

1. INTRODUCTION:

1.1 These instructions prescribe the format of Offers. Offers are defined as consisting of both Contractor's Technical and Price Proposal. These instructions describe the approach for the development and presentation of the required information and documentation. These instructions are designed to ensure the submission of necessary information and documentation to provide for the understanding and comprehensive evaluation of offers.

1.2 Offerors are cautioned to carefully review this section prior to commencing preparation. In order for offers to receive full consideration for award, Offerors should ensure that the information and documentation furnished in support of the price proposal and of the technical proposal are current, factual, accurate, and complete.

1.3 Offerors are strictly advised to comply with all instructions within this solicitation to ensure submission of a complete Prime Contractor Offer. Failure to furnish complete Offer, at the required time and on the required date, may result in the Offer's price proposal or technical proposal or both being determined deficient, and, therefore, unacceptable to the Government with elimination from consideration for award.

*****Special Note: The Government may not award to an Offer with a Deficiency as defined at FAR Part 15.001.*****

2. CONTRACT TYPE:

This solicitation is **100% Total Small Business set aside**. The Offeror **MUST** have an active DUNS number and be current in SAMS (CCR, ORCA) at the time of proposal submission. If the offeror is a Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business (SDVOSB) certified veteran eligibility (CVE) verification or Veteran Owned Small Business (VOSB) certified verification applies, they must have been completed prior to the submission of proposals per VAAR 819.7003.

3. SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS:

3.1 Submission shall be received not later than date and time posted on the SF1449 blocks 8 & 20, and/or SF30 blocks 11 & 14 at Network Contracting Office 21 via email to mandy.thompson2@va.gov (Mandy Thompson – Contracting Officer). Late submissions shall be treated in accordance with the solicitation provision at FAR 52.212-1 (f).

3.2 Email sizes larger than 5MB will need to be broken into separate emails; please identify as 1 of 2, and 2 of 2.

ONLY ELECTRONIC OFFERS WILL BE ACCEPTED

4. PROPOSAL DUE DATE:

Proposals are due by the date and time set for the receipt of proposals shown in SF1449 blocks 8 & 20, and/or SF30 blocks 11 & 14.

5. QUESTIONS CONCERNING THIS RFP:

All Requests for Information (RFIs) regarding this RFP must be submitted in writing and received **NLT 2:00 P.M. PST on May 25, 2018** in order to allow replies to reach all prospective Offerors in a timely manner. Questions/RFI's can be sent via email to Mandy Thompson at mandy.thompson2@va.gov.

6. PROPOSAL FORMAT:

6.1 All commitments made in the proposal may become a part of the resultant contract. The data submitted with each proposal should be complete and concise, but not overly elaborate. Excessive reliance on promotional brochures is discouraged.

6.2 The Technical Volume shall not exceed the page limits stated herein. If the page limits are exceeded, the pages in excess of the limit will not be read or considered. The page limit for the **Technical** Proposal is thirty-four (34) sheets.

6.3 Page Limits Shall Include: All appendices, charts, graphs, diagrams, tables, photographs, drawings, etc. except as noted in the instructions. Type size will not be smaller than Microsoft Word Times New Roman 11 point font, normal proportional spacing. Text lines will be single-spaced.

6.4 Offerors may, at the discretion of the Government, be asked to provide information for clarification purposes regarding their proposals. **Requests for such clarification information do not constitute discussions.**

6.5 The Offeror shall be held responsible for the validity of all information supplied in his/her proposal, including information provided by potential subcontractors. Should subsequent investigation disclose that the fact and conditions were not as stated, the proposal may be rejected and receive no further consideration.

6.6 Award may be made without discussions

7. PROPOSAL VOLUME CONTENTS:

TECHNICAL

7.1 General Instructions: The Technical volume should include necessary information regarding the Offeror's ability to perform the requirements outlined in the solicitation. Failure to provide a Technical proposal in accordance with the solicitation instructions shall render an Offeror's proposal incomplete and ineligible for award.

7.2 Technical Proposals shall not include price or pricing information, and shall be limited to thirty-four (34) sheets.

7.3 In no case shall statements such as "we comply with the requirements of the contract" or its equivalent be acceptable to meet the requirements of this request for proposal. A proposal that merely reiterates or promises to accomplish the requirements of the RFP will be considered unacceptable.

7.4 Offerors shall provide information to demonstrate a history of performance that reveals experience in performing multidiscipline work that is similar in scope, size, and complexity to the categories stated in the solicitation.

