

# AF Life Cycle Management Center

---



**EPASS**  
**Highest Technically  
Rated Offeror w/Realistic  
and Reasonable Price  
(HTRO-RRP)**

**Kelly Martineau  
Strategic Services  
16 December 2020**

---

*Providing the Warfighter's Edge*



U.S. AIR FORCE

# Background



*AFLCMC... Providing the Warfighter's Edge*

- FY 17 NDAA Language to move away from LPTA
  - Sec 813 FY 17 NDAA Required DOD to avoid using LPTA... when acquiring...knowledge based services
- Uses FAR 16.505 IAW basic contract ordering instructions
- GSA's proven process & GAO case law
  - Evaluation methodology modeled after GSA OASIS
  - Industry Days, before every solicitation release, Q&As with Industry, One on Ones, Phasing Charts, Draft solicitations released and revised based on Industry comments/suggestions
- HTRO has Streamlined the process by prioritizing the quality of work over the price/cost
- No underlying "strengths" or "weaknesses" to be evaluated, nor any "Trade-offs"
- Interchanges conducted in writing (Interchange Notices) to offerors if determined to be in the best interest of the Government:
  - To some, none, or all
- Debriefings given to both unsuccessful and successful offerors
  - IAW DPAP Class Deviation – enhanced post-award debrief



U.S. AIR FORCE

# HTRO w/RRP Overview



*AFLCMC... Providing the Warfighter's Edge*

- Proposals contain three Volumes
  - Volume I(a) – Executive Summary
  - Volume I(b) – Contract Documentation
  - Volume II – Task Order Contractor Rating System
    - Evidence of experience in the form of work samples
      - Limited to five
  - Volume III – Task Order Cost/Price
- Two Factor evaluation process
  - Factor 1 – Technical Evaluation
  - Factor 2 – Cost/Price
    - 2 step approach



U.S. AIR FORCE

# Contract Type/Tools



*AFLCMC... Providing the Warfighter's Edge*

- CPFF Term Contract Type, Level of Effort (LOE)
  - “Performance” is defined as:
    - Completing the PWS activities
    - With the designated labor categories
    - For the amount of hours on contract – No Fee Paid on unused hours
  - Previously was traditional CPFF
- LOE Attachment/Labor Requirements Matrix
  - Each tab in the LOE matrix is identified by Division and a unique Project ID is aligned with a program in the PWS
  - Each tab defines hours by labor competency, security clearance, and location
- B-Tables for Labor Rates
  - Pre-priced labor ordering matrix detailing the rate and fee per hour
  - Will be used to bilaterally order additional hours
  - Streamlined bilateral modifications



U.S. AIR FORCE

# Fair Opportunity Proposal Request (FOPR) Documents



AFLCMC... Providing the Warfighter's Edge

- PWS
- CLIN Structure
- LOE Matrix
- Instructions to Offerors (ITO)
- [Objective Evaluation Criteria](#)
- [Self Scoring Matrix](#)
- [LOE Matrix](#)
- [Uniform Pricing Template \(UPT\)](#)
- EPASS B-Table Implementation
- OCI Briefing Slide Deck
- Provisions and Clauses
- DD254
- Financial Responsibility
- NAICS Codes for OASIS Pool Numbers
- *EPASS Cross Reference Matrix*
- Past Performance Rating Form
- Standard HTRO w/RRP Past Performance Questionnaire
- Model Contract



U.S. AIR FORCE

# Objective Evaluation Criteria



*AFLCMC... Providing the Warfighter's Edge*

Narrative for each of the Categories within the Self-Scoring Matrix

**Category 10: Maximum CMEs transitioned/hired within 30 Calendar Days (Prime Only)**

Of the work samples submitted, the Offeror shall rate itself based off of the highest number of CMEs transitioned and/or hired within 30 days as the prime (multiple Contracts/TOs allowed). "Prime Only" means that the Offeror can include in its count any subcontractor CMEs that were part of the team, but the Prime Offeror had to have been the prime on the effort. Sole-source contract extensions, bridge contracts, and winning recompetes as the incumbent are not considered 'transitions'.

