Evaluation Report for the Special Operations Resource Business Information System Solicitation Number H92222-08-R-0048

Executive Summary:

1. This evaluation report is made to subject solicitation for Special Operations Resource Business Information System (SORBIS). The SORBIS is an enterprise business systems tool for the United States Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) that facilitates planning, programming, budgeting, execution, and program information reporting. The tool's software and hardware are to be located on the Command's Secure Internet Protocol Router Network (SIPRNet) and consists of a flexible user interface for data entry and retrieval and automated generation of necessary planning, programming, budgeting, and execution documents. It will also contain flexible Business Intelligence (BI) reporting tools for creating standard, ad hoc, and dashboard reporting; databases; and data management tools. The solicitation consists of a requirement for a five year Indefinite Delivery, Indefinite Quantity contract for a system integrator services to develop and implement a SORBIS material solution and documentation of business processes, procedures, and/or business process re-engineering. Task Orders will be awarded to reflect Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee pricing.

2. The solicitation utilized the best value concept. The award is to be made 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 five evaluation factors, listed in order of importance: Technical Approach, Past Performance Risk, Management Approach, Price, and Proposed Software Compatibility/Maturity. The non-price factors, when combined, are significantly more important than the Price factor.

3. A total of five offerors responded to the solicitation and it was determined that all five offerors proposals were acceptable and would be included in the competitive range.

4. Below are the offerors' ratings for Technical Approach, Past Performance Risk, Management Approach, Proposed Software Compatibility/Maturity, and Final Proposal Revision Price.

SORBIS Source Selection Summary

OFFEROR	Technical Approach Proposal Risk	Past Performance	Management Approach Proposal Risk	Software Compatibility/ Maturity Risk	Cost
(b)(4)	Low	Confident	Low	Low	(b)(4)
	Low	Highly Confident	Low	Low	
	Low	Confident	Low	Low	
	Low	Confident	Low	Low	
	Moderate	Highly Confident	Low	Low	

Technical Approach: (b)(4) technical approaches were rated Green (acceptable) with low proposal risk because they provided adequate plans for the development and implementation of a COTS solution for an enterprise resource business system that would replace the legacy USSOCOM financial management systems.

(b)(4) technical approach was rated Green with a moderate proposal risk because they propose to "support USSOCOM in developing a roadmap that would incorporate USSOCOM'S objectives of incremental system improvements with a modular approach…", as opposed to the preferred approach of any "roadmap" or requirement refinement and articulation being included as an integral part of the design activity. The dependence on untrained USSOCOM people rather than trained contractor IT professionals for the development of any "roadmap" or requirement refinement and articulation raises an element of risk. Also, in their Final Proposal Revisions, (b)(4) revised their proposed software package by adding a modified version (b)(4) (b)(4) However, it was not clear from the proposal (b)(4) SOCOM to accomplish the SOO/CPD requirements. This lack of specificity raises overall risk.

(b)(4) proposal was rated Blue (outstanding) because their proposal addressing requirements, data integration, business process refinement, and re-engineering exceeded government requirements and expectations. Secondly, their proposal provided a detailed comprehensive approach for replacing legacy systems with COTS solutions, COTS integration problem management, interactive feedback, and project integration with required SOCOM change and configuration controls. Also, they had a solid understanding of the problem, requirement, and SOF fiscal/budget information environment and proposed a team that has strong experience with SOCOM and Component-unique financial systems.

(b)(4) was rated Blue (outstanding) because their proposal addressing requirements, using detailed Project Management disciplines for design, planning, and re-engineering, exceeded government requirements and expectations. Secondly, their proposal provided a detailed comprehensive approach for replacing the "As-Is" systems with COTS solutions and industry best practices, including employment of prototypes and modeling to baseline the XML, metadata tagging and mapping required for indexed storage and near-real time retrieval of data. Additionally, their demonstrated expertise in software development is a major strength of this proposal along with their understanding of the problem, requirement, and SOF fiscal/budget information environment. They too propose a technically mature staff with extensive SOCOM experience.

Past Performance: All five offerors were given either a Confident or Highly Confident rating based on the results of the surveys returned and information from the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA). Also, the offerors provided past performance reference contracts that were rated highly relevant.

Management Approach: Four of the five offerors management approaches were rated Green with low proposal risk due to them providing adequate discussion on their overall management approach, internal controls, risk management process, and commitment to small business subcontracting opportunities. Project management approach/techniques described indicate an adequate understanding of project management requirements for this SORBIS project. Also,

they have integrated a risk management environment into their overall program management approach and all four were at least Capability Maturity Model Integration (CMMI) Level 3 certified.

(b)(4) management approach was rated Blue with low risk because their proposal exceeded in providing all information and data required by the RFP. The proposal clearly demonstrates (b)(4) management capabilities and was comprehensive in addressing the management requirements of the RFP. Also, the project and risk management approaches/techniques described were extensive and presented detailed descriptions of (b)(4) management and risk approaches and controls and indicates an excellent understanding of project management requirements, controls and associated risks especially applicable for this SORBIS project. The proposal clearly identifies the lines of communication that promote effective interface between (b)(4) program implementation staff, advisory committee, and security office and SORBIS program offices. (b)(4) CMMI Level 5 certified and provided an excellent discussion of many desirable certifications, best practices and quality initiatives and provides evidence that the offeror and proposed subcontractors place significant corporate value and commitment on obtaining and maintaining industry-recognized certifications and incorporating the value of these certifications in quality and continuous improvement practices.

Software Compatibility/Maturity: All of the offerors proposed software loaded and functionally operated within the USSOCOM SOF Information Enterprise (SIE) run-time environment and performed the requested document generations. However, it should be noted that because (b)(4) submitted a change to their proposed software as part of their FPR package, the Source Selection Evaluation Board was unable to assess the compatibility and maturity of this newly proposed software.

Cost/Price: All offeror cost proposals were found to be reasonable; however, (b)(4) (b)(4) cost proposals were seen as at a greater risk for cost growth because little or no labor costs were proposed for the sustainment portion (years three through five) of the contract. Three of the five offerors had comparable labor costs and labor hours for the development phase of the contract (b)(4) having the highest labor costs (b)(4) due to their proposed total labor hours (120K and 95K hours). The direct material cost ranged from $3.2M and $4.1M for (b)(4) and (b)(4) to $5.1M and $5.7M for (b)(4) to $6.5M for (b)(4) Overall, (b)(4) proposed cost is the lowest among the five offerors (b)(4) (b)(4) and it reflects a clear understanding of the requirements, and is consistent with the unique methods of performance described in its technical proposal.

Proposal Analysis: The following is a detailed SSEB analysis of each proposal's likelihood of meeting the requirements stated in the RFP.

A. (b)(4)

1. Technical Approach: Green – The quality of this proposal to satisfy the full range of requirements was acceptable. The software development and integration approach provided a plan to meet the SORBIS Capability Production Document (CPD) and Statement of Objectives (SOO). The Integrated Master Plan (IMP) and Integrated Master Schedule (IMS), while generic, provided a plan to for replacing or converting the legacy systems (i.e. Planning, Programming,

Budgeting, and Execution System Management Information System (PPBES MIS) or Integrated Financial Tool for SOAL (IFTS)). (b)(4) presented a strong/experienced team record with other agencies and a strong two year commitment of team personnel. They provided a detailed track record and background in delivery of financial planning and budget applications. Ready and able to do pre-award demonstration, prototype, and model for delivery of their solutions.

Proposal Risk: Low – Software development approach, from design to sustainment, provided details on the needed re-configuration and data management needed for SORBIS. The IMP presentation demonstrated repeatable, centralized structure with their development approach. Their statement about their experience with legacy systems and how this often limits the range of solutions for their proposed Enterprise Resource Business (ERB) system and presents challenges for the replacement/conversion of legacy systems with Commercial-off-the-Shelf (COTS) applications raises some risk concerns that will require close government monitoring. Also, their proposed two-site delivery model for the unclassified development environment with a remote site in the (b)(4) will require close Government monitoring.

a. Factor 1.1 – Software Development Approach: Green – The quality of the proposal in addressing the full range of requirements was acceptable. They provided a description of deliverables but supported these by reference to previous Federal ERB deliveries rather than providing a detailed and tailored approach that is truly aligned to the SORBIS SOO and CPD. COTS (Cognos) integration model (b)(4) where government participation is limited, may be problematic.

Risk Rating: Moderate – Required close government monitoring is less likely under provided two-site model for Software Development. Program risk analysis, management, and mitigation plan demonstrated by reference to previous government program deliveries and not by providing an approach tailored to the SORBIS requirements and the SOF Information Environment (SIE).

(1) Strengths – Detailed track record and background in delivery of financial planning and budget applications.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – Proposed two-site delivery model for unclassified development environment with remote site in their (b)(4)

b. Factor 1.2 – Development and Integration Technical Approach: Green – Their development and integration technical approach was adequate. (b)(4) explained their ERB methodology (b)(4) and made reference to previous government Financial ERB efforts as the SORBIS development and integration blueprint but their approach description was not tailored toward SORBIS development requirements.

Risk Rating: Low – Their limited and constrained solution set, justified by their described risks and complexities associated with the transition from legacy systems to COTS, degrades confidence in performance and the timely delivery of solutions at cost and on schedule. However, any difficulties from this issue can probably be overcome with normal contractor effort and government monitoring.

(1) Strengths – (b)(4) delivery method would be tailored to support SORBIS 90-day internal spiral releases.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – Reasoning for omission of detailed design for data integration, further encumbered by "Legacy systems often place constraints on the range of solutions we can consider" for SORBIS integration.

c. Factor 1.3 – Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) and Integrated Master Plan (IMP): Green – The quality of this proposal to satisfy the full range of requirements was acceptable. IMS is a cookie cutter schedule of activities but it was aligned to the SORBIS requirements and the known SOF information and data environments.

Risk Rating: Low – IMP included a generic/graphical presentation of SORBIS goals to replace/convert the legacy systems into a COTS solution.

(1) Strengths – Structured Project Management approach employs centralized, repeatable work plans.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – None.

d. Factor 1.4 – Proposed Key Personnel – Technical/Professional Qualifications: Green (b)(4) proposal meets government requirements and documents in detail an experienced team record with other agencies and a two year commitment of original team personnel. They presented a track record in delivery of other government financial planning and budget applications as justification for providing expected capabilities.

Risk Rating: Low – Team composed of experienced personnel with very applicable backgrounds.

