# SECTION A: Instructions, Conditions, and Notices to Respondents

1. All correspondence in conjunction with this RFQ shall be directed to the following Contracting Officer (CO) Government point of contact (POC): Arita Edwards, [arita.edwards@usdoj.gov](mailto:arita.edwards@usdoj.gov)
   1. Communications and questions or requests for clarifications shall be submitted by email to the CO **on or before (8/18/2023), no later than 12:00 p.m. local time (Washington D.C.)**. The subject of the email should contain the Offeror’s name and the RFQ number. Failure to submit questions in the time specified may result in a “no response” from the Government, unless otherwise determined by the CO. Offerors should not direct any communications or questions (written or verbal) concerning this RFQ to anyone other than the CO. Answers to all written questions submitted will be provided as an amendment to this RFQ as soon as possible after the time and date listed above.
   2. Questions and comments should be listed, and sections and paragraphs identified as listed in chart below. When referencing specific text of this RFQ, questions or comments shall include the following information:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Solicitation Number: 15JPSS-(23)-Q-00000081** | | | |
| **Page #** | **Section and Paragraph # or Attachment** | **Question/Comment** | **Recommended Changeor Supplemental Information Requested** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

* 1. Offerors questions and responses by the Department may form the basis of an amendment to the RFQ. Responses to questions will not reveal the Offeror who proposed the question.

1. **Offer Acceptance Period**: The Department requires a minimum acceptance period of at least 90 calendar days. Offerors may specify a longer acceptance period than the Department’s minimum requirement. A response allowing less than the Department’s minimum acceptance period may be rejected.
2. **Quotation Submission Instructions**: The Offeror shall submit documentation that comports with the requirements of this RFQ. Offerors shall acknowledge all amendments, complete necessary fill-ins in their entirety, and return them with their submission to this RFQ. Any response not in compliance with the Department’s request may be rejected. The Department, at its discretion, may incorporate all or portions of an Offeror’s quote at (Task Order) Award.
   1. **Representations and Certifications:** Offeror shall ensure they have updated and complete representations and certifications in the System forAward Management (SAM), to include its representation and certifications for FAR 52.204-24, Representation Regarding Certain Telecommunications and Video Surveillance Services or Equipment.
   2. **Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI)**: The Offeror shall disclose any potential or actual organizational conflicts of interest (OCIs) that your firm (to include subcontractors) may have with the requirements of the SOW/RFQ. Include a description of the OCI(s) and the action(s) taken, if any, to avoid, mitigate, or neutralize the OCIs. A negative response is required.
   3. RFQ responses shall be submitted in accordance with the instructions in this section. RFQ responses must be prepared in three parts: Volume I – Technical Proposal 10 pages, Volume II – Past Performance 10 Pages, and Volume III – Price 5 pages, no volume, with the exception of Volume III – Price, shall contain any costs related to this RFQ; however, resource information may be contained in the technical quote so that your understanding of the scope of work may be evaluated. Resumes and attachments required from the Government (i.e., past performance questionnaire) shall be excluded from the page limit requirement.
   4. RFQ responses are due no later than (**8/18/23) 12:00 PM Eastern Time.** Any quote, modification, or revision that is received after the exact time specified for receipt of quotes is late and will not be considered.
   5. An official authorized to bind your organization must sign the RFQ responses. The Offeror’s quote shall provide convincing rationale to address how the Offeror intends to meet these requirements. ***Offerors are reminded that that Department reserves the right to award this effort based on the initial quote, as received, without discussions.***

This RFQ does not commit the Government to pay any costs incurred in the submission of any quotation or in making necessary studies for the preparation thereof. Nor does it commit the Government to procure or contract for said services. The Contracting Officer is the only individual who can commit the Government to the expenditure of public funds in connection with this proposed procurement.

* 1. The quote must include all data and information requested by these instructions and must be submitted in accordance with these instructions. Offerors shall be compliant with the requirements stated in the RFQ. ***The Department may reject any offer that is not in compliance with the instructions provided in this RFQ.*** Quotes must be clear, coherent, and prepared in sufficient detail for effective evaluation and for substantiating the validity of stated claims. The quote shall not simply rephrase or restate the Department’s requirements, but rather shall provide convincing rationale to address how the Offeror intends to meet these requirements. Each volume shall be written on a stand-alone basis so that its contents may be evaluated without seeking information from other volumes of the quote. Information required for quote evaluation, which is not found in its designated volume, will be assumed to have been omitted from the quote.

Offerors are advised not to make generalized statements, such as “the Offeror understands and will comply with the requirements,” “standard procedures will be used,” “well known techniques will be used,” “best known practices,”orstatements that paraphrase the RFQ/SOW in whole or in part. General statements that the Offeror can or will comply with the requirements, that standard procedures will be used, that well-known techniques

will be used, or paraphrasing the solicitation’s requirements in whole or in part will NOT constitute compliance. Failure to conform to any of the requirements of the solicitation may form the basis for rejection of the proposal.

