

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
6TH AIR REFUELING WING (AMC)
MACDILL AIR FORCE BASE, FLORIDA



10 December 2024

MEMORANDUM FOR ALL SAM.GOV CONTRACTORS

FROM: 6th Contracting Squadron/PKB
2160 Pink Flamingo Avenue
MacDill AFB, FL 33621

SUBJECT: Request for Proposal (RFP), FA481424R0002, CENTCOM Headquarters Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Professional Services (CHIPS)

1. This is a Combined Synopsis/Solicitation RFP in accordance with (IAW) Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 12.6, as supplemented with additional information included within this notice. This RFP is for the subject requirement to be awarded on a competitive best value subjective tradeoff source selection conducted IAW FAR 15.3, Source Selection, as supplemented by the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS), the Department of the Air Force Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DAFFARS), and the specific requirements outlined in this request and attachments. The terms and conditions will be utilized IAW FAR Part 12 and 15, and the specific requirements outlined in this request and its attachments. The SEED Project utilized for this source selection will be awarded to one company that is determined to be the overall best value to the Government.

2. The Government intends to award a multiple award Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) for professional services with ceiling value of \$750M. The Government anticipates awarding ten contracts in each of the two socioeconomic pools to the responsible Offerors whose offer, conforms to the solicitation and provides the best value to the Government. The period of performance for each IDIQ contract will have a one (1) base year with the inclusion of four (4) one-year options to include the six (6) month extension of service. **This RFP will be a 100% small business set-aside, specifically to the following socioeconomic pools: for Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business (SDVOSB) and Small Business Administration (SBA) certified 8(a) small business at locations currently accepted into the 8(a) program, via the SAM.gov website.** The anticipated period of performance for the seed project Task Order will have a one (1) base year with the inclusion of four (4) one-year options to include the six (6) month extension of service. The Government anticipates placing approximately 20 task orders against the CHIPS IDIQ; however, this number is subject to change based on the scope of requirements received. The Government reserves the right to award more or less than the targets identified for both pools, or to make no award at all.

3. The selection for award of these contracts will be made to the offerors who are deemed responsible IAW FAR 9.104, 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 FAR Clause 52.212-1 of the solicitation and is judged, based on the evaluation factors and subfactors, to represent the best value to the Government.

4. Notice to Offeror(s): The basic IDIQ awards will be issued to include a mandatory participation, for up to three attendees per company, in a virtual post award orientation. The Offeror must acknowledge it understands and is willing to accept the terms should it be awarded an IDIQ contract. **The Offeror must therefore submit with its proposal a signed statement from an authorized representative on company letterhead indicating it will participate in the mandatory post award virtual orientation; that it understands \$150.00 will be the total award amount for the Offeror's participation (no more and no less) and will serve as the minimum guarantee.** The SEED Project awardee is required to attend the meeting at no additional cost to the Government. No pricing information is required with this statement; therefore, it should be no more than one (1) page. The Government reserves the right to cancel this solicitation, either before or after the closing date. In the event the Government cancels this solicitation, the Government has no obligation to reimburse an offeror for any costs.

5. Disclose any potential or actual Organization Conflict of Interest (OCI) IAW FAR 9.5, as supplemented. Organizational Conflict of Interest mitigation plans or a statement that no OCI exists should accompany your proposal. Contractors are responsible for immediately notifying the Contracting Officer should any potential conflict of interest arise at any time prior to

CHARGE THE STORM...LET'S GO

and/or after contract award. Include a description of the OCI(s) and the action(s) taken, if any, to avoid, mitigate, or neutralize the OCIs.

6. The proposal shall be accompanied by a complete and signed Proposal Cover Sheet (See Solicitation Attachment 1, Proposal Cover Sheet) to be included in Volume I (see below in section 4.2.1 of Addendum to FAR Clause 52.212-1). The Proposal Cover Sheet Template requires the Offeror to specify whether it intends to compete as an 8(a) Firm, SDVOSB, or both.

7. Questions and Answers/Assumptions and Exceptions: Contractors are cautioned that all communications are to be channeled through the Contracting Officer. Any questions, whether technical or contractual in nature, shall be submitted in writing utilizing the Questions and Answers (Q&A) Matrix (Attachment 10). Q&As shall be submitted in writing to 6CONS.PKB.SA@us.af.mil address to the Contract Specialist, Mr. Jason Wilkin and Contracting Officer, Ms. LaKeisha Gamble. All Questions shall be submitted by 10:00 AM Eastern Time, on 20 December 2024. Questions will be consolidated, and responses will be posted to the SAM.gov website. No further questions will be addressed on this requirement after this time and date. Contractors shall address any assumptions and proposed exceptions to the Contracting Officer in their proposal.

8. This RFP is not authorization to begin performance, and in no way obligates the Government for any costs incurred by the offeror associated with developing a proposal. The Government reserves the right not to award a contract in response to this RFP. Prior to commencement of any activities associated with performance of this requirement, the Government will issue a written directive or contractual document signed by the Contracting Officer with appropriate consideration established.

9. Proposals are due by 10:00 AM Eastern Time on 9 January 2024. Submit proposals electronically via email to the attention of Mr. Jason Wilkin and Ms. LaKeisha Gamble at 6CONS.PKB.SA@us.af.mil. All electronic submissions shall reference, RFP number, CHIPS, Offeror name, small business designation, Source Selection Information – See FAR 2.101 & 3.104” in the subject line. Proposal submissions are limited to 10 MB via email. Proposal submissions larger than 10 MB shall use DoD SAFE at <https://safe.apps.mil/>. DoD SAFE does not guarantee delivery time, so allow up to four hours. LATE PROPOSALS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED.

10. For all technical and contractual questions and comments, please submit electronically via email to the attention of Mr. Jason Wilkin and Ms. LaKeisha Gamble at 6CONS.PKB.SA@us.af.mil.

