

Innovation, Integration, and Information Support (3IS) III
RFP: FA2518-22-R-0023
Attachment 16, Section M - Evaluation Factors for Award

In accordance with (IAW) FAR 52.232-19 - Availability of Funds (Apr 1984)

Notice to Offeror(s)/Supplier(s): Funds are not presently available for this effort. No award will be made under this solicitation until funds are available. 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. The Government's obligation under this contract is contingent upon the availability of appropriated funds from which payment for contract purposes can be made. No legal liability on the part of the Government for any payment may arise until funds are made available to the Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO) for this contract and until the Contractor receives notice of such availability, to be confirmed in writing by the PCO.

(End of Clause)

M-1. FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION (48CFR, CHAPTER 1) CLAUSES

Clauses are located in Section I of the SF 33.

M-2. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION (48 CFR, CHAPTER 2) PROVISIONS

None at this time.

M-3. EVALUATION CRITERIA

1.0 BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD.

- 1.1 Best Value.** This is a best value source selection conducted in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.3, Source Selection, and FAR 15.101-1, Tradeoff Process, as supplemented by the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) and the Air Force Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (AFFARS). These regulations are available electronically at <https://www.acquisition.gov/>

The Government intends to make a single award by selecting the best value offeror, who is deemed responsible in accordance with FAR 9.1, Responsible Prospective Contractors, as supplemented by the DFARS 209.1. The Offeror's proposal shall conform to the solicitation's requirements (to include all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and all other information required by the Instructions to Offerors) and will be assessed based on the evaluation factors and subfactors to represent the best value to the Government. The SSA will base the source selection decision on an integrated assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria in the solicitation (described below). The Government will select the best overall offer, based upon an integrated assessment of Technical and Cost/Price. Among the acceptable proposals, a tradeoff may occur among the Technical Subfactors under Phase II Factor 1, Technical, and Factor 3, Cost/Price, if it is in the Government's best interest to do so. This may result in an award to other than the lowest priced proposal where the decision is consistent with the evaluation factors, and the Source Selection Authority (SSA) reasonably determines that the tradeoff process is in the best interest of the Government.

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. The SSA may consider recommendations, minority opinions, and reports and analyses prepared by others; the source selection decision shall be based upon the SSA's independent judgment.

- 1.1.1 Number of Contracts to be Awarded.** The Government intends to award a single contract as a result of this solicitation. However, the Government reserves the right to make no award at all.
- 1.1.2 Responsibility Determination.** To be eligible for award, the offeror must be deemed responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104. If the Offeror is determined not responsible, then PCO will comply with FAR 19.6 (Certificates of Competency and Determinations of Responsibility). Information will not be evaluated in accordance with FAR 15.101-1, Trade-off Process, but will be used solely for the purpose of determining contractor responsibility
- 1.1.3 Adequate Price Competition.** The PCO (PCO) has determined there is a high probability of adequate price competition in this acquisition. Upon examination of the initial offers, the PCO will review this determination, and if in the PCO's opinion adequate price competition exists, no additional data will be requested and certification under FAR 15.406-2, Certificate of Current Pricing Data, will not be required.
- 1.1.4 Discussions.** In accordance with FAR 52.215-1(f)(4), the Government intends to award the contract without discussions (except clarification as described in FAR 15.306(a)) but reserves the right to conduct discussions if necessary. In the event discussions are held, 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.
- 1.1.5 Competitive Range.** IAW FAR 15.306(c)(2), the Contracting Officer may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly rated proposals. The Government intends to conduct Two-Phased Approach. Phase I will be a gate approach which all eligible 8(a) Offerors must pass to advance to Phase II. If an Offeror's Phase I proposal does not receive a "pass," the Government will not evaluate that Offeror's Phase II proposal, and will notify the Offeror that the Offeror was eliminated from further consideration, and therefore ineligible for award.
- 1.1.6 North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Code.** This acquisition is a competitive 8(a) set aside. The prime contractor must be an 8(a) company under NAICS Code 541715 Research & Development (R&D) in the Physical, Engineering & Life Sciences, with a small business size standard of 1000 employees, and perform at least

