M.1. BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD: This acquisition will use formal source selection processes and techniques IAW RFO FAR 15.103-1; Department of Defense Source Selection Procedures, dated August 20, 2022; and the Army Source Selection Supplement to the Department of Defense Source Selection Procedures, dated October 1, 2024. The Government will compare the Offeror's proposal to Section L in order to perform a compliance review. Any Offeror's proposal determined non-compliant by the terms noted in Section L will not be evaluated and will not be further considered for award. Award will be made using a Best Value Continuum Subjective Tradeoff Process as described herein. Prior to the evaluation of the factors listed below, the Government will evaluate the acceptability of the Offeror's Facility Clearance. Once determinations are made regarding the acceptability of the Offerors' Facility Clearances, the following evaluation factors will be used to determine award: Technical, Past Performance, and Price. ACC-RI will make an award to the responsible contractor whose offer conforms to the solicitation and is determined to provide the best value to the Government considering price and non-price factors. This may result in an award to other than the lowest priced or highest rated Offeror.

M.2. NUMBER OF CONTRACT AWARDS. ACC-RI intends to award a single FFUP contract with some non-fee-bearing Cost Reimbursable CLINs. The Government reserves the right to reject any or all proposals and make no award if such action is in the best interest of the Government.

M.3. COMPETITIVE RANGE & NEGOTIATIONS. IAW RFO FAR Provision 52.215-1, Instructions to Offerors – Competitive Acquisition; the Government intends to award a contract resulting from this RFP without negotiations with offerors, except for clarifications described in RFO FAR 15.202(a)(2). Therefore, the offeror's initial proposal should contain the offeror's best terms from a cost or price and technical standpoint. The Government reserves the right to conduct negotiations if the Contracting Officer later determines them to be necessary. If the Contracting Officer determines that the number of proposals that would otherwise be in the competitive range exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted, 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 evaluated proposals.

M.4. PROOF OF FACILITY CLEARANCE, AFFIRMATIVE STATEMENT AS TO IRAQ LABOR LAW COMPLIANCE, AND SUPPLEMENTAL DOCUMENTS.

M.4.1. Facility Clearance. The PCO will verify that the Commercial and Government Entity (CAGE) code(s) for the Offeror and the teammates / subcontractors/ managing partner, provided in Volume I, Supplemental Documents & Facility Clearance, possess a SECRET Facility Clearance via the Defense Security Service (DSS) Industrial Security Facilities Database (ISFD) by the Request for Proposal (RFP) closing date. If the CAGE code for the Offeror, managing partner, teammate or subcontractor provided does not possess a Secret Facility Clearance, the Offeror will be found unacceptable. Unacceptable proposals

will not be further evaluated and will not be further considered for award.

The Offeror will be rated IAW the following definitions:

Acceptable: Proposal clearly meets the minimum requirements of the solicitation.

Unacceptable: Proposal does not clearly meet the minimum requirements of the solicitation.

M.4.2. Affirmative Statement as to Iraq Labor Law Compliance. The PCO will verify that the Offeror has included an affirmative statement that it understands and will fully comply with Iraq labor law. If the Offeror fails to provide an affirmative statement as to Iraq labor law compliance, the Offeror will be considered unacceptable and will not be further considered for award. The Offeror will be rated IAW the following definitions:

Acceptable: Proposal clearly meets the minimum requirements of the solicitation.

Unacceptable: Proposal does not clearly meet the minimum requirements of the solicitation.

M.4.3. The Government will review the completed solicitation and amendments for accurate completion and applicable signatures.

M.4.4. The Executive Summary will not be evaluated. Rather, it will be reviewed to assist evaluators in familiarizing themselves with the approach each Offeror will use to meet the requirements of the Performance Work Statement (PWS).

M.5. EVALUATION FACTORS. For those Offerors with an Acceptable Facility Clearance and Acceptable Affirmative Statement as to Iraq Labor Law Compliance, the U.S. Government will evaluate the following factors and subfactors:

Factor 1: Technical
- Subfactor 1: Management Plan
- Subfactor 2: Key Personnel

Factor 2: Past Performance
Factor 3: Price

M.6. RELATIVE IMPORTANCE. For the Offerors with an Acceptable Facility Clearance, the Government assigns the following order of importance:

M.6.1. Technical sub-factors and technical factor will be rated on an acceptable/unacceptable basis and the proposal must be rated acceptable for all technical sub-factors in order to receive an acceptable rating for the technical factor. The past performance factor will be adjectivally rated via a

PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE – CUI
See FAR 2.101 and 3.104

Performance Confidence assessment. Past performance is more important than Price. However, as non-price factors equalize, price becomes more important in the best value analysis. Clarifications and negotiations with Offerors may occur during the evaluation process.

M.7. EVALUATION APPROACH. All proposals shall be subject to evaluation by the Source Selection Team (SST). The overarching evaluation approach for all factors is as follows:

1. Adequacy of Response: The proposal will be evaluated to determine whether the Offeror's methods and approach have adequately and completely considered, defined, and satisfied the requirements specified in the RFP.