LAKEISHA GAMBLE
Contracting Officer

RFP Attachments:

- Attachment 1 – Proposal Cover Sheet
- Attachment 2 – CHIPS IDIQ PWS
- Attachment 3 – SEED Project PWS
- Attachment 4 – DD Form 254
- Attachment 5 – SEED Project Pricing Sheet
- Attachment 6 – Staffing Matrix Template
- Attachment 7 – Task Order Ordering Procedures
- Attachment 8 – Provisions and Clauses
- Attachment 9 – CHIPS Past Performance Questionnaire
- Attachment 10 – Q&A Matrix

Addendum to FAR 52.212-1 – Instructions to Offerors-Commercial Products and Commercial Services

1. Instructions to Offerors

1.1. The purpose of this solicitation is to acquire a full range of professional services classifications including management activities involving policy, doctrine, planning, intelligence, strategy, exercises, logistics, assessments, and operations for multiple HQ USCENTCOM directorates, Joint Staff, Office of Secretary of Defense (OSD), and Department of Defense (DoD) counterparts along with allies and partner nations within the HQ USCENTCOM Area of Responsibility (AoR). Additionally, the 6th Air Refueling Wing (ARW), United States Special Operations Command (USSOCOM), Special Operations Command Central (SOCCENT), Joint Communication Support Element (JCSE), and other MacDill AFB Tenant units may leverage this contract if services are determined to be in scope.

1.2. This RFP will be a 100% small business set-aside, specifically to the following socioeconomic pools: for Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business (SDVOSB) and Small Business Administration (SBA) certified 8(a) small business at locations currently accepted into the 8(a) program, via the SAM.gov website. The Government plans to accomplish one source selection. It is anticipated that the source selection will result in the government awarding up to ten Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contracts in each of the socioeconomic categories set asides. Each IDIQ will have a one (1) base year with the inclusion of four (4) one-year options to include the six (6) month extension of service. The contract will primarily include professional services (non-personal) to support a unique joint staff planning need focused on integrating and synchronizing DoD military activities with U.S. Government strategy.

1.3 The basic IDIQ awards will be issued to include a mandatory participation, for up to three attendees per company, in a virtual post award orientation. The Offeror must acknowledge it understands and is willing to accept these terms. The Offeror must therefore submit with its proposal a signed statement from an authorized representative on company letterhead indicating it will participate in the mandatory post award virtual orientation; that it understands \$150.00 will be the total price for this participation (no more and no less) and will serve as the minimum guarantee. No pricing information is required with this statement; therefore, it should be no more than one (1) page.

1.4 One source selection will be held, evaluating both SDVOSB Offerors and SBA Certified 8(a) Offerors under the same criteria. However, the Offeror will identify to which small business designation they are proposing. An 8(a) Offeror who is also a SDVOSB could submit a proposal as a SDVOSB, 8(a) Firm or both. The offeror is required to identify which pool (SDVOSB or 8(a)) they are proposing. The target number of awardees will be ten SDVOSB concerns and ten 8(a) concerns. The government reserves the right to award to more or less than the targets identified for both pools, or to make no award at all.

1.5. This acquisition will utilize FAR 15.3, Source Selection, as supplemented by the DFARS, and the DAFFARS. These regulations are available electronically at <https://acquisition.gov>. Regarding the order of importance, past performance is significantly more important than price. (Note: Technical will be rated on an acceptable/unacceptable basis. To be eligible for award, an offeror shall be acceptable in all Technical subfactors.)

2. Proposal Instructions

2.1 This section provides general guidance for preparing proposals. Section 4.0 will provide specific instructions on the format and content of the proposal. The Offeror's proposal must include all data and information requested and must be submitted in accordance with these instructions. Any Offeror who submits an incomplete proposal package may be considered ineligible for award. The offer shall be compliant with the requirements as stated in this RFP and attachments. Non-conformance with the instructions may result in an unfavorable proposal evaluation.

2.2 The proposal shall be clear, concise, and shall include sufficient detail for effective evaluation and for substantiating the validity of all stated claims. The proposal shall not simply rephrase or restate the Government's requirements but rather shall provide convincing rationale to address how the Offeror intends to meet these requirements. Offerors shall assume that the Government has no prior knowledge of their facilities and experience and will base its evaluation on the information presented in the Offeror's proposal.

2.3 The proposal shall be accompanied by a complete and signed Proposal Cover Sheet (See Solicitation Attachment 1, Proposal Cover Sheet) to be included in Volume I (see section 4.2.1). The Proposal Cover Sheet Template requires the Offeror to specify whether it intends to compete as an 8(a) Firm, SDVOSB, or both.

2.4 The Contract Specialist (CS), Mr. Jason Wilkin and the Contracting Officer (CO), Ms. LaKeisha Gamble, are the sole points of contact for this acquisition. Address any questions or concerns you may have to these POCs by 10:00 AM Eastern Time 20 December 2024. Questions received after this date and time will not be addressed prior to the solicitation due date. Questions will only be accepted utilizing the Questions and Answers (Q&A) Matrix provided in Attachment 10. Written requests for clarification may be sent to the email addresses listed below:

Mr. Jason Wilkin and Ms. LaKeisha Gamble at 6CONS.PKB.SA@us.af.mil

2.5 The CO will promptly notify Offerors of any decision to exclude them from the competition IAW FAR 15.503. Upon notification of exclusion, an Offeror may request and receive a debriefing. Offerors desiring debriefing must make a request in accordance with the requirements of FAR 15.503 or 15.506 as applicable. Debriefings will be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.505 or 15.506.

2.6 In accordance with FAR Subpart 4.8 (Government Contract Files), the Government will retain one copy of all unsuccessful proposals.

2.7 Complete proposals include an electronic submission (via email), no later than the required proposal due date and time. Use separate files to permit rapid location of all portions, including subfactors, exhibits, annexes, and attachments, if any. The electronic submission shall be submitted in a format readable by Microsoft Word (*.docx), Microsoft Excel (*.xlsx), Microsoft PowerPoint (*.pptx), and/or Adobe (*.pdf). If discussions are required, Evaluation Notices (ENs) will be distributed electronically via email. Offerors shall submit electronic copies of their EN responses not later than the required EN response due date and time. Final Proposal Revisions shall be submitted electronically by due date and time. An electronic copy of the resultant contract will be emailed to the award-winning Offeror. All email communications will include "Offeror name, small business designation, Source Selection Information – See FAR 2.101 & 3.104" in the subject line. Submit proposals electronically via email to the attention of Mr. Jason Wilkin and Ms. Lakeisha Gamble at 6CONS.PKB.SA@us.af.mil. All electronic submissions shall reference, RFP number, CHIPS, Offeror name, small business designation, Source Selection Information – See FAR 2.101 & 3.104" in the subject line. Proposal submissions are limited to 10 MB via email. LATE PROPOSALS WILL NOT BE ACCEPTED.

