



August 25, 2010

Attention: Offerors

The Food and Nutrition Service (FNS), Contract Management Division (CMD) on behalf of the Office of Research and Analysis (ORA), announces this Request for Proposal (RFP) for the attached Performance Work Statement (PWS). Offerors will propose on the entire PWS, all or nothing. It is the Government's intent to request competitive proposals and place an order with the offeror that can provide the required services as outlined in the PWS.

This is a competitive **full and open** procurement for advisory and assistance services to conduct a rigorous and robust evaluation of the impact of the Summer Electronic Benefit Transfer for Children (SEBTC) demonstrations on food insecurity among children during the summer months when school is not in session. The scale of SEBTC demonstration operations will be major and the role of the contractor significant. The overall effort will involve as many as 15 demonstration sites across the country that collectively feed as many as 75,000 children over the summers of 2011 through 2013. **There is a ceiling of \$24,500,000 for all aspects of the contract, from award through completion.**

Award will be made to the offeror whose proposal, when technical merit, price and risk of failure to address all objectives within price are considered, provides the best value to the government.

Please provide eight hard copies of your capability proposal plus one original to be received by the office specified below not later than September 27, 2010 by 12:00 pm (EST). Please provide eight hard copies of your technical and four hard copies of your price proposal, including originals (one each), to be received by the office specified below not later than **October 26, 2010 by** 12:00 pm (EST). In addition, please provide one CD for the technical factors and one CD for price. Proposals shall be submitted to Belal.hammad@fns.usda.gov

Hard copies shall be sent to:
USDA, Food and Nutrition Service
Contract Management Branch, Rm 228
Attn: Mr. Belal Hammad, Contract Specialist
3101 Park Center Drive
Alexandria, VA 22302

SECTION B – SUPPLIES OR SERVICES AND PRICES/COSTS

B.1. SERVICES NONPERSONAL

This is a performance based, combination firm-fixed price/indefinite quantity contract. This procurement will be based on FAR 12 and 15. The firm-fixed price portion of the work under this solicitation will consist of finalizing the evaluation design; developing an OMB data collection clearance package; evaluating up to 5 SEBTC-SNAP and SEBTC-WIC 2011 proof-of-concept demonstrations; evaluating up to 15 full SEBTC demonstrations¹ in 2012; writing the stored-benefit card white paper; and reporting on the implementation, status, and final evaluation of the 2011 and the 2012 SEBTC demonstrations.

B.2 PROPOSAL SCHEDULE NOTES

Offeror shall submit prices on all items. The contractor shall provide all management, supervision, labor and equipment, and shall plan, schedule, coordinate and assure effective performance of all services/tasks as described in the RFP.

1. Only one contract will be awarded under this solicitation.
2. All costs associated with IDIQ CLINs 004.01, 004.02, 004.03, 004.04 and 004.05 below are “fully burdened rates, including profit” and all subcontractor cost.
3. The Government will issue delivery orders in accordance with the Ordering clause 52.216-18 and the Indefinite Quantity clause 52.216-22.
4. Minimum Guarantee

The guaranteed minimum that the Government is obligated to purchase under this contract is \$500,000 covered in the base period of the contract; no guarantee exists beyond the minimum.

5. Maximum Quantities

The maximum quantity is the total dollar value of the maximum quantity for each item as set forth in the indefinite-quantity portion of the schedule. The maximum quantity shall not exceed the total value of the IDIQ items, except as may be provided by formal modification to the contract.

¹ Full demonstrations will have 5000 treatment and 5000 control children. The 15 2012 sites are expected to consist of the 5 proof-of-concept demonstrations brought to full scale plus up to 10 new SEBTC demonstrations that start at full scale and provide variation in urban/rural location and other characteristics.

PRICING

(a) Insert the labor category and labor hours used to complete CLIN one (1) thru three (3) and the extended total below

Labor Category	Hours

(b) Insert the total fixed price for each Contract Line Items Numbers (CLIN) and total price.

(b) Insert the total fixed price for each Contract Line Items Numbers (CLIN) and total price.

CLIN #	Sub-CLIN	DESCRIPTION	Related Task	Total FIXED PRICE
001		<p><i><u>Start the <u>Evaluation of the Impact of the Summer Food for Children Household-based Demonstrations on Food Insecurity:</u></u></i></p> <p><i><u>Finalize the Research Design;</u></i></p> <p><i><u>Prepare to Conduct an Evaluation of 2011 Proof-of-Concept Demonstrations; and</u></i></p> <p><i><u>Write Stored-Benefit Alternative White Paper</u></i></p>		Insert Price below, in total.
	001.01	Summary of Research Approach and PowerPoint Slides	1	\$
	001.02	Finalize Proposed Research Design	2.1 – 2.2	\$
	001.03	2011 Data Collection and Analysis Plans	2.3	\$
	001.04	Develop and Test Data Collection Instruments	2.4	\$
	001.05	Obtain Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Clearance	2.5	\$
	001.06	Prepare Data Collector Training Materials	2.6	\$
	001.07	Stored Benefit Alternative White Paper	3	\$
Total Price for CLIN 001				\$

CLIN #	Sub-CLIN	DESCRIPTION	Related Task	Total Firm FIXED PRICE
002		<i>Complete the Process and Impact Evaluations of the 2011 SEBTC Proof-of-Concept Demonstrations; and Prepare for Process and Impact Evaluations of the 2012 SEBTC Full Demonstrations</i>		Insert Price below, in total.
	002.01	Conduct 2011 Data Collection	4	\$
	002.02	Analyze 2011 Data	4	\$
	002.03	Draft and Final Implementation Reports on the 2011 SEBTC Demonstrations	5.1 – 5.2	\$
	002.04	Assessment of Data Collection Approach and Methods	5.3	\$
	002.05	Draft and Final Congressional Status Report on 2011 Demonstrations	5.4 – 5.5	\$
	002.06	Draft, Final and Revised Evaluation Report on the 2011 SEBTC Demonstrations	5.6 – 5.8	\$
	002.07	Annual Presentations	5.9	\$
	002.08	2011 Documentation	6	\$
	002.09	Revise Study Plans for 2012 Data Collection	7	\$
Total Price for CLIN 002 (total price for Task 4 thru 7)				\$

CLIN #	Sub-CLIN	DESCRIPTION	Related Task	Total Firm FIXED PRICE
003		<p><i>Complete the Process and Impact Evaluations of the 2012 SEBTC Full Demonstrations;</i></p> <p><i>Complete Analysis and Documentation for Entire Project;</i></p> <p>Submit Final Report: <u>Evaluation of the Impact of the Summer Food for Children Household-based Demonstrations on Food Insecurity</u></p>		Insert Price below, in total.
	003.01	Conduct 2012 Data Collection	8	\$
	003.02	Analyze 2012 Data	8	\$
	003.03	Draft and Final Congressional Status Report on 2012 Demonstrations	9.1 – 9.2	\$
	003.04	Draft, Final and Revised Evaluation Report on the 2012 SEBTC Demonstrations	9.3 – 9.5	\$
	003.05	Annual Presentations	9.6	\$
	003.06	2012 Documentation	10	\$
	003.07	Comprehensive SEBTC Process and Impact Evaluation Report	11.1 – 11.5	\$
	003.08	Outline for and Supplement to Professional Journal	11.6 – 11.7	\$
	003.9	Presentations on Final Results	11.8	\$
	003.10	Final Comprehensive Documentation	12	\$
Total Price for CLIN 003 (total price for Task 8 thru 12)				\$

NOTE: The Government may exercise IDIQ CLNs at time of award.

Insert the total firm fixed price for each IDIQ and total price.

CLIN #	DESCRIPTION	IDIQ FIXED PRICE
004.01	<i>Process Evaluation of an SEBTC Demonstration</i> Estimated Quantity: up to 25 Unit Price:	\$
004.02	<i>Impact Evaluation of a Proof-of-Concept SEBTC Demonstration</i> Estimated Quantity: up to 10 Unit Price:	\$
004.03	<i>Impact Evaluation of a Full SEBTC Demonstration</i> Estimated Quantity: up to 20 Unit Price:	\$
004.04	<i>Post-Summer Conferences</i> Estimated Quantity: 2 Unit Price:	\$
004.05	<i>Presentations on Final Results</i> Estimated Quantity: 12 Unit Price:	\$

(c) Travel Costs:

Travel is expected. Cost for lodging, meals, and incidental expenses incurred by contractor personnel shall be considered to be reasonable and allowable to the extent they do not exceed on a daily basis the per diem rates set forth in the Federal Travel regulations, general service administration (GSA). Therefore, if travel costs are applicable and proposed by offerors, please be advised that they shall be calculated using the per diem rate schedule as established by GSA. Reimbursement of travel costs under any contract awarded from this RFP shall be in accordance with far 31.205-46.

SECTION C – PERFORMANCE WORK STATEMENT (PWS)

EVALUATION OF THE IMPACT OF THE SUMMER FOOD FOR CHILDREN HOUSEHOLD-BASED DEMONSTRATIONS ON FOOD INSECURITY

OVERVIEW

USDA is committed to ending childhood hunger by 2015. A key challenge in meeting this commitment is the problem of hunger and food insecurity in the summer months, when school is not in session. The Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) was created in 1968 to ensure that children in lower-income areas could continue to receive nutritious meals during long school vacations, when they do not have access to free or reduced-price school lunches or breakfasts. Some studies, however, show that food insecurity nonetheless continues to increase over the summer months, the period when free and reduced-price school lunches and breakfasts are unavailable to most children who qualify for them.

While the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) enriches the lives of millions of low-income children during the summer, both by making nutritious food available and by providing resources that support summer education and recreation programs, it reaches only a small fraction of the children served during the school year. Peak SFSP participation has rarely exceeded 10 to 15 percent of average participation in free and reduced-price school lunches. Aggressive initiatives to promote and expand SFSP over many years have met with limited success. And the problem of increased hunger in the summer persists.

The 2010 Agriculture Appropriations Act provided authority and funding to demonstrate and rigorously evaluate methods of reducing or preventing food insecurity and hunger among children in the summer months.² To this end, the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) will conduct the Summer Food for Children (SFC) Demonstrations, a range of demonstration projects that will take place in the summers of 2010 to 2013 to test enhancements to the existing Summer Food Service Program (SFSP), as well as ones that test new approaches to provide food benefits directly to households of children who are certified for free or reduced-price meals. As part of the SFC Demonstration initiative, FNS seeks contractors to design, conduct and report on rigorous and robust evaluations of the operations and impact of these demonstrations.

² The Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2010 (P.L. 111-80), Section 749(g), directed that:

(1) *The Secretary shall carry out demonstration projects to develop and test methods of providing access to food for children in urban and rural areas during the summer months when schools are not in regular session to--*

(A) reduce or eliminate the food insecurity and hunger of children; and

(B) improve the nutritional status of children. ...

(3)(A) *The Secretary shall provide for an independent evaluation of the demonstration projects carried out under this subsection, which shall use rigorous methodologies, including—*

(i) random assignment of children or schools, where practicable; or

(ii) if random assignment of children or schools is not practicable, quasi-experimental or other methods that are capable of producing scientifically valid information regarding which projects are effective in achieving the purposes described in [(A) and (B), above].

The Summer Food for Children (SFC) demonstrations consist of two main approaches. The first set consists of household-based demonstrations which will directly provide benefits to families for the purchase of food for their children in the summer months through electronic benefit transfer (EBT) technology. The evaluation of these demonstrations is the subject of this procurement. The second set will enhance existing SFSP operations to reach and serve more children during the summer. The second set of demonstrations is not part of this procurement. Table 1 provides an overview of the planned SFC demonstrations. FNS seeks to evaluate the SFC demonstrations under three independent contracts for evaluation services. Interested firms may bid on one, two or all contracts. Either way, coordination and cooperation among the contracts will be required as it is essential to form an overall picture of the outcome of the SFC demonstrations. The evaluations will help FNS determine the most efficient ways to reach and improve the food security and nutritional status of school-aged children during the summer.

Through THIS solicitation FNS seeks an evaluation contractor to:

- 1. Assess and compare the operations and impact of two EBT approaches, SNAP-based and WIC-based, to provide summer child nutrition benefits directly to households with children certified for free or reduced-price school meals; and,**
- 2. Prepare a white paper exploring the feasibility, advantages and risks of using stored-benefit (e.g., store “gift card”) technology to provide food benefits directly to households for children certified for free or reduced-price meals.** The essential goal of the white paper is to enable FNS to determine whether to demonstrate and evaluate this type of benefit delivery mechanism.

There is a ceiling of \$24,500,000 for all aspects of the base contract from award to completion. The successful bidder will be the one whose proposal, when technical merit, price and risk of failing to address all objectives within price are considered, represents the best value to the Government.

The two household-based approaches to be evaluated under this procurement will be referred to as the Summer Electronic Benefits Transfer for Children (SEBTC) demonstrations. They will deliver benefits to households of K-12 school children certified for free and reduced-price school meals under the National School Lunch Program using the EBT technology and processes of (1) the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SEBTC-SNAP) or (2) the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (SEBTC-WIC). In both demonstration categories, eligible households will receive an EBT card good for food purchases at grocery stores during the summer. In the SNAP model, SEBTC benefits will be issued and redeemed under SNAP procedures (i.e., used to purchase SNAP-authorized foods from SNAP-authorized retailers). In the WIC model, SEBTC benefits will be issued and redeemed under WIC procedures (i.e., used to purchase *prescribed* foods available in the WIC children’s’ food package, though amounts may vary.³ Outcomes will include, but are not limited to, measures of:

³ It is important to recognize that while SEBTC demonstrations cross program lines they are fundamentally child nutrition programs: eligibility for summer benefits is determined solely by the free or reduced-price status of children in the household; neither the SNAP nor WIC programs are involved in eligibility determination, their involvement is with issuance and redemption.

food security and nutritional status among children certified for free or reduced-price meals. In addition, customer satisfaction, operational efficiency, and integrity at the Federal, State, local and household levels will be assessed.

The scale of SEBTC demonstration operations will be major and the role of the contractor significant. The overall effort will involve as many as 15 demonstration sites that collectively feed as many as 75,000 children over the summers of 2011 through 2013. The household-based effort will begin in the summer of 2011 with an estimated 3 SEBTC-SNAP and 2 SEBTC-WIC demonstrations, each with a sample of about 10,000 participants per demonstration site randomly assigned to control and treatment. The number of SEBTC demonstrations and children served will increase significantly in 2012 if the 2011 demonstrations are successful in providing food benefits to participants. FNS expects the 2012 demonstrations to continue in 2013.

FNS anticipates that grant awards to States for the operation of SEBTC-SNAP and SEBTC-WIC demonstrations in the summer of 2011 will be made in November 2010. Therefore, many demonstration design choices already will have been determined by the time the evaluation contract begins. The Requests for Application (RFAs) for States to compete to operate SEBTC-SNAP and SEBTC-WIC demonstrations, along with other background material, can be found at <http://www.fns.usda.gov/ora/menu/DemoProjects/SummerFood/Announcement.htm>.

Under the base contract, the winner of this solicitation will be expected to advise and support FNS and the States which will operate the SEBTC demonstrations by:

- conducting a rigorous and robust evaluation of the 2011 and 2012 demonstrations;
- supporting the States implementing the 2011 and 2012 demonstrations (e.g., through assistance with random assignment and opt-out notification);
- helping FNS determine the most promising 2011 demonstrations to expand in the summer of 2012 and helping FNS select new demonstration sites to start implementation in 2012;
- implementing optimal research designs for evaluating and comparing the demonstrations so that data for outcome measures are collected in the summers of 2011 through 2012;
- maximizing comparability of outcome measures from multiple demonstration sites located across the nation, operating at different times, and continuing for varying lengths of time;
- preparing a white paper exploring the feasibility, benefits and risks of demonstrating a third type of household-based benefit, the stored-benefit (i.e., gift) card;
- reporting results in time for USDA policy officials' 2014 preparations for reauthorization of the Child Nutrition Programs;
- allowing sufficient time for independent peer review and contractor response before reports are final; and,
- supporting FNS in meeting Congressional requirements for annual reports on demonstration progress and findings.

SEBTC DEMONSTRATION OVERVIEW

Schedule

- Summer 2011 Proof-of-Concept (POC) Demonstrations. Two to four SEBTC-SNAP and one to two SEBTC-WIC demonstrations will operate to establish the feasibility of the approaches and provide a field test of the evaluation methodology.
- Summer 2012 Expansion of POC Demonstrations. The treatment group in successful proof-of-concept demonstrations will be increased so that a full-sample impact evaluation is conducted.
- Additional Demonstrations Started in New Sites. Six to ten additional SEBTC-SNAP and one to four additional SEBTC-WIC demonstrations will begin operations to be included in the process and impact evaluations.
- Summer 2013 Successful demonstrations continue. These are not part of the base contract. CLIN 004 provides for process and impact evaluations of them.

TABLE 1: SUMMER FOOD FOR CHILDREN DEMONSTRATIONS – OPERATION OVERVIEW

Demonstration Category	Summer 2010	Summer 2011	Summer 2012	Summer 2013	Reporting
Strengthen the SFSP					
(i) Incentives to extend the duration of program operations; (ii) funding for enrichment activities at summer sites	2 demonstrations (statewide)	The 2 demonstrations continue operations			
(iii) Non-congregate meals-on-wheels in rural areas; (iv) “backpack” food packages for consumption over weekends		2 demonstrations	The 2 demonstrations continue operations		
Develop household-based SEBTC alternatives					
Electronic benefit card that uses the SNAP EBT infrastructure to reach low-income families with school children at the end of the school year	FNS releases RFAs soliciting applications to conduct proof-of-concept demonstrations	2 – 4 proof-of-concept (POC) demonstrations of SEBTC-SNAP	√ Expand successful POC demonstrations √ Add 6 – 10 sites that provide variation in geography, benefit, demographics, etc.	Continue successful demonstrations for another year	<u>October 2011, 2012, 2013:</u> Annual reports for Congress <u>Spring 2012, 2013:</u> Final evaluations of the preceding summer <u>Spring 2013 (base) or Spring 2014 (CLIN 004):</u> Comprehensive evaluation results available for discussion on CN reauthorization
Electronic benefit card that uses the WIC EBT infrastructure		1 - 2 POC demonstrations of SEBTC-WIC	√ Expand successful POC demonstrations √ Add 1 – 4 sites that provide variation in geography, benefit, demographics, etc.	Continue successful demonstrations for another year	
Electronic benefit card that uses stored benefit (“gift”) infrastructure (SEBTC-Gift)		White paper on benefits and risks of gift card approach	Challenge grants to develop technology that can address risks	1 POC demonstration of SEBTC-Gift	

Blue shading shows the portions of the SFC demonstrations that are the subject of THIS procurement.

Operational Assumptions

The competitive Requests for Application (RFAs) for SEBTC-SNAP and SEBTC-WIC released to States can be found at

<http://www.fns.usda.gov/ora/menu/DemoProjects/SummerFood/Announcement.htm>. These RFAs give the best description of FNS' assumptions about the operation of the demonstrations. Other information may also be posted on the website. FNS will provide more current information at the pre-proposal bidders' conference. **Offerors should bear in mind that FNS continues to update its plans and assumptions. The assumptions contained in the SOW and the RFAs on the website are a starting point for offerors to develop their proposed research design.**

Operational Highlights

- Demonstrations of SEBTC-WIC will be operated only in States that have operational *online* WIC EBT systems.
- For both SEBTC-WIC and SEBTC-SNAP each demonstration area will be defined as contiguous school districts that contain 10,000 to 12,000 K-12 students certified eligible for free or reduced-price (FRP) meals. The proposed demonstration area can be urban (e.g., a small portion of a School Food Authority [SFA] in a large city) or rural (e.g., many contiguous SFAs in sparsely populated areas). **Proposed demonstration areas must have 10,000 to 12,000 children certified for free or reduced-price meals but may vary in geographic size according to population density.**
- For the 2011 proof-of-concept demonstration, the treatment group will consist of 2,500 children per demonstration site. For the 2012 demonstrations, 5,000 children per demonstration site will be in the treatment group.
- Within each demonstration area, eligible children shall be aggregated into households; and then consenting households containing eligible children shall be randomly assigned to treatment or control groups. Households in the treatment group will receive a benefit card good for all eligible children in the household (i.e., there will be one physical card but the benefit amount varies by the number of eligible children). Controls will not receive a benefit card. Both treatment and control children continue to be eligible to receive meals at sites subsidized by the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP). Data collection and analysis plans to address dual participation in SFSP and SEBTC must be considered in the evaluation proposal.
- During the proof-of-concept demonstrations, one benefit level will be tested (e.g., \$60 per eligible child per month). In 2012, several benefit amount levels may be tested in SEBTC-SNAP demonstrations based on different metrics (e.g., monthly value of the food portion of NSLP reimbursement, average per meal cost of the Thrifty Food Plan, monthly value of school lunches and breakfasts, etc.). The SEBTC-WIC benefit level will stay at the same level in both 2011 and later summers.
- Under the SEBTC-SNAP demonstrations, the benefit card may be used to purchase SNAP eligible foods at SNAP authorized retailers. In SEBTC-WIC, the benefit card may be used to

purchase foods in a prescribed children's food package (including the value of fruit and vegetable cash vouchers) at WIC-authorized vendors.

