Response to Questions from the Evaluation Committee

Proposal

Use or disclosure of information contained on this sheet is subject to the restrictions on the title page of this proposal.

1

Q1: Miscellaneous

Please provide the number of Working Knowledge^{CSP} hours your company had in each of the companies/clients you provided examples to in your proposal. Please break out the work/deliverable and number of hours for each. Please use this format or a similar format in your response.

Q1: Response

Department of Veteran Affairs Acquisition Academy

The project that we provided as past performance that was most similar to the desired ETF KM outcomes in the entirety is the Department of Veteran Affairs Acquisition Academy (VAAA) Next Generation Knowledge Management (KM) Framework.

The following table shows our estimated breakout in the format ETF requested.

Company/Client: Department of Veteran Affairs Acquisition Academy (VAAA)	Working Knowledge^{CSP} Hours
Gap Analysis*	175
Taxonomy Analysis	40
Phased Implementation Plan	130
Service:	N/A
TOTAL Number of Hours	345

*includes similar Software, Tools & Methods analysis

This effort was Phase I of a multi-year project and is reflected above. The Phase II effort implemented the recommendations. Phase II is ongoing and in its third year of implementation of this multiyear investment effort by the VAAA.

 We have also attached the contract award and the Performance Work Statement (PWS) supporting this effort for reference.

The Lubrizol Corporation

This project involved one plant in the company with a plant workforce of 700+ employees. In addition to the scope of the effort described in Section 6.3 of our ETF proposal, please note this effort was tailored to focus on one issue using our knowledge flow and use survey tool and its results. Outcomes included:

1. Assess the flow and use of critical knowledge within and across Plant operations including the identification of challenges (gaps) and associated risks that marginalize the effective flow and use of knowledge across the Plant
2. Assess the impacts of current knowledge use and flow processes, practices, and methods on the ability to mitigate the challenges of workforce turnover and knowledge loss
3. Recommend mitigation to the challenges and associated risks identified.

Company/Client: The Lubrizol Corporation	Working Knowledge^{CSP} Hours
Survey Development and Deployment	16
Follow up Interviews, Analysis and Recommendations	40
Service:	N/A
TOTAL Number of Hours	56

Inter-American Development Bank

Proposal

Use or disclosure of information contained on this sheet is subject to the restrictions on the title page of this proposal.

2

This project involved an external review of the IDB KM Teams deployment of KM concepts, strategies, implementing practices, and enabling technology. The scope of the effort is described in Section 6.3.

Company/Client: Inter-American Development Bank	Working Knowledge[CSP] Hours
Research, Observation, Interviews, Baseline Development	25
Assessment	30
Recommendations	20
Service:	N/A
TOTAL Number of Hours	75

Proposal

Use or disclosure of information contained on this sheet is subject to the restrictions on the title page of this proposal.

3

Q2: The evaluation committee calculated the following Working Knowledge^{CSP} hours listed in the Vendor Hours column in the table below which reflects the number of hours your company had provided for each of the deliverables. Please verify if these are the numbers of Working Knowledge^{CSP} hours to complete each deliverable.

Section	Deliverable	Vendor Hours
5.1.1	Gap Analysis	126
5.1.2	Taxonomy Analysis	54
5.1.3	Assessment of current knowledge management Software, Tools & Methods	54
5.1.4	Phased Implementation Plan	126
Overall Not-to-Exceed Cost Total (Basis of Award)		360

Q2: Response

The overall hours proposed for the ETF effort are the estimated hours that we believe not only will deliver the desired ETF outcomes, but also will exceed your expectations.

As a comparison for price reasonableness, please refer to the reference VAAA project identified in Section 6.3 and discussed in the answer to Q1 above. The requirements and acquisition outcomes desired by the ETF are very similar in content and scope to the requirements defined by the VAAA and awarded as Phase I of this two Phase effort.

The VAAA requirements and the desired VAAA KM outcomes are shown in the relevant contract extract that is attached. The estimating model for the VAAA Phase I effort ($98,000 for the VAAA and $91,800 for the ETF) is consistent for both efforts for these organizations of similar size, scope, and understood complexity.

The period of performance for the VAAA Phase I effort extended from April 2011 to Dec 2011 with an additional month included at the VAAA's request to ensure time to review the deliverables. Contract value was $98,000 comprising $95,000 for direct labor and $3000 of other direct costs. The Contracting Officer awarded Working Knowledge^{CSP} an Excellent rating in the Contractor Performance Assessment Review (CPAR) system, a rating we continued to earn in the ongoing Phase II implementation effort. This is an indication that we not only understood the requirements, but also proposed the work accurately, meeting or exceeding all cost, schedule and technical requirements.

We also use an "IV&V" approach to proposals. Kent Greenes, a world recognized KM expert and practitioner, who we have identified as a subject matter expert in support of this effort, did an independent review of the proposal for quality and relevance. We believe that we have (1) fairly and reasonably assessed the effort required based on past experience and that (2) our risk of poor performance from a source selection evaluation perspective would be judged low. We believe our experience and past performance demonstrate this.

Finally, in comparison to other KM Consulting organizations:
1. The experienced consultants who deliver the ETF effort are also the consultants who develop the proposals.

2. As a service disabled veteran owned small business (SDVOSB), we can maintain low overhead.
3. We understand the knowledge management domain, the types of challenges facing organizations like the ETF, and believe we fairly well understand your desired outcomes.
4. Because of our extensive experience as KM practitioners as well as consultants, we are efficient and effective in our efforts, proposing only what we believe is required the meet our clients' requirements.
5. Our past performance demonstrates not only quality of delivery and customer experience, but also accuracy in estimating the effort, fairly and reasonably.

Proposal

Use or disclosure of information contained on this sheet is subject to the restrictions on the title page of this proposal.

5

Q3: Page 76
The RFP Assumption listed to RFP Section 7.4 is a little misleading and hard for the evaluation committee to fully understand the meaning behind *"Working KnowledgeCSP Team will have access to all necessary sites, technology, and personnel in order to deliver the requirements of the RFP."*

Please elaborate a more detailed explanation behind the meaning of the RFP Assumption to Section 7.4. Include in your response the distinction between on-site versus off-site access.

Q3: Response
This assumption addresses one of the risks we identified in our response to Section 7.1, Key Obstacles, Risks, and Environment, specifically Logistics, noted in Tab 4, on p.37 of our proposal. We know from KM project experience that in order to maintain schedule and overall contract commitments, timely access to needed client sites, technology, and personnel is required to complete the project.

For scope of access, all organizations have different challenges ranging from unique security rules on access, physical access, privacy issues, and the like. We also know that careful planning and scheduling will be required between our team and the ETF team and through this planning and coordination, many potential issues can be prevented. This assumption addresses the fact that access to the sites, technology, and personnel is a contributing factor to project success.

For example, will badges be required, and if they are provided, will we have the ability to move freely to deliver the project, or will we need escorts? Will we have access to content, technology and systems we need to understand and assess technology and applications to better understand how they work, how they are used, and how they support your work processes? Inability to access what is needed when it is needed can delay the effort and otherwise impact both schedule and delivery. On a fixed price effort, this is particularly important.

With respect to "on-site vs. off-site" access, will we have the ability to securely access ETF technology and applications while not on-site? While not required for successful delivery, it certainly helps. Based on previous projects of all types, we know that each client has different rules, restrictions, and permissions in this area...sometimes granted and sometimes not.

Proposal
Use or disclosure of information contained on this sheet is subject to the restrictions on the title page of this proposal.

6