2.8 The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award contracts without discussions with Offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). Therefore, the Offeror's initial proposal should contain the Offeror's best terms from a technical and price standpoint. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the CO later determines them to be in the Government's best interest. At the time of submitting a proposal, Offeror must state affirmatively if it has OCI issues and must submit an OCI Identification and Mitigation Plan. The Government-accepted OCI Identification and Mitigation Plan shall be incorporated by reference into a resultant Contract.

2.9 If an Offeror believes that the requirements in these instructions contain an error, omission, or are otherwise unsound, the Offeror shall immediately notify the CS and CO in writing with supporting rationale as well as the remedies the Offeror is asking the CS and CO to consider as related to the omission or error. The Offeror is reminded that the Government reserves the right to award this effort based on the initial proposal, as received,

without establishing a competitive range and entering into discussions. This reservation includes matters of additional or substitute pages of the initial proposal.

2.10 All reference documents for this solicitation are available on the SAM.gov website at <https://sam.gov/>. Potential Offerors are encouraged to subscribe for real-time e-mail notifications when information has been posted to the website for this solicitation.

2.11 Oral presentations will not be permitted.

2.12 Exchanges of source selection information between the Government and Offerors will be controlled by the CS and CO. Email may be used to transmit such information to Offerors only if the email can be sent and received encrypted and includes “Offeror name, small business designation, Source Selection Information – See FAR 2.101 & 3.104” in the subject line.

2.13 If this RFP is amended, all terms and conditions that are not amended remain unchanged. Offerors shall acknowledge receipt of any amendment to this request by the day and time specified in the amendment(s).

2.14 Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified factors and subfactors. Additionally, proposals must comply in all material respects with the requirements of law, regulation and conditions set forth in the solicitation. Failure to comply with these requirements may result in the Offeror’s proposal being ineligible for award. Offerors must clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and must provide complete supporting rationale.

3.0 Organization / Number of Copies / Page Limits

3.1 The Offeror shall prepare the proposal for the CHIPS solicitation as set forth in the Proposal Organization Table 1 below. The titles and contents of the volumes shall be defined in the below table, all of which shall be within the required page limits as specified. The Volumes identified in Table 1 shall be submitted electronically to the CS and CO by the proposal due date. The contents of each proposal volume are described in the Instructions to Offerors (ITO) paragraph as noted in the table below:

Table 1 – Proposal Organization

ELEMENT	REF.	TITLE	# OF COPIES	MAXIMUM # PAGES
		Contracting Information		
Volume I	4.2.1	Tab 1 – Proposal Cover Sheet (Atch 1)	1	1
	3.3.1	Tab 2 – Master Table of Contents		No Limit
	3.3.2	Tab 3 – Volume 1 Table of Contents		No Limit
	4.2.2	Tab 4 – Proposal Validity		1
	1.3	Tab 5 – IDIQ Signed Statement		1
	4.2.3	Tab 6 – Contact Information		1
	4.2.4	Tab 7 – Company Information		1
	2.8	Tab 8 – OCI Disclosure		1
	4.2.6	Tab 9 - Subcontractor/Teaming Partner Consent Letters		No Limit
	4.2.7	Tab 10 – Continuation of Essential Contractor Services		1
		Technical		
Volume II	3.3.2	Tab 1 – Volume II Table of Contents	1	No Limit
	4.3.3	Tab 2 – Subfactor 1.1: Staffing Approach		

	4.3.3.1.1	Tab 2.1 – Staffing and Retention Plan		3
	4.3.3.1.2	Tab 2.2 – Attachment 6 - Staffing Matrix		1
	4.3.4	Tab 3 – Subfactor 1.2: Management Approach		
	4.3.4.1.1	Tab 3.1 – Quality Control Plan		3
	4.3.4.1.2	Tab 3.3 – SEED Project Task Order Transition Plan		3
		Past Performance		
Volume III	3.3.2	Tab 1 – Volume III Table of Contents	1	No Limit
	4.4.4/4.5	Tab 2 – CHIPS Project Performance History		3 (1 page per contract/reference)
		Price		
Volume IV	4.6.1/4.6.4.1.3	Tab 1 – Seed Project Pricing Spreadsheet (Tab 1)/ SEED Employee Compensation Plan (Tab 2) (Atch 5)	2	2

3.2 Page limitations shall be treated as maximums as indicated in Table 1 above. If exceeded, the excess pages will not be read nor considered in the evaluation of the proposal. For Past Performance, Factor 2, any submission in excess of the limit will not be considered and it will be handled IAW paragraph 4.3.4 as applicable. Page limitations may also be placed on responses to Evaluation Notices (EN). The specified page limits for EN responses will be identified in the letters forwarding the ENs to the Offerors. Each page shall be counted except the following: blank pages, title pages, tables of contents, tabs, indexes, glossaries, and those noted in the Proposal Organization Chart as ‘No Limit’.

3.3 Table of Contents

3.3.1 Master Table of Contents – Volume I, Contracting Information shall contain a consolidation of the individual Table of Contents for all Volumes (I through IV). This will be referred to as the Master Table of Contents.

3.3.2 The Contracting Information, Technical, and Past Performance Volumes shall contain a detailed table of contents to delineate the subparagraphs within that volume.

3.3.3 The Table of Contents will not count against page limitations.

4.0 Proposal Organization Continued – Content of Volumes

4.1 The information requested in the following four volumes will be evaluated in accordance with the evaluation criteria listed at FAR Provision 52.212-2 – Evaluation – Commercial Items.

