

AN A.S. PRATT PUBLICATION

SEPTEMBER 2015

VOL. 1 • NO. 6

PRATT'S  
**GOVERNMENT  
CONTRACTING  
LAW**  
REPORT



**EDITOR'S NOTE: PARTNERSHIPS AND PROPOSALS**

Steven A. Meyerowitz

**PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS - IS THIS A NEW CONCEPT IN GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING?**

Vincent J. Napoleon and Diana Vilmenay

**NEW PROPOSED REGULATIONS AND GUIDANCE FOR FEDERAL CONTRACTORS: COMPLYING WITH PRESIDENT OBAMA'S FAIR PAY AND SAFE WORKPLACES EXECUTIVE ORDER**

Craig A. Holman, Ronald D. Lee, and Joshua F. Alloy

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATIONS POSE SUBSTANTIAL NEW BURDENS AND RISKS FOR FEDERAL CONTRACTORS - PART II**

Jon A. Geier, Kenneth W. Gage, Blake R. Bertagna, Zina Deldar, and Alex J. Maturi

**PROPOSED SUBCONTRACTING AND AFFILIATION RULES MAY AID SMALL BUSINESS PRIME CONTRACTORS**

C. Joël Van Over and Meghan D. Doherty

**A BAD DAY FOR PROPOSAL CONSULTANTS - GAO FINDS AGENCY MAY REASONABLY PROHIBIT USE OF CONSULTANTS FOR PROPOSAL PREPARATION PURPOSES**

Paul F. Khoury and Brian Walsh

**SEC ENFORCEMENT ACTION PUTS PUBLICLY-TRADED CONTRACTORS' INTERNAL INVESTIGATION POLICIES IN THE CROSSHAIRS**

Robert K. Tompkins and William M. Pannier

**IN THE COURTS**

Steven A. Meyerowitz

# PRATT'S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT

---

VOLUME 1

NUMBER 6

SEPTEMBER 2015

---

**Editor's Note: Partnerships and Proposals**

Steven A. Meyerowitz

173

**Public-Private Partnerships—Is This a New Concept in Government Contracting?**

Vincent J. Napoleon and Diana Vilmenay

176

**New Proposed Regulations and Guidance for Federal Contractors: Complying with President Obama's Fair Pay and Safe Workplaces Executive Order**

Craig A. Holman, Ronald D. Lee, and Joshua F. Alloy

185

**Proposed Amendments to the Federal Acquisition Regulations Pose Substantial New Burdens and Risks for Federal Contractors—Part II**

Jon A. Geier, Kenneth W. Gage, Blake R. Bertagna, Zina Deldar, and Alex J. Maturi

191

**Proposed Subcontracting and Affiliation Rules May Aid Small Business Prime Contractors**

C. Joël Van Over and Meghan D. Doherty

199

**A Bad Day for Proposal Consultants—GAO Finds Agency May Reasonably Prohibit Use of Consultants for Proposal Preparation Purposes**

Paul F. Khoury and Brian Walsh

203

**SEC Enforcement Action Puts Publicly-Traded Contractors' Internal Investigation Policies in the Crosshairs**

Robert K. Tompkins and William M. Pannier

206

**In the Courts**

Steven A. Meyerowitz

209

**QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?**

---

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please call:

Heidi A. Litman at ..... 516-771-2169  
Email: ..... heidi.a.litman@lexisnexis.com

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at ..... (800) 833-9844  
Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (518) 487-3000  
Fax Number ..... (518) 487-3584  
Customer Service Web site ..... <http://www.lexisnexis.com/custserv/>  
For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call

Your account manager or ..... (800) 223-1940  
Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (518) 487-3000

---

Library of Congress Card Number:

ISBN: 978-1-6328-2705-0 (print)

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [article title], [vol. no.] PRATT’S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT [page number] (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt);  
Michelle E. Litteken, GAO Holds NASA Exceeded Its Discretion in Protest of FSS Task Order, 1 PRATT’S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT 30 (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

Because the section you are citing may be revised in a later release, you may wish to photocopy or print out the section for convenient future reference.

This publication is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. A.S. Pratt is a registered trademark of Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license.

Copyright © 2015 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., or Reed Elsevier Properties SA, in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

*An A.S. Pratt® Publication*

Editorial Offices  
630 Central Ave., New Providence, NJ 07974 (908) 464-6800  
201 Mission St., San Francisco, CA 94105-1831 (415) 908-3200  
[www.lexisnexis.com](http://www.lexisnexis.com)

MATTHEW  BENDER

# *Editor-in-Chief, Editor, & Board of Editors*

---

**EDITOR-IN-CHIEF**

**STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ**

*President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.*

**EDITOR**

**VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS**

*Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.*

**BOARD OF EDITORS**

**MARY BETH BOSCO**

*Partner, Holland & Knight LLP*

**DARWIN A. HINDMAN III**

*Shareholder, Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC*

**J. ANDREW HOWARD**

*Partner, Alston & Bird LLP*

**KYLE R. JEFCOAT**

*Counsel, Latham & Watkins LLP*

**JOHN E. JENSEN**

*Partner, Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP*

**DISMAS LOCARIA**

*Partner, Venable LLP*

**MARCIA G. MADSEN**

*Partner, Mayer Brown LLP*

**KEVIN P. MULLEN**

*Partner, Jenner & Block*

**VINCENT J. NAPOLEON**

*Partner, Nixon Peabody LLP*

**STUART W. TURNER**

*Counsel, Arnold & Porter LLP*

**WALTER A.I. WILSON**

*Senior Partner, Polsinelli PC*

PRATT'S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT is published twelve times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Copyright 2015 Reed Elsevier Properties SA., used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. All rights reserved. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or

incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For permission to photocopy or use material electronically from *Pratt's Government Contracting Law Report*, please access [www.copyright.com](http://www.copyright.com) or contact the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc. (CCC), 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, 978-750-8400. CCC is a not-for-profit organization that provides licenses and registration for a variety of users. For subscription information and customer service, call 1-800-833-9844. Direct any editorial inquires and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, [smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com](mailto:smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com), 718.224.2258. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to government contractors, attorneys and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, and senior business executives. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Pratt's Government Contracting Law Report*, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 630 Central Avenue, New Providence, NJ 07974.

# A Bad Day for Proposal Consultants—GAO Finds Agency May Reasonably Prohibit Use of Consultants for Proposal Preparation Purposes

*By Paul F. Khoury and Brian Walsh\**

*The Government Accountability Office recently ruled that it was not unduly restrictive of competition for an agency to include in a solicitation a provision that prohibits the use of consultants for proposal preparation purposes—specifically, the preparation of sample task order responses. The authors of this article explain the decision and how it could significantly affect how companies prepare proposals.*

In an interesting decision that could significantly affect how companies prepare proposals, the Government Accountability Office (“GAO”) ruled that it was not unduly restrictive of competition for an agency to include in a solicitation a provision that prohibits the use of consultants for proposal preparation purposes—specifically, the preparation of sample task order responses. This decision opens the door for other agencies similarly to bar the use of proposal consultants in future solicitations—a result that might prove burdensome for both smaller government contractors that lack the in-house resources necessary to prepare significant proposals, and larger government contractors that rely on consultants to supplement their in-house proposal preparation resources.

## **ADVANCED COMMUNICATION CABLING, INC.**

The GAO recently issued its public decision in *Advanced Communication Cabling, Inc.*<sup>1</sup> In this pre-award protest of a Department of Veterans Affairs (“VA”) solicitation, Advanced Communication challenged the reasonableness of a clause expressly prohibiting offerors from using consultants to assist them in preparing their sample task responses and requiring offerors to certify that their sample task responses were prepared only by themselves and their subcontractors. The solicitation provided that the agency would not consider proposals that did not include the certification or that provided false certifications. Advanced Communications argued that this prohibition was improper because, among other reasons, it might force a small business to subcontract with a large business to complete its proposal, potentially calling into question

---

\* Paul F. Khoury is a partner and Brian Walsh is an associate at Wiley Rein LLP, where they represent government contractors on a broad range of matters. The authors may be contacted at pkhoury@wileyrein.com and bwalsh@wileyrein.com, respectively.

<sup>1</sup> B-410898.2 (Mar. 25, 2015).

the small business's size status, and otherwise was not needed to meet any minimum need of the agency.

In response to Advanced Communication's protest, the agency argued that the solicitation provision was reasonable, because it helped ensure that the responses received by the agency would reflect the technical abilities of the offerors and their subcontractors, and not those of outside experts who would not be involved in performing the contract. The agency went on to argue that this restriction would reduce the risk of unsuccessful performance because it made it more likely that the agency's technical evaluation would be based on the knowledge and abilities of the individuals who would actually be involved in performing under an awarded contract. The agency further noted that, in its experience, the use of consultants to prepare sample task responses has resulted in the agency receiving identical responses from multiple offerors, despite the fact that the offerors' teams were comprised of entirely different members.

GAO found the agency's rationale for its inclusion of the clause reasonable, explaining that because the fundamental purpose underlying the sample task order's requirement is to gauge an offeror's ability to successfully perform the contract, it was reasonable to require that the sample task responses be prepared by the firms proposed to perform the contract, as opposed to outside consultants who have not been identified as members of the offeror's team. GAO likened the prohibition to an agency's decision to consider only the experience and past performance of contractors with which the agency will have contractual privity. GAO noted that, in such cases, it had found that the government's desire to reduce the risk of unsuccessful performance was rationally achieved by restricting its consideration of experience and past performance to the firms contractually obligated to meet the agency's requirements. Thus, while GAO agreed with Advanced Communication's observation that the provision at issue did not guarantee that the same individuals who prepare the sample task responses will also perform under the contract, GAO still found the provision reasonable as it eliminated the possibility that an offeror will submit sample task responses that do not reflect its own technical ability because the responses were prepared by an outside consultant. Lastly, while GAO recognized that this prohibition might burden small contractors more than large contractors, this fact alone was not enough to find the clause unreasonable when it was necessary to meet a legitimate agency need-in this case, attempting to reduce the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

## CONCLUSION

How other agencies react to GAO's decision in *Advanced Communication* could lead to a significant impact on proposal preparation, particularly in response to solicitations involving sample tasks. Critics of the procurement

process have commented over the years that source selections are often based more on who is a better proposal writer than who has the ability to actually perform the work. The VA in this procurement apparently wanted to address this concern. Time will tell if other agencies follow suit.