

1. Instructions, Conditions, and Notices to Offerors

1.1 General

This solicitation will follow a three-stage down-select approach. The instructions for each stage are described below.

Offerors shall furnish the information required by this solicitation. Offerors are expected to examine this entire solicitation document. Failure to do so will be at the Offeror's own risk.

1.1.1 Best Value Evaluation

The Government will award a Task Order resulting from this solicitation to the responsible Offeror whose offer conforming to the solicitation will be most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered. The Offeror's proposal will be evaluated on a Best Value Source Selection of the Offeror's response to the factors listed in Section 13 of this RFQ. Non-price factors are significantly more important when compared to price.

1.1.2 Discussions/Communications

The Contracting Officer anticipates awarding a Task Order without entering into discussion with Offerors, however, the Contracting Officer reserves the right to engage in discussions if warranted.

The Government may also have communications with Offerors before establishing a competitive range.

1.1.3 Options

The Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. The Government may determine that an offer is unacceptable if the option prices are significantly unbalanced. Evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

1.1.4 Notice of Award

A written notice of award or acceptance of an offer, mailed or otherwise furnished to the successful Offeror within the time for acceptance specified in the offer, shall result in a binding contract without further action by either party. Before the offer's specified expiration time, the Government may accept an offer (or part of an offer), whether or not there are negotiations after its receipt, unless a written notice of withdrawal is received before award.

1.1.5 Point of Contact/Questions

The point of contact for this solicitation is Toni Hoskinson, Contracting Officer, toni.hoskinson@sba.gov and 303-844-2026.

Prospective offerors may request an explanation or interpretation of the solicitation via email to the Contracting Officer at toni.hoskinson@sba.gov. If sending questions via email, prospective offerors are requested to include the solicitation number and RFQ title in the subject line of the email and the company's full name and address in the body of the email.

All questions related to the solicitation are due to the Contracting Officer at toni.hoskinson@sba.gov no later than May 4th, 2015 at 11:59pm EST.

1.1.6 Changes to Solicitation

Notification of any changes to the RFQ (amendments) shall be made within the solicitation and circulated by email by the Contracting Officer.

1.2 Stage One (Completed)

Stage One closed on April 16, 2015, and no further opt-in will be considered. Stage One required the submission of a formal "opt-in" to the solicitation. Industry Partners were required to inform the CO of their affirmative interest in the competition by 11:59pm EST on April 16, 2015, by sending an email to toni.hoskinson@sba.gov or they would not be included in any subsequent solicitation activities. Alliant SB contractors were notified that a non-response in the affirmative would constitute an opt-out.

Those Alliant SB contractors who have indicated interest (opted-in) during Stage One received a copy of the full RFQ and may submit proposals in Stage Two.

1.3 Industry Day

SBA invites Offerors who opted-in during Stage One to attend an Industry Day which will be held as follows:

Location: SBA Headquarters, 409 Third Street, SW, Washington, DC 20416.

Date & Time: Thursday, April 30th, 2015, 10am-12pm EST

Conference Line: Dial in: 888-844-9904 Code: 5003011

The purpose of this industry day is to provide industry insight into the solicitation and provide answers to questions. A maximum of two (2) representatives from each Alliant SB contractor holder that expressed interest in the solicitation during Stage One will be permitted to attend the industry day.

1.4 Stage Two Instructions

1.4.1 Stage Two—Submittal of Proposals

Stage Two will require the submission of the following:

1. Technical Concept Paper (Not to exceed 8 pages)
2. Past Performance/Relevant Prior Experience (Not to exceed 10 pages)
3. Price Submission (No format)

1.4.2 Stage Two—Delivery of Proposals

Proposals for Stage Two are due at **12:00 PM MDT, May 18, 2015**. Offerors shall submit one electronic copy of their Stage Two proposal in PDF format via email to toni.hoskinson@sba.gov.

All documents must be submitted electronically as PDF documents and meet the following specifications:

- 8.5 x 11 inches maximum paper size
- Times New Roman Font
- Font size 12 (except for tables, figures and graphics as all text is legible)
- Single-Spaced
- 1 inch margins on all sides
- Include page numbers
- Cover page must reference Solicitation Number

Offerors are cautioned that if any part of their offer exceeds page limitations, the Government may evaluate only through the permitted number of pages. Pages beyond that limit may not be evaluated. **Note: Cover page and Table of Contents will not be included in any page limitations.**

Only e-mail submissions will be accepted. A facsimile proposal or proposal received through the mail will not be accepted. Please include the following subject line for the email: "Proposal Submission for Solicitation SBAHQ-15-Q-0012". Please note that SBA email has a 5 MB size limit. Submissions may need to be broken into multiple parts.