7.4.1 Offerors shall prepare and submit to prior clients a Past Performance Questionnaire and instruct the clients to forward directly to the contracting office via e-mail to the address below. The due date for receipt of Past Performance Questionnaires shall be on or before the proposal due date shown in Block 8 and 20 of the SF 1449. Offerors shall be responsible for ensuring Past Performance Questionnaires are delivered to the Contracting Officer on or before the proposal due date.

7.4.2 Completed Past Performance Questionnaire shall be sent to the contracting office via e-mail:
mandy.thompson2@va.gov

7.4.3 **Questionnaires must be submitted by the client/evaluator directly to the Contracting Office.** Offerors should follow-up and encourage references to get the questionnaires to the Contracting Officer in a timely manner. **Do not** include copies of these transmittal letters, or communications or questionnaires in the proposal.

7.4.4 Offerors lacking relevant Past Performance experience may submit information regarding predecessor companies, key personnel who have relevant experience or subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement if such information is relevant to this acquisition. Such information shall, as a minimum, include: Name(s) of Predecessor Company/Subcontractor and/or Key Personnel and include: Complete Address and Point of Contact; Telephone, Fax Number and email address; and a brief synopsis of the experience (a resume may be submitted for "Key Personnel") and relevancy to this project.

7.4.5 Offerors are advised that the Government may use all data provided by the Offeror in this volume and data obtained from other sources, including, but not limited to, Government-wide databases, rely upon personal business experience with the Offeror, in the development of performance confidence assessments. Past Performance information on contracts not listed by the Offeror may also be evaluated. The Government may contact references provided by the Offeror, as well as any other source it identifies, and information received may be used in the evaluation of the Offeror's Past Performance. While the Government may elect to consider data obtained from other sources, the burden of providing current, accurate and complete Past Performance information rests with the Offeror.

7.5 In order to establish relevancy, Offerors shall provide references for projects which employed similar methods; had similar project complexity and scope; and were performed in similar conditions to Activation Warehouse San Jose.

7.6 The information gathered shall address relevant contracts awarded within the **last five (5) years of Activation Warehouse San Jose proposal due date**.

7.6.1 Project Experience, Evaluation Factor #1, must not to be confused with the Past Performance Questionnaire, and shall be used as the principal means of gathering relevancy information.

7.7 Offerors should include with their proposal information any problems encountered on the identified contracts, and the Offeror's corrective actions. Include project awards, customer letters of commendation, etc., with points of contact and telephone numbers.

7.8 If proposing as a joint venture, a copy of the executed joint venture agreement shall be included with the proposal.

7.9 Socioeconomic Status. Factor #5

7.9.1 VAAR 815.304 Evaluation factors and significant subfactors.

(a) In an effort to assist SDVOSBs and VOSBs, contracting officers shall include evaluation factors providing additional consideration to such offerors in competitively negotiated solicitations that are not set aside for SDVOSBs or VOSBs.

(b) Additional consideration shall also be given to any offeror, regardless of size status, that proposes to subcontract with SDVOSBs or VOSBs.

7.9.2 VAAR 819.7003 Eligibility.

(a) Size eligibility of SDVOSBs/VOSBs continues to be governed by the Small Business Administration (SBA) regulations, 13 CFR subparts 125.8 through 125.13, as well as [FAR part 19](#), except where expressly directed otherwise by this part, and 38 CFR 74 verification regulations for SDVOSBs /VOSBs.

(b) At the time of submission of offers/quotes, and prior to award of any contracts, the offeror must represent to the contracting officer that it is a—

(1) SDVOSB or VOSB eligible under this subpart;

(2) Small business concern under the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code assigned to the acquisition; and

(3) SDVOSB/VOSB listed as verified in VIP database at: <https://www.vip.vetbiz.gov>.

(c) A joint venture may be considered an SDVOSB/VOSB concern if—

(1) At least one member of the joint venture is a verified SDVOSB or VOSB and makes the representations in paragraph (b) of this section;

(2) Each other concern is small under the size standard corresponding to the NAICS code assigned to the procurement;

(3) The joint venture meets the requirements of paragraph 7 of the size standard explanation of affiliates in [FAR 19.101](#); and

(4) The joint venture meets the requirements of 13 CFR 125.15(b), modified to include VOSBs where this CFR section refers to SDVOSBs.

