

# ***Headquarters U.S. Air Force***

---

*Integrity - Service - Excellence*

## **Continental Group Industry Forum**

### **Selection Strategy**

**31 Aug 2010**

**David M. Foote, AFCEE/ACX**



**U.S. AIR FORCE**

---



**U.S. AIR FORCE**

---

# Overview

- ✓ **Background**
- ✓ **Acquisition Process**
- ✓ **Evaluation Process**
- ✓ **Oral Presentations**
- ✓ **Debriefings**



# Background

---

- **One-Step Process**
  - Offerors are ranked based on “most advantageous” approach
  - Highest Ranked Offeror (HRO) is identified and notified
- The HRO and AF work together during the 5-month exclusive negotiation period to successfully reach a simultaneous transaction and financial closing.



# Background

## *RFQ Sections*

---

- **READ AND UNDERSTAND THE RFQ**
  - **Section 1:** Executive Summary
  - **Section 2: Existing Conditions**
  - **Section 3: Project Requirements**
  - **Section 4: Instructions to Offerors**
  - **Section 5: Basis of Selection**
  - **Section 6:** HRO Exclusive Negotiations
  - **Section 7:** Reference Sources and Points of Contact
  - **Appendices A through R**



**U.S. AIR FORCE**

---

# Acquisition Process

- Use of One-Step RFQ
- RFQ Amendments used to change requirements during the process
  - Provided to all offerors prior to HRO determination; may require assessment of effect
  - Due date for receipt same for all
  - Must provide acknowledgment of amendments



**U.S. AIR FORCE**

---

# Acquisition Process

- **Basis of Selection**
  - **Most Advantageous Proposal**
  - **Integrated Assessment of Factors/Subfactors**
    - Factors/Subfactors are assigned ratings
- **Exclusive Negotiations**
  - Conducted with Highest Ranked Offeror (HRO)
  - Final approval for successful negotiations by SAF/IEI



**U.S. AIR FORCE**

# **Evaluation Process**

## ***Section Overview***

---

- **Important to Thoroughly Understand all Sections of RFQ. Special emphasis on Sections 4.0 (Instruction to Offerors) and 5.0 (Basis of Selection)**
  - **Sections 4.0 & 5.0 considered most important sections to the source selection process**
  - **Section 4.0 information required to be submitted by offerors to be evaluated against criteria specified in Section 5.0**
  - **Desired Features and Enhancements will be evaluated**
  - **The difference between meeting a requirement and exceeding a requirement is based on submittal of Desired Features or Enhancements**



**U.S. AIR FORCE**

# **Evaluation Process**

## ***Section Overview Cont'd***

---

- **Factor/Subfactor Overview**
- **Subfactor Ratings**
- **Terms & Rating Definitions**
- **Performance Confidence Assessment Evaluation Process**





U.S. AIR FORCE

# Evaluation Process

## *Subfactor/Factor Ratings*

---

- Subfactors within Factors 1, 2, & 3 receive a *Color Ratings*
- Subfactors within Factor 4 receive a *Qualification Rating*
- Factor 5, will receive a *Confidence Assessment Rating* at the factor level



**U.S. AIR FORCE**

# Evaluation Process

## *Factor Subfactor Ratings*

---

- **Each subfactor evaluated IAW RFQ to determine whether proposal meets/exceeds minimum requirements**
  - **Sections 1.0, 2.0 , and 3.0 identify Project Requirements**
- **Each subfactor assigned a rating based on Strengths, Deficiencies and Weaknesses**
  - **Section 4.0 Instructions to Offerors**
  - **Section 5.0 Basis of Selection**
- **Additional evaluation credit possible for Desired Features & offeror proposed Enhancements IAW RFQ Sections 3.0 & 5.0**



**U.S. AIR FORCE**

# Evaluation Process

## *Color Ratings*

Proposals will be evaluated according to subfactors outlined in the RFQ; extra credit may be assigned for desired features identified in the RFQ and/or additional enhancements proposed by the Offeror.

