



[REDACTED]

**SUSPENSION OF AWARD REQUIRED**

August 19, 2021

General Counsel  
U.S. Government Accountability Office  
441 G Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20548

BY EPDS

Re: Pre-Award Protest of Computer World Services Corporation under  
Solicitation No. 75N98121R00001<sup>1</sup>

Dear Sir or Madam:

Computer World Services Corporation (“CWS”), through counsel, hereby protests the terms of Solicitation No. 75N98121R00001 (the “Solicitation”), issued by the Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health (“Agency” or “NIH”).

As explained below, when the Agency issued Amendment 9 to the Solicitation, the Agency changed the scoring parameters for Corporate Experience, Leading Edge Technology Experience, Federal Multiple Award Experience, and the Past Performance factor so that the amended Solicitation is unduly restrictive of competition and otherwise unreasonable. Before the issuance of Amendment 9, the Solicitation stated that offerors would earn evaluation points based on the *dollar value* of the federal contract used for evaluation of these factors. Amendment 9 revised the Solicitation so that points will be awarded based on the *obligated dollar value* of the federal contract.

The amended Solicitation is unduly restrictive of competition because awarding points based on the obligated dollar value of a federal contract—instead of the awarded dollar value—is not necessary to meet NIH’s requirements. In addition, NIH’s decision to assign points based on the obligated dollar value of a federal contract is perplexing because a contract’s obligated dollar value provides an incomplete—and often misleading—picture of the contract’s actual value. The same reasoning applies to using a contract’s obligated dollar value to assess relevance under the Past Performance factor; the awarded dollar value of a contract is a more accurate indicator of the size of a past performance reference than the obligated dollar value.

---

<sup>1</sup> Prior protests filed under the Solicitation have been docketed under file number B-419956 *et seq.*

General Counsel  
August 19, 2021  
Page 2

For the reasons set for below, the U.S. Government Accountability Office (“GAO”) should sustain CWS’s protest.

## **1. PARTIES TO THIS PROTEST**

CWS is headquartered at 6402 Arlington Blvd, Suite 650, Falls Church, VA 22042. CWS’s telephone number is (202) 637-9699. The Morris, Manning & Martin, LLP attorneys on this pleading are Michelle Litteken ([mlitteken@mmmlaw.com](mailto:mlitteken@mmmlaw.com)), Andrew Mohr ([amohr@mmmlaw.com](mailto:amohr@mmmlaw.com)) and C. Kelly Kroll ([kkroll@mmmlaw.com](mailto:kkroll@mmmlaw.com)). The contact information for Morris, Manning & Martin, LLP is set forth below.

The contracting agency is the Department of Health and Human Services, National Institutes of Health. The contracting officer for the procurement is Rose Schultz. Ms. Shultz’s phone number is 888-773-6542, and the email address provided in the Solicitation for service of protest is [CIOSP4.NITAAC@nih.gov](mailto:CIOSP4.NITAAC@nih.gov). Ms. Shultz’s address is:

National Institutes of Health  
Information Technology Acquisition and Assessment Center (NITAAC)  
6011 Executive Boulevard, Suite 503  
Rockville, MD 20852

## **2. INTERESTED PARTY STATUS**

CWS is an interested party because CWS is a prospective offeror under the Solicitation whose direct economic interest would be affected by the award of a contract or by the failure to receive an award. See 4 C.F.R. 21.0(a)(1). CWS’s direct economic interest is affected by the unduly restrictive terms in the Solicitation.

## **3. TIMELINESS**

This protest is timely filed prior to the time set for receipt of initial proposals, August 20, 2021. 4 C.F.R. § 21.2(a)(1).

## **4. SUSPENSION**

This protest is filed before the deadline for the receipt of proposals, August 20, 2021. Therefore, award of any contract contemplated by the Solicitation must be suspended during the pendency of this protest pursuant to 31 U.S.C. § 3353(c)(1) and 48 C.F.R. § 33.104(b)(1). Because this protest is filed before the deadline for the receipt of proposals, the Agency must suspend contract award during the pendency of the protest.

General Counsel  
August 19, 2021  
Page 3



## 5. JURISDICTION

GAO has jurisdiction over this protest, which alleges a violation of a procurement statute or regulation by a federal agency. See 31 U.S.C. §§ 3551-3556; see also 48 C.F.R. § 33.104. GAO's regulations require that a protest include a detailed statement of the legal and factual grounds for the protest, and that the grounds stated be legally sufficient. 4 C.F.R. §§ 21.1(c)(4), (f). These requirements contemplate that protesters will provide, at a minimum, either allegations or evidence sufficient, if uncontradicted, to establish the likelihood that the protester will prevail in its claim of improper agency action. CACI Techs., Inc., B-408858.2, at 4 (Dec. 5, 2013). This protest meets those standards.

