

FAR 52.212-2, ADDENDUM, EVALUATION—COMMERCIAL PRODUCTS AND COMMERCIAL SERVICES (NOV 2021)

1. GENERAL

The Government will execute the evaluation using the Best Value Tradeoff source selection process and will be conducted pursuant to FAR Part 15 “Contracting by Negotiations”. The Best Value Tradeoff criteria is established in Tables 3-5 in the Department of Defense (DoD) Source Selection Procedures (SSP), dated 20 August 2022.

1.1 Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools in Proposal Evaluation

- 1.1.1 Use of AI tools in Support of Evaluations: The Government may employ AI as a tool to assist in the analysis and review of offeror proposals. AI tools may be used to support tasks such as summarizing proposal content, identifying compliance with solicitation requirements, and highlighting areas of potential strength, weakness, or risk.
- 1.1.2 Maintaining Inherently Governmental Functions: Notwithstanding the use of AI tools to support the evaluation process, all final evaluation judgements, including the assignment or assessment of adjectival ratings, best value determinations, and source selection decisions, will be made exclusively by duly appointed Government personnel. The Government retains sole responsibility for all inherently governmental functions and will not delegate decision making authority to any AI tool.
- 1.1.3 Offeror Confidentiality and Data Protection: The AI tools utilized by the Government will be employed in a manner consistent with applicable regulations that govern the protection of proprietary and source selection sensitive information. The AI tool will be an output-only system. Any generated report data is not saved. No proposal data will be transmitted to or processed by external, non-Government systems without appropriate safeguards and authorizations in place.

2. BASIS OF AWARD

The Government will select the best overall proposal, based on integrated assessment of the evaluation factors described below. The Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible offeror whose proposal, conforming to the solicitation, represents the best value to the Government, non-price and price factors considered.

Offerors must submit an offer/proposal and other information in strict accordance with the instructions listed in FAR 52.212-1 Addendum. Failure to do so may result in the Offeror's offer/proposal being determined as unacceptable and ineligible for award. Each Offeror's submission will be screened by the Contracting Officer or a designee upon receipt to ensure compliance with the instructions contained in the Request for Proposal (RFP).

The following factors will be used to evaluate offers:

- Factor 1 – Technical Approach (Volume 2)
- Factor 2 – Past Performance (Volume 3)
- Factor 3 – Price (Volume 4)

The non-price factors (Factors 1 and 2), are of equal importance and when combined are significantly more important than Factor 3 – Price. Although, Factor 3 – Price becomes increasingly more important when Offerors receive similar ratings for the non-price factors.

Prospective Offerors are forewarned that a proposal meeting solicitation requirement with the lowest evaluated price may not be selected for award if a higher rated evaluated priced proposal is determined to be most advantageous to the Government.

The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with Offerors. However, the Government reserves the right to conduct discussions 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 rated proposals.

3. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Government will conduct a verification of the proposal as it relates to adherence to FAR 52.212-1 Instruction to Offerors Addendum. This verification will be done to determine the completeness of the proposal as it relates to the solicitation instructions.

Volume 1- Compliance Documents will be reviewed to determine proposal responsiveness.

4. EVALUATION FACTORS

4.1. FACTOR 1: TECHNICAL APPROACH

The Technical Approach factor will include evaluation of the Offeror's proposed Approach Description, Staffing and Sample Task Order Matrix, and Transition Plan. This factor will be rated in accordance with the DoD Source Selection Procedures Combined Technical/Risk Rating Method adjectival ratings. Evaluation criteria are as follows:

- **Approach Description:** Evaluation will consist of an assessment of the Offeror's proposed technical approach to execute the following:
 - PWS Sections Task 1, Design, Develop and Maintain DPME programs specifically for the following sub-sections:
 - 5.2.1 Req 1 CSC Program Services,
 - 5.2.2 Req 2 EWS Program Services,
 - 5.2.3 Req 3 Enlisted College Programs Services,
 - 5.2.4 Req 4 Specifically for:
 - 5.2.4.1 Editorial and Online Writing Services,
 - 5.2.4.2 Media/Videography Services, and
 - 5.2.4.5 Faculty Development Services

- PWS Section Task 2 with regional campus support for each requirement/location specifically for the following sub-sections:
 - 5.3.1.1 Regional Chief Instructor,
 - 5.3.1.2 Administrative and Educational Support Services and
 - 5.3.2 Blended Teaching Faculty Services.
 - PWS Section Task 3 Seminar/Adjunct Faculty Support for each requirement.
 - PWS section Task 4 MCDL Program Support Services specifically for the following sub-sections:
 - 5.5.3 Req 3 Institutional Research Support Services,
 - 5.5.5 Req 5 Policy Development and Distribution Support Services
- **Staffing and Sample TO Matrix Attachment (RFP Attachment 1):** This evaluation includes an assessment of the qualifications considered for each labor category included in the Staffing Matrix tab and the labor mix (labor categories and hours) proposed to execute the sample task order. The evaluation will consider the effectiveness of the approach considered to integrate various backgrounds, education and experience included in the labor mix and how it meets or exceeds the PWS requirements.
- **Transition Plan:**
- Contract Transition: The Government will evaluate the feasibility and comprehensiveness of the Offeror's plan to ensure a seamless and orderly transfer of support responsibilities from the incumbent contractor. The Government will assess:
 - The viability of the overall transition strategy to assume full responsibility without degradation of services.
 - The soundness and viability of the hiring and recruiting process, including the Offeror's understanding of staffing availability in the current market to execute their approach. This includes the feasibility of the timeline and schedule of events to become fully staffed and operational, alongside the adequacy and effectiveness of proposed risk mitigation strategies.
 - The completeness and practicality of the detailed transition period schedule, including the duration, key activities, and logical start/end dates.

