

**DRAFT RFP HC1013-05-R-2001
(REFERENCE EBM-RFI-0001)
DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS AGENCY (DISA)
DEFENSE INFORMATION SYSTEMS INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ORGANIZATION (DITCO)
ENTERPRISE BUSINESS MODERNIZATION (EBM) PROJECT
ISSUE DATE: 10 NOV 04**

ADDENDUM A - DRAFT RFP INFORMATION.

A.1.1. This is Draft RFP HC1013-05-R-2001 for the Enterprise Business Modernization (EBM) Project for the Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA)/Defense Information Technology Contracting Organization (DITCO). There is no requirement for vendors to submit a proposal for this Draft RFP. However, small businesses interested in submitting a proposal as a prime contractor to the final RFP, if issued, are requested to complete Addendum J-3, Small Business Information. Request vendors submit questions/comments on the Draft RFP to the DITCO Contracts electronic mailbox at ditco@scott.disa.mil not later than 4:00pm, CST, Wednesday, 24 Nov 2004. The Government may not publish the responses to the vendor questions/comments prior to the release of the Final RFP. DITCO POCs are Deborah (Debbie) E. Arentsen/Contracting Officer/618-229-9661 and Janice (Jan) M. Haake/Contract Specialist/618-229-9678.

A.1.2. FAR 52.215-3 - REQUEST FOR INFORMATION OR SOLICITATION FOR PLANNING PURPOSES (OCT 1997).

(a) The Government does not intend to award a contract on the basis of this solicitation or to otherwise pay for the information solicited except as an allowable cost under other contracts as provided in subsection 31.205-18, Bid and proposal costs, of the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

(b) Although "proposal" and "offeror" are used in this Request for Information, your response will be treated as information only. It shall not be used as a proposal.

(c) This solicitation is issued for the purpose of information and planning purposes.

A.1.3. Projected Final RFP HC1013-05-R-2001 Milestone Schedule:

Issue Final RFP:	12 Jan 05
Proposals Due:	28 Feb 05
Award:	Late July/Early August 2005

ADDENDUM B - SUPPLIES OR SERVICES AND PRICES/COSTS

B.1.1. The Government requests the offerors propose a Contract Line Item Number (CLIN)/Sub-Contract Line Item Number (SLIN) structure with their Cost/Price proposal. CLINs/SLINs for the base period shall be for the complete solution through Full Operating Capability (FOC). CLINs/SLINs for the option years shall be for offeror's proposed Service Level Agreement (SLA) to support the proposed solution (such as annual software maintenance and technical support).

ADDENDUM F - DELIVERIES OR PERFORMANCE

F.1.1. Testing:

The contractor shall ship and install all equipment necessary to conduct testing. Testing shall be conducted at DISA's Continuity of Operation Plan (COOP) site located in Slidell, LA.

Upon successful completion of testing, the contractor shall pack and ship all equipment to the final delivery location specified in Paragraph F.1.2.

F.1.2. Possible final delivery locations_(Actual location(s) may not be provided to the offerors until Final Proposal Revisions are requested.)

DECC MECHANICSBURG
5450 Carlisle Pike
BLDG 308
Mechanicsburg, PA 17050

DECC OGDEN
7879 Wardleigh Road
BLDG 891
Hill AFB, UT 84056-5997

DECC OKLAHOMA CITY
8705 Industrial Blvd
BLDG 3900
Tinker AFB, OK 73145

DECC COLUMBUS
3990 EAST BROAD ST.
BLDG 20
COLUMBUS, OH 43216

DECC ST. LOUIS
4300 Goodfellow Blvd
St. Louis, MO 63120

F.1.3. Period of Contract/Performance: Full Operating Capability (FOC) is required within 24 months after contract award. Following FOC, the resulting contract will have five one year option periods.

F.1.4. Government Ownership. The Government will take ownership of the proposed solution at FOC, to include, but not limited to, hardware, software license, warranties, etc.

ADDENDUM G - CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION

G.1.1. Payment address: Request offerors include the payment address in their proposal if it is different from that shown on the offer.

G.1.2. Payment Structure:

20% payment due vendor - Pre-Initial Operational Capability
30% payment due vendor - Initial Operational Capability (IOC)
50% payment due vendor - Full Operating Capability (FOC)

G.1.3. Contract Type: The Government contemplates award of a firm fixed price contract. However, request vendors provide comments on this draft RFP by the due date in A.1.1 on alternative risk sharing contract types associated with the base period and option years.