2. Feasibility of Approach: The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the proposed approach is workable and the end results achievable. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which successful performance is contingent upon proven devices and techniques. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the Offeror is expected to be able to successfully complete the proposed tasks and technical requirements within the required schedule.

M.8. EVALUATION APPROACH. IAW the DoD Source Selection Procedures dated 20 August 2023, Section D.8.2.2, the technical factors/sub-factors are evaluated on an objective, acceptable/unacceptable basis, (see below).

Technical Acceptable/Unacceptable Rating Method	
Adjectival Rating	**Description**
Acceptable	Proposal meets the requirements of the solicitation.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet the requirements of the solicitation.

M.9. FACTOR I - TECHNICAL.

The Offeror's technical proposal will be evaluated on the acceptability of the Offeror to clearly demonstrate the following:

M.9.1. Subfactor 1 – Management Plan.

M.9.1.1. The Management Plan clearly demonstrates a logical and effective approach for supporting and meeting the entire range of task requirements of PWS. The Management Plan clearly and fully demonstrates that the Offeror has resources needed to acquire, train, and retain qualified, experienced staff to meet the requirements of PWS. The proposal clearly details how the offeror will ensure continuity of operations by having capable employees who meet the security requirements prior to the performance start date. The proposal provided detailed procedures for backfilling positions to avoid vacancies and timelines to meet the requirements of 100 percent fill at the end of the transition period. The Management Plan specifically addressed procedures for backfill requirements in the event of leave, bereavement, termination, etc.

M.9.1.2. The Offeror's approach to and understanding of the transition plan in accordance with Sections 3.15, 3.16, and 3.17 of the PWS. The transition plan clearly demonstrates the plan for transitioning in/out within 30 days and meets the requirements of the PWS.

M.9.1.3. The Offeror's approach to and understanding of the training requirements as described in Section 2.4 of the PWS.

M.9.1.4. The Offeror's approach to and understanding of the Quality Control Program.

The Government will conduct its analysis by evaluating the information submitted by the Offeror in response to L.7.1.

M.9.2. Subfactor 2 – Key Personnel.

M.9.2.1. The Government will evaluate the resumes for each of the Key Personnel positions to ensure they meet the qualifications identified in the PWS. The Government will evaluate the extent to which the Offeror's proposal contains firm commitments for positions identified as "Key Personnel" in the PWS. Criteria include reviewing resumes provided in the Offeror's proposal to verify they indicate an acceptable level of skill and experience for the positions and reviewing letter of commitment to verify they include the proposed hire's intent to join offeror's team on a specific date. It is acceptable for the letters of commitment to state that employment is contingent upon contract award to the applicable offeror.

The Government will conduct its analysis by evaluating the information submitted by the Offeror in response to L.7.2.

M.10. FACTOR II - PAST PERFORMANCE.

The Government will utilize the Performance Confidence Assessment (see below) to select the most appropriate confidence level for each Offeror. Ensure the rationality for the conclusions reached are included.

PROCUREMENT SENSITIVE – CUI
See FAR 2.101 and 3.104

Performance Confidence Assessments	
Rating	**Definition**
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.
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 by 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.

The past performance evaluation is an assessment of the Offeror's probability of meeting the minimum past performance solicitation requirements. This assessment will be based on the Offeror's record of relevant and recent past performance information that pertains to the products and/or services outlined in the solicitation requirements. Past Performance will be evaluated IAW RFO FAR 15.104 and RFO Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) 215.202-70.

Past performance will be initially evaluated to determine whether the Offeror's present/past performance is recent, and relevant or not relevant to the effort to be acquired. Second, the past performance evaluation will determine how well the Offeror performed on the prior contracts.

Note: In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available or so sparse that no meaningful past performance rating can be reasonably assigned, the Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance (see RFO FAR 15.202(c)(1). Therefore, the Offeror shall be determined to have unknown (or "neutral) past performance. In the context of acceptability/unacceptability, a neutral rating shall be considered "neutral confidence".

M.10.1. RECENT contracts are defined as follows (not a separate rating):

- Were awarded or commenced within three years prior to the closing date of this solicitation; or
- Were awarded or commenced prior to three years, but a contract period of performance (i.e., providing services pursuant to the contract's performance work statement) remained on-going as of the closing date of this solicitation.

M.10.2. RELEVANCY is not separately rated. When determining relevancy, the USG will review the following for similarity with SAMA: type of service/support, complexity, dollar value, contract type, and degree of subcontracting/teaming. The following definitions will be used to determine relevancy of past performance information:

Past Performance Relevancy Ratings	
Rating	**Definition**
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.

M.10.3. Following the recency and relevancy determination, the quality and how well the contractor performed on the contracts will be assessed. Documented results from the following sources form the support and basis for this assessment:

- Past performance information provided by the Offeror, as solicited.
- Past performance questionnaires (List of Attachments' section of the Solicitation, Attachment 00XX).
- Past performance information may be obtained from established systems such as the Past Performance Information Retrieval System, Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System, Electronic Subcontract Reporting System, or other databases.
- Past performance information may also be obtained from other sources available to the USG, such as the Defense Contract Management Agency; and interviews with Program Managers, PCOs, Fee Determining Officials, etc.