- Under the demonstration agreements with States, food benefit costs and State, local, and EBT processor administrative costs will be paid by FNS. These include costs that States, Local Education Agencies (LEAs) and EBT processors will incur to implement the demonstrations and cooperate with evaluation data collection requirements. Therefore, offerors should NOT include these costs in their business proposals.
- In each area, the benefit cards will be distributed to participants in the treatment group about the last week of the school year.
- For demonstration families who do NOT participate in either SNAP or WIC, cards will be branded differently than those used in the regular SNAP and WIC programs. For demonstration families who DO participate in either SNAP or WIC, States bidding on the RFA may choose to integrate summer food benefits onto existing SNAP cards for those families participating in SNAP while providing non-SNAP families a separate SEBTC card.⁴
- The evaluation contractor, working with the EBT processor, will track the benefit redemption (transaction) stream of each card in order to determine how much of the benefits each household used when and where.
- States shall not operate both an SEBTC-SNAP and an SEBTC-WIC demonstration in the same area simultaneously.

SCOPE OF WORK

This scope of work provides an overview of the purposes, objectives, design and activities of this contract. Detailed requirements of this contract appear in the Tasks and Deliverables.

Purpose

SEBTC Evaluation

The purpose of this procurement is to design and conduct a rigorous evaluation of the SEBTC-SNAP and SEBTC-WIC demonstrations that responds to the mandate in law, and answers other important research questions. This will include comprehensive evaluation of demonstration process and demonstration impact on the food security and nutritional status of participating (treatment and control) children.

⁴ For households that participate in SNAP, this hybrid model would allow folding the summer benefit into the SNAP allotment and following all SNAP rules regarding issuance and expunging of benefits. Households that are not SNAP participants would receive a separate card which might have different expunging rules (see demonstration details section in the RFA). If a State proposes to use a hybrid model, FNS will also entertain applications that propose to randomly assign SNAP families so that some receive summer benefits on their SNAP card and some receive summer benefits on an SEBTC card. This approach would potentially provide a strong basis for determining the impact of a single, integrated card on consumer acceptance, benefit usage, operational efficiency, and administrative costs.

The evaluation of these projects is intended to provide policymakers with clear, rigorous and timely findings to make decisions about potential changes to Federal summer feeding programs during the next Child Nutrition reauthorization cycle. In all, we anticipate as many as 15 different demonstration sites for household-based SEBTC demonstrations serving perhaps as many as 75,000 children over the course of the project.

The SEBTC demonstrations will begin with small, “proof-of-concept” projects to determine the basic feasibility of each. Proof-of-Concept demonstration sites will contain 10,000 to 12,000 participants. Of the children in consenting households, 2500 will receive benefits and the remainder (about 7500) will be able to serve as controls.⁵ The size of the treatment group in successful proof-of-concept approaches will be expanded in subsequent summers from 2500 to 5000 and the controls reduced to about 5000. In addition, new demonstration sites will be added for an estimated total of 15 demonstration sites operating in 2012 and continuing in 2013. These new full demonstration sites will also contain 10,000 consenting participants, half receiving benefits and half acting as controls. The evaluations of the proof-of-concept and the full demonstrations should be mostly the same, collecting and analyzing the same information with the same data collection instruments. The proof-of-concept study should address the added aspect of feasibility of the SEBTC concept.

Primarily, the SEBTC evaluations will examine how the provision of summer food benefits to the households of children certified for free or reduced-price school meals (under either the WIC or SNAP approach) impacts the prevalence of very low food security among children certified for free or reduced-price meals as well as their nutritional status. Nutritional status will be examined with relatively simple measures of food choices, nutritional behaviors and Body Mass Index (BMI). Other effects, such as perceptions of parents and changes in household food supply and food expenditures, are of secondary importance, but may be considered if resources permit.

In addition to impact measures, the evaluation will document the process and challenges of implementing the SEBTC demonstrations. The results will provide valuable information to States considering applying for additional demonstrations as well as if the demonstrations lead to policy changes.

Stored-Benefit Card White Paper

The purpose of this white paper is to help FNS determine whether to solicit States to operate demonstrations of a stored-benefit (e.g., store gift-card) household-based approach. Should FNS decide to demonstrate the approach, evaluation will be performed under a separate independent procurement issued in 2011 or 2012. The white paper will explore the feasibility, benefits and risks of a household-based stored-benefit delivery mechanism which will enable FNS to determine whether to demonstrate this type of benefit delivery mechanism. The white paper

⁵ FNS does not require the contractor to interview all 10,000 participants in a demonstration area. The 10,000 figure was set to ensure that there would be available a sufficient number of participants to measure changes in the level of very low food security among children. Offerors should propose to interview whatever numbers of treatment and control participants are needed under their proposed research design to measure changes in very low food security among children at the level of precision they are committing to.

should report on gift-card market conditions, including, but not limited to, the availability, characteristics and costs of these cards. The paper should also explore the risks of utilizing gift-cards for benefit delivery such as the likelihood of leakage of benefits to non-food purchases or transfer of benefits to non-eligible persons.

Objectives

A. SEBTC Evaluation

The contractor shall develop a rigorous research design, data collection instruments, and analysis plan with a robust methodological approach; conduct the specified data collection; analyze the data; and, answer research questions associated with the following key research objectives:

1. Determine the operational feasibility of SEBTC-SNAP and SEBTC-WIC.
2. Determine the impact of participation in SEBTC-SNAP and SEBTC-WIC on the level of very low food security among children among demonstration participants.
3. Determine the impact of participation in SEBTC-SNAP and SEBTC-WIC on the nutritional status of demonstration participants.
4. Compare and contrast the impacts on very low food security and nutrition status among children for households that participate in SNAP vs. households that do not participate in SNAP.
5. Determine how impacts on very low food security and nutrition status among children vary by:
 - 5.1. type of intervention (SEBTC-SNAP vs. SEBTC-WIC)
 - 5.2. recipient characteristics (e.g., grade level, household size and income, number of children in household, urban/rural location of recipient household, etc.)
 - 5.3. location in urban and rural areas, which will be varied across the 2012 demonstrations
 - 5.4. participation in the SFSP, WIC, and NSLP/SBP⁶ programs
 - 5.5. monthly dollar value of demonstration benefit, which may be varied in some of the 2012 demonstrations
 - 5.6. acceptance, receipt and usage of a household-based benefit among various groups (i.e., families that received and used a household-based demonstration benefit card vs. families who did not accept or who received but did not use a household-based

⁶ The demonstration includes only children certified for free and reduced-price meals – some of whom will participate (i.e., eat) in school meals, some of whom will not, a distinction that may affect food security levels.

demonstration benefit card). Were redemptions predominantly at supermarkets or not? What percentage of total benefit amount was used? Were benefits exhausted before end-of-month? etc.

- 5.7. baseline levels of household food security and nutrition status among children
- 5.8. household food expenditures (e.g., households in which the summer benefit increases total household food expenditures vs. households in which the summer benefit is used to free up resources for non-food items)
- 5.9. where children eat meals during the summer (e.g., SFSP site, relatives, home, etc.)
6. Describe and document the process of project implementation, including:
 - 6.1. process for distribution of demonstration cards to participating households
 - 6.2. timing and methods of informing parents and caretakers of the availability, benefits, and procedures of the demonstration
 - 6.3. process for obtaining consent and the rates of consent
 - 6.4. design, delivery, timing, and effectiveness of training made available to participating schools, parents, food retailers and others
 - 6.5. roles and responsibilities of those involved in implementation in the State, demonstration schools, and EBT processors
 - 6.6. procedures for and frequency of replacement cards for benefits reported lost, stolen or destroyed
 - 6.7. administrative controls and other actions to maintain program integrity and prevent loss, theft and improper issuance
 - 6.8. role and involvement of other community organizations, such as local SNAP offices, local WIC offices, and anti-hunger advocates
 - 6.9. challenges encountered and resolved
7. Determine and document the total and component costs of implementing and operating the demonstrations to support distinctions between and comparisons among:
 - 7.1. the organization incurring costs (Federal, State, local, and EBT processor)
 - 7.2. administrative costs of start-up
 - 7.3. administrative costs of ongoing operations

- 7.4. benefit obligations and actual costs
 - 7.5. total, average, and range of costs (administrative and benefit) in the aggregate and per unit (per school, school-aged child and household; per reduction in child hunger).
 - 7.6. demonstration intervention (SEBTC-SNAP v. SEBTC-WIC)
 8. Assess the impact of the availability of a summer benefit on the aggregate number of children or households certified for or participating in NSLP, SBP, SNAP and SFSP
- B. White Paper
1. Provide FNS with market information necessary to determine whether to solicit state interest in conducting an SEBTC demonstration using a stored-benefit gift-card as the benefit delivery mechanism by describing:
 - 1.1 the state of the stored-benefit market
 - 1.2 whether cards can be enabled for use at multiple grocery chains
 - 1.3 whether cards can be limited to purchase of food only
 - 1.4 expected developments in technology within the next 2 years
 2. Evaluate the benefits and risks, from USDA's perspective, of using stored-benefit technology to deliver summer food benefits for children, paying special attention to:
 - 2.1 the anticipated cost differential between EBT and gift card delivery
 - 2.2 ease of use for client, State and retailer
 - 2.3 whether benefits can be made available on a monthly basis or must be provided as a lump-sum at the start of the summer
 - 2.4 the risk that cards will be trafficked or used by non-family individuals
 - 2.5 the ability to require a PIN with gift cards
 - 2.6 the difference between EBT and gift card delivery in regard to tracking and identifying redemption transactions by store and household
 - 2.7 whether there are procedures that would allow lost cards to be replaced without risking double benefit issuance

Evaluation Activities

To accomplish these purposes and objectives, we anticipate that the evaluation contractor will need to plan, design, and carry out a strategy to collect, analyze and report information on:

- The process of establishing, launching, and operating each SEBTC demonstration, including schedule, roles and responsibilities, implementation issues, and feasibility;
- The food security status of treatment and control children, especially very low food security, as measured through USDA’s methodology used in the Food Security Supplement of the Census Bureau’s Current Population Survey (or an alternative acceptable to FNS);
- Household benefit transaction data as provided by the redemptions associated with each card (i.e., from the EBT transaction data);
- Key food choices and nutrition status of participating children, as well as their BMI ;
- A range of child and household characteristics, circumstances and behaviors to assess the relationship between these factors and demonstration impacts; and
- The costs of demonstration operation, broken out by start-up and on-going expenses, benefits, and any other costs of the SEBTC demonstrations that are incurred by Federal, State and local governments, providers, and retailers.

Evaluation Design

The research design must be rigorous enough to support reliable comparisons between the demonstration sites, as well as between treatment and control groups within each demonstration site. We expect that the households of eligible participants will be randomly assigned to the treatment group to receive demonstration benefits or to the control group. We anticipate that data on food security status among children, food choices, nutrition behaviors, BMI and a range of other circumstances and characteristics will need to be collected from households at their homes.

While the Instructions to Offerors (Section L) provide the most definitive information on what proposals must contain in regard to evaluation design, some aspects are so important that they are included here. These key evaluation design parameters include:

1. While the 2011 proof-of-concept and the 2012/2013 “full” demonstration areas both include contiguous school districts with 10,000 to 12,000 K-12 children certified for free and reduced-price meals, the number of children in the treatment group will be lower at the proof-of-concept stage than at the full stage. The process evaluation will be the same for both proof-of-concept and full demonstrations. The data collection for the impact evaluation is intended to be more rigorous, detecting smaller changes in levels of food insecurity among children, at the full demonstration level. At the proof-of-concept level impact data collection is intended to enable a field test of proposed methods and resulting response rates and to give

an assessment of impact but not at the level of precision (minimum detectable difference) required for the full demonstrations.

2. At the full demonstration level, the design must be able to detect policy relevant changes in food insecurity among children with 95% confidence and 80% power. **Policy interest is focused on households with very low food security among children, as measured by the Food Security Supplement to the Current Population Survey.** Offerors are expected to specify the minimum difference their proposed technical approach will detect and commit to achieving that level of detection in the evaluation should they win. In determining their proposed level, offerors should bear in mind that in 2008:
 - a. among all households with children, 1.3% experienced very low food security among children;
 - b. among households with children and income less than 185% of poverty (a level consistent with the income eligibility limits for school meal programs), 3.1% experienced very low food security among children;
 - c. households that received a free or reduced-price lunch or participated in SNAP in the past 30 days generally have higher than average rates of food insecurity among children (about 15% experienced low or very low food security among children on average in 2006-07);
 - d. slightly under 6% of all households had very low food security; and,
 - e. among households with incomes below 185% of poverty, about 15% experienced very low food security.

These statistics suggest that the overall prevalence of very low food security among children is relatively low, but likely to be higher among the target population – children certified for free and reduced price school meals – of interest in this evaluation.

3. Offerors should specify the sample sizes required within each demonstration site in order to detect differences in food insecurity among children between treatment and control families in aggregate and by subgroup. The demonstrations will involve 10,000 to 12,000 eligible K-12 participants per demonstration site. In the proof-of-concept demonstration 2,500 participants per site will receive benefits, and 5,000 per site will receive benefits in 2012 and 2013.⁷ The number of treatment and control participants sampled for interviews should be chosen by the offeror to maximize power for analyzing impacts on very low food security and nutritional status among children for each of the various interventions with both aggregate and subgroup analyses. A minimum of three subgroup analyses that compare the impacts on food security and nutrition status among children are required: one subgroup must compare SNAP participants vs. non-participants; the two other subgroups will be determined by FNS in consultation with the contractor. Given that food insecurity among children is the most important measure in this evaluation and among the most sensitive measures to sample size, offerors shall explicitly discuss the sample size necessary within each demonstration area in order to detect differences in food insecurity among children at

⁷ FNS does not require the contractor to interview all 10,000 participants in a demonstration area. The 10,000 figure was set to ensure that there would be available a sufficient number of participants to measure changes in the level of very low food security among children. Offerors should propose to interview whatever numbers of treatment and control participants are needed under their proposed research design to measure changes in very low food security among children at the level of precision and power they are committing to.

various levels (very low, low, and secure) between treatment and control families. Offerors shall discuss how they will combine samples across demonstration areas in order to detect smaller differences.

4. Offerors shall note that full conformance is required with the Office of Management and Budget standards and guidelines for surveys.⁸ Offerors shall note that an 80% response rate is required by OMB and that if the response rate is less, a nonresponse bias analysis is mandatory.
5. The Agency considers the USDA methodology used in the Food Security Supplement to the Current Population Survey to be the best means of measuring very low food security among children. However, offerors may propose other approaches to use in addition if they consider them better suited to specific components of the evaluation.
6. Random assignment to treatment and control shall be used in order to have a robust evaluation. Children certified for free and reduced-price meals shall be aggregated into households and the households randomly assigned to treatment and control. Offerors shall explicitly discuss how they propose to conduct randomization at the household level, the tradeoffs between the different choices, and the robustness of the results their design will deliver. Offerors should explain how practical issues and challenges of random assignment will be addressed.
7. Cross-site and cross-demonstration model comparability is important for the evaluation. In their proposals offerors shall discuss their plans to maximize the ability to compare results across sites testing the same model and across sites testing different models. Offerors shall discuss how the randomization approach they propose will allow them to combine samples across demonstrations to increase the ability to detect small changes in levels of very low food security among children and/or to enhance subgroup analyses.
8. As the existing Summer Food Service Program will continue to operate in demonstration sites, the evaluation design must be able to distinguish between participants that received only SEBTC benefits and those which received both the SEBTC benefit and subsidized meals at SFSP sites. The proposal should also discuss how it will collect information on the frequency of SFSP meal receipt of participants.
9. Offerors shall explain and justify their proposed procedures for ensuring that high response rates are obtained and demonstrate their understanding and acceptance of OMB standards and guidelines for calculating response rates and actions that are required if response rates are under 80%.

While the parameters above are some of the most important considerations in developing the proposed evaluation design, there are additional important considerations offerors should bear in mind. See Instructions to Offerors for complete information on what the proposal must contain.

Evaluation Reporting

⁸ See: http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/assets/omb/inforeg/statpolicy/standards_stat_surveys.pdf.

To support timely policy decisions, the final comprehensive evaluation report for all demonstrations must be completed by Spring 2013 (base contract only) or Spring 2014 (if CLIN 004 is ordered). In addition, several significant reports are needed before then, including:

- An early “heads up” report on the operational viability of the SEBTC concept based on review of the experience (successes and failures) during the first month of operations in the proof of concept demonstrations, due June 2011.
- An end-of-summer report on the efficacy of data collection approach, methods, response rates and other factors that bear on the contractor’s ability to deliver a rigorous, robust, and accurately executed process and impact evaluation of the 2012 “full” demonstrations, due September 2011.
- Annual Congressional Status Reports that will form the basis for FNS’ submission of required annual reports to Congress. These reports will provide (i) detailed implementation status and (ii) early results of process and impact evaluations of each SEBTC demonstration conducted during each preceding summer, due October 2011, 2012, and 2013 (if CLIN 004 is ordered).
- Annual evaluation reports that will provide the complete (final) process and impact evaluation results of each summer’s demonstrations, due March 2012, 2013, and 2014 (if CLIN 004 is ordered).

PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

Proposals must address the instructions, assumptions, and requirements described in *Section L: Instructions to Offerors* of this solicitation.

TASKS AND DELIVERABLES

The contractor shall perform all tasks and deliver all intermediate memos and documents and in-person briefings needed to address the study objectives and deliver the major deliverables below in final form acceptable to FNS.

BASE CONTRACT – Research Design, Evaluation of 2011 Proof-of-Concept Demonstrations, 2012 Full Demonstrations, White Paper, Final Reporting and Documentation

Finalize research design including OMB package, evaluate up to 5 SEBTC-SNAP and SEBTC-WIC 2011 proof-of-concept demonstrations, conduct a full, high precision, evaluation of up to 15 SEBTC 2012 full demonstrations, write a stored-benefit card white paper, and submit final reports and documentation.

Task 1 – Orientation Meeting Presentation

For the orientation meeting the contractor shall conduct a thorough presentation and discussion of the proposed approach to developing the research design and data collection plans and the tasks to be performed to achieve the study objectives. The meeting agenda shall be flexible to ensure that FNS senior leaders are able to attend relevant portions of the meeting.

Deliverable 1: Summary of Research Approach and PowerPoint Slides. As part of the orientation, the contractor shall provide PowerPoint slides and a 10 to 15 page narrative summary describing the contractor's proposed approach. These should be presented in sufficient detail for members of the professional public who have not read the proposal or the RFP to understand the proposed study.

Task 2 – Finalize Proposed Research Design

The contractor shall finalize the proposed design and methodology based on meetings with FNS staff, independent experts retained by FNS, and organizations with significant interest in the summer demonstrations. This revised plan shall not change the Scope of Work nor have a substantial impact on either the depth or quality of the research questions to be answered by the contractor's proposal or the contractor's ability to do so within the awarded budget. No revisions or changes to the contract shall occur without the approval of the contracting officer.

