908) 532-1530

# **RDEC BEST VALUE OPPORTUNITIES**

**TITLE:** HIGH TECH SUPPORT TONIGHT VISION/ELECTRONIC  
SENSORS DIRECTORATE (NVEDS)

**OBJECTIVE:** TO PROVIDE ENGINEERING SUPPORT TO NVEDS  
TECHNICAL PROGRAMS

**KEY MILESTONES:** RFP: MAR 96  
AWD: OCT 96

**CONTRACT TYPE:** T&M

**EST VALUE:** \$250M (OVER 5 YRS)

**TECH POC:** LARRY FILLIAN (703) 704-1143

**CONT. POC:** JOE BRADY, (908) 532-4717

# **RDEC BEST VALUE OPPORTUNITIES**

**TITLE:** NIGHT VISION ELECTRO OPTICS SYSTEMS &  
SOFTWARE ENGINEERING

**OBJECTIVE:** LCSE SUPPORT FOR SYSTEMS IN THE IEW  
FUNCTIONAL AREA

**KEY MILESTONES:** RFP: FEB 96  
AWD: JUL 96

**CONTRACT TYPE:** T&M

**EST VALUE:** \$10M

**TECH POC:** GENE BOYLE (908) 532-8220

**CONT. POC:** DAVE CONCILIO (908) 532-2461

**PEO, INTELLIGENCE AND  
ELECTRONIC WARFARE**

**BEST VALUE OPPORTUNITIES**

**DONALD DAMSTETTER  
CHIEF, BUSINESS MGMT DIVISION  
PEO, IEW**

# CONTRACT OPPORTUNITIES

**TITLE:**

**JOINT TACTICAL TERMINAL**

**OBJECTIVE:**

**TO PURCHASE FIELDING QUANTITIES OF NEXT  
GENERATION PLUG-IN BROADCAST MODULES**

**KEY MILESTONES:**

**DRAFT SPEC TO INDUSTRY DEC 95; RFP JUL 96;  
COMPETITIVE DEMO OCT 96; AWARD DEC 96**

**EST VALUE:**

**\$300-500M**

**TECH POC:**

**HANK WOLLMAN (908) 427-5214**

**CONT. POC:**

**DIANE CURRY/KATHY RIZZO (908) 532-1984**

# **CONTRACT OPPORTUNITIES**

**TITLE:** LIGHTWEIGHT TARGET ACQUISITION SYSTEM  
(TAS)

**OBJECTIVE:** ACQUIRE FIELDING QUANTITIES OF LIGHTWEIGHT  
TAS DEVICES

**KEY MILESTONES:** RFP AUG 96, AWARD NOV 96

**EST VALUE:** APPROXIMATELY \$30.0M

**TECH POC:** WILLIAM PETERS (703) 704-3400

**CONT. POC:** STEPHANIE ALLEN (908) 532-2166

# **CONTRACT OPPORTUNITIES**

**TITLE:**

**PEO-IEW CORE SUPPORT SERVICES**

**OBJECTIVE:**

**TO ACQUIRE PROGRAM MANAGEMENT SUPPORT  
FOR PEO-IEW AND IEW PMS**

**KEY MILESTONES:**

**RFP: APR 96, AWD: SEP 96**

**EST VALUE:**

**APPROXIMATELY \$25M**

**TECH POC:**

**PAT RUPPE (703) 427-2933**

**CONT. POC:**

**JOSEPH BRADY (908) 532-4847**

# CONTRACT OPPORTUNITIES

**TITLE:** TRAILBLAZER INTERFERENCE CANCELLATION

**OBJECTIVE:** REDUCE FRIENDLY COMMUNICATION  
INTERFERENCE

**KEY MILESTONES:** RFP RELEASED JAN 96, CONTRACT AWARD APR 96

**EST VALUE:** \$22M

**TECH POC:** MARY WILEY (504) 349-6822

**CONT. POC:** PAT OTTO (504) 349-5694

**PEO, COMMAND, CONTROL  
AND COMMUNICATIONS  
SYSTEMS**

**BEST VALUE OPPORTUNITIES**

**ROBERT LEHNES  
DEPUTY PEO, COMMUNICATIONS  
SYSTEMS**

# CONTRACT OPPORTUNITIES

**TITLE:**

PM SATCOM - SPECIAL OPERATIONS FORCES TACTICAL ASSURED CONNECTIVITY SYSTEM (SOFTACS) AND SHF TRI - BAND ADVANCED RANGE EXTENSION TERMINAL (STAR - T).

**OBJECTIVE:**

PROCURE FAMILY OF TRI - BAND TERMINALS THAT ARE BACKWARD COMPATIBLE WITH GMF TERMINALS. OPERATE IN C,X, & KU FREQUENCY BANDS.

