

Defense Counterintelligence and Security Agency  
Background Investigation Fieldwork Services  
Solicitation HS002122R0003  
[Amendment 05](#)

02 EVALUATION PROCESS

I. GENERAL

The Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible Offeror whose proposal, conforming to the solicitation, will be most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered. The Government may select for award an Offeror that does not offer the lowest price if that Offeror proposes an approach that the Government deems technically superior to, or believes represents a lower risk than, the approaches of lower-priced competitors. The Government may also select an Offeror that does not offer the best technical solution or represent the lowest risk if the Government believes that a lower-priced proposal represents a better value.

The evaluation factors and rating methods that will be applied are summarized in the following table:

<b>Factor/Subfactor #</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Rating Method</b>
Factor 1	Proposal Compliance	Acceptable/Unacceptable
Factor 2	Security	Acceptable/Unacceptable
Factor 3	Technical Capability	Quality Assessment Rating
Subfactor A	Management Approach	
Subfactor B	Quality Control	
Subfactor C	Corporate Experience	
Factor 4	Past Performance	Confidence Assessment Rating
Factor 5	Small Business Participation	Small Business Participation Assessment Rating
Factor 6	Price	N/A (Price Analysis)

The Government will evaluate proposals in two steps. Under the first step, the Government will evaluate Factors 1 and 2. Proposals must be deemed “Acceptable” under these factors for the Government to continue evaluating Factors 3-6 under the second step. Proposals deemed “Unacceptable” under the first step will be immediately rejected as unawardable.

Factors 3 and 4 are approximately equal in importance, and each is more important than Factors 5 or 6. Non-price factors, when combined, are significantly more important than price.

The Government may, at its discretion, incorporate any aspects of the successful Offeror’s proposal into the resultant contract.

The rating methods are described in further detail below.

Acceptable/Unacceptable (Factors 1 and 2)

Adjectival Rating	Description
Acceptable	Proposal meets the requirements of the solicitation.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet the requirements of the solicitation.

Quality Assessment Rating (Factor 3)

Adjectival Rating	Description
Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low to moderate.
Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation, and thus, contains one or more deficiencies, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is unacceptable. Proposal is unawardable.

The Government will define the term “risk” and its various levels, as used in the preceding table, as follows:

Adjectival Rating	Description
Low	Proposal may contain weakness(es) which have little potential to cause disruption of schedule or degradation of performance, <u>and</u> the Offeror exhibits a significant amount of qualifying corporate experience. Normal contractor effort and normal Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.
Moderate	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which may potentially cause disruption of schedule or degradation of performance, <u>or</u> the Offeror exhibits a moderate (but not significant) amount of qualifying corporate experience. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome difficulties.

High	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which is likely to cause significant disruption of schedule or degradation of performance, <u>or</u> the Offeror exhibits little or no qualifying corporate experience. A proposal that contains both “Moderate” and “High” risk features (i.e., potential for disruption and no experience, or likelihood of disruption and moderate experience) will be deemed “High” risk. Is unlikely to overcome any difficulties, even with special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring.
Unacceptable	Proposal contains a material failure or a combination of significant weaknesses that increases the risk of unsuccessful performance to an unacceptable level.

The Government will define the terms “strength,” “weakness,” “significant weakness,” and “deficiency”, as used in the preceding tables, as follows:

Adjectival Rating	Description
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.
Weakness	A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
Significant Weakness	A flaw in the proposal that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
Deficiency	A material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.

#### Confidence Assessment Rating (Factor 4)

Adjectival Rating	Description
Substantial Confidence	Based on the Offeror’s recent and 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 and relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Neutral Confidence	No recent and 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 on the factor of past performance.

Limited Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent and 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 and relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the Offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

#### Small Business Participation Assessment Rating (Factor 5)

Adjectival Rating	Description
Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the small business objectives.
Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the small business objectives.
Acceptable	Proposal indicates an adequate approach and understanding of small business objectives.
Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the small business objectives.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet small business objectives.

## II. METHODOLOGY

The Government will assess Offerors on each factor based upon the considerations described below.

### 1. Factor 1: Proposal Compliance

The Government will evaluate whether the proposal conforms to the following administrative requirements stated at sections II.1. and III.1. of the *Instructions to Offerors ("Instructions")*:

- Contains a cover letter signed by a senior company official with authority to enter the company into a contract for this requirement.
- Contains two resumes, one for the proposed program manager, and the other for the proposed information technology manager, both of whom meet the minimum qualifications stated under section 1.11 of the PWS.
- Contains a subcontracting plan.
- Contains an OCI mitigation plan (if required).

