

June 30, 2004

RFQ Number: RFTOP #193

Dear Sir/Madam:

The Office of Justice Programs (OJP), Bureau of Justice Assistance anticipates awarding a delivery order for twelve (12) months, including three option years, to provide BJA with technical assistance and logistical support for the peer review of FY 2005 BJA competitive grant programs. The period of performance of this order will be October 1, 2004 to September 30, 2005.

The mission of BJA is to provide leadership and assistance in support of local criminal justice strategies to achieve safe communities. BJA's overall goals are to (1) reduce and prevent crime, violence, and drug abuse and (2) improve the functioning of the criminal justice system. A fair and balanced peer review process is critical to BJA's ability to meet its goals and accomplish its mission. BJA anticipates using subject matter experts to conduct a peer review of applications received under six competitive grant programs annually. In FY 2005, BJA anticipates the receipt of over 600 applications under these competitive grant programs.

BJA representatives will work in consultation with a contractor to develop a plan for administering the peer review program. The Contractor will manage the technical assistance and logistics required for successful peer reviews and other activities that support the mission of BJA. The Contractor must be attentive to detail, excel at making logistical arrangements and decisions, and must be responsive to BJA's needs. All BJA peer reviews supported under this order will be conducted using OJP's online Grants Management System (GMS). Therefore, the Contractor must be fully prepared to utilize this application tool to support this process.

The estimated dollar value associated with this effort is **not to exceed \$787,500 for 12 months**. Proposals are due on **July 21, 2004**. Pending review and approval, the minimum award amount of \$500,000 is/are anticipated to begin on or about **October 1, 2004**. **The total estimated dollar value for the base and 3-option years is \$4M.**

To ensure that your proposal is in compliance with OJP/BJA requirements, please read the entire proposed Request for Quotation (RFQ). Please pay attention to:

- \$ Basis for Award. Evaluation criteria are listed here as well as Attachment A
- \$ Statement of Objectives (Attachment B)
- \$ Demonstrated experience

Proposals are due **July 28, 2004** at 5:00 p.m. EDT. Please direct all questions regarding the RFQ to the undersigned no later than **July 14, 2004**.

Please send proposals to:

Eldred L. Jackson  
Chief, Acquisition Team I  
Acquisitions Management Division  
Office of Justice Programs  
810 Seventh Street, NW, Room 3616  
Washington, DC 20531  
Phone: 202/514-0696

Thank you for your interest.

Sincerely,

Eldred Jackson, Chief  
Acquisition Management Division Team I

Enclosures

## **Attachment A**

### **SOLICITATION PROVISIONS**

#### **Basis for Award**

The Office of Justice Programs (OJP) anticipates awarding a Not-to-Exceed Single Delivery Order resulting from this solicitation to the responsible offeror whose offer conforms to the solicitation and is evaluated as being the most advantageous to OJP. For this solicitation, technical merit is more important than cost or price. The award will not be automatically determined by numerical calculation or formula relationship between cost or price and technical merit. As technical merit of the offeror proposals becomes more equal, the evaluated cost or price may become the determining factor. The Contracting Officer shall determine what trade-off between technical merit and cost or price promises the greatest value to OJP. For evaluation purposes, in terms of importance, the following eight technical criteria shall be considered approximately equal: past performance, experience, key personnel and professional staff, sample products, technical understanding, quality control, management approach and an oral presentation.

The Government will evaluate all technical factors as exceptional, acceptable, marginal, or unacceptable.