Deliverable 2.1 – 2.2: Revised and Final Evaluation Design. Based upon discussions with FNS staff, independent experts retained by FNS, and organizations with significant interest in the summer demonstration, the contractor shall revise and finalize the research design for the 2011 demonstrations. The deliverable shall include a report assessing challenges to successful design and execution of the evaluation. It shall identify areas of agreement and disagreement among the stakeholders and recommend a revised research design. The Final Evaluation Design shall include:

- a complete list of demonstration and evaluation challenges and considerations;

- recommendations to address and resolve the challenges in order to ensure successful demonstration and rigorous evaluation of the SEBTC demonstrations;
- a research design that revises and expands upon the process and impact research designs in their proposal;
- updated and more detailed plans for approaching State agencies, school districts, EBT processors, SFSP sponsors, benefit recipient households and others that are likely to maximize cooperation with the data collection; and,
- memoranda of Understanding that will be used during data collection that detail the decisions reached between the contractor and State agencies.

Deliverable 2.3: Revised 2011 Data Collection/Analysis Plans. This plan shall update the original study proposal; include a database development plan; and, incorporate information obtained from States, school districts, and EBT processors about the availability of specific data at the student and EBT processor levels, and other data as needed. It should indicate what data are available from extant data sources and what data will require primary data collection.

Deliverable 2.4: Data Collection Instruments and Test Report. This deliverable shall include all data collection instruments required for both the process and impact evaluations. The deliverable shall include the results of a pretest of the survey instruments and proposed field procedures. The pretest shall be conducted at a minimum number of sites not to be included in the study. No single instrument, however, shall be tested on more than nine respondents. The results of this pretest will be used to refine the instruments prior to submission for OMB approval. Before initiating the pretest, the contractor shall submit the instrument package and proposed field procedures to FNS for review and approval.

Deliverable 2.5: OMB Package.⁹ This package shall request OMB approval for all data collection activities. The package shall contain copies of all instruments and a supporting statement as set forth in either the revised Standard Form No. 83a, “Instructions for Requesting OMB Approval under the Federal Reports Act, as Amended” or the most recent federal requirements in effect on the date of submission. The OMB package shall provide an explicit and concise description of the links between the study objectives, research questions, variables, instrument items, data analysis plans and desired products. It shall include a summary of public comments received in response to the 60-Day Federal Register Notice concerning the information collection and in response to independent peer reviewers selected by FNS and any actions taken in response to these comments. The contractor shall make any necessary changes that result from the information collection review and approval process. The OMB package shall be revised as needed until approval is received from OMB.

Deliverable 2.6: Data Collector Training Package and Manual for 2011. The contractor shall develop and deliver data collection training manuals to accompany the 2011 data collection instruments for use by both the field personnel and data processors. The training package shall include, at a minimum, an overview of the study, data collection instruments,

⁹ Before this procurement is awarded, FNS will prepare and submit the 60-day Notice for clearance and publication in the Federal Register in conformance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 so that process evaluation data can be collected before the end of the 2010-2011 school year.

procedures for data collection and simulated data collection exercises. This data collection training manual shall be submitted to FNS for review and approval. Following receipt of FNS comments and any changes to study plan or instruments required by OMB, the contractor shall provide FNS with a final data collection training manual within one week after OMB approval of the study.

Task 3 – Stored-Benefit Alternative White Paper

Deliverable 3.1: Draft Request for Information (RFI) for FNS to issue in the *Commerce Business Daily*. The RFI should solicit information on current and expected future technological capabilities of stored-benefit cards, especially including the ability to enable use at multiple food retailers and the ability to restrict use to food items within those stores.

Deliverable 3.2 - 3.3: Draft and Final White Paper on the benefits and risks of “gift” card technology. The white paper shall be based on responses to the RFI and consultations with up to 9 experts in the field. The paper shall address the applicability of gift card technology for providing summer food benefits to families while maintaining program integrity. The paper shall describe the current state of “gift” card technology (e.g., beyond retailer name, can restrictions on use be imposed such as limiting use to food items), estimate likely developments in technology within the next 2 years, assess whether, from the perspective of USDA, the benefits of gift card technology outweigh the risks, such as trafficking of benefits, and recommend whether or not to invest further resources to develop a demonstration of the use of gift cards for summer benefits in 2012 or 2013.

Task 4 – Collect and Analyze 2011 Data

Following the plans and protocols approved in Task 2, contractor shall collect both process and impact data from up to 5 SEBTC proof-of-concept demonstrations (2 to 4 of the SNAP-EBT model and 1 to 2 of the WIC-EBT model). A complete and thorough process evaluation shall be conducted on each proof-of-concept demonstration. The impact data collection shall be designed to constitute a field test of the methods proposed to measure and analyze impact. Enough data shall be collected such that an analysis and reporting of the impact on food insecurity among children is possible, but at a lower level of precision (minimum detectable difference) than that planned for the full demonstrations in 2012.

Task 5—2011 Demonstration Reports

Deliverable 5.1 – 5.2: Draft and Final Implementation Report on the 2011 SEBTC Demonstrations. No later than June 30, 2011, the contractor shall deliver a report describing the implementation of the SNAP-based and WIC-EBT-based demonstrations. This report shall provide an early “heads up” on the successes and challenges of the SEBTC concept based on the first month’s results and experiences of the proof-of-concept tests. This deliverable shall document and report on visible successes and failures of major processes and address key operational questions, such as: What percent of the parents/guardians of free or reduced-price students were schools able to identify and contact? How rigorously was random assignment of students accomplished? What percent of cards were distributed to the

parent/guardian selected for inclusion in the treatment group? Which aspects of the demonstration operated as planned; which experienced significant problems? If data are available, how many families redeemed benefits (in what amount)? Were EBT processors able to keep separate account of summer benefits? What, if any, lessons were learned in the first month of operations?

Deliverable 5.3: Assessment of Data Collection Approach and Methods. This deliverable shall document and report on an end-of-summer assessment of the efficacy of sampling plans, interview protocols and questionnaires, approach to randomization and household opt-in or opt-out, ability to find and interview households, refusal conversion protocols, overall and item response rates, data coding and quality checks, and other aspects of the methodology that bear on the contractor's ability to conduct and deliver a rigorous, robust, and accurately executed process and impact evaluation of the 2012 "full" SEBTC demonstrations.

Deliverable 5.4 – 5.5: Draft and Final Congressional Status Report on the 2011 SEBTC Demonstrations. This deliverable shall comprise a major portion of FNS' submission of the required Congressional report due December 31, 2011. To allow sufficient time for FNS review and clearance, the **final** version of the report must be delivered by **October 8, 2011**. It shall include:

- a report on the status of the SEBTC proof-of-concept demonstration projects;
- process and impact evaluation results available to date, including overall and item response rates (treatment, control, total) by site and over all demonstrations;
- a summary of project accomplishments to date; and,
- plans for 2012/13.

Deliverable 5.6 - 5.8: Draft, Revised and Final Evaluation Report on the 2011 SEBTC Demonstrations. This deliverable shall cover the complete process and impact evaluations of the 2011 proof-of-concept demonstrations and the contractor's final conclusions regarding the ongoing feasibility of the SEBTC concept. It shall include:

- process evaluation results for each site and overall;
- impact evaluation results for each site and overall;
- discussion of key lessons learned;
- conclusions concerning the feasibility of the SEBTC-SNAP and SEBTC-WIC models;
- recommendations for changes to the implementation of the demonstrations that may improve operations in 2012; and,
- recommendations for improvements in the evaluation design for 2012 including estimate of cost and delivery schedule impacts for each recommended improvement.

Deliverable 5.9: Annual Presentations. The contractor shall conduct a 60-minute executive briefing for USDA policy officials at the Whitten Building (or other location agreeable to FNS) as well as a 3-hour briefing for FNS staff in Alexandria, Virginia (or other location agreeable to FNS) presenting an overview of the study design, detailed presentation of the findings for each intervention, and overall conclusions. The presentation shall include visual display materials and handouts. The presentation shall be prepared in PowerPoint or

similar format that is agreeable to FNS. Copies of the draft visual display materials and handouts shall be submitted to FNS for review two weeks prior to the presentation. Final visual display materials and handouts shall be submitted to FNS for approval 3 working days prior to the presentation.

Task 6 – 2011 Documentation

Deliverable 6.1: 2011 Datafiles and Codebooks. Following the procedures described in the approved Data Collection Plan/Analysis Plan, the contractor shall create the database analytic files and documentation. At a minimum, the creation of these data files shall include a 100 percent manual edit, verified data entry procedures, machine editing, and the production of descriptive statistics to ensure the integrity of the study data set. If the contractor perceives a need to make any changes to the database framework after the revised Database Development Plan was approved, the contractor shall submit a Memorandum of Intent outlining these changes for FNS approval. Each time a version of a report (draft, revised and final) is submitted the contractor shall simultaneously provide FNS with the appropriate analytic database (not public use files) and documentation to enable FNS to independently replicate all analyses in the report.

Deliverable 6.2: 2011 Public Use Files. The contractor shall prepare and submit a set of CDs containing the raw data and any analytic files used to produce findings in the final report. These may be submitted on alternate electronic media if agreeable to FNS. The documentation, data format, SAS/SUDAAN and other computer code should be comprehensive to allow replication of all findings. In addition, a separate set of public use CDs that eliminates any confidential information and is ready for copying and dissemination to the public shall be prepared. These may be submitted on alternate electronic media if agreeable to FNS.

Task 7 – Revise Study Plans for 2012 SEBTC Demonstrations

Deliverable 7.1: Revised Research Design – 2012 Update. This deliverable shall make any adjustments needed to the evaluation design in light of lessons learned from the summer 2011 activities. This deliverable is not intended to make significant changes to study plans.

Deliverable 7.2: Report on Site Selection of Additional SEBTC Demonstrations. This report shall assess the ideal and practicable number of new demonstration sites, the characteristics of sites, and recruitment of sites. It shall analyze the options for demonstration site combinations and recommend the optimal and practicable sites and site combinations to FNS.

Deliverable 7.3: Revised 2012 Data Collection/Analysis Plan. This deliverable shall update the 2011 plan based on lessons learned from the prior activities. This deliverable is not intended to make significant changes to study plans.

Deliverable 7.4: Data Collector Training Package and Manual for 2012. This deliverable shall update the 2011 plan based on lessons learned from the prior activities. This deliverable is not intended to make significant changes to study plans.

Task 8 – Collect and Analyze 2012 Data

Following the plans and protocols approved in Task 2 of the Base Contract as updated in Task 7, contractor shall collect both process and impact data from:

- *Successful 2011 demonstrations continuing into 2012.* Of the proof-of-concept demonstrations conducted in 2011, successful demonstrations will continue and the number of children in the treatment group will be expanded in size for the 2012 demonstrations.
- *New SEBTC full demonstrations added in 2012.* There will be 6 to 10 SEBTC-SNAP and 1 to 4 SEBTC-WIC model demonstrations added, to bring the total number of demonstration sites to no more than 15.

Task 9 – 2012 Demonstration Reports

Deliverable 9.1 – 9.2: Draft and Final Congressional Status Report on the 2012 SEBTC Demonstrations. This deliverable shall comprise a major portion of FNS’ submission of the required Congressional report due December 31, 2012. To allow sufficient time for FNS review and clearance, the **final** version of the report must be delivered by **October 8, 2012**. It shall include:

- a report on the status of each SEBTC demonstration project;
- a summary of the **final** process and impact evaluations results from 2011;
- 2012 process and impact evaluation results available to date;
- a summary of project accomplishments to date; and,
- plans for 2013.

Deliverable 9.3 - 9.5: Draft, Revised and Final Evaluation Report on the 2012 SEBTC Demonstrations. This deliverable shall include:

- completed process evaluation for each site and overall;
- completed impact evaluations for each site and overall;
- lessons learned in 2012;
- recommendations, if any, for changes to the implementation of the demonstrations that may improve operations in 2013;
- recommendations, if any, for improvements in the evaluation design for 2013; and,
- estimated costs and delivery schedule impacts of any recommended changes or improvements.

Deliverable 9.6: Annual Presentations. The contractor shall conduct a 60-minute executive briefing for USDA policy officials at the Whitten Building (or other location agreeable to FNS) as well as a 3-hour briefing for FNS staff in Alexandria, Virginia (or other location agreeable to FNS) presenting an overview of the study design, detailed presentation of the findings for each intervention, and overall conclusions. The presentation shall include

visual display materials and handouts. The presentation shall be prepared in PowerPoint or similar format that is agreeable to FNS. Copies of the draft visual display materials and handouts shall be submitted to FNS for review two weeks prior to the presentation. Final visual display materials and handouts shall be submitted to FNS for approval 3 working days prior to the presentation.

Task 10 – 2012 Documentation

Deliverable 10.1: 2012 Datafiles and Codebooks. Following the procedures described in the approved Data Collection Plan/Analysis Plan, the contractor shall create the database analytic files and documentation. At a minimum, the creation of these data files shall include a 100 percent manual edit, verified data entry procedures, machine editing, and the production of descriptive statistics to ensure the integrity of the study data set. If the contractor perceives a need to make any changes to the database framework after the revised Database Development Plan was approved, the contractor shall submit a Memorandum of Intent outlining these changes for FNS approval. Each time a version of a report (draft, revised and final) is submitted the contractor shall simultaneously provide FNS with the appropriate analytic database (not public use files) and documentation to enable FNS to independently replicate all analyses in the report.

Deliverable 10.2: 2012 Public Use Files. The contractor shall prepare and submit a set of CDs containing the raw data and any analytic files used to produce findings in the final report. These may be submitted on alternate electronic media if agreeable to FNS. The documentation, data format, SAS/SUDAAN and other computer code should be comprehensive to allow replication of all findings. In addition, a separate set of public use CDs that eliminates any confidential information and is ready for copying and dissemination to the public shall be prepared. These may be submitted on alternate electronic media if agreeable to FNS.

Task 11 – Comprehensive SEBTC Report, Journal Supplement, and Presentations¹⁰

The final report for the evaluation, this deliverable shall contain ALL results completed and data collected under the Base Contract and all exercised IDIQ CLINs. It will be due in 2013 or 2014 depending on whether CLIN 004 is exercised or not.

The contractor shall prepare a final report, journal supplement and presentations that provide a comprehensive and integrated description of all SEBTC demonstration activities and results completed under the Base Contract and the exercised CLIN 004 tasks. The report shall address all of the study objectives; synthesize findings across years and demonstrations; and include a comparison of the demographics of demonstration participants with relevant state-level and national demographics of the households of free and reduced-price certified children, for each demonstration and across all demonstrations. It shall assess the likely costs and benefits of permanently implementing the demonstrations.

¹⁰ When costing this task, the offeror shall provide a cost that assumes the final report is based on and requires little change from the results from the Base Contract (2011 and 2012 demonstrations) except for synthesizing across years and demonstrations and assessing the costs/benefits of permanent implementation. If FNS exercises Option I (2013) the increased costs incurred for this task shall be included in Option I, not in the base contract.

Deliverable 11.1 – 11.2: Draft and Revised Outline. A detailed outline shall be submitted for FNS approval prior to writing the report.

Deliverable 11.3 – 11.5: Draft, Revised and Final Report. At a minimum, the report shall contain the following:

- a separately bound executive summary of the major findings¹¹;
- an introduction and background;
- a delineation of study issues, objectives and research questions;
- a discussion of the methodology employed;
- a presentation of all major findings of the study;
- a discussion of the study limitations;
- study conclusions; and
- technical appendices necessary to fully document all analytic procedures used.

Deliverable 11.6: Outline for Supplement to a Professional Journal. The contractor, working with FNS staff, shall prepare a proposed outline for the Supplement and a proposed list of authors for FNS approval.

Deliverable 11.7: Supplement to a Professional Journal. The contractor, working with FNS staff, shall prepare a set of articles (based on the Final Report) for inclusion in a supplement to a professional journal agreeable to FNS.

Deliverables 11.8.1 – 11.8.2: Presentation on Final Results. A final 60-minute executive briefing and a final 3-hour staff briefing shall be conducted in 2013 and/or 2014 for USDA policy officials and FNS staff.

Task 12 – Final Comprehensive Documentation¹²

Deliverable 12.1: Final Datafiles and codebooks. Following the procedures described in the approved Data Collection Plan/Analysis Plan, the contractor shall create the database analytic files and documentation for the entire SEBTC evaluation (base plus exercised CLIN 004 tasks). At a minimum, the creation of these data files shall include a 100 percent manual edit, verified data entry procedures, machine editing, and the production of descriptive statistics to ensure the integrity of the study data set. If the contractor perceives a need to make any changes to the database framework after the revised Database Development Plan was approved, the contractor shall submit a Memorandum of Intent outlining these changes for FNS approval. The contractor shall provide FNS with the appropriate analytic database

¹¹ This shall be a glossy, professionally formatted full color document with text, graphics, photos, and maps. Examples of the report quality expected can be found at: <http://www.fns.usda.gov/ora/menu/Published/CNP/FILES/SNDAllI-SummaryofFindings.pdf> or <http://www.fns.usda.gov/ora/menu/Published/SNAP/FILES/Other/FSPPProfile.pdf>

¹² When costing this task, the offeror shall provide a cost that assumes the final report is based on and requires little change from the results from the Base Contract (2011 and 2012). If FNS exercises Option I (2013) the increased costs incurred for this task shall be included in Option I, not in the base contract.

(not public use files) and documentation each time a version of a report (draft, revised and final versions) based on the data is submitted. The data shall be submitted simultaneously with the report.

Deliverable 12.2: Final Public Use Files. The contractor shall prepare and submit a set of CDs containing the raw data and any analytic files used to produce findings in the comprehensive final report (task 11). These may be submitted on alternate electronic media if agreeable to FNS. The documentation, data format, SAS/SUDAAN and other computer code should be comprehensive to allow replication of all findings. In addition, a separate set of public use CDs that eliminates any confidential information and is ready for copying and dissemination to the public shall be prepared. These may be submitted on alternate electronic media if agreeable to FNS.

CLIN 004.01 – Process Evaluation of an SEBTC Demonstration

These demonstrations will operate at either the proof-of-concept (2500 children in treatment group) or the full level (households of 5000 children in the treatment group).

The cost impact, if any, on base contract tasks 11 and 12 due to the exercise of this IDIQ CLIN shall be included as part of the IDIQ pricing and shall be specifically and separately identified.

Task 1 – Update Plans to Collect and Analyze 2013 Data

Deliverable 1.1: Revised Research Design – 2013 Update. This deliverable shall make any adjustments needed to the evaluation design in light of lessons learned from the summer 2012 activities. This deliverable is not intended to make significant changes to study plans.

Deliverable 1.2: Report on 2013 Site Selection. FNS expects to continue the 2012 household-based demonstrations in 2013. This report shall address changes in the sites participating in the demonstrations, including a description of sites continuing and/or beginning operations and those discontinuing operations, and a discussion of why drop-outs are ending operations.

Deliverable 1.3: Revised 2013 Data Collection/Analysis Plan. This deliverable shall update the 2012 plan based on lessons learned from the summer 2012 activities. This deliverable is not intended to make significant changes to study plans.

Deliverable 1.4: Data Collector Training Package and Manual for 2013. This deliverable shall update the 2012 plan based on lessons learned from the summer 2012 activities. This deliverable is not intended to make significant changes to study plans.

Task 2 – Collect and Analyze 2013 Data

Following the plans and protocols approved in Base Contract Task 2 and updated in Task 7, the contractor shall collect both process and impact data from 15 demonstrations (which may consist of a mix of demonstrations active in 2012 and new ones starting in 2013).

A complete and thorough process evaluation shall be conducted on each 2013 demonstration. The impact data collection shall be designed to measure the impact on very low food security and nutrition status among children at the level of precision specified in the contract.

Task 3 – 2013 Evaluation Reports

Deliverable 3.1 – 3.2: Draft and Final Congressional Status Report on the 2013 SEBTC Demonstrations. This deliverable shall comprise a major portion of FNS’ submission of the required Congressional report due December 31, 2012. To allow sufficient time for FNS review and clearance, the **final** version of the report must be delivered by **October 8, 2013**.

It shall include:

- a report on the status of the SEBTC demonstration project;
- a summary of the complete process and impact evaluations results from 2012;
- 2013 process and impact evaluation results available to date; and
- a summary of project accomplishments to date.

Deliverable 3.3 - 3.5: Draft, Revised and Final Evaluation Report on the 2013 SEBTC Demonstrations. This deliverable shall include:

- completed process evaluation;
- completed impact evaluations;
- lessons learned in 2013.