Any proposal risk associated with the proposed approach shall be identified as a weakness within the subfactor it applies.

The following color ratings will be used to rate Factor 1, 2, & 3 subfactors:

Color	Rating	Definition
Blue	Exceptional	Exceeds specified minimum project requirements in a manner beneficial to the Government; proposal must have one or more Strengths and no Deficiencies to receive a blue.
Green	Acceptable	Meets specified minimum project requirements delineated in the Request for Proposal; proposal rated green must have no Deficiencies but may have one or more strengths.
Yellow	Marginal	Does not clearly meet some specified minimum project requirements delineated in the Request for Proposal, but any uncertainty is correctable.
Red	Unacceptable	Fails to meet specified minimum project requirements; proposal has one or more Deficiencies. Proposals with an unacceptable rating are not awardable.



U.S. AIR FORCE

# Evaluation Process

## *Qualification Rating*

---

- Factor 4 will be evaluated at the Subfactor level and assigned a *Qualification Rating*:
  - Highly Qualified – The Offeror’s proposal exceeds the stated minimum requirements in a way that is deemed beneficial to the Government
  - Qualified – The Offeror’s proposal meets stated minimum requirements
  - Unqualified – The Offeror’s proposal fails to meet stated minimum requirements



U.S. AIR FORCE

# Evaluation Process

## *Past Performance Confidence Assessment*

---

- Factor 5, Past Performance evaluated at the Factor level will receive a Past Performance Confidence Assessment Rating that assesses Offeror's past work record to determine probability of successfully accomplishing the project's requirements.
- Analyzes an Offeror's relevant present and past performance, focusing on and targeting performance that is relevant to the Subfactors for Factors 1, 2, & 3
- **RELEVANCE + PERFORMANCE = CONFIDENCE**



# ***PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION***

**U.S. AIR FORCE**

---

- **One indicator of an offeror's ability to perform the contract successfully**
- **Currency and relevancy of the information, source of the information, context of the data, and general trends in contractor's performance are considered**
- **Information on problems encountered on projects, and the offeror's corrective actions also considered**



# ***PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION***

**U.S. AIR FORCE**

---

- **May include data on efforts performed by other divisions, teaming contractors ( e.g., >20% of proposed effort), or critical subcontractors.**
- **Efforts performed for federal, state, or local governments and commercial customers.**
- **Data from any other source!**



U.S. AIR FORCE

# Evaluation Process

## *Past Performance Confidence Assessment*

---

- **Relevancy Rating** will be assigned to each project submitted by the offeror, based on the relevancy of that project to the RFQ's Factors 1, 2 & 3 Subfactors:

**Factor 1.0: Financial**

**Subfactor 1.1: Project Financing**

**Subfactor 1.2: Project Financial Viability & Sustainability**

**Factor 2.0: Development**

**Subfactor 2.1: Development Management Approach**

**Subfactor 2.2: Project Concept**

**Factor 3.0 Property Management**

**Subfactor 3.1: Project Management Approach**

**Subfactor 3.2: Property Operations & Maintenance Strategy**



U.S. AIR FORCE

# Evaluation Process

## *Past Performance Confidence Assessment*

---

### Relevancy Ratings

- **Highly Relevant** – The magnitude of the effort and the complexities on this contract are essentially what the solicitation requires.
- **Relevant** – Some dissimilarities in magnitude of the effort and/or complexities exist on this contract, but it contains most of what the solicitation requires.
- **Somewhat Relevant** – Much less or dissimilar magnitude of effort and complexities exist on this contract, but it contains some of what the solicitation requires.
- **Not Relevant** – Performance on this contract contains relatively no similarities to the performance required by the solicitation.



# Evaluation Process Past Performance Confidence Assessment

---

## Performance Ratings

- **Exceptional** – Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many requirements to the Government’s benefit. The contractual performance of the element being assessed was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were highly effective.
- **Very Good** – Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some requirements to the Government’s benefit. The contractual performance of the element being assessed was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective.
- **Satisfactory** – Performance meets contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element being assessed contains some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were, or appear to be, satisfactory



## Evaluation Process *Past Performance Confidence Assessment*

---

- **Marginal** – Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element being assessed reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions or the contractor’s proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.
- **Unsatisfactory** – Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element being assessed contains serious problem(s) for which the contractor’s corrective actions were, or appear to be, ineffective.
- **Not Applicable** – Self explanatory.



