

Attachment 13 –Evaluation Criteria

ADDENDUM TO 52.212-2 EVALUATION--COMMERCIAL ITEMS (Oct 2014)

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1. This competitive best value source selection will be conducted in accordance with (IAW) FAR Part 12, Acquisition of Commercial Items; FAR Part 15, Contracting by Negotiation, DoD Source Selection Procedures effective 31 March 2016 and Air Force Federal Acquisition Regulation (AFFARS) Mandatory Procedures (MP) 5315.3 for Source Selection as revised 3 Oct 2017 using the Subjective Tradeoff source selection process. Award will be made to the offeror who is deemed responsible in accordance with FAR Part 9 and whose proposal conforms to the solicitation's requirements and is judged, through an integrated assessment of the specific evaluation criteria, to represent the best value to the Government. In accordance with FAR 52.212-1, the Government reserves the right to award without discussions, but may conduct discussions if the Government determines it is necessary.

1.2. Proposals will be evaluated using three evaluation factors: (1) Technical, (2) Past Performance, and (3) Price. Proposals will be evaluated on individual merit and overall benefit to the Government. The offeror's proposal is a representation of its ability to perform tasks outlined in the PWS. The Air Force reserves the right to incorporate unique aspects of the successful offeror's technical approach which are considered beneficial. Beneficial aspects of the proposal will therefore become part of the contract.

1.3. Technical proposals (Volume I) will be assessed on at the subfactor level IAW DoD Source Selection Procedures Table 2A and the risk descriptions set forth in Table 2B. An overall factor-level rating will not be assigned. Technical subfactor ratings will focus on the Strengths, Weaknesses, and Deficiencies of the offeror's technical solution for meeting the Government's requirement and shall be assigned a rating (Outstanding, Good, Acceptable, Marginal, or Unacceptable) as defined in DoD Source Selection Procedures and AFFARS MP5315.3. The sub-factor ratings will not be rolled up to an overall rating for Technical factor. To be eligible for award, an offeror must receive an "Acceptable" or higher rating for all technical subfactors. Additionally, each technical proposal will receive a Risk rating focusing on the weaknesses associated with an offeror's approach.

1.4. Past Performance (Volume II) The Government will evaluate this factor to assess the offeror's recent and relevant present and past performance record to determine confidence in the offeror's probability of successfully performing the solicitation requirements. For purposes of this evaluation, the "offeror" includes any joint ventures, subcontractors and/or teaming partners proposed as part of the Prime Contractor's team under this effort. The Government will evaluate each offeror's recent and relevant demonstrated record of contract performance in supplying services that meet user's needs, including quality, cost and schedule for the assigned NAICS code 561110 – Office Administrative Services.

1.5. An offeror's proposed Price (Volume III) must be determined fair, reasonable and balanced to be rated eligible for award. Offerors should submit their best price proposal with the original submission of Volume III, in the case that the Government decides to award without discussions. If it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government to open discussions we could address/resolve any pricing concerns at that time.

1.6. In order to be eligible for award, offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions; representations and certifications; evaluation factor requirements; and be deemed responsible in accordance with FAR Part 9. If an offeror fails to meet all solicitation requirements, the Government may not make an award to that offeror.

1.7. The Government intends to select one contractor. However, the Government reserves the right to award no contract at all, depending on the quality of proposal(s) submitted and the availability of funds.

1.8. The CLINs series for this contract will be: 0001 – 5008

2. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY:

2.1. Evaluation Factors. Proposals will be evaluated using three evaluation factors: (1) Technical, (2) Past Performance, and (3) Price. The Technical Factor is slightly more important than Past Performance. The Technical Factor and Past Performance, when combined, are approximately equal in importance to Price.

2.2. Technical. The offerors' proposals shall demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the nature and scope of work required. The Government will not search for data to cure problems or address inconsistencies in an Offeror's proposal. There are four (4) subfactors under the Technical Capability evaluation factor. They are (A) Management Approach/Staffing Plan, (B) Quality Control Plan, (C) Process Improvement, and (D) Technical Expertise/Knowledge. Technical proposals will be

assessed using the Separate Technical/Risk Rating Method at the subfactor level IAW DoD Source Selection Procedures Table 2A with risk descriptions set forth in Table 2B. An overall factor-level rating will not be assigned.