Deliverable 3.6: Annual Presentations. The contractor shall conduct a 60-minute executive briefing for USDA policy officials at the Whitten Building (or other location agreeable to FNS) as well as a 3-hour briefing for FNS staff in Alexandria, Virginia (or other location agreeable to FNS) presenting an overview of the study design, detailed presentation of the findings for each intervention, and overall conclusions. The presentation shall include visual display materials and handouts. The presentation shall be prepared in PowerPoint or similar format that is agreeable to FNS. Copies of the visual display materials and handouts shall be submitted to FNS for review two weeks prior to the presentation.

Task 4 – 2013 Documentation

Deliverable 4.1: 2013 Datafiles and codebooks. Following the procedures described in the approved Data Collection Plan/Analysis Plan, the contractor shall create the database analytic files and documentation. At a minimum, the creation of these data files shall include a 100 percent manual edit, verified data entry procedures, machine editing, and the production of descriptive statistics to ensure the integrity of the study data set. If the contractor perceives a need to make any changes to the database framework after the revised Database Development Plan was approved, the contractor shall submit a Memorandum of Intent outlining these changes for FNS approval. The contractor shall provide FNS with the

appropriate analytic database (not public use files) and documentation each time a version of a report (draft, revised and final versions) based on the data is submitted. The data shall be submitted simultaneously with the report.

Deliverable 4.2: 2013 Public Use Files. The contractor shall prepare and submit a set of CDs containing the raw data and any analytic files used to produce findings in the final report. These may be submitted on alternate electronic media if agreeable to FNS. The documentation, data format, SAS/SUDAAN and other computer code should be comprehensive to allow replication of all findings. In addition, a separate set of public use CDs that eliminates any confidential information and is ready for copying and dissemination to the public shall be prepared. These may be submitted on alternate electronic media if agreeable to FNS.

Deliverables 4.3.1 – 4.3.xx: Monthly Reports. The contractor shall provide FNS with monthly reports on the progress of the contract. Each progress report shall include the following:

- Cover page with contract number, title, period of performance covered and number in the sequence of reports;
- Brief description of the purpose and scope of the contract;
- Description of the activities, by task, that were carried out during the reporting period;
- Descriptions of the activities planned for the next reporting period;
- Discussion of problems and delays encountered during the reporting period and steps taken or proposed to resolve them;
- Discussion of anticipated problems and recommendation for avoiding or resolving them;
- Schedule identifying for each task and deliverable the dates on which work started, was expected to end and actually ended;
- Table with dollars budgeted, dollars spent during the reporting period and cumulatively, and dollars remaining *by task and subtask*; and,
- Table with hours budgeted, hours spent during the reporting period and cumulatively, and hours remaining by person and combined project staff for each task.

CLIN 004.02 and 004.03 – Impact Evaluation of a Proof-of-Concept or Full Demonstration

Under this CLIN 004.02 FNS would add one or more additional proof-of-concept (2500 in treatment group) demonstrations. Under CLIN 004.03 FNS would add one or more additional demonstration sites at the full (5000 in treatment group) level. Results from demonstration sites added through these CLINs shall be included in the Congressional Status and Evaluation Reports and presentations in the base contract. The cost impact on base contract analysis, reporting and documentation due to adding demonstration sites is to be included in the costing of these CLINs.

CLIN 004.04 –Conferences

Under this CLIN, the contractor will host, facilitate and report on a conference of the 2011 and/or 2012 demonstration operators, FNS, and interested stakeholders on lessons learned. The conference location will be in Northern Virginia or D.C. within 10 miles of FNS headquarters.

Task 1 – Facilitate Conference

The contractor shall schedule and arrange all aspects of a conference for demonstration operators, FNS staff, and interested stakeholders in the fall. All demonstration operators shall be given the opportunity to conduct a PowerPoint presentation of their implementation experiences, challenges and successes.

Deliverable 1.1: **Conference Agenda.**

Deliverable 1.2: **PowerPoint Presentation.** The contractor shall deliver a presentation describing the implementation of operations, lessons learned, evaluation study results to date and recommendations for improvements to demonstration operations and evaluation.

Task 2 –Conference Report

Deliverable 2.1 – 2.2: **Draft and Final Conference Report.** The report shall synthesize the information presented by demonstration operators, summarize conclusions and decisions reached concerning future operations and summarize issues left to be resolved.

CLIN 004.05 – Presentations of Results

FNS may order up to 20 executive briefings (60-minutes) and 20 staff briefings (3-hours) in 2012, 2013 and/or 2014 for USDA policy officials, Congress, FNS staff, and at national meetings of organizations agreeable to FNS. Up to 10 executive and 10 staff briefings may occur at locations in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area. The remainder can be at locations anywhere in the United States to be chosen by FNS. Presentations may be scheduled before or after completion of the comprehensive final report. They may be scheduled as late as October 2015 in order to have relevance to the debate surrounding Child Nutrition Reauthorization and other bills. Presentations may focus on final 2011 evaluation results and/or final 2012/2013 results or other topics to be specified.

SECTION D – PACKAGING AND MARKING

D.1 PACKING FOR DOMESTIC SHIPMENT (AGAR 452.247-72) (FEB 1988)

Material shall be packed for shipment in such a manner that will insure acceptance by common carriers and safe delivery at destination. Containers and closures shall comply with the Department of Transportation regulations, Uniform Freight Classification Rules, or regulations of other carriers as applicable to the mode of transportation.

SECTION E – INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE

E.1 INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE (AGAR 452.246-70)(FEB 1988)

(a) The Contracting Officer or the Contracting Officer's duly authorized representative will inspect and accept the supplies and/or services to be provided under this contract.

(b) Inspection and acceptance will be performed at:

Project Office:

TBD

Food and Nutrition Service
Special Nutrition Evaluation Branch
Office of Research and Analysis
3101 Park Center Drive
Alexandria, VA 22302
703-305-2017

E.2 SCOPE OF INSPECTION

All deliverables will be inspected for content, completeness, accuracy, and conformance to task order requirements by the COR. Inspection may include validation of information or software through the use of automated tools and/or testing of the deliverables, as specified in the task order.

E.3 BASIS OF ACCEPTANCE

The basis for acceptance shall be compliance with the requirements set forth in the performance work statement, the acceptance measures in the schedule of deliverables, the contractor's proposal and other terms and conditions of the contract. Deliverable items rejected shall be corrected in accordance with the applicable clauses.

The Government shall have up to fifteen (15) business days upon receipt to review each deliverable and provide oral and written comments. The Contractor shall review and incorporate comments or implement directed changes, after discussion or clarification from the Project

Manager and submit a final version of the deliverable no later than ten (10) business days thereafter.

NOTE All stated days for delivery and government review, unless denoted otherwise, are stated in business days.

SECTION F – DELIVERIES OR PERFORMANCE

F.1 IDENTIFICATION OF CONTRACT DELIVERABLES

Unless otherwise specified by the Contracting Officer in writing, all documents prepared and submitted by the contractor to the Government under this contract shall include the following information on the cover page of each document:

- (a) Name and business address of the contractor;
- (b) Contract number
- (c) Contracting Officer's Representative's Name; and
- (d) Date of delivery order

F.2 PLACE OF DELIVERY-FOB DESTINATION

All reports and/or deliverables identified under the contract shall be delivered, and all transportation charges paid by the Contractor, in accordance with the FOB Destination clause (FAR 52-247-35) as follow:

Project Office:
USDA/Food and Nutrition Service
Office of Research and Analysis
Attn: **TBD**
3101 Park Center Drive, Room 1014
Alexandria, VA 22302

Progress Reports and a copy of all invoices shall be delivered electronically to the Contracting Office and the Project Office at the addresses shown below:

tbd@fns.usda.gov

Belal.hammad@fns.usda.gov

F.3 TIME OF DELIVERY

The Government requires delivery to be made in accordance with Schedule of Deliverable (TBD).

F.4 PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE

The period of performance will be 60 months from the date of award.

F.5 Monthly Reports

The contractor shall provide FNS with monthly reports on the progress of the study. Each progress report shall include the following:

- Cover page with contract number, title, period of performance covered and number in the sequence of reports.
- Brief description of the purpose and scope of the study.
- Description of activities, by task, that were carried out during the reporting period.
- Description of the activities planned for the next reporting period;
- Discussion of problems and delays encountered during the reporting period and steps taken or proposed to resolve them.
- Discussion of anticipated problems and recommendation for avoiding or resolving them.
- Schedule identifying for each task and deliverable the dates on which work started, was expected to end, and actually ended.
- Table with dollars budgeted, dollars spent during the reporting period and cumulatively, and dollars remaining by task and subtask; and
- Table with hours budgeted, hours spent during the reporting period and cumulatively, and hours remaining by person and combined project staff for each task.

One copy of the monthly report shall be submitted directly to the FNS Contracting Officer, and one copy to the Contracting Officer's Technical Representative. These reports shall be submitted no later than the 20th working day of the following month.

F.6 All Other Deliverables

All required deliverables (with the exception of the monthly progress report) shall be delivered to the Contracting Officer's Representative as follow: See Schedule of Deliverable (Attachment II).

SECTION G – CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION

G.1 POST AWARD CONFERENCE (AGAR 452.215-73)(NOV 1996)

A post award conference with the successful offeror is required. It will be scheduled within 10 days after the date of contract award.

The contractor shall meet with FNS staff in Alexandria, Virginia during the second week after the contract award to review, discuss and clarify the study objectives delineated above, program management plans, and schedule.

The contractor shall submit an agenda for the orientation meeting one week after the contract award for review by FNS. The agenda shall be flexible to ensure that FNS senior leaders are able to attend relevant portions of the meeting.

At a minimum, the following items shall be addressed:

- A protocol for all communications between FNS and contractor staff, including financial reporting, periodic progress reports, and procedures for product approval;
- Clarification of project schedule, contents of deliverables, and staffing assignments as needed;
- Strategies for handling potential problems, such as changes in variable coding or other data irregularities; and
- Technical orientation for both the contractor and FNS senior leadership.

At the conference the contractor shall conduct a thorough presentation and discussion of the proposed approach to developing the research design and data collection plans and the tasks to be performed to achieve the study objectives.

Deliverable 1.1: Summary of Research Approach and PowerPoint Slides. As part of the conference, the contractor shall provide PowerPoint slides and a 10 to 15 page narrative summary describing the contractor's proposed approach. These should be presented in sufficient detail for members of the professional public who have not read the proposal or the RFP to understand the proposed study.

The contractor shall submit a memorandum to FNS within 2 weeks after the orientation meeting that shall clearly identify any decisions made during the meeting, as well as issues or decisions raised but left for future resolution. It shall identify steps to address such outstanding issues and the projected timeline for reaching resolution.

G.2 CONTRACT MANAGEMENT

Notwithstanding the Contractor's responsibility for total management during the performance of this contract, the administration of the contract will require maximum coordination between the Government and the Contractor.

G-3 CONTRACTING OFFICER’S AUTHORITY (OCT 1992)

The Contracting Officer is the only person authorized to approve changes to any of the requirements under this contract, and notwithstanding any provision contained elsewhere in this contract, the said authority remains solely with the Contracting Officer. In the event the Contractor effects any change at the direction of any person other than the Contracting Officer, the change will be considered to have been without authority and no adjustment will be made in the contract price to cover any increase in charges incurred as a result thereof.

(a) The contractor shall designate one individual to be contacted during the period of the contract for prompt contract administration:

Name:*

Title:*

Phone:*

Email:*

*to be completed by offeror

(d) Contracting Officer (CO): Lance C. Petteway

(e) Contracting Officer’s Representative (COR):

TBD

Food and Nutrition Service
Special Nutrition Evaluation Branch
Office of Research and Analysis
3101 Park Center Drive
Alexandria, VA 22302
703-305-2017

G.4 CONTRACTING OFFICER’S REPRESENTATIVE (COR):

CONTRACTING OFFICER’S REPRESENTATIVE (COR)

Food and Nutrition Service (FNS)

NAME: TO BE PROVIDED AT CONTRACT AWARD

USDA/FNS/Accounting Division

3101 Park Center Drive, RM 700

Alexandria VA 22302-1500

The invoice shall contain:

- a. Contract Number
- b. Contract Description
- c. Contract Amount
- d. Taxpayer identification number

The Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) is an individual designated in writing by a Contracting Officer (KO) to act as the Contracting Officer's authorized representative for oversight of the Contractor's performance within the scope and limitations established within the contract or by the Contracting Officer.

The types of actions within the purview of the COR's authority are: to assure that the Contractor performs the technical requirements of the contract; to perform or cause to be performed, inspections necessary in connection with performance of the contract; to maintain both written and oral communications with the Contractor concerning the aspects of the contract within his purview; to monitor the Contractor's performance under the contract and notify the Contractor and Contracting Officer of any potential or actual performance problems observed; to assure that any changes or additional work to the contract are formally effected by the Contracting Officer in a written modification before the contractor proceeds with the changes; to report any instances of suspected conflict of interest, fraud, waste, and abuse to the Contracting Officer; and to coordinate Government furnished property availability and provide for site entry of Contractor personnel if required.

A letter of designation will be issued to the COR, with a copy supplied to the Contractor, stating the responsibilities and limitations of the COR. This letter will clarify to all parties of this contract the responsibilities which would result in a modification to the scope of work; changes in cost or price totals or estimates; changes in delivery dates; changes in any other mutually agreed upon term or provision of the contract.

G-5 COR RESPONSIBILITIES

The COR will annotate on the invoice the date received. If acceptable, the COR will include the statement, "THIS INVOICE IS CERTIFIED CORRECT AND PROPER FOR PAYMENT," if no certification statement has already been included on the invoice. The COR then will sign and date it, and forward the original and two (2) copies to Finance for payment within seven (7) days of receipt. If the COR disagrees with any part of the invoice the COR shall immediately notify the contractor telephonically of noncertification and state the areas of disagreement. The COR will then return only the Original invoice to the Contractor as an enclosure to a written letter, listing the area(s) of disagreement. A courtesy copy of such letters needs to be furnished to the Contracting Officer. **THE COR IS NOT AUTHORIZED TO CORRECT INVOICES.**

G-6 CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES

CONTRACTOR RESPONSIBILITIES. An original and two (2) copies of each invoice, with all supporting documentation, shall be submitted to the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) at the address listed above Section G-3 above for certification by the first of each month following services provided.

G.7 METHOD OF PAYMENT

All payments under this contract shall be made via electronic funds transfer (EFT). The government shall make payment to the contractor using the EFT information contained in the Central Contractor Registration (CCR) database. In the event that the EFT information changes the contractor shall be responsible for providing the updated information to the CCR database and the Contracting Officer.

G.8 AUTHORIZED PAYMENT SCHEDULE

Payment will be made upon receipt of a proper invoice for services completed and accepted in accordance with the Contract's payment schedule, which will be determined at time of award.

SECTION H – SPECIAL CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS

H.1 SECURITY

The contractor shall be responsible for properly protecting all information used, gathered, or developed as a result of this contract. The contractor shall implement procedures that ensure that appropriate administrative, technical, and physical safeguards are established to ensure the security and confidentiality of sensitive government information, data, and/or equipment. The contractor's procedures shall be consistent with Government, OMB Circular A-130, Management of Federal Information Resources, the Computer Security Act of 1987, the Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002 (FISMA), and the Privacy Act. In addition, during all activities and operations on government premises the contractor shall comply with the policies, rules, procedures and regulations governing the conduct of personnel or protection of government facilities and data as expressed by USDA, written or oral.

(a) Sensitive Information Storage and Disclosure

Sensitive-But-Unclassified (SBU) information, data, and/or equipment will be disclosed only to authorized personnel on a Need-To-Know basis. The holder shall ensure that appropriate administrative, technical, and physical safeguards are established to ensure the security and confidentiality of this information, data, and/or equipment is properly protected. When no longer required, this information, data, and/or equipment will be returned to Government control; destroyed; or held until otherwise directed. Destruction of items shall be accomplished by tearing into small parts; burning; shredding or any other method that precludes the reconstruction of the material, consistent with GSA guidelines.

(b) Protection of Information

All information about the USDA networks and/or the security posture of any USDA information asset gathered or created under this contract will be considered SBU information. It is anticipated that this information will be gathered, created and stored within the primary Government work location. If the contractor personnel must remove any information from the

primary work area they should protect it to the same extent they would their proprietary data and/or company trade secrets. If the contractor must remove any materials from the primary work location prior approval must be obtained.

(c) **Security and Privacy**

The use of any information that is subject to the Privacy Act will be utilized in full accordance with all rules of conduct as applicable to Privacy Act Information.

(d) **Security Classification**

The preparation of the deliverables under this contract will be completed at a Sensitive-But-Unclassified (SBU) level unless otherwise stated, in writing, by the COR.

(e) **Facility Access**

All contractor personnel who work at the USDA/FNS site must have approval for facility access; the contractor must supply the names and other required information of those employees selected to perform the work to the COR.

(f) **Special Requirements**

All work performed must meet and comply with all National Institute of Standards & Technology (NIST), other government-wide laws and regulations, and USDA and OCIO directives, guidelines, and requirements for protection and security of Information Technology. Such directives and guidelines include but are not limited to:

- Computer Security Act of 1987
- Federal Information Security Management Act (FISMA)
- OMB Circular A-130, Management of Federal Information Resources
- Presidential Directive Decision 63, Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP)
- Presidential Directive Decision 67, Enduring Constitutional Government and Continuity of Government Operations
- Homeland Security Presidential Directive 7
- NIST's Guide for developing Security Plans for Information Technology systems (Special Publication 800-18)
- U.S. Government "Plain Language" Guidelines
- <http://www.ocio.usda.gov/directives/files/dm/DM3535-000.htm>

(g) **Confidentiality and Non-Disclosure**

The contractor may have to access proprietary information and shall be required to sign non-disclosure and conflict of interest statements (see Attachment IV). The preliminary and final deliverables and all associated working papers, and other material deemed relevant by the agency that have been generated by the contractor are the property of the U.S. Government and cannot be reproduced, or retained by the contractor. When no longer required, this information, data,

and/or equipment will be returned to Government control. All documents and information pertaining to network vulnerabilities, security policy, operational procedures or related functions shall be maintained under absolute accountability and relinquished to the COR upon completion of the contract.

H.2 CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION (AGAR 452.224-70) (FEB 1988)

(a) Confidential information, as used in this clause, means:

- (1) Information or data of a personal nature, proprietary about an individual, or
- (2) information or data submitted by or pertaining to an institution or organization.

(b) In addition to the types of confidential information described in (a)(1) and (2) above, information which might require special consideration with regard to the timing of its disclosure may derive from studies or research during which public disclosure of primarily invalidated findings could create an erroneous conclusion which might threaten public health or safety if acted upon.

(c) The Contracting Officer and the Contractor may, by mutual consent, identify elsewhere in this contract specific information and/or categories of information which the Government will furnish to the Contractor or that the Contractor is expected to generate which is confidential. Similarly, the Contracting Officer and the Contractor may, by mutual consent, identify such confidential information from time to time during the performance of the contract. Failure to agree will be settled pursuant to the "Disputes" clause.

(d) If it is established that information to be utilized under this contract is subject to the Privacy Act, the Contractor will follow the rules and procedures of disclosure set forth in the Privacy Act of 1974, 5 U.S.C. 552a, and implementing regulations and policies, with respect to systems of records determined to be subject to the Privacy Act.

(e) Confidential information, as defined in (a)(1) and (2) above, shall not be disclosed without the prior written consent of the individual, institution or organization.

(f) Written advance notice of at least 45 days will be provided to the Contracting Officer of the Contractor's intent to release findings of studies or research, which have the possibility of adverse effects on the public or the Federal agency, as described in (b) above. If the Contracting Officer does not pose any objections in writing within the 45 day period, the contractor may proceed with disclosure. Disagreements not resolved by the Contractor and Contracting Officer will be settled pursuant to the "Disputes" clause.

(g) Whenever the Contractor is uncertain with regard to the proper handling of material under the contract, or if the material in question is subject to the Privacy Act or is confidential information subject to the provisions of this clause, the Contractor shall obtain a written determination from the Contracting Officer prior to any release, disclosure, dissemination, or publication.

(h) The provisions of paragraph (e) of this clause shall not apply when the information is subject to conflicting or overlapping provisions in other Federal, State or local laws.