50% of the work. If a Joint Venture, then the 8(a) company needs to perform at least 40% of the work. This acquisition will be conducted using a Two-Phased approach. All eligible 8(a) companies must submit a proposal for Phase I and Phase II. Upon receipt of proposals, the Government will verify that the Offeror is an 8(a) before proceeding to evaluate its Phase I proposal. If the Offeror is not an 8(a), the Government will notify that Offeror that it is not eligible for consideration since it is not an 8(a), and is therefore eliminated from consideration for this award. The Government will evaluate all 8(a) Offerors' Phase I proposals, and will evaluate each proposal as either "pass" or "fail". If an 8(a) offeror's Phase I proposal passes, then the Government will evaluate their Phase II proposal IAW 15.3, Source Selection, and FAR 15.101-1, Tradeoff Process, as supplemented by the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) and the Air Force Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (AFFARS).

1.1.7 Non-Compliance. Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions, representations and certifications as required in Section K, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as factors or subfactors. This also includes being an 8(a) company under the NAICS Code listed above. IAW FAR 19.816(c), a contractor that has completed its term of participation in the 8(a) program may be awarded this acquisition if it was an 8(a) participant eligible for award of the contract on the initial date specified for receipt of the offers contain in the solicitation and if the contractor continues to meet all other applicable eligibility criteria. To confirm this, the Government intends to conduct a compliance check on both Offerors' Phase I and Phase II proposals. If the Government finds either Phase I or Phase II proposal to be non-compliant with the terms and conditions of the solicitation, the Offeror's overall proposal may result in the Offeror being excluded from the competition or being ineligible for award.

2.0 EVALUATION FACTORS. The evaluation process shall proceed as follows:

2.1 Two-Phased Approach. The Government requests Offerors submit proposals for Phase I and Phase II on or before the date/time listed in Section L-4, 3.1. Failure to submit both proposals on or before the exact date/time may result in the Offeror being considered non-compliant and ineligible for award. The Government will evaluate first an Offeror's Phase I proposal and determine whether the Offeror met the criteria to "pass" this gate. If an Offeror receives a "pass" rating for Phase I, then the Government will evaluate an Offeror's Phase II proposal. If the Offeror does not receive a "pass" rating for Phase I, then the Government will not evaluate an Offeror's Phase II proposal and that Offeror will be ineligible for award.

3.0 Phase I - Technical Qualification Gate. The Offeror must receive a "pass" rating on all 12 elements to receive an overall "pass" on its Phase I proposal. See Section Attachment 15, Section L, Paragraph 4.3-4.6. Each element has a list of sub-elements. To pass an element experience must be provided that substantiates the element and all sub-elements (list of aspects within each element). The Offeror must provide at least one example of prior experience*, ongoing or completed within the past 3 years from the date the solicitation was issued, that meets the criteria outlined in Table 1 below. Examples must be from the prime, Joint Venture, affiliate company, sister companies, division, and/or teaming arrangements/subcontractors

who will be working on this effort. For each example of prior experience, the Offeror must identify the company the example is from. The examples and explanations need to be within the page limitations identified in Section L-4, 2.2.1, Table 1. Each element will be rated against the following table. To

(NOTE: Experience means the experience of the prime, Joint Venture, affiliate company, sister company, subsidiary, divisions, and/or teammates/ subcontractors who will be working on this effort.)

Table 1 - Phase I Technical Qualification Rating

Rating	Definition
Pass:	Offeror did provide the required prior experience and demonstrated an understanding of all the elements.
Fail:	Offeror did not provide the required prior experience and did not demonstrate an understanding of all the elements.

If any of the 12 elements are rated as “fail”, then the overall rating for Phase I will be “fail”. If this occurs, the Government will notify an Offeror, and that Offeror will not proceed to Phase II and will be ineligible for award.

4.0 Phase II. Technical & Price/Cost Evaluation.

4.1 Factors and Subfactors. All Offerors’ Phase I proposals determined a “pass” will advance to Phase II, and the Government will evaluate their Phase II proposal IAW FAR Part 15 and the evaluation factors of this solicitation. Each Phase II proposal will be evaluated using the following factors and subfactors:

- 4.2 Factor 1: Technical**
 - Subfactor 1: Information Technology**
 - Subfactor 2: Wargaming**
 - Subfactor 3: Combat Training Support**
 - Subfactor 4: Test and Evaluation**

Factor 1 will be evaluated at the subfactor level. All Subfactors under Factor 1 are of equal importance to each other, and each will be assigned a combined technical/risk rating.