ADDENDUM J - LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

- J-1. Statement of Objectives (S00)
- J-2. Capabilities Requirements Document (CRD)
- J-3. Small Business Information
- J-4. List of Deliverables

ADDENDUM L - INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARATION OF PROPOSALS

L.1.1. Purpose. These instructions prescribe the format for the proposal and describe the approach for the development and presentation of proposed data. They are designed to ensure the submission of information essential to the understanding and comprehensive validation of proposals. Offerors are cautioned to follow the instructions carefully.

THE GOVERNMENT RESERVES THE RIGHT TO REJECT ANY PROPOSAL THAT DOES NOT SUBSTANTIALLY COMPLY WITH THESE PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS.

L.1.2. Proposal Format.

a. The written portion of the proposal shall be submitted in electronic format as outlined below. Oral presentations and/or Demonstrations may be required after the initial evaluation of written proposals. Written proposal parts are as follows:

Executive Summary. Offerors provide an executive summary that describes the significant attributes and theme of its proposal.

Volume I, Functional. Volume I Functional Documents. Offerors shall describe how their solution addresses each of the functional sections listed below. Detail functional information regarding the objectives and requirements for each section are provided in the Capability Requirements Document (CRD), addendum J-2. Additionally, offerors shall complete the Fit Gap Matrix attached to the CRD to show the relationship between their proposal and the desired capabilities and configurations anticipated by the Government. Volume I shall also include any revised process models, operational views or system views necessary to describe how the proposed solution will function.

- Section 1. Buyer Management
- Section 2. Financial Management
- Section 3. Order Management
- Section 4. Workflow Management
- Section 5. Reports Management

Volume II, Technical. Volume II Technical Documents. Offerors shall describe how their solution addresses each of the technical sections listed below. Detail technical information regarding the objective and requirements for each section are provided in the Capability Requirements Document (CRD), addendum J-2. Additionally, offerors shall complete the Fit Gap Matrix attached to the CRD to show the relationship between their proposal and the desired capabilities and configurations anticipated by the Government. Volume II

shall also include any revised process models, operational views or system views necessary to describe how the proposed solution will be implemented.

- Section 1. System Administration
- Section 2. Data Management
- Section 3. Infrastructure
- Section 4. Interfaces
- Section 5. Security
- Section 6. Test and Evaluation Plan
- Section 7. Statement of Work (SOW)

Volume III, Management/Past Performance. Volume III Management/Past Performance documents. The offeror shall provide no more than 5 past performance references. Past performance information shall be on efforts performed within the last two years, or ongoing, either commercial and/or government having requirements similar in scope and requirements to this solicitation.

- Section 1 - Management
 - Part 1 - Organizational Structure
 - Part 2 - Quality Recognition and Certifications
 - Part 3 - Management Plans
 - Program/Project Management Plan
 - Transition Plan (SV-8)
 - Logistics Support Plan
 - Evaluation Master Plan
- Section 2 - Past Performance
 - Part 1 - Past Performance Data
 - Part 2 - Cost Control
 - Part 3 - Schedule
 - Part 4 - Quality of Services
 - Part 5 - Management of Key Personnel
 - Part 6 - Business Relations
 - Part 7 - Socioeconomic Goals

Volume IV, Cost/Price. The offeror submits a cost/price proposal to outline proposed prices for each of the Contract Line Item Number (CLIN)/Sub-Contract Line Item Number (SLIN) in MS Excel Version 2000. Offerors shall provide all cost breakouts (such as hardware, software, hardware maintenance, software maintenance, integration, training, etc.) to support their total proposed cost. Because of the competitive nature of this solicitation, this supporting documentation shall be considered information other than cost or pricing data. According to FAR 15.403-5, information other than cost or pricing data may be submitted in the offeror's own format unless the contracting officer decides that use of a specific format is essential and the format has been described in the solicitation. For this solicitation, the supporting data shall be submitted in the format indicated in Table 15-2 of FAR 15.408.

Volume V, Contract Information. Contains the information necessary to award the contract.

