

**M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD - Amendment 1****52.252-1 SOLICITATION PROVISIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE (FEB 1998)**

This solicitation incorporates one or more solicitation provisions by reference, with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request, the Contracting Officer will make their full text available. The Offeror is cautioned that the listed provisions may include blocks that must be completed by the Offeror and submitted with its quotation or offer. In lieu of submitting the full text of those provisions, the Offeror may identify the provision by paragraph identifier and provide the appropriate information with its quotation or offer. Also, the full text of the solicitation provisions may be accessed electronically at the following address: <http://farsite.hill.af.mil/>

52.217-5 Evaluation of Options JUL 1990

**CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY FULL TEXT**

52.222-46 Evaluation of Compensation for Professional Employees FEB 1993

(a) Recompetition of service contracts may in some cases result in lowering the compensation (salaries and fringe benefits) paid or furnished professional employees. This lowering can be detrimental in obtaining the quality of professional services needed for adequate contract performance. It is therefore in the Government's best interest that professional employees, as defined in 29 CFR 541, be properly and fairly compensated. As part of their proposals, Offerors will submit a total compensation plan setting forth salaries and fringe benefits proposed for the professional employees who will work under the contract. The Government will evaluate the plan to assure that it reflects a sound management approach and understanding of the contract requirements. This evaluation will include an assessment of the Offeror's ability to provide uninterrupted high-quality work. 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. Supporting information will include data, such as recognized national and regional compensation surveys and studies of professional, public and private organizations, used in establishing the total compensation structure.

(b) The compensation levels proposed should reflect a clear understanding of work to be performed and should indicate the capability of the proposed compensation structure to obtain and keep suitably qualified personnel to meet mission objectives. The salary rates or ranges must take into account differences in skills, the complexity of various disciplines, and professional job difficulty. Additionally, proposals envisioning compensation levels lower than those of predecessor contractors for the same work will be evaluated on the basis of maintaining program continuity, uninterrupted high-quality work, and availability of required competent professional service employees. Offerors are cautioned that lowered compensation for essentially the same professional work may indicate lack of sound management judgment and lack of understanding of the requirement.

(c) The Government is concerned with the quality and stability of the work force to be employed on this contract. Professional compensation that is unrealistically low or not in reasonable relationship to the various job categories, which may impair the Contractor's ability to attract and retain competent professional service employees, may be viewed as evidence of failure to comprehend the complexity of the contract requirements.

(d) Failure to comply with these provisions may constitute sufficient cause to justify rejection of a proposal.

## **M.1 GENERAL**

a. Offeror's proposal, inclusive of teaming arrangements, that do not affirm a currently operating Employee Assistance Program (EAP) call center, will be rejected without further evaluation, deliberation or discussion. Offerors in the competitive range will be required to host the discussions forum at one of the Offeror's currently operating EAP call centers, either most similar to this procurement or representing the proposed technical solution, within the CONUS.

b. The Government reserves the right to make an award to other than the lowest priced Offeror or the highest technically rated Offeror if the Source Selection Authority (SSA) determines that to do so would result in the best value (trade off) to the Government.

The award decision will be based on the Offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government based on all factors combined, which may not be the lowest price or the lowest risk. When the proposal with the highest rated non-price evaluation is other than the proposal that has the lowest price, a price/non-price tradeoff may be necessary. The Government will use a best value analysis to perform this tradeoff.

The Offeror's technical proposal will be rated at the factor and sub-factor level as indicated in Section M4. The technical rating evaluates the quality of the Offeror's technical solution for meeting the Government's requirement, inclusive of the inherent risk associated with the technical approach in meeting the requirement.

c. The Government intends to make a single award under this solicitation.

d. The Offeror's proposal shall be in the form prescribed by this solicitation and shall contain a response to each of the areas identified in Section L which affects the evaluation factors for award. All proposals will be evaluated in accordance with (IAW) Section M. Proposals that do not conform to the requirements of the solicitation may be rejected without further evaluation, deliberation or discussion.

e. Proposal information provided for one factor or subfactor may be used to assess other factors and/or subfactors if the Government deems it appropriate. Technical quality of the Offeror's proposal, risk, and price, will be assessed in determining which proposal is most advantageous to the Government.

f. The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award with discussions. However, each initial offer should contain the Offeror's best terms from a technical, risk and price standpoint. The Government will establish a competitive range composed of the most highly rated proposals in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.306. If the contracting officer (CO) determines that the number of highly rated proposals that otherwise would be included in the competitive range exceeds the number at which an efficient competition may be conducted, the CO reserves the right to further limit the competitive range to the number of proposals that will permit such efficient competition.