H3. RESTRICTIONS AGAINST DISCLOSURE (AGAR 452.237-75) (FEB 1988)

(a) The Contractor agrees, in the performance of this contract, to keep all information contained in source documents or other media furnished by the Government in the strictest confidence. The Contractor also agrees not to publish or otherwise divulge such information in whole or in part in any manner or form, or to authorize or permit others to do so, taking such reasonable measures as are necessary to restrict access to such information while in the Contractor's possession, to those employees needing such information to perform the work provided herein, i.e., on a "need to know" basis. The Contractor agrees to immediately notify in writing, the Contracting Officer, named herein, in the event that the Contractor determines or has reason to suspect a breach of this requirement.

(b) The Contractor agrees not to disclose any information concerning the work under this contract to any persons or individual unless prior written approval is obtained from the Contracting Officer. The Contractor agrees to insert the substance of this clause in any consultant agreement or subcontract hereunder.

H.4 GOVERNMENT FURNISHED DATA

The Government shall deliver to the Contractor the Government-furnished data described in the contract. Title to Government-furnished data shall remain with the Government. The Government shall retain all rights and privileges, including those of patent and copy, to all Government furnished data. The Contractor shall neither retain nor reproduce for private or commercial use any information or other materials furnished or made available under this contract. The Contractor agrees not to assert any rights at common law or in equity or establish any claim to statutory copyright in such data. These rights are not exclusive and are in addition to any other rights and remedies to which the Government is otherwise entitled elsewhere in the contract. The Contractor shall use the Government-furnished data only in connection with this contract. Provisions of FAR 52.245-5, Government Furnished Property will apply to all Government furnished data.

H.5 WITHHOLDING OF CONTRACT PAYMENTS

Notwithstanding other payment provisions of this contract, failure of the Contractor to submit required reports or failure to perform or deliver required work, supplies, or services, may result

in the withholding of payments under this contract. Failure may arise out of causes beyond the control, and without the fault or negligence of the contractor as defined by the clauses titled "Excusable Delays" or "Default". The Government shall promptly notify the Contractor of its intention to withhold payment of any invoice or voucher submitted.

H.6 ADP COMPATIBILITY

The contractor agrees to comply with both the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) and the Food and Nutrition Service's (FNS) ADP system security requirements to the extent necessary to meet the requirements of the work herein. All databases created and maintained by the contractor shall have proper validation and control techniques, and all ADP resources, including data media, which become the property of the Government shall be fully documented, both in source code (if any) and written materials. Software documentation shall include, as appropriate (in the determination of the Contracting Officer's Representative), flowcharts; textual explanation of subroutines, processes, and algorithms; screens; and other materials as necessary to ensure that a programmer conversant with the language may maintain the software. Database documentation shall include: variable names and labels; variable locations the source of each data item; the formulas used to compute or transform variables, if any, database structure and relationship; a printout of the data or first 50 pages. Further, all data media must be compatible with FNS ADPE.

FNS performs its computing applications utilizing the Windows XP-Professional operating system. Work performed under this contract may require transfer of limited data and text files, as well as extensive data media. All data must be compatible with Microsoft Office 2007 (Word, Excel, Access, PowerPoint, etc.)

H.7 PRINTING

Unless otherwise specified in this contract, the Contractor shall not engage in, nor subcontract for, any printing (as that term is defined in Title I of the Government Printing and Binding Regulations in effect on the effective date of this contract) in connection with the performance of work under this contract. Provided, however, that performance of a requirement under this contract involving the duplication of less than 5,000 units in the aggregate of multiple pages, will not be deemed to be printing. For the purpose of this paragraph, such pages may not exceed a maximum image size of 10 3/4 by 14 1/4 inches.

H.8 PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT

In the event that it becomes a contractual requirement to collect identical information from ten or more public respondents, the Paperwork Reduction Act, 44 U.S.C., 3501 et seq., shall apply to this contract. In such an event, the contractor shall not expend any funds to take any other action whatsoever to solicit information from any of the public respondents until the Contracting Officer has notified the contractor in writing that the required Office of Management and Budget clearance has been obtained. The contractor shall provide to the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) or to the Contracting Officer such information as will facilitate obtaining such clearance.

H9. OMBUDSMEN

The Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) has designated an ombudsman to address concerns of procurement improprieties. The designations and responsibilities are described below:

PROCUREMENT OMBUDSMAN

Concerns of procurement impropriety or the appearance of impropriety should be immediately brought to the attention of the Contracting Officer. If you choose not to raise the issue to the Contracting Officer, the Agency has designated Mr. Steve Butler, Deputy Administrator, Financial Management, as the Procurement Ombudsman (PO). Mr. Butler will serve as an additional source available to contractors, subcontractors, and FNS staff that may have concerns regarding possible impropriety or the appearance of impropriety in a contract, but choose not to raise the issue through normal administrative mechanisms.

Mr. Butler has independent authority to address any issue of impropriety with absolute confidentiality and report directly to the Agency Administrator as necessary. He will have complete access to everyone involved in the process, at all levels in the FNS organization. Additionally, Mr. Butler has full authority to complete a thorough review of each concern raised. Mr. Butler may be contacted at the following address/phone number/e-mail address:

Mr. Steve Butler
USDA/FNS/FM
3101 Park Center Drive, Rm. 712
Alexandria, VA 22302
(703) 305-2046
Steve.Butler@fns.usda.gov

H.10 KEY PERSONNEL AGAR 452.237-74 Key Personnel.

KEY PERSONNEL (FEB 1988)

(a) The Contractor shall assign to this contract the following key personnel:

(b) During the first ninety (90) days of performance, the Contractor shall make no substitutions of key personnel unless the substitution is necessitated by illness, death, or termination of employment. The Contractor shall notify the Contracting Officer within 15 calendar days after

the occurrence of any of these events and provide the information required by paragraph (c) below. After the initial 90-day period, the Contractor shall submit the information required by paragraph (c) to the Contracting Officer at least 15 days prior to making any permanent substitutions.

(c) The Contractor shall provide a detailed explanation of the circumstances necessitating the proposed substitutions, complete resumes for the proposed substitutes, and any additional information requested by the Contracting Officer. Proposed substitutes should have comparable qualifications to those of the persons being replaced. The Contracting Officer will notify the Contractor within 15 calendar days after receipt of all required information of the decision on substitutions. The contract will be modified to reflect any approved changes of key personnel.

(End of Clause)

SECTION I – CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

(FAR 52.252-2)(FEB 1998)

This contract incorporates one or more clauses by reference, with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request, the Contracting Officer will make their full text available. Also, the full text of a clause may be accessed electronically at this address:
<http://www.arnet.gov/far/>

Solicitation Provisions, Contract Clauses and Representations and Certifications

I. Solicitation Provisions for Commercial Acquisition

1. The Solicitation Provision at FAR 52.212.1 Instruction to Offerors—Commercial Items (Jun 2008) is hereby incorporated by reference.

Addendum to FAR 52.212-1(c) is hereby changed: (1) Refer to enclosure 3 for Instructions to Offerors and (2) Reflect 180 calendar days.

2. The Solicitation Provision at FAR 52.212-2 Evaluation—Commercial Items (Jan 1999) is hereby incorporated by reference. Addendum to FAR 52.212-2 is hereby changed: Refer to enclosure 4 for Evaluation of Offerors.

3. The Solicitation Provision at FAR 52.217-5, Evaluation of Options (Jul 1990) is hereby incorporated by reference.

II. Contract Clauses for Commercial Acquisition

1. The Solicitation Clause at FAR 52.212-4 Contract Terms and Conditions—Commercial Items (Mar 2009) is hereby incorporated by reference.

2. The Solicitation Clause at FAR 52.212-5 Contract Terms and Conditions Required to Implement Statutes or Executive Orders – Commercial Items (Feb 2010) is hereby

incorporated in full text and is modified to include only applicable contract clauses for this acquisition and subsequent contract award as provided by the Contracting Officer.

(a) The Contractor shall comply with the following Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) clauses, which are incorporated in this contract by reference, to implement provisions of law or Executive orders applicable to acquisitions of commercial items:

- 1--52.222-50, Combating Trafficking in Persons (FEB 2009) (22 USC 7104(g))
- 2--52.233-3, Protest after Award (Aug 1996) (31 U.S.C 3553)
- 3--52.233-4, Applicable Law for Breach of Contract Claim (Oct 2004) (PubL 108-77,108-78).

(b) The Contractor shall comply with the FAR clauses in this paragraph (b) that the contracting officer has indicated as being incorporated in this contract by reference to implement provisions of law or Executive orders applicable to acquisitions of commercial items:

- 1--52.203-13 Contractor Code of Business Ethics and Conduct (DEC 2008) (PUB. L. 110-252, Title VI, Chapter 1) (41 USC 251)
- 2--52.219-6, Notice of Total Small Business Aside (June 2003) (15 USC 644)
- 3--52.219-14, Limitations on Subcontracting (Dec 1996)(15 U.S.C. 637(a)(14)).
- 4--52.219-28 Post-Award Small Business Program Representation (Apr 2009) 15 U.S.C. 632(a)(2)
- 5--52.222-3, Convict Labor (June 2003)(E.O. 11755).
- 6--52.222-19, Child Labor—Cooperation with Authorities and Remedies (Aug 2009) E.O. 13126).
- 7--52.222-21, Prohibition of Segregated Facilities (Feb 1999).
- 8--52.222-26, Equal Opportunity (Apr 2007)(E.O. 11246).
- 9--52.222-35, Equal Opportunity for Special Disabled Veterans, Veterans of the Vietnam Era, and Other Eligible Veterans (Sept 2006)(38 U.S.C. 4212).
- 10-- 52.222-36, Affirmative Action for Workers with Disabilities (Jun 1998)(29 U.S.C. 793).
- 11--52.222-37, Employment Reports on Special Disabled Veterans, Veterans of the Vietnam Era, and Other Eligible Veterans (Sept 2006)(38 U.S.C. 4212).
- 12-52.222-29 Notification of Employee Rights Concerning Payment of Union Dues or Fees (Dec 2004) (E.O. 13201). Enclosure 2 – AG-3198-S-10-0003 Solicitation Provisions 16

13--52.222-29 Employment Eligibility Verification (Jan 2009). (E.O. 12989).

14--52.225-13 Restrictions on Certain Foreign Purchases (June 2008) (E.O.'s, proclamations, and statutes administered by the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury).

15--52.232-33, Payment by Electronic Funds Transfer—Central Contractor Registration (Oct. 2003)(31 U.S.C. 3332).

(c) The Contractor shall comply with the FAR clauses in this paragraph (c), applicable to commercial services, that the Contracting Officer has indicated as being incorporated in this contract by reference to implement provisions of law or executive orders applicable to acquisitions of commercial items:

(d) Comptroller General Examination of Record. The Contractor shall comply with the provisions of this paragraph (d) if this contract was awarded using other than sealed bid, is in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold, and does not contain the clause at 52.215-2, Audit and Records -- Negotiation.

(1) The Comptroller General of the United States, or an authorized representative of the Comptroller General, shall have access to and right to examine any of the Contractor's directly pertinent records involving transactions related to this contract.

(2) The Contractor shall make available at its offices at all reasonable times the records, materials, and other evidence for examination, audit, or reproduction, until 3 years after final payment under this contract or for any shorter period specified in FAR Subpart 4.7, Contractor Records Retention, of the other clauses of this contract. If this contract is completely or partially terminated, the records relating to the work terminated shall be made available for 3 years after any resulting final termination settlement. Records relating to appeals under the disputes clause or to litigation or the settlement of claims arising under or relating Enclosure 2 – AG-3198-S-10-0003 Solicitation Provisions 17

to this contract shall be made available until such appeals, litigation, or claims are finally resolved.

(3) As used in this clause, records include books, documents, accounting procedures and practices, and other data, regardless of type and regardless of form. This does not require the Contractor to create or maintain any record that the Contractor does not maintain in the ordinary course of business or pursuant to a provision of law.

(e) (1) Notwithstanding the requirements of the clauses in paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (d) of this clause, the Contractor is not required to flow down any FAR clause, other than those in paragraphs (i) through (viii) of this paragraph in a subcontract for commercial items. Unless otherwise indicated below, the extent of the flow down shall be as required by the clause--

(i) 52.203-13, Contractor Code of Business Ethics and Conduct (Dec 2008) (Pub. L. 110-252, Title VI, Chapter 1 (41 USC 251 note)).

(ii) 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns (May 2004)(15 U.S.C. 637(d)(2) and (3)), in all subcontracts that offer further subcontracting opportunities. If the subcontract (except subcontracts to small business concerns) exceeds \$500,000 (\$1,000,000 for construction of any public facility), the subcontractor must include 52.219-8 in lower tier subcontracts that offer subcontracting opportunities.

(iii) 52.222-26, Equal Opportunity (Mar 2007)(E.O. 11246).

(iv) 52.222-35, Equal Opportunity for Special Disabled Veterans, Veterans of the Vietnam Era, and Other Eligible Veterans (Sept 2006)(38 U.S.C. 4212).

(v) 52.222-36, Affirmative Action for Workers with Disabilities (June 1998)(29 U.S.C. 793).

(vi) 52.222-41, Service Contract Act of 1965 (Nov 2007), flow down required for all subcontracts subject to the Service Contract Act of 1965 (41 U.S.C. 351, *et seq.*)

(vii) 52.222-50, Combating Trafficking in Persons (Feb 2009) (22 USC 7104(g)).

(viii) 52.222-54, Employment Eligibility Verification (Jan 2009)

(2) While not required, the contractor may include in its subcontracts for commercial items a minimal number of additional clauses necessary to satisfy its contractual obligations.

III. Other FAR and Agriculture Acquisition Regulation (AGAR) applicable Clauses.

Enclosure 2 – AG-3198-S-10-0003 Solicitation Provisions 18

Below are other clauses specific to this Solicitation and resultant contract that is hereby provided in full text and by reference, as applicable:

1—52.217-8 Option to Extend Services (Nov 1999)

The Government may require continued performance of any services within the limits and at the rates specified in the contract. These rates may be adjusted only as a result of revisions to prevailing labor rates provided by the Secretary of Labor. The option provision may be exercised more than once, but the total extension of performance hereunder shall not exceed 6 months. The Contracting Officer may exercise the option by written notice to the Contractor within 30 calendar days.

2—52.217-9 Option to Extend the Term of the Contract (Mar 2000)

(a) The Government may extend the term of this contract by written notice to the Contractor within 30 calendar days; provided that the Government gives the Contractor a preliminary written notice of its intent to extend at least 60 days before the contract expires. The preliminary notice does not commit the Government to an extension.

(b) If the Government exercises this option, the extended contract shall be considered to include this option clause.

(c) The total duration of this contract, including the exercise of any options under this clause, shall not exceed 5 years.

3—52.216-18 Ordering (Oct 1995)

(a) Any supplies and services to be furnished under this contract shall be ordered by issuance of delivery orders or task orders by FNS Contracting Officer and issuance of call orders by FNS designated SNAP staff in the Schedule. Such orders may be issued from __ (date TBD)_____ through __ (date TBD)_____.

(b) All delivery orders or task orders are subject to the terms and conditions of this contract. In the event of conflict between a delivery order or task order and this contract, the contract shall control.

(c) If mailed, a delivery order or task order is considered —issued|| when the Government deposits the order in the mail. Orders may be issued orally, by facsimile, or by electronic commerce methods only if authorized in the Schedule.

4—52.216-19 Order Limitations (Oct 1995)

(a) **Minimum order:** 5,000 visits.

(b) **Maximum order.** The Contractor is not obligated to honor—

(1) Any order for a single item in excess of __50,000 visits____;

(2) Any order for a combination of items in excess of __50,000 visits _____; or

(3) A series of orders from the same ordering office within __30 days_ that together call for quantities exceeding the limitation in paragraph (b)(1) or (2) of this section.

(c) If this is a requirements contract (**i.e.**, includes the Requirements clause at subsection 52.216-21 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR)), the Government is not required to order a part of any one requirement from the Contractor if that requirement exceeds the maximum-order limitations in paragraph (b) of this section.

5—52.216.22 Indefinite Quantity (Oct 1995). Enclosure 2 – AG-3198-S-10-0003 Solicitation Provisions 19

(a) This is an indefinite-quantity contract for the supplies or services specified, and effective for the period stated, in the Schedule. The quantities of supplies and services specified in the Schedule are estimates only and are not purchased by this contract.

(b) Delivery or performance shall be made only as authorized by orders issued in accordance with the Ordering clause. The Contractor shall furnish to the Government, when and if ordered, the supplies or services specified in the Schedule up to and including the quantity designated in the Schedule as the —maximum.|| The Government shall order at least the quantity of supplies or services designated in the Schedule as the —minimum.||

(c) Except for any limitations on quantities in the Order Limitations clause or in the Schedule, there is no limit on the number of orders that may be issued. The Government may issue orders requiring delivery to multiple destinations or performance at multiple locations.

(d) Any order issued during the effective period of this contract and not completed within that period shall be completed by the Contractor within the time specified in the order. The contract shall govern the Contractor's and Government's rights and obligations with respect to that order to the same extent as if the order were completed during the contract's effective period; **provided**, that the Contractor shall not be required to make any deliveries under this contract after _____30 days_____.

Supplement to FAR: Agriculture Acquisition Regulation (AGAR) Clauses Incorporated by Reference:

1—AGAR 452.224-70 Confidentiality of Information (Feb 1988)

2—AGAR 452.237-75 Restrictions Against Disclosure (Feb 1988)

I-2 FAR 52.222-42 Statement of Equivalent Rates for Federal Hires (MAY 1989)

In compliance with the Service Contract Act of 1965, as amended, and the regulations of the Secretary of Labor (29 CFR Part 4), this clause identifies the classes of service employees expected to be employed under the contract and states the wages and fringe benefits payable to each if they were employed by the contracting agency subject to the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 5341 or 5332.

THIS STATEMENT IS FOR INFORMATION ONLY: IT IS NOT A WAGE DETERMINATION

Employee Class

GS Equivalent

I.3 AGAR 452.224-70 CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION (FEB 1988)

(a) Confidential information, as used in this clause, means:

(1) Information or data of a personal nature, proprietary about an individual; or,

(2) information or data submitted by or pertaining to an institution or organization.

(b) In addition to the types of confidential information described in (a)(1) and (2) above, information which might require special consideration with regard to the timing of its disclosure may derive from studies or research during which public disclosure of primarily invalidated findings could create an erroneous conclusion which might threaten public health or safety if acted upon.

(c) The Contracting Officer and the contractor may, by mutual consent, identify elsewhere in this contract specific information and/or categories of information which the Government will furnish to the contractor or that the contractor is expected to generate which is confidential. Similarly, the Contracting Officer and the contractor may, by mutual consent, identify such confidential information from time to time during the performance of the contract. Failure to agree will be settled pursuant to the "Disputes" clause.

(d) If it is established that information to be utilized under this contract is subject to the Privacy Act, the contractor will follow the rules and procedures of disclosure set forth in the Privacy Act of 1974, 5 U.S.C. 552a, and implementing regulations and policies, with respect to systems of records determined to be subject to the Privacy Act.

(e) Confidential information, as defined in (a)(1) and (2) above, shall not be disclosed without the prior written consent of the individual, institution or organization.

(f) Written advance notice of at least 45 days will be provided to the Contracting Officer of the contractor's intent to release findings of studies or research, which have the possibility of adverse effects on the public or the Federal agency, as described in (b) above. If the Contracting Officer does not pose any objections in writing within the 45-day period, the contractor may proceed with disclosure. Disagreements not resolved by the contractor and Contracting Officer will be settled pursuant to the "Disputes" clause.

(g) Whenever the contractor is uncertain with regard to the proper handling of material under the contract, or if the material in question is subject to the Privacy Act or is confidential information subject to the provisions of this clause, the contractor shall obtain a written determination from the Contracting Officer prior to any release, disclosure, dissemination, or publication.

(h) The provisions of paragraph (e) of this clause shall not apply when the information is subject to conflicting or overlapping provisions in other Federal, State or local laws.

I.4 AGAR 452.247-75 RESTRICTIONS AGAINST DISCLOSURE (FEB 1988)

(a) The contractor agrees, in the performance of this contract, to keep all information contained in source documents or other media furnished by the Government in the strictest confidence. The contractor also agrees not to publish or otherwise divulge such information in whole or in part in any manner or form, or to authorize or permit others to do so, taking such reasonable measures as are necessary to restrict access to such information while in the contractor's possession, to those employees needing such information to perform the work

provided herein, i.e., on a "need to know" basis. The contractor agrees to immediately notify in writing, the Contracting Officer, named herein, in the event that the contractor determines or has reason to suspect a breach of this requirement.