Unnecessary elaboration or other presentations beyond that sufficient to present a complete and effective proposal are NOT desired. Elaborate artwork, expensive visuals, or other presentation aids are neither necessary nor desired. Clarity, completeness, and conciseness are essential, and the overall quality of the proposal will be evaluated in the context of being representative of the Offeror’s services. Since only the proposal submitted in response to this solicitation will be evaluated, Offerors should make certain that their proposal is complete regarding the information provided. Offerors are responsible for ensuring that their proposal responds to the requirements of this solicitation and are responsible for ensuring that a proposal contains sufficient detail for the Department to evaluate it. Data either previously submitted or presumed to be known will not be considered in the evaluation unless that information is contained in the proposal.

# Quotation Format and Content:

* + 1. All quotations shall contain the three separate volumes (and sections) identified in the chart below and be submitted as three (3) separate PDF files, subject to the quantities and page limits as specified below:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Volume** | **Title** | **Original Plus # ofCopies** | **Maximum Page Limit\*** |
| I | Technical Proposal | 1 Original – Electronic Version | 10 Pages total (Resumes and government required  attachments will not count against this total) |
| II | Past Performance | 1 Original – Electronic Version | 10 Pages (Government required attachments  will not count against this total) |
| III | Price | 1 Original – Electronic  Version | 5 pages |
| \*Pages submitted in excess of the page limitations described above will not be evaluated. | | | |

* + 1. **Paper, Page Size and Markings**: Each volume shall have a Table of Contents for easy reference. The quotations shall be formatted such that, if printed, they fit within 8 ½ x 11- inch paper, in a commercially standard font size (12-point). The offeror should mark its RFQ response with any proprietary marking, if needed, based on their assessment of the contents of each of these volumes.
    2. **Illustrations and Tables:** Pages shall not contain any graphics or illustrations other than for the purposes of depicting the technical approach. Illustrations, charts, and graphs other than for depicting the technical approach are not permitted. Tables, charts, graphs, diagrams, and figures shall be used wherever practical to depict organizations, systems

and layout, implementation schedules, plans, etc. These displays shall be uncomplicated, legible, and shall not exceed 8.5 x 11 inches. Text shall be no smaller than 10 points for tables, charts, graphs, and figures. Elaborate formats or color presentations are not required.

* + 1. After evaluation, selection, and award, the files of each unsuccessful quotation will be retained per FAR 4.805.

# Technical Proposal Volume I Instructions

Technical submissions must consist of a technical proposal of no more than ten (10) pages, a staffing plan of no more than three (3) pages plus resumes and signed letters of intent to participate, and references to one or more examples of data migration projects of similar scope. Technical submissions may also include user research plans and design artifacts of no more than 30 pages combined. Technical proposals and staffing plans must be submitted using 12-point type.

# Past Performance Volume II Instructions

* + - 1. Past Performance Reference Listing: Offerors shall provide information on no more than three (3) previous contracts performed for federal, state, and local government agencies and/or commercial customers, for which the Offeror’s efforts are recent and relevant to the efforts required by this RFQ and which demonstrates their ability to perform their proposed effort of a project of similar scope and size. Offerors shall also provide information on problems encountered on the identified contracts and the Offerors corrective actions. If the Offeror has no recent or relevant Past Performance, the Offeror shall state so. No past performance will be considered neutral when evaluated. Past performance on government projects reported to CPARS (Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System) may be considered in addition to submitted past performance documentation. See attached Past Performance Questionnaire.
         1. “Recent” is defined as occurring within the last three years prior to the RFQ closing date. Recent is further defined as those contracts in which efforts have been performed for at least 1 year. [This 1-year performance requirement applies to referenced efforts that have already been completed within three (3) years of the date that quotations are due as well as referenced efforts that are still ongoing. In other words, both types of references (those completed and those still ongoing) must have 1-year of performance to be considered recent.].
         2. “Relevant” is defined as a contract of similar scope, magnitude, and complexity to the requirements as set forth in this solicitation.

**Scope**: Experience in the areas defined in the SOW.

**Magnitude**: The measure of the similarity of the volume, dollar value and/or duration of the work actually performed under the Offeror’s submitted contracts to the SOW.

**Complexity**: The measure of the similarity of technical difficulty, managerial intricacy, and/or required coordination of efforts and disciplines performed by the offeror in its submitted contracts to the SOW. For complexity, not only will the tasks performed by the Offeror be considered, but also the Offeror’s ability to coordinate tasks (e.g., concurrent performance requirements).

