

SECTION M

BASIS FOR AWARD

Evaluation and award of this contract will be made in accordance with the Best Value Continuum Tradeoff procedures described in Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 15.101-1 Tradeoff Process for a Best Value Decision.

One (1) contract will be awarded to a responsible (as defined at FAR Subpart 9.1) Offeror whose offer is eligible forward and is determined to provide the best value to the Government.

This acquisition will utilize a Best Value Trade-off approach. Award will be based on an integrated assessment of each Offeror's proposals, and award will be made based on the best overall (i.e. "best value") proposal that is determined to be the most beneficial to the Government, with appropriate consideration given to the four (4) following evaluation factors: Technical Approach (Technical), Management Approach (Management), Past Performance, and Cost. The Government intends to award a contract to the Offeror whose Past Performance is rated as neutral or better, and whose proposal represents the best value after a trade-off analysis IAW FAR 15.101-1 between Technical, Management, Past Performance and Cost. Technical is significantly more important than Management. Management is more important than Past Performance. Past Performance is more important than Cost. Technical on its own is more important than Management and Past Performance combined. The non-cost factors when combined are significantly more important than the Cost factor. Notwithstanding the relative importance of the evaluation factors, Cost may control the award decision when (a) proposals are otherwise considered approximately equal in their non-cost factors, (b) an otherwise superior proposal is not offered at a fair and reasonable cost, or (c) the advantages of a higher rated, higher cost proposal are not considered to be worth the cost premium.

To be considered eligible for award, a rating of no less than "Acceptable" must be achieved for Technical, and Management; and no less than "Neutral" must be achieved for Past Performance; and Cost must be determined to be fair and reasonable.

The Government intends to award without discussions with Offerors, IAW FAR 52.215-1(f)(4). Therefore, the Offeror's initial proposal should contain the Offeror's best terms from a cost or price and technical standpoint. However, the Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer later determines them necessary. If the Contracting Officer conducts discussions, then such discussions will be held with the Offerors whose proposals have been determined to be within the competitive range, IAW FAR 15.306(c). Proposals with an omission or unclear proposals may be judged to mean the Offeror does not fully understand the requirements or understand what it takes to meet or exceed the requirements, regardless of the proposed cost. In that case, the Offeror may be found unacceptable and ineligible for award.

If the Contracting Officer determines that 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. Again, Offeror's initial proposal should contain the Offeror's best terms from a cost and technical standpoint. Offerors excluded from the competitive range or otherwise eliminated from the competition before award will receive prompt written notice of this decision IAW FAR 15.503.

FACTORS AND SUBFACTORS TO BE EVALUATED

The following evaluation factors and subfactors will be used to evaluate each proposal:

Factor 1 – Technical Approach

Subfactor 1 – Demonstration of PWS Sections 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4.1, 3.5, 3.6

Subfactor 2 – Demonstration of FD, PAE, CAA, DIG, and HQDA/DCS Functions

Subfactor 3 – Key Personnel Qualifications and Resumes

Factor 2 – Management Approach

Subfactor 1 – Organizational Chart

Subfactor 2 – Small Business Subcontracting Plan

Factor 3 – Past Performance

Factor 4 – Cost

Factor 1: Technical Factor. Evaluation of the Technical Factor will involve consideration of three (3) Subfactors. Evaluation of the Offeror's proposal shall address each Technical Subfactor as it applies to the Performance Work Statement (PWS). During the evaluation of each proposal, the Government will not assign each Technical Subfactor an adjectival rating. Technical Subfactors will be holistically considered in determining the overall adjectival evaluation rating for the Technical Factor and a written narrative will be prepared reflecting the identified findings supporting the overall Technical Factor rating.

Factor 2: Management Factor. The Management factor is divided into subfactors. Evaluation of the Offeror's proposal shall address each Management Subfactor. During evaluation of each proposal, the Government will not assign a rating to each Management Subfactor. Management Subfactors will be holistically considered in determining the overall evaluation rating for the Management Factor and a written narrative will be prepared reflecting the identified findings supporting the overall Management Factor rating.