The USG may consider a wide array of information from a variety of sources but is not compelled to rely on all the information available. The Government will evaluate the

Offeror's record of past and current performance to ascertain the probability of successfully performing the required efforts of the PWS.

The USG will focus its inquiries on the Offeror's (and major subcontractor's) record of performance as it relates to all solicitation requirements, including price, schedule, performance, and management of subcontractors. Major subcontractors are defined as members of an Offeror's overall team who are expected to perform 10 percent or more of the proposed effort. Labor brokers are not considered major subcontractors. A significant achievement, problem, or lack of relevant data in any element of the work can become an important consideration in the evaluation process. Therefore, the Offeror is reminded to include its most recent and relevant efforts (within the past three years) in its proposal.

M.11. FACTOR III – PRICE. Price is an evaluation factor; however, it will not be adjectively scored. The FAR requires that contracts be awarded at prices that are fair and reasonable. The Contracting Officer is responsible for the determination of price reasonableness. The proposal will be evaluated in IAW RFO FAR 15.404, Cost and/or price analysis.

In terms of "price reasonableness" the Government will focus on whether the price is too high to be considered fair and reasonable. In terms of "cost realism", the Government will focus on whether the cost is too low and not realistic for the work to be performed. The Government's concern is that the offeror may not understand the requirement or may be offering such a low proposed cost price that there may be disruption to the program such as high employee turnover, or an inability to recruit and retain quality individuals. Cost realism is the process of independently reviewing and evaluating specific elements of the Offeror's proposed cost elements to determine the following: whether the estimated proposed cost elements are realistic for the work to be performed; whether the proposed cost elements reflect a clear understanding of the requirements; and whether the proposed cost elements are consistent with the unique methods of performance described in the Technical Proposal. In terms of "completeness", the Government will focus on whether the price appears to cover all the work identified in the PWS. In terms of "balance", the Government will focus on whether the pricing is consistent throughout the term of contract to include any options.

CLIN 0001:

The Pricing Matrix calculates the Evaluated Price for CLIN 0001 by multiplying the Number of Months by the Contractor provided Firm Fixed Unit Price Per Month for each Direct Labor Category.

CLIN 0002:

The Pricing Matrix calculates the Evaluated Price for CLIN 0002 by multiplying the Government provided Number of Months by the Government provided Number of Key Personnel and then again multiplying by the Contractor provided Firm Fixed Unit Price

Per Month for each Direct Labor Category.

CLIN 0003:

The Pricing Matrix calculates the Evaluated Price for CLIN 0003 by multiplying the Government provided Number of Months by the Government provided Number of Key Personnel and then again multiplying by the Contractor provided Firm Fixed Unit Price Per Month for each Direct Labor Category.

CLIN 0004:

The Pricing Matrix calculates the Evaluated Price for CLIN 0004 by multiplying the Government provided Number of Months by the Government provided Number of Key Personnel and then again multiplying by the Contractor provided Firm Fixed Unit Price Per Month for each Direct Labor Category.

CLIN 0005:

This number is provided as a surrogate with the value of $52,857.00 for the Base Year and escalated by 3.0% in each of the Options One through Four.

CLIN 0006AA and CLIN 0006AB:

These numbers are provided as surrogates with the value of $2,213.75 for CLIN 0006AA for the Base Year, and $8,855.00 for CLIN 0006AB for the Base Year and escalated by 3.0% in each of the Options One through Four.

CLIN 0007:

This number is provided as a surrogate with the value of $8,855.00 for the Base Year and escalated by 3.0% in each of the Options One through Four.

CLIN 0008:

This number is provided as a surrogate with the value of $31,625.00 for the Base Year and escalated by 3.0% in each of the Options One through Four.

CLIN 0014:

The Pricing Matrix calculates the Evaluated Price for CLIN 0014 by multiplying the Government provided Number of Months by the Government provided Number of Key Personnel and then again multiplying by the Contractor provided Firm Fixed Unit Price Per Month for each Direct Labor Category.

Option to Extend Services:

The Price Matrix calculates the 6-Month Option to Extend by adding the Option Year Four subtotals for all CLINs and then multiplying the product by 50%. This number is for evaluation purposes only and is utilized in the Total Evaluated Price Calculation.

Total Evaluated Price:

On the Summary Tab, the prices in the Price Matrix will be evaluated by adding the Base Year, Option One through Four for all CLINs, and then adding the 6-Month Option to Extend Services Number to obtain a total evaluated price. The Government will make a fair and reasonable price determination in accordance with RFO FAR Part 15.404-1(b), relying primarily upon competition.

The Government shall utilize the Price Matrix of the solicitation to build the CLIN structure of the contract. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the options. The Government is under no obligation to exercise options beyond the awarded base period. Failure to provide prices for all items within each CLIN is unacceptable and may render the offeror ineligible for award.

Unbalanced Pricing will be evaluated as required by RFO FAR 15.404-6, Unbalanced pricing. A proposal may be rejected if the PCO determines the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.