

OCC-HEALTH POST AWARD DEBRIEFING

Introduction

- **Objectives.** Our objective is to provide to assure offerors that the Government properly evaluated your proposal and made the award determination in accordance with the RFP terms and conditions. The debriefing also provides feedback to offerors to assist in improving future proposal submissions. We want you to know that the Government conducted a thorough, fair evaluation and made a sound decision according to the established source selection methodology.
- **Ground Rules.** We may only discuss issues pertaining to YOUR proposal and your score in relation to the rating of the successful bidder, as appropriate.

Evaluation Overview

- **Source Selection Organization and Duties** The TET (source selection team) consisted of:
 1. Ms. Lillian Jones
 2. Mr. Johnny Roberts
 3. Mr. Paul Mark
 4. Mr. Markie Mark- Manager

- **Factors for Award & Rating**

- a. **Past Performance (Experience) 30 Points**

Proposals will be evaluated to determine if the offeror's previous experience with this type of operation lends itself to adequate performance of this contract. Experience will be evaluated for each aspect of the task order requirements. References will be contacted.

Proposals will be evaluated to determine performance quality, schedule reliability, and cost efficiencies.

Proposals will be evaluated to determine relative experience for printing operations for each of the task order type requirements.

- b. **Qualifications of Professional Staff, Organizational Staffing Chart & Resumes 20 Points**

Proposals will be evaluated to determine if the offeror's "key personnel" meet the requirements of the PWS and to determine if the offeror has demonstrated his understanding of the requirements by his designation of "key personnel".

OCC-HEALTH POST AWARD DEBRIEFING

c. Plan of Operation and Understanding of the Work Requirement 25 Points

Proposals will be evaluated to determine if the offeror has demonstrated an understanding of the total work requirement, objectives, and potential EHS impacts which may occur as a result of performing under this contract.

Proposals will be evaluated to determine if the offeror's permits and licenses are adequate and up to date, and to determine if the offeror has the ability to provide the full range of environmental services identified by the Statement of Work.

Proposals will be evaluated to determine if the offeror's health, safety, and environmental protection procedures are adequate for the performance of this contract.

Proposals will be evaluated to determine if the offeror's management proposal assures that the offeror has the potential for completing the required work under this contract.

d. Quality Control Plan 25 Points

Proposals will be evaluated to determine if the offeror's quality assurance and control plan demonstrates that the procedures utilized are in accordance with all current rules and regulations.

Debrief Offeror's Evaluation Results

Will be discussed by Mr. Markie Mark filling in as needed the ratings your firm was assigned and will discuss issues the TET had with your proposal that caused it to be rated unacceptable.

a. Past Performance (Experience) 30 Points - Consensus - 20

Evaluator 1 – 20

Vendor D (you) demonstrated similar experience to that required in the PWS, but they had a **very limited number of contracts**.

Evaluator 2 – 25

The contractor demonstrates that they have some relevant experience in projects of similar size and scope. They did not demonstrate that their experience is relevant to the printing industry but it appears that they could handle our requirements. The contractor provided detail on how each current contract is similar to ours, listed special problems encountered and listed information on schedule reliability and cost containment.

Evaluator 3 – 22

Good background in areas related to Occupational Health, Fitness, Medical Staffing and workers compensation, but very limited in general industry safety. Some specialized safety areas.

OCC-HEALTH POST AWARD DEBRIEFING

Evaluator 4 – 15

Limited experience in the operation and management of similar tasks in a BEP type environment.

b. Qualifications of Professional Staff, Organizational Staffing Chart & Resumes 20 Points

Consensus 10

Evaluator 1 – 10

They do not have proposed staff for ½ of the positions proposed. Qualifications for those vacant positions cannot be evaluated. The proposed staff has limited experience in safety.

Evaluator 2 – 10

It is unclear whether the proposed Project Manager or other key personnel have the requisite years of EHS and/or management experience. It is unclear who the contractor proposes for Senior Engineer and Safety/Environmental Specialist. Many of the resumes indicate that personnel have no HAZWOPR training. The organizational staffing chart is non-specific.

Evaluator 3 – 10

Limited as addressed. For example the Senior Safety Specialist has a good fire safety background but appears to have little overall safety experience, training, or education. Showed a very heavy on Environmental background. The staff qualifications for a senior safety specialist, as addressed their proposal in attachment C (position descriptions), are the same as for the senior environmental specialist. These are two different areas of expertise regarding different backgrounds and are not necessarily interchangeable.

Evaluator 4 – 15

Staff would be hired for this contract.

c. Plan of Operation and Understanding of the Work Requirement 25 Points Consensus - 20

Evaluator 1 – 18

They do not show a thorough understanding of the work requirement. The plan of operation does not assure that the vacant positions can be filled or contingencies can be met. The proposal contains errors. The Government does not require a COTS for the MSDS requirement. They misunderstand the approach for developing the filing system. The proposal sounds "canned" does not sound like there is genuine commitment to meeting BEP requirements.

Evaluator 2 – 20

The contractor demonstrates an understanding of the work requirements and objectives. Their health, safety and environmental; protection procedures are adequate. Their contingency plan is weak.

Evaluator 3 – 20

Good plan. However, the total numbers of safety specialists that they think they will need wasn't addressed.

Evaluator 4 – 25

Good responses to tasks C5.

