



July 3, 2008

SUBJECT: Request for Proposal FNS 08-201JAK for Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) Associate Administrator for Special Nutrition Programs (AASNP) "Seeds of Change" Correspondence Management System Design and Consulting

Dear Prospective Offeror,

The USDA, Associate Administrator for Special Nutrition Programs, is considering award of a contract to a small business to consider and document what needs to occur in order to implement a correspondence tracking and editing system that will meet the needs of AASNP.

This contract results from an internal initiative. FNS plans to expend no more than \$50,000 and is looking to small business to propose a viable and robust proposal for services to accomplish the minimum objectives set forth for this program as well as additional deliverables the offeror believes will be an added value to the USDA that are in context and scope of the original requirement.

There are four minimum objectives for this procurement:

1. Identify all of the areas for which requirements shall be gathered
2. Gather requirements to a level of detail that will allow the solution to be designed and then design the solution
3. Structure requirements activities in a manner that allows for efficient use of government personnel and resources
4. Establish traceability for requirements through the entire process.

At a minimum the deliverables will include:

- Requirements Specification,
- Concept of Operations
- Alternatives Analysis
- Project Management Plan

In addition the above minimum objectives and deliverables, the Statement of Objectives (SOO) states stakeholder needs that must be complied with, unless a different, more suitable solution is proposed.

The first two specifications shall adhere to the templates specified in Attachments A and B of the SOO attached to this RFP.

Proposal Submission Directions:

Proposals are due July 21' 2008.

Technical Proposal:

Each offeror should submit a Technical proposal containing a Performance Work Statement (PWS) that addresses their comprehensive approach to accomplishing the minimum requirements and system needs defined with the USDA FNS Statement of Objectives (SOO) as well as an explicit listing and description of additional services or deliverables they believe will be an added value to the government within scope and context of the base requirements.

Cost Proposal:

A cost proposal not exceeding \$50,000.00 should be submitted in addition to the Technical proposal.

Please submit electronic copies of your proposal to the Contracting Officer, Leonard Green at leonard.green@fns.usda.gov. Please also submit 3 hardcopies to the address for receipt no later than July 23, 2008. Any additional delay may impact the evaluation board's ability to effectively consider your offer within the competitive range.

USDA/Food and Nutrition Service
Contract Management Branch, Rm. 220
ATTN: Leonard Green Contracting Officer
3101 Park Center Drive
Alexandria, VA 22302

"Submission, Modification, Revision, and Withdrawal of Proposals" shall apply in the determination of late proposal submissions. It is suggested that you transmit electronic versions early to ensure it reaches it's destination by the date and time required. Otherwise, it will be considered late in accordance with FAR 15.208.

"Best Value" Determination:

In accordance with FAR Part 15 "Contracting by Negotiation", the government intends to establish this Firm Fixed Price (FFP) contract with the vendor that represents the best value offering to the USDA.

Evaluation of Proposals

Weighting of Factors in a “Best Value” Procurement

Individual proposals will stand on their own merits and deficiencies. Weights presented below are purely guidelines to determine the most important factors and subsequently for assigning overall color ratings to each proposal. There will not be any points assigned to colors or any other numerical formula. Instead, the ranking will be based on the combined expert judgment of the Technical Evaluation Board (TEB) and TEB Chair.

This method will document and present the findings of the Technical Evaluation Board to clearly identify the contractor that proposes the most beneficial and viable effort.

Overall Weighting Guidelines for the USDA FNS Seeds of Change Support Acquisition.

Factor	Weighting Guideline
1: Service Solution	50%
2: Performance Risk	30%
3: Price/Cost	20%
Total	100%

Technical Evaluation Criteria

Technical proposals will be evaluated individually for compliance and conformance with the solicitation requirements and the evaluation factors. Technical sub-factors will be rated individually using a color rating scale.

Price Evaluation Criteria

The Price proposals will be evaluated individually for compliance and conformance with the solicitation requirements. Price proposals will be rank ordered to determine price relationships to be used as a factor for determining the proposal offering the overall best value.

Factor 1: Service Solution

The following rating scheme will be used for each evaluation factor. Each proposal will be rated on each factor and rationale for the selected rating will be justified with specific information coinciding with the criteria below.

Rating	General Description
Purple	The proposal clearly meets the Government's stated requirements in all areas and exceeds those requirements in a majority of the areas in a meaningful way thus providing the Government significant additional benefits.
Blue	The proposal meets the Government's stated requirements in all areas, and in some areas the offeror exceeds the Government's stated requirements.
Green	The proposal meets the Government's stated requirements in all areas.
Yellow	The proposal meets some the Government's stated requirements in most areas, but in some areas, it barely meets the Government's stated requirements.
Red	The proposal fails to meet the Government's stated requirements.

Sub-Factor 1.1: Fulfillment of Minimum Technical Requirements

- The government will review each technical proposal and assess if it addresses the requirement and the degree it demonstrates how the approach will successfully accomplish each requirement.
- The government will not accept any proposals that do not meet the minimum requirements as set forth in the SOO. As a result, any proposal that is not rated a "Green" in this category will be eliminated from the competitive range.
- This acquisition has been structured to allow for creative and "out-of-the-box" solutions. While this is the case, proposals should indicate solutions that are reasonable, achievable within the constraints and propose best practices to meet the minimum requirements first, and "added value" items second.