## 6. FACTUAL SUMMARY

### A. The Solicitation

The Agency issued the Solicitation for the Chief Information Officer – Solutions and Partners (“CIO-SP4”) program on May 25, 2021. NIH has since issued nine amendments to the Solicitation, with the most recent amendment, Amendment 10, issued on August 16, 2021.

The Solicitation contemplates the award of multiple government-wide acquisition contracts under which successful offerors will provide information technology (“IT”) solutions and services to the federal government. Solicitation at 1 (§ A.1).<sup>2</sup> The CIO-SP4 program is valued at more than \$40 billion, and the Agency expects to receive more than 1,000 proposals.<sup>3</sup>

IT services provided under awarded contracts will fall under the following ten task areas:

- Task Area 1: IT Services for Biomedical Research, Health Sciences, and Healthcare
- Task Area 2: CIO Support
- Task Area 3: Digital Media
- Task Area 4: Outsourcing
- Task Area 5: IT Operations and Maintenance
- Task Area 6: Integration Services
- Task Area 7: Cyber Security
- Task Area 8: Digital Government and Cloud Services

---

<sup>2</sup> Amendment 10 did not substantively alter any of the requirements at issue in this protest. Unless otherwise stated herein, citations of the Solicitation refer to the version of the Solicitation issued with Amendment 9 on August 2, 2021.

<sup>3</sup> Miller, Jason, NITAAC details timing, evaluation plans for \$40B IT services contract, Federal News Network (Feb. 22, 2021), <https://nitaac.nih.gov/resources/news/nitaac-details-timing-evaluation-plans-40b-it-services-contract>.

General Counsel  
August 19, 2021  
Page 4

- Task Area 9: Enterprise Resource Planning
- Task Area 10: Software Development

Solicitation at 18-19 (§ C.2). The Agency intends to award contracts to other than small businesses, emerging large businesses,<sup>4</sup> and small businesses that participate in certain socioeconomic programs (i.e., Woman-Owned Small Business, Veteran-Owned Small Business, etc.). Solicitation at 142 (§ L.2).

The Solicitation contemplates a three phased approach to the evaluation, using the three phases described below:

**Phase I:** The government will review the self-scoring sheets of all offerors and notify the offerors with the highest scores that will proceed to phase II of the evaluation.

**Phase II:** The government will review the offerors' documentation and compare it against the go / no-go requirements found in L.5.3 and M.3. Offerors that receive a go for all go / no-go requirements will proceed to phase III of the evaluation.

**Phase III:** The government will evaluate the offerors' Health IT capability management, past performance, and price proposals. An adjectival rating will be assigned to each offeror, and the most highly rated offerors will receive awards.

Id. at 148-49 (§ L.4). For Phase 1, the Solicitation requires offerors to complete the self-scoring sheet, with points awarded for experience, capabilities, business systems, and certifications. Solicitation at 155 (§ L.5.2). The self-scoring sheet will determine whether an offeror moves from Phase I to Phase II, and points awarded for experience will likely be determinative in that phase of the evaluation. An offeror may receive up to 10,000 points on the self-scoring sheet, and 7,800 of the 10,000 points are allocated to Corporate Experience (4,500 points); Leading Edge Technology Experience 1,800 points); Federal Multiple Award Experience (1,200 points); and Executive Order 13779 (300 points). See Attach. J.5, Self-Scoring Sheet.

The Solicitation identifies four experience areas to be scored in Phase 1: Corporate Experience (§ L.5.2.1); Leading Edge Technology Experience (§ L.5.2.2); Federal Multiple Award Experience (§ L.5.2.3), Executive Order 13779. Id. at 156-62. For each experience area, offerors are instructed to provide experience examples, which can be a contract, a single task

---

<sup>4</sup> An emerging large business is required to submit "documentation that shows their average yearly revenue for the last five years was between \$30M and \$500M per year." Solicitation at 154 (§ L.5.1(ix)). "Any business with average yearly revenue greater than \$500M per year for the last five years is considered another than small business." Id.