# Past Performance

The Department may also contact the references provided or check available records, such as CPARS and PPIRS, for performance evaluation information.

# Price Volume III Instructions

It is anticipated that pricing and award will be based on adequate price competition. The offeror shall provide sufficient price information to allow the Contracting Officer to determine the reasonableness of the proposed price. Completion of the price template is necessary for a full evaluation of an Offeror’s quote.

* + - 1. Cover Letter: At a minimum, the price volume of the quotation shall include the following information:
         1. **RFQ number**: 15JPSS23Q00000081

# Offeror Name, Address, DUNS Number

* + - * 1. **Authorized Individuals**. Provide the name, title, telephone number, fax number, and e-mail address for the individual designated as the central point of contact for this quotation.
        2. **Acknowledgment** of RFQ Amendments (if applicable).
        3. **Agreement with terms**. A statement specifying the extent of agreement with all terms, conditions, and provisions included in the RFQ. Offerors are to clearly detail any exceptions taken and the rationale for the exceptions taken to the RFQ. Please note that exceptions taken to the RFQ may render the submission unacceptable to the Government.
        4. **Assumptions**. Offeror shall describe any assumptions used to develop the quotation.
        5. **Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI)**. Offeror shall include any disclosures of potential or actual organizational conflicts of interest (OCIs) as outlined Paragraph 3.2.
        6. **Representations and Certifications.** Offeror shall confirm all representations and certifications are completed in SAM.

# Quote expiration date.

* + - 1. Pricing Spreadsheet. Complete the price template provided at Attachment 3 of the RFQ. Proposed labor must include all resources necessary to perform all of the services described in the RFQ/SOW. Offerors may change the total estimated Annual Hours shown in Attachment 3 to reflect full time/part time staffing proposals. However, hourly rates and labor categories based on the awarded schedule must be clearly defined for comparative purposes.
         1. **(LABOR or TASK REQUIREMENTS)**: The Department has provided the estimated labor categories and labor hours on this template, which represent the Department’s current best estimate of requirements. This template shall be used by the Offeror for computing the total (labor ceiling or annual price). It is recognized that some of the labor category titles used in the RFQ may not exactly match the titles normally used in a particular company operation. Accordingly, in order to permit a rapid comparison between the anticipated labor team shown on the template and the Offeror’s actual labor category nomenclature, each proposal must provide a statement of the Offeror’s normally used nomenclature for each labor category included in the template, together with a copy of the Offeror’s position description for each labor category as proposed.
         2. OTHER DIRECT COSTS & TRAVEL

# SECTION B: Evaluation of Proposals

1. **Evaluation Process**: This is a fair opportunity ordering process under FAR Part 8.405-2 or FAR Part 19.5 Total Small Business Set Aside. The procedures in FAR Subpart 15.3 do not apply to this acquisition. The use of this fair opportunity process does not obligate the Department to determine a competitive range, conduct discussions with any Offerors, solicit proposals or revisions thereto, or use any other source selection techniques associated with FAR Subpart 15.3.
   1. **Exchanges**: During the evaluation process, the Department reserves the right to conduct exchanges. If the Department conducts exchanges, it may be with one, several, or all Offerors. Exchanges may vary with each Offeror based on the Department’s need to understand or give the Offeror an opportunity to improve their quotation. However, exchanges with Offerors will be fair and equitable.
2. **Evaluation Factors**: The Department intends to issue a single task order under this RFQ. In determining which contractor represents the best overall value, the Department will consider the following evaluation factors.

Factor 1 – FedRAMP, Solution Overview & Capabilities Checklist Factor 2 – Product Demonstration

Factor 3 – Price

CRT will evaluate the submitted quotes against the criteria set forth below and then make an award based on best value using tradeoffs. CRT will award an agreement resulting from this RFQ to the responsible quoter whose quote conforms to the RFQ and represents the best value to the government, price and the other criteria specified below considered. Quoters are advised that technical evaluation factor 1 is more important than technical evaluation factor 2. And both technical evaluation factors 1 and 2 combined are more important than price; as non-price ratings become closer, price will become more important.

# Factor 4 – Past Performance

The Offeror’s Past Performance will be evaluated to assess the Offeror’s likelihood of successful performance in providing requirements similar in size, scope, and complexity of this solicitation. The Department may use present and/or past performance data obtained from a variety of sources, not just those identified by the Offeror.