- Section 1 - Transmittal Letter, SF 1449, Solicitation/Contract/Order for Commercial Items;
- Section 2 - On-Line Representations and Certifications (www.bpn.gov/orca).
- Section 3 - Subcontracting Plan (Large Businesses Only).

b. Documents shall be submitted in Adobe Acrobat, Portable Document Format (PDF), Version 4.0 or newer. The font type shall either be Times New Roman or Arial Narrow, no smaller than 10-Point. It is recommended that the electronic PDF file be no larger than 5MB. Volume IV, Cost/Price, shall be submitted in MS Excel Office 2000.

c. Any other attached documents required herein shall be compatible with Microsoft (MS) Office 2000 format. All spreadsheets shall be submitted in MS Excel Office 2000 version software. Any graphics files embedded within the MS documents shall be provided in either *.jpg or *.pcs format in order to minimize memory storage requirements for electronic files. Landscape pages shall face right. It is recommended that the sum of all MS document files be no larger than 5MB compressed. Compression tools are limited to PKZip or WinZip.

L.1.3. Electronic Submission.

a. The Government will access the softcopy versions of the Offeror's quote over the Internet using the DecisionPoint source selection tool provided by AcqCenter.com (<http://www.acqcenter.com>). Use of the software and procedures described in this section will reduce the amount of time and effort needed by the Government to receive and install proposals into an electronic evaluation system and will help to ensure that proposals are suitable for reading electronically. Information regarding electronic products listed herein should not be construed as Government endorsement for such products.

b. As indicated above, and except as otherwise identified (such as all spreadsheets shall be submitted in MS Excel Office 2000), all proposals shall be submitted in Adobe Acrobat PDF, Version 4.0 or newer. Offerors shall use the Acrobat Link feature for cross-references that are electronically linked, and linked files must be contained in the same directory. The Acrobat Bookmark feature may also be used for document navigation; however use of the Acrobat Notes feature is prohibited. Offerors shall use the 'Optimize' feature of Adobe Acrobat to decrease file size and prepare them for viewing on the Internet. Offerors are encouraged to limit file size to 5MB to reduce delay in downloading proposals over the Internet.

c. The Offeror shall prepare a "readme" file which describes the organization and layout of its softcopy submission.

d. Page Numbering. The Offeror shall use a standard page numbering system to facilitate proposal references. Consecutive page numbering within sections is preferred, e.g. Page I-2-5, indicates Part I, Section 2, page 5. Charts, graphs and other insert materials shall be page-numbered as part of the page numbering system.

L.1.4. World Wide Web (WWW) Interface.

a.. Proposal Submission. Prior to submitting proposals, Offerors shall register with DITCO via its Contracting Opportunities web site at <https://www.ditco.disa.mil/dcop>. During the registration process, choose the option for "The solicitation requires vendor registration for eligibility". You will be prompted to enter the solicitation number. Upon completion of registration, Offerors will receive a user-id and password for use when uploading proposals. This process allows DITCO to precisely track when proposals are uploaded (or attempted to be uploaded). Registration

information will be verified by DITCO personnel, which takes about a day. Once the Offeror's information is verified, proposals will be able to be uploaded. **Vendors must register a minimum of one week prior to uploading a proposal to ensure the proposal upload is accomplished by the closing date and time. Vendors should also attempt to upload their proposal as early as possible to ensure no problems arise at the last minute.** If an offeror would like to test the upload process, they may do so by typing in this url: <https://www.scott.disa.mil/dcop>. Under the heading **Submit Proposals for:**, look for **Upload Proposal Test**. If you have any problems, please contact Kevin Mehlan at (618)229-9334, email address: mehlank@scott.disa.mil, or the DITCO customer service center at (618) 229-9333.

b. In order to respond to this proposal, the Offeror must upload a complete proposal to the DITCO web site at <https://www.ditco.disa.mil/dcop>. It will be necessary to use a web browser with 128-bit (domestic strength) encryption. It is recommended that Offerors use a recent version of a web browser; either Netscape 6.1, which is available at <http://home.netscape.com/computing/download/index.html> or Internet Explorer 5.5, which is available at <http://www.microsoft.com/downloads>. The proposal submission web session will be protected by Secure Sockets Layer (SSL), ensuring the confidentiality of the submission.

c. In accordance with FAR 52.215-1, Instructions to Offerors - Competitive Acquisitions, the offeror's proposal submission will be considered complete when all volumes are received.

d. Testing. If an offeror would like to test the upload process, they may do so by typing in this URL: <https://www.scott.disa.mil/dcop>. Under the heading "**SUBMIT PROPOSAL FOR**" look for "**UPLOAD PROPOSAL TEST.**" If you have problems, please contact Kevin Mehlan at (618) 229-9334, e-mail address: mehlank@scott.disa.mil, or the DITCO Customer Service Center at (618) 229-9333.