Discussions will be conducted at the Offeror's call center location as discussed in Section a. The forum for discussions will include demonstration, evidence and documentation, written responses, oral discussion and other means as required to address the Government's interrogatories, weaknesses and deficiencies of the Offeror's proposal.

g. The CO will make a determination that a prospective Contractor is responsible or non-responsible IAW FAR 9.1. A determination of non-responsibility may result in the rejection of an offer; the rejected offer may not be considered for award.

## **M.2 EVALUATION FACTORS**

### 52.212-2 EVALUATION--COMMERCIAL ITEMS (JAN 1999)

a) The Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible Offeror whose offer conforming to the solicitation will be the best value to the Government, price and all other factors considered, including risk. Regardless of technical rating or price, an Offeror's proposal may not be considered for award if the risk is evaluated as high. Evaluation criteria shall be applied to the following non-price and price factors:

#### **Non-Price Factors**

Factor 1: Non-Medical Counseling

Subfactor I: Technical Capability & Approach  
Subfactor II: Network & Credentials  
Subfactor III: Quality Assurance

Factor 2: Call Center/Website Operations

Subfactor I: Call Center Operations  
Subfactor II: EAP Web Presence  
Subfactor III: IT & IA Services; Return to Operation/Disaster Recovery

Factor 3: Program Management

Subfactor I: Capability & Approach to Perform Program & Financial Management  
Subfactor II: Reporting & Documentation  
Subfactor III: Joint Family Support Assistance Program (JFSAP)  
Subfactor IV: Strategic Outreach & Fulfillment  
Subfactor V: Subcontracting Plan

Factor 4: Past Performance

#### **Price Factor**

Factor 5: Price

(b) *Options*. The Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all option periods and optional quantities to the total price for the requirement. The Government may determine that an offer is unacceptable if the option prices are significantly unbalanced. Evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

(c) Before the offer's specified expiration time, the Government may accept an offer, or part of an offer, unless a written notice of withdrawal is received before award.

### M.3 RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS

- a. Factors 1, 2, 3, and 4 are listed in descending order of importance.
- b. All non-price evaluation factors, when combined, are significantly more important than price.

### M.4 EXPLANATION OF EVALUATION CRITERIA

#### Risk

The evaluation will consider the risk inherent in the Offeror's proposed solution and the degree to which the proposal demonstrates understanding of how to identify and mitigate risk for each individual factor. Risk will be evaluated at the factor level and will be a consideration in determining the rating assigned to each factor. Part of the risk assessment will include an evaluation of the Offeror's proposed Transition Plan's (PWS 11.3 and L.18) ability to seamlessly fulfill the requirements of each individual factor.

#### **Factor 1: Non-Medical Counseling**

Within Factor 1, all subfactors are equal in importance.

##### Subfactor I: Technical Capability & Approach

Reference PWS 5.0, 5.0.1, 5.0.2, 5.2, 5.8.3, 6.0, 6.1, 6.1.1, 6.1.2, 6.1.4, 6.1.5, 6.1.7, 6.1.9, 7.0, 7.1.1, 7.1.3, 7.1.4, 7.1.5, 7.2, 7.2.1–7.2.3

The degree to which the proposal demonstrates technical capability, understanding, and approach to deliver private, confidential non-medical counseling services to eligible participants intended to be solution-focused, short-term for defined problem areas amenable to brief intervention as described in the PWS and in compliance with Section J attachments.

##### Subfactor II: Network & Credentials

Reference PWS 5.8, 5.8.2, 5.9, 6.1.8, 7.1, 7.1.2, ~~10.1.2, 10.2, 10.2.2, 10.2.4, 10.2.7~~

The degree to which the proposed national network complies with the requirements as described in the PWS and in compliance with Section J attachments in terms of training, licensing, credentialing certifications, experience, proximity to participants, and network management processes.