2.3 Past Performance. The Government will evaluate each offeror's recent and relevant present past performance to assess whether there is a reasonable expectation that an offeror can successfully perform as proposed. For purposes of this evaluation, the "offeror" includes any joint ventures, subcontractors and/or teaming partners proposed as part of the Prime Contractor's team under this effort. The Government will evaluate the offeror's demonstrated record of contract compliance in supplying services that meet contract requirements including PWS requirements, price and schedule.

2.4. Price. All Price (Volume III) proposals will be evaluated by the total price. The total evaluated price of each proposal will be calculated by adding the total proposed price for all CLINs including the basic period, option periods and fifty percent (50%) of the offeror's Option Year 4 price (the price for the optional extension of services IAW FAR 52.217-8).

2.3. The Government reserves the right to award without discussions in accordance with FAR 52.212-1 and make an award based on acceptable initial proposals. Accordingly, offerors are advised to submit proposals that are fully and clearly acceptable without additional information. If the Government elects to open discussions, the competitive range may include proposals rated as Technically "Unacceptable" at the sole discretion of the Government. The Government may make a final determination as to whether the Offeror's technical proposal is acceptable solely on the basis of the initial proposal submitted.

2.3.1. If the Government holds discussions, the Government may issue evaluation notices to offerors in the competitive range. Responses will be requested from applicable offerors and discussions will be opened. Formal responses to evaluation notices (if applicable), discussion items, and final proposal revisions will be considered in making the award decision.

2.4. Final Proposal Revisions (FPR) will be requested from each offeror in the competitive range at the conclusion of discussions. Any revision or non-concurrence to contract terms and conditions submitted in the FPR may not be subject to further discussion or negotiation, and may render the offer unacceptable to the Government. This provision is not intended to restrict the offeror's opportunity to revise figures (e.g., prices, discounts, percentages, rates, etc.); rather, it is intended to preclude any misunderstandings by the Government which could result if new or revised terms and conditions are submitted in the FPR that have not been fully disclosed, discussed and understood during discussions or negotiations. Hence, such new or revised terms and conditions are not solicited and, if submitted in the FPR, may render the offer unacceptable to the Government.

2.5. Factor ratings and assessments will identify the proposal strengths, deficiencies, weaknesses, performance confidence, and price. This may result in an award being made to a higher-rated and higher-priced offeror where the decision is consistent with the evaluation factors.

3. EVALUATION FACTORS

3.1. Factor 1 – Technical. The offerors' proposals shall demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the nature and scope of work required. The Government will not search for data to cure problems or address inconsistencies in an Offeror's proposal. There are four (4) subfactors under the Technical Capability evaluation factor. They are (A) Management Approach/Staffing Plan, (B) Quality Control Plan, (C) Process Improvement, and (D) MPF/HR Technical Expertise/Knowledge. Technical proposals will be assessed at the subfactor level IAW DoD Source Selection Procedures Table 2A Technical Rating Method and Table 2B, Technical Risk Rating Method. An overall factor-level rating will not be assigned.

Table 2A. Technical Rating Method

| Adjectival Rating | Description |
|--------------------------|--|
| Outstanding | Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths. |
| Good | Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength. |
| Acceptable | Proposal indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. |
| Marginal | Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. |
| Unacceptable | Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation and, thus, contains one or more deficiencies and is unawardable. |

Table 2B. Technical Risk Rating Method

| Adjectival Rating | Description |
|--------------------------|---|
| Low | Proposal may contain weakness(es) which have little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and normal Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties. |
| Moderate | Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which may potentially cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome difficulties. |
| High | Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which is likely to cause significant disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Is unlikely to overcome any difficulties, even with special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring. |
| Unacceptable | Proposal contains a material failure or a combination of significant weaknesses that increases the risk of unsuccessful performance to an unacceptable level. |

3.1.1. Subfactor A: Management Approach and Staffing Plan. The offeror's proposal will be evaluated on the following:

- a. Provide management approach the offeror will use to ensure effective communication procedures both within the company and with the government to effectively execute the MPF PWS requirements. Provide an organizational structure for all functional areas detailing lines of authority and communication, responsibilities, and functional relationships (to include teaming partners and subcontractors). Provide a flow chart or other illustrative tool to show how your organization will utilize resources to respond to and integrate internally and externally driven existing or new mission-related requirements. PWS Table 1.10.
- b. Provide a detailed staffing plan that depicts the labor categories, skill level, and number of personnel depicted in PWS Table 1.10. Clearly explain how the staffing plan meets the requirements to fill and maintain personnel in all the positions and effectively execute the PWS requirements at all locations. Describe your company's plan to attract/retain talented and driven employees.
- c. Provide a plan for establishing required management processes that will result in continuity of mission support and contract performance at all locations; and efficiently transitioning/phasing-in resources and personnel onto the contract. Plan shall include the following:

d. Procedure for phasing-in all existing work at each location, to prevent interruption in services (to include printer/copiers placement as stated in PWS paragraph 3.5.8.

e. Procedures to verify that all major subcontracted efforts (if applicable) will be in place as necessary for contract performance.