(d) Any SDVOSB/VOSB (non-manufacturer) must meet the requirements in [FAR 19.102\(f\)](#) to receive a benefit under this program.

(e) In some instances, SDVOSB eligibility may be extended to businesses owned and operated by surviving spouses, as set forth in [802.101](#);

(f) Pursuant to 38 USC 8127(g), any business concern that is determined by VA to have willfully and intentionally misrepresented its SDVOSB/VOSB status is subject to debarment from contracting with the Department for a period of not less than five years. This debarment includes all principals in the business. See [809.406](#), Debarment.

7.10 Price, Factor #6

7.10.1 Completed Standard Form (SF) 1449

7.10.2 Completed Bid Schedule with Base and Option pricing detail titled Bid Schedule San Jose_

7.10.3 Completed Solicitation Amendment(s) SF30, as applicable

EVALUATION FACTORS AND BASIS FOR AWARD

8. BASIS FOR AWARD

8.1 Proposals will be evaluated against the following factors. They are listed in **descending** order of importance below:

- Factor 1- Project Experience
- Factor 2- Project Personnel Experience
- Factor 3- Technical/Management Approach
- Factor 4- Past Performance
- Factor 5- Socioeconomic Status
- Factor 6- Price

NOTE: All evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are significantly more important than price.

8.2 The Government intends to award a firm fixed price (FFP) contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible Offeror whose offer provides the Best Value Trade-off from the solicitation in accordance with FAR 15.101-1.

9. EVALUATION FACTORS AND THEIR RELATIVE ORDER OF IMPORTANCE

9.1 Proposals will be evaluated against the following factors. They are listed in **descending** order of importance below:

- Factor 1- Project Experience
- Factor 2- Project Personnel Experience
- Factor 3- Technical/Management Approach
- Factor 4- Past Performance
- Factor 5- Socioeconomic Status
- Factor 6- Price

NOTE: All evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are significantly more important than price.

9.2. Factor Rating

9.2.1 For this acquisition ratings will be a combined evaluation of the extent to which the Offeror(s) technical criteria and/or qualifications meet, or exceed, the Government's specified performance and capability requirements. An adjective rating will be assigned to each factor. The rating depicts how well the Offeror(s) technical criteria and/or qualifications meet or exceed the specified requirements under each factor.

9.2.2 The Past Performance/Experience Rating represents the Government's assignment of a confidence assessment rating based on assessing performance risk. Performance risk assessment will be accomplished by reviewing aspects of the Offeror's recent and relevant present and past performance record and project experience.

9.2.3 Price.

9.3. Evaluation Factors

9.3.1 Evaluation Factor #1: Project Experience.

For each project submitted Offeror shall provide the following. Limit to two (2) pages per project.

- _ Government Agency/Hospital which awarded contract to Offeror
- _ Type of Contract – Federal, State, Private
- _ Description of Contract Scope
- _ Contract Number(s)
- _ Contract Value(s)
- _ Number of modification(s) and dollar value(s) if any
- _ Performance Period

- _ Place of Performance
- _ Customer/End User Point of Contact (name, email, phone number, address)
- _ Contracting Officer/Procurement Official (name, email, phone number, address)

The Offeror's response to this factor will be evaluated as to its relevance and similarity to work under this project. This section shall clearly demonstrate and provide exceptional detail to demonstrate previous medical facility activations of a similar size (square foot), scope and complexity and how it relates to the characteristics of this project.

The Offeror shall clearly demonstrate and provide exceptional detail to demonstrate relative activation services (medical facility) project experience with no less than one (1) and no more than three (3) completed projects or substantially completed within the preceding five (5) years. Substantial completion is defined in this context as being no less than 80% complete.

9.3.1.2 Evaluation Factor #2: Project Personnel Experience.

Provide a Key Personnel Worksheet, and if necessary a resume, for the following key personnel. Key Personnel and Resume shall not exceed two (2) pages per individual.

The Offeror proposes qualified individuals who meet the following experience requirements for all key positions. The proposed key personnel shall have a minimum of five (5) years' experience in their respective fields with similar or like job titles. The same individual may function in one or more of the capacities listed below.

Resumes shall clearly demonstrate and provide exceptional detail indicating the function each individual will be performing and how it relates to this project.

- _ Program Manager
- _ Activation Project Manager
- _ Logistics Project Manager
- _ Warehouse Manager

Key Personnel and/or resumes of proposed key personnel shall as a minimum include pertinent information relative to their duties and responsibilities for this project and past performance with projects similar in size and scope.