Late proposals will not be considered. SBA cannot be held responsible for errors, including technological, or delays in the submission of proposals.

1.4.3 Stage Two—Proposal Preparation

Stage Two proposals shall consist of two separate volumes individually titled and numbered as stated below.

Volume No.	Volume Title
I	Technical Concept Paper; Past Performance/Relevant Prior Experience

II	Price Submission; and Recertification of Small Business Size
----	---

There is no specific format/template required for Part II – Price Submission, as long pricing is expressed in firm fixed price per iteration. See Section 13.3.3 Factor 3 – Price Submission for additional details. Also see Section 9.3 for instructions on submission of the recertification of small business size.

Each of the parts must be complete in itself so evaluation of each part may be conducted independently, and so the technical part may be evaluated strictly on its own merit.

1.4.4 Stage Two Selections

The Government will evaluate the Stage Two submissions and select the Offerors most likely to submit the highest value solutions, in accordance with FAR 16.505(b)(1)(v)(A)(5)(ii). Those Offerors considered the most likely to submit the highest value solutions will be notified of their selection for participation in Stage Three.

1.5 Stage Three Instructions

1.5.1 Stage Three—Submittal of Proposals

Those offerors selected for participation in Stage Three will be required to submit the following:

1. Performance Work Statement (PWS), including IT Security and 508 Compliance (Not to exceed 30 pages)
2. Agile Development Management Plan (ADMP) (Not to exceed 20 pages)
3. Proposed Quality Assurance Management Plan (QASP) (No Limitation)
4. Price Proposal (No Limitation)

1.5.2 Stage Three—Delivery of Proposals

Proposals for Stage Three are due at 11:59pm EST on the date that is two (2) weeks after the Government provides notice of the offerors selected for participation in Stage Three.

All documents must be submitted electronically as PDF documents and meet the following specifications:

- 8.5 x 11 inches maximum paper size
- Times New Roman Font
- Font size 12
- Single-Spaced
- 1 inch margins on all sides

- Include page numbers
- Cover page must reference Solicitation Number

Offerors are cautioned that if any part of their offer exceeds page limitations, the Government may evaluate only through the permitted number of pages. Pages beyond that limit may not be evaluated. **Note: Cover page and Table of Contents will not be included in any page limitations.**

Only e-mail submissions will be accepted. A facsimile proposal or proposal received through the mail will not be accepted. Please include the following subject line for the email: “Proposal Submission for Solicitation SBAHQ-15-Q-0012”. Please note that SBA email has a 5 MB size limit. Submissions may need to be broken into multiple parts.

Late proposals will not be considered. SBA cannot be held responsible for errors, including technological, or delays in the submission of proposals.

1.5.3 Stage Three—Proposal Preparation

Stage Three proposals shall consist of two separate volumes individually titled and numbered as stated below.

Volume No.	Volume Title
I	Technical Submission
II	Price Submission

There is no specific format/template required for Part II – Price Submission, as long as pricing is expressed in firm fixed price per iteration. See Section 13.4.5 Factor 5 – Price Submission for additional details.

Each of the parts must be complete in itself so evaluation of each part may be conducted independently, and so the technical part may be evaluated strictly on its own merit.

1.5.4 Stage Three – Oral Presentations

Each Offeror in Stage Three will provide an Oral Presentation, which will be evaluated. The Oral Presentations will be scheduled to occur in the week after Stage Three submissions are due.

Reference Attachment 2 for additional information about the Scenario and User Stories for the Oral Presentations.

2. Evaluation Factors

2.1 General

SBA will conduct two evaluations. The first evaluation will evaluate Stage Two submissions to determine which Offerors will be permitted to submit proposals in Stage Three. The second evaluation will evaluate Stage Three submissions. All information provided in any stage may be used to make the best value determination in Stage Three.

The Government may make award based on initial offers received in Stage Three, without discussion of such offers. Quotes shall set forth full, accurate, and complete information as required by this solicitation package (including Appendices and Attachments). The penalty for making false statements in quotes is prescribed in 18 USC. 1001. Discussions may be utilized if it is in the best interest of the Government as determined by the Contracting Officer.

2.2 Technical Capability Evaluation Criteria

The Offeror's technical qualifications shall be used to determine whether the Offeror has the requisite experience and expertise to perform various types of work as outlined in the Statement of Objectives. The rating definitions provided below will be used for the evaluation of each Technical Evaluation Factor and sub-factor and to assign each proposal with an overall rating. This applies to both stages of the evaluation.