General Counsel  
August 19, 2021  
Page 5



order, or a collection of task orders placed under an indefinite-delivery, indefinite quantity contract or a blanket purchase agreement.<sup>5</sup> *Id.* at 156 (§ L.5.2). Each example provided must be from the three years preceding the date the Solicitation was issued (May 25, 2021). *Id.* at 156 (§ L.5.2.1), 158 (§ L.5.2.2), 160 (§ L.5.2.3), 161 (§ L.5.2.4). An offeror will earn points for each example submitted, with higher dollar value examples earning more points. For example, for Leading Edge Technology Experience, points will be awarded under the following parameters:

<b>Obligated Dollar Value of Federal Contract / Agreement</b>	<b>Points Per Example</b>
\$1,000,000 – \$3,000,000	120 points
\$3,000,001 – \$7,000,000	240 points
\$7,000,001 – \$15,000,000	320 points
\$15,000,001 – \$31,000,000	480 points
Over \$31,000,000	600 points

*Id.* at 159 (§ L.5.2.2). Notably, prior to the issuance of Amendment 9, the Solicitation did not use the term “obligated dollar value.” Instead, the Solicitation used the term “dollar value” when explaining how points would be assigned for Corporate Experience (§ L.5.2.1); Leading Edge Technology Experience (§ L.5.2.2); and Federal Multiple Award Experience (§ L.5.2.3). Amdt. 8 at 155-59.

Amendment 9 also altered the criteria for the Past Performance factor. Prior to the issuance of Amendment 9, the Past Performance sections of the Solicitation (§ L.5.7; § M.4, Table 13; and § M.4.3) did not use either “dollar value” or “obligated dollar value.” Amdt. 8 at 166-67, 171-72, and 174. Amendment 9 added the following language to Section L.5.7:

The dollar value utilized for past performance references [sic] is determined by the total dollars that were obligated.

Projects can be either a collection of orders or one single order. If a project is a “collection of orders” placed under an IDIQ contract or BPA, the dollar value will be the sum of all orders based on the methods above being applied to each individual order. (If the maximum dollar value is achieved without submitting all the orders that have been awarded, then only submit those orders that achieve the maximum results).

---

<sup>5</sup> For Corporate Experience, the Solicitation states: “Offerors must provide a minimum of three corporate experience examples. Up to 30 examples may be provided, with no more than three examples per task area.” Solicitation at 156 (§ L.5.2.1). For Leading Edge Technology Experience, Federal Multiple Award Experience, and Executive Order 13779, offerors may provide up to three examples. *Id.* at 158 (§ L.5.2.2), 160 (§ L.5.2.3), 161 (§ L.5.2.4).

General Counsel  
August 19, 2021  
Page 6



Solicitation at 167-68.

The cover letter to Amendment 9 explained the change as follows:

This amendment addresses a potential ambiguity regarding the use of obligated versus awarded value for Phase I and Phase III. The Questions and Answers posted for amendment 0003 stated the values for experience and past performance must be obligated values. However, the term obligated value was not incorporated into any amendments. Therefore, this amendment addresses this potential ambiguity by adding the term obligated value to sections L.5.2 and L.5.7.

Amdt. 9 Cover Letter.

Amendment 9 extended the deadline for proposal submission from August 3 to August 20, 2021—an extension of less than three weeks.<sup>6</sup> Solicitation at 143 (§ L.3.1).

## 7. **GROUNDS OF PROTEST**

The following discusses CWS’s protest grounds against the terms of the Solicitation.

### **A. The Agency’s Use of Obligated Dollar Value to Assign Points for the Three Experience Areas Is Unduly Restrictive of Competition and Unreasonable**

The Solicitation’s use of the obligated dollar value of a contract to award points for Corporate Experience; Leading Edge Technology Experience; and Federal Multiple Award Experience is unduly restrictive of competition because the requirement is not necessary to meet the Agency’s needs. Using the obligated dollar value of a contract—as opposed to the awarded dollar value—is also unreasonable because the obligated dollar value provides an incomplete and often misleading representation of a contract’s actual value.

When drafting a solicitation, an agency may include restrictive provisions only to the extent necessary to satisfy the agency’s actual needs. 10 U.S.C. § 2305(a)(1)(B)(ii). As GAO has explained, “Where a protester challenges a solicitation provision as unduly restrictive of competition, the procuring agency is required to establish that the challenged provision is reasonably necessary to meet the agency’s requirements.” *AES UXO, LLC*, B-419150, Dec. 7, 2020, 2020 CPD ¶ 395. If a pre-award protest is filed, GAO “examine[s] the adequacy of the

---

<sup>6</sup> Amendment 10 did not alter the deadline for proposal submission. Amdt. 10 at 138 (§ 1.3.1). With respect to a contract’s obligated dollar value, the Amendment 10 clarified that obligated mean funded. See Amdt. 10 at 151 (§ L.5.2) (“The dollar value utilized for experience in sections L.5.2.1, L.5.2.2, and L.5.2.3 is determined by the total dollars that were obligated (funded).”).

General Counsel  
August 19, 2021  
Page 7

agency's justification for a restrictive solicitation term to ensure that it is rational and can withstand logical scrutiny." Ekagra Partners, LLC, B-408685.18, Feb. 15, 2019, 2019 CPD ¶ 83.