(1) Strengths – None.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – Relied on 'track record' to demonstrate effectiveness of the team.

2. Past Performance: Based on the results of the surveys returned and information from the DCMA, (b)(4) was given a Confident rating. Their past performance reference contracts were rated highly relevant or relevant. (b)(4) was given excellent to fair ratings on the performance quality. The information provided by DCMA (b)(4) indicates a confidence rating on their ability to perform the work.

3. Management Approach: Green – The proposal provides an adequate discussion of (b)(4) overall management approach, internal controls, risk management process, and commitment to small business subcontracting opportunities that indicate an adequate understanding of project management requirements for this SORBIS project. The corporate experience and certifications described (Capability Maturity Model Integration (CMMI) Level 4 or Level 5 in all delivery center sites and ISO 9001 certified in all five of its Global Operating Groups) are of a quantity and level to conclude that (b)(4) places significant corporate value and commitment on obtaining/maintaining industry-recognized certifications and incorporating the benefit of these certifications in quality and continuous improvement practices, demonstrating an excellent continuous improvement program.

Proposal Risk: Low – The proposal is unclear as to how many total project personnel are being proposed, for what roles/responsibilities, from what organizations (prime, subcontractor or government), and whether any of the proposed personnel possess the required security clearances. However, this issue could be address through contract negotiations and close government monitoring during contract execution.

a. Factor 3.1 – Program and Resource Management: Green – The proposal provides an adequate discussion of overall management approach and internal controls. Project management approach/techniques described are reasonable and indicate an adequate understanding of project management requirements for this SORBIS project. Project management reports, reviews, communications and meetings were provided and appear to be generally appropriate. Roles and responsibilities for the six proposed Key Personnel are adequately addressed and reasonable, meeting the minimum RFP requirements for roles and responsibilities.

Risk Rating: Moderate – The proposal is unclear as to how many total project personnel are being proposed, for what roles/ responsibilities, from what organizations (prime, subcontractor or government), and whether any of the proposed personnel possess the required security clearances. (Their cost proposal provides a list of labor categories, hours, and organizations proposed giving an indication that approximately 30 personnel, from the prime and subcontractor, will be working on the project.)

(1) Strengths – The proposed program and resource management approach, (b)(4) is patented and comprehensive. The proposal states that proposed Key Personnel have either DoD experience or relevant business systems integration experience. (b)(4) to use their (b)(4) application design, which is the home base for dozens of developers with Cognos and Microsoft expertise and provides access to these high cost subject matter experts only when necessary, which will help minimize costs.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – Although Key Personnel are adequately addressed, meeting the minimum RFP requirements, the proposal does not clearly identify any additional proposed project personnel beyond the six Key Personnel. The minimal discussion of project team composition, SORBIS team structure, how subcontractor personnel and resources would be utilized, and how government personnel would be utilized implies that additional project

personnel and roles/responsibilities beyond the six Key Personnel have not been fully identified yet for this SORBIS project. The management proposal is unclear as to how many total project personnel are being proposed, for what roles/responsibilities and from what organizations (prime, subcontractor or government). (Their cost proposal provides a list of labor categories, hours, and organizations proposed giving an indication that approximately 30 personnel, from the prime and subcontractor, will be working on the project.)

b. Factor 3.2 – Risk Management Approach: Green – The proposal provided the information and data required by the RFP and the overall risk management process was adequate. (b)(4) has integrated a risk management environment to their overall program management approach.

Risk Rating: Low – No weaknesses were identified.

(1) Strengths – None.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – None

c. Factor 3.3 – Corporate Excellence: Blue – The proposal provided information and data required by the RFP and the explanation of overall corporate management was clear, concise, and satisfactory. The certifications described are of a quantity and level to conclude that (b)(4) places significant corporate value and commitment on obtaining and maintaining industry-recognized certifications, contributing to and supporting the institutions sponsoring these certifications, and incorporating the benefit of these certifications in quality and continuous improvement practices, demonstrating an excellent continuous improvement program. The proposal implies that (b)(4) is certified as CMMI Level 4 or Level 5 in all delivery center sites, exceeding RFP requirements. (b)(4) In addition, the proposal states that (b)(4) ISO 9001 certified in all five of its Global Operating Groups.

Risk Rating: Low – No weaknesses were identified.

(1) Strengths – The proposal states that (b)(4) has achieved a CMMI Level 5 target for 90% of "delivery center network headcount", that their (b)(4) currently pursuing CMMI Level 5 certification, and that (b)(4) is ISO 9001 certified in all five of its Global Operating Groups. The proposal also states that (b)(4) (b)(4)

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – None.

d. Factor 3.4 – Subcontracting Plan: Green – The proposal provides small business (SB) contracting plan content consistent with the FAR and DFARS references required by the

SORBIS RFP and provides content that adequately meets the RFP requirements for developing and interfacing SB business opportunity strategies.

Risk Rating: Low – Their proposed subcontract plan has little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and government monitoring will probably be able to overcome difficulties.

(1) Strengths – None.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses - None

4. Cost/Price: (b)(4) cost proposal was evaluated for magnitude and realism against the Government's cost estimate and the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA), the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA), and the U.S. Department of Labor's labor rate indices. (b)(4) costing was found to be reasonable and was (b)(4) government's cost estimate. Labor accounts for (b)(4) However, a majority of (b)(4) proposed labor hours (119,791 out of 120,399) are for the first 24 months of effort only. In discussions with (b)(4) the government indicated its requirement for some sustainment support in contract years three through five. The lack of continued support in the Contract Years after SORBIS implementation by (b)(4) is seen as a potential cost (growth) risk beyond what was identified in their proposal.

In considering labor cost, (b)(4) used labor hour costs associated with Forward Pricing Rate Agreements (FPRA) as validated and approved by DCAA. In terms of labor hour split between prime contractor and sub-contractors, (b)(4) held the majority of the labor hours (88%). While (b)(4) proposed a direct material cost of $3,180,385 for software and hardware, the consensus of cost and technical teams is that the proposed hardware costs is likely inadequate to support the SORBIS effort, thus resulting in potential contract cost growth to the government.

5. Proposed Software Compatibility and Maturity: Low risk – The proposed software loaded and functionally operated within the USSOCOM SOF Information Enterprise (SIE) run-time environment.

a. Factor 5.1 – Program Loading and Environment Compatibility: Low risk – Using an external hard drive and numerous DVDs that where included in their proposal submission, (b)(4) successfully loaded their proposed application software into the SIE run-time environment within the 8 hour limit. (b)(4) used a SQL 2005 extraction of the mock data base for real-time data presentation and manipulation. (b)(4) provided ESX virtual machines that were ready to run within the stated SIE ESX virtual environment. Their application load employed Windows 2003 Operating System and Windows XP clients in a SORBIS test bed Domain that required government provided Domain Controller, Domain Name Service (DNS) and Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol (DHCP) ip-address pool. The loading and presentation of the framework of (b)(4) proposed software solution demonstrated compatibility with the SIE run-time environment.

b. Factor 5.2 – Software Maturity for Document Generation: Low risk – (b)(4) functional demonstration their proposed software in generating the requested documents (an R-1 Budget Exhibit, a financial planning delta, and a financial execution dashboard) showed that the proposed software was a mature product that would require little tailoring to meet the SORBIS requirements.

B. (b)(4)

1. Technical Approach: Blue – The quality of the proposal in addressing requirements, data integration, business process refinement, and re-engineering exceeds government requirements and expectations. It provides a detailed comprehensive approach for replacing legacy systems with COTS solutions. The IMP and IMS provided top-level visibility to test, evaluation, and performance verifications to be applied at each phase of development, testing, and integration. They had a solid understanding of the problem, requirement, and SOF fiscal/budget information environment. The technical list of COTS products and platforms, with their proposed use, were well presented and understood. They have strong experience with SOCOM and Component-unique financial systems.

Proposal Risk: Low – Little or no loss is expected from this approach that employs Preliminary Design Reviews (PDR), Critical Design Reviews (CDR), and Test Readiness Reviews (TRR) prior to execution. They clearly stated understanding of the problem and requirements with a detailed approach to COTS integration problem management, interactive feedback, along with required SOCOM change and configuration controls. This approach will ensure risk mitigation.

a. Factor 1.1 – Software Development Approach: Blue – The simplicity and quality of the proposal in addressing requirements, data integration, business process refinement, and re-engineering exceeded reviewers expectations for a comprehensive and clearly articulated approach for development of SORBIS. This simple and unique insight to the CPD and SOO requirements gave way to a clear roadmap for SORBIS delivery. It is a fully integrated and collaborative understanding that provides an environment for near-real time interaction of Microsoft Office and Sharepoint users employing "less clicks" of the mouse to find SOF fiscal and business information – when needed.

Risk Rating: Low – Little or no loss is expected from this approach that employs PDRs, CDRs, and TRRs prior to execution. They clearly stated understanding of the problem and requirements with a detailed approach to COTS integration problem management, interactive feedback, along with required SOCOM change and configuration controls. This approach will ensure risk mitigation.

(1) Strengths – Sound understating of the problem, requirement and SOF information (fiscal/budget) environment.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – None.

b. Factor 1.2 – Development and Integration Technical Approach: Blue – The quality of this proposed factor is deserving of a rating that easily exceeds acceptable and effectively demonstrates the use of technical best practices that integrate SORBIS to USSOCOM's Microsoft Office SharePoint Services (MOSS) Portal by providing access to SORBIS functionality between COTS and legacy systems. In addition, this factor facilitates a secure cross-domain web service employing Trusted Data Exchange Guards for near real-time loading, processing, conversion and packaging of low-side DFAS data to SORBIS data.

Risk Rating: Low – Degradation of performance, cost, and schedule is unlikely with an approach that begins with a clearly articulated understanding of current business and data configurations before deploying change.

(1) Strengths – List of COTS products and platforms are technically feasible and very well understood.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – None.

c. Factor 1.3 – Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) and Integrated Master Plan (IMP): Blue – Strict adherence to this IMS/IMP will all but assure a successful, on-time, project implementation. The IMP very completely and clearly iterates the specific components of the contractor's approach to the integration of engineering functions, control functions, and risk mitigation activities necessary to develop and integrate the legacy systems and develop the required new processes that will sustain the system through an extended lifecycle. Not only are the classic components of any high quality development included in the Plan, but emphasis on As-Is Architecture Analysis, Net Centric Analysis, Metadata Mapping and the use of a proven Project Management Plan Template will greatly enhance the overall implementation, Subcontractor Management and Risk Abatement. All items in the IMP have specific Entry and Exit criteria.