4.2 VOLUME I – CONTRACTING INFORMATION

4.2.1 The Proposal Cover Sheet, (See Solicitation Attachment 1, Proposal Cover Sheet) shall be included as the first page of this volume as discussed in section 2.3.

4.2.2 The Offeror shall provide a statement that the proposal and prices provided in Volume IV (Price) are valid and will remain in effect for 365 calendar days after the proposal closing date.

4.2.3 Offerors shall provide the name, title, email address, and telephone number of the company/division point of contact regarding decisions made with respect to the Offeror’s proposal and who can obligate the company contractually. Also, Offerors shall identify those individuals authorized to negotiate with the Government.

4.2.4 Offerors shall provide company/division's street address, county and facility code, Commercial and Government Entity code, Unique Entity ID (UEI), and Tax Identification Number.

4.2.5 If you are contemplating a new joint venture (not existing SBA approved Joint Ventures) on this project, you must advise your assigned SBA Business Opportunity Specialist (BOS) as soon as possible. It is also recommended that the agreement be submitted as soon as practicable to ensure compliance with established regulations. Any corrections and/or changes needed can be made only when your BOS has adequate time for a thorough review before the proposal due date. No corrections and/or changes are allowed after time of submission of proposal or bids.

4.2.6 The Government cannot disclose past performance information concerning subcontractors and teaming partners to a private party without the subcontractor's or teaming partner's consent. Because a prime contractor is a private party, the Government will need that consent before disclosing subcontractor/teaming partner past and present performance information to the prime contractor during any exchanges that may take place. To assist the Government in assessing your past performance relevancy and confidence, submit a consent letter from each of the major subcontractors/teaming partners identified in your proposal.

4.2.7 The Government has identified that some contractor services performed under this contract will require essential contractor services in support of mission essential functions. Task orders requiring the need for continuation of essential contractor services will be identified in the task order PWS and in accordance with DFARS 252.237-7023. When the requirement is identified, contractors will be required to provide a written plan describing how it will continue to perform essential contractor services in accordance with DFARS 252.237-7024. For the purposes of this solicitation, offerors shall acknowledge this requirement and provide firm assurance that the offeror is capable of fulfilling this requirement. Mission essential functions will not be required on the SEED project.

4.3 VOLUME II – TECHNICAL

4.3.1 The technical proposal, including its sub-factors, should not make any reference to cost or pricing information.

4.3.2 The technical proposal shall be specific and complete. Legibility, clarity, and coherence are very important. Your responses will be evaluated as defined in Addendum to FAR Provision 52.212-2 – Evaluation – Commercial Items. Using the instructions provided below, provide as specifically as possible the actual methodology you would use for accomplishing/satisfying the subfactors. All the requirements specified in the solicitation are mandatory. By your proposal submission, you are representing that your firm will perform all the requirements specified in the solicitation. It is neither necessary nor desirable for you to tell us so in your proposal. Do not merely reiterate the objectives or reformulate the requirements specified in the solicitation. Commercials, elaborate brochures, or advertisements are unnecessary and will not be evaluated.

4.3.3 Technical Subfactor 1.1: Staffing Approach

4.3.3.1 The Offeror shall clearly detail their understanding and approach to recruit, hire, and retain qualified personnel who can execute the functional requirements as outlined in Attachment 3 - SEED Project PWS. Offerors shall address how they will minimize the risk of non-performance (e.g., performance gap or poor performance).

4.3.3.1.1 Staffing and Retention Plan: The Offeror shall provide an overall staffing and retention plan that will reduce turnover and maintain high quality services identified in Attachment 2 – CHIPS IDIQ PWS.

4.3.3.1.2 Staffing Matrix: Offeror must provide a staffing matrix listing labor categories and descriptions, labor hours, and number of employees required to perform the SEED Project effort utilizing the Staffing Matrix template (Attachment 6).

4.2.4 Technical Subfactor 1.2: Management Approach

4.3.4.1 The Offeror shall provide details to fully describe and demonstrate effective knowledge and understanding of the CHIPS Multiple Award IDIQ PWS requirements and all applicable subsections. Offerors shall describe how their plan for managing this contract and associated task orders will be efficient, responsive, and flexible in meeting PWS requirements.

4.3.4.1.1 Quality Control Plan: Offeror shall provide a quality control plan (QCP) in accordance with the CHIP IDIQ PWS paragraph 22 that will effectively eliminate government oversight and remediation for any interruption or degradation of service levels.

4.3.4.1.2 SEED Task Order Transition Plan: Offeror shall clearly describe an effective approach to accomplish a phase-in plan to meet (attachment 2) CHIPS IDIQ PWS paragraph 20 requirements for the seed project task order to include a logical timeline to ensure a smooth start of the contract tasks without interruption or degradation of service levels.

4.4 VOLUME III – PAST PERFORMANCE

4.4.1 Past performance will be evaluated in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(2) and Solicitation, Addendum to FAR Provision 52.212-2 – Evaluation – Commercial Items. Each Offeror shall provide recent and relevant past performance on Performance of professional services, and according to the format identified in Paragraph 4.3.5. The Government will determine a Performance Confidence Assessment, based on the overall quality of recent and relevant past performance of professional services.

4.4.2 The Government may consider past performance in the aggregate in addition to on an individual contract basis. In the case of offerors for which 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 (see FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv)). In this case, the offeror's past performance is unknown and assigned a performance confidence rating of "neutral". IAW 3.1.3.3 of the DoD Source Selection Procedures, although the Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) will not rate an offeror that lacks recent, relevant past performance favorably or unfavorably with regard to past performance, the Source Selection Authority (SSA) may determine that a "Substantial Confidence" or "Satisfactory Confidence" past performance rating is worth more than a "Neutral Confidence" past performance rating in a best value tradeoff.

4.4.3 SBA Certified 8(a) and SDVOSB Offerors may rely on past performance of its subcontracting or teaming partners. Please note, if the Offeror is a formal Joint Venture, the Offeror shall provide a copy of the SBA Joint Venture certificate documentation IAW CFR 125.8, CFR 125.9, and/or CFR 128.4. The SBA must receive the certification documentation prior to the proposal due date and must approve the documentation prior to contract award. 8(a) and SDVOSB Offerors may rely on the past performance of the Joint Venture itself, and each Joint Venture partners individually, if the Joint Venture partner is identified in the Offeror's response.