Assigning points based on the obligated dollar value of a contract is unduly restrictive because the approach is not based on NIH's actual needs. Presumably, the Agency chose to award more points to higher-valued contracts because such contracts indicate an offeror has experience performing larger and more complex contracts. The dollar value of a contract is a recognized indicator of the magnitude or size of the contract. See WingGate Travel, Inc., B-412921, July 1, 2016, 2016 CPD ¶ 179, at n.11 ("We think it is self-evident that the size of an offeror's prior efforts . . . logically relates to the relevance of those contracts to the anticipated requirement."). However, assigning points based on the *obligated dollar value* is not necessary to meet the Agency's objective, i.e., identifying the offerors with the most experience performing large and complex contracts. The awarded dollar value of a contract accomplishes the same objective and is less restrictive because (i) the awarded dollar value also represents the size and complexity of a contract and (ii) contracts with awarded dollar values in excess of \$15 million and \$31 million are significantly more common than contracts with obligated dollar values in excess of those amounts because of how contracts are awarded and funded.

The obligated dollar value of a contract is often substantially lower than the awarded dollar value. Indeed, when a contract is awarded, the government often does not obligate any funds for the base period of performance. If contracts were fully funded at award, there would be no need for FAR 52.232-18—Availability of Funds<sup>7</sup> or FAR 52.232-19—Availability of Funds for the Next Fiscal Year.<sup>8</sup> Additionally, it is not uncommon for an agency to de-obligate funds over the course of performance—often for reasons unrelated to performance. The obligated dollar value of a contract will change over time, while the awarded dollar value remains relatively constant. At the same time, the Solicitation requires all experience examples to "be from the last three years prior to the date the date the solicitation was originally released

---

<sup>7</sup> FAR 52.232-18 provides: "Funds are not presently available for this contract. The Government's obligation under this contract is contingent upon the availability of appropriated funds from which payment for contract purposes can be made. No legal liability on the part of the Government for any payment may arise until funds are made available to the Contracting Officer for this contract and until the Contractor receives notice of such availability, to be confirmed in writing by the Contracting Officer."

<sup>8</sup> FAR 52.232-19 states: "Funds are not presently available for performance under this contract beyond \_\_\_\_\_. The Government's obligation for performance of this contract beyond that date is contingent upon the availability of appropriated funds from which payment for contract purposes can be made. No legal liability on the part of the Government for any payment may arise for performance under this contract beyond \_\_\_\_\_, until funds are made available to the Contracting Officer for performance and until the Contractor receives notice of availability, to be confirmed in writing by the Contracting Officer."

General Counsel  
August 19, 2021  
Page 8

[REDACTED]

(May 25, 2021).” Solicitation at 156 (§ L.5.2.1); see also at 158 (§ L.5.2.2), 160 (§ L.5.2.3). A contract awarded within the last three years will likely have an obligated dollar value that suggests the contract is smaller than it actually is because the contract has not been fully funded. The Agency’s approach effectively ignores the fact that the obligated dollar value of a contract that is not close to or has not yet reached completion will have a substantially lower obligated dollar value than the actual value of the contract. This discrepancy has nothing to do with the actual size of the contract, but offerors will not be able to obtain points for the actual size of the example contract.

[REDACTED]

This example is not unusual—it is a logical outcome of the manner in which the government awards and funds contracts.

This example further demonstrates that using the obligated value of a contract to assign points is unnecessary to meet the Agency’s needs and is therefore unduly restrictive of competition. The experience examples are intended to demonstrate that an offeror has experience performing large contracts, and assigning points based on the awarded dollar value of the contract achieves that objective. Assigning points based on the obligated dollar value simply shows how the amount of the contract that the contracting agency has chosen to fund at a given point in time.

It is important to recognize that CWS is submitting its proposal as [REDACTED]. As noted above, [REDACTED]

At the same time, each offeror will be submitting multiple experience examples under the three experience areas, and the more examples an offeror submits, the more points an offeror can earn.<sup>9</sup> [REDACTED]

---

<sup>9</sup> The Solicitation prohibits offerors from reusing the experience example provided for Task Area 1 for other task areas. Solicitation at 156 (§ L.5.2.1). Other examples may be reused for other task areas, and examples provided for Corporate Experience may be used for Leading Edge Technology Experience and Federal Multiple Award Experience. Id.



General Counsel  
August 19, 2021  
Page 9

[REDACTED]. Id. at 156-157 (§ L.5.2.1). Yet, it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, for a potential offeror to have multiple contracts performed within the last three years with obligated dollar values in excess of [REDACTED]. Simply said, the Agency is imposing a requirement that the vast majority of [REDACTED] cannot possibly meet.