Risk Rating: Low – In addition to the significant risk reduction that will result from the complete and well found plan and schedule, stated plans "to use USSOCOM's Unclassified Test Bed (UTB) and VMWare virtualization environment to minimize integration risk and provide greater transparency to the government for status and capability evaluations" will greatly reduce overall risk by enabling USSOCOM to fully evaluate and approve SORBIS increments in a highly controlled test environment before any costly implementation efforts are attempted.

(1) Strengths – The use of a local, accessible, and modern facility (UTB) is a clear strength in this proposal. Proper use of this tool, as described in the proposal, will mitigate risk, enhance control, and in the final analysis, ease the burden on the Government.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – None.

d. Factor 1.4 – Proposed Key Personnel – Technical/Professional Qualifications: Blue – (b)(4) a fully diversified key staff that not only has extensive DoD Planning, Programming, Budgeting and Execution (PPBE) experience but one that is very well versed in USSOCOM systems and the SOF environment. The team is led by a Senior Project Manager with extensive experience completing troubled projects and the leadership competencies necessary to institute managed change; supported by a Senior SharePoint Engineer for required SharePoint 2007 integration. The SOCOM Process SME has strong experience with PPBES MIS. His background and experience with SOCOM Financial Planning and Execution processes is invaluable to the testing and final delivery of required SORBIS products.

Risk Rating: Low – The assortment of experienced Senior Managers and Manager/Technicians should rapidly mitigate any unforeseen threat to project deliverables, while providing the focus and leadership needed to reduce the risk(s) associated with building a contractor support team.

(1) Strengths – Experienced Project Manager, Systems Architect, along with the inclusion of the former PPBES-MIS Manager as part of the implementation team.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – None.

2. Past Performance: Based on the results of the surveys returned (b)(4) a Highly Confident rating. Their past performance reference contracts for themselves and their subcontractors were rated highly relevant. (b)(4) (b)(4) subcontractors were given excellent to good ratings on the performance quality.

3. Management Approach: Green – The management approach/techniques/controls described, including in the proposed (b)(4) were reasonable and indicate an adequate understanding of project management requirements for this SORBIS project. The proposal clearly identifies the project team composition (including key personnel), number of team members, roles/responsibilities, and organizational affiliation (prime or subcontractor) of the different project team members. The proposal discusses the use of (b)(4) that applies a specific process intended to provide a proactive, quantitative and qualitative assessment of risks.

The proposal provides an adequate discussion of certifications, recognitions, accreditations, standards, frameworks, methodologies, and continuous improvement practices adopted/incorporated into the (b)(4) strategies and adequately addresses benefit to the SORBIS project of these certifications. The proposal states that (b)(4) subcontractors have achieved a CMMI Level 3, meeting the minimum RFP requirements.

Proposal Risk: Low – Little or no loss is expected from the proposed program and risk management approaches.

a. Factor 3.1 – Program and Resource Management: Green – The proposal discusses the use of (b)(4) and describes provisions for project reporting. The project management approach/techniques/controls described were reasonable and indicate an adequate understanding of project management requirements for this SORBIS project. The proposal identifies eight Key Personnel including individual security clearances; provides a comprehensive discussion including additional members of the total anticipated project team proposed; and clearly identifies the project team composition, number, roles/responsibilities, and organizational affiliation (prime or subcontractor) of the different project team members.

Risk Rating: Low – Little or no loss is expected from their proposed project management approach/techniques/controls and proposed team.

(1) Strengths – The proposal identifies additional project team members beyond the Key Personnel and further identifies the total anticipated members of the proposed team by their functional role/responsibility. The proposal includes a comprehensive discussion of the roles and responsibilities of Key Personnel as well as identifying those who report to the key staff leads. (b)(4) use two USSOCOM subject matter experts for Process and Legacy System. The proposal states that those Key Personnel holding TS clearances have SSBI and "are eligible to fill SORBIS SCI billets;" that (b)(4) a bench of TS cleared personnel to support SORBIS requirements, all eligible for SCI billets;" and that (b)(4) members have received "Defense Security Service Cogswell Awards for outstanding security performance and practices".

(b)(4)

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – None.

b. Factor 3.2 – Risk Management Approach: Green – The risk management approach/ techniques described met the RFP requirements; are reasonable, feasible and comprehensive; and indicate an adequate understanding of project management requirements, controls and associated risks. The proposal outlines an integrated risk management approach using (b)(4) (b)(4) that is appropriate and that applies a specific process intended to provide a proactive, quantitative and qualitative assessment of risks.

Risk Rating: Low – No weaknesses were identified.

(1) Strengths – None.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – None.

c. Factor 3.3 – Corporate Excellence: Green – The proposal provides an adequate discussion of certifications, recognitions, accreditations, standards, frameworks, methodologies, and continuous improvement practices adopted/incorporated into (b)(4) strategies (including subcontractors), primarily focusing on CMMI, ISO and EVM as examples listed in the RFP requirements (RFP paragraph M-5.3.3 Factor 3.3). The proposal adequately addresses benefit to the SORBIS project of these certifications. The proposal states that (b)(4) the subcontractors have achieved a CMMI Level 3, meeting the minimum RFP requirements.

Risk Rating: Low – No weaknesses were identified.

(1) Strengths – None.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – None.

d. Factor 3.4 – Subcontracting Plan: Green – (b)(4) an FY 2008 Corporate Small Business Subcontracting Plan. The proposal states that (b)(4) Subcontracting Plan "is compliant with" the FAR references required by the SORBIS RFP. The proposal provides content that satisfactorily met the RFP requirements for FAR/DFARS compliance (with the minor exception of applicable business types-see below), and for developing and interfacing SB business opportunity strategies.

Risk Rating: Low – Their proposed subcontract plan has little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and government monitoring will probably be able to overcome difficulties.

(1) Strengths – (b)(4) much recognition from various SB, diversity and other industry organizations and has received a rating of "Outstanding" from the US Small Business Administration dated 16-Aug-2007.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – None.

4. Cost/Price: (b)(4) was evaluated for magnitude and realism against the Government's cost estimate and DCMA, DCAA, and U.S. Department of Labor's labor rate indices. (b)(4) was found to be reasonable and was (b)(4) government's cost estimate. Labor accounts for (b)(4) The Labor hours (68, 126) are split over the five year ordering period with the bulk of labor hours (59,667 out of 68,126) in years one and two with a reduction in labor to a level of effort in years three through five.

In considering labor cost, (b)(4) hour costs associated with FPRA as validated and approved by DCAA. In terms of labor hour split between prime contractor and sub-contractors, (b)(4) to perform 66% of the work and their subcontracts performing 34% of the work.

After reviewing notes from the technical team, it is the consensus of both teams that the hardware costs is likely inadequate to support the SORBIS effort, thus resulting in potential contract cost growth to the government. However, overall (b)(4) material cost for software licenses ($5.59M vs. $5.22M) is comparable to the Government's cost estimate.

5. Proposed Software Compatibility and Maturity: Low risk – The proposed software loaded and functionally operated within the USSOCOM SOF Information Enterprise (SIE) run-time environment.

a. Factor 5.1 – Program Loading and Environment Compatibility: Low risk – Using an external hard drive that was included in their proposal submission, (b)(4) loaded their proposed application software into the SIE run-time environment within the 8 hour limit. (b)(4) used an Oracle Express application to access the Government provided Oracle based mock data base for real-time data presentation and manipulation. (b)(4) ESX virtual machines that were ready to run within the stated SIE ESX virtual environment. Their application load employed Windows 2003 Operating System and Windows XP clients in a SORBIS test bed Domain that required government provided Domain Controller, DNS and DHCP ip-address pool. The loading and presentation of the framework of (b)(4) software solution demonstrated compatibility with the SIE run-time environment.

b. Factor 5.2 – Software Maturity for Document Generation: Low risk – (b)(4) functional demonstration their proposed software in generating the requested documents (an R-1 Budget Exhibit, a financial planning delta, and a financial execution dashboard) showed that the proposed software was a mature product that would require little tailoring to meet the SORBIS requirements.

C. (b)(4)

1. Technical Approach: Blue – The quality of the proposal in addressing requirements using detailed Project Management disciplines for design, planning, and re-engineering exceeds government requirements and expectations. Proposal provides a detailed comprehensive approach for replacing the "As-Is" systems with COTS solutions and industry best practices. Clear and synchronized IMP and IMS with detailed entry and exit points for each increment of delivery that exceeds IMP task listing with supporting details that promote high feasibility for successful completion of the plan. Demonstrated expertise in software development is a major strength of this proposal. Solid understanding of the problem, requirement, and SOF fiscal/budget information environment provided by an easily understood summary and technical list of COTS products and platforms to be delivered by a technically matured staff with extensive SOCOM experience.

Proposal Risk: Low – Little or no loss is expected from their approach to employ prototypes and modeling to baseline the XML, metadata tagging and mapping required for indexed storage and near-real time retrieval of data. Detailed approach for COTS software transition and integration follows the SOO/CPD with assured government to contractor interaction and risk mitigation.

a. Factor 1.1 – Software Development Approach: Blue – The quality of the proposal in addressing requirements using detailed Project Management disciplines for design, planning, and re-engineering exceeds government requirements and expectations. Proposal provides a detailed

comprehensive approach for replacing the "As-Is" systems with COTS solutions and industry best practices. Clear and synchronized IMP and IMS with detailed entry and exit points for each increment of delivery that exceeds IMP task listing with supporting details that promote high feasibility for successful completion of the plan. Demonstrated expertise in software development is a major strength of this proposal. Solid understanding of the problem, requirement, and SOF fiscal/budget information environment provided by an easily understood summary and technical list of COTS products and platforms to be delivered by a technically matured staff with extensive SOCOM experience. The COGNOS suite of software is already used, and well understood at USSOCOM. Its selection will significantly increase the potential for increased performance; while reducing the total cost of ownership.

Risk Rating: Low – Little or no loss is expected from their approach to employ prototypes and modeling to baseline the XML, metadata tagging and mapping required for indexed storage and near-real time retrieval of data. Detailed approach for COTS software transition and integration follows the SOO/CPD with assured government to contractor interaction and risk mitigation.

(1) Strengths – Employing a COTS structure that will enable unlimited what-if scenarios and the recommended Cross Domain Security Solution (CDSS).

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – None.