Factor 3: Past Performance. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's record of recent and relevant past performance to ascertain the probability of successfully performing the required efforts of the PWS.

Factor 4: Cost. The resulting award will be a Cost Plus Fixed Fee (CPFF). Cost realism will be utilized in the evaluation of Cost Reimbursable efforts.

D. EVALUATION APPROACH

All proposals shall be evaluated by the Source Selection Team (SST). The overarching evaluation approach for all factors and subfactors is as follows:

Adequacy of Response. The proposal will be evaluated to determine whether the Offeror's methods and approach have adequately and completely considered, defined, and satisfied the requirements specified in the RFP. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which each requirement has been addressed in the proposal in accordance with the proposal submission section of the RFP.

Feasibility of Approach. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the proposed approach is workable and the end results achievable. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which successful performance is contingent upon proven devices and techniques. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the Offeror is expected to be able to successfully complete the proposed tasks and technical requirements within the required schedule.

All proposal submission requirements must be clear, concise, and comprehensive and meet the requirements of the PWS in order to be found technically acceptable. Ambiguities may result in an unacceptable rating. No assumptions will be made by the Government evaluators regarding areas not defined in the Offeror's proposal. The Government's evaluation of the Offeror's proposal will be limited to information provided within proposals submitted, with the exception of Cost, Past Performance and Small Business Participation, where data extrinsic to the Offeror's proposals may be considered.

- 1. Factor 1 – Technical Factor.** The Offeror's proposal will be evaluated for the extent to which the Offeror's Technical proposal will result in successful performance of the requirements of the solicitation. The Technical Factor will be assessed an overall rating of Outstanding, Good, Acceptable, Marginal or Unacceptable in accordance with table 1, below. All Offerors must receive a rating of Acceptable or better in the Technical Factor to be eligible for award. Evaluation of the adjectival rating for the Technical Factor considers Subfactor 1, Subfactor 2, and Subfactor 3.



| Table 1 – Combined Technical/Risk Rating Method | |
|--|---|
| Adjectival Rating | Description |
| Outstanding | Proposal demonstrates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements, contains multiple strengths and/or at least one significant strength, and the risk of unsuccessful performance is low. |
| Good | Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength or significant strength, and the risk of unsuccessful performance is low to moderate |
| Acceptable | Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and the risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate. |
| Marginal | Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and/or the risk of unsuccessful performance is high. |
| Unacceptable | Proposal does not meet the requirements of the solicitation, and thus, contains one or more deficiencies and is unawardable, and/or the risk of unsuccessful performance is unacceptably high. |

This methodology holistically considers risk, in conjunction with the significant strengths, strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, uncertainties, and deficiencies in determining technical ratings. Note, risk is a component of overall technical rating and is not evaluated separately.

Definitions:

Significant Strength. An aspect of an Offeror's proposal with appreciable merit or will exceed specified performance or capability requirements to the considerable advantage of the Government during contract performance.

Strength. An aspect of an Offeror's proposal with merit or will exceed specified performance or capability requirements to the advantage of the Government during contract performance.

Weakness. A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. See FAR 15.001.

Significant Weakness. A flaw in the proposal that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. See FAR 15.001.

Deficiency. A material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level. See FAR 15.001.

Uncertainty. Any aspect of a non-cost/price factor proposal for which the intent of the offer is unclear (e.g., more than one way to interpret the offer or inconsistencies in the proposal indicating that there may have been an error, omission, or mistake).

Risk. The potential for unsuccessful contract performance. The consideration of risk assesses the degree to which an Offeror's proposed approach to achieving the technical factor or subfactor may involve risk of disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight, and the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance.

2. Factor 2 – Management Factor. The Management Factor will be evaluated for compliance with Section L and the PWS requirements as detailed below. The Management Factor will be assessed an overall rating of Acceptable or Unacceptable in accordance with table 2, below. All Offerors must receive a rating of Acceptable to be eligible for award. Evaluation of the rating for the Management Factor considers Subfactor 1, and Subfactor 2.