- Outstanding (O) – Significantly exceeds most or all solicitation requirements for this factor or sub-factor or overall. Response exceeds an “Excellent” rating. The risk of unsuccessful contract performance is extremely low. Contains no Deficiencies, Significant Weaknesses, or Weaknesses.
- Excellent (E) – Fully meets all solicitation minimum requirements and exceeds many of the solicitation requirements for this factor or sub-factor or overall OR exceeds a small number of the minimum requirements but to a significant degree or in a valuable way for this factor or sub-factor overall. Response exceeds an “Acceptable” rating. The risk of unsuccessful contract performance is very low. Contains no Deficiencies or Significant Weaknesses.
- Acceptable (A) – Fully meets all solicitation minimum requirements for this factor or sub-factor or overall. Areas where the proposal exceeds the minimum solicitation requirements, if any, are of little or no value to the Government. The risk of unsuccessful contract performance is low. Contains no Deficiencies.
- Marginal (M) – Does not meet all solicitation requirements for this factor or sub-factor or overall. The proposal indicates a superficial or vague understanding of the program goals and the methods, resources, schedules, and/or other aspects essential to contract performance. Response is below an “Acceptable” rating. The risk of unsuccessful contract performance is moderate.
- Unacceptable (U) – Technical proposal has many or significant deficiencies and/or substantial omissions for a factor or sub-factor or overall AND/OR the proposal demonstrates a lack of understanding of the program goals, methods, resources, schedules, and/or other aspects essential to contract performance. Response is below a “Marginal” rating. The risk of unsuccessful contract performance is high.

The terms below are used in the ratings:

- “Deficiency” is a material failure of a quote to meet a government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a quote that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.
- “Weakness” means a flaw in the quote that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
- “Significant weakness” is a flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
- “Strength” means the quote exceeds a Government requirement that appreciably decreases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
- “Reasonableness”, in terms of price, occurs if in its nature and amount, it does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person in the conduct of competitive businesses.
- “Completeness/Accuracy” is when the Offeror’s quote is in compliance with the price volume instructions in the solicitation.

2.3 Stage Two Evaluation Factors

2.3.1 Factor 1 – Technical Approach Concept Paper

The Technical Approach Concept Paper should demonstrate the Offeror’s ability and expertise to deliver a solution that meets the established needs and purpose of the solicitation. Offeror’s proposed solution should align with the goals stated in the Statement of Objectives. Within the Technical Approach Concept Paper, the Offeror should demonstrate its:

- 1) Technical capability to perform the work, including how coordination with stakeholders will be accomplished.
- 2) Understanding of and ability to meet the technical requirements expressed in the solicitation.
- 3) Overall approach and what, if anything, it would need from the Government to ensure success as well as identifying any barriers that would reduce or delay success.
- 4) Conceptual approach for the transition to a modern technology stack.
- 5) Knowledge and experience with Agile implementation, including but not limited to the following:
 - a. Management of an Agile software development methodology;
 - b. User Story management, sizing, and estimation method;
 - c. Techniques for release planning;
 - d. Plans for engaging end users;
 - e. Methods for capturing and applying lessons learned, testing processes, reasons behind the composition of their Agile teams;
 - f. Rationale behind the proposed development talent and project oversight (tied to Product Vision);
 - g. How they will make resources available within schedule and budget constraints; and
 - h. Approach to configuration management.

This factor will be evaluated based on the above, to determine the extent to which the Offeror's proposed approach will ensure successful implementation of the stated objectives. This factor will assess the Offeror's overall approach to the project and what, if anything, it would need from the Government to ensure success as well as identifying any barriers that would reduce or delay success.

2.3.2 Factor 2 – Past Performance/Prior Experience

Offerors shall submit information for not more than five (5) distinct projects completed within the last 3 years that are similar in scope and complexity to this requirement which clearly demonstrate an understanding of and ability to meet the technical requirements expressed in this solicitation. In evaluation of past performance, the Contracting Officer can consider other sources beyond what is provided.

Within the five permitted references, only three are allowed to be submitted for subcontractors.

Preference may be given to Offerors who submit at least one example of past experience with agile software development.