Factor 1.2 – Development and Integration Technical Approach: Blue – The quality of the (b)(4) Development & Integration Technical Approach is an exceptional piece of work that far exceeds proposal requirements. It is a simple, easy to understand, logical, and technically sound plan with constant reference to the latest government and industry best practices and standards. From rapid prototypes, incremental roll-outs, and roll-backs to COTS transition, deployment, and sustainment.

Risk Rating: Low – The simple blueprint to satisfy the requirements of both the SORBIS SOO and CPD includes start-to-finish risk analysis and management activities that leave very little chance of shortfalls or failures associated with this Development Approach and Integration Plan.

(1) Strengths – Employs an innovative (b)(4) to ensure that no SORBIS requirement will be overlooked, misunderstood, or lost.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – None.

b. Factor 1.3 – Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) and Integrated Master Plan (IMP): Blue – The alignment of the described approach to the IMP and IMS is exceptional. It is clear, understandable and fully oriented to an incremental development approach with sound and logical progression through each. Pre-increment planning steps help set the stage for increased performance in the delivery of well-connected and explained development processes. The construction of the Metadata Model is clearly defined as a baseline for fiscal information

exchange. Each building step of each project, from start to finish, is logically and succinctly presented and discussed. The IMS is directly related and traceable to the Master Plan.

Risk Rating: Low – Sound IMP and IMS with little or no loss expected. Pre-staging facility for prototype design and implementation reduces foreseen risks and identifies unforeseen risks. Outstanding plan to maximize government participation throughout the preliminary design and testing of proposed deliverables.

(1) Strengths – Detailed and easily understood approach for COTS transition and integration strongly aligned to SOO/CPD guidelines with assurance of close Government/ Contractor interaction and involvement.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – None.

c. Factor 1.4 – Proposed Key Personnel – Technical/Professional Qualifications: Blue – Staffing the delivery of the SORBIS ERB requires the distributed depth of experience in Oracle, Hyperion, DoD Financial Systems, and COTS integration that this proposal provides in great detail. The team includes a SOCOM proven expert with the practical experience and knowledge gained from working as an Oracle developer for PBES-MIS.

Risk Rating: Low – (b)(4) Contractor for SOCOM with the best understanding of the SIE and the challenges the SIE presents for delivery and sustainment of enabling technologies, strongly reduces the likelihood of unforeseen shortfalls or failures.

(1) Strengths – The proposed Oracle/Financial SME spearheaded the design and implementation for re-engineering PPBES MIS. He is practical, efficient, and forward-looking, with much respect from his peers.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – None.

2. Past Performance: Based on the results of the surveys returned and information from the DCMA, (b)(4) was given a Confident rating. Their past performance reference contracts were for their subcontractors and these were rated highly relevant. Their referenced (b)(4) Their subcontractors were given excellent to good ratings on the performance quality. The information provided by DCMA on (b)(4) indicates a confidence rating on their ability to perform the work.

3. Management Approach: Green – Project management approach/techniques described are reasonable and indicate an adequate understanding of project management requirements for this SORBIS project. The proposal describes project tracking, controls, oversight, reviews and

meetings that are appropriate (with the exception of reports as noted below), indicate an emphasis on a controlled project management environment, and reflect an adequate understanding of the controls needed to appropriately manage the SORBIS project.

The risk management approach/techniques are described in excellent and extensive detail, clearly demonstrates (b)(4) and provide for government to be involved in the integrated process. (b)(4) is comprehensive and enables a risk assessment and management process that is directly applicable; indicates an excellent understanding of project management requirements, controls and associated risks; and provides benefit to the government. (b)(4) management process is aligned with its quality assurance and configuration management processes which provide an integrated overall program management approach.

The proposal provides an adequate discussion of certifications (CMMI Level 3 and ISO 9001:2000). It also addresses the benefit of these certifications to the SORBIS project and how these certifications ensure high quality performance and reduce cost/schedule/ performance risks.

Proposal Risk: Low – The proposal provides a comprehensive illustration of the offeror's Problem and Conflict Resolution Process that includes a formalized escalation process designed to help communicate and mitigate risks. In addition, the (b)(4) evidence of a risk mitigation process already in progress and has included a clear and detailed list of SORBIS specific risks, impact and mitigation strategies that demonstrate a realistic assessment for this point in the SORBIS project

a. Factor 3.1 – Program and Resource Management: Green – Project management approach/techniques described are minimal but reasonable and indicate an adequate understanding of project management requirements for this SORBIS project. The proposal describes project tracking, controls, oversight, reviews and meetings that are appropriate (with the exception of reports as noted below), indicate an emphasis on a controlled project management environment, and reflects an adequate understanding of the controls needed to appropriately manage the SORBIS project. The proposal identifies nine Key Personnel as well as some additional team members and identifies the project team composition, number, and organizational affiliation (prime or subcontractor) of the different project team members.

Risk Rating: Low – No weakness were identified.

(1) Strengths – The proposal identifies some additional project team members by their functional title beyond the nine Key Personnel and also identifies those who report to the key staff leads.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – None.

b. Factor 3.2 – Risk Management Approach: Blue – The risk management approach/techniques are described in excellent and extensive detail, clearly demonstrates (b)(4) capabilities, and provide for government to be involved in the integrated process. (b)(4) approach is comprehensive and enables a risk assessment and management process that is

directly applicable; indicates an excellent understanding of project management requirements, controls and associated risks; and provides benefit to the government. (b)(4) process is aligned with its quality assurance and configuration management processes which provide an integrated overall program management approach.

Risk Rating: Low – No weaknesses were identified.

(1) Strengths - The proposal provides a comprehensive illustration of (b)(4) (b)(4) In addition, (b)(4) evidence of a risk mitigation process already in progress and has included a clear and detailed list of SORBIS specific risks, impact, and mitigation strategies that demonstrate a realistic assessment for this point in the SORBIS project.

The proposal provides a comprehensive illustration of planning, execution, tracking, control, oversight and closeout phases of (b)(4) integrated management process that includes actions, tools, metrics, reports, documents and communications proposed that demonstrate a well integrated process.

The proposal was proactive in identifying a risk for "Availability of physical space for (b)(4) Team to work in the UTB" and provided a mitigation strategy.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – None.

c. Factor 3.3 – Corporate Excellence: Green – The proposal provides an adequate discussion of only a minimal number of certifications, recognitions, accreditations, standards, frameworks, methodologies, and quality/continuous improvement practices incorporated into (b)(4) business strategies. The proposal included discussion of only CMMI Level 3 and ISO 9001:2000 but not EVM of the examples listed in the RFP requirements (RFP paragraph M-5.3.3 Factor 3.3). The proposal minimally addresses benefit to the SORBIS project and minimally addresses how certifications ensure high quality performance and reduce cost/ schedule/performance risks.

Risk Rating: Low – No weakness were identified.

(1) Strengths – None.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – None.

d. Factor 3.4 – Subcontracting Plan: Green – The Small Business (SB) Subcontracting Plan provided in this proposal minimally satisfies the government's requirements, is minimally documented, and (b)(4) and corporate commitment is not clearly demonstrated. The (b)(4) subcontracting goals for Small Businesses for this

acquisition" and that the subcontracting plan submitted is for USSOCOM only in support of SORBIS and specifically for this RFP. But while (b)(4) must still demonstrate a valid corporate commitment in providing subcontracting opportunities for small business concerns by category (RFP paragraph M-5.3.4 Factor 3.4), which this proposal only minimally satisfies. In addition, the proposal provides a format and content that minimally satisfies the RFP requirements for developing and interfacing SB business opportunity strategies.

Risk Rating: Low – Despite the fact that (b)(4) minimally sufficient content in their Small Business Subcontracting plan, this should have little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and government monitoring will probably be able to overcome difficulties.

(1) Strengths – None.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – The proposal provides a format and content that minimally satisfies most of the FAR 52.219-9 requirements; however, no references of the method used to develop the subcontracting goals or statements as to whether or not (b)(4) indirect costs were found.

4. Cost/Price: (b)(4) was evaluated for magnitude and realism against the Government's cost estimate and DCMA, DCAA, and U.S. Department of Labor's labor rate indices. (b)(4) was found to be reasonable and was (b)(4) government's MPC estimate. Labor accounts for (b)(4) The Labor hours (62,772) are split over the 5 year ordering period with the bulk of labor hours (46,950 out of 62,772) in years one and two with a reduction of labor to a level of effort in years three through five.

In considering labor cost, (b)(4) hour costs associated with FPRA as validated and approved by DCAA. In terms of labor hour split between prime contractor and sub-contractors, (b)(4) perform 54% of the work while their subcontractors will perform 46% of the work. After reviewing notes from the technical team, it is the consensus of both teams that the proposed hardware costs is likely inadequate to support the SORBIS effort, thus resulting in potential contract cost growth to the government. However, overall (b)(4) material cost for software licenses ($4.95M vs. $5.22M) is comparable with the Government's cost estimate.

5. Proposed Software Compatibility and Maturity: The proposed software loaded and functionally operated within the USSOCOM SOF Information Enterprise (SIE) run-time environment.

a. Factor 5.1 – Program Loading and Environment Compatibility: Low risk – Using the DVDs that where included in their proposal submission, (b)(4) loaded their proposed application software into the SIE run-time environment within the 8 hour limit. (b)(4) Government provided Oracle 10g.X Enterprise Server application to access the Oracle based mock data base for real-time data presentation and manipulation. During the loading process, (b)(4) use the government provided VMWare converter application to enable their already

provided GSX virtual work stations to run in the existing ESX virtual environment. Their application load employed Windows 2003 Operating System and Windows XP clients in a SORBIS test bed Domain that required government provided Domain Controller, DNS and DHCP ip-address pool. The loading and presentation of the framework of (b)(4) software solution demonstrated compatibility with the SIE run-time environment.

b. Factor 5.2 – Software Maturity for Document Generation: Low risk – (b)(4) functional demonstration their proposed software in generating the requested documents (an R-1 Budget Exhibit, a financial planning delta, and a financial execution dashboard) showed that the proposed software was a mature product that would require little tailoring to meet the SORBIS requirements.

D. (b)(4)

1. Technical Approach: Green – The quality of the proposal in addressing the full range of requirements, especially the retirement of SOALIS, IFTS, and PPBES-MIS, by the end of 'increment C' is well presented and described. The proposal recognizes the need to logistics cost, schedule, and risks delivering each new configuration item. The resultant software solution(s) in intended to integrate seamlessly with the applied COTS application modules that are designed to meet open architecture standards. The presentation of Project Management disciplines shows maturity and experience in delivery of an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system that could meet government requirements. Their integration approach as presented in the Go-Live portion of the matrix provided a risk mitigation process based on first obtaining USSOCOM approval for successful adoption of SORBIS and then conducting Post Go-Live assessment.