L.1.5. Electronic Files. If necessary, separate the electronic files of the proposal at logical breakpoints using the table of contents as a guide. Each file must be autonomous and complete.

L.1.6. Virus Check. Offerors shall perform a virus check prior to proposal submittal. Virus checking will be conducted at the source selection site prior to the beginning of the evaluation using the current version of Norton AntiVirus.

L.1.7. Clarification of Proposals. All changes resulting from clarifications to the proposal will be submitted on a page by page basis. Each page change should contain a revision date located in a uniform location. Submissions will follow the electronic format.

L.1.8. Freedom from Ambiguity. The information supplied shall be closely aligned with the procurement under consideration and shall be free from ambiguities. Ambiguous statements or statements with dual meanings will be interpreted in their most stringent or unfavorable sense.

L.1.9. Oral Presentations.

a. Offerors will be required to give an oral presentation to the Government evaluation panel, unless the offeror has voluntarily withdrawn their proposal after the advisory down-select. Oral presentations will be

held at Scott AFB, Illinois or the surrounding area. The Contracting Officer, or her representative, will schedule the oral presentations after receipt of the written proposals. Offerors will be notified of the exact date, location, and time for oral presentations. The Government will randomly select offerors to determine the order in which offerors will present.

b. Presentations by the offeror are to be made in person. Videotapes or other forms of media will not be accepted in lieu of an on-site presentation. The Government reserves the right to record these presentations for source selection evaluation purposes in audio form. The audio tapes will be digitized and imported into the DecisionPoint source selection tool for review by the evaluation teams. Offerors will be given two hours to make its presentation to the Government. A question and answer session may follow for the purpose of clarification or expansion on presented material. However, questions and answers shall not be allowed to commence until such time as the vendor declares the formal presentation to be complete, or two hours have elapsed, whichever is sooner.

c. Offeror personnel presenting the briefing must be those identified in the offeror's proposal as key personnel and/or senior management. It is important to the Government that the individuals responsible for performance of this contract are the ones that present at the oral presentations. The program manager that would be responsible for delivery of the solution is to be present and identified as the program manager. No more than ten (10) vendor personnel are allowed to attend each presentation. One electronic copy on a Compact Disc and fifteen hard copies of the oral presentation should be presented to the Government team on the day of the presentation.

d. The Government will provide a meeting room for oral presentation and standard audiovisual equipment including an overhead projector, projection screen, and podium. The Government will also provide access to a telephone, fax machine, and copier. Offerors will be responsible for providing any other specialized equipment or supplies they may require.

e. Information discussed in the oral presentations is supplementary to the offeror's written proposal. Any information discussed can be used as an integral part of the evaluation process. Ratings will not be assigned solely on the basis of the oral presentation.

ADDENDUM M - EVALUATION CRITERIA

The proposals shall be evaluated against the Government's requirements for Cost/Price and for the non-cost factors. Offerors must meet or exceed all solicitation requirements to be eligible for award. Number the paragraphs accordingly to mimic **Addendum M** of the solicitation. Your **Addendum M** may contain more than the below listed clauses/provisions. The following are meant to indicate only the basic clauses/provisions.

M.1. SOLICITATION PROVISIONS.

M.1.1. Single Award. The Government will award a single firm-fixed price contract under the solicitation. The Government also reserves the right to not award a contract as a result of this solicitation.

M.1.2. Evaluation of Options. The Government evaluates offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the

basic requirement. Evaluation of options does not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

M.2. EVALUATION OF OFFERS.

M.2.1. The Government intends to conduct the source selection in accordance with FAR Part 12 using competitive negotiation source selection procedures. The Government anticipates awarding a contract based on written proposals, oral presentations, and demonstrations (herein after referred to as "proposal(s)"). The Government reserves the right to award with or without discussions. The Government plans to conduct this source selection evaluation in three phases.