#### **TECHNICAL PROPOSAL RATINGS**

- |               |   |
|---------------|---|
| Exceptional:  | The proposal meets or exceeds the most important factors in a way that is beneficial to the agency. Risk is low, and the proposal indicates a very high probability of successful performance. There are no weaknesses in major subject areas or items. |
| Acceptable:   | The proposal meets all significant standards. Risk is low, and there is a good probability of success. There are no deficiencies or significant weaknesses.   |
| Marginal:     | Some important standards have not been met. Risk is evident, and there is a low probability of success. There are serious deficiencies in the proposals, but they are correctable.  |
| Unacceptable: | Several important standards have not been met. Risk is high, and there is little likelihood of success. The proposal would have to be completely rewritten to make it acceptable.   |

## TECHNICAL FACTORS

1. **Past Performance.** Past Performance report should reflect that Contractor has past experience performing work of similar nature and scope. Three completed copies of Attachment C should be submitted with the technical proposal in a separate envelope labeled Attachment C: Past Performance. Please note that we are experiencing mail delays via the U.S. Postal System; thus, preferred and expedited methods of submission include either hand delivery or the use of an express mail service (e.g., UPS, FedEx, etc.).

2. **Experience.** The narrative must demonstrate a minimum of three years of government or commercial experience as an organization. If corporate experience is not available, an offeror may substitute relevant experience information regarding predecessor companies, key personnel who have relevant experience, or subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement. If this substitution is made, the offeror must clearly indicate how this experience relates or compares to that necessary to complete the services. The narrative must demonstrate relevant technical ability, and current and past experience with supporting the peer review of Federal grants. While a general knowledge of criminal justice-related federal government grant proposals is desirable, it is not crucial. The narrative must demonstrate the ability to handle various projects at one time. It must also describe two of the largest dollar projects that were completed on time at or under cost by offerors firm in the last three years. The narrative may include any awards received for projects, and must include the names and titles only of key personnel who worked on the projects. (Do not submit resumes in response to technical factor #2). The offeror should include **a general statement of no more than one (1) page** detailing the organization's history, which may include the organization's structure, the number of years it has been in business, and an organizational chart indicating key personnel.

3. **Key Personnel and Professional Staff.** The offeror shall submit resumes of key staff members to be assigned work resulting from this solicitation. Resumes must be sufficiently detailed to permit an assessment of the capability of professional staff to perform the work described in the Statement of Work. The offeror must demonstrate the staffing ability to handle multiple tasks/events at one time. If subcontractors or consultants perform a major or critical aspect of the work, the offeror must submit a Letter of Commitment from such individual(s). **The offeror shall submit no more than five (5) resumes.** Resumes shall not exceed one (1) typed page each.

4. **Sample Products.** The Sample Products should include examples of correspondence with subject matter experts, deliverable schedules, reports and scoring matrixes, consensus comments, and reimbursement forms. Please submit Sample Products with technical proposal **in a separate envelope labeled Sample Products.**

5. **Technical Understanding.** The offeror shall submit a narrative demonstrating its technical understanding and approach to the Federal Government, specifically for handling logistics and providing technical assistance in support of large-scale projects. The narrative shall include the quality, comprehensiveness, and feasibility of the methods and plans proposed to accomplish the tasks specified in the Statement of Work and the application of the offeror's understanding in accomplishing these tasks. **The narrative must not exceed five (5) pages.**

6. **Quality Control.** The offerors shall provide a narrative that identifies the internal review procedures to ensure that high quality standards are sustained. The narrative shall contain a company profile showing all highly qualified individuals who will directly supervise or review projects to ensure quality control, which includes any quality control measures for subcontractors resulting in acceptable measures for subcontractors. The narrative shall also address the approach for application of innovative quality leadership; productivity enhancement; cost reduction methods and techniques; handling of potential problem areas and solutions; and customer relations and procedures for meeting urgent requirements. **The narrative shall also contain a statement on how the offerors firm will execute multiple peer reviews simultaneously, if applicable. The narrative must not exceed three (3) pages.**

7. **Management Approach.** The offerors shall include in the narrative a description that includes the various management approaches utilized in identifying potential peer reviewers, coordinating with Federal officials, logistics coordination, consensus meeting facilitation, database maintenance, and utilization of on-line information systems.