Proposal Risk: Low – Multiple references are made to risk management and risk reduction approaches. Risk analysis and management of the "number of interfaces to be added" to an already complex model shows a good understanding of a key risks performance. Project Charter (IMP) is their blueprint for delivery of SAP Business Objectives, Business Intelligence, and Transaction Management aligned to IT service management and experience in the delivery of previous ERPs.

a. Factor 1.1 – Software Development Approach: Green – The quality of the proposal in addressing the full range of requirements, especially the retirement of SOALIS, IFTS, and PPBES-MIS, by the end of 'increment C', is acceptable and well described. Changes to the baseline can only be approved after a formal change request (CRs) has been submitted, reviewed, and approved by USSOCOM Configuration Control Board (CCB). Cost, schedule, and risk assessments will be completed for each CR. The resultant software will be an integral part of the product software architecture and will integrate seamlessly with the configured COTS application modules to meet open architecture standards.

Risk Rating: Low – Multiple references are made to risk management and risk reduction approaches. A key metric is the number of interfaces to be added to an already complex model. This shows good understanding of a key risk to cost and schedule.

(1) Strengths – None.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – None.

b. Factor 1.2 – Development and Integration Technical Approach: Green – The quality of the proposal in addressing the architecture for the design, development, and integration is acceptable. Presentation of Project Management disciplines shows maturity and experience in delivery of an ERP. Project Charter (IMP) is their blueprint for delivery of SAP Business Objectives, Business Intelligence, and Transaction Management aligned to IT service management and delivery of previous ERPs.

Risk Rating: Low – Their integration approach as presented in the Go-Live portion of the matrix provided a risk mitigation process based on first obtaining USSOCOM approval for successful adoption of SORBIS and conducting Post Go-Live assessment (Figure 1.2.2-1, page I-23). Feedback will ensure low risks inherent in a plan.

(1) Strengths – Presentation of Project Management disciplines shows maturity and experience in delivery of an ERP that could meet government requirements.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – None

c. Factor 1.3 – Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) and Integrated Master Plan (IMP) – Green – Acceptable descriptions of the roadmap for their COTS development and implementation plan.

Risk Rating: Low – The proposal's multiple references to risk management and reduction approaches shows (b)(4) and experience in delivery of an ERP that could work and meet expectations/ requirements with normal contractor effort and government monitoring.

(1) Strengths – (b)(4) of project and risk management in this factor showed maturity and experience in delivery of an ERP that could work and meet expectations/requirements.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – None.

d. Factor 1.4 – Proposed Key Personnel – Technical/Professional Qualifications: Green – Meets all government requirements regarding education, experience, commitment, and clearances for 3 identified key personnel from start to finish. Contractor identified at least three additional individuals with the credentials to be SCI cleared to fill the required six contract SCI billets.

Risk Rating: Low – No weaknesses were identified.

(1) Strengths – None.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – None.

2. Past Performance: Based on the results of the surveys returned and information from the DCMA, (b)(4) given a Confident rating. Their past performance reference contracts were rated highly relevant. (b)(4) was given excellent to good ratings on the performance quality. The information provided by DCMA on (b)(4) a confidence rating on their ability to perform the work.

3. Management Approach: Blue – The proposal exceeded in providing all information and data required by the RFP; clearly demonstrated (b)(4) and was well organized, well written, easy to evaluate, and comprehensive in addressing the requirements of the RFP. The project management approach/techniques described are extensive and presented detailed descriptions of (b)(4) and management controls along with a column for listing many "Benefits to USSOCOM." The approach also clearly "identifies the lines of communication that promote effective interface between (b)(4) and SORBIS program offices and the (b)(4) program implementation staff, advisory committee, and security office". Additionally, the proposal provides a clear discussion of Key Personnel and some additional proposed project personnel and clearly identifies the project team composition and roles/responsibilities.

The risk management approach/tools/techniques are explained in extensive detail and describe an integrated risk management environment that provides benefit to the government by incorporating this integration into daily processes which enable early identification and warning of risks; and indicates an excellent understanding of project management requirements, controls and associated risks especially applicable for this SORBIS project.

The proposal exceeded RFP requirements by demonstrating that the actual performing business unit proposed for this SORBIS project is CMMI Level 5 certified. The proposal provides an excellent discussion of many desirable certifications, best practices and quality initiatives and provides evidence that (b)(4) proposed subcontractors place significant corporate value and commitment on obtaining and maintaining industry-recognized certifications and incorporating the value of these certifications in quality and continuous improvement practices. The proposal includes excellent, integrated discussion of benefits and assurances related to cost/schedule/ performance and reduction of risk, including those contributed by subcontractors.

Proposal Risk: Low – Little or no loss is expected from (b)(4) and risk management approaches. Normal contractor effort and government monitoring will probably be able to overcome any difficulties that may arise.

a. Factor 3.1 – Program and Resource Management: Blue – The proposal exceeded in providing all information and data required by the RFP; clearly demonstrated (b)(4)

capabilities; and was well organized, well written and easy to evaluate, and comprehensive in addressing the requirements of the RFP. The project management approach/techniques described is extensive and comprehensive and the proposal discussion and illustrations include the benefits of the approach to USSOCOM. The approach also clearly "identifies the lines of communication that promote effective interface between (b)(4) and SORBIS program offices and (b)(4) program implementation staff, advisory committee, and security office". The proposal provides a clear discussion of Key Personnel and some additional proposed project personnel and clearly identifies the project team composition and roles/responsibilities. The proposal describes project management, project tracking, oversight, reports, reviews, meetings, communications and metrics that are appropriate and comprehensive, indicate an emphasis on a controlled project management environment, and reflect a comprehensive understanding of the controls needed to appropriately manage the SORBIS project.

Risk Rating: Low – No weaknesses were identified.

(1) Strengths – The proposal provides a Cross-Reference Matrix tab that details an RFP Section, RFP Requirement and (b)(4) column for all volumes and factors of the proposal as well as an Acronym List tab. The team found these features to be an enhancement to the proposal's overall format, contributing to a proposal that was well organized, well written, detailed and easy to evaluate.

The proposal "identifies seven management performance metrics based on SORBIS RFP SOO Section 4.5, Management Objectives" as well as clearly stating the related quantitative or qualitative measurement with which (b)(4) "measure performance against SOO management objectives" for the SORBIS project.

The proposal includes an approach to satisfying security requirements and states (b)(4) "central materials' repository will contain our corporate and USSOCOM-specific security policies;" (b)(4) "will conduct in-processing and annual refresher training courses for team personnel during the life of the program to ensure they are adequately briefed on SORBIS related security requirements;" and that (b)(4) facility security officer/security specialist in place at (b)(4) and that this person "will screen (b)(4) subcontractor personnel to ensure appropriate clearances are in place in accordance with the DD254 and USSOCOM contract requirements". The team feels that this clearly demonstrates a detailed understanding of, commitment to, and actions for assuring that there is a significant importance placed on security requirements for USSOCOM.

The proposal integrates the benefit to USSOCOM into discussion and illustrations (b)(4) project management approach and management controls, presents in extensive detail the integrated project team role of the prime and each subcontractor, and further clearly describes each prime/subcontractor's integrated project team role, key capability and contribution to the SORBIS program.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – None.

b. Factor 3.2 – Risk Management Approach: Blue – The risk management approach/tools/techniques described are well organized and explained in extensive detail that clearly demonstrates (b)(4) are reasonable, feasible and comprehensive; describes an integrated risk management environment that provides benefit to the government by incorporating this integration into daily processes which enable early identification and warning of risks; and indicates a excellent understanding of project management requirements, controls and associated risks especially applicable for this SORBIS project.

Risk Rating: Low – The proposal provides for government involvement in project team discussions, RMB meetings, communication and reporting of SORBIS risks and associated mitigation activities. This "teaming" arrangement will aid in the risk management of the project.

(1) Strengths – The proposal provides an excellent discussion and illustration of (b)(4) cyclical risk management process" that "provides the formal structure for identifying and treating risks, tracking them until they no longer threaten the program, and reporting an up-to-date risk posture" in the Risk Register tool. The process also includes a focus on actions for preventing/avoiding risk; a formalized escalation process designed to help communicate and mitigate risks; and formal steps for generating mitigation options and approving a mitigation plan for each risk. In addition, (b)(4) evidence of a risk mitigation process already in progress and has included a clear and detailed "initial draft" of SORBIS specific risks, categories, impact and mitigation strategies that demonstrate a realistic assessment for this point in the SORBIS project.

Also, the proposal states that "Once we identify, analyze, and assess the risk, the RMB assigns a risk owner" that is "fully responsible for actions to mitigate or eliminate risks and for providing visibility on progress in clearing the risk". The proposal is clear that the risk is assigned to a single risk owner, and the team feels that this provides a benefit to the SORBIS program by assuring accountability for risk mitigation activities.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – None.

c. Factor 3.3 – Corporate Excellence: Blue – The proposal exceeded in providing all information and data required by the RFP; clearly demonstrated (b)(4) was well organized, well written and easy to evaluate, and comprehensive in addressing the requirements of the RFP. The proposal also exceeded RFP requirements by stating that CMMI Level 5 certification is held by the actual business unit that is the proposing and performing organization for the SORBIS project and demonstrated this by including copies of CMMI and ISO certificates (b)(4) their subcontractors.

Throughout, the proposal provides an excellent discussion of desirable certifications, recognitions, principles, best practices, standards, processes and quality initiatives adopted/incorporated into (b)(4) business strategies. The proposal lists CMMI, ISO 9000 and ISO 20000, EVMS, Six Sigma, and ITIL certifications along with related benefits to USSOCOM for each for (b)(4) as well as for subcontractor organizations. The certifications described are of a quantity and level to conclude that (b)(4) subcontractors

place significant corporate value and commitment on obtaining and maintaining industry-recognized certifications and incorporating the value of these certifications in quality and continuous improvement practices. The proposal includes excellent discussion of benefits and assurances related to cost/schedule/performance and reduction of risk, including those contributed by subcontractors.

Risk Rating: Low – No weaknesses were identified.