M.2.1.1. Phase I: Written Proposals. The Government will evaluate initial written proposals in accordance with Addendum **M.4**, below. Based on the ratings of each proposal against all evaluation criteria, the Government will identify the most highly rated proposal(s) and perform an advisory down-select in which offerors who did not provide a highly rated proposal(s) are given an opportunity to voluntarily withdraw their proposal from further competition.

M.2.1.1.1. All elements, subfactors, and factors will be measured against standards developed to represent guidelines for adequacy of approach and understanding the solicitation requirements.

M.2.1.1.2. Evaluation includes the determination of strengths, weaknesses, and risks for each element, subfactor, and factor.

M.2.1.2. Phase II: Oral Presentations. Offerors will be required to prepare and present an oral presentation, unless the offeror has voluntarily withdrawn their proposal after the advisory down-select. When scheduled, offerors will conduct their presentations and be prepared to answer questions pertaining to their written proposals and oral presentations. The Government reserves the right to record these presentations for source selection evaluation purposes in audio form. Following the conclusion of all oral presentations, the Government will establish a competitive range of offerors for continuation to Phase III.

M.2.1.3. Phase III: Use-Case Demonstrations. Offerors in the competitive range will be required to demonstrate their proposed solution utilizing government provided use-case scenario(s). When scheduled, offerors will demonstrate their systems solutions to members of the Source Selection Evaluation Teams and other government representatives.

M.2.1.4 In accordance with FAR Subpart 15.3, offerors may be given the opportunity to clarify certain aspects of their proposal or to resolve minor or clerical errors.

M.2.1.5. During and after each phase, Source Selection Evaluation Team members will conduct individual evaluations that are then aggregated by each panel and evaluation results documented in the Source Selection Evaluation Tool. Cost and price is not included in Phases II and III.

M.3. BASIS FOR AWARD.

M.3.1. The Government anticipates a single award.

M.3.2. In accordance with FAR Clause 52.215-1, Instructions to Offerors - Competitive Acquisition, the Government intends to award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible offeror whose proposal represent the best value after evaluation in accordance with the factors, subfactors, and elements specified in the solicitation.

M.3.3. The contract award decision will be based on the Government's evaluation of each offeror's complete proposal against the evaluation criteria identified in Addendum M.4, below. Award will be made to the offeror whose proposal contains the combination of factors offering the best overall value to the Government. Best value means the expected outcome of an acquisition that, in the Government's estimation, provides the greatest overall benefit in response to the requirement (FAR section 2.101). In making this evaluation, the Government is more concerned with obtaining superior functional, technical and management skills than with making an award to the offeror with the lowest proposed price.

M.3.4. When conducting the evaluation, the Government will consider data included by offerors in their written proposals, oral presentations, and demonstrations as well as data obtained from other sources.

M.4. EVALUATION CRITERIA

M.4.1. Factors, Subfactors, and Elements.

M.4.1.1. General. The Government will apply the following tailored evaluation criteria to identify the best value proposal(s). The evaluation criteria represent key areas of importance to be considered in the source selection decision. The elements, subfactors, and factors have been chosen to support a meaningful discrimination between and among competing proposals. The proposals will be evaluated against the Government's requirements using four factors:

- Functional
- Technical
- Management/Past Performance.
- Cost and Price.

M.4.1.2. Definitions. In order to provide insight into the Government's value of the factors, the following terminology is used:

- **More Important.** The criterion is greater in value than another criterion.
- **Approximately Equal.** The criterion is nearly the same in value as another criterion; any difference is very slight and unimportant.

M.4.1.3. Relative Importance. Technical, Management and Past Performance are approximately equal. Functional is more important than Technical, Management or Past Performance. Each of these non-cost factors is divided into subfactors, which may be further divided into elements. Each subfactor and/or element within each factor is approximately equal. Each non-cost factor individually is more important than Cost and Price.

M.4.1.4. Risk Assessment. The Government will perform a risk assessment of each offeror's proposal. The proposal risk assessment focuses on the risks

and weaknesses associated with the offeror's proposed approach. Assessment of risk is done for all non-cost factors and identifies potential for disruption of schedule, degradation of performance, and the need for increased Government oversight as well as the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance. For any risk identified, the evaluation addresses the offeror's proposal for mitigating those risks and why that approach is or is not feasible.

