
Army Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Services

**Attachment 0013: Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award
Army Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Services
SOLICITATION NUMBER: W52P1J-14-R-0059**

DRAFT

**Army Contracting Command – Rock Island (ACC-RI)
1 Rock Island Arsenal
Rock Island, IL 61299**

11 July 2014

A. Basis for Award

Awards will be made using formal source selection procedures in accordance with (IAW) Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.1 and the DoD Source Selection Procedures. This acquisition will be conducted using the Best-Value Tradeoff Process authorized at FAR 15.101-1; therefore, the Offerors whose proposals are determined to be the most beneficial to the Government given appropriate consideration to the three evaluation factors (Technical, Past Performance, and Price) will be awarded a basic contract. The Government anticipates making at least seven awards. The Government reserves the right to: limit the competitive range for the purpose of efficiency, to make awards to other than the lowest price Offerors, and to make more or less than the anticipated number of awards. Awards will be made on an all or none basis (i.e., Offerors must propose against all 14 task areas and labor categories for all years). To receive consideration for award, a rating of no less than "Acceptable" must be achieved for the Technical Factor, including both Technical subfactors. **NOTE: THE COMBINATION OF ALL NON-PRICE FACTORS IS SIGNIFICANTLY MORE IMPORTANT THAN THE PRICE FACTOR.**

B. Factors and Subfactors to be Evaluated

The evaluation factors and subfactors described below will be used to evaluate each proposal. Awards will be made to the Offerors whose proposals are determined to provide the best value to the Government. Best-Value is determined by an integrated assessment of the following factors and subfactors:

- 1) **Technical Factor**. The Technical Factor consists of two Subfactors:
 - a) Sample Task Order Subfactor
 - b) Personnel Management Subfactor
- 2) **Past Performance Factor**
- 3) **Price Factor**

Evaluation of the Offerors' proposals shall address all factors and subfactors. A detailed explanation of the criteria for the evaluation is set forth in the Evaluation Approach (Paragraph C of this section). During evaluations of each proposal, the Government will assign each factor and subfactor (other than the Price Factor) an adjectival rating and write a narrative evaluation reflecting the identified findings.

The relative order of importance assigned to the evaluation factors and subfactors are: The Technical Factor is more important than the Past Performance Factor. The Past

Army ERP Services
Attachment 0013: Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award

Performance Factor is significantly more important than the Price Factor. The combination of all non-Price factors is significantly more important than the Price Factor. Within the Technical Factor, the Sample Task Order Subfactor is slightly more important than the Personnel Management Subfactor. Offerors are cautioned that awards may not necessarily be made to the lowest price Offerors. To receive consideration for award, a rating of no less than "Acceptable" must be achieved in the Technical Factor, including both Technical subfactors.

C. Evaluation Approach

All proposals shall be subject to evaluation by the Source Selection Team (SST) using the criteria described below.

1. FACTOR 1-Technical Evaluation Approach. The Technical subfactors will be evaluated as set forth below.
 - a) Sample Task Order Subfactor Criteria:
 - i. Understanding of the Requirement.
 - The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the Offeror demonstrates a clear understanding of the Sample Task Order scope, and the associated business and technical environments in which the Army utilizes SAP ERPs.
 - The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the Offeror identifies constraints and uncertainties as well as proposed resolutions to meet the requirements of the Sample Task Order PWS.
 - ii. Adequacy of Response. The proposal will be evaluated to determine whether the Offeror's methods and approach have adequately and completely considered and satisfied the requirements specified in the Sample Task Order PWS.
 - iii. Feasibility of Approach. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the Offeror's approach, methods, and processes are feasible and the end results achievable. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which it provides the Government with a high level of confidence that the Offeror will be able to successfully meet the requirements of the Sample Task Order PWS in a timely manner.

Army ERP Services
Attachment 0013: Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award

b) Personnel Management Subfactor Criteria:

- i. Adequacy of Response. The proposal will be evaluated to determine whether the Offeror’s approach demonstrates adequate and complete personnel management processes necessary to meet the requirements of the Basic Contract PWS.
- ii. Feasibility of Approach.
 - The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the Offeror’s personnel management approach is feasible, including its teaming strategy among the Prime Contractor and its subcontractors.
 - The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the Offeror’s proposed personnel management processes provide the Government with a high level of confidence that the Offeror has the ability to recruit, retain, and replace personnel with the experience and skill sets needed to successfully perform all task areas described in the Basic Contract PWS on one or more TOs in a timely manner.