In sum, assigning points for Corporate Experience, Leading Edge Technology Experience, and Federal Multiple Award experience based on the obligated dollar value of an example contract is unduly restrictive of competition and otherwise unreasonable. With 75 percent of the 10,000 points available on the self-scoring sheeting coming from these three experience areas, the impact on the evaluation and the potential prejudice to CWS is clear. The Solicitation's requirements make it extremely difficult, if not impossible, for many [REDACTED] to obtain high point values under the three experience areas. Assigning points using the awarded value of example contracts would allow more [REDACTED] offerors to obtain more points and enhance competition. Furthermore, assigning points based on the awarded dollar value of examples contracts would accomplish the same objective: identifying offerors with experience performing large contracts.

**B. NIH's Use of Obligated Dollar Value to evaluate the Past Performance Factor Is Unreasonable and Unduly Restrictive of Competition**

With Amendment 9, the Agency clarified that "The dollar value utilized for past performance references [sic] is determined by the total dollars that were obligated." Solicitation at 167 (§ L.5.7). Like the experience examples, past performance references "must have occurred within the last three years from the date the solicitation was originally released (May 25, 2021)." Solicitation at 168 (§ L.5.7). The Solicitation's use of obligated dollar values to evaluate past performance references unreasonable and unduly restrictive of competition.

In the Past Performance evaluation, NIH will assess the relevance of an offeror's past performance references, and NIH will likely consider the size, complexity, and magnitude of the past performance references provided using the obligated dollar value.<sup>10</sup> However, using the obligated dollar value of a past performance reference to evaluate relevance is unduly restrictive of competition because it exceeds what is necessary to meet the Agency's needs. As explained above with the respect to the experience areas, the obligated dollar value of a contract is often lower than the awarded value of the contract for reasons unrelated to the size, scope, and complexity of the contract. This discrepancy will likely lead the Agency to erroneously deem highly relevant contracts less relevant than the contracts actually are. Stated differently, the

---

<sup>10</sup> The Solicitation states: "To be relevant, the past performance must be similar in scope and complexity to any of the task areas defined in C.2.1 through C.2.10 (e.g., task areas 1 – 10)." See Solicitation at 168 (§ L.5.7).

General Counsel  
August 19, 2021  
Page 10

terms of the Solicitation are likely to cause NIH to discount a relevant past performance reference simply because the contracting agency has not fully funded the contract.

In a past performance evaluation, the intent is to assess “an offeror’s ability to perform the contract successfully.” FAR 15.305(a)(2)(i). Using the awarded dollar value of the past performance reference would accomplish the same objective while imposing fewer restrictions on offerors. Additionally, for the reasons discussed above, the awarded dollar value of a past performance references is a more accurate indicator of the size, complexity, or magnitude of a contract. The Solicitation should be amended to evaluate past performance references using the awarded contract value.

## **8. REQUEST FOR DOCUMENTS<sup>15</sup>.**

CWS requests the following specific documents that are relevant to the issues raised in connection with this protest:

- (1) Copies of “all relevant documents,” as are required to be produced in accordance with 4 C.F.R. section 21.3(d);
- (2) All questions received by NIH from any potential offeror concerning the Corporate Experience, Leading Edge Technology Experience, Federal Multiple Award Experience areas, and Past Performance sections of the Solicitation, which documents are relevant to CWS’s challenges to the experience and past performance evaluation criteria;
- (3) All Agency-issued responses to questions received from potential offerors concerning the Corporate Experience, Leading Edge Technology Experience, Federal Multiple Award Experience areas, and Past Performance sections of the Solicitation, which documents are relevant to CWS’s challenges to the experience and past performance evaluation criteria;
- (4) All non-privileged written communications, including email, between or among NIH personnel, including, but not limited to the evaluators and/or the source selection official pertaining to the experience areas and Past Performance evaluation criteria, which documents are relevant to CWS’s challenges to the experience areas and Past Performance evaluation criteria;
- (5) All documents related to the Agency’s basis, if any, for using the obligated dollar value of a contract to evaluate experience and past performance.

General Counsel  
August 19, 2021  
Page 11

These documents are relevant to CWS's argument that using the obligated dollar value is unduly restrictive of competition;

- (6) All source selection plans, selection guidelines, and evaluation criteria pertaining to the Solicitation. These documents are relevant to CWS's argument that the Solicitation is unduly restrictive of competition.

**9. REQUEST FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER**

CWS requests that a protective order be issued in this case. See 4 C.F.R. § 21.4.

**10. RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO REQUEST A HEARING**

CWS does not believe at this time that a hearing will be required, but reserves its right to request a hearing in the future after reviewing the agency report.

**11. RELIEF REQUESTED**

For the reasons stated above, CWS respectfully asks GAO to: (i) issue a decision holding that the Solicitation is unduly restrictive of competition and (ii) recommend that the Agency amend the Solicitation to address the issues raised in this protest. GAO should also recommend award to CWS of its costs and expenses, including legal fees, incurred in the preparation and pursuit of this protest, as well as such other recommendations as GAO deems necessary and proper under 4 C.F.R. § 21.8.