(b) The contractor agrees not to disclose any information concerning the work under this contract to any persons or individual unless prior written approval is obtained from the Contracting Officer. The contractor agrees to insert the substance of this clause in any consultant agreement or subcontract hereunder.

SECTION J – LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

The documents listed below are attached to this section and are made a part hereof:

ATTACHMENT I References
ATTACHMENT II Schedule of Deliverables
ATTACHMENT III Past Performance Questionnaires

SECTION K – REPRESENTATIONS, CERTIFICATIONS AND OTHER STATEMENTS OF OFFERORS

To be eligible for award of a contract resulting from this solicitation, contractors must be registered in the Federal Government’s Central Contractor Registration” (CCR) and the Federal Government “Online Representations and Certifications Application” (ORCA). Registrations must be current and up to date.

K-1 SOLICITATION PROVISIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE (FAR 52.252-1)(FEB 1998)

This solicitation incorporates one or more solicitation provisions by reference, with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request, the Contracting Officer will make their full text available. The offeror is cautioned that the listed provisions may include blocks that must be completed by the offeror and submitted with its quotation or offer. In lieu of submitting the full text of those provisions, the offeror may identify the provision by paragraph identifier and provide the appropriate information with its quotation or offer. Also, the full text of a solicitation provision may be accessed electronically at this address:
<http://www.arnet.gov/far/>

<u>PROVISION</u>		
<u>NUMBER</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>DATE</u>
52.203-11	CERTIFICATION AND DISCLOSURE REGARDING PAYMENTS TO INFLUENCE CERTAIN FEDERAL TRANSACTIONS	SEP 2007

K-2 TAXPAYER IDENTIFICATION (FAR 52.204-3)(OCT 1998)

(a) Definitions.

“Common parent,” as used in this provision, means that corporate entity that owns or controls an affiliated group of corporations that files its Federal income tax returns on a consolidated basis, and of which the offeror is a member.

“Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN),” as used in this provision, means the number required by the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) to be used by the offeror in reporting income tax and other returns. The TIN may be either a Social Security Number or an Employer Identification Number.

(b) All offerors must submit the information required in paragraphs (d) through (f) of this provision to comply with debt collection requirements of 31 U.S.C. 7701(c) and 3325(d), reporting requirements of 26 U.S.C. 6041, 6041A, and 6050M, and implementing regulations issued by the IRS. If the resulting contract is subject to the payment reporting requirements described in Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 4.904, the failure or refusal by the offeror to furnish the information may result in a 31 percent reduction of payments otherwise due under the contract.

The TIN may be used by the Government to collect and report on any delinquent amounts arising out of the offeror’s relationship with the Government (31 U.S.C. 7701(c)(3)). If the resulting contract is subject to the payment reporting requirements described in FAR 4.904, the TIN provided hereunder may be matched with IRS records to verify the accuracy of the offeror’s TIN.

(d) Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN).

TIN: _____.

TIN has been applied for.

TIN is not required because:

Offeror is a nonresident alien, foreign corporation, or foreign partnership that does not have income effectively connected with the conduct of a trade or business in the United States and does not have an office or place of business or a fiscal paying agent in the United States;

Offeror is an agency or instrumentality of a foreign government;

Offeror is an agency or instrumentality of the Federal government;

(e) Type of organization.

Sole proprietorship;

Partnership;

- Corporate entity (not tax-exempt);
- Corporate entity (tax-exempt);
- Government entity (Federal, State, or local);
- Foreign government;
- International organization per 26 CFR 1.6049-4;
- Other _____;

(f) Common Parent.

Offeror is not owned or controlled by a common parent as defined in paragraph (a) of this provision.

Name and TIN of common parent:

Name _____

TIN _____

**K-3 CERTIFICATION OF TOXIC CHEMICAL RELEASE REPORTING
(FAR 52.223-13) (AUG 2003)**

(a) Executive Order 13148, of April 21, 2000, Greening the Government through Leadership in Environmental Management, requires submission of this certification as a prerequisite for contract award.

(b) By signing this offer, the offeror certifies that-

(1) As the owner or operator of facilities that will be used in the performance of this contract that are subject to the filing and reporting requirements described in section 313 of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1986 (EPCRA) (42 U.S.C. 11023) and section 6607 of the Pollution Prevention Act of 1990 (PPA) (42 U.S.C. 13106), the offeror will file and continue to file for such facilities for the life of the contract the Toxic Chemical Release Inventory Form (Form R) as described in sections 313(a) and (g) of EPCRA and section 6607 of PPA; or

(2) None of its owned or operated facilities to be used in the performance of this contract is subject to the Form R filing and reporting requirements because each such facility is exempt for at least one of the following reasons: [*Check each block that is applicable.*]

(i) The facility does not manufacture, process, or otherwise use any toxic chemicals listed in 40 CFR 372.65;

(ii) The facility does not have 10 or more full-time employees as specified in section 313(b)(1)(A) of EPCRA, 42 U.S.C. 11023(b)(1)(A);

(iii) The facility does not meet the reporting thresholds of toxic chemicals

established under section 313(f) of EPCRA, 42 U.S.C. 11023(f) (including the alternate thresholds at 40 CFR 372.27, provided an appropriate certification form has been filed with EPA);

(iv) The facility does not fall within the following Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes or their corresponding North American Industry Classification System sectors:

- (A) Major group code 10 (except 1011, 1081, and 1094).
- (B) Major group code 12 (except 1241).
- (C) Major group codes 20 through 39.
- (D) Industry code 4911, 4931, or 4939 (limited facilities that combust coal and/or oil for the purpose of generating power for distribution in commerce).
- (E) Industry code 4953 (limited to facilities regulated under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, Subtitle C (42 U.S.C. 6921, *et seq.*), or 5169, or 5171, or 7389 (limited to facilities primarily engaged in solvent recovery services on a contract or fee basis); or

(v) The facility is not located in the United States or its outlying areas.

K.4 TOXIC CHEMICAL RELEASE REPORTING (FAR 52.223-14, AUGUST 2003)

(a) Unless otherwise exempt, the Contractor, as owner or operator of a facility used in the performance of this contract, shall file by July 1 for the prior calendar year an annual Toxic Chemical Release Inventory Form (Form R) as described in sections 313(a) and (g) of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act of 1986 (EPCRA) (42 U.S.C. 11023(a) and (g)), and section 6607 of the Pollution Prevention Act of 1990 (PPA) (42 U.S.C. 13106). The Contractor shall file, for each facility subject to the Form R filing and reporting requirements, the annual Form R throughout the life of the contract.

(b) A Contractor-owned or -operated facility used in the performance of this contract is exempt from the requirement to file an annual Form R if—

(1) The facility does not manufacture, process, or otherwise use any toxic chemicals listed in 40 CFR 372.65;

(2) The facility does not have 10 or more full-time employees as specified in section 313(b)(1)(A) of EPCRA, 42 U.S.C. 11023(b)(1)(A);

(3) The facility does not meet the reporting thresholds of toxic chemicals established under section 313(f) of EPCRA, 42 U.S.C. 11023(f) (including the alternate thresholds at 40 CFR 372.27, provided an appropriate certification form has been filed with EPA);

(4) The facility does not fall within the following Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes or their corresponding North American Industry Classification System sectors:

- (i) Major group code 10 (except 1011, 1081, and 1094).

- (ii) Major group code 12 (except 1241).
 - (iii) Major group codes 20 through 39.
 - (iv) Industry code 4911, 4931, or 4939 (limited to facilities that combust coal and/or oil for the purpose of generating power for distribution in commerce).
 - (v) Industry code 4953 (limited to facilities regulated under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, Subtitle C (42 U.S.C. 6921, *et seq.*)), or 5169, or 5171, or 7389 (limited to facilities primarily engaged in solvent recovery services on a contract or fee basis); or
 - (5) The facility is not located in the United States or its outlying areas.
- (c) If the Contractor has certified to an exemption in accordance with one or more of the criteria in paragraph (b) of this clause, and after award of the contract circumstances change so that any of its owned or operated facilities used in the performance of this contract is no longer exempt—
- (1) The Contractor shall notify the Contracting Officer; and
 - (2) The Contractor, as owner or operator of a facility used in the performance of this contract that is no longer exempt, shall—
 - (i) Submit a Toxic Chemical Release Inventory Form (Form R) on or before July 1 for the prior calendar year during which the facility becomes eligible; and
 - (ii) Continue to file the annual Form R for the life of the contract for such facility.
- (d) The Contracting Officer may terminate this contract or take other action as appropriate, if the Contractor fails to comply accurately and fully with the EPCRA and PPA toxic chemical release filing and reporting requirements.
- (e) Except for acquisitions of commercial items as defined in FAR Part 2, the Contractor shall—
- (1) For competitive subcontracts expected to exceed \$100,000 (including all options), include a solicitation provision substantially the same as the provision at FAR 52.223-13, Certification of Toxic Chemical Release Reporting; and
 - (2) Include in any resultant subcontract exceeding \$100,000 (including all options), the substance of this clause, except this paragraph (e).

K-5 DUPLICATION OF COST

The offeror represents and certifies that any changes contemplated and included in its estimate of cost for performance are not duplicative of any charges against any other Government contract, subcontract, or other Government source.

K-12 CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the responses to the above Representations, Certifications and other statements are accurate and complete.

Signature: _____

Title: _____

Date: _____

SECTION L – INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES TO OFFERORS

These instructions and additional information are provided to assist potential offerors in preparation of their technical and business proposals.

Special instructions to offerors to establish a basis for proposals and price and cost estimates. All proposals shall adhere to these instructions so that proposals from all offerors can be compared to one another.

L.1 Important Elements / Dates

Notice of Intent/Questions from Offerors

A notice of intent to bid along with any questions about the procurement must be submitted in writing not later than 12:00 p.m. on September 3, 2010 to Belal Hammad belal.hammad@fns.usda.gov.

Pre-Proposal Conference

If submitted questions warrant a pre-proposal bidder's conference, it is strongly recommended that interested evaluation firms should participate in the conference.

Proposal Delivery

1. Capability Proposals are due by 12:00 p.m., September 27, 2010. The Capability Proposal shall include past performance, staffing, key personnel, and financial capability. The past performance section must include:
 - Experience working with demonstration officials and staffs: The proposal demonstrates capability and experience in successfully working with state, federal, local and private officials/staff implementing and operating large-scale demonstrations.
 - Successfully conducting evaluations of multiple, simultaneous demonstrations of a geographic size and complexity similar to the SEBTC demonstrations: The proposal demonstrates the ability to mount large data collection efforts in diverse regions of the country at one time.
 - Experience with projects which involved household data collections, sophisticated analyses, and Congressional attention: The proposal demonstrates the ability to conduct statistically valid and representative surveys, complex analysis (e.g., econometric analysis and modeling, survival analysis, statistical analysis and testing, sampling, general data manipulation, programming) and reporting

the methods and findings of such work to Congressional and policy advocacy audiences.

- Experience in achieving overall and item response rates that meet or exceed OMB standards and guidelines for federal statistical surveys. The capability proposal must include a list of overall response rates (proportion of the sample frame that is represented by responding units) achieved on primary data collection from individuals and households for all Federal OMB-approved domestic data collections initiated since July 1, 2005.

L.2 Format for Written Technical and Price Proposal

The offeror shall submit one one original and eight hard copies of your technical proposal, one original and four hard copies of your price proposal, one CD for the technical and price factors shall be delivered to:

USDA Food and Nutrition Service
Attn: Belal Hammad
Room 228
3101 Park Center Drive
Alexandria, VA 22302

Each volume shall be delivered in a binder and appropriately tabbed, with the offeror and volume number identified on the spine of the binder. The original and hard copy proposal volumes shall be submitted on white paper.

The offeror also shall provide a soft copy of the proposals using electronic media in MS Word, Excel (unprotected read/write) as appropriate, on CD-ROM.

Text shall be presented on 8 ½ X 11 inch paper in Arial or Times New Roman typeface, no smaller than 12-point pitch (smaller fonts are acceptable for graphics, figures, tables, footnotes, and legends) with 1-inch margins. **The proposal should be concise and should not include any marketing material.** Proposal narrative shall not exceed the number of single-sided pages for each Volume as shown in the following table.

Page Limitation Restrictions	
Volume	Page Limit
Volume I: Technical Approach	80 pages -
Volume II: Experience/Management	20 pages – completed response 3-5 pages- per person for key personnel
Volume III: Past Performance	20 pages –
Volume IV: Price	Unlimited

Technical and Cost Proposals: Written proposal must be received on 26 October, 2010 at 1:00 p.m. eastern (daylight saving) time at USDA, Food and Nutrition Service, Contract Management Division, Room 228, 3101 Park Center Drive, Alexandria, VA 22302. All submitted materials will become the property of the Government and will not be returned. Regardless of the manner you choose to deliver your package, it is the offeror’s responsibility to make sure it is received before the submission deadline.

L.2 Important Information and Instructions

L.2.1 Demonstration Operations

For information purposes only, the competitive Requests for Application (RFAs) for SEBTC-SNAP and SEBTC-WIC demonstrations released to States give the best description of FNS’ assumptions about the operation of the demonstrations. The Requests for Application (RFAs) for States to compete to operate SEBTC-SNAP and SEBTC-WIC demonstrations, along with other background material, can be found at <http://www.fns.usda.gov/ora/menu/DemoProjects/SummerFood/Announcement.htm>. FNS will provide more current information at the pre-proposal bidders’ conference. Offerors should bear in mind that FNS continues to update its plans and assumptions. The assumptions contained in the SOW and the RFAs are a starting point for offerors to develop their proposed research design. If there is an information conflict between the SOW and the items on the web page, the SOW shall be considered definitive.

L.2.2 Congressional Appropriation

While Congress appropriated \$85 million for the Summer Food for Children demonstrations, over half of that amount is needed to pay for food benefits in the household-based demonstrations and incentives payments in the SFSP demonstrations. In addition, State, local education agency (LEA) and EBT vendor costs to implement and operate the demonstrations over several years must come from the \$85 million total. FNS also is funding two other evaluation contracts and several support contracts related to the demonstrations and evaluations out of this total. There is a ceiling of \$24,500,000 for all aspects of the base contract from award

to completion. FNS, in its sole discretion, may discard without evaluation proposals that exceed the ceiling.

L.2.3 Important Study Requirements and Constraints

1. It is not the intent of this effort to obtain data at the scope, detail and invasiveness as obtained from surveys such as the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey. For the purposes of the base work under this procurement, impact on **nutritional status** shall include:
 - a. measure of body mass index (offerors shall propose whether this should be self-reported or measured and why that proposal is made).
 - b. Self-reported dietary measures such as food intake behaviors that can be assessed with questions taken from available instruments such as the Center for Disease Control and Prevention' Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS) high school questionnaire items 72 through 79 (see: www.cdc.gov/HealthyYouth/yrbs/pdf/questionnaire/2009HighSchool.pdf). YRBS is mentioned *as an example, not a requirement*, to clearly indicate that the far more intensive (and expensive) methods such as 24-hour recalls are not being sought as part of the base contract and CLIN 004. Offerors should propose the best sets of tools they believe are appropriate and efficient to meet study objectives.
2. **To the degree possible within resource constraints, for each of the food security and nutrition status questions, FNS is interested in assessing the degree of variation by a child's characteristics and circumstances**, including grade level, characteristics of schools they attend, household size and socio-economic status, race, ethnicity, frequency of NSLP participation during the school year; participation in other food and nutrition assistance programs; household concern about stigma; presence of a disabled individual in the household; and value of an change in household food expenditures. We are also interested in how these impacts vary in successive years of operation of the demonstrations.
3. **To the degree possible within resource constraints, FNS is interested in identifying other effects of the demonstrations on participating children and sites.** Offerors should consider whether it is possible, either within the base contract, to address such questions as:
 - What proportion of the population certified for free and reduced price school meals (FRP) accepted and used demonstration benefits?
 - Did households redeem demonstration benefits at a constant rate over the summer? If not, what is the pattern of redemptions and how does this relate to impacts on food insecurity?
 - Did demonstration benefits last until the end of each summer month? Until the start of the next school year?

- Were the demonstrations benefits largely used for eligible children or were they distributed among all household members? Does this vary by category of demonstration? By age of child? By level of food security at the start of the summer? By other characteristics of the child and household?
- For SEBTC-WIC benefits, to what extent (dollars, percent and quantity) did redemption vary by specific types of food (e.g., milk, cheese, eggs, cereal, whole grains, etc.)? How did the redemption of the benefit differ from redemption of cash-value vouchers for fruits and vegetables?
- For each type of demonstration, how did the household's food supply change in the summer? What portion of the household's meals and snacks were provided by the demonstration and by other sources? What strategies did the intervention and control population use to obtain food over the school vacation period and how did this differ for these groups?
- How did the demonstrations impact parental and community awareness of and participation in summer feeding options including the traditional SFSP? Does the answer vary by demonstration category, benefit level, level of benefit use or other factors?
- To what extent were the SEBTC demonstrations viewed favorably by parents?
- What, if any, other initiatives occurred in the demonstration area to reduce or eliminate child hunger?
- What is the impact of the demonstration on the local economy (total economic activity generated, net shift in case expenditures for food, etc.)

L.2.4 STUDY PLAN

Each Offeror shall submit a detailed Study Plan, which describes and explains how the Offeror will answer the research questions and objectives discussed in the Statement of Work from both technical, staffing and management perspectives. The Study Plan shall contain the following:

Technical Approach

1. Executive summary of evaluation approach and activities.
2. Proposed evaluation research design, including descriptions of:
 - a. Sampling Plan. A discussion of the sampling plan including proposed sample power, size, design and frame.
 - b. Evaluation Approach. A discussion of the evaluation approach that will achieve the objectives contained in this solicitation.
 - c. State and local agency Cooperation. A discussion of offeror's approach to working with State and local agencies.
 - d. Training Plan. Discussion of how data collectors and local partners involved in data collection will be trained.
 - e. Data Collection and Database Development Plan. Discussion of proposed data collection instruments, data collection methods and creation of database, including data obtained from EBT processors.

- f. Analysis Plan. Discussion of outcome measures to be developed and analytical methodology of producing those measures and comparing results across demonstration sites and types (i.e. SEBTC-SNAP vs. SEBTC-WIC).
 - g. Description of nonresponsive bias analyses to be conducted if response rates do not achieve either the 80% overall or 70% item standard.
3. Proposed evaluation reporting and documentation plan.
 4. Description of deliverables.

Management Plan

1. Key Personnel
 - a. Major responsibilities
 - b. Percentage commitment. Expected time commitment to this project and to all other concurrent projects. Assurance that future projects will not reduce the time commitment to this project.
 - c. Resume synopses (3 paragraph maximum per person)
2. Qualifications of generic personnel, time loading chart by key and generic staff by task, specific project-level management procedures and organization, and specific company-level procedures for oversight of the project and for ensuring adequate commitment of corporate resources to the project.
3. Quality Control Plan.
4. Data Confidentiality and Security Plan.
5. Schedule. Schedule of all activities by task and deliverable to organize and structure the work. This section must include the proposed scheduling and sequencing of tasks and the identification of any key dates not reflected in the RFC's Schedule of Deliverables...
6. Labor. Proposed labor hours for each task and deliverable by personnel

The Study Plan "Technical Approach" section shall not exceed eighty (80) pages in length, one-and-a-half line spacing, 12 point font, one inch margins. The tabular research design presentation called for in section L.2.6 (h) is not included in the 80 pages. The tabular presentation should use 1.15 line spacing and one inch margins.

The Study Plan "Management Plan" Section shall not exceed twenty (20) pages in length, double spacing, 12 point font, one inch margins. Resumes and other business information (time loading charts, GANTT charts, proposed scheduling and sequencing of tasks) are excluded from the 20 page limit.

Pages shall be numbered consecutively; a page printed on both sides shall be counted as two pages. Pages submitted in excess of the page limitations stated above will be removed and not evaluated.

Offerors should organize their proposals such that the Study Plan is a separate and complete part of the proposal. The Study Plan may be a separate chapter composed of the various sections discussed above.