**CONTRACT TYPE:**

COMPETITIVE FIRM FIXED PRICE (FFP) HARDWARE AND TIME AND MATERIAL (T&M) FOR SERVICES

**KEY MILESTONES:** RFP RELEASE - 7 FEB 96

CONTRACT AWARD - 30 JUN 96

**EST VALUE:**

\$500M

**TECH POC:**

LTC DAVID LUDWIG (908) 532-9727 x5848

**CONT. POC:**

WENDY MCCUTCHEON (908) 532-5438

# CONTRACT OPPORTUNITIES

**TITLE:** PM SATCOM - UNIVERSAL MODEM SYSTEM

**OBJECTIVE:** ANTI-JAM, ANTI-SCINTILLATION LPI, LPD  
SHF SATELLITE MODEM  
REPLACE THE USC-28 AND OM-55  
U.S., UK, AND FR COOPERATIVE DEV PROG

**CONTRACT TYPE:** COMPETITIVE PRODUCTION, FIXED PRICE AWD FEE  
AND FIRM FIXED PRICE

**KEY MILESTONES:** RFP RELEASE - APR 96  
CONTRACT AWARD - JAN 97

**EST VALUE:** \$100M

**TECH POC:** LTC SIDWELL (908) 532-9727 x6828

**CONT. POC:** KEVIN COAKLEY (908) 532-2924

# CONTRACT OPPORTUNITIES

**TITLE:** PM OPTADS - MANEUVER CONTROL SYSTEM  
BLOCK IV

**OBJECTIVE:** SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT - VERSION 12.1,  
VERSION 12.2, VERSION 12.3

**CONTRACT TYPE:** COMPETITIVE COST PLUS INCENTIVE FEE

**KEY MILESTONES:** RFP RELEASE -DEC 95  
CONTRACT AWARD - 4TH QTR FY96

**EST VALUE:** \$60- 90M

**TECH POC:** MS. B. GIRGAS (908) 532-2947

**CONT. POC:** STEPHEN LASCELLES (908) 532-4433

**LOGISTICS READINESS  
CENTER**

**BEST VALUE OPPORTUNITIES**

**MARC GIETTER  
ELEC ENGINEER  
POWER SOURCES TEAM, LRC**

# **CONTRACT OPPORTUNITIES**

**TITLE:** NEW EQUIPMENT TRAINING (NET) TEAMS AND NET ACTION OFFICERS SERVICES

**OBJECTIVE:** TO PROVIDE NET SERVICES WORLDWIDE, TO INCLUDE INSTRUCTOR AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL AND ALL RELATED ACTIVITIES

**KEY MILESTONES:** ISSUE SOLICITATION: FEB 96  
RECEIVE PROPOSAL: MAR 96  
CONTRACT AWARD: APR 96

**EST VALUE:** \$74M (5 YRS)

**TECH POC:** LARRY CARLUCCI (908) 532-5433

**CONT. POC:** JOSEPH BRADY (908) 532-5500

# CONTRACT OPPORTUNITIES

**TITLE:** HIGH PERFORMANCE BATTERY FAMILY

**OBJECTIVE:** TO ACQUIRE THE FOLLOWING NON-RECHARGEABLE BATTERIES: BA-X093, BA-X112, BA-X290, BX-X372, BA-X557, BA-X567, BA-X588, BA-X590, BA-X598, BA-X599, BA-X600, BA-X800, BA-X847/A

**KEY MILESTONES:** ISSUE SOLICITATION: JAN 96  
RECEIVE PROPOSAL: FEB 96  
CONTRACT AWARD: JUN 96

**EST VALUE:** MINIMUM \$102M  
MAXIMUM \$345M

**TECH POC:** MARC GIETTER (908) 532-6764

**CONT. POC:** ALEX MATEJKA (908) 532-5207

# NOTES

**MOCK SOURCE SELECTION  
COMPARING THE PROPOSALS  
AND  
SELECTING THE WINNER**


**UNCLASSIFIED**

# **NIGHT VISION FUTURE SIGHT**


## **BASIS FOR AWARD**

- ANY AWARD TO BE MADE WILL BE BASED ON THE BEST OVERALL (I.E., BEST VALUE) PROPOSAL THAT IS DETERMINED TO BE THE MOST BENEFICIAL TO THE GOVERNMENT, WITH APPROPRIATE CONSIDERATION GIVEN TO THE THREE (3) EVALUATION FACTORS:
  - TECHNICAL
  - PERFORMANCE RISK
  - COST
- THE TECHNICAL FACTOR IS SLIGHTLY MORE IMPORTANT THAN THE PERFORMANCE RISK AND COST FACTORS COMBINED.
- THE PERFORMANCE RISK FACTOR IS APPROXIMATELY TWICE AS IMPORTANT AS THE COST FACTOR.
- TO RECEIVE CONSIDERATION FOR AWARD, A RATING OF NO LESS THAN "ACCEPTABLE" MUST BE ACHIEVED IN THE TECHNICAL FACTOR AND IN THE TECHNICAL SUBFACTOR OF ENGINEERING APPROACH.
- THE AWARD MAY NOT NECESSARILY BE MADE TO THE LOWEST COST OFFEROR.