In performing the evaluation of the Technical Factor and each of its subfactors, the following ratings and definitions will be used:

Combined Technical/Risk Ratings	
Adjectival Rating	Definition
Outstanding	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths far outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is very low.
Good	Proposal meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal contains strengths which outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths and weaknesses are offsetting or will have little or no impact on contract performance. Risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Marginal	Proposal does not clearly meet requirements and has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. The proposal has one or more weaknesses which are not offset by strengths. Risk of unsuccessful performance is high.

Army ERP Services
Attachment 0013: Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award

Combined Technical/Risk Ratings	
Adjectival Rating	Definition
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies. Proposal is unawardable.

Table 1: Combined Technical/Risk Ratings

2. FACTOR 2 - Past Performance Evaluation Approach

Past performance information is evaluated as a predictor of future contract performance. The Government will assess the degree of confidence it has that the Offeror will successfully complete the requirements in accordance with the contract terms based on the Offeror's demonstrated record of recent, relevant performance.

Past performance will be evaluated for the Offeror (Prime Contractor, including individual members of a Joint Venture) and its Major subcontractors. ~~A Major Subcontractor is defined as one that is proposed to provide at least ten (10) percent of the expected total effort as proposed in Offeror's Army ERP Services IDIQ Price Model in the Price Volume.~~ The Offeror's and its Major subcontractors' ~~records of~~ recent and relevant projects/contracts performance will be assessed individually and the results will then be assessed in totality to determine the Offeror's Overall Past Performance Confidence Assessment Rating.

The Government may consider the recency, degree of relevance, source, and context of the past performance information it evaluates as well as quality, general trends in performance, and demonstrated corrective actions. A significant achievement, problem, problem resolution, or lack of relevant data in any element can become an important consideration in the assessment process. A negative finding in any element may result in a lower Overall Past Performance Confidence Assessment Rating.

Absent any recent and relevant past performance history, the Offeror will be assigned an "Unknown Confidence (Neutral) Past Performance Rating" and its proposal will not be evaluated either favorably or unfavorably on past performance.

The Government may also consider past performance information regarding predecessor companies, officers and employees of newly formed corporate entities key personnel, and other corporate entities or subcontractors where such information is relevant to this solicitation.

In conducting the past performance evaluation, the Government may use information obtained from other sources, or may use information with regard to other contracts

Army ERP Services
Attachment 0013: Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award

performed by the Offeror of which it has knowledge, whether or not those contracts are disclosed to the Government by the Offeror.

Recent Projects are defined as services or deliverables performed - anytime within five (5) years of issuance of this solicitation - under one or more of the following contract instruments: contracts, subcontracts, task orders, or delivery orders. Work performed on multiple orders under the same contract may be submitted as a single Project reference as long as all of the work supports the same program/solution. The Government reserves the right to consider any significant past performance after the solicitation closing date and prior to award.

~~Recent Contracts are defined as prime contracts, task orders, delivery orders, or subcontracts where services or deliverables were performed, or are still being performed, any time within five (5) years of issuance of this RFP. The Government reserves the right to consider any significant past performance after the solicitation closing date and prior to award.~~

Relevant means performance that demonstrates recent or past work efforts performed by the Offeror or its proposed ~~major~~ subcontractors that have an average annual value of at least \$500,000 and includes one or more of the SAP ERP Services listed below. The Government is particularly interested in work performed for DoD SAP implementations within the Logistics and Finance Domains.

- Solution Architecture
- Requirements Analysis and Traceability
- Design Specifications (Functional & Technical)
- System Configuration and Build
- Test
- Deployment and Fielding
- Configuration Management
- Maintenance
- Organizational Change Management (OCM)
- Help Desk
- Information Assurance
- Compliance
- Transition Services
- Task Order Management

Army ERP Services
Attachment 0013: Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award

The Government recommends that Offerors limit past performance references to those involving performance as a prime or first tier subcontractor unless it cannot otherwise be avoided.

In performing the evaluation of the Past Performance Factor, the following relevancy levels will be applied to assess the relevance of the Project/Contract references~~prior contract effort(s)~~ of Offerors:

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.

Table 2: Past Performance Relevancy Ratings

In performing the evaluation of the Past Performance Factor, the following ratings and definitions will be used:

Performance Confidence Assessments	
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 successfully perform the required effort.

Army ERP Services
Attachment 0013: Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award

Performance Confidence Assessments	
Rating	Description
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.

Table 3: Past Performance Confidence Assessments Ratings

The Government is not required to interview all points of contact identified by an Offeror.