L.2.5 IMPORTANT INFORMATION FOR PREPARING THE STUDY PLAN

Evaluation design:

1. Sampling Plan

- a. **Power and Minimum Detectable Difference:** At the “full” demonstration level, the design must be able to detect policy relevant changes in food security with 95% confidence and 80% power. **Policy interest is focused on households with very low food security.** Offerors shall specify the minimum detectable difference for estimates of means and proportions for subgroups. Offerors shall discuss how the minimum detectable differences proposed will support future Federal decisions on policy choices regarding interventions to improve food security and eliminate child hunger in the summer months. *Offerors must commit to using and achieving that level in the evaluation should they win.* Offerors are encouraged to familiarize themselves with the reports on food security on both the FNS¹³ and ERS¹⁴ websites as well as with Mark Nord and Kathleen Romig, “Hunger in the Summer: Seasonal food insecurity and the National School Lunch and Summer Food Service programs” *Journal of Children and Poverty*, Vol. 12, No 2, 2006. In determining their proposed level, offerors should bear in mind that in 2008:
 - i. slightly under 6% of households population had very low food security;
 - ii. among households with children, 1.3% experienced very low food security among children;
 - iii. among households with incomes below poverty, about 19% experienced very low food security; and,
 - iv. among households with incomes below 185% of poverty, about 15% experienced very low food security.

- b. **Sample Size:** The demonstrations will involve 10,000 to 12,000 eligible K-12 participants per demonstration site in both proof-of-concept evaluation and full evaluations phases. The 2011 proof-of-concept demonstrations will have 2,500 children in the treatment group; in 2012 we anticipate 5,000 children in the treatment group. The size of the interview samples should be chosen by the offeror to maximize power for analyzing impacts on very low food security and nutritional status among children for each of the various interventions with both aggregate and subgroup analyses. A minimum of three subgroup analyses that compare the impacts on food security and nutrition status among children are required: one subgroup must compare SNAP participants vs. non-participants; the two other subgroups will be determined by FNS in consultation with the contractor. Given that food insecurity is the most important measure in this evaluation and among the most sensitive measure to sample size, offerors shall explicitly discuss the sample size necessary within each demonstration area in order to detect differences in food security at various levels (very low, low, and secure) between treatment and control families. Offerors shall

¹³ www.fns.usda.gov/ora/menu/Published/FoodSecurity/

¹⁴ www.ers.usda.gov/Briefing/FoodSecurity/

discuss how they will combine samples across demonstration areas in order to detect smaller differences.

- c. **Sampling Design:** Random assignment to treatment and control shall be used in order to produce a robust evaluation. Children certified for free and reduced-price meals shall be aggregated into households and the households randomly assigned to treatment and control. Offerors shall discuss how they will work with local educational agencies to identify common households of children who may attend different schools or who may have different surnames. Offerors shall explicitly discuss how they propose to conduct randomization at the family level, the tradeoffs between the different choices, and the robustness of the results their design will deliver. Offerors should explain how practical issues and challenges of random assignment will be addressed.

- d. **Sampling Frame:** FNS shall select the geographic areas where the various interventions will be fielded. The potential sample frame, that is the list of and contact information for free and reduced price children in the demonstration area, will be supplied by the demonstration grantee. The offeror shall design and construct the most efficient sample frame(s) and sampling plan(s) for meeting the requirements of this study.

- e. **Cases and Response Rates:** Offerors must specify their estimate of the likely response rates. Response rates shall be calculated according to the standards OMB applies to federal agencies. (See: http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/assets/omb/infocore/statpolicy/standards_stat_surveys.pdf.) Offerors shall note that an 80% overall and a 70% item response rate are required by OMB and that if the response rate is less, then a nonresponsive bias analysis is mandatory.

2. Evaluation Approach

- a. **Outcome Measurement:** Offerors shall discuss how they will measure each of the outcomes and areas identified in the objectives in the Statement of Work. For the following areas, offerors should discuss measurement methods, rationale for those methods, and whether they propose to use the same measures in the 2011 proof-of-concept demonstrations, the 2012 expanded demonstrations, and the 2013 continuation demonstrations:
 - i. Food Security
 - ii. Nutritional Status
 - iii. Benefit acceptance and usage
 - iv. Implementation Process
 - v. Costs

The Agency considers the USDA methodology used in the Food Security Supplement to be the best means of measuring very low food security. However, offerors may consider other approaches in addition to the Food Security Supplement scale if they consider them better suited to specific components of the evaluation.

- b. **Comparison with the School Year:** Offerors shall discuss how they will determine if the measurement of outcomes during the summer represents a change from the levels occurring during the school year. That is, random assignment ensures that we will know whether a difference between treatment and control households is a result of the treatment. But, assuming a difference is found, it does not tell whether the absolute level of food insecurity among treatment households is lower, the same, or higher than during the school year. Offerors shall propose how they will conduct a comparison of summer food insecurity levels with school year food insecurity levels.

In regard to the 2011 proof-of-concept demonstrations, FNS is concerned that the time required to develop instruments, obtain clearance of information collection, and train interviewers will pose a significant challenge to collecting baseline measures of food security status before the end of the 2010/2011 school year. Offerors shall discuss what actions they can take to speed the study to enable a baseline measure in regard to the 2011 proof-of-concept demonstrations.

If offerors believe that measurement near the end of the 2010/2011 school year is unlikely to be possible, they shall propose an alternative and discuss the advantages/disadvantages of the alternatives they consider (e.g., measuring school-year levels early in the 2011/2012 school year, deferring baseline comparisons until the 2012 demonstrations, regression-adjusted comparisons of demonstration data to national food security data, etc.).

c. **Comparability**

- i. *Comparison Groups:* Offerors shall specify the appropriate comparison groups (e.g., gender, age, grade level, baseline food security status) of children for the data collection. The rationale for the specifications and any alternatives considered and rejected shall be presented and discussed.
- ii. *Cross-site and cross-demonstration model comparability:* Offerors shall discuss their plans to maximize the ability to compare results across sites testing the same model and across sites testing different models. Offerors shall discuss how the randomization approach they propose will allow them to combine samples across demonstrations to increase the ability to detect small changes in food security levels.
- iii. *Annual comparisons:* Offerors shall specify how they will analyze data to compare across multiple years of operation.

3. **Cooperation with State and Local Agency:** The offeror shall identify the areas of its plans that require significant coordination with State and local agency staff. The offeror shall describe its plans for coordinating operations with these partners, decision-making that

requires assent of partners, resolving disputes, and apprising partners of progress and needs of the evaluation.

4. **Training Plan:** Offerors shall discuss how, when and where data collectors and local partners will be informed about and/or trained to collect data.

5. **Data Collection and Database Development Plan**

- a. **Frequency:** Offerors shall explicitly discuss when and how frequently they will measure demonstration outcomes, such as food security or nutritional status. FNS assumes that it will be necessary to measure the food security of participants shortly before the end of the school year and shortly before the end of the summer in order to analyze the change in food security over the summer. Offerors shall discuss whether they propose a different frequency or timing of measurement and why.
- b. **Schedule:** Offerors shall specify an approximate schedule of data collection points, bearing in mind the need for OMB clearance, school-year calendars, and the need to deliver a final report acceptable to FNS by the deadline in the deliverable schedule.
- c. **Longitudinal v. Cross-Sectional:** Offerors shall discuss whether they propose to use cross-sectional or longitudinal measurement of food security and why.
- d. **Variables:** Offerors shall specify variables they will use in the analysis to help explain the outcomes (e.g., school characteristics, student and family characteristics, baseline food security, etc.) and discuss why these variables were chosen and how they might be relevant. Offerors shall discuss their procedures for collecting the relevant school-level, aggregate, and administrative data under their approach and how it will be integrated into their analyses.
- e. **Instruments:**
 - i. *Food Security:* The Agency considers the USDA methodology used in the Food Security Supplement to be the best means of measuring very low food security. Offerors should identify which instrument they will use to measure food security (e.g., use the 18-item scale fielded in the Current Population Survey alone or this and an adaptation of that scale or the 1 or 2 questions fielded in various Gallup surveys, etc.) However, offerors may consider other approaches that may be better suited to this evaluation.
 - ii. *Anthropometrics:* To the degree possible within resource constraints, offerors shall collect a measure of body mass index and shall discuss whether they propose to do this through independent measurement or self-report.
 - iii. *Dietary Measures:* FNS recommends the use of food intake behaviors that can be assessed with questions taken from available instruments such as the Center for Disease Control and Prevention' Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS) high school questionnaire items 72 through 79 (see: www.cdc.gov/HealthyYouth/yrbs/pdf/questionnaire/2009HighSchool.pdf). YRBS is mentioned *as an example, not a requirement*, to clearly indicate that the far more intensive (and expensive) methods such as 24-hour recalls are not being sought as part of the base contract. Offerors should propose the best

sets of tools they believe are appropriate and efficient to meet study objectives.

- iv. **SFSP Program Participation**: As the existing Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) will continue to operate in demonstration sites, the evaluation design must be able to distinguish between participants that received only SEBTC benefits and those which received both SEBTC benefits and subsidized meals at SFSP sites. The proposal should also discuss how it will collect information on the frequency of SFSP meal receipt of demonstration participants.
 - v. **Other Necessary Instruments**: The offeror shall discuss all other instruments necessary to collect data to respond to the objectives of this evaluation.
- f. **Methods**: Offerors shall specify how they will collect data to address the study's objectives for each data collection instrument proposed.
- i. **Means**: Offerors shall discuss what means they will use to acquire data from subjects such as in-person interviews, mail surveys, computer aided data collection, telephone interviews, etc.
 - ii. **Cooperation**: Offerors shall specify their approach to gaining cooperation with schools, parents, and students.
 - iii. **Confidentiality**: Offerors shall describe their approach to conducting this evaluation in a manner that maintains the confidentiality of NSLP meal certification status of children or households. Offerors shall discuss in detail how they will accommodate the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) in developing the student sample, if necessitated by their proposed approach. The FERPA regulation is available on the web.¹⁵
 - iv. **Respondents**: This study requires collection of data from students and/or their families. Offerors shall specify which individuals they will gather data from and what grade level(s) and age group(s) they are proposing to gather data from.
 - v. **Database Development**: Offerors shall discuss how they plan to integrate data they collect from the community and individuals with administrative and EBT transaction data provided by FNS through a separate procurement.

NOTE: While this contract requires strict protection of personally identifiable information on individuals and households, the report and data base shall identify the state, geographic area and other institutional identifiers to enable mapping and other comparisons.

6. **Analysis Plan**: Offerors shall discuss their approach and plans for analyzing the data collected in the study.
 - a. **Descriptive and inferential statistics**: Offerors shall enumerate how the characteristics and outcomes of their analyses shall be presented.
 - b. **Models**: Offerors shall specify the primary model(s) to be tested using standard econometric and/or other applicable format(s) to derive inferential statistics.

¹⁵ <http://www.ed.gov/policy/gen/reg/ferpa/index.html>

- c. **Variables:** Offerors shall specify the variables they will use in each analysis to help explain outcomes and discuss why these variables were chosen and how they might be relevant.

L.2.6 DRAFT PARTIAL OMB PACKAGE

FNS is concerned that the timing of award, coupled with the time required to obtain USDA-OCIO and OMB clearance for data collection, will pose significant challenges to successful summer 2011 data collection. In addition to discussing what they can do to minimize this challenge (as required in section L.2.5.2.b), offerors shall submit a draft of Part A of their intended OMB clearance package and their draft household data collection instruments, as an appendix to their proposal. FNS will review and rate the draft partial OMB packages submitted by offerors during the technical evaluation of proposals (see basis for award section). Draft packages are separate from the study plan, required above. Well-thought out packages will receive higher ratings. FNS reserves the right to require substantial revisions in the draft package if the offeror is the successful bidder.

L.2.7 GENERAL GUIDANCE

- (a) Offerors should demonstrate their ability to meet the proposed time frame for each task.
- (b) Offerors should include the names of those who wrote each section of the technical proposal and the percent of the section written by each contributor.
- (c) All final reports, memoranda, and other appropriate deliverables shall include an electronic copy. The form of the electronic copy (PDF, text, or other) shall be determined by FNS at the time the report is complete.
- (d) Offerors should develop proposals based on the assumption that, excluding data collection training sessions, all meetings between the Contractor and Agency's staff and all briefings shall take place at the FNS National Office in Alexandria, VA or an alternate location in the DC Metro area agreeable to FNS.
- (e) FNS reserves the right to attend and video and/or record any meetings, briefings, conferences and/ or training sessions paid for with funding provided through this contract. FNS shall retain all rights to such recordings including the right to make them publically available for free, without payment of royalties to the contractor or individuals recorded. If FNS elects to make such recording, the contractor and others attending the session may be required to sign a release form.
- (f) Assume that the time between drafts of each contract deliverable is equally divided between the FNS for review and the offeror for revisions.
- (g) **Deliverable Review Process:** Offerors should bear in mind that FNS intends to have outside experts review and comment on deliverables, including, but not limited to the proposed sampling, weighting, statistical analysis and other methodological procedures proposed by

the offeror. In addition, FNS may opt to have outside experts review and comment on the data collection instruments, the OMB clearance package, report outlines, draft and revised tables, graphics and presentation materials, and the various draft, revised, clearance and final reports. At FNS discretion, and prior to acceptance of the final comprehensive report, FNS plans to send the draft and/or revised report for review by outside peer reviewers. FNS requires documentation that all comments were carefully considered and addressed, or justification as to why they were not addressed. Therefore, in the transmittal memorandum to accompany each version of a deliverable, the contractor shall inform FNS how they addressed each comment from outside and government reviewers. Offerors should plan their schedules accordingly; budget for revisions based on these reviews; and, include sufficient time for these review processes.

- (h) **Tabular Research Design Presentation:** To facilitate comparisons across offerors, every offeror shall include a summary table with five columns: The first shall list; row by row, each discrete research objective and sub-objective (see SOW section “scope of work” subsection “objectives”). The second column shall state whether the objective will be answered in full, in part or not at all by the offeror’s approach. The third column shall indicate the subgroups they will represent in the analysis and at what level. Column four shall briefly indicate both the proposed data source to answer the question/sub-question and the primary analysis method to be performed. The final column shall give a reference to the page or subsection where the item is discussed in the technical approach.
- (i) **Documentation:** Offerors must agree that if they win they shall prepare and submit to FNS a set of CDs that include the raw data files and data analytic files used to produce all results that appear in each draft, revised, clearance and final report. With each version of the reports, the contractor shall submit all data files that were used to create the drafts including, the first draft, revised draft, final draft, and the published final report. These files shall be provided in micro-computer format for use with PC SAS, SPSS, or other suitable analytic software selected by FNS. In addition, the winning offeror shall provide all computer code (e.g., scripts, PROC statements, etc.) used to produce the analyses and tables and provide full documentation in hard copy and on CD for these data files. In part, the purpose is to allow FNS and others to quickly replicate the analyses to verify the findings.
- (j) **Reports:** Offerors should assume that all final reports from this contract shall have a professionally designed full color cover including photographs and/or graphics acceptable to FNS that graphics in the final reports shall be in multiple colors. The consumer friendly executive summary of the final comprehensive report shall be 36 pages in length and shall be professionally designed and in full color.
- (k) **Schedule of Deliverables:** Offerors shall propose a table displaying the complete *Schedule of Deliverables* consistent with their proposed approach and the dates shown for those items where the delivery date has not been specified in this RFP.

L.2.8 REFERENCES

All referenced materials in this solicitation are available in electronic format and most are available on the Internet. Please contact Belal Hammad, Contract Specialist, at (703) 305-2260 to receive any of these materials that are not available on the Internet. A list of reference materials is attached to this solicitation under Attachment I with URLs for those available on the Internet.

L.2.9 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The Offerors shall propose prices in all items in B section of this RFP.

The cost proposal must be separate from the technical proposal and should clearly describe the following:

- (a) A Bottom-Up estimate of the total Firm Fixed Price offered including:
 - 1) Level of effort anticipated for each portion of the effort.
 - 2) Labor category and associated schedule rate (with discount) for each person involved in the effort.
 - 3) General and Administrative costs.
 - 4) Other expenses as your firm deems necessary.

L.3 General Instructions

- (a) Proposals submitted in response to this solicitation shall be furnished in the following format:
 - (1) The proposal must include a technical proposal and cost proposal. Each of the parts shall be separate and complete so that evaluation of one may be accomplished independently from evaluation of the other. The technical proposal must not contain reference to cost; however, resource information (such as data concerning labor hours and categories, materials, subcontracts, etc.) must be contained in the technical proposal so that the contractor's understanding of the Performance Based Work Statement may be evaluated.

The Estimated Award announcement and the Period of Performance Begins' Dates are subject to change.

- (b) Technical Proposal Instructions. The technical proposal will be used to make an evaluation and arrive at a determination as to whether the proposal will meet the requirements of the Government. Therefore, the technical proposal must present sufficient information to reflect a thorough understanding of the requirements and a detailed, description of the techniques, procedures and program for achieving the objectives of the Performance Based Work Statement. Proposals which merely paraphrase the requirements of the Government's Performance Based Work Statement, or use such phrases as "will comply" or "standard techniques will be employed"

will be considered unacceptable and will not be considered further. As a minimum, the proposal must clearly provide the following:

- (1) Address all items and sub-items listed in the RFP.
- (2) Refer to the requirements and their own initiative in order to fully respond to the requirements.
- (3) Mark each TAB with the correct TAB letter and contain the information cited below for that TAB.
- (4) Include with the proposal any documentation that is referenced in the proposal with page and paragraph numbers included with the reference.
- (5) Submit a comprehensive technical proposal to provide a basis for sound evaluation by the Government. The information provided shall be concise, factual, and complete.
- (6) Offerors are required to submit, as part of their proposals, an INDEX referencing the page and paragraph numbers that contain their response/methodology/narrative, on an item-by-item basis to all of the requirements and evaluation criteria listed in the following paragraphs and sub-paragraphs.

TAB A –Technical Approach

The offeror shall demonstrate an understanding of each of the proposed task areas, describe approach for performing each task area, and provide indication of relevant experience.

TAB B –Experience/Management

The offeror shall describe their management plan that will be followed during contract execution. The management plan must include the proposed lines of responsibility, authority and communication through which the task will be managed and the procedures to be taken to insure quality and meeting contract objectives' deadlines within the contract price. The offeror shall include plans for ensuring continuity of the project if staff turnover occurs during the task period. The contractor shall submit a Schedule of Tasks for the Deliverables with the scheduled dates for the individual tasks. Subcontracting plans shall be included as part of the Management Plan, if applicable.

TAB C –Past Performances

The offeror shall provide a list of overall response rates (proportion of the sample frame that is represented by the responding units) achieved on primary data collection from individuals and households for all Federal OMB-approved domestic data collections initiated since July 1, 2005.

Provide a list of at least 3 projects you have or have had over the past 5 years of similar size and scope that are deemed to be the best representation of your performance.

You will need to supply a copy of the Performance Questionnaire (see attachment III) to the sponsoring agency for each of the three (3) projects for them to complete and include the performance questionnaires in the technical proposal.

The vendor acknowledges that the Government is not responsible if the point of contact provided by the vendor fails to respond to the Government's past performance inquiry. Vendors are also advised that the Government reserves the right to obtain information for use in the evaluation of past performance from any sources including non-USDA Government systems and sources outside of the Government.

TAB D – Staffing

The offeror shall submit resumes for all key personnel for this project.

L.3 AGAR 452.215-72 “Amendments to Proposals”

As prescribed in 415.407(b):

Amendment to Proposals (FEB 1988)

Any changes to a proposal made by the offeror after its initial submittal shall be accomplished by replacement pages. Changes from the original page shall be indicated on the outside margin by vertical lines adjacent to the change. The offeror shall include the date of the amendment on the lower right corner of the changed pages.

L.4 Questions Pertaining to this Solicitation

Any questions that you may have regarding this solicitation and/or procurement process **must** be submitted in writing, or by email, no later than 4:00 PM June 11, 2010. No telephone inquiries will be answered. Questions should be sent to:

Attn: Belal Hammad
USDA/FNS/CMB
3101 Park Center Drive, Room 228
Alexandria, VA 22302-1500
Belal.hammad@fns.usda.gov

L.5 Confidential Information

The Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) and its amendments have resulted in an increasing number of requests from outside the Government for copies of contract proposals submitted to federal agencies. If an offeror's proposal contains information that he/she believes should be withheld from such requesters under FOIA on the grounds that it contains "trade secrets and commercial or financial information" [5 USC§552(b)(4)], the offeror should mark its submission in the following manner:

The following notice should be placed on the title page:

Some parts of this document, as identified on individual pages, are considered by the offeror to be privileged or confidential trade secrets or commercial or financial information not subject to mandatory disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act. Material considered privileged or confidential on such grounds is contained on page(s)_____.