Within 30 days is defined as a single 30 consecutive calendar-day period. For example, 15 Apr 2017 to 14 May 2107 is 30 calendar days.

This may be difficult to substantiate with contract documentation or business systems printouts, so any Past Performance Questioners (PPQs) that are submitted shall CLEARLY indicate the singular, consecutive 30 calendar-day period.

The Government has determined this qualification to be important as it directly relates to mitigating transition risk.



# Self- Scoring Matrix



U.S. AIR FORCE

AFLCMC... Providing the Warfighter's Edge

- Points and a weighting system applied to each category was based off of customer's level of importance
- Contractors required to rank themselves based on matrix provided

#	Category	Percentage of Points	Maximum Score	Offeror Score													
1	CPARs categories rated Exceptional over last 5 years*	0%	32000	0													
2	CPARs categories rated Very Good over last 5 years*		18000	0													
3	CPARs categories rated Satisfactory over last 5 years*		10000	0													
4	CPARs categories rated Marginal over last 5 years*		-4000	0													
5	CPARs categories rated Unsatisfactory over last 5 years*		-12000	0													
	Totals		32,000	0													
	* performance ending within the last 5 years of proposal release date; see Evaluation Criteria definition.																
	Max Section Score	32,000															
	Contractor's Score	0															

  

Category	Points	1000	900	750	500	250	Weight Factor	Max Possible Pts	Offeror's Self Score	Offeror's Total	Column1	Column2	Column3	Column4	Column5	Column6
6 Financial Stability (as % of Base Period) (prime only)	≥35%		26.67%-34.99%	18.34%-26.66%	10%-18.33%	5%-9.99%	5	5,000		0						
# of specifically identified Contracts/TOs with NAICS Codes 541330 Exception A (≥250 CMEs) that support air and/or ground ISR administered in the last 5 yrs	5	4	3	2	1	3	3,000		0							
# of CMEs on largest Contract/TO administered as Prime in last 5 years (Include subcontractors in the CME count)	≥500	400-499	300-399	200-299	100-199	0	0		0							
# of Contracts/TOs administered in the last 5 years (prime only) with at least 3 Geographic Locations (≥3 CMEs at each location)	5	4	3	2	1	3	3,000		0							
Maximum # of CMEs transitioned/hired within 30 days (Prime only) (multiple Contracts/TOs allowed)	≥250	200-249	150-199	100-149	50-99	5	5,000		0							
# of DoD Contracts/TOs administered (≥250 CMEs) in last 5 years	5	4	3	2	1	2	2,000		0							
# of current employees with Tier 5 Investigations (Prime Only)	≥120	100-120	80-99	60-79	40-59	5	5,000		0							
# of DoD Contracts/TOs (≥50 CMEs) administered in last 5 years that included direct Program Management activities on ACAT III (or higher) programs	5	4	3	2	1	3	3,000		0							
# of DoD Contracts/TOs (≥50 CMEs) administered in last 5 years that included direct Cybersecurity engineering activities on ACAT III (or higher) programs	5	4	3	2	1	1	1,000		0							
# of DoD Contracts/TOs (≥50 CMEs) administered in last 5 years that included direct Systems Engineering activities on ACAT III (or higher) programs	5	4	3	2	1	3	3,000		0							
# of DoD Contracts/TOs (≥50 CMEs) administered in last 5 years that included direct activities on TS/SCI programs	5	4	3	2	1	5	5,000		0							
# of DoD Contracts/TOs (≥50 CMEs) administered in last 5 years that included direct support for software intensive programs	5	4	3	2	1	3	3,000		0							
# of Contracts/TOs (≥50 CMEs) administered in last 5 years that included direct support for Agile Deployment and Fielding and/or Rapid Acquisition	5	4	3	2	1	3	3,000		0							