NOTE: Small Business Subcontracting plans will only be reviewed for the Offerors deemed to be apparent awardees, meaning that the subject Offeror has been deemed no less than "Acceptable" for Technical, no less than "Acceptable" for Management, no less than "neutral" for Past Performance, and be deemed "fair and reasonable" for Cost. IAW Defense FAR Supplement (DFARS) 215.304(c)(i), the extent to which Offeror's identify and commit to small business performance of the contract shall be evaluated. Offerors shall submit a Small Business Participation Commitment Document (SBPCD) which specifies the Offeror's level and degree of commitment to small business utilization/participation in performance of this requirement. An SBPCD is required from all Offerors, including companies with commercial plans and comprehensive subcontracting plans. The Government will evaluate the participation of such firms in terms of the value of the total acquisition, the realism of the proposal, and the commitment to use such firm. Small Business Concerns do not need to provide a Participation Commitment Document and will not be prejudiced by the omission of a SBPCD.

| Table 2 –Management Approach Rating Method | |
|--|---|
| Rating | Description |
| Acceptable | Proposed Organizational Chart meets the requirement of the Solicitation and Proposal indicates an adequate approach and understanding of small business objectives. |
| Unacceptable | Proposed Organizational Chart does not meet the requirement of the Solicitation and/or Proposal does not meet small business objectives. |

3. Past Performance Factor. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's record of recent and relevant past performance to ascertain the probability of successfully performing the required efforts of the PWS.

a. Evaluation of past performance shall be in accordance with DoD Source Selection Procedures utilizing the attached Past Performance Questionnaire Form found in Section J, Attachment J.10.

b. The Government will focus its evaluation on the Offeror's (and Major Subcontractor's) record of performance as it relates to all solicitation requirements, including cost, schedule, performance, management of subcontractors and compliance with FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns, and FAR 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan. For the purposes of this Requirement, Major Subcontractors are defined as members of an Offeror's overall team who are expected to perform more than five percent (5%) of the proposed effort. Absent any recent and relevant past performance history or when the performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned, the Offeror will be assigned a "neutral confidence" rating. The Government may use data provided by the Offeror in its proposal and data obtained from other sources, including data in Government files or data obtained through interviews with personnel familiar with the contractor and their current and past performance under Federal, State or Local government or commercial contracts for same or similar services as compared to the NAICS 541611.

c. The Government may consider a wide array of information from a variety of sources but is not compelled to rely on all of the information available. For example: The Government may evaluate third party references provided as to each Offeror's (and Major Subcontractor's) relevant and recent efforts, to verify the probability of successful accomplishment of the required effort. Adverse past performance can include information that supports a less than satisfactory rating on any evaluation aspect, any unfavorable comment received from sources without a formal rating system, or information to which the Offeror has not previously had the opportunity to respond.

d. The past performance factor considers each Offeror's demonstrated recent and relevant record of past performance in supplying products and services that meet the contract requirements. There are three aspects to the past performance evaluation: recency, relevancy, and quality.

(i) RECENCY: The first aspect that will be evaluated is the recency of the Offeror's past performance. Recency is defined as the three (3) preceding calendar years from the date of Solicitation, during which past performance references are considered relevant and is critical to establishing the relevancy of past performance information. Only past performance determined to be "Recent" shall be evaluated for "Relevancy", as provided below.

(ii) **RELEVANCY:** The second aspect is to determine how relevant a recent effort accomplished by the Offeror is to the effort to be acquired through the source selection. The following criteria (see Table 3) will be used to establish what is relevant which shall include similarity of service/support, complexity, dollar value, contract type, use of key personnel and degree of subcontract/teaming.

| Table 3 - Past Performance Relevancy Ratings | |
|---|---|
| Rating | Definition |
| Very Relevant | Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires. |
| Relevant | Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires. |
| Somewhat Relevant | Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires. |
| Not Relevant | Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires. |

NOTE: A Recency determination must be made prior to Offerors' past performance being evaluated for relevancy.