# EVALUATION FACTORS



**TECHNICAL**




**PERFORMANCE RISK**



**COST**


# TECHNICAL FACTOR

ENGINEERING  
APPROACH



- THE ENGINEERING APPROACH SUBFACTOR IS SLIGHTLY MORE IMPORTANT THAN THE IPPD APPROACH AND S/SDBSP SUBFACTORS COMBINED

INTEGRATED PRODUCT  
AND PROCESS DEVELOPMENT  
(IPPD)  
APPROACH



- THE IPPD APPROACH SUBFACTOR IS SIGNIFICANTLY MORE IMPORTANT THAN THE S/SDBSP SUBFACTOR

SMALL & SMALL  
DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS  
SUBCONTRACTING  
PLAN



# EVALUATION APPROACH

- **UNDERSTANDING OF PROBLEMS -**  
THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE PROPOSAL DEMONSTRATES A CLEAR UNDERSTANDING OF ALL TECHNICAL FEATURES INVOLVED IN SOLVING THE PROBLEMS AND MEETING THE REQUIREMENTS. EXTENT TO WHICH UNCERTAINTIES ARE IDENTIFIED AND RESOLUTIONS PROPOSED.
- **FEASIBILITY OF APPROACH -**  
THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE PROPOSED APPROACH IS WORKABLE AND THE END RESULTS ACHIEVABLE. THE EXTENT TO WHICH SUCCESSFUL PERFORMANCE IS BASED UPON PROVEN DEVICES AND TECHNIQUES WHICH DO NOT REQUIRE EXCESSIVE DEVELOPMENT. THE PROPOSAL WILL BE EVALUATED TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE OFFEROR'S METHODS AND APPROACH IN MEETING THE REQUIREMENTS IN A TIMELY MANNER PROVIDE THE GOVERNMENT WITH A HIGH LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE OF SUCCESSFUL COMPLETION.
- **COMPLETENESS -**  
THE EXTENT TO WHICH TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS HAVE BEEN CONSIDERED, DEFINED, AND SATISFIED, RATING EACH PROPOSAL STRICTLY IN ACCORDANCE WITH ITS WRITTEN CONTENT ONLY.

# EVALUATION APPROACH

- **FLEXIBILITY -**  
THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE APPROACH FACILITATES THE IMPLEMENTATION OF BOTH COST EFFECTIVE AND SIMPLIFIED ENHANCEMENTS, AND UNANTICIPATED FUTURE CHANGES TO THE OVERALL SYSTEM.
- **SAMPLE HARDWARE DEMONSTRATION -**  
THE SAMPLE HARDWARE DEMONSTRATION WILL BE USED FOR VERIFICATION PURPOSES IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE EVALUATION OF THE ENGINEERING APPROACH AND IPPD APPROACH SUBFACTORS WITHIN THE TECHNICAL FACTOR. THE SAMPLES WILL BE INTEGRATED INTO US ARMY HELICOPTERS AND FLOWN THROUGH AVIATOR TRAINING MANUAL TASKS TO PROVIDE OPERATIONAL PERFORMANCE AND RELIABILITY INFORMATION WITH RESPECT TO STATED PARAMETERS.
- **SMALL AND SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLAN -**  
THE SMALL AND SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLAN SUBMITTED BY THE OFFEROR SHALL BE EVALUATED IN ACCORDANCE WITH FAR 52.219-9 BASED ON COMMITMENT TO SMALL AND SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESSES IN SUBCONTRACTING.

# ADJECTIVAL RATING DEFINITIONS

- **OUTSTANDING -**  
A PROPOSAL THAT HAS A SIGNIFICANT ADVANTAGE(S) IN MEETING THE RFP REQUIREMENTS WHICH IS NOT OFFSET BY A DISADVANTAGE(S).
- **GOOD -**  
A PROPOSAL THAT MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE RFP AND HAS AN ADVANTAGE(S) WHICH IS NOT OFFSET BY A DISADVANTAGE(S).
- **ACCEPTABLE -**  
A PROPOSAL THAT BARELY MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE RFP AND/OR HAS A SIGNIFICANT DISADVANTAGE(S).
- **SUSCEPTIBLE -**  
A PROPOSAL THAT DOES NOT CLEARLY MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE RFP AND/OR APPEARS TO BE AN UNACCEPTABLE APPROACH. OFFEROR CAN CORRECT WITHOUT A MAJOR REWRITE OF THE PROPOSAL.
- **UNACCEPTABLE -**  
A PROPOSAL THAT HAS MINIMAL OR NO CHANCE OF SUCCESS AND CONTAINS DEFICIENCIES WHICH REQUIRE A MAJOR REWRITE OF THE PROPOSAL TO CORRECT.