3.1.2. Subfactor B: Quality Control Plan. Provide a detailed explanation of your quality control approach and how the quality processes will be integrated into your overall program management approach structure to ensure timely and accurate deliverables and processes. At a minimum provide the following:

a. Describe the quality management structure to include personnel authority and responsibility (using a tree diagram), quality policy, quality objectives, and related documents needed to ensure effective planning, operation, and control of your processes.

b. Describe process/procedures used to ensure top management commitment/involvement to development, implementation, and continuous improvement of your quality program with emphasis on customer satisfaction.

c. Describe how the Government will be notified of issues affecting contract performance, contract impact, and proposed mitigation.

3.1.3. Subfactor C: Process Improvement.

a. Describe your company's solution to streamline Common Access Card (CAC) service process to reduce lobby wait times. See PWS Table 1.1

b. Describe your company's process to ensure the highest level of customer satisfaction through better customer service strategies. See PWS, Section 1.

3.1.4. Subfactor D: MPF/HR Technical Expertise/Knowledge. Each MPF includes major personnel service components (See PWS Section 1). Describe your expertise/ knowledge in each area below:

a. Service. This Section serves as the initial point of contact between the customer and other MPF work centers as well as the installation DEERS/RAPIDS issuing facility.

b. Awards and Decorations. This Section serves as the base-level focal point for officer, enlisted, and unit awards and decorations actions.

c. Cyber Security Liaison (CSL). This Section provides information management support for the MPF and CSL support to the Force Support Squadron configuration.

d. Personnel Systems Management. This Section provides the functional link between the MPF, CPF, Commander's Support Staffs (CSS), and the Military and Civilian Personnel Data Systems (PDS).

3.2. Factor 2 - Past Performance.

3.2.1. The Government will evaluate the offeror's recent and relevant past performance records to the offeror's probability of successfully performing the solicitation requirements and assign a confidence rating. The Government will evaluate each offeror's demonstrated record of contract performance in providing the services that meet user's needs, including quality, cost and schedule. The Past Performance Evaluation Team will review all past performance information collected and determine the quality of the offeror's performance, general trends, and usefulness of the information. The information collected on recency, relevancy and quality of performance will be used to determine the Performance Confidence Assessment ratings.

Table 4. Past Performance Relevancy Rating Method

| Adjectival Rating | Description |
|--------------------------|---|
| 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. |

Table 5. Performance Confidence Assessments Rating Method

| Adjectival Rating | Description |
|--------------------------|--|
| 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 no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort. |

3.2.2. The Government will evaluate each offeror's recent and relevant present and past performance to assess whether there is a reasonable expectation that an offeror can successfully perform as proposed. For purposes of this evaluation, the "offeror" includes any joint ventures, subcontractors and/or teaming partners proposed as part of the Prime Contractor's team under this effort. The Government will evaluate the offeror's demonstrated record of contract compliance in supplying services that meet contract requirements including PWS requirements, price and schedule.

3.2.3. A recency determination of "acceptable" or "unacceptable" will be made for each contract reference. Recent past performance is defined as active work/services (minimum of 12 months) that was/were performed during the three (3) years preceding the date of issuance of this solicitation. This includes contracts that were started prior to this time period, but still in effect with active performance (minimum of 12 months) as of three (3) years from the date of this solicitation. The Government will not consider performance that concluded more than three (3) years prior to the date of issuance of this solicitation.

3.2.4. A relevancy determination of the offeror's recent past performance will be made. The Government is not bound by the offeror's opinion of relevancy.