U.S. AIR FORCE

# LOE Matrix Example



AFLCMC... Providing the Warfighter's Edge

Project ID-Program Name	Labor Competency	Pop Start Date	Skill Level	Security Clearance	Location	Base Year	Opt 1	Opt 2	Opt 3	Opt 4
EN	Computer Scientist	1-Dec-19	Journeyman	Secret	Robins	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
EN/ADSM	Computer Scientist	1-Dec-19	Journeyman	TS/SCI	Robins	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
EN/Branch	Computer Scientist	1-Dec-19	Journeyman	Secret	Robins	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
EN	Computer Scientist	1-Dec-19	Senior	TS/SCI	Robins	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
EN/IT	Computer Scientist	1-Dec-19	Senior	TS/SCI	Robins	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
EN/IT/SR	Computer Scientist	1-Dec-19	Senior	TS/SCI	Robins	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
FPED	Configuration Manager	1-Dec-19	Senior	TS/SCI	Robins	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
EN	Configuration Manager	1-Dec-19	Senior	TS/SCI	Robins	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
EN	Configuration Manager	1-Dec-19	Senior	TS/SCI	Robins	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
EN	Configuration Manager	1-Dec-19	Senior	TS/SCI	Robins	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00





## ***AFLCMC... Providing the Warfighter's Edge***



Option Year 4 (CLIN 5004)										Hanscom AFB										Period of Performance: DD MM YYYY - DD MM YYYY (12 Months)										B-Table									
Labor Category		Experience Level		Security Clearance		Estimated Hours		Direct Labor Rate		Fringe (%)		OH (%)		G&A (%)		Total Estimated Cost (Less Fixed Fee)		Fixed Fee (%)		Fixed Fee (\$)		Total Price		Fully Burdened Labor Rate (Less Fee)		Fixed Fee/Hour													
"SAMPLE"						1000		\$ 23.36		3%		3%		26%		\$ 31,230.00		8%		\$ 2,498.40		\$ 33,728.40		\$ 31.23		\$ 2.50													
Systems Engineer	Junior	Secret	0													\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -											
Systems Engineer	Junior	Top Secret	0													\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -											
Systems Engineer	Journeyman	Secret	0													\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -											
Systems Engineer	Journeyman	Top Secret	0													\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -											
Systems Engineer	Senior	Secret	0													\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -											
Systems Engineer	Senior	Top Secret	0													\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -		\$ -											
Labor Category	Exp Level	Sec Clear	Est Hrs	Direct Labor Rate	Fringe	O/H	G&A	Tot Est Cost Less Fixed Fee	Fixed Fee %	Fixed Fee \$	Total Price	FBLR (Less Fee)	Fixed Fee Hr																										
Security Manager	Junior	Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Security Manager	Junior	Top Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Security Manager	Journeyman	Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Security Manager	Journeyman	Top Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Security Manager	Senior	Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Security Manager	Senior	Top Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Configuration Manager	Junior	Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Configuration Manager	Junior	Top Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Configuration Manager	Journeyman	Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Configuration Manager	Journeyman	Top Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Configuration Manager	Senior	Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Configuration Manager	Senior	Top Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Equipment Specialist	Junior	Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Equipment Specialist	Junior	Top Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Equipment Specialist	Journeyman	Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Equipment Specialist	Journeyman	Top Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Equipment Specialist	Senior	Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Equipment Specialist	Senior	Top Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Program Analyst	Junior	Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Program Analyst	Junior	Top Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Program Analyst	Journeyman	Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Program Analyst	Journeyman	Top Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Program Analyst	Senior	Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Program Analyst	Senior	Top Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Technical Writer	Junior	Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Technical Writer	Junior	Top Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Technical Writer	Journeyman	Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Technical Writer	Journeyman	Top Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Technical Writer	Senior	Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Technical Writer	Senior	Top Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Cost Estimating and Cost Analysis	Junior	Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Cost Estimating and Cost Analysis	Junior	Top Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Cost Estimating and Cost Analysis	Journeyman	Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -																										
Cost Estimating and Cost Analysis	Journeyman	Top Secret	0					\$ -		\$ -																													



# Evaluation Process Factor 1

## Technical Evaluation

*AFLCMC... Providing the Warfighter's Edge*



- Offerors provide up to 5 work samples as evidence for validation of self-score
- Allows Government to objectively validate previous work experience of Offerors
- The highest self-scored proposal is validated by the Technical Evaluation Team
- Only downward adjustments are made if substantiating documents and/or Government POC's does not validate the scores
- If validated score is lower than the second highest self-score, then the next highest self-scored proposal is evaluated
- This would continue until the highest validated score is determined