# **PERFORMANCE RISK FACTOR**

- PAST PERFORMANCE WILL BE EVALUATED FOR THE PURPOSE OF ASSESSING THE RELATIVE PERFORMANCE RISK ASSOCIATED WITH EACH OFFEROR'S PROPOSAL. THE GOVERNMENT WILL CONDUCT A PERFORMANCE RISK ASSESSMENT BASED ON THE QUALITY, RELEVANCY AND RECENCY OF THE OFFEROR'S (INCLUDING TEAM MEMBERS/MAJOR SUBCONTRACTORS) CURRENT AND PAST RECORD OF PERFORMANCE AS IT RELATES TO THE PROBABILITY OF SUCCESSFUL ACCOMPLISHMENT OF THE REQUIRED EFFORT.
- THE GOVERNMENT WILL FOCUS ITS INQUIRY INTO THE OFFEROR'S RECORD OF PERFORMANCE AS IT RELATES TO ALL SOLICITATION REQUIREMENTS, INCLUDING COST, SCHEDULE AND PERFORMANCE.
- A SIGNIFICANT ACHIEVEMENT, PROBLEM, OR LACK OF RELEVANT DATA IN ANY ELEMENT OF THE WORK CAN BECOME AN IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION IN THE SOURCE SELECTION PROCESS. THEREFORE, OFFERORS ARE REMINDED TO INCLUDE ALL RELEVANT PAST EFFORTS, INCLUDING DEMONSTRATED CORRECTIVE ACTIONS, IN THEIR PROPOSALS.
- IN CONDUCTING THE PERFORMANCE RISK ASSESSMENT, THE GOVERNMENT MAY ALSO CONSIDER DATA EXTRINSIC TO THE PROPOSAL WHICH IS AVAILABLE FROM OTHER SOURCES.

# **PERFORMANCE RISK DEFINITIONS**

- **LOW RISK -**  
LITTLE DOUBT EXISTS, BASED ON THE OFFEROR'S PERFORMANCE RECORD, THAT THE OFFEROR CAN PERFORM THE PROPOSED EFFORT.
- **MODERATE RISK -**  
SOME DOUBT EXISTS, BASED ON THE OFFEROR'S PERFORMANCE RECORD, THAT THE OFFEROR CAN PERFORM THE PROPOSED EFFORT.
- **HIGH RISK -**  
SIGNIFICANT DOUBT EXISTS, BASED ON THE OFFEROR'S PERFORMANCE RECORD, THAT THE OFFEROR CAN PERFORM THE PROPOSED EFFORT.
- **UNKNOWN RISK -**  
NO RELEVANT PERFORMANCE RECORD IDENTIFIABLE.  
EQUATES TO A NEUTRAL RATING HAVING NO POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE EVALUATION SIGNIFICANCE.

# COLOR CODES KEY

| TECHNICAL     | PERFORMANCE RISK |
|---------------|------------------|
| <b>BLUE</b>   | OUTSTANDING      |
| <b>GREEN</b>  | GOOD             |
| <b>YELLOW</b> | ACCEPTABLE       |
| <b>PINK</b>   | SUSCEPTIBLE      |
| <b>RED</b>    | UNACCEPTABLE     |
|               | LOW              |
|               | MODERATE         |
|               | HIGH             |

# **COST FACTOR**

- **THE GOVERNMENT WILL CONSIDER THE OFFEROR'S TOTAL EVALUATED COST.**
- **THE REALISM OF THE OFFEROR'S PROPOSED COSTS IN RELATION TO THE OFFEROR'S SPECIFIC TECHNICAL APPROACH WILL BE EVALUATED BY DETERMINING WHAT THE GOVERNMENT THINKS THE OFFEROR'S APPROACH WILL MOST PROBABLY COST THE GOVERNMENT WHEN THE WORK PERFORMED UNDER THE CONTRACT IS COMPLETED.**
- **TO THE DEGREE THAT THE GOVERNMENT'S MOST PROBABLE COST ESTIMATE EXCEEDS THE OFFEROR'S PROPOSED COST PLUS FEE, THE PROPOSED COST PLUS FEE WILL BE ADJUSTED UPWARD FOR PURPOSES OF EVALUATION ONLY.**

