ATTACHMENT 5 – EVALUATION PROCEDURES
J6 PROGRAM MANAGEMENT OFFICE SUPPORT SERVICES (PMOSS)

M0 GENERAL

M0.1 Introduction. Section M describes the criteria the Government will use in evaluating the Offerors' proposals submitted for the J6 Program Management Support Services (PMOSS) contract. The Government will evaluate each Offeror's capabilities and proposal elements against this evaluation criteria. This is a competitive, best value, source selection using a tradeoff process that will be conducted in accordance with (IAW) Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.101-1, Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) Part 215.101, and FAR 15.404. The Government intends to make a single prime contract award under this solicitation.

M0.2 Evaluation. The Government will evaluate each Offeror's proposal against the evaluation criteria set forth below. The Government will award the J6 PMOSS contract from this solicitation to the Offeror whose proposal conforming to the solicitation is determined most advantageous to the Government. Technical execution, past performance, price, and other factors will be considered.

M0.3 Basis for Award. Award of the contract resulting from this solicitation will be made to the Offeror whose proposal complies with the solicitation requirements, who is deemed responsible and whose proposal is deemed to represent the best value to the Government based on the factors listed in Table M.1 below.

TABLE M.1

VOLUME	TITLE	EVALUATION RATING
I	**Compliance**	**Acceptable / Unacceptable**
II	**Technical Management Proposal**	**Color / Risk Rating**
	Management Approach	Not assigned an individual rating
	Transition Management and Mission Continuity	Not assigned an individual rating
	Staffing	Not assigned an individual rating
	Retention	Not assigned an individual rating
	Staffing Experience	Not assigned an individual rating
III	**Past Performance**	**Confidence Rating**
IV	**Price**	**Total Evaluated Price (TEP)**

M0.4 Order of Importance. Factor 1 (Compliance) will be evaluated on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis. Proposals that receive an Unacceptable rating for Factor 1 – Compliance will not be evaluated further and will be eliminated from any further consideration for award. Factor 2 (Technical Management) is more important than Factor 3 (Past Performance). Technical Management and Past Performance when combined are significantly more important than Factor 4 – Price.

Subjective tradeoff is a source selection process used when it may be in the best interest of the Government to consider award to other than the lowest priced Offeror or other than the highest technically rated Offeror, but it is not possible to place a quantifiable value on proposed performance or capabilities above threshold (minimum) requirements.

M0.5 Definitions.

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.

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

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.

M1 VOLUME I – COMPLIANCE

M1.1 RFP. Offeror has provided a completed and signed conformed copy of the solicitation through the latest amendment (if applicable) signed by an official authorized to contractually bind the Offeror.

M1.2 Top Secret Facility Clearance. Offeror has provided proof of Top Secret (TS) Security Facility Clearance as accredited by the Defense Security Service (DSS) with submission of its proposal. The TS Security Facility Clearance is active at time of proposal submission.

M1.3 Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification (CMMC). Offeror has an active CMMC Level 2 C3PAO certification at time of proposal submission which is valid during the proposal validity period (150 days after proposal due date) as verified in the Supplier Performance Risk System (SPRS).

M1.4 Organizational Conflict of Interest. Offeror, to include its affiliates and subcontractors, does not currently hold a Prime contract with USSOCOM in which the ITMO (e.g. J6, G6, N6, etc.) is the customer or plays a role in the contract in any way, during the performance of the potential award.

M1.5 Ratings. The Offeror's Volume I – Compliance proposal will be evaluated on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis. Any Offeror who receives an Unacceptable rating will not be evaluated further and will be eliminated from any further consideration for award.

Acceptable – Offeror meets all of the above criteria.

Unacceptable – Offeror does not meet one or more of the above criteria.

M2 VOLUME II - TECHNICAL MANAGEMENT PROPOSAL

M2.1 The Government will evaluate the Offeror's overall proposed management approach, transition and mission continuity, staffing, and retention. **The Government may incorporate areas of the Offeror's proposed technical volume, which are determined as 'strengths' into the contract prior to award (i.e., added to SOW, Section H clause, etc.) as appropriate**. Offerors that simply restate the Government's requirement will be rated unacceptable. **Evaluation of risk associated with the Offeror's proposal for this factor is inherent in the evaluation.** The Government will determine if the proposal meets or exceeds requirements, to what degree the proposed approach indicates an understanding of the requirements (Table M.2(A)), and the level of risk to unsuccessful performance per the color rating assigned based on the definitions contained within Table M.2(B) below.

The Government will utilize the combined Technical/Risk rating methodology contained within Table M.1(A) below, which includes consideration of risk in conjunction with the evaluation findings; significant strengths, strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, and deficiencies of the Offeror's proposal when determining the Technical Management Factor color rating. Evaluation of risk will assess the degree to which the Offeror's proposed approach for meeting the requirements outlined in this solicitation may cause disruption of schedule, increased costs, degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight, or the increased likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance. Any inconsistencies between the proposed Management Approach, Transition Management and Mission Continuity, Staffing, Retention, and the Price Proposal, such as unbalanced pricing, pricing incompatibility, or other pricing anomalies will be assessed under the Factor 1 - Technical Management evaluation rating as technical risk. Risk is one aspect of the technical evaluation and contributes to determining the Factor level color rating.