4.2.1 Factor 2: Transition In. Factor 2 will be assigned a rating of “Acceptable” or “Unacceptable.”

4.2.2 Factor 3: Price/Cost. Factor 2 (Price/Cost) will be assessed for reasonableness, realism and balance using a Total Evaluated Price (TEP) established for source selection evaluation purposes only.

4.2.3 Relative Importance of Factors and Subfactors. All non-cost/price factors to include Factor 1, Technical, and Factor 2, Transition in, are significantly more important than Factor 3, Cost/Price. Factor 2 will be rated at the factor level and will be assigned a rating of acceptable or unacceptable and will not be part of any tradeoff analysis.

Factor 1 will be evaluated at the subfactor level. All Subfactors under Factor 1 are of equal importance, and each will be assigned a combined technical/risk rating IAW DoD Source Selection Procedures dated 20 Aug 2022. Each of the Factor 1 sub-factors are equal in importance to Factor 2. Each of Factor 1 sub-factors are significantly more important than Factor 3, Cost/Price, and can be traded off for Factor 3, Cost/Price.

4.2.4 Unawardability for Phase II. An “Unacceptable” combined technical/risk rating for any of the Factor 1 four (4) technical subfactors or an unacceptable rating for the phase-in plan may render an offeror’s overall proposal as unawardable. In addition, any Price/Cost proposal analyzed and found to be “unreasonable”, “unrealistic” or “unbalanced” may result in an offeror’s proposal excluded from the competitive range or will render the overall proposal unawardable.

4.3 Phase II, FACTOR 1 - Technical.

4.3.1 General. The Offeror shall demonstrate their proposed technical approach for meeting the request for proposal requirements specified by each of the four subfactors.

4.3.2 The purpose is to assess whether the Offeror’s Phase II proposal will meet the Government’s requirements expressed below for each of the four technical subfactors. The Government shall utilize the combined technical/risk rating listed under Table 3; the risk “descriptions” set forth Table 2b, and definitions for significant strengths, strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, uncertainties, and deficiencies under paragraph 5.0, Definitions, to evaluate and assign a rating for each technical subfactor. This is as follows:

Table 2: Combined Technical/ Risk Rating Method

Color	Rating	Description
Blue	Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements, and contains <i>multiple strengths and/or at least one significant strength</i> , and risk of unsuccessful performance is <i>low</i> .
Purple	Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements, and <i>contains at least one strength or significant strength</i> , and risk of unsuccessful performance is <i>low to moderate</i> .
Green	Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and risk of unsuccessful performance is <i>no worse than moderate</i> .
Yellow	Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is <i>high</i> .

Color	Rating	Description
Red	Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation, and thus, <i>contains one or more deficiencies and is unawardable, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is unacceptably high.</i>

Table 3: Technical Risk Rating Method

Risk Rating	Description
Low	Proposal may contain weakness/weaknesses which have low potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation of performance. Normal contractor emphasis and normal Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.
Moderate	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which may have a moderate potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.
High	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which is likely to have high potential to cause significant disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will unlikely be able to overcome any difficulties.
Unacceptable	Proposal contains a deficiency or a combination of significant weaknesses that causes an unacceptable level of risk of unsuccessful performance.

Definitions for significant strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, uncertainties, and deficiencies are as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

4.3.3 SUBFACTOR 1: Information Technology

4.3.3.1 The Government will evaluate the extent to which the Offeror's proposal demonstrates an adequate approach to provide contractor personnel with the required certification/qualifications and security clearance to staff the Information Technology to meet or exceed the requirements listed in Information Technology PWS, Attachment 7, to support the 12 Delta Organizations located at Schriever Space Force Base at Bldg 24 and Geographical Separated Location

4.3.3.2 The Government will evaluate the extent to which the Offeror's proposal demonstrates an understanding of the requirements and provides an adequate approach to engineer, develop, operate, administer, support and maintain information system and network support for internal/external communications at an Unclassified, Secret, and Top Secret (TS)/Sensitive Compartmented Information (SCI) classification levels.