It is the responsibility of the Offeror to provide complete past performance information and thorough explanations as required by Section L. The Government is not obligated to make another request for the required information.

References provided on classified contracts or contracts to foreign entities cannot be verified. Classified and foreign contracts will not be evaluated.

3. FACTOR 3 - Price Evaluation Approach

To arrive at the Total Evaluated Price, the Government will sum the Total Evaluated IDIQ Price and the Total Evaluated Sample Task Order Price. The Total Evaluated Price will be evaluated but will not be assigned a rating. The Total Evaluated Price will be evaluated utilizing the proposal analysis techniques IAW FAR 15.404 to support a determination of fair and reasonable price.

a. IDIQ PRICE

The Total Evaluated IDIQ Price will be evaluated but will not be assigned a rating. The Army ERP Services IDIQ Price Model will multiply the Government provided hours by the proposed fully burdened hourly labor rate for each labor category in each of the Performance Periods. The proposed labor will be summed and added to the Government provided dollar amounts for the Guaranteed Minimum Amount and Travel to arrive at a Performance Period Total. The Government will then sum each of Performance Periods to arrive at the Total Evaluated IDIQ Price.

The Total Evaluated IDIQ Price will be evaluated utilizing the proposal analysis techniques IAW FAR 15.404.

Army ERP Services
Attachment 0013: Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award

Proposals will be reviewed to identify any Unbalanced Pricing. In accordance with FAR 15.404-1(g), Unbalanced Pricing, a proposal may be rejected if the Contracting Officer determines the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.

b. SAMPLE TASK ORDER PRICE

The Total Evaluated Sample Task Order Price will be evaluated but will not be assigned a rating.

The Army ERP Services Sample Task Order Price Model (Attachment 0010) will sum the Offeror's proposed Performance Period hours and the Government provided IGCE hours for the B Tasks. The Sample Task Order Price Model will then multiply these hours by the proposed Fully Burdened Hourly Rate (ceiling rate), from the Army ERP Service IDIQ Price Model, for each applicable labor category in each of the Performance Periods. The Government will then sum each of the five Performance Period totals to arrive at the Total Evaluated Sample Task Order Price. The Total Evaluated Sample Task Order Price will be a firm fixed price for evaluation purposes.

The Total Evaluated Sample Task Order Price will be evaluated utilizing the proposal analysis techniques IAW FAR 15.404.

Proposals will be reviewed to identify any Unbalanced Pricing. In accordance with FAR 15.404-1(g), Unbalanced Pricing, a proposal may be rejected if the Contracting Officer determines the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.

Army ERP Services
Attachment 0013: Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award

Definitions

1. Ratings. The ratings are adjectival/color descriptors assigned to the non-Price Factors and Subfactors that express the results of the evaluation. They summarily indicate the merits of the proposal when compared against the requirements of the solicitation. The rating categories and definitions that will be used for each non-Price Factor and Subfactor in this acquisition are set forth in paragraph 2 below.

2. Findings and Definitions

Finding: A “finding” is a “term of art” used in the Acquisition Source Selection Interactive Support Tool (ASSIST). A finding is the identification and documentation by the Government evaluation team of a specific individual aspect of merit (positive or negative) of a proposal. It is accomplished by assessing the merit (positive or negative) of a proposal against the Government’s requirements using the evaluation criteria as the measuring tools. The ASSIST provides capability for eleven different types of findings which are defined below. [Denotes “POSITIVE” (+), or “NEGATIVE” (-)]

Strength (+): An aspect of an Offeror's proposal that has merit or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Government during contract performance.

Significant Strength (+): An aspect of an Offeror's proposal that has appreciable merit or appreciably exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be appreciably advantageous to the Government during contract performance.

Weakness (-): A flaw in an Offeror’s proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Significant Weakness (-): A flaw in an Offeror’s proposal that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Deficiency (-): A material failure of an Offeror’s proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in an Offeror’s proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.

Cost/Price Concern (-): A flaw, issue with, or lack of information in the cost/price proposal.

Terms and Conditions (-): An issue related to any of the solicitation provisions.

Army ERP Services
Attachment 0013: Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award

Uncertainty (-): 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).

Minor or Clerical Error (-): A minor non-cost/price factor informality or irregularity that is merely a matter of form and not of substance or a clerical error apparent on its face in the proposal.

Past Performance Relevancy Concern (-): An aspect of the proposal that raises a question about the relevancy of the Offeror's past performance information.

Adverse Past Performance Information (-): Any unfavorable past performance information to which the Offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond.

DRAFT