Respectfully submitted,



Michelle E. Litteken  
Andrew J. Mohr  
C. Kelly Kroll

Morris, Manning & Martin, LLP  
*Attorneys for Computer World Services  
Corporation*

cc: Rose Schultz, Contracting Officer

# **EXHIBIT A**

Print Close Help

Transaction Information

Award Type: Delivery/Task Order Prepared Date: 08/12/2020 07:07:14 Prepared User: WAYNE.LATIMORE7001
Award Status: Final Last Modified Date: 10/05/2020 09:38:26 Last Modified User: TROWAN2
Closed Status: No Closed Status Date: Closed By:
Approved Date: 08/13/2020 15:33:44 Approved By: CBYRD7001

Document Information

Agency Procurement Identifier Modification No Trans No
Award ID: 7001 70RCSA20FR0000054 0 0
Referenced IDV ID: 7529 HHSN316201300001W 11
Reason For Modification:
Solicitation ID: 70RCSA20Q00000014
Agency Main Sub Identifier Account Account Initiative
Treasury Account Symbol: Select One

Dates Amounts
Date Signed: 08/13/2020 Action Obligation: \$8,955,640.40
Period of Performance Start Date: 08/17/2020 Base And Exercised Options Value: \$8,955,640.40
Completion Date: 05/16/2024 Base and All Options Value (Total Contract Value): \$46,683,029.83
Est. Ultimate Completion Date: 05/16/2024 Fee Paid for Use of Indefinite Delivery Vehicle: \$0.00
Solicitation Date: 05/15/2020

Purchaser Information

Contracting Office Agency ID: 7001 Contracting Office Agency Name: OFFICE OF PROCUREMENT OPERATIONS
Contracting Office ID: 70RCSA Contracting Office Name: CISA ACQ DIV
Funding Agency ID: 7050 Funding Agency Name: OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MA
Funding Office ID: 70MUS8 Funding Office Name: OFF OF THE UNDER SCTY FOR MGMT
Foreign Funding: Not Applicable

Entity Information

SAM Exception: Remove Exception
Unique Entity ID (DUNS): 621796044 Street: 100 INDIANA AVE NW
Unique Entity ID (SAM): SELVLQN46MM7 Street2:
Legal Business Name: COMPUTER WORLD SERVICES CORP. City: WASHINGTON
DBAN: State: DC Zip: 200012144
CAGE Code: 0P8H9 Country: UNITED STATES
Phone: (202) 637-9699
Fax No: (703) 707-6169
Congressional District: DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA 00

Business Category

Organization Type: CORPORATE NOT TAX EX
State of Incorporation: DC
Country of Incorporation: USA

Business Types

- Labor Surplus Area Firm
Corporate Entity, Not Tax Exempt
Socio Economic Data
Minority Owned Business
Subcontinent Asian (Asian-Indian) American Owned
Relationship With Federal Government
All Awards
Organization Factors
For Profit Organization
Certifications
SBA Certified HUBZone firm
Self-Certified Small Disadvantaged Business

Contract Data

Type of Contract: Time and Materials
Inherently Governmental Functions: Select One
Multiyear Contract: Select One

Major Program:

National Interest Action:

None

Cost Or Pricing Data:

Select One

Purchase Card Used As Payment Method:

No

Undefinized Action:

No

Performance Based Service Acquisition:

Not Applicable

\* FY 2004 and prior; 80% or more specified as performance requirement  
\* FY 2005 and later; 50% or more specified as performance requirement

Emergency Acquisition:

Not Applicable

Contract Financing:

Select One

Cost Accounting Standards Clause:

Select One

Consolidated Contract:

Not Consolidated

Number Of Actions:

1

Legislative Mandates

Clinger-Cohen Act:

No

Labor Standards:

Not Applicable

Materials, Supplies, Articles, and Equip:

Not Applicable

Construction Wage Rate Requirements:

Not Applicable

Additional Reporting:

Select One or More Options  
Employment Eligibility Verification (52.222-54)  
Service Contract Inventory (FAR 4.17)  
None of the Above

Interagency Contracting Authority:

Not Applicable

Other Interagency Contracting Statutory Authority:  
(1000 characters)

Principal Place of Performance

Principal Place Of Performance Code:	State	Location	Country
	VA		USA

Principal Place Of Performance County Name: FAIRFAX

Principal Place Of Performance City Name: FALLS CHURCH

Congressional District Place Of Performance: VIRGINIA 08

Place Of Performance Zip Code(+4): 22042 - 7434

Product Or Service Information

Product/Service Code: 5419 Description: COLLECTIVE MODULAR SUPPORT SYSTEM

Principal NAICS Code: 541512 Description: COMPUTER SYSTEMS DESIGN SERVICES

Bundled Contract: Not Bundled

DOD Acquisition Program:

Country of Product or Service Origin: USA UNITED STATES

Place of Manufacture: Mfg in U.S.