(1) Strengths – The proposal discusses (b)(4) that are not only for the overall organization, but that are held by (b)(4) (b)(4) that is the "proposing and performing organization for the SORBIS contract". The proposal states that (b)(4) achieved a CMMI Level 5 for the specific business unit that is proposed to perform the SORBIS contract and states that "USSOCOM is assured (b)(4) bidding organization and SORBIS-assigned staff will deliver the benefits associated with CMMI Level 5 processes and capabilities". (b)(4) has certified personnel who hold Green Belt and other managing group personnel who hold Black Belt in Six Sigma and (b)(4) that these individuals are trained and experienced in using quality and lean enterprise improvement methodologies, techniques, and tools. In addition, (b)(4) ISO 9001:2000 certified in more than 25 of its organizational units, (b)(4) (b)(4) and has experience using the ISO 20000 standard which will assure their "ability to provide an integrated process approach to effectively delver managed services" to meet USSOCOM requirements. Further, (b)(4) has many certified Information Technology Infrastructure Library (ITIL) personnel who would be experienced in using the ITIL concepts for the planning of consistent, documented, and repeatable processes that improve service delivery to organizations.

Also, the proposal addresses benefit to the SORBIS project in all discussions, being thorough to integrate the benefits as part of the discussion of each certification, recognition, principle, best practice, standard, process and quality initiative.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – None.

d. Factor 3.4 – Subcontracting Plan: Green – (b)(4) submitted a "comprehensive companywide Master Subcontracting Plan" for the period 01 Jan 2006 through 31 Dec 2008. The proposal states (b)(4) "Master Subcontracting Plan is fully compliant with FAR Part 52.219-9" as required by the SORBIS RFP. Therefore, the proposal provided the majority of the information and data required by the RFP and was determined acceptable regarding compliance with appropriate FAR and DFARS parts. The proposal also provided content that has satisfactorily met the RFP requirements for developing and interfacing SB business opportunity strategies.

Risk Rating: Low – Normal contractor effort and government monitoring will probably be able to overcome difficulties.

(1) Strengths – The proposal's Master Subcontracting Plan Table of Contents includes a "Reference" column that references each section of the Plan to a corresponding FAR 52.219-9 paragraph, a detail that improved the team's ability to determine compliance.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – None.

4. Cost/Price: (b)(4) proposal was evaluated for magnitude and realism against the Government's cost estimate and DCMA, DCAA, and U.S. Department of Labor's labor rate indices. (b)(4) was found to be reasonable and was (b)(4) government's MPC estimate. Labor accounts for (b)(4) (b)(4) pricing of complete five years of labor (total hours = 52,500); however, even after discussions (b)(4) in which the government indicated its requirement for some sustainment support in contract years three through five, (b)(4) propose any labor costs for these years. (b)(4) this cost approach by claiming that the government will issue a separate contract for the SORBIS sustainment efforts. The lack of continued support in the contract years after SORBIS implementation by (b)(4) as a potential cost (growth) risk beyond what was identified in their proposal.

In considering labor cost, (b)(4) labor hour costs associated with Forward Pricing Rate Agreements (FPRA) as validated and approved by DCAA. In terms of labor hour split between prime contractor and sub-contractors, (b)(4) the majority of the labor hours (76%).

After reviewing notes from the technical team, it is the consensus of both teams that hardware costs, as proposed (b)(4) likely inadequate to support the SORBIS effort, thus resulting in potential contract cost growth to the government. However, overall (b)(4) material cost for software licenses ($6.32M vs. $5.22M) seems a bit high when compared with the Government's cost estimate.

In addition, (b)(4) travel costs were deemed unrealistically low. (b)(4) presence in the Tampa area is realized by the cost team; however, the proposed amount for travel seems to only support the ~24-month effort as proposed by the contractor; if more contract years are implemented, it is likely the travel costs will increase beyond what is currently in the proposal adding additional cost risks.

5. Proposed Software Compatibility and Maturity: The proposed software loaded and functionally operated within the USSOCOM SOF Information Enterprise (SIE) run-time environment.

a. Factor 5.1 – Program Loading and Environment Compatibility: Low risk – Using an external hard drive and numerous DVDs that where included in their proposal submission, (b)(4) successfully loaded their proposed application software into the SIE run-time environment within the 8 hour limit. (b)(4) a SQL 2005 version of the Government's mock data base and used it for real-time data presentation and manipulation. During the loading process, (b)(4) the government provided VMWare converter application to enable their already provided GSX virtual work stations to run in the existing ESX virtual environment. Their application load

employed Windows 2003 Operating System and Windows XP clients in a SORBIS test bed Domain that required government provided Domain Controller, DNS and DHCP ip-address pool. The loading and presentation of the framework of (b)(4) software solution demonstrated compatibility with the SIE run-time environment.

b. Factor 5.2 – Software Maturity for Document Generation: Low risk – (b)(4) functional demonstration their proposed software in generating the requested docnments (an R-1 Budget Exhibit, a financial planning delta, and a financial execution dashboard) showed that the proposed software was a mature product that would require little tailoring to meet the SORBIS requirements.

E. (b)(4)

1. Technical Approach: Green – The quality of the proposal in addressing the overall requirements for SORBIS was acceptable. However, (b)(4) proposes to "support USSOCOM in developing a roadmap that would incorporate USSOCOM'S objectives of incremental system improvements with a modular approach…", as opposed to the preferred approach of any "roadmap" or requirement refinement and articulation being included as an integral part of the design activity. Good detail and understanding was demonstrated with the proposed deployment of the Radiant Mercury Guard as the trusted gateway between the DFAS unclassified environment and the classified SORBIS network.

Proposal Risk: Moderate – The dependence on untrained USSOCOM people rather than trained contractor IT professionals for the development of any "roadmap" or requirement refinement and articulation raises an element of risk. Also, it is not clear from the proposal just what and how much of the (b)(4) will be coming to SOCOM to accomplish the SOO/CPD requirements. They discuss using various SAP and Cognos software but it is unclear as to whether these proposed software applications are the same ones used in the (b)(4) that will be modified. This lack of specificity raises overall risk. Additionally, there is an element of risk associated with (b)(4)

a. Factor 1.1 – Software Development Approach: Green – The quality of the proposal in addressing the requirements for SORIBS is marginally acceptable. The described approach to "build on the SORBIS objective of providing a single inclusive, scalable resource data management system to capture, process, discover, and display accurate and timely planning, programming, budgetary, financial accounting, and acquisition program information for decision makers" does provide for the transition from the legacy systems to the new system.

Risk Rating: Moderate – (b)(4) software development approach employs the use of a Business Intelligence tool with a modified version of the (b)(4) However, the proposal is unclear on what and how much of the (b)(4) will be modified to accomplish the SORBIS SOO/CPD requirements. There is discussion about using various SAP and Cognos software but it is not clear as to whether these proposed software applications are the same ones used in the (b)(4) that will be modified. This approach creates a potential for additional costs and prolonged scheduling that will require closer monitoring by government managers.

(1) Strengths – Initiation of efforts with an early focus on sustainment in the design phase demonstrates strong understanding of an ERB delivery.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – The proposal is unclear on what and how much (b)(4) (b)(4) will be modified to accomplish the SORBIS SOO/CPD requirements.

b. Factor 1.2 – Development and Integration Technical Approach: Green – The quality of the proposal in addressing the requirements for SORIBS is acceptable. They provided a good discussion of their incremental development, integration, and deployment approach that provides a Business Intelligence capability for the first two increments and integrates the modified (b)(4) (b)(4) during the final incremental capability development and deployment. However, there are a lot of references to re-using (b)(4) and "preconfigured knowledge of the budgeting and program management and acquisition processes" for building a SORBIS EPR solution with only broad or unclear details are provide on what portions (b)(4) or preconfigured knowledge will be modified and used in their SORBIS solution. Again there are discussions about using various SAP and Cognos software applications and how these will be used to meet the SORBIS requirements but it is not clear if these are the same ones used in the proposed (b)(4)

Risk Rating: Moderate – The dependence on untrained USSOCOM people rather than trained contractor IT professionals for the development of any "roadmap" or requirement refinement and articulation raises an element of risk. Also, (b)(4) design and implementation plan employs the use of a Business Intelligence tool with a modified version (b)(4) However, it is not clear from the proposal just what and how much (b)(4) will be coming to SOCOM to accomplish the SOO/CPD requirements. They discuss using various SAP and Cognos software applications in their design but it is unclear as to whether these are the same ones used in (b)(4) that will be modified. This lack of specificity raises overall risk. Additionally, there is an element of risk associated with the use of a system that (b)(4) or uses "preconfigured knowledge of the budgeting and program management and acquisition processes" based (b)(4)

(1) Strengths – Initial collection of requirements, using the Must Have, Should Have, and Could Have approach is innovative. They have great detail and understanding of the Radiant Mercury Guard as a certified trusted gateway between the DFAS unclassified environment and the classified SORIBS network.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – (b)(4) to "support USSOCOM in developing a roadmap that would incorporate USSOCOM'S objectives of incremental system improvements with a modular approach…" as opposed to the preferred approach of any "roadmap" or requirement refinement and articulation being included as an integral part of the design activity. A lot of discussion about (b)(4) design and implementation plan employing the use of a Business Intelligence tool with a modified version (b)(4) However, it is not clear from the proposal just what and how much (b)(4) will be coming to

SOCOM to accomplish the SOO/CPD requirements. They also discuss using various SAP and Cognos software applications in their design but it is unclear as to whether these are the same ones used in (b)(4) that will be modified.

c. Factor 1.3 – Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) and Integrated Master Plan (IMP): Green – Acceptable and detailed descriptions of the roadmap for their COTS development and implementation plan.

Risk Rating: Low – Sound IMP and IMS with little or no loss expected. IMP/IMS is aligned with their proposed development and integration approach and includes a roadmap for replacement/conversion of the legacy systems into a COTS solution.

(1) Strengths -- Detailed and easily understood approach for COTS transition and integration strongly aligned to SOO/CPD guidelines with assurance of close Government/ Contractor interaction and involvement.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – None

d. Factor 1.4 – Proposed Key Personnel – Technical/Professional Qualifications: Green (b)(4) meets government requirements and documents in detail an experienced team record with USSOCOM legacy systems and a commitment of original team personnel throughout the contract. However, (b)(4) only identified five personnel with credentials to be SCI cleared to fill the required six contract SCI billets.

Risk Rating: Low – Team composed of experienced personnel with very applicable backgrounds and hands-on knowledge of USSOCOM legacy systems.