4.4.4 The Government will review up to three total contracts past performance submitted by the Offeror; up to three contracts for performance demonstrating the same/similar professional services positions outlined in CHIPS IDIQ PWS, attachment 2, specifically addressing the functions outlined in para 2.6.1 of the addendum to 52.212-2. Task orders submitted will count toward the three-contract limit. At least one reference shall be from the Federal Government (includes U.S. Department of Defense). Offerors shall provide the most relevant contracts performed for government agencies within the last five years from the release date of this solicitation. Information shall include company or agency contact

information, address, and the nature of the contract performance. Relevancy is defined in Table 4. Any submission in excess of the limit will not be considered and only the first five contracts listed in Volume III will be evaluated.

4.4.5 Offeror shall submit the Contractor Performance Assessment Reports System (CPARS) for the referenced contracts/task orders listed in their proposal. CPARS reports do not count against the page limitations described in the proposal format and criteria section. If no CPARS is available or found in the government-wide Past Performance Information Application, the Government reserves the right to acquire past performance information from the offeror's listed company or agency. The purpose of CPARS is to determine "how well" the contractor performed on the referenced contracts/task orders.

4.4.5.1 Past performance for contracts where the Offeror performed as the prime contractor and/or subcontractor will be considered. Contracts where the Offeror performed as the prime contractor may be considered more relevant than contracts where the Offeror performed as a subcontractor. If the Offeror submits past performance for contracts where they performed as the subcontractor, the Government reserves the right to verify the performance with the prime contractor.

4.4.5.2 Offerors are required to explain what aspects of the contracts are deemed relevant to the proposed effort and to what aspects of the proposed effort they relate by providing a narrative for each contract. Specifically, the narrative should focus on relevancy to the Factor 1 Technical subfactor 1.1, subfactor 1.2 and Factor 3 Price, including relative order of importance, and should be tailored to the proposed portion of the effort the contractor is proposing to perform. The narrative may include a discussion of efforts accomplished by the offeror to resolve problems encountered on prior contracts as well as past efforts to identify and manage program risk. Merely having problems does not automatically equate to a limited or no confidence rating, since the problems encountered may have been on a more complex program, or an offeror may have subsequently demonstrated the ability to overcome the problems encountered. The offeror is required to clearly demonstrate management actions employed in overcoming problems and the effects of those actions in terms of improvements achieved or problems rectified. Submittal of quality performance indicators or other management indicators that clearly support that an offeror has overcome past problems is required. Categorize the relevant information into the specific Technical subfactor 1.1, subfactor 1.2, and Price factor used to evaluate the proposal.

4.4.5.3 Offerors are cautioned to submit sufficient information and, in the format, specified in Addendum to FAR 52.212-1, Instructions to Offerors, to permit a meaningful assessment of past performance. Offerors may be asked to clarify certain aspects of their proposal 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. Communication conducted to resolve minor or clerical errors, or for the purpose of clarifying Past Performance information in determining the competitive range, will not constitute discussions and the contracting officer reserves the right to award a contract without the opportunity for proposal revision.

4.4.6 The Government may also review the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIPRS), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), Government customer interviews, applicable commercial clients and any other source deemed necessary to obtain additional information that will be used in the evaluation of the Offeror's past performance. The Government may contact references other than those identified by the Offeror and use information received to evaluate the Offeror's past performance.

4.5 Past performance Questionnaires

4.5.1 For a description of the characteristics or aspects the Government will consider in determining recency and relevance for Performance of CHIPS IDIQ Services, see Addendum to FAR 52.212-2 – Evaluation – Commercial Products and Commercial Services, paragraph 2.4 - Factor 2 Past Performance.

4.5.2 As soon as practicable, Offerors shall send the Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs) Solicitation Attachment 9 (CHIPS IDIQ PPQ) and email to points of contact (POCs). The POCs the Offeror requests completion of the PPQ should represent the individuals most knowledgeable about the Offeror's performance on the identified contract or program, such as the following: (1) Contracting Officer's Representative; (2) Program/Project Manager; (3) Contracting Officer. The POCs will complete Section B of the questionnaires and forward them by email directly to both, Mr. Jason Wilkin, at jason.wilkin.2@us.af.mil, and Ms. LaKeisha Gamble, at lakeisha.gamble.2@us.af.mil. **RESPONDENTS TO THE QUESTIONNAIRES SHALL NOT SEND THE COMPLETED INFORMATION SHEETS BACK TO THE OFFEROR.** The Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) will conduct follow-up with any POC as necessary. PPQs should be received by the CS via email prior to the proposal due date. The CO will use discretion in accepting PPQs received after the requested date.

4.5.3 The Offeror shall complete Section 1: Contract Identification for Attachment 9..

4.5.4 The Offeror shall not submit Section 2 of the PPQs (Attachment 9) as part of the proposal. Section 2 shall be completed and sent to the CS/CO by the contractor POC.

4.5.5 The Government may also review the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), Government customer interviews, applicable commercial clients and any other source deemed necessary to obtain additional information that will be used in the evaluation of the Offeror's past performance. The Government may contact references other than those identified by the Offeror and use information received to evaluate the Offeror's past performance.

4.6 VOLUME IV - PRICE

4.6.1 Offerors shall populate the worksheet located in Solicitation Attachment 5 - SEED Project Pricing Sheet (Tab 1)/Employee Compensation Plan (ECP)(Tab 2). The offeror shall provide sufficient price information to allow the Contracting Officer to determine the reasonableness of the proposed price. The price proposal shall be submitted utilizing the Pricing Spreadsheet template in Attachment 5. Formulations shall be rounded to two decimal places (i.e., \$12.34) the price information shall be completed in accordance with the following:

4.6.1.1 Historical labor categories and labor hours for the Strategy Plans and Policy Support (SPPS) SEED Project can be found in Attachment 3 - SEED Project PWS para 3.1.1. The experience/qualifications identified in the SPPS SEED Project represent the Government's minimum knowledge and experience necessary for successful contract performance.