8. **Oral Presentation.** Offerors shall also be required to make oral presentations. Oral presentations shall address completely the technical factors described herein. The criteria shall focus on factors that help determine the offeror's ability to perform all aspects of the work, such as understanding of the requirements; problems and risks; qualifications of key personnel; innovativeness; extent of related past experience; soundness of approach; and perspective of what the offerors believes will constitute satisfactory performance. Offerors will be provided 30 minutes to make their oral presentations. This will be followed by a 15 minute break to allow the Government to caucus. Then a final period not to exceed one-half (2) hour will commence to allow for Government questions and Offerors responses. The Government questions and Offerors responses serve as clarification of the Oral presentation and/or Technical Proposal. **These will take place during the week of August 16-20, 2004 at 810 Seventh Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. and must be given by key personnel. A specific time will be provided at a later date.**

## **Proposals**

Offerors shall be required to provide a written proposal. Written proposals shall be comprised of **two volumes**, with an original and five (5) copies each, which shall be submitted to the Contracting Officer by 5:00 p.m. on **July 21, 2004**, the address set forth on page 2 of this RFQ

document. Volume I shall provide technical criteria 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7, to be limited to a maximum of 30 pages (12 pt. font minimum) exclusive of the resumes of the personnel that will perform the work and contact information (contact name, organization, address and telephone numbers), which must be included in this volume. Volume II shall provide the price for completing all work and the pricing you are proposing on the sliding scale to OJP on all labor categories you currently have and it should include pricing for the 12-month period set forth in the Statement of Work.

### **Discussions with Offerors**

Negotiations may be conducted with those offerors whose responsive and technically acceptable proposals, combined with their price proposals, place them in the competitive range.

**HOWEVER, OFFERORS ARE CAUTIONED TO SUBMIT THEIR PRICING PROPOSALS ON THE MOST FAVORABLE BASIS SINCE THE GOVERNMENT RESERVES THE RIGHT TO MAKE AN AWARD WITHOUT FURTHER NEGOTIATION OR DISCUSSION. Discussions with the contractor are not required in the context of a Multiple Award Schedule purchase but the Government reserves the right to seek additional information on quotes without triggering the discussion rules.**

### **Award of Delivery Orders**

The award of a Not-to-Exceed Single Delivery Order based on best value and in accordance with the technical criteria spelled out in the task order is anticipated based on the results of this request for quotation.

### **Inspection of Services**

The Government reserves the right to conduct an on-site inspection of services listed in the Technical Proposal that contractor has stated will be accomplished on-site at the contractor's facility.

**PROGRESS PAYMENTS NOT INCLUDED (APR 1984) FAR 52.232-15**

A progress payment clause is not included in this solicitation and will not be added to the resulting contract at the time of award. Bids conditioned upon inclusion of a progress payment clause in the resulting contract will be rejected as non-responsive.

**TYPE OF CONTRACT**

A Not-to-Exceed Single Delivery Order will be issued which includes other direct costs associated with this task.

**PRICE FOR PERFORMANCE**

Price: **\$787,500 based on FY 2005 funding and a guaranteed minimum of \$500,000 over the 12-month period. The total estimated dollar value for the base and 3-option years is \$4M.**

**CONTRACTING ADMINISTRATION DATA**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Contracting Officer:                                   | ELDRED JACKSON  |
| Contracting Administrator:                             | ELDRED JACKSON  |
| First Class Mailing:                                   | Acquisition Management Division<br>Office of Justice Programs<br>810 7 <sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Room 3616<br>Washington, D.C. 20531  |
| Courier or Hand Delivery:                              | Acquisition Management Division<br>Office of Justice Programs<br>810 7 <sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Room 3616<br>Washington, D.C. 20531  |
| Contracting Officer=s Technical Representative (COTR): | Stephen M. Antkowiak<br>Special Projects Manager<br>Bureau of Justice Assistance<br>Office of Justice Programs<br>810 7 <sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Room 4433<br>Washington, D.C. 20531<br>(202) 514-7663 |