Figure A-1 Risk Assessment Description Table

Risk	Description
High	Offeror's proposed approach is likely to cause significant disruption of schedule, increase in cost, or degradation of performance, and will require a high level of contractor emphasis and Government monitoring to overcome difficulties
Medium	Offeror's proposed approach is likely to cause a moderate disruption of schedule, increase in cost, or degradation of performance, and will require a medium level of contractor emphasis and Government monitoring to overcome difficulties
Low	Offeror's proposed approach is likely to cause minimal or no disruption of schedule, increase in cost, or degradation of performance, and will require a low level of contractor emphasis and Government monitoring to overcome difficulties

M.4.1.4.1. The risks, which will be assessed, are those associated with the non-cost factors of the project. Risks may occur as a result of a particular technical approach, operational process, management plan, or as a result of the schedule and economic impacts associated with these approaches.

M.4.1.4.2. Government risk assessments (High, Moderate or Low) will be addressed in evaluation narratives with strengths and weaknesses and depicted in briefings with the color ratings for each factor.

M.4.1.4.3. A risk assessment rating will be used in conjunction with the color codes for each assessed factor. The statements within the color code definitions reflect evaluation of how well the non-cost factors within the proposal meets the requirements. The risk assessment rating (High, Moderate or Low) reflects evaluation of the likelihood that the proposed approach will actually be achieved.

Figure A-2 Color Code Rating Table

Color	Functional, Technical, Management Capability	Strengths	Weaknesses	Past Performance
Blue	The proposal exceeds requirements and clearly demonstrates the offeror's capability to deliver exceptional performance.	There are numerous strengths that are of direct benefit to the Government.	Weaknesses are considered insignificant and have no apparent impact to the program.	Highly relevant/very recent past performance in all identified past performance efforts; excellent performance ratings.

Green	The proposal is satisfactory; the offeror is capable of meeting performance requirements.	Some strengths exist that are of benefit to the Government; the strengths clearly offset weaknesses.	A few weaknesses exist; they are correctable with minimal Government oversight or direction.	Relevant/somewhat recent past performance in all identified past performance efforts; acceptable performance ratings.
Yellow	The proposal is minimally adequate; the offeror is most likely able to meet performance requirements.	Few strengths exist that are of benefit to the Government; the strengths do not offset the weaknesses.	Substantial weaknesses exist that may impact the program; they are correctable with some Government oversight and direction.	Somewhat relevant/not very recent past performance; mostly acceptable performance ratings.
Red	The proposal is highly inadequate; the offeror cannot meet performance requirements.	There are no beneficial strengths.	Numerous weaknesses exist that are so significant that a proposal re-write is not feasible within a suitable timeframe.	Little relevant past performance identified; almost all unacceptable performance ratings.
White	Not used	Not used	Not used	Completely lacks relevant performance history or past performance is unavailable, not due offeror's failure to provide information.

M.5. DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION CRITERIA

M.5.1. Non-Cost Factors.

M.5.1.1. Factor 1 - Management.

Assess the offeror's ability to successfully manage and perform IT solutions by evaluating its structure, quality focus, management plans.

Subfactor 1 - Organizational Structure. Evaluate the organizational structure to determine if the offeror has a staff that will be dedicated to the EBM project and a management reporting structure that ensures the EBM project will receive support from senior management.

Subfactor 2 - Quality Recognition and Certifications. Evaluate the quality recognition and certifications held by the offeror. Emphasis is placed on quality recognition and certifications that directly support IT functions and operations. Evaluate offerors on documented and verified awards and certifications such as Carnegie Mellon University - Software Engineering Institute's Capability Maturity Model (SEI-CMM) and SEI-CMM Integration (SEI-CMMI) certification level within any of the designated CMM categories. In

addition to the level of the certification, evaluate the importance and number of different awards and certifications (i.e., ISO 9000/9001, Malcolm Baldrige or other similar professionally-recognized industry quality certifications).

Subfactor 3 - Management Plans. Evaluate management plans.

Element 1 - Program/Project Management Plan. Evaluate the type of organization, qualifications of the PM, management techniques, comm. Methods, staffing plan, proposed subcontracting, master project schedule, how schedule was developed and control procedures.

