

## **Attachment #01 - Section M - Functional Category 1 (FC1) – Optimization**

### **Section M. Evaluation Factors for Award**

Each Functional Category will have its own Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award

#### **Basis of Award - Functional Category 1 (FC1) – Optimization - Organizational Services Task & Customer Experience Task**

In accordance with FAR 52.215-1(f), the Government intends to award multiple contracts to the responsible Offerors whose proposals represent the best value. Best value is defined in FAR Part 2 as the expected outcome of an acquisition that in the Government's estimation, provides the greatest overall benefit in response to the requirement. Evaluations will be conducted utilizing the Best Value Tradeoff process. A Source Selection Evaluation Panel will evaluate all proposals based on the proposal/documentation provided. The evaluations will be based on the evaluation criteria set forth below.

#### **Multi-Phased Procurement with Advisory Down-select**

The Government intends to conduct this procurement through a multi-phased submission. This acquisition is being governed by FAR Part 12 and in conjunction with FAR Part 15 utilizing an advisory down-select in-between phases. This process is not the same as FAR 15.202 advisory multi-step process.

#### **Advisory Down-select Notification**

After the Government completes evaluation of Phase I submissions (Factors 1 and 2), Offerors will receive an advisory notification via email from the Contracting Officer. Proposals that rate most highly for Factors 1 and 2 will be advised to proceed to Phase II. Proposals that were not among the most highly rated will be advised not to proceed to Phase II as they are unlikely to be viable competitors. An advisory notification that an Offeror's proposal is not amongst the most highly rated is not considered an exclusion from competition or the competitive range and does not constitute a debriefing under FAR 15.505.

Offerors will be advised that Phase I and Phase II evaluation results will be included in the award decision. The intent of this advice is to minimize proposal development costs for proposals with little chance of receiving an award. This will be advisory only and discontinuing the pursuit of the requirement following the notification is voluntary. The Government does not intend to provide a brief explanation after the completion of the advisory down-select notifications.

An Offeror's failure to participate in Phase I precludes further consideration. Offeror submissions for Phase II will not be accepted from Offerors who have not submitted Phase I requirements by the due date and time provided in this solicitation.

Offerors wishing to proceed to Phase II shall provide their notice of intent to the Government in accordance with the instructions in the advisory notification. The Government intends to allow Offerors two (2) days to decide whether they wish to proceed with a Phase II submission. Phase II consists of Factors 3 and 4. All Phase II factors will be evaluated concurrently.

#### **The Government Intends to Award Without Discussions**

Pursuant to FAR 52.215-1, the Government intends to evaluate proposals and award an IDIQ(s) without discussions with Offerors. However, the right to conduct discussions is reserved if the Contracting Officer later determines it necessary. While the Government intends to ask questions during Oral Presentations, the Government will NOT invite or allow the Offeror to change its proposal.

1. The Government reserves the right to make award on initial proposal. Therefore, the initial proposal should contain the Offeror's best terms from a technical and price standpoint.
2. The Government may engage in clarifications on aspects of the proposal.

## **Attachment #01 - Section M - Functional Category 1 (FC1) – Optimization**

3. Exchanges conducted for clarification will not constitute a request for proposal revision as described in FAR 15.306(a).

### **Competitive Range Determination/ Discussions**

If the Government decides to conduct exchanges and allow proposal revisions, the Government will establish a competitive range of offers and hold discussions. In the event of discussions, selection will not be made on initial offers and a competitive range comprised of the most highly rated proposals shall be established in accordance with FAR 15.306(c). If discussions are deemed necessary, the Contracting Officer shall establish a competitive range based on the ratings of each proposal against all evaluation criteria. If the Contracting Officer determines the number of proposals, that would otherwise be in the competitive range, exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted, the Contracting Officer may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly rated proposals. Discussions, as defined in FAR 15.306(d) and FAR 52.215-1(a), will be conducted with all Offerors included in the competitive range. Offerors whose proposals are not included in the competitive range will be notified. After discussions, each Offeror remaining in the competitive range will be given an opportunity to submit a revised proposal. If, after discussions, an Offeror originally in the competitive range is no longer considered to be among the most highly rated offers being considered for award, that Offeror may be eliminated from the competitive range.