The Technical Management Factor will receive one of the adjectival ratings defined below:

TABLE M.2(A) COMBINED TECHNICAL/RISK RATING METHOD TECHNICAL RATING		
COLOR	**ADJECTIVAL RATING**	**DESCRIPTION**
Blue	**Outstanding**	Proposal demonstrates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths and/or at least one significant strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Purple	**Good**	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength or significant strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low to moderate.
Green	**Acceptable**	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Yellow	**Marginal**	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Red	**Unacceptable**	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation and, thus, contains one or more deficiencies and is unawardable, and/or risk of performance is unacceptably high.

TABLE M.2(B) COMBINED TECHNICAL/RISK RATING METHOD RISK DEFINITIONS	
Low	Proposal may contain weakness(es) which have little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and normal Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.
Moderate	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which may potentially cause disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.
High	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which is likely to cause significant disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation of performance. Is unlikely to overcome any difficulties, even with special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring.
Unacceptable	Proposal contains a material failure or a combination of significant weaknesses that increases the risk of unsuccessful performance to an unacceptable level.

M2.1.1 Management Approach (Element 1). The Government will evaluate the Management Approach according to the following:

M2.1.1.1 Team Construct and Management Approach: The Government will evaluate the degree to which the proposed team will provide the required capabilities to manage/perform requirements for this effort. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the proposed management organization is clear, logical, and provides for flat and effective communication and supervision. The Government will evaluate feasibility of proposed methods and processes to successfully oversee a geographically dispersed workforce. The Government will also evaluate the prime contractor's ability to effectively manage and integrate subcontract support.

M2.1.2 Transition Management and Mission Continuity (Element 2). The Government will evaluate the Transition Management and Mission Continuity Approach according to the following:

M2.1.2.1 Phase-In Approach: The proposal will be evaluated for feasibility and impact on mission continuity. The Government will evaluate Offeror's transition organization and dedicated resources provided to support contract transition activities that reduce anticipated risks and enable continuity of services. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's approach, processes, and expertise to incumbent capture and its effects on overall mission continuity. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's approach to provide appropriately cleared personnel to support the requirements of the contract IAW requirements of the DD Form 254. The Government will evaluate the clarity, feasibility and degree of detail in identification of key activities and resources to achieve proposed milestones that meet requirements of the 60-day transition and ensure full operational capability (FOC) for required personnel and locations stated in Attachment 1 - SOW. A feasible plan to capture a higher rate of incumbent personnel may be more favorably evaluated.

M2.1.3 Staffing (Element 3). The Government will evaluate the Offeror's Staffing methods according to the following:

M2.1.3.1 Plan to Recruit and Integrate Non-Incumbent Personnel: The Government will evaluate the proposed approach to recruit new (non-incumbent) qualified personnel. The Offeror's recruiting and backfill approach beyond the transition-in period will be evaluated to ensure sustainment of mission continuity and quality services. The Government will evaluate the extent to which risk mitigation strategies regarding staffing shortfalls are clear, logical, feasible, and align with the requirements of the SOW.

M2.1.3.2 Issue Management and Resolution: The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's issue mitigation approach is clear, logical, and feasible. The Government will also evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's procedures mitigate risk to mission continuity and prioritize clear communication between all stakeholders. An Offeror that provides proven successful issue mitigation strategies and procedures, to include quantifiable impact on contract efficiency, may be more favorably evaluated.

M2.1.3.3 Key Personnel: The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed approach to recruit/hire personnel for Key Personnel positions. The Government will review the resume for the proposed individual(s) to evaluate the degree to which the candidate(s) meet the position requirements.

M2.1.4 Retention (Element 4). The Government will evaluate the Offeror's Retention methods according to the following:

M2.1.4.1 Workforce Retention and Development: The Government will evaluate the Offeror's workforce retention and development approach to determine the Offeror's understanding of the necessary workforce, expertise and qualification requirements. An Offeror that provides achievable risk mitigation strategies that limit shortfalls resulting from extended absences or personnel terminations may be more favorably evaluated. An Offeror that provides evidence of successful retention rates (>95% throughout the life of the contract) may be more favorably evaluated.

M2.1.5 Staffing Experience (Element 5). The Government will evaluate the Offeror's Staffing Experience according to the following:

M2.1.5.1 Staffing Experience: The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's staffing experience demonstrates its ability to recruit and retain qualified individuals for this requirement. An Offeror that has staffing experience with USSOCOM may be more favorably evaluated. An Offeror that has staffing experience for positions supporting command, control, communications, computers, and cyber (C4) programs may be more favorably evaluated.

M3 VOLUME III - PAST PERFORMANCE.