For each individual submitted, the Offeror shall state if the individual is a current employee of the Prime Contractor or Subcontractor.

9.3.1.3 Evaluation Factor #3: Technical/Management Approach.

Shall not exceed a total of twenty-two (22) pages. Technical/Management Approach shall not exceed eight (8) pages.

Offeror shall clearly demonstrates and provides exceptional detail demonstrating their technical and management approach to planning, executing, and managing the project's scope as outlined in the Performance Work Statement (PWS). Exception detail is provided further demonstrating understanding of the project scope, restrictions which must be considered in the schedule, events associated with project, and feasibility of the Offerors' approach to coordinating work with the IPT to meet the schedule requirements and provide quality service.

Offeror shall clearly demonstrate and provide exceptional detail on their approach to achieving project quality as outlined the Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP).

- _ Project management Plan (PMP) shall include the following (shall not exceed twelve (12) pages):
 - o Phase-based integrated master schedule (IMS)
 - o Communication Management Plan
 - o Quality Management Plan
 - o Risk Management Plan
 - o Inventory Management Plan
 - o Receiving and Installation Plan
 - o Deactivation Plan
- _ Organization Chart shall not exceed one (1) page.

9.3.1.4 Evaluation Factor #4: Past Performance.

The Contracting Officer will evaluate information submitted by the Offeror in response to the Past Performance Questionnaire, and information provided under Project Experience. Please provide a minimum of one (1) and a maximum of three (3) Past Performance Questionnaires to complete this evaluation factor requirement. Past Performance questionnaires must be submitted as the Prime contractor. Do not submit Past Performance Questionnaires as the Sub-Contractor. Sub-Contractor Past Performance Questionnaires received will be rejected.

The Past Performance Questionnaire must be emailed or faxed to the Contracting Officer on or before the proposal due date.

9.3.1.5 Evaluation Factor #5: Socioeconomic Status.

Socio-Economic Status:

E	Exceptional	Offeror is a certified SDVOSB
O	Outstanding	Offeror is a certified VOSB
G	Good	Offeror in any other small business category
S	Satisfactory	Offeror in any other categories

9.3.1.5.1 Any offeror that is an SDVOSB or VOSB must have their CVE certifications at the time proposals are due.

9.3.1.5.2 Any offeror using an SDVOSB and/or VOSB in their subcontracting plan must have their respective certifications at the time proposals are due.

9.3.1.6 Evaluation Factor #6: Price.

- _Signed Standard Form (SF) 1449
 - o Signed by an authorized official
 - o Block 17a complete with Offeror information including DUN's, Tax Identification and GSA Contract Number
 - o Offers providing less than 60 days for Government acceptance after the date offers are due will not be considered and will be rejected.
- _Completed Bid Schedule with applicable supporting price information titled Bid Schedule San Jose_
 - o Base and Option pricing detail
- _Signed Solicitation Amendment(s) SF 30 as applicable

9.4 TECHNICAL PROPOSAL EVALUATION

9.4.1 The Technical Criteria must include the necessary information to enable evaluators to form a concrete conclusion of the Offeror(s) ability to perform the requirements as indicated in the solicitation. The evaluation of each Technical Criteria will evaluate and measure the ability of the Offeror(s) to effectively manage multi-discipline or specialized discipline, as applicable, provided in response to the submission requirements specified in this solicitation.

9.5 PAST PERFORMANCE CONSIDERATIONS

9.5.1 The Past Performance proposal evaluation will consider such things as an Offeror's business practices, customer relationship, and ability to successfully perform as proposed and other considerations considering recency, relevancy, sources, context, and trends. Past Performance includes current on-going (present) performance. Sources is defined as the source of the past performance information. Context is defined as the situation in which the past performance occurred. Trends may be defined as how often something occurs either good or bad.

9.5.2 The Government may evaluate present and past performance information through the use of questionnaires completed by the Offeror's references; use data independently obtained from other Government or commercial sources, including, but not limited to Government databases; rely upon personal business experience with the Offeror; and use the information provided in the Offeror's Past Performance Relevancy Questionnaires.

9.5.3 The evaluation will also consider information provided relative to corrective actions taken to resolve problems on past or existing contracts and trends in performance.