# OVERALL FACTOR SUMMARY

## INITIAL EVALUATION RESULTS

|                         | A      | B      | C      | D      | E      |
|-------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| <b>TECHNICAL</b>        | YELLOW | RED    | PINK   | BLUE   | PINK   |
| <b>PERFORMANCE RISK</b> | BLUE   | YELLOW | YELLOW | RED    | RED    |
| <b>COST</b>             | \$410M | \$470M | \$345M | \$440M | \$505M |

# OVERALL FACTOR SUMMARY

## INTERIM EVALUATION RESULTS

|                  | A      | C      | D      | E      |
|------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| TECHNICAL        | GREEN  | GREEN  | BLUE   | YELLOW |
| PERFORMANCE RISK | YELLOW | YELLOW | RED    | RED    |
| COST             | \$390M | \$345M | \$430M | \$505M |

# OVERALL FACTOR SUMMARY

## FINAL EVALUATION RESULTS

|                  | A      | C      | D      |
|------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| TECHNICAL        | GREEN  | YELLOW | BLUE   |
| PERFORMANCE RISK | YELLOW | BLUE   | RED    |
| COST             | \$370M | \$330M | \$410M |

# TECHNICAL FACTOR SUMMARY

## FINAL EVALUATION RESULTS

|                             | A     | C      | D      |
|-----------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| <b>ENGINEERING APPROACH</b> | GREEN | YELLOW | BLUE   |
| <b>IPPD APPROACH</b>        | BLUE  | GREEN  | BLUE   |
| <b>S/SDBSP</b>              | BLUE  | GREEN  | YELLOW |

# TECHNICAL FACTOR - OFFEROR A

## FINAL EVALUATION RESULTS

### ADVANTAGES

### DISADVANTAGES

- NEW MATERIAL REDUCES SYSTEM WEIGHT BY 25%
- NEW OPTICAL DESIGN PROVIDES MINOR IMPROVEMENTS IN MTF AND LOW LIGHT LEVEL PERFORMANCE
- HIGHER TEMPERATURE PERFORMANCE EXCEEDS ALL ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS
- NEW POWER SUPPLY DESIGN PROVIDES INCREASED RELIABILITY AND EXCEEDS EMI SPECIFICATION REQUIREMENTS
- WELL STRUCTURED PLAN FOR THE FURTHER REFINEMENT AND EXPANSION OF THE OFFEROR'S EXISTING MANAGEMENT CONTROL SYSTEM

- LIMITED DURABILITY OF NEW MATERIAL INCREASES THE RISK OF FIELD FAILURES/NON-OPERATIONAL AIRCRAFT
- PROPOSAL CONTAINED MINIMAL DETAIL REGARDING THE OFFEROR'S PRODUCT ASSURANCE AND TEST PROCEDURES
- TIMING OF RISK ABATEMENT INITIATIVES MAY CAUSE SCHEDULE DELAYS

**ENGR  
APPR**

**GREEN**

- SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCED EYE FATIGUE EXPERIENCED BY PILOTS DURING THE HARDWARE DEMONSTRATION
- DETAILED EXAMINATION OF THE 6 DOMAINS OF MANPRINT
- UTILIZATION OF PREPRODUCTION SIMULATION FACILITATES THE SMOOTH TRANSITION FROM ENGINEERING DESIGN TO PRODUCTION
- DETAILED ANALYSIS OF HOW KEY PROCESSES INTERACT AND FOSTER THE ACCOMPLISHMENT OF ALL CRITICAL PROGRAM MILESTONES

- PROPOSAL CONTAINED LIMITED DETAIL REGARDING THE VERIFICATION AND VALIDATION OF UNIQUE MANUFACTURING AND LOGISTICS SUPPORT PROCESSES