OCC-HEALTH POST AWARD DEBRIEFING

d. Quality Control Plan 25 Points Consensus - 15

Evaluator 1 – 15

The QA plan does not tell us how they will assure quality without input from BEP.

Evaluator 2 – 15

The QCP lacks detail and clear lines of responsibilities and lines of authority.

Evaluator 3 – 20

Fair to Good.

Evaluator 4 – 20

Good QC plan.

MAXIMUM POSSIBLE POINTS – 100

Total Evaluated Score 49

- **Evaluation Summary.** Assimilate the summary the TET put together here for each vendors overall rating.

Vendor Name	Technical Score – Out of a possible 100 points	Total Contract Price without the Incentive (\$10,000.00) added into the price.
Vendor A	90	\$2,736,186.00
Vendor D	49	\$4,758,984.42

Vendor A was rated 1st in technical score and 2nd in contract price.

The low offeror did not submit an acceptable offer. **Vendor D** was rated 4th in technical score and 7th in contract price.

OCC-HEALTH POST AWARD DEBRIEFING

1. FAR 15.506(d) (l): the Government's evaluation of the significant weaknesses or deficiencies in the proposal.

1) List the Strengths, weaknesses, or deficiencies in our proposal for each evaluation factor and sub factor.

1. Your Strengths were:

a. Past Performance (Experience)

Evaluator 1 – 20

Vendor D demonstrated similar experience of that required in the PWS, but they had a very limited number of contracts.

Evaluator 2 – 25

The contractor demonstrates that they have some relevant experience in projects of similar size and scope. They did not demonstrate that their experience is relevant to the printing industry but it appears that they could handle our requirements. The contractor provided detail on how each current contract is similar to ours, listed special problems encountered and listed information on schedule reliability and cost containment.

Evaluator 3 – 22

Good background in areas related to Occupational Health, Fitness, Medical Staffing and workers compensation. Limited in general industry safety. Some specialized safety areas.

c. Plan of Operation and Understanding of the Work Requirement 25 Points

Evaluator 2 – 20

The contractor demonstrates an understanding of the work requirements and objectives. Their health, safety and environmental; protection procedures are adequate. Their contingency plan is weak.

Evaluator 3 – 20

Good plan. However, the total numbers of safety specialists that they think they will need wasn't addressed.

Evaluator 4 – 25

Good responses to tasks C5.

d. Quality Control Plan 25 Points

Evaluator 3 – 20

Fair to Good.

Evaluator 4 – 20

Good QC plan.

OCC-HEALTH POST AWARD DEBRIEFING

2. Your Weakness or Deficiencies were:

a. Past Performance (Experience)

Evaluator 4 – 15

Limited experience in the operation and management of similar tasks

b. Qualifications of Professional Staff, Organizational Staffing Chart & Resumes

Evaluator 1 – 10

They do not have proposed staff for ½ of the positions proposed. Qualifications for those vacant positions cannot be evaluated. The proposed staff has limited experience in safety.

Evaluator 2 – 10

It is unclear whether the proposed Project Manager or other key personnel have the requisite years of EHS and/or management experience. It is unclear who the contractor proposes for Senior Engineer and Safety/Environmental Specialist. Many of the resumes indicate that personnel have no HAZWOPR training. The organizational staffing chart is non-specific.

Evaluator 3 – 10

Limited as addressed. For example the Senior Safety Specialist has a good fire safety background but appears to have little overall safety experience, training, or education. Heavy on Environmental background. The staff qualifications for a senior safety specialist, as addressed their proposal in attachment C (position descriptions), are the same as for the senior environmental specialist. These are two different areas of expertise regarding different backgrounds and are not necessarily interchangeable.

Evaluator 4 – 15

Staff would be hired for this contract.

c. Plan of Operation and Understanding of the Work Requirement 25 Points

Evaluator 1 – 18

They do not show a thorough understanding of the work requirement. The plan of operation does not assure that the vacant positions can be filled or contingencies can be met. The proposal contains errors.

Evaluator 2 – 20

Their contingency plan is weak.

d. Quality Control Plan 25 Points

Evaluator 1 – 15

The QA plan does not tell us how they will assure quality without input from BEP.

Evaluator 2 – 15

The vendor's QCP lacks detail and clear lines of responsibilities and lines of authority.

OCC-HEALTH POST AWARD DEBRIEFING

Your most significant weakness was...Qualifications of Professional Staff, Organizational Staffing Chart and Resumes it was unclear – what staff you were using and were.

4. FAR 15.506(d)(2) & (3): the overall evaluated cost or price (including unit prices) and technical and past performance rating of the successful offeror(s) and of our proposal and the overall ranking for all offerors if such a rating was developed as part of the source selection.

Vendor Name	Technical Score – Out of a possible 100 points	Total Contract Price without the Incentive (\$10,000.00) added into the price.
VENDOR A	90	\$2,736,186.00
Vendor B	89	\$4,133,962.00
Vendor C	78	\$3,342,540.00
Vendor D	49	\$4,758,984.42
Vendor E	45	\$3,354,810.00
Vendor F	45	\$3,944,158.02
Vendor G	25	\$7,201,589.52
Vendor H	20	\$987,960.00

Vendor A was rated 1st in technical score and 2nd in contract price.

The low offeror did not submit an acceptable offer. **Vendor D** was rated 4th in technical score and 7th in contract price.

5. FAR 15.506 (d) (4): a summary of the rationale for award. Vendor A presented the best technical and lowest acceptable proposal, giving the greatest overall value to the government.