3.2.4.1. Relevancy will be assigned a rating of "Very Relevant" "Relevant" "Somewhat Relevant" or "Not relevant" (see Table 4) for each Past Performance Information (PPI) contract reference. The Government will validate the relevancy information contained in the contractor provided PPI contract reference. Relevant present/past performance effort involves similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires. For each individual PPI contract reference to be considered "Relevant," it must meet one of the following criteria:

1. Managed the operations of a DoD personnel program contract at one or more locations.

2. Performed contract services involving any of the following personnel systems or similar personnel systems: Military Personnel Data Systems (MILPDS), Defense Enrollment Eligibility Reporting System (DEERS), Real-Time Personnel Identification System (RAPIDS), and/or Automatic Records Management System (ARMS).

3.2.5. For each recent and relevant contract, the Government will evaluate the offeror's performance.

3.2.5.1. The Government will conduct a review and evaluation of all performance data obtained to determine relevancy of the work performed under those efforts as it relates to the proposed effort. The Government will, as deemed necessary, 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: 1) the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS); 2) similar systems of other Government departments and agencies; 3) questionnaires tailored to the circumstances of this acquisition; 4) DCMA channels; 5) interviews with program managers and COs; and, 6) other sources known to the Government, including commercial sources. The main purpose of the past performance evaluation is to appropriately consider each offeror's demonstrated record of contract compliance by supplying services that meet users' needs by examining references determined by the Government to be recent and relevant in relation to this requirement and the assigned NAICS code 561110 – Office Administrative Services.

3.2.5.2. A performance confidence assessment will be performed on each recent and relevant past performance submission. The aspect is to determine how well the offeror performed on those contracts or, the quality of product or service provided. Past performance shall be evaluated and assessed based on the whole record and not solely on the number of records submitted. Each offeror's past performance will be assigned an overall performance confidence assessment rating of "Satisfactory Confidence" "Neutral Confidence" "Limited Confidence" or "No Confidence." During the selection process, it may be determined that a "Satisfactory Confidence" rating may be worth more than a "Neutral Confidence" rating.

3.2.6. Adverse past performance is defined as past performance information that supports a less than satisfactory rating on any evaluation aspect or any unfavorable comments received from sources without a formal rating system. When relevant performance record indicates performance problems, the Government will consider the number and severity of the problems and the appropriateness and effectiveness of any actual corrective actions taken (not just planned or promised). The Government may review more recent contracts or performance evaluations to ensure corrective actions have been implemented and to evaluate their effectiveness.

3.3. Factor 3 – Price

3.3.1. Price will be evaluated using techniques established in FAR 15.404-1 to ensure the Government receives a fair, reasonable, and balanced price.

3.3.1.1. In addition to the price analysis as described at FAR 15.404-1(b), price proposals will be analyzed to identify any potential unbalanced pricing (See FAR 15.404-1(g)). If the Government sees a wide variation in proposed contract line item prices, the technical evaluation team will be informed as soon as possible during the initial evaluation of proposals so the appropriate personnel may seek clarity through offeror exchanges. Absent any issues related to the stated requirement, unbalanced pricing may pose an unacceptable risk to the Government and may be a reason to reject an offeror's proposal.

3.3.1.2. There is a great expectation of competition for this requirement; thus offerors are cautioned to present their best price proposal up-front. The offeror's price proposal shall represent the offeror's best effort to respond to the solicitation. In instances where an offeror receives acceptable technical and past performance ratings, yet proposed prices appear exceptionally low, offerors may be requested to address this disparity, providing evidence of their capability and/or experience providing similar service(s) at similar price(s). An exceptionally or unrealistically low offer may pose an unacceptable risk to the Government and may be a reason to reject an offeror's proposal.

3.3.1.3. Price will be evaluated on the total overall price. The total evaluated price consists of the total proposed price for all the firm fixed price Contract Line Item Numbers (CLINs) for the basic contract period plus all option periods. The New Mexico Gross Receipts Tax (NMGRT) associated with each period of performance (e.g. Base Period and all Option Periods) shall be included in the unit price and extended price proposed for the Holloman AFB CLIN(s). The resulting total (estimated amount plus applicable burdens) shall be included in the total overall evaluated price. This amount will be evaluated at the time of award as part of the overall price.

3.3.1.4. The Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all CLINS including basic period, option periods and FAR clause 52.217-8 entitled "Option to Extend Services." Accordingly, for evaluation purposes, the Government will add fifty percent (50%) of the offeror's Option Year 4 price as the price for the optional extension of services. This amount will be included in the Government's overall evaluation for each proposal.

NOTE: Evaluation of the option periods shall not obligate the Government to exercise such options.