

1.0 Addendum to 52.212-2 – Evaluation – Commercial Items

1.1 Basis for Contract Award. The Source Selection Authority (SSA) shall select the source whose proposal offers the best value to the Government in accordance with the established criteria in this Evaluation Criteria. Trade-offs may be utilized to award to the best-value source based on a comparative assessment of proposals in accordance with the established criteria and with consideration of the recommendations and minority opinions presented to the SSA.

1.2 This contract is a full and open competitive procurement conducted in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 12, Commercial Items, as supplemented by the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS), and the Air Force Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (AFFARS). These regulations are available electronically at the Air Force (AF) FAR Site, <http://farsite.hill.af.mil>.

1.3 The Government intends to award a multiple award Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) and will select the proposal(s) found to be most advantageous to the Government. The evaluation criteria are first divided into two (2) segments: SWAG Oral Presentations and Staffing Plan. Then evaluated according to three (3) factors: Technical Approach, Past Performance, and Price. The tradeoff process for this acquisition will permit a tradeoff between technical, past performance and price for acceptable proposals reaching the contract award decision. The Contract may be awarded to the offeror(s) deemed responsible in accordance with the FAR, as supplemented, whose proposal conforms to the solicitation's requirements (to include all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and all other information required by Addendum to 52.212-1 – Instructions to Offerors – Commercial Item of this solicitation) and is judged, based on the evaluation factors to represent the best value to the Government. The Government seeks to award to the offeror(s) who give(s) the Air Force the greatest confidence that it will best meet the requirements. This may result in an award to a higher rated, higher priced offeror, where the decision is consistent with the evaluation factors, and the Source Selection Authority (SSA) reasonably determines that performance of the technically acceptable higher priced offeror outweighs the cost difference. The SSA will base the source selection decision on an integrated assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria in the solicitation (described below). While the Government source selection evaluation team and the SSA will strive for maximum objectivity, the source selection process, by its nature, is subjective; and therefore, professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire process.

1.4 The Government intends to award multiple award indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity (ID/IQ) contract as well as Task Order 0001 for the SAF/MG Business - Capability Lifecycle Management (B-CLM) Projects. However, the Government reserves the right to make an award, or no award at all. This acquisition will result in a Firm Fixed Price (FFP) multi-award IDIQ contract. The Government will review the proposals for responsiveness. If a proposal is non-responsive then it will not be further evaluated.

2.0 Correction Potential of Written Proposals (Only applies to written volumes, not oral presentations. Exchanges can take place during oral presentations)

2.1 The Government intends to award without exchanges. Accordingly, offerors are advised to submit initial proposals that are fully and clearly acceptable without additional information. The

Attachment 2

Government will not search for information within the proposal in order to make the proposal acceptable. However, if during the evaluation period, it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government to hold exchanges, a notice will be sent to the offeror.

2.1.1 If exchanges are necessary, the Government will issue Exchange Notices (ENs) as necessary to offerors. ENs will be sent electronically to offerors to ensure complete understanding of any discrepancies. Any necessary page changes to the offeror's proposals will be obtained prior to concluding exchanges. Throughout the exchange process, the Government will document any changes in ratings and total evaluated price. Offeror responses to ENs at the conclusions of exchanges will become their final proposal and be considered in making the source selection decision. If the offeror's proposal has been evaluated as acceptable at the time exchanges are closed, any changes or exceptions are subject to evaluation and may introduce risk that the offeror's proposal be determined unacceptable and ineligible for award.

2.1.2 Offerors may be asked to clarify certain aspects of their proposal (for example, the relevance of past performance information) or respond to adverse past performance information to which the offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond. Adverse past performance is defined as past performance information that supports a less than satisfactory rating on any evaluation element or any unfavorable comments received from sources without a formal rating system.