**IPPD  
APPR**

**BLUE**

- SUBSTANTIALLY EXCEEDED MINIMUM DoD SMALL BUSINESS GOALS

- NONE

**S/SDBSP**

**BLUE**

# TECHNICAL FACTOR - OFFEROR C

## FINAL EVALUATION RESULTS

|   | ADVANTAGES  | DISADVANTAGES   |
|---|---|---|
| <p><b>ENGR</b><br/><b>APPR</b></p> <p><b>YELLOW</b></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BATTERY SENSING DEVICE WILL PROLONG BATTERY LIFE AND REDUCE LIFE CYCLE COSTS</li> <li>TUBE DESIGN PROVIDES LASER DAMAGE RESISTANCE</li> <li>VALIDATED COST/SCHEDULE CONTROL SYSTEM IN PLACE</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SAMPLE HARDWARE SYSTEM WEIGHT EXCEEDED SPECIFICATION REQUIREMENT DURING HARDWARE DEMONSTRATION</li> <li>LASER DAMAGE RESISTANCE TUBE DECREASES RESOLUTION</li> <li>LOW GAIN LEVEL IS MARGINALLY SPECIFICATION COMPLIANT - REDUCES LOW LIGHT LEVEL PERFORMANCE</li> <li>PROPOSAL FAILED TO IDENTIFY ALL HIGH RISK ASPECTS OF PROPOSED APPROACH</li> </ul> |
| <p><b>IPPD</b><br/><b>APPR</b></p> <p><b>GREEN</b></p>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ADDRESSED ALL 6 DOMAINS OF MANPRINT</li> <li>PROPOSED SUBMISSION OF HUMAN ENGINEERING TEST PLAN/REPORT</li> <li>THOROUGH ANALYSIS OF HOW SYSTEM AND HARDWARE ENGINEERING, LOGISTICS SUPPORT AND MANUFACTURING EFFORTS ARE LINKED INTO A FULLY INTEGRATED DESIGN EFFORT</li> <li>OUTSTANDING PRODUCTION CAPABILITY MAXIMIZES POTENTIAL TO MEET OR EXCEED CONTRACTUAL DELIVERY REQUIREMENTS</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>PROPOSAL CONTAINED LIMITED DETAIL IN SYSTEM SAFETY AREA</li> <li>PROPOSAL CONTAINED LIMITED DETAIL REGARDING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROVISIONING PROCESS</li> </ul>   |
| <p><b>S/SDBSP</b></p> <p><b>GREEN</b></p>               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EXCEEDED MINIMUM DoD SMALL BUSINESS GOALS</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NONE</li> </ul>  |

# TECHNICAL FACTOR - OFFEROR D

## FINAL EVALUATION RESULTS

|   | ADVANTAGES   | DISADVANTAGES  |
|---|--|--|
| <b>ENGR</b><br><b>APPR</b><br><br><b>BLUE</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>IMPROVED SYSTEM DESIGN ENHANCES DURABILITY WITH MINIMAL INCREASE IN WEIGHT - WILL SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCE NUMBER OF FIELD BREAKAGE PROBLEMS</li> <li>EXTENDED SYSTEM WARRANTY (36 MONTHS vs 24 MONTHS REQUIRED BY RFP)</li> <li>HIGHER SIGNAL - TO-NOISE RATIO IMPROVES LOW LIGHT LEVEL PERFORMANCE (RANGE)</li> <li>DETAILED PLAN FOR MINIMIZATION AND CONTROL OF RISK THROUGHOUT CONTRACT PERFORMANCE</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NEW DESIGN IS UNPROVEN IN PRODUCTION</li> <li>PLAN TO COMPLY WITH COST/SCHEDULE CONTROL SYSTEM CRITERIA LACKS DETAIL AND MAY DISTORT CONTRACT PERFORMANCE REPORTING DATA</li> </ul> |
| <b>IPPD</b><br><b>APPR</b><br><br><b>BLUE</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NEW DESIGN GREATLY FACILITATES EASE OF OPERATION AND SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCES REQUIRED TRAINING</li> <li>EXCELLENT PROPOSAL WHICH THOROUGHLY ADDRESSED AND ANALYZED EACH OF THE 6 DOMAINS OF MANPRINT</li> <li>COMPREHENSIVE IPPD PROGRAM INCLUDES KEY VENDORS AND ENSURES CONTINUOUS INTERACTION AND COMPATIBILITY AMONG ALL DISCIPLINES</li> <li>INCORPORATION OF "LESSONS LEARNED" ON PREVIOUS CONTRACTS MAXIMIZES EFFECTIVENESS AND FEASIBILITY OF PROPOSED APPROACH</li> <li>MANUFACTURING AND LOGISTICS SUPPORT METHODOLOGY WILL BE FULLY VALIDATED PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF PRODUCTION</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NONE</li> </ul>   |
| <b>S/SDBSP</b><br><b>YELLOW</b>               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MET MINIMUM DoD SMALL BUSINESS GOALS</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NONE</li> </ul>   |

# PERFORMANCE RISK FACTOR SUMMARY

## FINAL EVALUATION RESULTS

A

YELLOW

C

BLUE

D

RED

# PERFORMANCE RISK FACTOR - OFFEROR A

## FINAL EVALUATION RESULTS

### ADVANTAGES

- EXCELLENT ON TIME DELIVERY RECORD FOR PRIME AND ALL MAJOR SUBCONTRACTORS
- 8% REJECT RATE IN GROUP A TESTING
- GENERALLY POSITIVE ASSESSMENT OF PRIOR TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE BY PRIME AND 1 OF 2 MAJOR SUBCONTRACTORS BY PAST/PRESENT CUSTOMERS AND DCMC
- COST/SCHEDULE CONTROL SYSTEM SUCCESSFULLY IMPLEMENTED ON 3 COMPARABLE CONTRACTS