Each individual item considered privileged or confidential under FOIA should be marked with the following notice:

The data or information is considered confidential or privileged, and is not subject to mandatory disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act.

GOVERNMENT SHALL NOT PAY COST INCURRED IN SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL

This solicitation does not commit the Government to pay any cost incurred in the submission of the quotation or in making necessary studies of designs for the preparation thereof, nor to contract for services or supplies.

SECTION M – BASIS OF AWARD

M.1 METHOD OF AWARD/EVALUATION CRITERIA

Overview of the Source Selection Process.

This procurement action is considered a commercial item as described in Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) Part 12. Further, this action will follow best-value source selection procedures described in FAR Part 15 and the contract award will result in a combination firm fixed-price, indefinite delivery, and indefinite quantity (IDIQ) contract. Each offeror must submit a written proposal in strict accordance with instructions. When evaluating proposals, the Government will consider how well the offeror complied with both the letter and spirit of these instructions.

Contract award shall be made to the responsible offeror whose proposal in conforming to this RFP provides an overall best value to the Government, technical factors and price considered. The Government's objective is to obtain the highest technical quality considered necessary to achieve the project objectives, for a fair, reasonable and realistic price. Award will be made to the offeror whose technical proposal and price provide the best value to the government. The technical factors, when combined, are more important than price.

The Contracting Officer intends to evaluate proposals and make an award without discussions. However, the Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government.

M.2 EVALUATION CRITERIA

- Factor 1 – Technical Approach
- Factor 2 - Experience/Management
 - a. Key Personnel
 - b. Management Plan
- Factor 3 - Past Performance
- Factor 4 – Draft OMB package
- Factor 5 –Cost & Price

CAUTION!!! THE BELOW ITEMS ARE RISKS THAT COULD MEAN THE FAILURE OF THE PROJECT

1. Risk of Irreversible Failure

Congress has required FNS to deliver a rigorous, robust and timely evaluation of the SEBTC demonstrations. The five events below, should they occur, would lead to failure to meet the congressional requirement and a remedy for the failure would not be possible on any feasible timeline or budget.

- Independent peer reviewers of any of the 2012 Demonstration Reports (Task 9) judge that the design or execution of random assignment of households is a serious study deficiency.
- The overall and item response rates achieved on any of the 2012 Demonstration Reports (Task 9) are less than the OMB standards and guidelines but greater than 60% overall and 50% on the food security measures *and* the results of nonresponsive bias analysis raise a serious level of concern about the validity of findings among independent peer reviewers.
- The overall response rate achieved on any of the 2012 Demonstration Reports (Task 9) is less than 60% or the item nonresponsive rate on the food security scale measure is less than 50%.
- The data collected and analyzed for the 2012 demonstrations fails to provide a rigorous and robust evaluation of the impact of the SEBTC demonstrations on *very low* food security and nutritional status among children.
- FNS will not receive high quality results from the offeror *in sufficient time* for FNS to deliver a high quality mandatory Status Report to Congress each December.

2. Technical Approach

The offeror's response shall be evaluated with regard to the technical merit of the following:

- The discussion on the background and relevant research and on study objectives.
- The priority and appropriateness to the Congressional mandate of the study objectives and sub-objectives that the offeror **commits** to address within the fixed price vs. the study objectives and sub-objectives that the offeror will address if resources allow.
- Completeness of the proposed evaluation design in giving credible responses to the items and bullets in section L.2.5 of Instructions to Offerors.
- The minimum detectable difference in very low food security among children that the offeror **commits** to achieve in the evaluation of the “full” (2012) demonstrations.
- The methodology for determining the impact of the SEBTC demonstrations on food insecurity among children committed to in the proposal.
- The methodology and procedures for measuring nutritional status of children committed to in the proposal.
- The methodology and procedures for obtaining overall and item response rates of at least 80 percent and 70 percent, respectively.
- The methodology for the process evaluation of the SEBTC demonstrations committed to in the proposal.
- How the offeror will compare and contrast demonstration impacts among households that participate in SNAP and households that do not.
- The plans and procedures to accurately execute the proposed evaluation design.
- The analysis plan for measuring the impact of the SEBTC demonstrations in aggregate and by subgroups and contextual variables that provide an understanding of the reasons for the degree of impact.
- Quality Control Plan. The offeror identifies and commits to strong procedures for quality control, including review of key deliverables by independent experts from academic institutions.

3. **Experience/Management**

(A) **Key Personnel**

The offeror's proposed staff shall be evaluated with regard to:

- Expertise with research on food security in the United States.
- Expertise with research on nutrition status of children.
- Experience in achieving high response rates on large multisite evaluations requiring household level data collection from low-income populations.
- Familiarity with participation issues in SFSP.
- Experience in project management of social science evaluations.
- Expertise in social science data research and analysis.
- Expertise in descriptive and inferential statistics.
- Ability to write both brief and comprehensive evaluation reports clearly in non-technical language that is easily understandable to the layman.

(B) Management Plan

The offeror's proposed management plan will be evaluated with regard to:

- Identification of anticipated research challenges and the soundness of plans to address them;
- Relationship of staff assignments/expertise to needed skills;
- Relationship of time commitments to anticipated level of effort;
- Adequacy of task scheduling, coordination, and review to assure timely and high quality performance on all work;
- Planned management of subcontractor staff and consultants (if any); and
- Adequacy of confidentiality protection and security protocols.

4. Past Performance

The evaluation of past performance on projects will be a subjective assessment considering all relevant facts and circumstances. Past performance will be evaluated as a measure of the Government's confidence in the offeror's ability to successfully perform this project based on demonstrated relevant and recent performance.

The risk associated with the offeror's ability to perform on the proposed contract, i.e., to meet technical requirements, deliver quality products, and meet cost and schedule, will be assessed based on past performance. Particular emphasis will be placed on the degree to which the offeror's management can demonstrate successful past performance on the following criteria:

- Experience working with demonstration officials and staffs: The proposal demonstrates capability and experience in successfully working with state, federal, local and private officials/staff implementing and operating large-scale demonstrations.
- Successfully conducting evaluations of multiple, simultaneous demonstrations of a geographic size and complexity similar to the SEBTC demonstrations: The proposal demonstrates the ability to mount large data collection efforts in diverse regions of the country at one time.
- Experience with projects which involved household data collections, sophisticated analyses, and Congressional attention: The proposal demonstrates the ability to conduct statistically valid and representative surveys, complex analysis (e.g., econometric analysis and modeling, survival analysis, statistical analysis and testing, sampling, general data manipulation, programming) and reporting the methods and findings of such work to Congressional and policy advocacy audiences.
- Experience in achieving overall and item response rates that meet or exceed OMB standards and guidelines for federal statistical surveys. The proposal includes a

list of overall response rates (proportion of the sample frame that is represented by responding units) achieved on primary data collection from individuals and households for all Federal OMB-approved domestic data collections initiated since July 1, 2005.

In evaluating the offeror's past performance on completed projects, the Government may consider information in the offeror's proposal and information from other sources, including references, past and current customers, Government agencies and any other sources deemed necessary.

In the case of an offeror with respect to which there is no information on past contract performance or with respect to which information on past contract performance is not available, the offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on the factor of past contract performance.

5. Draft OMB Package

Offerors shall submit a draft of Part A of the OMB Package plus the household data collection instruments. This factor is intended to identify offerors who are "ready to hit the ground running."

6. Cost & Price

Price proposals will be evaluated for reasonableness and realism. In addition, when considering which offeror's proposal represents the overall best value to the government one or more of the following price analysis techniques may be utilized:

- a. Comparison of proposed prices received in response to the solicitation.
- b. Comparison of proposed prices with the independent Government Estimate.
- c. Comparison of proposed prices with available historical information.
- d. Comparison of proposed prices with information received from the DCAA or other governmental agencies.

Price realism: Examines whether the price is realistic for the work to be performed and reflects the offerors understanding of the requirements.

M.3 RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THE EVALUATION FACTORS

Award will be made to the offeror whose overall technical proposals, price, risk of failure to address all objectives within price, and risk of irreversible failure provide the best value to the government. The technical factors, when combined, are more important than price. Of the technical factors, factor 1 – Risk of irreversible failure is considered the most important, and then factor 1 – Technical Approach followed by factor 2 – Experience/Management, factor 3- Past Performance, and factor 4 – draft OMB package.

ADJECTIVAL RATING AND STANDARDS SCALE:

The evaluator shall select one of the adjectival ratings below that most clearly match the assessment of the proposal merit based on the established evaluation criteria. All proposals shall be assigned one of the below adjective ratings for all associate factors and sub factors.

EXCEPTIONAL (E): The proposal greatly exceeds stated requirements, as reflected through an innovative, comprehensive, outstanding approach. The response is complete in terms of the basic content and level of information the Government seeks for evaluation. There is a high probability of success and negligible risk that this offeror would fail to meet the quantity, quality and schedule requirements. There are no deficiencies and any weaknesses are very minor.

HIGHLY ACCEPTABLE (H): The proposal exceeds stated requirements. The response is complete in terms of the basic content and level of information the Government seeks for evaluation. There is a high probability of success and little or no risk that this offeror would fail to meet the quantity, quality and schedule requirements. There are no deficiencies or significant weaknesses, but there may be minor weaknesses that need not be corrected to make award.

ACCEPTABLE (A): The proposal meets the stated requirements. The response is considered complete in terms of the basic content and level of information the Government seeks for evaluation. There is good probability of success and little risk that this offeror would fail to meet the quantity, quality, and schedule requirements. Weaknesses, if any, are minor and need not be corrected to make award.

MARGINAL (M): The proposal significantly fails to meet the stated requirements. The response is considered incomplete or inadequate in terms of the basic content and level of information the Government seeks for evaluation. There is a low probability of success based on the present information. There are deficiencies and/or significant weaknesses, susceptible of correction through discussions and a major revision or a new proposal being submitted.

UNACCEPTABLE (U): The proposal significantly fails to meet the stated requirements. What was submitted lacks essential information or is conflicting and unproductive. There is no reasonable likelihood of success; deficiencies are so major or extensive that a major revision or complete rewrite of the proposal would be necessary.

M.4 BASIS FOR AWARD

(a) The contract resulting from this solicitation will be awarded to the responsible offeror whose offer, conforming to the solicitation, is determined to be most advantageous to the Government. All evaluation factors other than price, when combined, are more important than price.

(b) However, for an offer to be considered for award, it must:

- Meet all minimum standards (rated as “Acceptable”) on all evaluation factors.
- Be priced consistent with and based upon the data provided in the Technical proposal.
- Offer Realistic Pricing. An offer found to have unrealistic prices will not be considered for award.

(c) The contracting officer retains the right to evaluate offers and make award without discussions. However, the government reserves the right to conduct discussions if it is determined to be in the best interest of the government. The Government may reject any or all proposals if such action is in the public interest; accept other than the lowest cost/priced proposal; and waive informalities and minor irregularities in proposal received. Therefore, offerors are encouraged to insure that the initial proposals contain the offerors’s most favorable terms and reflect its best possible performance potential.

(d) The successful Offeror must present and submit a clear and concisely written proposal that gives the Government the greatest confidence in the Offeror’s ability to successfully meet the Government’s requirement.

[END OF SOLICITATION]

ATTACHMENT I
REFERENCES

Nord, M and Romig, K. 2006. "Hunger in the Summer: Seasonal food insecurity and the National School Lunch and Summer Food Service programs." In *Journal of Children and Poverty*. Vol. 12:2.

USDA food security reports and information:

www.fns.usda.gov/ora/MENU/Published/FoodSecurity/FoodSecurity.htm

www.ers.usda.gov/Briefing/FoodSecurity/

Youth Risk Behavior Survey:

www.cdc.gov/HealthyYouth/yrbs/pdf/questionnaire/2009HighSchool.pdf

Information on the SEBTC Demonstrations

<http://www.fns.usda.gov/ora/menu/DemoProjects/SummerFood/Announcement.htm>

ATTACHMENT II

SCHEDULE OF DELIVERABLES

SCHEDULE OF DELIVERABLES: BASE CONTRACT

Task	Deliverable	Copies	Due Date
Task 1	Orientation Meeting		
	Narrative & PowerPoint Summary of Research Approach	**	
Task 2	Finalize Proposed Research Design		
	Revised Research Design	**	
	Final Research Design	**	
	Revised 2011 Data Collection/Analysis Plans	**	
	Data Collection Instruments and Test Report	**	
	First Draft OMB Package	**	
	OMB Package	**	11.17.10 ¹⁶
	2011 Data Collector Training Package and Manual	**	
Task 3	Stored Benefit Alternative White Paper		
	Draft Request for Information for CBD	*	
	Draft White Paper	*	
	Final White Paper	**	
Task 4	Collect and Analyze 2011 Data		
Task 5	2011 Demonstration Reports		
	Draft Implementation Report	**	
	Final Implementation Report	**	6.30.11
	Assessment of Data Collection Approach and Methods	**	
	Draft Congressional Status Report	**	
	Final Congressional Status Report	**	10.08.11
	Draft Evaluation Report	**	
	Revised Evaluation Report	**	
	Final Evaluation Report	**	03.30.12
	2011 Annual Presentations (2)	*	
Task 6	2011 Documentation		
	Datafiles /Codebooks	*/**	
	Public Use Files	*	

** To be proposed by Offeror

* Provide electronically only

¹⁶ This is the due date for the version that FNS submits into Departmental and OMB clearance. The package shall be revised as needed until OMB clearance is obtained.

- # One of the copies shall be unbound. In addition to paper copies, one copy shall be submitted in electronic form using Microsoft Word (version TBD by FNS)

SCHEDULE OF DELIVERABLES: BASE CONTRACT

Task	Deliverable	Copies	Due Date
Task 7	Revise Research Design for 2012		
	Revised Research Design	**	11.1.11
	Report on Site Selection	*	11.15.11
	Revised 2012 Data Collection/Analysis Plans	**	
	2012 Data Collector Training Package and Manual	**	
Task 8	Collect and Analyze 2012 Data		
Task 9	2012 Demonstration Reports		
	Draft Status Report	**	
	Final Status Report	**	10.08.12
	Draft Evaluation Report	**	
	Revised Evaluation Report	**	
	Final Evaluation Report	**	03.30.13
	2012 Annual Presentations (2)	*	
Task 10	Documentation		
	2012 Datafiles /Codebooks	*/**	
	2012 Public Use Files	*	
Task 11	Comprehensive Report, Supplement & Presentations		
	Draft Outline	*	
	Revised Outline	*	
	Draft Report	**	
	Revised Report	**	
	Final Report	**	06.30.13
	Outline for Supplement to a Professional Journal	*	
	Supplement to a Professional Journal	**	
	Presentations (2)	**	
Task 12	Documentation		
	All Datafiles / Codebooks	*/**	
	All Public Use Files	*	
	Monthly Reports	*	

**** To be proposed by Offeror**

* Provide electronically only

One of the copies shall be unbound. In addition to paper copies, one copy shall be submitted in electronic form using Microsoft Word (version TBD by FNS)

SCHEDULE OF DELIVERABLES: OPTION I

Task	Deliverable	Copies	Due Date
Task 1	Update Plans to Collect and Analyze 2013 Data		
	Revised 2013 Research Design	**	
	Report on 2013 Site Selection	*	11.15.12
	Revised 2013 Data Collection/Analysis Plans	**	
	2013 Data Collector Training Package and Manual	**	
Task 2	Collect and Analyze 2013 Data		
Task 3	2013 Demonstration Reports		
	Draft Status Report	**	
	Final Status Report	**	10.08.13
	Draft Evaluation Report	**	
	Revised Evaluation Report	**	
	Final Evaluation Report	**	03.30.14
	2013 Annual Presentations (2)	*	
Task 4	Documentation		
	2013 Datafiles / Codebooks	*/**	
	2013 Public Use Files	*	
	Monthly Reports	*	

** To be proposed by Offeror

* Provide electronically only

One of the copies shall be unbound. In addition to paper copies, one copy shall be submitted in electronic form using Microsoft Word (version TBD by FNS)

SCHEDULE OF DELIVERABLES: OPTION II A & B

Options IIA and IIB would add 1-12 additional sites to the base contract for 2011 (IIA) and 2012 (IIB). To cost this option, the offeror should provide the cost of adding one site for 1 year.

SCHEDULE OF DELIVERABLES: OPTION III

Task	Deliverable	Copies	Due Date
Task 1	Facilitate 2011 Conference		
	Conference Agenda	**	
	PowerPoint Presentation	*	
Task 2	2011 Conference Report		
	Draft Report	**	
	Final report	**	

SCHEDULE OF DELIVERABLES: OPTION IV

Task	Deliverable	Copies	Due Date
Task 1	Facilitate 2012 Conference		
	Conference Agenda	**	
	PowerPoint Presentation	*	
Task 2	2012 Conference Report		
	Draft Report	**	
	Final report	**	

** To be proposed by Offeror

* Provide electronically only

One of the copies shall be unbound. In addition to paper copies, one copy shall be submitted in electronic form using Microsoft Word (version TBD by FNS)

SCHEDULE OF DELIVERABLES: OPTION V

- 60-minute executive briefings –
 - FNS may order up to 10 at times TBD at locations in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area.
 - FNS may order up to 10 at times TBD at locations TBD anyplace in the United States

- 3-hour staff briefings –
 - FNS may order up to 10 at times TBD at locations in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area.
 - FNS may order up to 10 at times TBD at locations TBD anyplace in the United States

ATTACHMENT III

THIS FORM IS PROVIDED FOR THE PURPOSE OF PROVIDING TO AND SUBMITTAL BY THE OFFEROR'S REFERENCES

PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SOLICITATION NUMBER: AG-3198-S-10-0012

The contractor listed below is being considered in a Source Selection by the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS), Contract Management Division, 3101 Park Center Drive, Alexandria, VA 22302. It would be appreciated if you would provide us with comments regarding the contractor's past performance. Your comments are considered Source Selection Sensitive; therefore, you are advised that the Federal Acquisition Regulation prohibits the release of the names of individuals providing reference information about an Offeror's past performance. In order to maintain the integrity of the source selection process, respectfully request that you do not divulge the name of the contractor nor discuss your comments on this questionnaire with any other individuals.

This form shall be mailed to the address mentioned above (Attention: Belal Hammad) or emailed to: Mr. Belal Hammad at: belal.hammad@fns.usda.gov

Past Project Information:

1. Contractor name and address:
2. Project Title and/or Contract Number:

Evaluator (The following information will assist in the analysis of the data. Information will be kept confidential.)

1. Name of Evaluator: _____ Date: _____
2. Phone Number: _____ Fax Number: _____
3. Address: _____
4. Position held or function in relation to the project: _____

RATINGS:

Please evaluate the contractor's performance using the following ratings:

"E" Exceptional – The contractor's performance greatly exceeded the stated requirements.
"HA" Highly Acceptable – The contractor's performance exceeded the stated requirements. "A" Acceptable – The contractor's performance met the stated requirements. "M" Marginal – The contractor's performance met the stated requirements, but with difficulty. "U" Unacceptable – The contractor's performance did not meet the stated requirements.

Please rate and provide any supporting information for the following: (Use additional sheets as necessary)

1. The relationship between the contractor and the customer's contract team.

2. The contractor's on-site management and coordination of subcontractors.

3. The contractor's overall corporate management, integrity, reasonableness and cooperative conduct.

4. The contractor provided competent program/project manager, supervisor, and workers

5. The contractor's quality control.

6. The contractor's ability to meet the performance schedule.

7. The contractor took measures to improve his schedule problems, if any?

8. The contractor's ability to provide the required work at a reasonable price.

9. The contractor's compliance with laws, regulations, and policies, if applicable.

10. The contractor rectified identified problems in a timely fashion without further incident of the same.

11. Has the contractor been given any of the following: Cure notice; show cause, letters of reprimand, suspension of payments, termination? If yes, please explain.

12. Would you award another contract to this contractor? If no, please explain.

13. Was the customer satisfied with the end product?

14. Was the contractor provided an opportunity to discuss any negative performance ratings? If so, what were the results?

15. The contractor maintained a professional working relationship with Government personnel.

16. The contractor was reasonable and cooperative in resolving customer complaints.

17. OVERALL RATING: _____

Please provide any additional comments.