(1) Strengths – Key personnel backgrounds included previous SOCOM experience.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – Only identified five personnel with credentials to be SCI cleared to fill the required six contract SCI billets

2. Past Performance: Based on the results of the surveys returned and information from the DCMA, (b)(4) was given a Highly Confident rating. Their past performance reference contracts for themselves and their subcontractors were rated highly relevant. Their referenced (b)(4) and their subcontractors were given excellent ratings on the performance quality. The information provided by DCMA on (b)(4) indicates a confidence rating on their ability to perform the work.

3. Management Approach: Green – The project management approach, techniques, controls and metrics described indicate an adequate understanding of project management requirements

for this SORBIS project and includes adequate discussion related to cost/schedule/ performance. The proposal is clear about the organizational affiliation (prime or subcontractor) that the proposed six Key Personnel represent, meeting the minimum RFP requirements.

The proposed risk mitigation tools/techniques are described only in general terms but are relevant, feasible and adequately described and the proposal is clear that USSOCOM will be jointly involved in risk management communication, assessment and other activities. The proposal provided adequate discussion of their corporate certifications and their corporate commitment on obtaining and maintaining these certifications.

Proposal Risk: Low – The proposal is inconsistent in identifying subcontractors proposed, listing a different combination of subcontractors in Factor 3.1 than what is listed in Factor 3.4, and is also unclear about how subcontractor resources and personnel will be utilized. This will require clarification and monitoring if a contract is awarded to this offeror.

a. Factor 3.1 – Program and Resource Management: Green – The project management approach, techniques, controls and metrics described indicate an adequate understanding of project management requirements for this SORBIS project and includes adequate discussion related to cost/schedule/performance. The proposal identifies the project team composition, six Key Personnel, and some additional proposed project personnel (by title/function only) providing an indication of the total number of personnel and roles/responsibilities (by team only) proposed. The proposal is clear about the organizational affiliation (prime or subcontractor) that the proposed six Key Personnel represent.

Risk Rating: Low – The proposal is inconsistent in identifying subcontractors proposed, listing a different combination of subcontractors in Factor 3.1 than what is listed in Factor 3.4, and is also unclear about how subcontractor resources and personnel will be utilized.

(1) Strengths – The proposal provides a Compliance Checklist within the Table of Contents section that details the SOO paragraph number and Requirement, RFP Section number and Requirement and (b)(4) proposal reference for all Management factors. The team found these features to be an enhancement to the proposal's overall format.

The proposal identifies additional project team members beyond the Key Personnel and further identifies the total anticipated members of the proposed team by their functional role/responsibility and states that that (b)(4) has "a pool of personnel that are cleared and ready to begin work on the first day".

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – The proposal is inconsistent in identifying subcontractors (b)(4) The proposal is unclear as to which of the subcontractors listed is correct.

b. Factor 3.2 – Risk Management Approach: Green – The risk management approach/techniques described met the RFP requirements; are reasonable, feasible and adequately described; and indicate an adequate understanding of project management requirements, controls and associated risks. The proposed risk mitigation tools/techniques are described in general terms but are relevant, feasible and adequately described and the proposal is clear that USSOCOM will be jointly involved in risk management communication, assessment and other activities.

Risk Rating: Low – No weaknesses were identified.

(1) Strengths – The proposal states that "the program manager assigns a risk owner and tasks them with developing the risk response strategy, which includes" avoidance, transference and acceptance. The proposal identifies that the risk is assigned to a single risk owner, assuring accountability and providing a benefit to the SORBIS program.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – None.

c. Factor 3.3 – Corporate Excellence: Green – The proposal satisfies the government's requirements as stated in the RFP (RFP paragraph L-3.4.3 and M-5.3.3 Factor 3.3). The proposal provided adequate discussion of the significance (b)(4) places on obtaining and maintaining industry-recognized certifications and incorporating the value of these certifications into their quality and continuous improvement practices.

Risk Rating: Low – No weaknesses were noted.

(1) Strengths – None.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – None.

d. Factor 3.4 – Subcontracting Plan: Green – The proposal provides a SB contracting plan content consistent with the FAR references required by the SORBIS RFP and has addressed all required categories of SB concerns. The proposal provides content that has satisfactorily met the RFP requirements for developing and interfacing SB business opportunity strategies.

Risk Rating: Low – The team feels that the weaknesses identified for the inconsistency in identifying subcontractors proposed (listing a different combination of subcontractors in Factor 3.1 than what is listed in Factor 3.4) have little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and government monitoring will probably be able to overcome difficulties.

(1) Strengths – None.

(2) Exceptions – None.

(3) Deficiencies – None.

(4) Weaknesses – The proposal is inconsistent in identifying subcontractors (b)(4) The proposal is unclear as to which of the six subcontractors listed is correct or if the combination of seven subcontractors is being proposed.

4. Cost/Price: (b)(4) cost proposal was evaluated for magnitude and realism against the Government's cost estimate and DCMA, DCAA, and U.S. Department of Labor's labor rate indices. (b)(4) was found to be reasonable and was (b)(4) government's cost estimate. Labor accounts for (b)(4) The Labor hours (95,474) are split over the five year ordering period with the bulk of labor hours (76,322 out of 95,474) in years one and two with a reduction of labor to a level of effort in years three through five.

In considering labor cost, (b)(4) used labor hour costs associated with FPRA as validated and approved by DCAA. In terms of labor hour split between prime contractor and sub-contractors, (b)(4) proposes to perform 60% of the work while their subcontractors will perform 40% of the work. While (b)(4) proposed a direct material cost of $3,453,84 for software and hardware, the consensus of cost and technical teams is that the proposed hardware costs is likely inadequate to support the SORBIS effort, thus resulting in potential contract cost growth to the government.

In addition, (b)(4) is proposing a direct charge facility cost of $638,871. While the cost of the facility is not unreasonable, this is seen as both a cost and schedule risk to the SORBIS effort. If the facility is necessary for this contractor to complete the effort, both the amount of time and amount of fund required to secure (and set-up) proposed facility may result in program delays and cost growth.

5. Proposed Software Compatibility and Maturity: The originally proposed software, a BI tool, loaded and functionally operated within the USSOCOM SOF Information Enterprise (SIE) run-time environment. However, in the Final Proposal Revisions, (b)(4) made changes to their proposed software by including a modified (b)(4) which the SSEB was unable to evaluation/assess. Therefore, the below statements pertain only to the originally proposed software and the ratings do not reflect an assessment of the newly proposed software.

a. Factor 5.1 – Program Loading and Environment Compatibility: Low risk – Using an external hard drive that was included in their proposal submission, (b)(4) successfully loaded their proposed application software into the SIE run-time environment within the 8 hour limit. (b)(4) used the Government provided Oracle 10g.X Enterprise Server application to access the Oracle based mock data base for real-time data presentation and manipulation. Their application load employed Windows 2003 Operating System and Windows XP clients in a SORBIS test bed Domain that required government provided Domain Controller, DNS and DHCP ip-address pool. The loading and presentation of the framework of (b)(4) proposed software solution demonstrated compatibility with the SIE run-time environment.

b. Factor 5.2 – Software Maturity for Document Generation: (b)(4) functional demonstration their proposed software in generating the requested documents (an R-1 Budget

Exhibit, a financial planning delta, and a financial execution dashboard) showed that the proposed software was a mature product that would require little tailoring to meet the SORBIS requirements.

Conclusion: (The merits of the proposals will be presented for each offeror in summary fashion with a numerical listing of the strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies, and exceptions for each. A recommendation for (a) the Competitive Range (before negotiations), or (b) for Award (after revised proposals are submitted), will be presented, as appropriate.)

SORBIS Source Selection Summary

OFFEROR	Technical Approach Proposal Risk	Past Performance	Management Approach Proposal Risk	Software Compatibility/ Maturity Risk	Cost
(b)(4)	Low	Confident	Low	Low	(b)(4)
	Low	Highly Confident	Low	Low	
	Low	Confident	Low	Low	
	Low	Confident	Low	Low	
	Moderate	Highly Confident	Low	Low	

(b)(4)

Technical Approach: Rated Green with a low proposal risk because they presented an acceptable software development and integration approach to meet the SORBIS Capability Production Document (CPD) and Statement of Objectives (SOO) requirements. (b)(4) presented a strong/experienced team record with other agencies and a strong two year commitment of team personnel. They provided a detailed track record and background in delivery of financial planning and budget applications.

Past Performance: Confident rating is based on the results of the surveys returned and information from the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA). They were given excellent to fair survey ratings on the performance quality and information provided by DCMA indicates a confidence rating on their ability to perform the work.

Management Approach: Rated Green with low proposal risk due to their overall management approach, internal controls, risk management process, and commitment to small business subcontracting opportunities. Project management approach/techniques described indicate an adequate understanding of project management requirements for this SORBIS project. Also, they have integrated a risk management environment to their overall program management approach and have a corporate commitment on obtaining and maintaining industry-recognized certifications (Capability Maturity Model Integration (CMMI) Level 4 or Level 5 in all delivery center sites and ISO 9001 certified in all five of its Global Operating Groups).

Software Compatibility/Maturity: The proposed software loaded and functionally operated within the USSOCOM SOF Information Enterprise (SIE) run-time environment and performed the requested document generations.

Cost/Price: (b)(4) a pricing structure that, while providing total cost (b)(4) information for the proposed five years of the contract, concentrates 99.5% of their labor cost (b)(4) in the first 24 months of effort and proposing very little labor support for any sustainment efforts in years three through five of the contract. Their proposed material costs are $3.180M over the five years of the contract. While these cost figures were evaluated to be acceptable, their proposed 24 month labor costs were the highest of all the offerors. Also, the lack of continued support in the contract years three through five after SORBIS implementation by (b)(4) seen as a potential cost (growth) risk beyond what was identified in their proposal.

(b)(4)

Technical Approach: Rated Blue with a low proposal risk due to their proposal addressing requirements, data integration, business process refinement, and re-engineering that exceeds government requirements and expectations. Secondly, the proposal provides a detailed comprehensive approach for replacing legacy systems with COTS solutions, COTS integration problem management, interactive feedback, and project integration with required SOCOM change and configuration controls. In addition, the IMP and IMS provided top-level visibility to test, evaluation, and performance verifications to be applied at each phase of development, testing, and integration. Also, they had a solid understanding of the problem, requirement, and SOF fiscal/budget information environment. The list of COTS products and platforms, with their proposed use, were well presented and understood. Finally, they have strong experience with SOCOM and Component-unique financial systems.