4.2. FACTOR 2: PAST PERFORMANCE

Factor 2 will consist of an evaluation of the contractor's past performance including an assessment of recency and relevancy of past performance contract references as it relates to this effort. The Government will conduct a structured past performance evaluation that examines each offeror's demonstrated record of recent past performance on similar contracts to determine its relevance to the Government's current needs, the quality of that performance, and the degree of confidence the Government places in each offeror's ability to meet the solicitation requirements. The evaluation will be conducted based on the information provided by the offeror in RFP Attachment 2 Past Performance Relevancy Matrix. This includes the Offeror's historical compliance with FAR 52.219-8 (utilization of small business concerns).

The Past Performance Relevancy Rating Method and Performance Confidence Assessments Rating Method defined in the DoD Source Selection Procedures will be utilized in this evaluation. The evaluation will also consider the Offeror's Supplier's Risk Rating obtained from the Supplier Performance Risk System under the Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE) web page.

Points of contact other than those identified by the Offeror may be contacted by the Government, and the information received from those other references may be used in the past performance evaluation. Past performance information may be obtained from any sources available to the Government, including, but not be limited to, the CPARS, Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), or other databases; and interviews with Program Managers, Contracting Officers, Contracting Officer's Representatives, and the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA). More recent and relevant performance may have a greater impact on Performance Confidence Assessment than a less recent or relevant effort. The Government will give greater consideration to the contracts or efforts which the Government determines are most relevant.

The evaluation may consider past performance information regarding predecessor companies, or subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement when such information is relevant to the performance of requirements and services detailed in the PWS. If subcontractor past performance is provided as part of the three most relevant contracts or efforts, the subcontractor experience will be given weight relative to the scope, magnitude, and complexity of the aspects of the work under the solicitation that the subcontractor is proposed to perform.

An offeror determined to have no record of relevant past performance (or in an instance where no information on the offeror's past performance is available), will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably for the Past Performance factor. In this case, the offeror's past performance is unknown and assigned a performance confidence rating of "Neutral".

The government will consider the quality of the records deemed recent and at least somewhat relevant past performance in the overall confidence rating determination.

4.3. FACTOR 3: PRICE

The price analysis techniques set forth in FAR 15.4 will be used to determine whether the price offered is fair and reasonable. A proposed price is reasonable when it is fair to the buyer, seller, and reasonable considering the market conditions, available alternatives, and price-related factors as determined through one or more of the price analysis techniques. The Government will utilize the Total Evaluated Price (TEP) for best value and price reasonableness determination. The Government will also perform a review of unbalanced pricing.

The TEP is the sum of the total proposed prices for Year 1 through 5 for CLINs 0001 through 0005 and the Government-provided travel and OCONUS Other Direct Cost amounts for CLINs 0006 and 0007.

4.6 OTHER INFORMATION TO CONSIDER

The following percentage allocation of estimated spending by task is provided to the contractor for consideration in their proposal preparation. The Government reserves the right to consider or not consider the use of this information in the evaluation of any factors and best value determination of this solicitation.

This historical information is provided for information purposes only and no adjustment to the contract price shall be made if conditions are different in execution of this contract. Offerors are not required to bid to these numbers in their proposal."

CLIN	Task Reference	PWS Reference	IDIQ Ceiling	% from Total
CLIN 0001	Task 1 - Design, Develop, and Maintain DPME Programs Support Services	5.2.	\$ 39,735,739	26%
CLIN 000	Task 2 - DPME Regional Campus Support Services	5.3	\$ 64,255,242	41%
CLIN 0003	Task 3 - Seminars/Adjunct Faculty Support Services	5.4	\$ 28,060,588	18%
CLIN 0004	Task 4 - Marine Corps Distance Learning Program Support Services	5.5	\$ 9,629,259	6%
CLIN 0005	Task 5 - MCU 3 MCU/CDET Support Services	5.6	\$ 12,016,513	8%
CLIN 0006	Travel		\$ 1,172,394	1%
CLIN 0007	Other OCONUS Travel Related Costs		\$ 130,266	0.08%
TOTAL			\$ 155,000,000	100%

(End of provision addendum)

LIST OF RFP ATTACHMENTS

Attachments included in the solicitation:

- Attachment 1 - Staffing Matrix & Sample Task Order Approach
- Attachment 2 - Past Performance Relevancy Matrix
- Attachment 3 - Past Performance Questionnaire
- Attachment 4 - DD Form 254 Academic Support
- Attachment 5 - Pricing Workbook

The following completed attachments will become part of the contract at time of award:

- Attachment 1 - Proposed Staffing Matrix and Sample Task Order
- Attachment 4 - Proposed DD Form 254
- Attachment 5 - Proposed Pricing Workbook

(End of provision addendum)