### **Debriefings**

If the Government decides to hold discussions, Offerors excluded from the competitive range may request a pre-award debriefing in accordance with FAR 15.505. Offerors may request a post-award debriefing after the date on which that Offeror has received notification of contract award in accordance with FAR 15.506.

### **Basis of Award**

This is a best-value competitive source selection conducted in accordance with FAR 15. To be eligible for award, the Offeror must be deemed responsible in accordance with FAR 9.1, meet all requirements of the solicitation, conform to all required terms and conditions, and include applicable required certifications. The source selection process will be best value “tradeoff” approach for making award determination.

The Government will select for award the proposals that are most advantageous and represent the best overall value to the Government, considering Corporate Experience, Past Performance, Technical Approach, and Price factors, and their respective subfactors (as applicable). Therefore, the Government may select for award those Offerors whose proposed prices are not the lowest, but whose Corporate Experience, Past Performance, and Technical Approach proposals are sufficiently more advantageous to justify the payment of a higher price. Conversely, the Government may select for award those offerors whose proposed price is lower than other proposals that are not sufficiently more advantageous to justify the payment of a higher price.

Proposals with contingent terms and conditions shall be deemed non-responsive and will result in the rejection of an Offeror’s proposal. The Government may reject any proposal that is evaluated to be unrealistic, including contract terms and conditions, unrealistically high or low in price, or deemed to reflect a lack of understanding/competence or failure to comprehend the risks of all stated requirements. If any aspect of an Offeror's proposal not meeting the Government's requirements is not considered correctable, the Offeror may be eliminated from the competitive range, if applicable. The Government will use this information to support the competitive range and contract award decisions, as applicable.

## Attachment #01 - Section M - Functional Category 1 (FC1) – Optimization

### Order of Importance

The order of importance for the evaluation factors is that Technical Approach Subfactors 3A and Subfactor 3B are equal. Technical Approach is more important than Corporate Experience and Past Performance. Corporate Experience and Past Performance are equal but more important than Price. All evaluation factors other than Price, when combined, are significantly more important than Price.

### Phase I

Factor 1	Corporate Experience (Written - Confidence Rating)
Factor 2	Past Performance (Written - Confidence Rating)

### Phase II

Factor 3	Technical Approach (Oral Presentation/ Written – Confidence Rating) Subfactor 3A – Understanding the Requirements (Oral Presentation) Subfactor 3B – Skilled Personnel (Written)
Factor 4	Price (Written – Price Reasonable/Unreasonable)

### RATINGS

The Government will assess its level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform all requirements regarding evaluation factors and criteria herein. Confidence ratings incorporate risk assessments that reflect the agency's degree of confidence that the Offeror understands the requirement, proposes a sound approach, and will be successful in performing the contract. The Government will perform an analysis of each proposal noting the strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies, risks and assigning each proposal a "Confidence Level." The unique attributes that make up each proposal's confidence level will be highlighted in the evaluation report and will lead to a confidence-level designation by each non-price factor.

**The evaluation of Factor 1 – Corporate Experience and Factor 3 – Technical Approach** will be done holistically with a rating scale of "high confidence," "some confidence," and "low confidence," representing the Government's confidence that the Offeror understands the requirement and will be successful in performing the work as follows:

Confidence Ratings	Definition
<b>High Confidence</b>	The Government has high confidence that the Offeror understands the requirement, proposes a sound approach, and will be successful in performing the contract with little or no Government intervention.
<b>Some Confidence</b>	The Government has some confidence that the Offeror understands the requirement, proposes a sound approach, and will be successful in performing the contract with some Government intervention
<b>Low Confidence</b>	The Government has low confidence that the Offeror understands the requirement, proposes a sound approach, or will be successful in performing the contract with Government intervention.

The confidence ratings are applied to all factors except IDIQ Price. Offerors are cautioned that a rating of "Low Confidence" in any single factor may result in the Offeror's proposal being rated unacceptable overall and may impact the overall evaluation of the Offeror's submission.

### The Evaluation of Factor 2 – Past Performance

The past performance evaluation factor assesses the degree of confidence the Government has in an Offeror's ability to provide services that meet users' needs based on a demonstrated record of performance. Past Performance will be done with a rating scale of High Confidence /Some Confidence/Low Confidence/Neutral Confidence basis as follows:

## Attachment #01 - Section M - Functional Category 1 (FC1) – Optimization

Rating	Description
<b>High Confidence</b>	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
<b>Some Confidence</b>	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
<b>Low Confidence</b>	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
<b>Neutral Confidence*</b>	No recent/relevant performance record is available or the Offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned. The Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on the factor of past performance.