Sub-Factor 1.2: Perceived Additional-Value to the Government

- While an award may be made to a company that submits a proposal that only meets the minimum requirements, the intention of this source selection methodology is to incentivize firms to propose best-practices and deliverables that provide additional value to the government above and beyond the minimum requirements while staying within the not-to-exceed price factor.
- Using their expert judgment, the TEB will weigh the items within each proposal that are identified as “above-and-beyond” the minimum requirements. The TEB will weigh these items based on current industry best-practices, perceived value to the government, and other possibly unique characteristics inherent within the approach.
- It is highly recommended that offerors clearly map their solutions to the requirements and explicitly identify “additional value” items not included in the original requirements. These should then be tied to the overall project management plan and comprehensive management approach to show how the proposed effort will be executed.

Sub-Factor 1.3: Quality of the Overall Proposal

- Offeror’s proposals shall be evaluated using the factors described within this RFP and must address, at a minimum, all information required in the Instructions to Offerors in this solicitation.
- In addition to standards reflected in the RFP, the proposals must adhere to commercially accepted professional standards to include: organization, readability, requirement traceability, grammar, spelling, and other indicators generally understood as commercial or industry standards for proposals and deliverables.

Factor 1 Weighting Guidelines

Factor 1 - Service Solution Sub-Factor	Weighting Guideline
Sub-Factor 1.1: Fulfillment of Minimum Technical Requirements	30%
Sub-Factor 1.2: Perceived Additional-Value to the Government	50%
Sub-Factor 1.3: Quality of the Overall Proposal	20%
Total	100%

Factor 2: Performance Risk Rating

The Technical Evaluation Team will use the following color ratings to rate Factor 2: Performance Risk elements of each offeror’s proposal:

Rating	General Description
Blue	The information provided suggests a very low risk of less than satisfactory performance on the part of the offeror.
Green	The information provided suggests a low risk of less than satisfactory performance on the part of the offeror.
Yellow	The information provided suggests a moderate risk of less than satisfactory performance on the part of the offeror.
Orange	The information provided suggests a substantial risk of less than satisfactory performance on the part of the offeror.
Red	The information provided suggests a very substantial risk of less than satisfactory on part of the offeror

The Government will examine the likelihood of success an offeror will have in fulfilling the objectives of this acquisition according to their proposed approach and the specific FNS environment. In doing so, the government will evaluate the offeror’s plan for successfully accomplishing the work and preventing and/or limiting negative impacts on the accomplishment of objectives specified in the PWS as well as mitigating risks to the Government; the offeror’s prior experience in performing similar contracts of similar size, scope, and complexity; and client satisfaction and feedback with past performance.

Sub-Factor 2.1: Corporate Experience

- Within the proposal, offerors demonstrate experience performing work related to the tasks under this acquisition.
- The firm has successfully performed tasks of a similar scope and magnitude.

Sub-Factor 2.2: Past Performance

- The offeror submits contact information for three references where the work performed is consistent with this acquisition.
- The offeror has no negative information reflected in the Federal Procurement Data System (FPDS).

Sub-Factor 2.3: Experience of Proposed Personnel

- Within the proposal, offerors identify key personnel with qualifications and experience performing both business process definition and solution design.

Sub-Factor 2.4: Corporate Capacity

- The organization submitting the proposal demonstrates the ability to administer contracts, submit invoices and create an environment in which the people they bring to the project will be able to perform.

Factor 2 Weighting Guidelines

Factor 2 Sub-Factor	Weighting Guideline
Sub-Factor 2.1: Corporate Experience	20%
Sub-Factor 2.2: Past Performance	20%
Sub-Factor 2.3: Experience of Proposed Personnel	40%
Sub-Factor 2.4: Corporate Capacity	20%
Total	100%

Factor 3: Price

The Price Evaluation Team will use price as an evaluation factor to differentiate between two or more superior offers.

PROPOSED PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE (PoP):

Performance of this effort, once awarded, is expected to take place shortly after award and completed by November 7, 2008. The PoP will depend most significantly on the offeror’s proposed project plan and the final PoP will be agreed to upon contract award and concurrence of the government and successful offeror.

SUBMISSION OF PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION:

The Government will collect past performance information on prospective offerors. Therefore, offerors shall submit no more than three relevant projects demonstrating the contractor's experience to the Contracting Officer within the original proposal no later than July 21, 2008.

1. Name of contracting activity
2. Contract number
3. Contract type and description of services
4. Total contract value
5. Contracting office and verified telephone and fax number
6. Program manager and verified telephone and fax number

Information shall be submitted electronically to leonard.green@fns.usda.gov.

If you have any questions please contact Jason Kattman, Contract Specialist, at (703) 305-2250 or the undersigned at (703) 305-2257. Technical questions regarding the specifications shall be provided via e-mail no later than July 11th, 2008 to jason.kattman@fns.usda.gov.

Sincerely,

Leonard Green
Contracting Officer
Contract Management Branch

Attachments:

- Statement of Objectives