



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
WASHINGTON DC

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY

NOV 03 2009

MEMORANDUM FOR ALMAJCOM/DRU/FOA (Contracting)

FROM: SAF/AQC

SUBJECT: Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI)

Concern about the number of potential and actual OCIs in public contracting has grown significantly and has been the subject of recent sustained GAO-level protests. The Fact Sheet and SAF/GCQ briefing slides that are attached to this memorandum are intended to assist contracting officers in recognizing and adjudicating OCIs in light of relevant case law, with special focus on restrictions that should be placed on conflicted contractors in future acquisitions.

Not all OCIs can be mitigated. There has been an overreliance on firewalls and non-disclosure agreements to try to resolve "biased ground rules" and "impaired objectivity" OCIs, which can only be avoided through the use of restrictions. I caution all of you to exercise "common sense, good judgment, and sound discretion" in assessing whether a conflict exists and not to attempt mitigation for those that must instead be avoided or neutralized.

If you have any questions, please contact Ms. Susan Tackis, SAF/AQCP, susan.tackis@pentagon.af.mil or 703-588-7060.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "R. S. Correll", written over a horizontal line.

ROGER S. CORRELL
Deputy Assistant Secretary (Contracting)
Assistant Secretary (Acquisition)

Attachments:

1. OCI Fact Sheet
2. SAF/GCQ OCI Briefing

FACT SHEET

ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST (OCI)

October, 2009

Biased Ground Rules. When a company assists the Government in setting the ground rules for a future competition, such as performing risk analyses, developing business cases, defining requirements, preparing specifications or work statements, and developing transition strategies, that company and its affiliates shall be restricted from participating in the resulting competition as either a potential prime contractor or subcontractor in order to resolve the OCI. This restriction may be lifted for follow-on competitions after enough time has elapsed to ensure that other companies are no longer disadvantaged.

Impaired Objectivity. When a requirement includes advisory tasks that call for objectivity, a company that has other interests that impair their objectivity shall be restricted from participating in the competition in order to resolve the OCI. Activities that impair objectivity include, but are not limited to, (1) the evaluation of *any* proposal (whether its own or a competitor's) whenever the contractor or any of its affiliates is an offeror in a competition, (2) testing its own articles for acceptance, and (3) overseeing its own employees under an unrelated contract.

Unequal Access to Information. When employees of a company have access to nonpublic information as part of its performance of a Government contract which gives that company or its affiliates an unfair advantage in a later competition, measures must be taken to (1) ensure the information is made available to all offerors, or (2) prevent the disclosure of the information to other employees of the company and its affiliates. Measures to make nonpublic information available to all offerors require that the Government know precisely what information the conflicted company employees have accessed. Absent such knowledge, this OCI avoidance technique would be inappropriate. Measures that might be taken to prevent disclosure include the use of firewalls and non-disclosure agreements (NDAs) established prior to the time the contractor or its employees gain access to the information. Firewalls are a combination of procedures and physical/electronic security arrangements intended to restrict the flow of information either within an organization or between organizations. Non-disclosure mitigation plans must (1) be comprehensive (e.g., include corporate and supervisory NDAs), (2) be approved well before a company's employees are given access to nonpublic information, and (3) clearly define the non-public information to be protected.

Headquarters U.S. Air Force

Integrity - Service - Excellence

Organizational Conflicts of Interest in Services Contracts



**James E. Durkee, YA-03
SAF/GCQ
June 17, 2009**

U.S. AIR FORCE



U.S. AIR FORCE

Acknowledgement

Daniel I. Gordon

***Organizational Conflicts of Interest:
A Growing Integrity Challenge***

35 Public Contract Law Journal 25 (Fall 2005)



Why OCI Are Important Now

U.S. AIR FORCE

- **INDUSTRY CONSOLIDATION**
- **INCREASE IN CONTRACTING FOR ADVISORY AND ASSISTANCE SERVICES, AND OTHER PROFESSIONAL SERVICES**
- **INCREASED USE OF MULTI-AGENCY CONTRACTS**



What Is An OCI? [4,3,2...]

U.S. AIR FORCE

- **FOUR GENERAL RULES UNDER FAR § 9.505 (1988)**
 - **Systems Engineering and Technical Direction**
 - **FAR § 9.505-1**
 - **Preparing Specifications or Work Statements**
 - **FAR § 9.505-2**
 - **Providing Evaluation Services**
 - **FAR § 9.505-3**
 - **Obtaining Access to Proprietary Information**
 - **FAR § 9.505-4**



What Is An OCI? [4,3,2...]