9.5.4 The evaluation may take into account Past Performance information regarding predecessor companies, key personnel who have relevant experience, and/or subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement when such information is relevant to this acquisition. If multiple subcontractors are provided for the same discipline, the government will use the lowest rated subcontractor in the evaluation.

9.5.5 Past Performance information on contracts not listed by the Offeror may also be evaluated. The Government may contact references and contact parties other than those identified by the Offeror, and information received may be used in the evaluation of the Offeror's Past Performance. While the Government may elect to consider data obtained from other sources, the burden of providing current accurate and complete Past Performance information rests with the Offeror. The Government reserves the rights to obtain and evaluate Past Performance information from any source it deems appropriate.

9.5.6 An Offeror with no Past Performance may receive a rating based on the evaluation of its predecessor companies and/or its proposed key personnel. These ratings may have the same importance as the ratings of the proposing company. If such information is not applicable (i.e., the Offeror does not have a predecessor company, key personnel or subcontractors with relevant experience), the Offeror shall be evaluated as "**Neutral**". However, the proposal of an Offeror with no relevant Past Performance history, while rated "**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.

9.5.7 The Government may consider an Offeror's previous contracts in the aggregate in determining relevancy, should the Offeror's present and past performance lend itself to this approach. For example, an Offeror's work experience on three contracts may, by definition, represent only a *semi-relevant* effort when each contract is considered as a stand-alone effort. However, when these contracts are performed concurrently (in part or in whole) and are assessed in the aggregate, the work may more accurately reflect a *relevant* effort.

9.6 PRICE EVALUATION

9.6.1 The purpose of Price evaluation is to provide an assessment of the reasonableness of the proposed price in relation to the solicitation requirements.

Price proposals will be evaluated to determine if the prices are:

Complete – The proposal contains prices to perform all tasks required by the Performance Work Statement (PWS)/and related documents.

Reasonable – The price is determined fair and reasonable

9.6.2 Those proposals evaluated as not satisfying all of the price criteria may be eliminated from consideration for award unless the Contracting Officer determines:

- (1) A minor clerical error has occurred, then the Offeror may be given an opportunity to correct the minor error within the constraints of the "clarifications" process or
- (2) The Contracting Officer determines discussions are required.

9.6.3 Reasonableness of an Offeror's proposal is evaluated through price analysis techniques as described in FAR Subpart 15.305(a) (1) and (4).

9.7 COMPETITIVE RANGE

The Government reserves the right to limit, for purposes of efficiency, the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly rated proposals (FAR 52.215-1). If the Contracting Officer decides that an Offeror's proposal should no longer be included in the competitive range, the proposal shall be eliminated from consideration for award and written notice of the decision shall be provided to the unsuccessful Offeror in accordance with FAR 15.503.

9.8 DISCUSSIONS

To maximize the Government's ability to obtain best value, based on the requirements and the evaluation factors set forth in this RFP, it may be necessary to conduct discussions. If discussions are necessary due to perceived weaknesses or other issues, which must be addressed before award, they will be conducted with only those Offerors determined to be within the competitive range. Discussions may be conducted either orally or in writing. The scope and extent of discussions are a matter of contracting officer judgment. Accordingly, Offerors are advised to submit initial proposals which are fully and clearly acceptable and without the need for additional information. The competitive range, if required, may be reduced for purposes of efficiency pursuant to FAR 15.306(c)(2). **Offerors may be restricted to a short turnaround (i.e., less than 48 hours) in responding to the contracting officer during any discussion period.**

9.9 FINAL PROPOSAL REVISIONS

If discussions are conducted, final proposal revisions will be required in determining the award of a contract resulting from this RFP. However, the Government reserves the right to award a contract without discussions or opportunity for proposal revisions, in which case, final proposal revisions will not be required.

9.10 DEBRIEFINGS

9.10.1 Offerors excluded from the competitive range or otherwise excluded from the competition before award may submit a written request for a debriefing to the Contracting Officer in accordance with FAR 15.505.

9.10.2 After award, unsuccessful Offerors may submit a written request for a debriefing to the Contracting Officer in accordance with FAR 15.506.

9.11 PROPOSED KEY PERSONNEL AND PROPOSED MINIMUM QUALIFICATIONS OF KEY PERSONNEL

Any proposed key personnel and minimum qualifications for incoming or replacement key personnel will be incorporated into the contract resulting from this solicitation and shall be limited to individuals and qualifications that were specifically identified in this solicitation. The Contractor shall obtain the Contracting Officer's written consent before making any substitutions.