U.S. AIR FORCE

# Evaluation Process Factor 2

## Cost/Price



*AFLCMC... Providing the Warfighter's Edge*

- The Highest Validated Self-Score (Highest Technically Rated Offeror) moves to Factor 2 Cost Price Evaluation
- Using Government benchmark rates cost/price analysis begins
- The Government customer pre-determines the percentile to be paid for each labor category based on several factors, including security level, geographic location....
- The 2-Step Process for Determining Cost Realism/Reasonableness of the Proposed Costs is determined by:
  1. Realistic - labor rates not understated by a % determined by the customer
  2. Reasonable – labor rates not overstated by a % determined by the customer
- If the Offeror's proposed cost is unrealistic or unreasonable then the next highest validated Offeror will be evaluated
- The Offeror with a proposed cost/price determined to be reasonable and realistic after most probable cost adjustments receives award



U.S. AIR FORCE

# Benchmark Rates



*AFLCMC... Providing the Warfighter's Edge*

- Government determines benchmark rates prior to receipt of proposals
- Benchmark rates are a qualified estimate of what the Government should expect to pay in the competitive labor market
- Derived from a variety of sources/data points
- If historical actuals are higher than the benchmark rate a higher rate may be established for specific/specialized positions
- Government may calculate hybrid/blended benchmark rates if the duties of a specific position cross multiple functions/labor categories



U.S. AIR FORCE

# Evaluation Process

## Factor 2 Cost/Price (Step 1)

*AFLCMC... Providing the Warfighter's Edge*



- Compare Offeror's proposed direct labor rates in Uniform Pricing Template (UPT) to Government established benchmark rates
- If Offeror's proposed rate for a labor category falls within pre-established percentage (+/-), rate is accepted
- If Offeror's proposed rate for a labor category falls outside pre-established percentage (+/-), Government will evaluate Offeror's Basis of Estimate (BOE) before accepting the Offeror's proposed rate
- Decision Point:
  - Government may accept rate if Offeror's BOE justification is sufficient
  - If BOE justification not sufficient, Offeror's proposed rate is rejected and Government adjusts and substitutes benchmark rate in calculation
- Comparison of summation of proposed direct labor rates (Quantity of 1 hr. per rate) against summation of all Government evaluated/adjusted rates
- If result of comparison summation is within pre-established percentage (+/-), Offeror moves to step 2 of evaluation process



# Evaluation Process

## Factor 2 Cost/Price (Step 2)



*AFLCMC... Providing the Warfighter's Edge*

**Most Probable Cost (MPC)** = Fully burdened (not including fee)  
Government evaluated rates x total number of hours for each labor category

**Total Evaluated Price (TEP)** = MPC + travel/ODC costs + CAF +  
proposed fee percentage

### Reasonable

If the Offeror's proposed total cost is within the pre-established percentage (+/-) compared to the Government MPC the Offeror is deemed reasonable, realistic, and eligible for award

### Realistic

If Offeror's proposed total cost is not within the pre-established percentage (+/-) the Offeror is deemed unreasonable, unrealistic, and not eligible for award

- Indicates Offeror does not likely understand Government requirements and/or the labor market



# Evaluation Process

## Adequate Price Competition



*AFLCMC... Providing the Warfighter's Edge*

### Adequate Price Competition

FAR 15.403-1(c)(1) (i) A price is based on adequate price competition when—

- (A) Two or more responsible Offerors, competing independently, submit priced offers that satisfy the Government's expressed requirement;
- (B) Award will be made to the Offeror whose proposal represents the best value (see 2.101) where price is a substantial factor in source selection; and
- (C) There is no finding that the price of the otherwise successful Offeror is unreasonable.

### Government meets the intent based on:

- Two or more independent offers received in response to the Fair Opportunity Proposal Request
- Government's express requirement satisfied when an Offeror submits a proposal that contains a complete Uniform Pricing Template (UPT) IAW the instructions to Offerors (ITO) and evaluation criteria in the FOPR

### Price Reasonableness- FAR 15.404-1

- Price analysis conducted as part of cost/price evaluation
- A Total Evaluated Price (TEP) outside the pre-established percentage is deemed unreasonable