The evaluation will be completed in the following steps:

2.2 Step 1: The Government will evaluate the Offeror's Oral Presentation to the SWAG scenario (attachment 6). The SWAG Scenario will be evaluated using the criteria listed below:

2.2.1 This criteria pertains to the soundness and flexibility of the proposed SWAG scenario approach. The Offeror should submit its approach for accomplishing a task order for the scenario. The Offeror's approach shall clearly demonstrate an understanding of the requirements and include an innovative and efficient approach for satisfying the overall objectives of the scenario. The Offeror shall describe proposed manning levels and skill mix and explain why they are adequate and sufficient to execute the project task order as defined in SWAG scenario. The offeror's staffing plan shall include proposed labor categories to meet the requirements. It is the contractor's responsibility to propose labor categories and labor category mix needed for successful performance. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposal in the following areas:

2.2.1.1 The offeror's technical approaches for demonstrating its ability to accomplish the tasks per DoD and Air Force policy (ref: PWS Appendix 2). The offer shall clearly demonstrate the offerors' understanding of the work to be performed including the approach, methodology, and analytical techniques to perform the requirements outlined in the SWAG scenario inclusive of all tasks.

2.2.1.2 The offeror's plan that demonstrates the ability to produce and deliver all reports required by this SWAG scenario in the timely and efficient manner.

Attachment 2

2.2.1.3 The offeror's knowledge and demonstrated use of program management methods, especially in the area of sequenced information technology capability delivery

2.2.1.4 The Government will evaluate the Offeror's approach for demonstrating a comprehensive understanding of performance and business reference models, enterprise architectures, and process modeling tools.

2.2.1.5 The Government will evaluate the offeror's approach for facilitating team activities through the development, documentation, and approval of documentation as identified in the PWS Appendix 2.

2.2.1.6 The Government will evaluate the Offeror's approach for facilitating the team through the development of the Doctrine, Organization, Training, Materiel, Leadership and Education, Personnel, Facilities and Policy (DOTMLPF-P) Implementation Plan was very comprehensively planned.

2.2.1.7 The Government will evaluate the Offeror's staffing approach for SWAG Scenario for to ensure the accomplishment of timely and effective support, performed IAW the requirements contained in the PWS. The Government will also evaluate the Offeror's capability to properly allocate proper resources and a realistic timeline to complete the project in accordance with the scenario. The offeror should send a knowledgeable representative with authority to make changes in the event a response to the Government's question results in a proposal change.

2.3 Step 2: The Government will evaluate the Offeror's Volume I- IDIQ Staffing/ Management Plan.

2.3.1 Management Plan. At the IDIQ level, the Government will evaluate the Offeror's management approach to oversee all activities performed by Contractor personnel, including subcontractors, to ensure the accomplishment of timely and effective support, performed IAW the requirements contained in the PWS. This demonstrates an offeror's plan to managing the basic indefinite delivery/indefinite quantity (ID/IQ) contract and all awarded Task Orders.

2.3.2 Staffing Plan. This demonstrates an offeror's capability to properly allocate resources in accordance with the PWS and the capability to recruit and retain employees. At the IDIQ level, the Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed cross reference matrix that assigns the proposed labor categories IAW PWS. If applicable, the Government will evaluate any alternate labor categories proposed by the offeror. The cross-matrix will be evaluated to assess the offerors full understanding of the requirement for staffing resources and overall management of the entire project and scope. The Government will review submitted resumes for all key personnel to show an understanding of the requirement. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's staffing plan for a solid approach that demonstrates an offeror's plan to minimize impact on recruiting, and staff and retain.

2.3.3 Step 1 and 2 will be rated Acceptable and Unacceptable.

Rating	Description
Acceptable	Proposal meets the requirements of the solicitation
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet the requirements of the solicitation.

Step 3: The Government will evaluate the remaining factors.

2.4 Evaluation Factors

2.4.1 The following evaluation factors will be used to evaluate each proposal: Award will be made to the Offeror(s) proposing the combination most advantageous to the Government based upon an assessment of the evaluation factors described below.

