1.0 Basis for Contract Award.

This source selection will be conducted in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 12, Acquisition of Commercial Items and FAR Part 15, Contracting by Negotiation, as supplemented by the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS), and the Department of the Air Force Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DAFFARS). These regulations are available electronically at https://www.acquisition.gov/content/regulations.

This requirement is a competitive full and open acquisition. The Government will select each and all proposals found to be Technically Acceptable. The evaluation criteria consist of one (1) factor with four (4) subfactors. FACTOR 1: Technical: SUBFACTORS: (1) Scenario Responses,   
(2) Corporate Experience, (3) Small Business Participation Commitment Document (SBPCD),   
(4) Management and Capacity Plan.

There are no tradeoffs for this source selection. Offerors are either Technically Acceptable or Unacceptable when reaching contract award decision. Contract(s) will be awarded to the Offerors that are deemed compliant and responsible in accordance with the FAR, as supplemented, and whose proposal conforms to the solicitation requirements (to include all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and all other information required by Addendum to FAR 52.212-1 – Instructions to Offerors – Commercial Item of this solicitation and is judged, based on the evaluation factor and subfactors. The Government seeks to award to the Offeror(s) that give(s) the government the greatest confidence that it will meet the requirements. The Source Selection Authority (SSA) shall select the Offeror(s) whose proposal(s) are Technically Acceptable in accordance with the established criteria in this Source Selection (described below). The Government will review the proposals for compliance. If a proposal is non-compliant then it will not be further evaluated. 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.

2.0 Number of Contracts Awarded.

The Government intends to award to each and all Technically Acceptable Offerors for DAFSTS II with a five (5) year ordering period, each with one initial task order for a post award conference. The Government reserves the right to make some or no awards at all. DAFSTS II will consist of two (2) Tiers. Within the multi-award IDIQ structure for DAFSTS II, the Government intends to award to each and all Technically Acceptable vendors that submit a proposal in Tier 1 and each and all Technically Acceptable vendors that submit a proposal in Tier 2.

Task orders issued from the awarded IDIQs will be Firm Fixed Price (FFP)

\*\*For Tier Criteria/Definitions see Attachment 1, paragraph 2.1.3\*\*

3.0 Evaluation Steps

Step 1 – Minimum “Compliant/Noncompliant” Gate: Tier Declaration, Facility Clearance Validation, and Small Business Subcontracting Plan compliance review. The Contracting Officer (CO) will validate each Prime Offerors Facility Clearance (FCL) via the Defense Information Security System (DISS) and accept each Offerors declared Tier via email submission. The CO will also review applicable Offerors Small Business Subcontracting plan for compliance with FAR Clause 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan. Offerors will be notified via email if its FCL is validated and if the Small Business Subcontracting Plan is in compliance with FAR Clause 52.219-9 and will move to Step 2. If the Offeror does not meet the FCL criteria and/or is not in compliance with FAR Clause 52.219-9, the Offeror will be deemed “noncompliant” and eliminated from consideration for award. The Offeror will receive written notice IAW FAR 15.503.

3. Step 2 – Minimum “Compliant/Noncompliant” Gate: Corporate Experience Compliance Review (Tier specific )

The government will review the submitted corporate experience for compliance with the minimum requirements detailed in Attachment 1, Instructions to Offerors: If the entire corporate experience submission is compliant, the Offeror will be deemed compliant, the Offeror will be notified via email and move to Step 3. If any portion of the corporate experience is deemed noncompliant, the Offeror will be deemed noncompliant, the Offeror will be notified via email and eliminated for consideration for award and will not move to Step 3. The Offeror will receive written notice IAW FAR 15.503.

\*\*Each Tier has different corporate experience requirements. See Attachment 1, paragraph 2.1.3\*\*

Step 3 – Evaluate Technical Subfactors 1-3, Volumes I and II

4.0. Technical Evaluation

The following evaluation of the technical factor and subfactors will be used to evaluate each proposal:

Factor I: Technical

Subfactor 1: Scenario Response

Subfactor 2: Small Business Participation Commitment Document (SBPCD)

Subfactor 3: Management and Capacity Plan

Relative Importance of Factors and Subfactors. There is only one Factor, Technical with four (4) subfactors. The relative importance of each subfactor is equal.