Although not part of this volume, for evaluation purposes the Government will also review proposals under this step to ensure that the following documents are included:

- Proposal slide deck (*Instructions*, II.3-II.5).
- Completed Small-Business Participation Matrix (*Instructions*, II.7).

- Completed Price Workbook (*Instructions*, II.8).

A proposal that does not conform to the material requirements described above will be deemed “Unacceptable” and rejected by the Government without further evaluation.

## 2. Factor 2: Security

The Government will confirm the following:

- The Offeror has submitted the required security documents stated at sections II.2. and III.2. of the *Instructions*;
- The Offeror possesses an active Top Secret facility clearance level;
- The Offeror does not possess any unresolved foreign ownership, control, or influence issues;
- The Security Plan fully addresses how the Offeror will protect sensitive information during the conduct of this work, including each of the specific aspects identified in section III.2.C. of the *Instructions*.
- The Offeror received a rating of at least “Marginal” in response to its most recent Security Vulnerability Assessment or explained in its security plan that it has never received an SVA.

If the Offeror does not meet these requirements, the response is deemed incomplete, or the Government is unable to determine whether the Offeror meets these requirements, the proposal will be deemed “Unacceptable” and rejected by the Government without further evaluation.

## 3. Factor 3: Technical Capability

This factor is composed of Subfactors A, B, and C. The Government will provide a quality assessment rating for Factor 3 based upon its combined evaluation of these Subfactors. [In performing the evaluation, the Government will consider the spoken contents of the presentation and the written contents of each slide \(excluding the “Notes” field underneath each slide\).](#)

### A. Subfactor A: Management Approach

*Oral Presentation.* The Government will evaluate the soundness of the Offeror’s approach to successfully managing specific tasks. To do this, the Government will consider whether the approach would (1) be realistically achievable, (2) meet the requirements of the task if successfully executed, and (3) pose any excessive risks to the Government. The specific tasks are:

- Hiring or contracting, and retaining, capacity to provide nationwide support sufficient to meet the Government’s requirement despite constant fluctuation in workload. (Response must include the estimated time to reach full performance capability, not to exceed one (1) year following award.)
- Adhering to the required quality and timeliness standards described under section 6.2. of the PWS.
- Maintaining a workforce that remains knowledgeable of the statutes, regulations, policies, and procedures listed under section 7 of the PWS, to include a plan for updating the workforce as these references change over time and ensuring that personnel are capable of operating independently of Government support.

- Maintaining a workforce that is compliant with the National Training Standards, information technology training and certification requirements (Technical Exhibit A, 15), DCSA-specific investigator training requirements (Technical Exhibit B), and security training requirements (Technical Exhibit C, 2.9.). (Response must include the estimated time to fully train the Offeror's entire workforce.)
- Obtaining timely authorization to operate its own case-management system in accordance with Technical Exhibit A, 2.1.

*Interview Responses.* The Government will evaluate the Offeror's responses for:

- Indication that the Offeror fully understood the question.
- A technically sound management approach.
- Excessive performance and compliance risks.

B. Subfactor B: Quality Control

*Oral Presentation.* The Government will evaluate the soundness of the Offeror's approach to ensuring the quality of personnel and processes, applying the same considerations as described above under II.3.A. Specifically, the Government will evaluate the Offeror's approach to:

- Overseeing the professionalism, integrity, and accuracy of personnel completing BIs, to include establishment of an investigator integrity program (PWS 5.4.1.).
- Overseeing the quality, integrity, compliance, and accuracy of the processes used to complete investigations, to include controls for a check-ride program, annual observations, ad hoc Government observations, and observation-based evaluation record maintenance (PWS 5.5.2.) and establishment of a records verification program providing for at least one verification per month, maintenance of records verification documents, and destruction of records verification documents (PWS 5.5.3.).

*Interview Responses.* The Government will evaluate the Offeror's responses for:

- Indication that the Offeror fully understood the question.
- A technically sound quality control approach.
- Excessive performance and compliance risks.

C. Subfactor C: Corporate Experience

*Oral Presentation.* The Government will evaluate the amount of experience the Offeror has performing work similar in size, scope, and complexity to this requirement. Referenced projects that do not meet the criteria stated under section III.3.D.iii. of the *Instructions* will not be evaluated by the Government. In evaluating this Subfactor, the Government will specifically consider the following:

- Overall experience performing Federal background investigation work (based on length of time, quantity of projects, and fluency of presenters with respect to industry-specific concepts and language).
- Experience maintaining nationwide capacity to conduct both in-person and virtual background investigations.