##### Subfactor III: Quality Assurance

Reference PWS 4.2.11, 5.6, 6.1.6, 7.2.4, 10.5, 10.6, 10.6.1–10.6.4, 10.6.6–10.6.9

The degree to which the Offeror's processes and procedures for gathering feedback and Quality Control Plan ensure a consistent high level of quality as described in the PWS and in compliance with Section J attachments.

#### **Factor 2: Call Center/Website Operations**

Within Factor 2, all subfactors are listed in descending order of importance.

Subfactor I: Call Center Operations

Reference PWS 4.1, 4.2–4.2.10.2, 4.2.12–4.2.17, 5.5, ~~10.1.2, 10.2, 10.2.1–10.2.4, 10.2.7~~, 10.7, 10.8

The degree to which the proposed approach to perform call center operations demonstrates technical capability and understanding as a commercial EAP provider to deliver MOS services to CONUS/OCONUS participants meeting all requirements as described in the PWS and in compliance with Section J attachments.

Subfactor II: EAP Web Presence

Reference PWS 4.3, 4.4, 4.5

The degree to which the proposed solution demonstrates technical capability, understanding and approach to maintain a web presence that supports EAP online services offered only to eligible Participants as described in the PWS and in compliance with Section J attachments.

Subfactor III: IT & IA Services; Return to Operation/Disaster Recovery

Reference PWS 10.9, 11.0, 11.1, 11.1.1–11.1.2, 11.2

The degree to which the proposed solution demonstrates technical capability, understanding and approach to deliver IT & IA Services and Return to Operation/Disaster Recovery as described in the PWS and in compliance with Section J attachments.

**Factor 3: Program Management**

Within Factor 3, all Subfactors are listed in descending order of importance

Subfactor I: Capability & Approach to Perform Program & Financial Management

Reference PWS 10.0, 10.1, 10.1.1–10.1.11, 10.2, 10.2.2–10.2.4, 10.2.7

The degree to which the proposed approach demonstrates technical capability and understanding to perform Program and Financial Management as described in the PWS and in compliance with Section J attachments.

Subfactor II: Reporting & Documentation

Reference PWS 5.1, 5.3, 5.4, 5.7, 5.8.1, 6.1.3, 7.2.5, 8.3.5, 10.1.12, 10.2.5, 10.2.6, 10.3, 10.4, 10.4.1–10.4.6, 10.6.5, 11.1.3

The degree to which the proposed approach demonstrates technical capability and understanding to provide timely and accurate records, reports and ad hoc requests, and adheres to established Government MOS processes and procedures as described in the PWS and in compliance with Section J attachments.

Subfactor III: Joint Family Support Assistance Program (JFSAP)

Reference PWS 9.0, 9.1, 9.1.1–9.1.3

The degree to which the proposed approach demonstrates technical capability and understanding to provide JFSAP consultants to states and territories to support increased outreach and coordination to geographically isolated service members and their families as described in the PWS and in compliance with Section J attachments.

**Subfactor IV: Strategic Outreach & Fulfillment**

Reference PWS 8.0, 8.1, 8.2, 8.3.1–8.3.4

The degree to which the proposed approach demonstrates technical capability and understanding to provide educational and informational materials, referral information normally provided as part of EAP support services, as well as strategic outreach as described in the PWS and in compliance with Section J attachments.

**Subfactor V: Subcontracting Plan**

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's Subcontracting Plan as acceptable, unacceptable, or neutral (IAW FAR 19.702(b)(1)) including teaming arrangements. Subcontracting Plans are not required from Small Business Offerors. The evaluation includes an assessment of the Offeror's compliance with a minimum of 10% of the proposed total contract value subcontracted among all the socioeconomic business categories listed in 19.704 (and including AbilityOne), conformance to the requirements of FAR subpart 19.7 (and including AbilityOne) and DFARS 215.304 unless exempted pursuant to FAR 19.702(b)(1), and Section L.

**Factor 4: Past Performance**

The purpose of the past performance evaluation is to allow the Government to assess the likelihood of Offeror's successful performance. The Government will evaluate past performance from recent (within the past three years that have at least one year of performance history) and relevant sources. The Government will assign a confidence rating for this factor for the Offeror and all subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement as defined by the Offeror.