\* The "Neutral" rating is applicable to past performance ONLY. This rating will only be used for Offerors with no previous relevant past performance.

**The evaluation of Factor 4** – Price will be determined to be fair and reasonable or unreasonable in accordance with FAR 15.4.

At any time, if the evaluation team discovers misleading, falsified, and/or fraudulent supporting documents, the Offeror shall be eliminated from further consideration for award. Falsification of any proposal submission, documents, or statements may subject the Offeror to civil or criminal prosecution under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code.

### EVALUATION CRITERIA

#### PHASE I

##### **Factor 1 – Corporate Experience (Written)**

The Government will evaluate the extent to which the Offeror's (if proposed, including first-tier subcontractors or JV partners) previous experience with recent and relevant projects demonstrates its capability to successfully perform the requirements of this solicitation. Additionally, the Government may use other sources of information available (e.g., Federal Procurement Data System-Next Generation (FPDS-NG), interviews with references, PMs, COs, and other sources) to assess corporate experience.

A **"project"** is defined as a single contract, order, or subcontract.

A project is defined as **"relevant"** when:

- The Offeror performed the predominant service(s) of a project the same as the services of Functional Category 1 (FC1) – Optimization – Organizational Services Task & Customer Experience Task as outlined in the PWS (Section C of the solicitation).
- The Offeror has demonstrated at least six (6) consecutive months of performance by the date the ASPS solicitation is issued. This date remains unchanged if any amendments to the original solicitation are issued.

A project is defined as **"recent"** if performed within the last five (5) years from the issue date of this solicitation.

## **Attachment #01 - Section M - Functional Category 1 (FC1) – Optimization**

### **Factor 2 - Past Performance (Written):**

The Government will evaluate the quality of the Offeror's (if proposed, including first-tier subcontractors or JV partners) past performance deemed recent and relevant to the requirements of this solicitation. The Government will use information submitted by the Offeror. Additionally, the Government may use other sources of information available (e.g., CPARS, interviews with PMs, COs, and other sources) to assess past performance.

A “**project**” is defined as a single contract, order, or subcontract.

A project is defined as “**relevant**” when:

- The Offeror performed the predominant service(s) of a project the same as the services of Functional Category 1 (FC1) – Optimization – Organizational Services Task & Customer Experience Task as outlined in the PWS (Section C of the solicitation).
- The Offeror has provided at least six (6) consecutive months of performance by the date the ASPS solicitation is issued. This date remains unchanged if any amendments to the original solicitation are issued.

A project is defined as “**recent**” if performed within the last five (5) years from the issue date of this solicitation.

### **Negative Past Performance Narrative**

The Government will evaluate the information concerning past problems encountered and the Offeror's corrective actions described in the Negative Past Performance Narrative to assess the Offerors' ability to successfully perform the work of this solicitation in determining a past performance rating. Additionally, the Government reserves the right to obtain information from other sources when evaluating the offeror's past performance.

## **\*ADVISORY DOWN-SELECT NOTIFICATION\***

## **PHASE II**

### **Factor 3 – Technical Approach (Oral Presentations/Written)**

#### **Subfactor 3A – Understanding the Requirements (Oral Presentation)**

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's technical approach to determine its understanding of the requirements and recognition of technical risks that clearly demonstrate a plan for successful performance, specifically:

- The Government will assess the adequacy of the Offeror's organizational structure in terms of facilitating the successful accomplishment of multiple tasks. Emphasis shall be placed on the provision of an organizational structure and approach that will demonstrate:
  - Efficient delineation of responsibilities,
  - Clear lines of authority and effective spans of control,
  - Communication processes that effectively disseminate program information throughout the organization and the Government; as well as business practices that will ensure successful execution of the PMO program.
- The Government will evaluate the extent to which the Offeror demonstrates a thorough understanding of the requirements including recruitment & staffing capabilities, retention of staff,

## **Attachment #01 - Section M - Functional Category 1 (FC1) – Optimization**

and transition approaches to achieve successful performance of the tasks within the solicitation, specifically:

- What are your best practices for ensuring employees' commitment to achieving the mission that aids in the retention of employees?
- How does your company maintain an environment of skilled and talented people capable of successful performance?
- Provide a transition approach that clearly describes your methodologies and processes to transitioning staff in/out of work on contracts and that demonstrates timely, orderly, and seamless continuity of services for the successful completion of work. The transition approach must include:
  - Processes for transitioning current contractor employees including on/off boarding.
  - Methods for managing transition critical milestones and staffing.
  - Processes for managing and tracking personnel clearances.
  - Methods for transitioning work to and from incumbent contractors and Government personnel.
  - Techniques for identifying transition risk and mitigation of risks.