4.3.4 SUBFACTOR 2: Wargaming.

4.3.4.1 The Government will evaluate the extent to which the Offeror's proposal demonstrates an adequate approach to provide contractor personnel with the required certification/qualifications and security clearance required to meet or exceed the requirements listed in Wargaming PWS, Attachment 8.

4.3.4.2 The Government will evaluate the extent to which the Offeror's proposal demonstrates an understanding of the requirements and provides an adequate approach to prepare for, plan, and execute a scenario-driven, all-domain wargame within a DoD framework involving Blue (DoD; Commercial, Civil, and international partners; whole-of-government agencies; etc.) and Red (representative of an active and challenging adversary) participation.

4.3.5 SUBFACTOR 3: 392d Combat Training Squadron (CTS) (Task Order 0002)

4.3.5.1 The Government will evaluate the extent to which the Offeror's proposal demonstrates an adequate approach to provide contractor personnel with the required certification/qualifications and security clearance required to meet or exceed the requirements listed in 392 CTS PWS, Attachment 9.

4.3.5.2 The Government will evaluate to the extent to which the Offeror's proposal demonstrates an understanding of the requirements and provides an adequate approach to operate existing and future Modeling & Simulation (M&S) systems.

- 4.3.5.3 The Government will evaluate to the extent to which the Offeror's proposal demonstrates an understanding of the requirements and provides an adequate approach to plan, develop, and test the interface to other Distributed Mission Operations (DMO) domains.
- 4.3.5.4 The Government will evaluate to the extent to which the Offeror's proposal demonstrates an understanding of the requirements and provides an adequate approach to provide cradle-to-grave exercise support (design, develop, plan, execute, and assess) for exercises across all security classifications to include but not limited to Special Access Program/Special Access Required (SAP/SAR) Advanced Program.

4.3.6 SUBFACTOR 4: Test & Evaluation

- 4.3.6.1 The Government will evaluate the extent to which the Offeror's proposal demonstrates an adequate approach to provide contractor personnel with the required certification/qualifications and security clearance required to meet or exceed the requirements listed in T&E SBMW PWS, Attachment 10.
- 4.3.6.2 The Government will evaluate the extent to which the Offeror's proposal demonstrates an understanding of the requirements and provides an adequate approach to support integrated testing requirements of the Space Based Missile Warning (SBMW) Oversight Program through the life of the testing effort to include planning, execution, analysis, reporting, and closeout.

4.4 Phase II, FACTOR 2 - Transition In (Acceptable/Unacceptable)

This factor evaluates the proposed approach to Transition In. The Transition In Plan will be assigned a rating of "Acceptable" or "Unacceptable" in accordance with Table 4. The Government will evaluate an Offeror's Transition In proposal and will rate them "Acceptable" when their proposal indicates an understanding and adequate approach of the 3IS III Transition In requirements. These requirements are as follows:

- 4.4.1 Provide a process to on-board personnel to include the following actions:
- Identifying new staff and on-boarding process/timeline
 - Capturing and transitioning incumbent staff
 - Initiating background checks as needed and completing security paperwork
 - Verification and transfer of security clearances (if needed) or obtaining clearances to appropriate levels (JPAS/DISS clearance transfers)
 - Coordinating Common Access Card issuance
 - Coordinating Restricted Area Badge issuance
 - Nominating and processing SCI indoctrinations
 - Issuance of SCIF badge
- 4.4.2 Provide a process to ensure all contract requirements continue seamlessly during the transition of the contract to include to the following actions:
- Executing DD254s
 - Network account setup (Collateral to SAP/SAR)

- Ensuring personnel supporting missions requiring overseas travel have passports
- GFE Inventory/Reconciliation (ITEC)
- Ensuring production of all deliverables

Table 4 - Ratings for Factor 2

Rating	Description
Acceptable	Proposal does indicate an understanding and adequate approach of 3IS III Transition In requirements.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not indicate an understanding and adequate approach of 3IS III Transition In requirements.