This factor assesses the Offeror's experience performing work that is similar to the work to be performed under this Task Order. Consideration will be given to what aspects of an Offeror's contract history provide the most confidence that the Offeror will satisfy the requirements described in this RFQ. This factor considers the quality of the Offeror's performance on current or completed contracts and evaluates the Government's level of confidence that the Offeror will be able to successfully accomplish this effort. The following points will be considered in assessing the Offeror's ability to perform the Task Order successfully (confidence rating):

- Technical past performance: quality of product, analytical capability and capability to employ sound engineering practices; in particular, prior experience with projects where the Offeror was responsible for the following activities which are considered most relevant to success on this project:
 - Built custom software application development using a modern, industry standard web application framework and relational databases
 - Designed and implemented a user interface for a web application using visual design and user experience best practices, as described in the Digital Services Playbook (<https://playbook.cio.gov>)
 - Deployed web applications in virtualized hosting infrastructure where resources can be provisioned on demand, in real time
 - Completed a migration from legacy applications and databases to new applications and databases, the end result of which was the old system was deprecated and eventually removed from service
 - Used an agile software development process to deliver incremental results
- Management past performance: adherence to schedule and responsiveness to the customer, and communication between the customer and the Offeror

Offerors shall provide Project Summaries for each effort referenced. Offerors are encouraged to submit any information they consider relevant in demonstrating their ability to perform the proposed effort, including but not limited to how referenced performance is relevant to this RFQ's requirements, illustrates the company's capabilities, and shows the company's ability to ensure quality and mitigate schedule and other risks.

This factor will be evaluated by the Government to determine confidence in the ability of the Offeror and the Offeror team members (e.g., Subcontractors) to perform this effort and to fully satisfy the technical, management, and other contractual requirements based on their record of past performance and prior experience on contracts of similar nature, requirements, size, and complexity using the criteria listed above.

2.3.3 Factor 3 – Price Submission

The price submission shall include the following:

- Firm Fixed Price per iteration

Price will be evaluated to determine whether the firm, fixed price proposed is reasonable. This determination will be based on the review of the Technical Concept Paper in comparison to the total proposed price per iteration. Pricing for Stage Two of this effort is required to be of a unit of measure that is equivalent to the proposed iteration cycle as proposed in the Technical Concept Paper. The technical solution for sizing, iteration time, estimation process, and throughput must correlate to the proposed pricing.

2.4 Stage Three Evaluation Factors

2.4.1 Factor 1 – Performance Work Statement (PWS)

Offerors shall provide a Performance Work Statement (PWS) in response to the Statement of Objectives and this RFQ. The deliverables under this PWS are to have functionality scheduled for an available release without defects.

The PWS shall clearly illustrate the process through which Agile Development of software in small iterations lasting two to five weeks generally results in the delivery of usable software as described in Section 3.2.2 Deliverables. The Offeror must propose a “Definition of Done” that will apply to all User Stories and demonstrates the validation necessary to complete an iteration.

The PWS shall describe how user stories are to be sized, how estimation and determination of sizes shall be accomplished, and how these will correlate to iterations and throughput. Additionally, the PWS should provide a detailed process for working with the Product Manager and End Users to capture user stories, prioritize, and work-off the product backlog. The prioritization effort may include working backlog items across multiple projects concurrently based on team capacity and end user priorities.

The Offeror shall demonstrate in its PWS how the applications, databases, and other products it will produce will meet all requirements for compliance with Section 508 and SBA's IT Security Requirements (see Appendix).

Assumptions, Conditions, or Exceptions – Technical submissions shall include all (if any) technical assumptions, conditions, or exceptions related to any of the requirements or terms and conditions of the Statement of Objectives. If not noted in this section of Offeror's quote, it will be assumed that there are no assumptions, conditions, or exceptions for award, and that the Offeror agrees to comply with all of the terms and conditions set forth in this RFQ. It is not the responsibility of the Government to seek out and identify technical assumptions, conditions, or exceptions buried within the Offeror's submission. The Government reserves the right to reject any quote that includes any technical assumptions, conditions, or exceptions that impact or affect the Government's objectives or requirements.

The Government will evaluate the feasibility of the proposed PWS to meet the Objectives of the Agency.

2.4.2 Factor 2 – Agile Development Management Plan (ADMP)

The Offeror shall submit an Agile Development Management Plan (ADMP) to support the Offeror's proposed approach to agile software development and management of the technical process, scoping and envisioning for the projects, descriptions of resources, management team structure, team makeup, reporting process, financial process, schedule, risk management approach, cost-efficiency opportunities, and prioritization of work. As part of the ADMP, the Offeror shall document the management of the User Story Determination Process for determining the complexity of developing, estimating, integrating, and/or delivering Technical Services from the Initial Product Backlog (see Appendix). This process shall utilize the Offeror's specified methodology to assist the Government in managing the Product Backlog. The plan should be linked to the PWS and should describe the necessary activities to support the agile process. The ADMP shall be in a contractor-specified format.