### **Subfactor 3B – Skilled Personnel (Written)**

The Government will evaluate the qualifications (i.e., education, years of relevant work experience(s), of the proposed personnel for the designated Program Manager labor category that clearly demonstrate their ability to accomplish the work. The Government will assess the Offeror's capability to provide qualified personnel to successfully perform.

### **Factor 4 – Price (Written)**

The Government will not rate or score price but evaluate the Offeror's price proposal for fairness and reasonableness as follows:

1. The Government will evaluate the rationale for the proposed price and its alignment to the Offerors proposed technical approach. Prices that have an irrational basis or do not align to the Offerors proposed technical approach may be indicative of failure to comprehend the complexity of the requirement, reflective of a lack of competence or an inherent weakness in the approach.
2. Price will be evaluated for its accuracy and mathematical correctness. The Government will evaluate the proposed hourly rates and total evaluated price to verify that Offeror provided sufficient, logical detail to fully support the offer and permit the Government to evaluate the proposal price.
3. FAR 52.217-5 Evaluation of Options (JUL 1990). The Government will evaluate price for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the price for the base requirement. Evaluation of options does not obligate the Government to exercise the options.

The total evaluated price will be the base price plus all option years. The Option to Extend Services (FAR 52.217-8) is included in this solicitation. The 6-month option pricing will not be part of the total evaluated price. The Option to Extend Services will be computed as 50% of the Option Period 4 pricing.

4. Price analysis will be performed using one or more of the applicable FAR techniques defined in FAR 15.404 to determine the price fair and reasonable.

## Attachment #01 - Section M - Functional Category 1 (FC1) – Optimization

5. When appropriate, the Government **may** choose to perform a price realism analysis for any proposal. This may occur if any hourly rate or the total evaluated price appear to be unrealistically low, indicating a potential lack of understanding by the Offeror and/or increased risk of performance failure. Upon conducting a price realism analysis, the Government will reject a proposal that it considers contain unrealistically low prices.

Source Selection Process Overview		
1.	Phase I Submission	Phase I, Volume 1 Submission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Volume Cover Sheet</li> <li>• Table of Contents</li> <li>• SF-33</li> <li>• Provisions/Clauses and Representations/Certifications</li> <li>• Fill in IR1052.209-9002 Notice and Consent to Disclose and Use of Taxpayer Return Information (May 2018)</li> <li>• Fill in IR1052.232-9001 Electronic Invoicing and Payment Requirements for the Invoice Processing Platform (IPP) (JUL 2019)</li> <li>• 8(a) Certification</li> <li>• If applicable, Contractor Teaming Arrangements (CTA)</li> <li>• Factor 1 – Corporate Experience – Written</li> <li>• Factor 2 – Past Performance – Written</li> </ul>
2.	Phase I Evaluations	Phase I Evaluations Conducted
3.	Advisory Down-Select	Notification of Advisory Down-Select
4.	Notice of Intent	Notice of Intent provided by Offerors wishing to proceed, or not, to Phase II
5.	Phase II Submission Due Date Released	Phase II Submission Due Date and Schedule for Oral Presentations Released
6.	Phase II Submission	Phase II, Volume 2 Submission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Volume Cover Sheet</li> <li>• Table of Contents</li> <li>• Factor 3 – Technical Approach – Oral Presentation/Written:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Subfactor 3A – Understanding the Requirements – Oral</li> <li>Subfactor 3B – Skilled Personnel – Written</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
	Phase II Submission	Phase II, Volume 3 Submission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Volume Cover Sheet</li> <li>• Table of Contents</li> <li>• Price Narrative</li> <li>• Factor 4 – Price – Written</li> </ul>
7.	Phase II Evaluations	Phase II Evaluations Concluded
8.	Award	Multiple Award IDIQs Awarded