### DISADVANTAGES

- LIMITED EXPERIENCE IN MANUFACTURING CURRENT GENERATION NIGHT VISION DEVICES
- PRODUCED MINIMAL QUANTITIES OF DEVICES TO DATE (2500)
- SIGNIFICANT TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE PROBLEMS IDENTIFIED FOR 1 MAJOR SUBCONTRACTOR BY PAST/PRESENT CUSTOMERS AND DCMC
- PRIOR IPPD EXPERIENCE IS LIMITED TO SIGNIFICANTLY LESS COMPLEX PROGRAMS

# PERFORMANCE RISK FACTOR - OFFEROR C

## FINAL EVALUATION RESULTS

### ADVANTAGES

- 10 YEARS EXPERIENCE IN MANUFACTURING CURRENT GENERATION NIGHT VISION DEVICES
- PRODUCED SIGNIFICANT QUANTITIES OF DEVICES TO DATE (45,000)
- PRIME HAS 95% ON TIME DELIVERY RECORD; MAJOR SUBCONTRACTORS HAVE CONSISTENTLY LOW DELINQUENCY RATES
- MAJOR SUBCONTRACTOR RECEIVED THE MALCOLM BALDRIGE QUALITY AWARD
- CONSISTENTLY POSITIVE ASSESSMENT OF PRIOR TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE BY PRIME AND 2 OF 3 MAJOR SUBCONTRACTORS BY PAST/PRESENT CUSTOMERS AND DCMC
- EFFECTIVENESS OF COST/SCHEDULE CONTROL SYSTEM REPORTING ON PRIOR CONTRACTS HAS GREATLY FACILITATED PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AND THE EARLY DETECTION AND RESOLUTION OF PROBLEMS

### DISADVANTAGES

- 20% REJECT RATE IN GROUP A TESTING
- VERY LIMITED UTILIZATION OF, OR EXPERIENCE WITH, IPPD PRINCIPLES AND TECHNIQUES

# PERFORMANCE RISK FACTOR - OFFEROR D

## FINAL EVALUATION RESULTS

### ADVANTAGES

- 5 YEARS EXPERIENCE IN MANUFACTURING CURRENT GENERATION NIGHT VISION DEVICES
- PRODUCED MODERATE QUANTITIES OF DEVICES TO DATE (20,000)
- NUMBER OF RECURRING REJECTS DECREASING STEADILY
- CORRECTIVE ACTION TIMELY AND EFFECTIVE
- CONSISTENTLY POSITIVE ASSESSMENT OF PRIOR TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE BY 1 OF 4 MAJOR SUBCONTRACTORS, AND FOR PRIME DURING PRECEDING 6-12 MONTHS, BY PAST/PRESENT CUSTOMERS AND DCMC. GENERALLY POSITIVE ASSESSMENT OF PRIOR TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE FOR 1 ADDITIONAL MAJOR SUBCONTRACTOR
- CORPORATE-WIDE IPPD PROGRAM IN PLACE; WORKFORCE THOROUGHLY TRAINED AND FAMILIAR WITH KEY IPPD CONCEPTS

### DISADVANTAGES

- 2 OF 4 MAJOR SUBCONTRACTORS HAVE HIGH DELINQUENCY RATES (15-25%)
- PRIME WAS ON DLA'S CONTRACTOR IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND AMC'S CONTRACTORS REQUIRING SPECIAL ATTENTION PROGRAM DUE TO POOR PERFORMANCE (REMOVED IN JANUARY 1995); 1 MAJOR SUBCONTRACTOR IS CURRENTLY IN BOTH PROGRAMS
- 30% REJECT RATE IN GROUP A TESTING
- EXPERIENCED COST OVERRUNS ON 25% OF COST TYPE CONTRACTS
- GENERALLY POOR ASSESSMENT OF PRIOR TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE BY 2 OF 4 MAJOR SUBCONTRACTORS BY PAST/PRESENT CUSTOMERS AND DCMC
- COST/SCHEDULE CONTROL SYSTEM REPORTING HAS FAILED TO ACCURATELY PORTRAY STATUS OF CONTRACT PERFORMANCE

# **COST FACTOR SUMMARY FINAL EVALUATION RESULTS**

| <b>A</b>      | <b>C</b>      | <b>D</b>      |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| <b>\$370M</b> | <b>\$330M</b> | <b>\$410M</b> |

# COST FACTOR FINAL EVALUATION RESULTS

A                      C                      D

|  |                      |   |                      |
|--|----------------------|---|----------------------|
| <p><b>PROPOSED<br/>COST (BAFO)</b></p>   | <p><b>\$365M</b></p> | <p><b>\$330M</b></p>  | <p><b>\$380M</b></p> |
| <p><b>EVALUATED<br/>COST</b></p>   | <p><b>\$370M</b></p> | <p><b>\$330M</b></p>  | <p><b>\$410M</b></p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• INCONSISTENCY IN REQUIRED NUMBER OF MANHOURS IN TECHNICAL AND COST PROPOSALS</li> </ul> |                      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DISCREPANCY BETWEEN OFFEROR D'S PROPOSED AND DCAA APPROVED OVERHEAD RATES</li> </ul> |                      |