Factor 1: Technical Approach

Factor 2: Past Performance

Factor 3: Cost/Price

2.4.2 Technical and past performance, when combined, are significantly more important than price

2.5 The Government will provide Labor Categories and descriptions. If the Offeror is proposing other labor categories, provide rationale.

2.6 Volume II- Factor 1: Technical. The Government will evaluate the offerors technical proposal and provide a single rating at the factor level by assigning a rating per table 1.

Table 1 - Technical Approach

Rating	Description
Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements; the proposal exceeds the minimum requirements of the solicitation by providing innovative approaches. The Offeror's industry experience reflects a minimum of 10 years of industry experience; plus three (3) or more years of Federal experience that is essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low to moderate. The Offeror's industry experience reflects a minimum of six to nine (6 to 9) years of industry experience; plus a minimum of two (2) years of Federal experience that is essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

Fair	Proposal meet some of the requirements and indicates a somewhat adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. The Offeror's industry experience reflects a minimum of three to five (3 to 5) years of industry experience; plus a minimum of one (1) years of Federal experience that is essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet the requirements of the solicitation. The Offeror has less than two (2) years of industry experience and less than one (1) year of Federal experience that reflects expertise and experience with little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires

2.6.1 The Government will evaluate the Offeror's, technical approach, methodology, and understanding of the requirement and associated processes to complete all required tasks IAW the PWS at the IDIQ level. The Government will only evaluate LCATs at the IDIQ level if the Offeror proposes different labor categories than those stated in the PWS.

2.6.2 Task Order 0001. For Task Order 0001, the Government will evaluate the proposed FTEs and labor categories for the kick off meeting. The Government will use the TO pricing sheet to assess that the offeror is proposing enough resources to meet the full requirement of the kick off meeting.

2.6.3 Industry Experience. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's experience in leveraging industry standards and procedures; implementing enterprise resourcing planning; consolidating IT systems; modernizing business systems, and performing data integration. The Government will also evaluate the Offeror's experience in taking functional need statements and delineating them into requirement documentation. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's experience with converting requirements to implemented systems.

2.7 Volume III- Factor 2: Past Performance. Past performance will be evaluated as a measure of the Government's confidence in the offeror's ability to successfully perform based on the offeror's demonstrated recent and relevant record of performance in supplying the services that meet the task order requirements. As a result of the recency, relevancy, and quality ratings, offerors will receive an integrated performance confidence assessment rating. Although the past performance evaluation focuses on performance that is relevant to the Technical subfactors and cost/price factor, the resulting performance confidence assessment rating is made at the factor level and represents an overall evaluation of contractor performance. Offerors without a record of recent / relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance and, as a result, will receive an "Unknown Confidence" rating for the Past Performance factor.

2.7.1 More recent performance will have a greater impact on the Performance Confidence Assessment than less recent or relevant effort. A strong record of relevant past performance may be considered more advantageous to the Government than an "Unknown Confidence" rating. Likewise, a more relevant past performance record may receive a higher confidence rating and be considered more favorably than a less relevant record of favorable performance.

2.7.2 The performance confidence assessment may result in positive or adverse findings. Adverse is defined as past performance information that supports a less than satisfactory rating on any evaluation element or any unfavorable comment received from sources without a formal rating system. For adverse information identified, the evaluation will consider the number and severity of the problem(s), mitigating circumstances, and the effectiveness of corrective actions that have resulted in sustained improvements. Process changes will only be considered when objectively measurable improvements in performance have been demonstrated. The Government will use the following performance confidence ratings when assessing recent, relevant efforts

2.7.3 As a result of the relevancy and quality assessments of the recent contracts evaluated, offerors will receive an overall performance confidence assessment rating using the ratings described in Table 2. Although the past performance evaluation focuses on performance that is relevant to the Technical factor (with emphasis on industry experience), the resulting performance confidence assessment rating is made at the past performance factor level and represents an overall evaluation of offeror's performance. Offerors whose past performance will be assessed will receive one overall performance confidence assessment rating as follows:

Table 2 – Past Performance Confidence Assessment

Rating	Description
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.
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 no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.
UNKNOWN CONFIDENCE (NEUTRAL)	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.