U.S. AIR FORCE

# Evaluation Process

## *Past Performance Confidence Assessment*

After relevancy has been determined and past performance rating has been obtained a specific Confidence Rating will be applied:

- **High Confidence** – Based on the Offeror’s performance record, the Government has high confidence the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
- **Significant Confidence** – Based on the Offeror’s performance record, the Government has significant confidence the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
- **Satisfactory Confidence** – Based on the Offeror’s performance record, the Government has confidence the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Normal emphasis should preclude any problems.
- **Little Confidence** – Based on the Offeror’s performance record, substantial doubt exists that Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
- **No Confidence** – Based on the Offeror’s performance record, extreme doubt exists that Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
- **Unknown Confidence** - No performance record is identifiable or the Offeror’s performance record is so sparse that no confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned.



**U.S. AIR FORCE**

---

# ***Evaluation Notice (EN)***

- **Exchanges With Offerors**
  - **Type of exchange will be identified**
  - **Any ENs which result from Deficiencies in offeror's Proposal will be clearly identified to the offeror as Deficiencies**
  
- **Should be Specific to Individual Concern**
  - **ENs will be for single, not multiple topics**
  - **ENs will not cross subfactors**



**U.S. AIR FORCE**

---

# Oral Presentations

- **Oral Presentation - Face to Face Interaction between Government & Offeror; NOT evaluated as part of proposal**
- **AF & Offerors reach a “meeting of the minds”**
- **Offerors better understand solicitation requirements**
  - **AF evaluators better understand what is proposed**
  - **AF evaluators better understand teaming arrangements**
- **Takes “guess work” out of EN process**
- **Oral Presentations will not be evaluated**
- **Offeror responses to Evaluation Notices, along with any Government requested revisions, will be evaluated**



**U.S. AIR FORCE**

---

# Oral Presentations

- **Four (4) Hours for presentation and Q&A session, including breaks**
  - **Offeror must use remaining time wisely**
    - **Government may also submit questions at end of presentation**
    - **May result in a written EN**
  - **Only offeror's key personnel may present**
- **Offeror's presenting team and written presentation materials**
  - **1 copy to PRESS contractor two (2) work days prior to presentation**
  - **20 paper copies at time of presentation**



U.S. AIR FORCE

# Briefings

## *Unsuccessful Offeror/Non-HRO Debriefings*

---

- **Unsuccessful Offeror (UO)/Non-HRO debriefings:**
  - Offered to unawardable Offerors whenever they are eliminated from the competition
  - Offered to Non-HRO Offerors after Congressional Notification expires
- **One debriefing offered upon elimination from competition**
  - Non-HRO Offerors are not *eliminated* from competition until HRO and AF close the real estate transaction
- **Not a debate nor comparative assessment of other proposals (point-by-point proposal analysis)**



U.S. AIR FORCE

# Post Selection Debriefings

## *Unsuccessful Offeror Debriefings*

---

### Debriefing Format and Content:

- **Restate factors/sub-factors from RFQ**
- **Review RFQ evaluation process**
- **Provide Unsuccessful Offeror's evaluated Ratings**
  - **Description of strengths, weaknesses & deficiencies for that offeror**
  - **Same charts that were briefed to Selection Authority**
- **Provide Improvement Recommendations**



**U.S. AIR FORCE**

---

## ***Final Reminders***

- **Read and understand requirements of the project and the RFQ**
- **Carefully follow ALL instructions in Section 4.0**
- **Follow up on PPQs to ensure submitted to JLL/KGP**
- **Carefully proof read all documents and ensure electronic versions are in correct formats**



**U.S. AIR FORCE**

---

# *Questions*

- **Questions on the Continental Group RFQ acquisition process?**