4.6.1.2 Offerors shall provide a rate for ALL labor categories proposed in Attachment 5. Failure to offer fixed-price rates for all labor categories, unless rationale for the deviation is provided, may result in the Offeror being ineligible for award.

4.6.1.3 Travel and Surge Support: Section 16 and 17 of the SEED Project PWS, (Travel and Surge Support) will be funded by the Government on a Time and Material and Labor Hour CLIN. The Government has estimated the Travel costs, and those amounts are included in Attachment 5 - SEED Project Pricing Sheet. The Offeror shall not adjust these values.

4.6.1.3 IAW SEED Project PWS para 4.2.4.1.3 SEED Employee Compensation Plan: Offerors shall submit an Employee Compensation Plan (ECP) setting forth salaries and fringe benefits

proposed for the professional employees identified in the second tab of the SEED Project Pricing Spreadsheet (Attachment 5, Tab 2).

4.6.2 The Offeror shall not tamper with the provided Rows, Columns or Formulas or add any information other than what is requested in the instructions or to make calculation corrections. Any tampering of the worksheet outside of what is instructed will result in the Offeror's proposal being disqualified from further consideration.

Addendum to FAR 52.212-2 – Evaluation – Commercial Products and Commercial Services

1. Basis for Contract Award

This is a competitive best value performance price tradeoff source selection conducted in accordance with FAR 15.3, Source Selection, as supplemented by the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement, the Air Force Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement, DoD Source Selection Procedures, 20 August 2022, and Department of the Air Force Mandatory Procedures MP5315.3 Source Selection. These regulations are available electronically at <https://acquisition.gov>. This RFP will be a 100% small business set-aside, specifically to the following socioeconomic

pools: for Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business (SDVOSB) and Small Business Administration (SBA) certified 8(a) small business at locations currently accepted into the 8(a) program, via the SAM.gov website. The Government will select the best overall offers, based upon an integrated assessment of technical acceptability, Past Performance, and Price. The Government intends to award ten IDIQ contracts in each socioeconomic pool of SDVOSB and SBA Certified 8(a) companies from this solicitation. However, the Government reserves the right to award more or less than the targets identified for both set asides or make no award at all. Proposals will be ranked by proposed price from the lowest proposed price to the highest proposed price, and then evaluated for technical acceptability. Offerors shall be acceptable for all subfactors under Factor 1: Technical; before Factor 2: past performance will be evaluated. Therefore, offerors rated as technically “Unacceptable” may not be further evaluated and may be ineligible for award. If determined technically acceptable, then the proposals will proceed to have Factor 2: Past Performance evaluated and assigned a Past Performance Confidence Assessment rating based on proposed past performance information starting with the lowest priced technically acceptable offer. The evaluation will continue in order of lowest to highest total price until the target number of awardees, ten for SDVOSB and ten for 8(a) concerns, are rated as “Substantial Confidence”, at that time evaluations will conclude, and no additional offers will be evaluated. All offerors that have received a performance confidence rating at the time the target number of “substantial confidence” ratings has been achieved will be forwarded to the SSA and be included in the integrated assessment. If there are no offerors’ whose past performance is rated “substantial confidence”, or if it is not the best value to the Government; the Government may award to an offeror with a lower confidence rating than “Substantial.” If the SSA makes the determination to award without discussions, and the proposals represent the best value to the government, award shall be made to those Offerors without further consideration of any of the other Offerors. If the SSA determines discussions are necessary, then the SSA may open discussions anytime during the evaluation process described above.

A contract may be awarded to the Offerors who are deemed responsible IAW the FAR 9.104, as supplemented, whose proposal conforms to the solicitation's requirements, and is judged, based on the evaluation factors and subfactors to represent the best value to the Government. The Government seeks to award to the Offerors who give the AF the greatest confidence that they will best meet or exceed, the requirements. This may result in a higher rated, higher priced Offeror, where the decision is consistent with the evaluation factors, and the SSA reasonably determines that the overall past performance rating of the higher priced Offeror outweighs the price difference. Therefore, price is not expected to be the controlling factor in the selection of an offeror, but the degree of importance of price as a factor could become greater depending upon the equality of the proposal for other factors evaluated. When competing proposals are determined to be substantially equal after evaluation of all non-price factors, the price could become the controlling factor. The Government will conduct a price analysis to determine whether or not proposed prices are fair and reasonable.

The SSA will base the source selection decision on an integrated assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria in the solicitation. 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. By submission of its proposal in accordance with the instructions provided in Addendum to FAR 52.212-1, Instructions to Offerors, the Offeror agrees to all solicitation requirements, including terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as evaluation factors or subfactors. All technically acceptable offers will be considered equal in ratings for technical factors. The tradeoff (if one occurs) will occur only between the Past Performance factor and the Price factor to determine the best value to the government, as stated in Paragraph 2.2 below.

1.1 Discussions: The Government intends to award without discussions but reserves the right to conduct discussions if necessary. If, during the evaluation period, it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government to hold discussions, offeror responses to Evaluation Notices (ENs) and the Final Proposal Revision (FPR) will be considered in making the source selection decision. If the offeror’s proposal has been evaluated as acceptable at the time discussions are closed, any changes or exceptions in the FPR are subject to evaluation and may introduce risk that the offeror’s proposal be determined unacceptable and ineligible for award.

1.1.1 If the Government determines that, after the initial evaluation of proposals, discussions are necessary, the Government will make a competitive range determination (limited to a restricted number of highly rated proposals) in order to establish a list of offerors with which it will conduct discussions.

1.1.2 Discussions will be initiated by the Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO) upon issuance of ENs to the offerors within the competitive range. Exchange Notices may be orally briefed to offerors prior to written release to ensure complete understanding by the respective offeror of any discrepancies.