Domestic or Foreign Entity: U.S. Owned Business

Recovered Materials/Sustainability: No Clauses Included and No Sustainability Included [OMB Policy on Sustainable Acquisition](#)

InfoTech Commercial Item Category: Select One

Claimant Program Code: Description:

Sea Transportation: Select One

GFP Provided Under This Action: Transaction does not use GFP

Use Of EPA Designated Products: Not Required

Description Of Requirement: (Limit 250 characters)  
Current: 246  
The purpose of this acquisition is to provide OBIM with Program Level Systems Engineering Support and IV&V Testing support for all OBIM systems. OBIM requires contractor support to plan, prioritize,

Competition Information

Extent Competed For Referenced IDV:

Extent Competed: Full and Open Competition after exclusion of sources

Source Selection Process: Trade-off

Solicitation Procedures: Subject to Multiple Award Fair Opportunity

IDV Type Of Set Aside: HUBZone Set-Aside

Type Of Set Aside: Select One

Type Of Set Aside Source: GWAC

Evaluated Preference: No Preference used

SBIR/STTR: Select One

Fair Opportunity/Limited Sources: Fair Opportunity given

Other Than Full And Open Competition: Select One

<b>Local Area Set Aside:</b>	<input type="text" value="Yes"/>	
<b>FedBizOpps:</b>	<input type="text" value="Yes"/>	
<b>A76 Action:</b>	<input type="text" value="No"/>	
<b>Commercial Item Acquisition Procedures:</b>	<input type="text" value="Commercial Item Procedures not used"/>	
<b>IDV Number of Offers:</b>	<input type="text" value="7"/>	
<b>Number Of Offers Received:</b>	<input type="text" value="3"/>	<b>Number of Offers Source:</b> <input type="text" value="This Action"/>
<b>Small Business Competitiveness Demonstration Program:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Simplified Procedures for Certain Commercial Items:</b>	<input type="text" value="No"/>	
<b>Preference Programs / Other Data</b>		
<b>Contracting Officer's Business Size Selection:</b>	<input type="text" value="Small Business"/>	
<b>Subcontract Plan:</b>	<input type="text" value="Plan Not Required"/>	
<b>Price Evaluation Percent Difference:</b>	<input type="text" value=""/> %	

---

# **EXHIBIT B**



Print Close Help

Transaction Information

Award Type: Delivery/Task Order Prepared Date: 05/03/2021 12:59:06 Prepared User: 7001DANIEL.WEINGARTEN
Award Status: Final Last Modified Date: 05/11/2021 07:16:29 Last Modified User: LKEITH7001
Closed Status: No Closed Status Date: Closed By:
Approved Date: 05/11/2021 07:16:29 Approved By: LKEITH7001

Document Information

Award ID: 7001 Procurement Identifier: 70RCSA20FR0000054 Modification No: P00002 Trans No: 0
Referenced IDV ID: 7529 Procurement Identifier: HHSN316201300001W Modification No: P00015
Reason For Modification: EXERCISE AN OPTION
Solicitation ID: 70RCSA20Q00000014
Agency Main Sub Identifier Account Initiative
Treasury Account Symbol: Select One

Dates Amounts
Date Signed: 05/06/2021 Current Total
Period of Performance Start Date: 08/17/2020 Action Obligation: \$12,266,138.54 \$21,317,817.34
Completion Date: 05/16/2024 Base And Exercised Options Value: \$12,266,138.54 \$21,317,817.34
Est. Ultimate Completion Date: 05/16/2024 Base and All Options Value (Total Contract Value): \$0.00 \$46,779,068.23
Solicitation Date: 05/15/2020 Fee Paid for Use of Indefinite Delivery Vehicle: \$0.00

Purchaser Information

Contracting Office Agency ID: 7001 Contracting Office Agency Name: OFFICE OF PROCUREMENT OPERATIONS
Contracting Office ID: 70RDAD Contracting Office Name: DEPT OPS ACQ DIV
Funding Agency ID: 7050 Funding Agency Name: OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MA
Funding Office ID: 70MUS8 Funding Office Name: OFF OF THE UNDER SCTY FOR MGMT
Foreign Funding: Not Applicable