# OVERALL FACTOR SUMMARY

## FINAL EVALUATION RESULTS

|                  | A      | C      | D      |
|------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| TECHNICAL        | GREEN  | YELLOW | BLUE   |
| PERFORMANCE RISK | YELLOW | BLUE   | RED    |
| COST             | \$370M | \$330M | \$410M |

# NOTES

**MOCK SOURCE SELECTION**

**ANNOUNCING THE WINNER**

# NOTES

# CLOSING REMARKS

MG GERARD P. BROHM

COMMANDING GENERAL  
CECOM

# NOTES

# EXECUTIVE PANEL

**MG GERARD P. BROHM**  
COMMANDING GENERAL, CECOM

**MG WILLIAM H. CAMPBELL**  
PEO, COMMAND, CONTROL  
AND COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS

**BG DAVID R. GUST**  
PEO, INTELLIGENCE ELECTRONIC WARFARE

**MR. EDWARD G. ELGART**  
DIRECTOR, C4IEW ACQUISITION CENTER  
CECOM

**MR. ROBERT F. GIORDANO**  
DIRECTOR, RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT  
AND ENGINEERING CENTER, CECOM

**MS. KATHRYN HOENER**  
CHIEF COUNSEL, LEGAL OFFICE, CECOM

**SYMPOSIUM  
PARTICIPANTS**

**MG GERARD P. BROHM**  
HQ, US Army Communications-Electronics Command  
AMSEL-CG  
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703  
(908) 532-1515

**MG WILLIAM H. CAMPBELL**  
PEO, Command, Control and Communications Systems  
SFAE-C3S  
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703  
(908) 427-4937

**BG DAVID R. GUST**  
PEO, Intelligence and Electronic Warfare  
SFAE-IEW  
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703  
(908) 427-2153

**MR. EDWARD G. ELGART**  
HQ, US Army Communications-Electronics Command  
AMSEL-AC  
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703  
(908) 532-5601

**MR. ROBERT F. GIORDANO**  
HQ, US Army Communications-Electronics Command  
AMSEL-RD  
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703  
(908) 427-2686

**MS. KATHRYN T. HOENER**  
HQ, US Army Communications-Electronics Command  
AMSEL-LG  
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703  
(908) 532-3120

**MR. LAWRENCE ASCH**  
HQ, US Army Communications-Electronics Command  
AMSEL-ACCA-A-AE  
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703  
(908) 532-5486

MR. EUGENE J. BOYLE  
HQ, US Army Communications-Electronics Command  
AMSEL-RD-SE-R-T-PO  
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703  
(908) 532-8220

MR. JOSEPH BRADY  
HQ, US Army Communications-Electronics Command  
AMSEL-ACCB-C-BS  
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703  
(908) 532-5500

MR. THOMAS D. CARROLL  
HQ, US Army Communications-Electronics Command  
AMSEL-LG-PL-A  
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703  
(908) 532-3817

MR. DONALD L. DAMSTETTER  
HQ, US Army Communications-Electronics Command  
SFAE-IEW-BM  
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703  
(908) 427-4743

MR. RONALD GIBSON  
HQ, US Army Communications-Electronics Command  
AMSEL-LC-ED-IN-4  
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703  
(908) 532-8236

MR. MARC GIETTER  
HQ, US Army Communications-Electronics Command  
AMSEL-LC-PR-PS  
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703  
(908) 532-6764

MR. JOHN GOODBODY  
HQ, US Army Communications-Electronics Command  
AMSEL-AC-CA-A  
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703  
(908) 532-1835

MR. DAVID JIMENEZ  
Project Manager, MILSTAR (Army)  
SFAE-C3S-MSA-TMD  
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703  
(908) 532-9645

MR. EMERSON KESLAR  
Project Manager, MILSTAR (Army)  
SFAE-C3S-MSA-BMD  
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703  
(908) 532-9645

MR. ROBERT R. LEHNES  
PEO, Command, Control and Communications Systems  
SFAE-CS3-CM  
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703  
(908) 427-4148

MS. WENDY J. McCUTCHEON  
HQ, US Army Communications-Electronics Command  
AMSEL-ACCA-A-AD  
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703  
(908) 532-5438

MR. MARK A. SAGAN  
HQ, US Army Communications-Electronics Command  
AMSEL-LG-PL  
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703  
(908) 532-3098

MR. JOSEPH M. SIMPSON  
HQ, US Army Communications-Electronics Command  
AMSEL-AC-SP-D  
Fort Monmouth, New Jersey 07703  
(908) 532-2722