1.1.3 The Government will consider, throughout the evaluation, the “correction potential” of any aspect of a proposal. The judgement of such “correction potential” is within the sole discretion of the Government. If an aspect of an offeror’s proposal does not meet the Government’s requirements and is not considered correctable, or if the amount and complexity of the corrections needed to meet the Government requirement is impractical, the offeror may be eliminated from the competitive range.

1.1.4 Any offeror excluded at any time during the source selection process will be afforded the opportunity to request either a pre-award or post-award debriefing.

2. Evaluation Factors

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

Factor 1: Technical

Subfactor 1.1: Staffing Approach

Subfactor 1.2: Management Approach

Factor 2: Past Performance

Factor 3: Price

2.2 In accordance with FAR 15.304(e), past performance is significantly more important than price. (Note: Technical will be rated on an acceptable/unacceptable basis. To be eligible for award, an offeror shall be acceptable in all Technical subfactors.)

2.3 Factor 1: Technical

The Government’s technical evaluation team shall evaluate the technical proposals on an acceptable or unacceptable basis, assigning one of the ratings described below for each subfactor. Proposals shall receive an Acceptable rating for Staffing Approach and Management Approach (Subfactors 1.1 and 1.2) before Past Performance is evaluated. Any subfactor evaluated as Unacceptable will render the entire proposal unacceptable and, therefore, ineligible for award. Only those proposals determined to be technically acceptable, either initially or as a result of discussions, will be considered for award in accordance with the evaluation process described herein. The Offeror is reminded that the Government reserves the right to award this effort based on the initial proposal, as received, without discussion. Therefore, the Offeror should submit its most complete and best proposal for consideration. IAW DoD Source Selection Procedures Paragraph C.2.1.1, Table C-1 (shown below) to reflect the offeror’s technical solution for meeting the Government’s requirement.

Table C-1. Technical Acceptable/Unacceptable Rating Method

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

2.3.1 Subfactor 1.1 Staffing Approach

2.3.1.1 The Offeror shall clearly detail their understanding and approach to recruit, hire, and retain qualified personnel who can execute the functional requirements as outlined in the SEED project PWS (Attachment 3), paragraph 3.1 provides pertinent historical data to aid in proposed

staffing approach. Offerors proposal will be evaluated on the extent to which the Offeror has demonstrated the qualifications and organizational experience in performing work of the same or similar nature as that of the requirements of the PWS. Understanding is demonstrated when the offeror submits the following measures of merit:

- a. SEED Project Staffing and Retention Plan: The Offeror shall clearly detail their approach to ensure continuity of services during personnel absences due to sickness, leave, security violations, and voluntary or involuntary termination from employment to avoid disruption of services. The Offeror shall provide an overall plan that will detail their approach to reduce turnover and maintain high quality services, to include historical data on turnover rates from current/previous and same/similar Government contracts. Offerors shall provide a narrative that maps the mix of labor categories to the corresponding PWS paragraph(s)/sub-paragraphs listed in the SEED Project PWS, respectively, and describe the duties, responsibilities, personnel qualifications of each position. Sample resumes are not required. However, the offeror is required to outline experience and education requirements of proposed personnel for all labor categories.
- b. SEED Project Staffing Matrix: Offeror must provide a staffing matrix listing labor categories and descriptions, labor hours, and number of employees required to perform the SEED Project effort utilizing the Staffing Matrix template (Attachment 6). See attachment 3 SEED Project PWS para 3.1.1 for historical workload data.

2.3.2 Subfactor 1.2 Management Approach

2.3.2.1 The offeror shall provide details to fully describe and demonstrate effective knowledge and understanding of the CHIPS Multiple Award IDIQ PWS requirements and all applicable subsections. Offerors shall describe how their plan for managing this contract and associated task orders will be efficient, responsive, and flexible in meeting PWS requirements. Address how the Offeror will effectively manage a potential large number of task orders with varying complexities. Address how the Offeror will effectively manage employees and if applicable, interface with subcontractors. Understanding is demonstrated when the Offeror submits the following measures of merit:

- a. CHIPS IDIQ Quality Control Plan: Offeror shall provide a quality control plan (QCP) in accordance with the (attachment 2) CHIPS IDIQ PWS, that addresses paragraphs 22.5.1, 22.5.2, 22.5.3, 22.5.4. The plan should address how it will effectively eliminate government oversight and remediation for any interruption or degradation of service levels. Offerors shall describe how they will ensure successful accomplishment of task order requirements and delivery of all contract/task order deliverables at a high-quality level and what steps they will take to resolve quality issues/unsatisfactory deliverables. Offerors shall describe their communications plan for interfacing with Government individuals at the IDIQ contract level and at the task order level. Offerors shall address their proposed internal process for responding to task order proposal requests, which must demonstrate an ability to respond to turn around task order requests quickly and begin performance quickly.
- b. SEED Task Order Transition Plan: Offeror shall clearly describe an effective approach to accomplish a phase-in plan to meet (attachment 2) CHIPS IDIQ_PWS paragraph 20 requirements for the seed project task order to include a logical timeline to ensure a smooth start of the contract tasks without interruption or degradation of service levels.
- c. SEED Employee Compensation Plan: Offerors shall submit an Employee Compensation Plan (ECP) setting forth salaries and fringe benefits proposed for the professional employees identified in the **second tab** of the SEED Project Pricing Spreadsheet (Attachment 5). This shall

apply to the Prime and any Subcontractors. The offeror's compensation plan shall describe the offeror's ability to provide uninterrupted high-quality work and the impact upon recruiting and retention of employees. The ECP shall provide a narrative on how the offeror arrived at the rate proposed and how it is appropriate in relation to the work, qualifications, and experience required. Additionally, the offeror shall cite or include supporting documentation, such as market rates, industry standards, rates of similar businesses, etc., utilized to develop their compensation plan and base labor rates.