5.1. Factor I: Technical

The Government will rate the Technical Factor at the subfactor level and then assign an overall rating of “Acceptable” or “Unacceptable.” The subfactor ratings will be rolled up into an overall Technical Factor rating. All subfactors must receive an “Acceptable” rating in order for the Technical Factor rating to be found “Acceptable.” If any subfactor is rated “Unacceptable”, then the overall Technical Factor rating will be “Unacceptable” and the Offeror will be deemed ineligible for award. Factor 1 - Technical will be rated based on the rating table (Table 1) below:

Factor 1 - Technical Ratings (Table 1)

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

* + 1. **Subfactor 1: Scenario Response**

The Government will evaluate the contractor proposed PWS and oral presentation resulting from the provided scenario (Statement of Objectives [SOO]). The Government will evaluate each Offerors contractor proposed PWS and oral presentation in how they will meet the Government’s desired outcome IAW the scenario(s) (SOO). The government will evaluate for realism, understanding, effectiveness, sustainability, and risk of the approach. The Government will evaluate each Offerors contractor proposed PWS and oral presentation to ensure the solution and approach consider applicable regulations, stakeholder engagement, deliverables, and milestones. The Government will evaluate the realism and risks of all proposed approaches and assumptions. The Government will evaluate:

* 1. Realism: The proposed approach provided enough detail to persuade the Government the solution can achieve the desired outcome. The solution provided demonstrable measure of how economically resources/inputs (expertise, time, equipment, etc.) are converted into results.
  2. Understanding: The extent to which the transformation is consistent with the mission partners’ need, priorities
  3. Effectiveness: The extent to which the transformations objectives can be achieved, or are expected to be achieved
  4. Sustainability: The ability of the government to sustain transformation benefits and the continuation of those benefits after major transformation assistance ceases

5.1.1.1 The Government will evaluate an Offerors Scenario responses and contractor proposed PWS’ and judge it as Acceptable when the Government is persuaded that the Offeror proposal is considered exceptional.

Subfactor 1 will be rated based on the table below:

Subfactor 1 – Scenario Response (Table 2)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Adjectival Rating** | **Description** |
| Acceptable | Proposal indicates an exceptional approach to meet the requirements to address realism, understanding, effectiveness, sustainability, and risk. The proposed scenario responses shall have no more than two (2) weaknesses and contains at least five (5) strengths (in totality of both scenario responses), that in the Government’s assessment combined to successfully present a highly advantageous solution |
| Unacceptable | Proposal does not demonstrate an exceptional approach to meet the requirement to address realism, understanding, effectiveness, sustainability, and risk. The proposal has more than two (2) weaknesses and less than five (5) strengths, that the Government considers a risk to successful performance. |

# 5.1.3 Subfactor 2: Small Business Participation Commitment Document (SBPCD) – (Applicable to all Offerors)

The Government will evaluate the extent of the Offerors commitment stated in the SBPCD to use small business concerns, service-disabled veteran-owned small business concerns, HUBZone small business concerns, small disadvantaged business concerns, women-owned small business concerns (as defined in the clause at FAR 52.219-8), and non-traditional small businesses as subcontractors as defined in Attachment 1. The Government will also evaluate the SBCD for the following:

1. How it will meet the small business goals
2. How it will utilize Small Businesses and Non-traditional Small Businesses (NTSB).

* The Government will evaluate the Offerors detailed plan to incorporate the use of NTSBs and its plan to assist the SBs and NTSBs to become Government contractors (SAM registration, RFP process, intricacies of Government contracting, applicable regulations, points of contact, etc.)
* How it will allocate tasks to SBs and NTSBs;
* Plan to attract and utilize a minimum of three (3) NTSBs during the full five (5) year ordering period

1. The realism of the proposal meeting the minimum goals referenced in paragraph 2.2.1.4 in Attachment 1.

5.1.3.1 The Government will evaluate an Offerors written Small Business Commitment Document (SBPCD) and judge it as Acceptable when the Government is persuaded the Offeror is committed to utilize small businesses and non-traditional small businesses (to include assisting non-traditional small businesses become Government contractors) to the maximum extent practicable.

The SBCD will be rated based on the ratings in the table below:

Subfactor 2 – SBPCD Ratings (Table 3)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Adjectival Rating** | **Description** |
| Acceptable | Proposal meets the small business participation plan requirements of the solicitation |
| Unacceptable | Proposal does not meet the small business participation plan requirements of the solicitation |

# 5.1.4 Subfactor 3: Management and Capacity Plan

The Government will evaluate an Offerors written Management and Capacity Plan and judge it as Acceptable when the Government is persuaded the Offeror can sufficiently handle the breadth of transformational tasks, anticipated volume of task orders, across multiple locations, with minimal risk to the Government.

The Management and Capacity Plan will be rated based on the ratings in the table below:

Subfactor 3 –Management and Capacity Plan Ratings (Table 4)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Adjectival Rating** | **Description** |
| Acceptable | Proposal meets the of the management/capacity plan requirements of solicitation |
| Unacceptable | Proposal does not meet the management/capacity plan requirements of the solicitation |

# 6.0 Discussions.

# The Government reserves the right to award without discussions. However, the Government reserves the right to hold discussion using Evaluation Notices (ENs) if, during evaluation it is determined to be in the best interest of the government. Therefore, offerors are advised to submit proposals that are fully and clearly acceptable without additional information. Any discussions will be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.306.

# 7.0 Award.

The Source Selection Authority (SSA) shall select the Offeror(s) whose proposal(s) are Technically Acceptable in accordance with the established criteria in this Source Selection. The SSA will follow the law.