Element 2 - Transition Plan. Evaluate the transition plan, systems engineering plan.

Element 3 - Logistics Support Plan training, sustainment, refresh, buyer service, technical documentation.

Element 4 - Test and Evaluation Master Plan.

M.5.1.2. Factor 2 - Past Performance. The Government will assess the offeror's capability to perform under the EBM contract by evaluating the offeror's past performance as a prime contractor on comparable IT projects. Only past performance data regarding similar IT efforts either completed within the last two years or ongoing will be evaluated. The lack of relevant past performance information will result in the assignment of a white (neutral) rating (i.e., neither favorable nor unfavorable). Complex IT projects managed and implemented across an enterprise will be rated higher than projects of lesser size, scope, and complexity. The Government may consider all relevant past performance.

Subfactor 1 - Cost Control. Evaluate the offeror's ability to deliver a solution at an agreed price or cost. Evaluate the cause of any variances in the award amounts and the amounts at completion (or estimated to complete) to determine the extent to which the offeror controlled project costs.

Subfactor 2 - Schedule. Evaluate the offeror's ability to deliver a solution according to an agreed schedule. Examine the cause of any schedule variances to determine the extent to which the offeror delivered on time.

Subfactor 3 - Quality of Service. Evaluate the offeror's ability to provide a product or service that met the buyer's quality requirements.

Subfactor 4 - Socioeconomic Goals. Evaluate the offeror's ability to meet small business subcontracting goals, if applicable. Consider any circumstances that negatively impacted the offeror's ability to consistently meet or exceed small business subcontracting goals.

Subfactor 5 - Business Relations. Evaluate the offeror's ability to demonstrate a business-like concern for the buyer's interests and the ability to demonstrate a reasonable and cooperative behavior. Examine the assessment to determine the degree to which the offeror met the levels of cooperation needed to be an effective business partner.

Subfactor 6 - Management of Key Personnel. Evaluate the resumes of the offeror's key personnel, letters of commitment, and the accompanying resource matrix forms to determine the quality of individuals proposed to staff its organization.

M.5.1.3. Factor 3 - Functional. The Government will evaluate the offeror's proposed solution in meeting the requirements identified as functional requirements in the following subfactor categories in the SV-4 document, addendum J-2. Each requirement within each subfactor category will be evaluated. The Government will also use the offerors responses to the Fit Gap Matrix, (See Addendum J-2, Capabilities Requirements Document (CRD)), to evaluate each subfactor.

Subfactor 1 - Buyer Management

Subfactor 2 - Order Management

Subfactor 3 - Data Management and Reporting

Subfactor 4 - Financial Management

Subfactor 5 - Workflow and Document Management

M.5.1.4. Factor 4 - Technical. The Government will evaluate the offeror's proposed solution in meeting the requirements identified as technical requirements in the following subfactor categories in the SV-4 document, addendum J-2. Each requirement within each subfactor category will be evaluated. The Government will also use the offerors responses to the Fit Gap Matrix, addendum J-2, to evaluate each subfactor.

Subfactor 1 - Infrastructure

Subfactor 2 - Interface

Subfactor 3 - Security Management

Subfactor 4 - System Administration

Subfactor 5 - Workflow and Document Management

M.5.2. Factor 5 - Cost and Price Factor.

The price evaluation will be based upon the total proposed price submitted by each offeror for their complete solution. The Government will calculate the total discounted life cycle cost (DLCC) for each offeror by multiplying the proposed price for each of the seven years by the appropriate discount rate. The discount rates will be provided in the final RFP.

The total proposed price for each offeror will be evaluated for completeness, reasonableness, and if deemed necessary, price realism.

Completeness: The team verifies that all solicitation requirements have been priced, figures are correctly calculated, and costs are presented in an adequate format.

Reasonableness: Determine the reasonableness of the overall price on the basis of adequate price competition and by comparison with the Independent Government Cost Estimate (IGCE).

Realism: The Government may evaluate cost/price realism with regard to the ability of the offeror to meet the EBM requirements, if the Government deems such analysis is necessary. Results of any realism analysis may be used in

performance risk assessments and responsibility determinations. However, proposals shall be evaluated using the criteria in the solicitation, and the offered prices shall not be adjusted as a result of the analysis.

//////////////////////////////////END OF DRAFT RFP//////////////////////////////////