

JUSTIFICATION AND APPROVAL FOR OTHER THAN FULL AND OPEN COMPETITION

- 1. Requesting Agency:** Department of Veterans Affairs
Engineering (138)
4100 West Third Street
Dayton, Ohio 45428-9000

Contracting Activity: Department of Veterans Affairs
Network Contracting Office (NCO) 10
3140 Governor's Place Blvd. – Suite 210
Kettering, OH 45409-1337

2. Nature and/or description of the action:

Request approval to use other than full and open competition to solicit on a Brand Name Only Physical Access Control System (PACS) manufactured by Honeywell for use on:

Project No. 552-17-510 – Warehouse Upgrades at B-143

3. Description of the supplies or services required to meet the agency's needs:

PACS devices, consisting of controls/communications panels, electronic security management systems, door control modules, card reader/keypad combinations, portal control devices, and entry control devices.

~~XXXXXXXXXX \$5,000~~

4. Statutory authority permitting other than full and open competition.

This request is submitted pursuant to the authority of Title 10 U.S.C. 2304(c) (1) or 41 U.S.C. 253(c) (1), which provides that full and open competition need not be obtained where there is "only one responsible source and no other supplies or services will satisfy agency requirements". FAR Part 6.302-1(c) "Only one responsible source and no other supplies or services will satisfy agency requirements."

5. A demonstration that the proposed contractor's unique qualifications or the nature of the acquisition requires use of the authority cited.

The PSCS devices that are to be installed as part of this project represent an extension of the existing Honeywell PACS at our facility. As such, each new device must tie into and communicate with the existing Facility PACS, which is manufactured by Honeywell. Each device in a PACS, whether it's a card reader or control panel, constantly communicates with the front end of the PACS. This allows the system to monitor each and every device, so that it cannot only

receive alarms, but also can detect failures of the device as well – which is a critical element in any PACS. Software conflicts would make it difficult to impossible for devices by another manufacturer to communicate with the existing Honeywell System, and could result in circumventing the Physical Security of the Medical Center.

6. A description of efforts made to ensure that offers are solicited from as many potential sources as is practicable, including whether a notice was or will be publicized.

Research has shown that in the industry, it is standard for each PACS to have their own proprietary software which prohibits communication between different manufacturers. There is just too much at risk from an operations standpoint to attempt to intermingle manufacturers on a PACS; this facility has a Honeywell PACS, and we should only add devices to it that are manufactured by Honeywell. This solicitation will be publicized via FedBizOpps.

7. Determination by the Contracting Officer that the anticipated cost to the Government will be fair and reasonable.

Determination of fair and reasonableness of cost will be based upon a complete price analysis and Independent Government Cost Estimate (IGCE).

8. Description of the market research conducted and the results or a statement of the reason market research was not conducted.

Market research was not conducted. The cost for services will be compared with commercially published price lists and catalogs for similar door lock sets.

9. Other facts supporting the use of other than full and open competition, such as:

Maintenance and system familiarity, while secondary to the issues of warranty or UL Listing, are other important factors to consider. Engineering is charged with maintaining this system, Police Service is responsible for administering the system, and the rest of the facility is charged with responding appropriately. Attempting to introduce a PACS of a different manufacture with different software would no doubt compromise the ability of Police Service to maintain the physical security of the facility efficiently, let alone the other issues of how it would be able to communicate with the existing PACS.

10. A listing of the sources interested in the acquisition.

Honeywell

11. A statement of the actions, if any, the agency may take to remove or overcome any barriers to competition before any subsequent acquisition for the supplies or services required.

Solicitations for future requirements will utilize "brand name or equal" language, if it is in the Government's best interest to do so. The current requirement must be solicited using a brand name description because the Government needs to create an exact copy of a system/item that is currently in use.

12. Certification requirement:

I certify the supporting data, including the statement of the Government's minimum needs and other rationale for other than full and open competition is complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge. (FAR Subpart 6.303-1(b)).

The assertions and recommendations in support of the justification have been prepared by:

Chris Moorhead
Project Engineer/COR

Phone: (937) 268-6511 Ext. 2830

Contracting Officers Certification

The Contract Specialist has determined that the justification is accurate and complete to the best of the Contracting Officer's knowledge and belief.

Mathew Curtis
Contract Specialist

(Date)

Concur/Non-concur: ~~Non-concur~~

Robert Ivey
Contracting Officer

08/15/2017
(Date)