- Experience maintaining adequately trained, experienced, and cleared staffing in a constantly changing environment.
- How the Offeror has overcome obstacles the same as, or similar to, those that have and will arise during this work (e.g., changing investigative standards, implementation of new technologies, national emergency).

All else being equal, the Government will favor proposals that exhibit the following:

- Greater length of experience in years.
- A higher quantity of referenced projects.
- A wider breadth of experience with the specific topics in the preceding list.
- Greater fluency in addressing the specific topics in the preceding list.
- Sound judgment and general success in overcoming obstacles.

*Interview Responses.* The Government will evaluate the Offeror's responses for:

- The degree to which they cite specific examples from the Offeror's or major subcontractors' experience.
- Fluency on industry-specific concepts and language.

#### 4. Factor 4: Past Performance

The Government will evaluate the quality of the Offeror's performance history. Referenced projects that are not both recent and relevant, as these terms are defined under section III.4. of the *Instructions*, will not be evaluated by the Government. In determining each confidence assessment rating, the Government will specifically consider the following:

- Past performance ratings that are relevant to the successful performance of background investigation work (e.g., quality control, management, timeliness, compliance, etc.).
- The extent of performance history.
- The quality of the supporting narratives.
- Performance trends.

All else being equal, the Government will favor proposals that contain or exhibit the following:

- Higher past performance ratings.
- A higher quantity of referenced projects (up to a maximum of three).
- Objective narratives that cite specific work examples and performance standards.
- A performance history that shows performance improvement over time instead of one that shows a decline in performance over time.

Offerors without any recent and relevant past performance, or that have a performance record so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned, will receive a "Neutral Confidence" rating for this factor.

#### 5. Factor 5: Small-Business Participation

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's (except for small-business Offerors) approach and commitment to meeting the small-business goals for this requirement, which are stated under section III.5.A. of the *Instructions*. In determining the small-business participation assessment rating, the Government will consider the following:

- The degree to which the proposal satisfies each of the goals stated at section III.5.A. of the *Instructions* (based on the total proposed ~~proposed~~ **evaluated** contract value).
- Whether appropriate representations have been submitted for each firm in accordance with section III.5.B. of the *Instructions*.
- The degree to which the Offeror commits to specific small-business participants.
- The Offeror's past performance with respect to meeting its small-business participation goals (based upon the information submitted for Factor 4 and the Offeror's self-described commitment to small business).
- The degree to which any provided supplemental information indicates a commitment to small business.

All else being equal, the Government will favor proposals that contain the following:

- An appropriate representation for each specific proposed firm.
- Completed matrixes that exceed the Government's small-business goals instead of merely meeting the Government's small-business goals.
- Matrixes with specific firms proposed for each goal (over matrixes listing potential small-business candidates).
- When specific firms are not proposed for each goal, matrixes with potential small-business candidates for each goal (over matrixes that do not specify any firms).
- Strong past performance with respect to small-business participation, as evidenced by high ratings supported by objective information drafted by a project client, and/or by the Offeror's self-described success in meeting small-business requirements.
- Supplemental information (if provided) that shows a strong commitment to small business.

Additional notes regarding this factor:

- Plans that do not meet one or more of the Government's small-business participation goals will be rated as "Unacceptable" for this factor.
- If a specific small-business firm is proposed in the *Small-Business Participation Matrix* but no representation is provided for that firm, the Government will categorize the firm as a "potential" firm.
- The Government will not consider past-performance history for this factor if the Offeror lacks a past-performance record addressing this topic, or if the Offeror's performance record on this topic is so sparse that no meaningful confidence level can be reasonably determined.
- Small-business Offerors will automatically receive a rating of "Outstanding" for this factor.



#### 6. Factor 6: Price

- The total evaluated price will be automatically calculated within the *Price Workbook*. It represents the sum of: each Offeror's proposed unit price by job type and year multiplied by sample quantities for each job type.
- The Government will analyze the total evaluated price utilizing one or more of the methods stated at FAR 15.404-1(b)(2) to determine whether it is fair and reasonable.
- The Government may choose to perform a price realism analysis as appropriate for any proposal. This will occur if any unit price or the total evaluated price appear to be unrealistically low, indicating a potential lack of understanding by the Offeror and/or increased risk of performance failure. Upon conducting a price realism analysis, the Government may reject a proposal it considers to contain unrealistically low prices.