



SeNet International Corporation
Technology Solutions You Can Trust

December 15, 2015 via FEDEX

Ms. Sara W. Sloane
Procurement Division
Metro Government of Nashville and Davidson County
Suite 112, Lindsley Hall Building
730 2nd Avenue South
Nashville, TN 37219

RE: Intent to award letter e-mailed on 12/14/2015

PROTEST

SeNet International Corporation (SeNet) hereby files a protest against the intent to award of the solicitation RFQ 780211 - Information Security Management Program Consultant – to Berry Dunn. SeNet was notified of this intent to award in an e-mail sent on 12/14/2015 and signed by Ms. Sara W. Sloane. Attached to the e-mail was a document called “Final Consensus Score”.

SeNet believes that its scores were not properly assigned and calculated. We request that Metro Government revise SeNet’s score and award the solicitation to SeNet based on the revised score. Our justifications for this action are based on the submitted proposal and the presentation delivered in Nashville by our representative Mr. Steve Davis, and are provided below.

1. SeNet submitted the lowest price proposal and therefore is entitled for the highest possible score of 24. The follow-up e-mail from Ms. Sloane confirms that the score was inadvertently misplaced and should have been 24 instead of 12.90. This brings our total score to 70.00, without contention.
2. The following factors are listed in the “Final Consensus Score” as SeNet Proposal’s weaknesses (SeNet’s responses included with each factor):
 - a. The offered services did not mention security consulting and policy experience.

In Section 2, EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS of our proposal Table 2: SeNet Services clearly lists the following services which are directly applicable to this effort:

3040 Williams Drive Suite 510, Fairfax, VA 22031 | P: (703)206-9383 | F: (703)206-9666
www.senet-int.com

- Compliance Verification & Validation
- Risk Assessment
- Security Program Planning
- System Security Planning
- Business Continuity/Disaster Recovery Planning
- Policies & Procedures Development

In addition, Mr. Davis covered this area in great detail during his presentation. He showed examples of redacted policies and reports that we had previously written. He further stated that we performed various security consulting tasks for numerous federal, state and commercial clients and provided several examples of such engagements.

This weakness therefore should be disregarded.

- b. The Corporate Experience and Capacity section did not address Offeror’s financial capacity to perform. The section did not address current workload versus current staffing so it is unclear whether Offeror has the capacity to perform immediately if awarded the contract.

While we did not provide this information in the proposal, Mr. Davis addressed this requirement in detail during his presentation and subsequent questions from the Metro representatives. He stated that SeNet maintained “a bench” of personnel that we would use and could begin work within 5 days of contract award. He covered the fact that we use our own employees, do not depend on subcontractors, and that we did not hire personnel and then let them go upon the completion of a task. He stated that our average employee was with the company for over 5 years. We believe we provided sufficient information to prove that we have ample qualified resources to perform the task on schedule.

This weakness therefore should be disregarded.

- c. The deliverables were presented as bullet points and it was unclear how the work would be accomplished.

The proposed methods for conducting the work are clearly referenced in Section 3 of the proposal. Mr. Davis additionally briefed Metro on our delivery methodology

We request that this weakness be reviewed and revised.

- d. The timeline for completing the work seems unrealistic.

SeNet has almost 18 years of experience performing tasks similar to the one solicited by Metro. We have a very good history of performing these tasks on time and within budget. We used our experience when developing the proposed schedule and are standing by it. SeNet would be willing to provide project risk mitigation plan if requested. This issue was not brought up during Mr. Davis’s presentation in Nashville, but nothing in the solicitation or in the presentation meeting caused us to question our proposed schedule – we still stand by it.

This weakness therefore should be disregarded.

- e. A business plan was not specifically identified.

This statement contradicts the high score of 32 points on this criteria assigned to SeNet's submission.

This weakness therefore should be disregarded.

f. References were based on vulnerability assessments.

In the reference section of the proposal, we provided three customers where we had written policy, conducted tests, and provided training. It's all in the chart as well as the 3 reference boxes. Department of Education speaks to auditing, as well as accomplishing the interviews and examinations to determine if controls are in place and the documentation of these results in work-papers. The last sentence in the City of Alexandria reference states "In 2015, SeNet interviewed the deputy CISO to determine the organization's information security policy requirements and drafted an overall information security policy using industry standards, such as NIST 800-53, Security Forum's Standard of Good Practice, etc."

This weakness therefore should be disregarded.

g. Much of the services would be done remotely with little to no onsite presence.

SeNet does not understand why this is listed as a weakness. In each client engagement, we strive to reduce the burden on the client's staff as much as possible. This includes spending the minimal amount of time on site, primarily for access to the facilities and computing environment. All other activities are performed remotely. This discussion took place while Mr. Davis was in Nashville, and he came out with the understanding that one week on site is what the Metro representatives expected from contractors, and we concur with this estimate.

SeNet considers our desire to reduce the imposition on the client's time and attention a strength, not a weakness, and therefore request that this review comment be disregarded.

The responses to the review comments marked as weaknesses provided above by SeNet show that our scores in two criteria: Corporate Experience & Capacity and References – must be revised upwards, making SeNet a clear winner of the competition. Even if the scores are not revised, the marginal difference in the intended winning bid score (72.70 points) and SeNet's corrected score (70.00) hardly justifies a six-fold increase in cost to Nashville.

In conclusion, SeNet request that the intent to award to Berry Dunn be revoked and the award is made to SeNet International Corporation.

V/R

Toly Kozushin

President

SeNet International Corporation