U.S. AIR FORCE

- **THREE GROUPS FROM *Aetna Gov't Health Plans*, B-254397 (1995)**
 - **Biased Ground Rules**
 - **Unequal Access to Information**
 - **Impaired Objectivity**



What Is An OCI? [4,3,2...]

U.S. AIR FORCE

- **TWO OVERARCHING PRINCIPLES (FAR § 9.505(a) & (b))**
 - **Duty to the Government (BIAS → USE RESTRICTIONS)**
 - **Fairness to Contractors (INFORMATION → USE FIREWALLS)**



CO Responsibilities

U.S. AIR FORCE

- **Identify and evaluate potential organizational conflicts of interest as early in the acquisition process as possible. (FAR § 9.504(a))**
- **Avoid, neutralize, or mitigate significant potential conflicts before contract award. (FAR § 9.504(a))**
- **Before issuing a solicitation for a contract that may involve a significant potential conflict, the contracting officer shall recommend to the head of the contracting activity a course of action for resolving the conflict. (FAR § 9.504(c))**
- **Notify the affected contractor and allow a reasonable time to reply. (FAR § 9.504(e))**
- **Obtain copies of contractor-to-contractor nondisclosure agreements and ensure their proper execution. (FAR § 9.505-4(b))**



Contractor Responsibilities

U.S. AIR FORCE

- **A contractor that gains access to proprietary information of other companies in performing advisory and assistance services must agree with the other companies to protect their information. (FAR § 9.505-4(b))**
- **Contractors should make inquiries of marketing consultants to ensure that the marketing consultant has provided no unfair competitive advantage. (FAR § 9.505-4(c))**
- **Through solicitation provisions and/or contract clauses, contractors can be directed to identify OCI and develop a proposed mitigation plan, but it is the Contracting Officer who must take action as set forth in FAR Subpart 9.5.**



Tools

U.S. AIR FORCE

- **BIAS versus INFORMATION**
 - **When BIAS is an issue, consider restrictions on contractor activities (see e.g., *LEADS Corp.*, B-292465, Sept. 26, 2003, 2003 CPD ¶ 197)**
 - **When INFORMATION is an issue, consider using firewalls and non-disclosure agreements, or just disclose the information**
- **AFMC FARS Subpart 5309.5, related solicitation provision, contract clause, and IG5309.504**
- **AFSPC FARS Subpart 5309.5, related solicitation provision, and contract clause**
- **VAAR Subpart 809.5, and related solicitation provision**
- **DEAR Subpart 909.5, related solicitation provisions, and contract clause**



What's the Advantage?

U.S. AIR FORCE

- ***ARINC Engineering Services, Inc. v. United States*, 77 Fed.Cl. 196 (2007) (to make a case of unfair access to information, the protester must show that (i) the awardee had access to nonpublic information that was unavailable to the protester; (ii) the nonpublic information was competitively useful in responding to the solicitation; (iii) by having unequal access to that information, the awardee was afforded an advantage that was unfair; and (iv) not having equal access to that information prejudiced the protester) See *id.* at 202.**



U.S. AIR FORCE

Government Misuse and Abuse of Contractor

- ***Spectrum Sciences and Software, Inc. v. United States*, 84 Fed.Cl. 716 (2008)** An improper disclosure of proprietary information by an agency risks creating an organizational conflict of interest.

“By placing officials who had worked closely with Spectrum under the [contract by which proprietary information was accessed] onto the [unrelated requirement] procurement team, the Air Force paved the way for proprietary information from the former effort to leak (and eventually gush) into the latter. Use of this staffing, which, at the least, risked creating an organizational conflict of interest, gave the warnings made by several Air Force officials that [the procurement team] should not rely on anything that Spectrum had produced a decidedly hollow ring.” *Id.* at 742.



Alion Protest Sustained

U.S. AIR FORCE

- ***Alion Science & Technology Corporation, B-297342, Jan. 9, 2006, 2006 CPD ¶ 1, and B-297022.3, Jan. 9, 2006, 2006 CPD ¶ 2***
 - **Awardee's conflicts of interest stemmed from performing services analysis, evaluation, and the exercise subjective judgment in formulating policies and regulations affecting the sale or use of products manufactured by the awardee or the awardee's competitors. Protest is sustained where record does not support the agency's assessment.**
 - **Bias ground rules.**



U.S. AIR FORCE

Alion Protest Corrected: Is a “Firewall” a Solution to Bias?