Entity Information

SAM Exception: Remove Exception
Unique Entity ID (DUNS): 621796044 Street: 6402 ARLINGTON BLVD STE 650
Unique Entity ID (SAM): SELVLQN46MM7 Street2:
Legal Business Name: COMPUTER WORLD SERVICES CORP. City: FALLS CHURCH
DBAN: State: VA Zip: 220422351
CAGE Code: 0P8H9 Country: UNITED STATES
Phone: (202) 637-9699
Fax No: (703) 707-6169
Congressional District: VIRGINIA 08

Business Category

Organization Type: CORPORATE NOT TAX EX
State of Incorporation: DC
Country of Incorporation: USA

- Business Types
Labor Surplus Area Firm
Corporate Entity, Not Tax Exempt
Socio Economic Data
Minority Owned Business
Subcontinent Asian (Asian-Indian) American Owned
Relationship With Federal Government
All Awards
Organization Factors
For Profit Organization
Certifications
SBA Certified HUBZone firm
Self-Certified Small Disadvantaged Business

Show Details

Contract Data

Type of Contract: Time and Materials
Inherently Governmental Functions: Other Functions
Multiyear Contract: Select One

Major Program:

National Interest Action:

Cost Or Pricing Data:

Purchase Card Used As Payment Method:

Undefinized Action:

Performance Based Service Acquisition:

\* FY 2004 and prior; 80% or more specified as performance requirement  
\* FY 2005 and later; 50% or more specified as performance requirement

Emergency Acquisition:

Contract Financing:

Cost Accounting Standards Clause:

Consolidated Contract:

Number Of Actions:

Legislative Mandates

Clinger-Cohen Act:

Labor Standards:

Materials, Supplies, Articles, and Equip:

Construction Wage Rate Requirements:

Additional Reporting:

Interagency Contracting Authority:

Other Interagency Contracting Statutory Authority:

(1000 characters)

Product Or Service Information

Product/Service Code:

5419

Description:

COLLECTIVE MODULAR SUPPORT SYSTEM

Principal NAICS Code:

541512

Description:

COMPUTER SYSTEMS DESIGN SERVICES

Bundled Contract:

Not Bundled

DOD Acquisition Program:

Country of Product or Service Origin:

USA

UNITED STATES

Place of Manufacture:

Mfg in U.S.

Domestic or Foreign Entity:

U.S. Owned Business

Recovered Materials/Sustainability:

No Clauses Included and No Sustainability Included

[OMB Policy on Sustainable Acquisition](#)

InfoTech Commercial Item Category:

Select One

Claimant Program Code:

Description:

Sea Transportation:

Select One

GFP Provided Under This Action:

Transaction does not use GFP

Use Of EPA Designated Products:

Not Required

Description Of Requirement:

(Limit 250 characters)

Current: 243

The purpose of this modification to Exercise OY1. CLIN's 1001-1005.PoP 5/17/2021-5/16/2022. Total \$12,266,138.54  
CLIN 1001: IDENT21 000 AR 25-00-00-000 02-12-3000-00-00-00-00 GE-0E-

Competition Information

Extent Competed For Referenced IDV:

Extent Competed:

Source Selection Process:

Solicitation Procedures:

IDV Type Of Set Aside:

Type Of Set Aside:

Type Of Set Aside Source:

Evaluated Preference:

SBIR/STTR:

Fair Opportunity/Limited Sources:

Other Than Full And Open Competition:

None

Select One

No

No

Not Applicable

Not Applicable

Select One

Select One

Not Consolidated

1

Principal Place of Performance

Principal Place Of Performance Code:

State	Location	Country
VA		USA

Principal Place Of Performance County Name:

FAIRFAX

Principal Place Of Performance City Name:

FALLS CHURCH

Congressional District Place Of Performance:

VIRGINIA 08

Place Of Performance Zip Code(+4):

22042 - 7434

<b>Local Area Set Aside:</b>	<input type="text" value="Yes"/>	
<b>FedBizOpps:</b>	<input type="text" value="Yes"/>	
<b>A76 Action:</b>	<input type="text" value="No"/>	
<b>Commercial Item Acquisition Procedures:</b>	<input type="text" value="Commercial Item Procedures not used"/>	
<b>IDV Number of Offers:</b>	<input type="text" value="7"/>	
<b>Number Of Offers Received:</b>	<input type="text" value="3"/>	<b>Number of Offers Source:</b> <input type="text" value="This Action"/>
<b>Small Business Competitiveness Demonstration Program:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<b>Simplified Procedures for Certain Commercial Items:</b>	<input type="text" value="No"/>	
<b>Preference Programs / Other Data</b>		
<b>Contracting Officer's Business Size Selection:</b>	<input type="text" value="Small Business"/>	
<b>Subcontract Plan:</b>	<input type="text" value="Plan Not Required"/>	
<b>Price Evaluation Percent Difference:</b>	<input type="text"/> %	

---