Past Performance: Highly Confident rating is based on the results of the surveys returned. The offeror and their subcontractors were given excellent to good survey ratings on the performance quality and their past performance referenced them and their subcontractors were rated highly relevant.

Management Approach: Rated Green with low proposal risk due to the offeror's adequate understanding of project management requirements (i.e. management approach/techniques/ controls) for the SORBIS project. Secondly, the proposal clearly identifies the project team composition (including key personnel), number of team members, roles/responsibilities, and organizational affiliation (prime or subcontractor) of the different project team members. Also, the proposal discusses a proactive, quantitative and qualitative assessment of risks. The proposal provides an adequate discussion of certifications (CMMI level 3), recognitions, accreditations, standards, frameworks, methodologies, and continuous improvement practices adopted/ incorporated into the offeror's daily business strategies and the benefits of these certificates to the SORBIS project.

Software Compatibility/Maturity: The proposed software loaded and functionally operated within the USSOCOM SIE run-time environment and performed the requested document generations.

Cost/Price: (b)(4) costs (b)(4) are distributed over the five year ordering period with the bulk of the costs in years one and two (b)(4) and a cost "reduction" to a level of effort in years three through five (b)(4) (b)(4) (b)(4) perform 66% of the work "in-house" and subcontract out 34% of the work. This ratio indicates that an effective internal cost control management system is implemented. Their proposed costs for the work to be performed reflects a clear understanding of the requirements and correlates with the detailed methods of performance described in the offeror's technical proposal.

(b)(4)

Technical Approach: Rated Blue with a low proposal risk due to their proposal addressing requirements using detailed Project Management disciplines for design, planning, and re-engineering that exceeds government requirements and expectations. Secondly, the proposal provides a detailed comprehensive approach for replacing the "As-Is" systems with COTS solutions and industry best practices, including employment of prototypes and modeling to baseline the XML, metadata tagging and mapping required for indexed storage and near-real time retrieval of data. Also, they presented a clear and synchronized IMP and IMS with detailed entry and exit points for each increment of delivery that exceeds IMP task listing with supporting details that promote high feasibility for successful completion of the plan. Additionally, their demonstrated expertise in software development is a major strength of this proposal. Furthermore, they have a solid understanding of the problem, requirement, and SOF fiscal/budget information environment provided by an easily understood summary and technical list of COTS products and platforms to be delivered by a technically matured staff with extensive SOCOM experience.

Past Performance: Confident rating is based on the results of the surveys returned and information from the DCMA. They were given excellent to good survey ratings on the performance quality and their past performance reference contracts were rated highly relevant. The information provided by DCMA indicates a confidence rating on their ability to perform the work.

Management Approach: Rated Green with a low proposal rating due to their project management approach/techniques using project tracking, controls, oversight, reviews and meetings that are appropriate. Their approach also indicates an emphasis on a controlled project management environment and reflects an adequate understanding of the controls needed to appropriately manage the SORBIS project. The risk management approach/techniques are described clearly demonstrates the offeror's capabilities, and provide for government to be involved in the integrated process. The proposal provides an adequate discussion of their certifications (CMMI Level 3 and ISO 9001:2000) and addresses how these certifications ensure high quality performance and reduces cost/schedule/ performance risks.

Software Compatibility/Maturity: The proposed software loaded and functionally operated within the USSOCOM SIE run-time environment and performed the requested document generations.

Cost/Price: (b)(4) costs (b)(4) are distributed over the five year ordering period with the bulk of the cost in years one and two (b)(4) and a cost "reduction" to a level of effort in years three through five (b)(4) (b)(4) (b)(4) to perform 54% of the work "in-house" while (b)(4) (b)(4) will perform 46% of the work, providing corporate technical expertise at a higher labor cost. This proposed labor structure could result in a higher overall labor costs and minimize the prime's management control of cost.

(b)(4)

Technical Approach: Rated Green with low proposal risk because their proposal adequately addresses the full range of requirements, especially the retirement of SOALIS, IFTS, and PPBES-MIS, by the end of 'increment C'. The presentation of Project Management disciplines shows maturity and experience in delivery of an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system that could meet government requirements. Additionally, their technical approach "will integrate seamlessly with the applied COTS application modules to meet open architecture standards". Their proposal has multiple references to risk management and risk reduction approaches and a commitment to keep key personnel assigned to the project throughout the duration of the contract.

Past Performance: Confident rating is based on the results of the surveys returned and information from the DCMA. Their referenced contracts were rated highly relevant and they were given excellent to good survey ratings on the performance quality. The information provided by DCMA indicates a confidence rating on their ability to perform the work.

Management Approach: Rated Blue with low proposal risk due to the proposal exceeding in providing all information and data required by the RFP. The proposal clearly demonstrates (b)(4) capabilities and was comprehensive in addressing the management requirements of the RFP. Also, the project and risk management approaches/techniques described were extensive and presented detailed descriptions of (b)(4) and risk approaches and controls and indicates an excellent understanding of project management requirements, controls and associated risks especially applicable for this SORBIS project. The proposal clearly identifies the lines of communication that promote effective interface between (b)(4) implementation staff, advisory committee, and security office and SORBIS program offices; and clearly identifies Key Personnel and some additional proposed project personnel, as well as the project team composition and roles/responsibilities. (b)(4) CMMI Level 5 certified and provided an excellent discussion of many desirable certifications, best practices and quality initiatives and provides evidence that the offeror and proposed subcontractors place significant corporate value and commitment on obtaining and maintaining industry-recognized certifications and incorporating the value of these certifications in quality and continuous improvement practices. In addition, the proposal includes excellent, integrated discussion of benefits and assurances related to cost/schedule/ performance and reduction of risk, including those contributed by subcontractors.

Software Compatibility/Maturity: The proposed software loaded and functionally operated within the USSOCOM SIE run-time environment and performed the requested document generations.

Cost/Price: (b)(4) costing was found to be reasonable (b)(4) and provided five years of labor category pricing. However, even after discussions with (b)(4) which the government indicated its requirement for some sustainment support in contract years three through five, (b)(4) not propose any labor costs for these years. (b)(4) this cost approach by claiming that the government will issue a separate contract for the SORBIS sustainment efforts. This demonstrates a lack of understanding of the requirements and the lack of continued support in the contract years after SORBIS implementation by (b)(4) seen as a potential cost (growth) risk beyond what was identified in their proposal. Additionally, (b)(4) overall proposed material cost for software licenses appears high when compared with the Government's estimate ($6.32M vs. $5.22M). This is a source of great risk and therefore does not provide best value to the government.

(b)(4)

Technical Approach: Rated Green with moderate proposal risk because the quality of the proposal in addressing the overall requirements for SORBIS was acceptable. However, (b)(4) proposes to "support USSOCOM in developing a roadmap that would incorporate USSOCOM'S objectives of incremental system improvements with a modular approach…", as opposed to the preferred approach of any "roadmap" or requirement refinement and articulation being included as an integral part of the design activity. The dependence on untrained USSOCOM people rather than trained contractor IT professionals for the development of any "roadmap" or requirement refinement and articulation raises an element of risk. Also, it is not clear from the proposal just what and how much (b)(4) will be coming to SOCOM to accomplish the SOO/CPD requirements. This lack of specificity raises overall risk. Additionally, there is an element of risk associated with the use of a system that was designed specifically for the Navy. Good detail and understanding was demonstrated with the proposed deployment of the Radiant Mercury Guard as the trusted gateway between the DFAS unclassified environment and the classified SORBIS network.

Past Performance: Highly Confident rating is based on the results of the surveys returned and information from the DCMA. Their referenced contracts were rated highly relevant and they were given excellent survey ratings on the performance quality. The information provided by DCMA indicates a confidence rating on their ability to perform the work.

Management Approach: Rated Green with low proposal risk due to the management approach, techniques, controls and metrics described indicated an adequate understanding of project management requirements for this SORBIS project and included adequate discussion related to cost/schedule/ performance. The proposal was clear about the organizational affiliation (prime or subcontractor) that the proposed six Key Personnel represent, meeting the minimum RFP requirements. The proposed risk mitigation tools/techniques were relevant and adequately described and the proposal was clear that USSOCOM will be jointly involved in risk management communication, assessment and other activities. The proposal provided adequate discussion of their corporate certifications and their corporate commitment on obtaining and maintaining these certifications.

Software Compatibility/Maturity: The proposed software loaded and functionally operated within the USSOCOM SIE run-time environment and performed the requested document generations.

Cost/Price: (b)(4) proposed costs (b)(4) were distributed over the five year ordering period with the bulk of the cost in years one and two (b)(4) materiel) and a cost "reduction" to a level of effort in years three through five (b)(4) (b)(4) This pricing reflects their technical approach of utilizing BI reporting and analysis tools and modifying the (b)(4) application to satisfy the SORBIS requirements. In addition, the (b)(4) is proposing a facilities cost of $638,871. While this cost is not unreasonable, this can be seen as both a cost and schedule risk to the SORBIS effort. If the facility is necessary for the offeror to complete the effort, both the amount of time and amount of funds required to secure (and set-up) the proposed facility may result in program delays and cost growth.

Recommendation:

Based on the non-cost factors and proposed cost, (b)(4) the best technical approach, lowest risk, and best value to the government for the proposed work in meeting the SORBIS requirement. Their proposal exceeded government requirements and objectives in addressing SORBIS requirements, data integration, business process refinement, and re-engineering. The proposal provided a detailed comprehensive approach for replacing legacy systems with COTS solutions and integration of their COTS applications within the Command's new Microsoft Office SharePoint Server 2007 (MOSS 2007) SOF Information Environment (SIE). They had a solid understanding of the problem, the requirement, and SOF fiscal/budget information environment. Their proposed COTS products and platforms, with their proposed use, were well presented, understood, and performed within the USSOCOM run-time environment. They have strong experience with SOCOM and Component-unique financial systems. The proposal clearly identifies the project team composition (including key personnel), number of team members, roles/responsibilities, and organizational affiliation (prime or subcontractor) of the different project team members. The proposal discusses the use of the offeror's Risk Management Framework that applies a specific process intended to provide a proactive, quantitative and qualitative assessment of risks.

(b)(4) cost is the lowest among the five offerors and reflects a clear understanding of the RFP requirements. Also, the proposed cost is consistent with the unique methods of performance described in the technical proposal. Finally, (b)(4) cost is reasonable and is logically distributed over the five year duration of the contract and provides the government with an overall best value delivery effort.

(b)(3) (10 U.S.C. § 130b), (b)(6)

7/20/09

Date

SORBIS Source Selection Chairman