M3.1 The Government will evaluate the Offeror's Past Performance for a demonstrated record of performance in providing the services delineated in Attachment 1 – SOW. The performance rating is assessed at the overall Past Performance Factor level after evaluating aspects of the Offeror's recent and relevant performance to the J6 PMOSS requirements stated in Attachment 1 – SOW.

M3.2 Past Performance Summary. The past performance evaluation will be based on the data provided in the Offeror's proposal, and other sources available to the Government. Past performance information may be obtained from any other sources available to the Government, to include, but not limited to, the Contract Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), or other databases; the Defense Contract Management Agency; and interviews with Program Managers, Contracting Officers, and Fee Determining Officials. The Government is not limited to these resources.

M3.3 Organizational Structure Change History. The Government will evaluate the past performance of the efforts that meet the recency and relevancy defined below to determine the Government's overall level of confidence in the Offeror's ability to successfully perform the required effort using the ratings below in Table M.4. In the case of Joint Ventures, the Government will consider past performance submitted by the managing partners of the Joint Venture. In the case of an Offeror without a record of recent and relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror shall receive a Past Performance rating of "Unknown Confidence," which equates to a neutral rating having neither positive nor negative evaluation significance.

M3.4 Past Performance Citations. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's past performance citations to determine how well an Offeror has performed under recent, relevant contracts and utilize that as an indicator on the likelihood the Offeror will successfully perform the J6 PMOSS effort. The Government may consider the currency, degree of relevance, source, and context of the past performance information it evaluates as well as general trends in performance and demonstrated corrective actions.

M3.5 Subcontractor Consent and Subcontractor Authorization. Key personnel experience will not be accepted for past performance submissions. Therefore, resumes or letters of recommendation are **not** valid.

M3.6 Recent Contracts. The Government will evaluate the "recency" of the Offeror's past performance. The Government defines "recent" as contracts that have performance taking place during the past three years from the date of issuance of this solicitation.

M3.7 Relevant Contracts. The Government will evaluate the "relevancy" of the Offeror's past performance. The Government will determine a degree of relevance in accordance with the relevant definition identified in Attachment 4 – Proposal Submission Instructions and Table M.3 for each past performance citation.

M3.7.1 For the prime Offerors, ***relevancy*** is defined as contracts that are most similar to this overall effort requiring (1) similarity of services, (2) similarity of security requirements, and similarity in complexity, (3) similarity in the number of required personnel (4) at a similar number of geographically dispersed locations, (5) services performed in support of Department of War, (5) services performed in support of USSOCOM.

M3.7.2 For proposed subcontractors/teaming partners, ***relevancy*** is defined by that which reflects performance in the area(s) of expertise the subcontractor is proposed to actually perform under this contract (i.e. specific functional areas in the SOW).

M3.7.3 When making the **relevancy determination** the following definitions will be used for both prime Offeror and subcontractor efforts:

Table M.3 Past Performance Relevancy Rating Method

Adjectival Ratings	Description
Very Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Somewhat Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Not Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

Table M.4 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.
Satisfactory Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Limited Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
No Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the Offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.
Unknown Confidence (Neutral)	No recent/relevant performance record is available, or the Offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned.

M3.8 A negative finding in any element may result in an overall high-risk rating. Offerors are advised that while an Offeror will not be evaluated either favorably or unfavorably for having Unknown Confidence (Neutral) past performance, that Unknown Confidence (Neutral) rating can be considered during a trade-off analysis with other offerors who have a performance rating other than Neutral.

M3.9 An offeror that is assessed as having a Limited Confidence or No Confidence rating will not be considered for award.

M4 VOLUME IV – PRICE.

M4.1 Price proposals will be evaluated for reasonableness, unbalanced pricing, and a clear understanding of the requirement and are consistent with the Offeror's technical proposal.

M4.2 Price. The Government will use price analysis techniques in order to determine price fair and reasonable IAW FAR 15.404. A Total Evaluated Price (TEP) shall be calculated using the Attachment 3 – Price Matrix. The TEP shall utilize the proposed labor rates and the estimated number of Full-Time Equivalents (FTE) for each Ordering Period. The number of FTEs identified in Attachment 3 is an estimate for evaluation purposes only.

M4.2.1 Travel. Costs incurred by contractor personnel for travel are subject to the limitations of Federal Regulation (FAR) 31.205-46, Travel Costs which include the Federal Travel Regulations (FTR) and the Joint Travel Regulation

(JTR). The TEP will include the Government estimated amount identified in Attachment 3 for evaluation purposes only.

M.4.2.4 Inconsistencies between the proposed Price Volume and Technical Management Volume, unbalanced pricing, or other pricing anomalies may be evaluated as proposal risk and may be assessed a weakness or significant weakness under Technical Management Factor 1.

M5 BASIS OF AWARD

M5.1 To arrive at a source selection decision, the Source Selection Authority (SSA) will perform an integrated assessment using the evaluation factors described in this solicitation. This may result in an award being made to a higher rated, higher priced Offeror where the decision is consistent with the evaluation factors.

M5.2 The Government intends to award without discussions but reserves the right to hold discussions **if necessary.** If discussions do become necessary, the Government will establish a competitive range.