4.5 Phase II - FACTOR 3 - Cost/Price

4.5.1 Overview. The Government will evaluate the cost/price of the Task Order 0001 (Transition In) and 0002 (392 CTS); and will use the total evaluated price from Task Order 0002 as a factor in determining the best-value offeror which may include a Government Estimated Most Probable Cost (GEMPC) applied to the Cost Plus Fixed Fee (CLINs). The Government will use one or more of the techniques defined in FAR 15.404-1, in order to determine if the costs/prices are reasonable, realistic, and balanced. The Government will base its evaluation on the total evaluated price to include an Offeror’s proposed total cost/price for Task Order 0002, the Government provided amounts for Travel and other direct costs, the Government’s cost realism assessment and the application of GEMPC to the CPFF CLINs. The Government will evaluate the initial proposed costs/prices, as well as any revisions the offeror may make. The Government will not assign a rating to the Cost/Price Factor.

4.5.2 Information Other Than Cost or Pricing Data. The Contracting Officer anticipates adequate price competition; therefore, certified cost or pricing data is not required. The Government will evaluate information other than certified cost or pricing data for purposes of determining cost realism and the best value.

4.5.3 Total Evaluated Price (TEP). For source selection evaluation purposes only, the Offeror will propose their calculated TEP. This TEP may be provided to the SSA as proposed or adjusted by the Government’s Estimated Most Proposal Cost (GEMPC) based upon the Government’s cost realism analysis of the CPFF CLINs. **The TEP is calculated by the sum of all Contract Line Item Numbers (CLINS) costs and prices to include all options for TO 0002 and may include an adjustment to an Offeror’s proposed CPFF CLINs to account for the GEMPC (see section below).**

4.5.4 Cost/Price Realism Assessment. The Government will evaluate the realism of the proposed costs/prices in TO 0002. This will include an evaluation of the extent to which proposed costs are sufficient for the work to be performed, are reflective of a clear understanding of the requirements, reflect a sound approach to satisfying the requirements, are consistent with the unique methods of performance and materials described in the offeror’s technical proposal and reflect reasonable labor escalation and indirect factors (FAR 15.404-1(d)(1) and 2.101). For the cost to be realistic, it must reflect what it would cost the offeror to perform the effort, if

performed with reasonable economy and efficiency. If the Government evaluates an offer as unrealistically low or high compared to the anticipated costs of performance, and the offeror fails to explain these differences, the Government will consider, under the Technical Risk Rating, the offeror's lack of understanding of the technical requirements of the applicable Technical Subfactor, which could cause the Government to rate the offeror's proposal as technically unacceptable.

- 4.5.5 Government Estimate of Most Probable Cost (GEMPC).** The Government will develop, based on the cost realism analysis, a GEMPC for each proposal. The Government will create the GEMPC using the offeror's proposal and the Government's evaluation of proposed approach, costs, and rates. The GEMPC may adjust the Offeror's proposed costs for the CPFF CLINs resulting from the cost realism analysis IAW FAR 15.404-1(d); the Government will use these costs, rather than the offeror's proposed costs, for the purpose of evaluation to determine the best value.
- 4.5.6 Reasonableness.** The Government will evaluate the reasonableness of all proposed costs/prices in all TOs to include the Transition In, TO 0001; and 329d Combat Training Squadron, TO 0002. For a cost/price to be reasonable, in its nature and amount, it must not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person in the conduct of competitive business (see FAR 31.201-3). The Government may determine an offer is unacceptable, and therefore unawardable, if the Government finds costs/prices not to be fair and reasonable. The techniques and procedures described under FAR 15.404-1 will be used to assess proposal reasonableness.
- 4.5.7 Unbalanced Offers.** The Government will also evaluate for unbalanced pricing in all TOs. Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable total evaluated price, the price of one or more items is significantly overstated or understated as indicated by the application of price analysis techniques. The Government shall analyze offers to determine whether there are unbalanced separately priced line items. An offeror whose proposal is determined to be unbalanced may be determined unawardable if the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government (FAR 15.404-1(g), Unbalanced Pricing).
- 4.5.8 Professional Compensation.** The professional compensation proposed will be considered in terms of its impact upon recruiting and retention, its realism, and its consistency with a total plan for compensation IAW FAR 52.222-46. Compensation Plans determined to be unrealistic may be excluded for consideration for award.