* + 1. There are three aspects to the past performance evaluation: Recency, Relevancy and Quality.
    2. After evaluating individual past performance submissions for recency, relevancy, and quality, the Department will assign one overall confidence rating for Past Performance as outlined in Section 3.2 below.
    3. The past performance evaluation conducted in support of this RFQ does not establish, create, or change existing records and history of the Offeror’s past performance on past contracts; rather, the past performance evaluation process gathers information from customers on how the Offeror performed those past contracts.
    4. In the case of an Offeror who does not provide information on recent or relevant past performance, or where past performance information is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on this factor. The Offeror shall receive the rating of “neutral,” meaning the rating is neither favorable nor unfavorable. In a best value tradeoff, the Department may determine that a “Substantial Confidence” or “Satisfactory Confidence” past performance rating is worth more than a “Neutral Confidence” past performance rating, as long as the determination is consistent with stated criteria.
  1. Factor 3 – Price
     1. The Department will conduct a price analysis to ensure that rate tables and other pricing data are accurate and reasonable. A determination will be made as to whether the price quotes submitted by Offerors are complete in all aspects and whether amounts submitted are calculated accurately. The proposal will also be reviewed for consistency to ensure that all performance, scope, and assumptions proposed in other sections of the proposal are captured in the price proposal section.
     2. The Department will evaluate the reasonableness of the total price and will make a price fairness and reasonableness determination using evaluation techniques at FAR 15.404-1(b)(2). The evaluation will assess the accuracy, completeness, GSA schedule pricing, discounts offered (price reduction), and reasonableness. The total evaluated price, including the base and four options, will be used in price analysis to determine reasonableness. This process involves comparison of competitive quotes for supplies and services, verification that prices are included for all.
     3. The proposed price is reasonable when it is fair to the buyer, fair to the seller, and reasonable considering the market conditions, available alternatives, and other price- related factors. The determination that a total price is reasonable will be based upon information submitted with the Offeror’s quote, review of individual CLINS, comparison to the IGCE, or other reasonable bases.
     4. Price volumes failing to meet or comply with price proposal instructions may be deemed noncompliant.
     5. Evaluation of options will be conducted in accordance with FAR 52.217-5, Evaluation of Options, the objective of the evaluation of options is to determine that the price for each of the options to be fair and reasonable. The evaluation of options shall not obligate the Department to exercise any options.
     6. The total evaluated price shall be used in the trade-off analysis between the price and non-price factors to determine the best value. The total evaluated price of the proposal shall include the total price for the base period and all option periods.

# Evaluation Ratings

* 1. Rating definitions for Factors 1, 2, and 3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Adjectival Rating** | **Description** |
| Outstanding | Quote meets the requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths far outweigh weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performanceis very low. |
| Good | Quote meets the requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of  the requirements. Proposal contains strengths which outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is low. |
| Acceptable | Quote meets the requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths and weaknesses are offsetting or will have little to no impact on contract performance. Risk of unsuccessful performance isno worse than moderate. |
| Marginal | Quote does not clearly meet requirements and has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. The proposal has one or more weaknesses which are not offset by strengths. Risk of unsuccessful performance is high. |
| Unacceptable | Quote does not meet requirements and contains oneor more deficiencies. Quote is not awardable. |

* 1. Ratings definitions for Factor 4 – Past Performance

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Past Performance Relevancy** | |
| **Rating** | **Definition** |
| Very Relevant | Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this RFQ requires. |
| Relevant | Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this RFQ requires. |
| Somewhat Relevant | Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this RFQ requires. |
| Not Relevant | Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this RFQ requires. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Performance Confidence Assessments** | |
| **Rating** | **Definition** |
| Substantial Confidence | Based on the Offeror’s recent and relevant performance record, the  Department has a high expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Satisfactory Confidence | Based on the Offeror’s recent and relevant performance record, the  Department has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror will Successfully perform the required effort. |
| Neutral Confidence | No recent or 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. |
| Limited Confidence | Based on the Offeror’s recent and relevant performance record, the Department has a low expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.. |
| No Confidence | Based on the Offeror’s recent and relevant performance record, the  Department has no expectation that the Offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort. |

* 1. Rating definitions for Factor 3 - Price The price factor does not receive a rating.

# Award

Following an evaluation and tradeoff analysis, the Department will make an award to the Offeror whose quote represents the best value to the Department, price and non-price factors considered. The Department reserves the right to make an award based on other than the lowest quoted price.

* 1. **Award on Initial Responses:** The Department anticipates making an award based on initial responses, without engaging in exchanges with Offerors. Therefore, Offerors are strongly encouraged to submit their best technical solutions and price in response to this RFQ.
  2. **Comparative Analysis:** The Department may perform a comparative analysis (comparing Offeror responses to one another) as a part of tradeoff analysis.
  3. **Basis of Award:** An award will be made to the responsible Offeror whose offer, conforming to the RFQ, is determined to be the best overall value to the Government. The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the evaluation criteria stated in this Section B.
  4. **Brief Explanations:** Post award notices will be issued in accordance with FAR Part 8.405(d) or FAR Part 16.505(b)(6).