- ***Alion Science & Technology Corporation, B-297022.3, Jan. 9, 2006, 2006 CPD ¶ 2***
 - **Agency's corrective actions remedied the prior procurement flaws by reasonably concluding that awardee's plan to perform conflicted portions of the contract through use of “firewalled” subcontractors will adequately avoid, neutralize, or mitigate the potential conflicts of interest.**
 - **How do you “firewall” bias? In reality, this was really a restriction on what the contractor could do, not on the information it had.**



U.S. AIR FORCE

Government Cannot Meet Responsibility by Transferring It

- ***Nortel Government Solutions, Inc., B-299522.5, B-299522.6, Dec. 30, 2008, 2009 CPD ¶ 10***
 - Offeror was required to review and provide input on designs proposed by itself under separate contract with same agency.
 - Agency improperly adopted offeror's mitigation plan because it did not avoid, mitigate, or neutralize the OCI. The mitigation plan merely relied on agency's existing process that made government responsible for final decisions.
 - Agency must identify and resolve integrity issues and organizational conflicts of interest.



U.S. AIR FORCE

Rule #1: Don't Embarrass Yourself or Your Agency

- ***Superlative Technologies, Inc.***, B-310489, B-310489.2, Jan. 4, 2008, 2008 CPD ¶ 12; and B-310489.4, June 3, 2008, 2008 CPD ¶ 123
 - Agency cancelled solicitation based on a potential “unfair advantage” provided to certain offerors as a result of the agency’s disclosure of information to those offerors.
 - Agency subsequently sole-sourced the contract to a team that included one of the offerors *to whom the information was disclosed!*
 - Agency must identify and resolve integrity issues and organizational conflicts of interest.



U.S. AIR FORCE

Government Cannot Meet Responsibility by Ignoring It

- ***AT & T Government Solutions, B-400216, Aug. 28, 2008, 2008 CPD ¶ 170***
 - **Firm eliminated from competition due to perceived OCI.**
 - **But agency failed to (1) evaluate protester's proposed mitigation plan, (2) consider whether protester would actually be in a position to evaluate its own products, and (3) did not give protester notice of and an opportunity to respond to OCI findings prior to firm's disqualification.**
 - **Agency must identify and resolve integrity issues and organizational conflicts of interest.**



Remote and Speculative

U.S. AIR FORCE

- ***Marinette Marine Corporation, B-400697, B-400697.2, B-400697.3, Jan. 12, 2009, 2009 CPD ¶ 16***
 - **Advice provided to awardee in preparing its proposal by entity that also assisted the agency in evaluating the proposals. It was OK, because...**
 - **The record showed that (1) the entity also provided advice to the protester, (2) any potential benefit to the entity is speculative and too remote (no financial interest), and (3) there is no reasonable possibility of prejudice because the entity was more critical of the awardee's proposal than it was of the protester's.**



Personal Conflicts of Interest?

U.S. AIR FORCE

- ***Savannah River Alliance*, B-311126, B-311126.2, B-311126.3, B-311126.4, Apr. 25, 2008, 2008 CPD ¶ 88**
 - **Allegation: Organizational conflicts of interest exist due to the employment of several of the awardee's key personnel.**
 - **Denied: Any conflict, if it exists, is personal to the employees, and not the organization, and is too speculative to impute to their employers.**
 - **How do we deal with personal conflicts of interest?**



Another Personal Conflict?

U.S. AIR FORCE

- ***Detica*, B-400523, B-400523.2, Dec. 2, 2008, 2008 CPD ¶ 217**
 - **“Biased ground rules” protest denied!**
 - **Record showed that former agency official working for successful vendor had not participated in planning the acquisition or preparing the solicitation.**
 - **Note: Many statutes and regulations address ethics and Government employee conflicts.**



U.S. AIR FORCE

Related Topics

- **Inherently Governmental Functions**

- **Personal Services Contracts**



Personal Conflicts of Interest

U.S. AIR FORCE

- **Personal Conflicts of Interest**
 - FAR Case 2007-017 (on hold until 2008-025 complete)
 - FAR Case 2008-025; NDAA FY09 Sec. 841 (OFPP reviewing draft proposed rule prepared by FAR Council analyst)
 - Making Gov't PCI Rules Apply to Contractors
 - Privacy Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552a (i) & (m)
 - IPA, 5 U.S.C. § 3374(c)(2)
 - ITEP, 5 U.S.C. § 3704(b)(2)
 - DOSAR 48 C.F.R. § 603.601
 - 18 USC 201 (bribery) versus 208 (conflicts of interest)



U.S. AIR FORCE

What's on the Horizon?

Stay tuned!