2.7.4 Recency Assessment: A recency determination will be made for each contract reference provided. To be recent, the effort must have at least six (6) months of continuous active contract performance within the last three (3) years from the date of issuance of this solicitation. Past performance information that fails this condition will not be evaluated.

2.7.5 Relevancy Assessment: A relevancy determination of the offeror's present and past performance will be made. The Government will determine relevancy on an individual contract basis in order to determine an OVERALL relevancy rating for each offeror whose past performance is evaluated. Once the relevancy of the individual contract is assessed, the Government will assign an OVERALL relevancy rating based on an aggregate assessment of all

Attachment 2

evaluated past performance. In determining relevancy for individual contracts, equal consideration will be given to the effort being proposed by the offeror, teaming partner or subcontractor whose contract is being reviewed and evaluated. Higher relevancy will be assigned for contracts that are most similar to the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires and may contribute to an overall higher relevancy rating for the offeror.

2.7.5.1 Relevancy in regard to scope, magnitude, and complexity will be assessed based on, but not limited to, the similarities between a given past performance effort and this solicitation in terms of the following subject areas and application within a complex, global-scale organization:

- A. Providing high level technical advice and support on IT business system enabling IT capabilities across an enterprise organization.
- B. Effective use of industry standards, methods and tools to support data management of IT business system.
- C. Providing effective Project Management Support

2.7.6 Offerors shall explain how the projects referenced are relevant to the proposed effort; however, the Government is not bound by the offeror's opinion of relevancy. The ratings in Table 3 will be used in evaluating relevancy of individual contracts, task orders, and/or BPA calls submitted by the offeror for evaluation:

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.

2.7.7 In the case of an offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available or so sparse that no meaningful past performance rating can be reasonably assigned, the offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance (FAR 15.305 (a)(2)(iv)). Therefore, the offeror shall be determined to have unknown past performance.

2.7.8 Performance Quality Assessment. Each submission will receive a quality assessment rating based on table 4. A quality assessment of the past performance information will be made to determine the quality of the performance for each of the references. Each submission will receiving an individual rating.

Table 4 – Past Performance Quality Assessment Rating

Rating	Description
--------	-------------

Attachment 2

Acceptable	During the contract period, the contractor's performance is meeting (or met) all contract requirements and consistently exceeding (exceeded) many. Very few, if any, minor problems encountered. Contractor provided immediate and effective correction action.
Unacceptable	During the contract period, the contractor's performance is failing (or failed) to meet contract requirements. Serious problems encountered and required corrective actions, were either ineffective or non-existent. Extensive customer oversight and involvement was (or is) required.

2.7.9 The performance quality assessment may result in positive or adverse findings. "Adverse" is defined as past performance information that supports a less than "Satisfactory" rating on any evaluation element. For adverse information identified, the evaluation will consider the number and severity of the problem(s), the mitigating circumstances, and the effectiveness of corrective actions that have resulted in sustained improvements. The Government will not use negative quality assessments against the Offeror until the Offeror has had a chance to address the findings made, either prior to the RFP submission if time permits or during the course of this evaluation. The Government may enter into communications with the Offeror regarding adverse past performance information to which the Offeror has not previously had an opportunity to comment.

2.7.10 The Government will consider the performance quality of recent, relevant efforts (how well the contractor performed on the contracts). The Government evaluation team will conduct an in-depth review and evaluation of all recent past performance data obtained to determine how closely the work performed under those efforts relates to the proposed effort and to determine the quality and usefulness as it applies to performance confidence assessment. The quality assessment may result in positive or adverse findings. Adverse is defined as past performance information that supports a less than satisfactory rating on any evaluation element or any unfavorable comment received from sources without a formal rating system. For adverse information identified, the evaluation will consider the number and severity of the problem(s), mitigating circumstances, and the effectiveness of corrective actions that have resulted in sustained improvements.