The Government will consider past performance with respect to Effectiveness of Program Management/Program Oversight, Quality of Service and Improvement, Cost Control, Responsiveness to Customers/Timeliness of Performance, and the Offeror's abilities to meet their prior subcontracting goals from the information contained within the proposal, and information from other sources.

IAW FAR Part 12.206, the Government may use multiple sources of past performance data from a wide variety of sources both inside and outside the Federal Government in accordance with the policies and procedures contained in Subpart 9.1 and Subpart 15.3.

**1 Verifying Past Performance Data**

The Government may contact the Offeror's references/clients to verify proposal information, which may include but is not limited to, the type of work performed, contractor accountability, costs/prices, and completion dates. However, the Government may not necessarily interview all of the Offeror's references.

## 2 Lack of Past Performance

If an Offeror does not have any projects whose past performance is recent and relevant to the solicitation, the Government will assign a rating of Unknown Confidence (Neutral), which is neither favorable nor unfavorable. However, an Offeror's proposal with no recent and relevant Past Performance history, while evaluated as Neutral in Past Performance, may not represent the most advantageous proposal to the Government and thus, may be an unsuccessful proposal when compared to the proposal of other Offerors.

The Government requires the Offeror to provide an explanation as to why the company does not have any recent and relevant past performance related to the scope of work defined in this solicitation.

The Government considers Offerors with good performance on recent and relevant past projects a lower performance risk than Offerors with no recent and relevant past projects. On the other hand, the Government considers Offerors with poor performance on past projects a higher performance risk than Offerors with no recent and relevant past projects.

## 3 Other Past Performance Project Data Considerations

The Government may evaluate as deficient if an Offeror has recent and relevant past performance projects, but fails to cite them in the proposal.

A significant achievement, problem, or lack of recent and relevant data in any element of the scope of work can become an important consideration in the selection process. Specifically, poor past performance for any area may result in a higher performance risk rating. In such cases, Offerors should describe relevant mitigating efforts, especially those demonstrating corrective actions or acceptable client solutions.

The Government may consider key personnel, staff, or subcontractor involvement in an Offeror's successful past performance project as a basis for improved performance risk ratings or as a basis to mitigate performance risk issues. The Government may permit Offerors to explain and/or clarify negative past performance information.

### **Factor 5: Price**

#### **GENERAL**

a. The Government will evaluate price provided in the CLIN Structure (Attachment J-1) and information found in any other section of the proposal that may aid in price evaluation. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's price proposal with respect to completeness, consistency, fairness, reasonableness, balance, and the Government's cost objectives. The Government defines the total price as the sum of the services and related costs over the term of the contract, including all optional quantities and periods.

b. Each Offeror's price proposal will be reviewed to determine if it is consistent with the Offeror's technical approach and reflects a clear understanding of the solicitation objectives and requirements. Inconsistencies between the technical and price proposals, unbalanced pricing, or other pricing anomalies may be assessed as proposal risk under the technical evaluation. As part of the evaluation, the Government may consider commercial published data, same or similar DoD contracts, Government estimates, industry standards, DCAA audit information, and other information the Government deems relevant.

c. The Firm Fixed Price (FFP) CLIN's Total Price is equal to the proposed unit price multiplied by the Quantity for that CLIN. For Time and Material (T&M) CLINs, the Government Total Evaluated Price is defined as the sum of all of the Government evaluated prices for all T&M CLINs. The evaluation will be inclusive of Base and all Option Periods.

d. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's labor rates, startup and implementation costs, the day-to-day operations and related costs the contractor found necessary for the performance of the contract, including all optional quantities and option periods.

e. The Government will also evaluate proposed percentages for any fees associated with any price item, to include, but not limited to the percentages for materials handling and pass through.

f. The Government will evaluate CLIN X001 Total Price as generated using the "Likelihood of Call Volume Level" chart as described in Section L. In addition, the Government will evaluate each tier. The Government will evaluate CLIN X003 Total Price as generated by adding all products of the Offeror's Session Prices and Government provided annual quantities. In addition, the Government will evaluate the price of each session.