(iii) **QUALITY:** The third aspect assesses the overall quality of the Offeror's past performance. Documented results from Past Performance Questionnaires, interviews, CPARS, and other sources form the support and basis for this assessment. Offerors' past performance shall only be evaluated for Quality *after* it has been determined to be both Recent and Relevant, as provided above.

e. Performance Confidence Assessment: Information from Past Performance Questionnaires, interviews, CPARS and other sources form the support and basis for this assessment. The Offeror will then be assigned an overall confidence rating, in accordance with Table 4 below, based on the quality of the Offeror's past performance.

| TABLE 4 - Performance Confidence Assessments | |
|---|---|
| Rating | Definition |
| Substantial Confidence | Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. |
| Satisfactory Confidence | Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. |
| Neutral Confidence | 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. |

| | |
|--------------------|--|
| Limited Confidence | Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. |
| No Confidence | Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low or no expectation that the Offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort. |

Note: The AI Fast Track Tool shall be used for some or all Past Performance evaluation. Please refer to the "AI Fast Track Integration" notice provided in full-text in Section L of the Solicitation's incorporated Section M.

4. Cost Factor.

The total evaluated cost to be used in the award determination will be the total identified in the Offeror's Cost Model Excel workbook (Attachment 3) (which includes all CLINs) and is subject to a probable cost adjustment IAW the below paragraphs. The total evaluated cost will be the summation of the Section B CLINs, including options, the option to extend services IAW FAR 52.217-8 (calculated by adding one half of the Offeror's probable final year cost/price to the Offeror's Total Evaluated Cost), and any probable cost adjustments made by the Government as determined to be necessary. The Government will evaluate to ensure that all proposed price/costs are fair and reasonable and will evaluate for realism The Offeror's proposal will be evaluated IAW the criteria in FAR 15.404-1. Accordingly, the analytical techniques and procedures prescribed in FAR 15.404-1 for evaluating an Offeror's proposal may be used singly or in combination with others to ensure the costs are fair and reasonable, and support evaluation of realism.

Probable cost may be determined by adjusting (for purposes of evaluation only) each Offeror's proposed cost, when appropriate, to reflect any additions or reductions in cost elements to realistic levels based on the results of the cost realism analysis. The Offeror shall ensure that a complete breakdown of costs is provided by all subcontractors. A complete evaluation of subcontractors' probable cost will be performed in the same manner as the Offeror's as defined in paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and this paragraph.

The Government may consult with the Source Selection Evaluation Board's Technical Evaluation Team to assist in establishing a probable cost and in the evaluation of cost realism. Proposed cost/price will not be adjectively rated. Risks identified in the evaluation of Cost Realism by the Technical Evaluation Team may be addressed in Factor 1.

The Government may use external sources of information to perform its cost evaluation. Such external sources may include, but not be limited to, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, Department of State, Department Contract Audit Agency, or Defense Contract Management Agency. The Government may consult with technical experts regarding labor rates, level of effort and/or skill mix. This DOES NOT relieve the

Offeror from the requirement to submit the supporting documentation for its proposed rates, or basis of estimate as identified in Section L.

For purposes of this solicitation If a meaningful number of the individual direct labor rates are determined to be unrealistic, the Offeror's entire cost proposal may be determined to be unrealistic and un-awardable. IAW FAR 15.404-1, the Government may use various analysis techniques to determine realism.

Note: The Offeror is cautioned that variance from proposed rates during contract performance will be used as a performance metric for the awardee and used as input for the award of additional contracts as well as for past performance reviews issued under the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS).

As noted above, the Offeror's proposed costs will be evaluated to determine the probable cost of the Offeror's approach. To the degree that the Government's probable cost estimate is higher or lower than the Offeror proposed cost, the cost will be adjusted upward/downward for the purposes of evaluation only.

b. The proposed Skill Mix (Labor Categories/ Labor Hours) and any deviations from the Government estimated skill mix will be evaluated using the basis of estimate and technical and management approaches to determine the realism of the proposed cost and the offerors' understanding of the requirements.