2.4 Factor 2: Past Performance

2.4.1 The past performance evaluation considers the Offeror's demonstrated recent and relevant record of performance as well as the quality of that performance, in providing services that are similar in effort to this acquisition. As stated in paragraph 1, basis award above, proposals which have been determined Technically Acceptable, the Government will rank those proposals by price. Starting with the lowest priced proposal, the Government will evaluate Past Performance, which addresses the Offeror's CHIPS IDIQ performance history and the Past Performance factor will receive one of the performance confidence assessments described in the DoD Source Selection Procedures, Table 5 – Performance Confidence Assessments Rating Method, excerpted below. The Past Performance factor will receive one of the performance confidence assessments ratings described in DoD Source Selection Procedures, Table 5 – Performance Confidence Assessments Rating Method, excerpted below.

Table 5. Performance Confidence Assessments Rating Method

Adjectival 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. Rating is considered higher than Neutral.
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. Rating is considered higher than Neutral.
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.

2.4.2 In conducting the Past Performance evaluation, the Government reserves the right to use both the information provided in the Offeror's Past Performance proposal volume and information obtained from other sources available to the Government, to include, but not limited to: Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIS), Past Performance Integrated Reporting System (PIIRS), System for Award Management (SAM), past performance questionnaires, government customer interviews, applicable commercial clients, and any other source deemed necessary to obtain additional information that will be used in the evaluation of the Offeror's past performance.

2.4.3 If the Offeror is 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, the Offeror will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past

performance and, as a result, will receive a "Neutral Confidence" rating for the Past Performance factor. A record of recent, relevant, and quality past performance may be considered more advantageous to the Government than a "Neutral Confidence" rating. IAW 3.1.3.3 of the DoD Source Selection Procedures, although the Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) will not rate an offeror that lacks recent, relevant past performance favorably or unfavorably with regard to past performance, the Source Selection Authority (SSA) may determine that a "Substantial Confidence" or "Satisfactory Confidence" past performance rating is worth more than a "Neutral Confidence" past performance rating in a best value tradeoff.

2.4.4 The Government will review recent past performance information collected, determine the quality of the offeror's performance, general trends, and usefulness of the information, and incorporate these into the performance confidence assessment. A separate quality assessment rating will not be assigned; rather, the past performance confidence assessment rating is based on the offeror's overall record of recency, relevancy, and quality of performance.

2.5 Recency Assessment

2.5.1 In order to be recent, the contract (or subcontract) must be ongoing or must have been performed within the past five (5) years from the release date of this solicitation.

2.6 Relevancy Assessment

2.6.1 CHIPS IDIQ Performance History: An assessment of the past performance information will be made to determine if it is relevant. Relevancy will be assessed for each individual submission (up to three). In determining the relevancy of effort performed under individual past performance, the government will only consider the specific effort or portion consistent with that proposed to be performed by the prime, subcontractor, or Joint Venture partner under this effort. To obtain a "Relevant" rating, offerors must describe in detail how closely the provided services performed under the identified contracts relate to the CHIPS Performance Work Statement. Failure to provide required detail may result in a rating less than "Relevant". To be considered for the individual relevancy rating, each contract submitted must be similar to the services provided under CHIPS IDIQ PWS. Specifically, the contracts submitted shall provide same or similar services capturing the functions described below.

1. Management Support (Operations, Program, and Policy)
2. Planning Support (Operational, Joint, and Exercise)
3. Analysis Support (Management, Program, Plans, Operations and Mission)
4. Strategy Support (Plans, Orders, and Communication)
5. Integration Support (Operations, Plans, and Concepts)

2.6.2 The Government will use the following relevancy ratings when assessing the Offeror's contracts for aggregate relevance:

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.

2.7 Performance Confidence Assessment

2.7.1 The past performance confidence assessment rating is based on the offeror’s overall record of recency, relevance and quality of products or services assessments. Offerors will receive an integrated performance confidence assessment rating at the factor level (see Table 5 above). Although the past performance evaluation focuses on performance that is relevant to the Technical subfactor 1.1, subfactor 1.2 and price factor, the resulting performance confidence assessment rating is made at the factor level and represents an overall evaluation of offeror’s 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 a "Neutral Confidence" rating for the Past Performance factor.

2.7.2 More recent or relevant performance will have a greater impact on the Performance Confidence Assessment rating than less recent effort. A strong record of relevant past performance may be considered more advantageous to the Government than a "Neutral 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.

2.8 Factor 3: Price (SEED Project)

2.8.1 The Government will review the Offeror’s price proposal for completeness, balance, and reasonableness. In evaluating submitted price proposals (Attachment 5 – SEED Project Pricing Sheet), the Government will evaluate the offeror’s proposed Total Evaluated Price (TEP) for reasonableness. The TEP will be utilized for evaluation purposes only.

2.8.2 TEP: The Total Evaluated Price is the sum of all costs/prices proposed by the offeror for the base year, 4 options years, plus the estimated Surge Support and the Government provided Travel Cost. See Attachment 5 – SEED Project Pricing Sheet. FAR 52.217-8, Option to Extend Services, will also be included in the evaluation. The Government will calculate pricing for the six-month option to extend services based on multiplying the proposed monthly amount for option period four by six.

2.8.3 Completeness: Proposals will be evaluated for completeness and compliance with each of the requirements listed in Evaluation Criteria. The review will determine the adequacy of the Offeror’s proposal in addressing and fulfilling the SEED project requirements.

2.8.4 Reasonableness: For a price to be reasonable, it must represent a price to the Government that a prudent person would pay in the conduct of competitive business. The Government will determine prices fair and reasonable through the use of one or more of the price analysis techniques at FAR 15.404-1(b)(2).

2.8.5 Balance: Unbalanced pricing exists where the prices of one or more line-items are significantly overstated or understated, despite an acceptable TEP. The Government shall analyze offers to determine whether they are unbalanced with respect to separately priced line items or

sub-line items. An offer that is determined to be unbalanced may be rejected if the Contracting Officer determines that the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.

2.8.6 The Government will conduct a price reasonableness analysis of Offeror's proposed price. To be considered for award, the proposed price must be determined fair and reasonable.

2.8.7 A written notice of award or acceptance of an offer, furnished to the successful offeror within the time for acceptance specified in the offer, shall result in a binding contract without further action by either party. Before the offer's specified expiration time, the Government may accept an offer (or part of an offer), whether or not there are negotiations after its receipt, unless a written notice of withdrawal is received before award.