Offerors shall propose an ADMP which correlates how the stated objectives align with the timeframe for implementation and the Offeror's proposed agile methodology.

The Offeror shall provide a notional release schedule which maps the proposed iteration cycle to the calendar Period of Performance. This release schedule shall include relevant governance process checkpoints such as Technical Reviews and Iteration Releases, as well as agile methodology functions such as Iteration Planning, Iteration Reviews, and Retrospectives.

The Government will evaluate the proposed ADMP to determine if it demonstrates an understanding of the complexity of the effort and how the stated objective aligns with the objectives and timeframe for implementation and the Offeror's proposed Agile methodology including where and how testing, training, security, cut over planning, etc. will be included.

2.4.3 Factor 3 – Proposed Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP)

Offerors shall describe a proposed Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP) and Performance Measurement approach, including how proposed performance standards will be monitored, evaluated, and reported. The purpose of the notional QASP is to provide evaluators with an understanding of how measures and metrics will be applied based on the proposed technical solution. **The QASP should include an Award Term Incentive Plan as explained in Section 2.5.2.**

The Government will evaluate the rationale for the proposed performance standards and performance measurement methodology and assess whether the total solution will ensure that the performance standards are met.

2.4.4 Factor 4 – Oral Presentation

The goal of the oral presentation will be for the Offeror to walk the Government through their proposed solution. It is the opportunity to determine how team dynamics will work as the Offeror is required to utilize a scenario to demonstrate how the proposed Agile Software Development Methodology will function if the Task Order is awarded.

The Government will schedule oral presentations by drawing lots among those Offerors selected for inclusion in Stage Three. The Government will advise Offerors of the date and time for the presentation of their Oral Presentation. The presentations will be recorded.

The Oral Presentation will be evaluated to determine the Offeror's capability and suitability to perform the work required in the Statement of Objectives. Through the walk through of the scenario, the oral presentation will be assessed to determine if the overall solution is feasible, will result in a quality product, and will meet the objectives for digital strategy implementation.

See Attachment 2 for additional information about the Scenario and User Stories for the Oral Presentations.

2.4.5 Factor 5 – Price Submission

Offerors shall submit a price quote, which shall include the following:

- Firm Fixed Price per iteration
- Firm Fixed Price by CLIN
- Supporting documentation
- Assumptions, conditions, and exceptions related to price

Supporting documentation - The price quote shall provide supporting documentation to support the pricing proposed. This shall demonstrate the correlation between the proposed technical solution in the PWS and the pricing submitted. The supporting documentation

shall also include a Basis of Estimate (BOE) which aligns to how the pricing methodology is applied within each iteration. The BOE should include, but is not limited to, such things as:

- Number of Teams proposed
- Size of Agile Teams
- Labor categories used to comprise Team
- User Story sizing

Price assumptions, conditions, or exceptions – Submit all (if any) price assumptions, conditions, or exceptions related to any of the terms and conditions of the Statement of Objectives. If not noted in this section of the Offeror’s quote, it will be assumed that the Offeror proposes no price assumptions, conditions, or exceptions for award, and agrees to comply with all of the terms and conditions set forth in this RFQ. It is not the responsibility of the Government to seek out and identify price assumptions, conditions, or exceptions buried within the Offeror’s quote. The Government reserves the right to reject any quote that includes any price assumptions, conditions, or exceptions that impact or affect the Government’s objectives or requirements.

Price will be evaluated to determine whether the firm, fixed price proposed is reasonable. This determination will be based on the review of the technical solution in comparison to the total proposed price and the backup documentation submitted. Pricing for Stage Three of this effort is required to be of a unit of measure that is equivalent to the proposed iteration cycle as proposed in the **Performance Work Statement** ~~Technical Concept Paper~~. The technical solution for sizing, iteration time, and throughput must correlate to the proposed pricing.

2.5 Basis for Award

Award will be made to that responsible Offeror whose Stage Three proposal contains the combination of those factors offering the best overall value to the Government utilizing a tradeoff process. This will be determined by comparing differences in technical capability with differences in price to the Government. In making this comparison, the Government is more concerned with obtaining superior technical merit. However, the Government will not make an award at a significantly higher Price to the Government to achieve slightly superior technical merit. The Government reserves the right to make an award to other than the lowest priced Offeror or to the Offeror with a higher technical score if the Contracting Officer determines that to do so would result in the best value to the Government.