2.7.11 The Government will confirm past and present performance data identified by offerors in their proposals and obtain additional past and present performance data, if available from other sources. Past performance information may be obtained through one or more of the following: Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS), Contract Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), questionnaires tailored to the circumstances of this acquisition or other sources or databases known to the Government. Interviews may be conducted with Program Managers, Contracting Officers, Fee Determining Officials and the Defense Contract Management Agency or other sources known to the Government.

2.8 Volume IV- Factor 3: Price

2.8.1 The offeror's Price proposal will be evaluated for award purposes based upon the proposed prices in the IDIQ Pricing Sheet (Attachment 9) being fair, reasonable and balanced, along with a

Attachment 2

realistic PECP. Price will also be evaluated for the total proposed price for Task Order 0001 to ensure consistency with the IDIQ. The Government reserves the right to eliminate a proposal from further evaluation due to evaluated prices that are unfair or unreasonable.

2.8.2 IDIQ Level. IDIQ Pricing Sheet (Attachment 9) will be evaluated for fairness, reasonableness, and balance. The IDIQ Pricing Sheet (Attachment 9) will be incorporated into the contract and utilized for pricing for future task orders.

As part of price evaluation, the government will evaluate its option to extend services (see FAR Clause 52.217-8). In accordance with the clause, price for any option exercised under FAR 52.217-8 will be at the same rates as those in effect for the period of performance at the time the option is exercised. This portion of the price evaluation does not affect the ranking of proposals based on price. The option can be exercised in increments less than six months but for no more than a total of six months during the life of the contract. This evaluation will not obligate the Government to exercise any option under FAR 52.217-8

2.8.2.1 Reasonableness. Comparison of proposed cost/prices received in response to this solicitation is the preferred and intended price analysis technique. Other techniques and procedures found in FAR 15.404-1, if deemed necessary and reasonable, may be used to ensure a fair, reasonable, and balanced cost/price.

2.8.3 Task Order 0001. The offeror's Price proposal will be evaluated for award purposes based upon the total proposed price for Task Order 0001. The total evaluated price (TEP) will consist of the sum of the Firm Fixed Price labor, for Task Order 0001. Price will be evaluated for balance, fairness, reasonableness, and completeness. Additionally, the fully burdened labor rates proposed will be evaluated on the IDIQ. The Government reserves the right to eliminate a proposal from further evaluation due to unacceptable risk if the evaluated prices are incomplete, unbalanced, unfair or unreasonable. The price proposal must include the labor categories and rates in accordance with the attached Pricing Sheet. Comparison of proposed prices received in response to this solicitation is the preferred and intended price analysis technique. Other techniques and procedures found in FAR Part 15.404-1, if deemed necessary, may be used to ensure a reasonable price.

2.8.4 PECP Realism Analysis. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's and PECP for realism in accordance with FAR Provision 52.222-46 - Evaluation of Compensation for Professional Employees (Feb 1993). For the PECP to be realistic, the compensation plan(s) will be evaluated to determine if the compensation level proposed is unrealistically low IAW the scope and effort of the PWS. The analysis will be based on labor rates in the Washington, D.C. area. The Government may utilize Government civilian rates, similar contract labor rates, salary.com, other similar or relevant websites, or anything else it deems appropriate or beneficial in its evaluation of realism. Failure to comply with the requirements in FAR Provision 52.222-46 may constitute sufficient cause to justify rejection of the proposal.

2.8.5 The Government will evaluate options in accordance with FAR clause 52.212-2(b), Evaluation – Commercial Items (OCT 2014), as prescribed in FAR 12.301(c)(1). The Government

Attachment 2

will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. Evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).