### **Contracting Officer=s Technical Representative (COTR)**

- a) Stephen M. Antkowiak, Special Projects Manager, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, 810 7<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Room 4433, Washington, D.C. 20531, (202) 514-7663, E-mail: [Stephen.Antkowiak@usdoj.gov](mailto:Stephen.Antkowiak@usdoj.gov), is hereby designated to act as Contracting Officer=s Technical Representative (COTR) under this contract.
- b) The COTR is responsible, as applicable, for the following: receiving all deliverables; inspecting and accepting the supplies and services provided hereunder in accordance with the terms and conditions of this contract; providing directions to the contractor which clarifies the contract effort; filling in the details or otherwise serves to accomplish the contractual Statement of Work; evaluating performance; and certifying all invoices and vouchers for acceptance of the services furnished for payment.
- c) The COTR does not have the authority to alter the contract=s obligations under the contract, and/or modify any of the expressed terms, conditions, specifications, or cost of the agreement. If, as a result of the technical discussions, it is desirable to alter or change the contractual obligations of the Statement of Work, the Contracting Officer shall issue such changes.

### **PLACE OF DELIVERY**

Deliverables under this contract shall be made to the following address:

Stephen M. Antkowiak  
Special Projects Manager  
Bureau of Justice Assistance  
Office of Justice Programs  
810 7<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Room 4433  
Washington, D.C. 20531  
(202) 514-7663  
(202) 305-1367 FAX  
[Stephen.Antkowiak@usdoj.gov](mailto:Stephen.Antkowiak@usdoj.gov)

### **KEY PERSONNEL AND LEVEL OF SUPPORT**

The personnel specified in the technical proposal as key personnel are considered to be essential to the work being performed. Prior to diverting any of the specified individuals to other programs, the Contractor shall notify the Contracting Officer reasonably in advance and shall submit justification (including proposed substitutions) in sufficient detail to permit evaluation of the impact on the program. No diversion shall be made by the Contractor without the written

consent of the Contracting Officer required by this clause. The designations of this contract to either add or delete personnel, as appropriate.



OF SERVICES UNDER THIS  
CONTRACT, I.E. LOCAL,  
NATIONWIDE, WORLDWIDE \_\_\_\_\_

A.D LOCATION WHERE WORKSHOPS  
AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE  
SERVICED BY THIS CONTRACT \_\_\_\_\_

III. EVALUATION

B. PERFORMANCE HISTORY

1. To what extent did the contractor adhere to contract delivery schedules?
- Considerably surpassed minimum requirements..... ( )4
  - Exceeded minimum requirements..... ( )3
  - Met minimum requirements..... ( )2
  - Less than minimum requirements..... ( )1

Comment:

2. To what extent did the contractor submit required reports and documentation in a timely manner?
- Considerably surpassed minimum requirements... ( )4
  - Exceeded minimum requirements..... ( )3
  - Met minimum requirements..... ( )2
  - Less than minimum requirements..... ( )1

Comment:

- C. To what extent were the contractor's reports and documentation accurate and complete?

- Considerably surpassed minimum requirements.....( )4
- Exceeded minimum requirements..... ( )3
- Met minimum requirements.....( )2
- Less than minimum requirements.....( )1

Comment:

D. To what extent was the contractor able to solve contract performance problems without extensive guidance from Government counterparts?

- Considerably surpassed minimum requirements..... ( )4
- Exceeded minimum requirements..... ( )3
- Met minimum requirements.....( )2
- Less than minimum requirements.....( )1

Comment:

\$ To what extent did the contractor display initiative in meeting requirements?

- Considerably surpassed minimum requirements..... ( )4
- Exceeded minimum requirements.....( )3
- Met minimum requirements.....( )2
- Less than minimum requirements..... ( )1

Comment:

\$ Did the contractor commit adequate resources in a timely fashion to the contract to meet the requirements and to successfully solve problems?

- Considerably surpassed minimum requirements..... ( )4
- Exceeded minimum requirements.....( )3

- Met minimum requirements.....( )2
- Less than minimum requirements.....( )1

Comment:

\$ To what extent did the contractor submit change orders and other required proposals in a timely manner?

- Considerably surpassed minimum requirements..... ( )4
- Exceeded minimum requirements.....( )3
- Met minimum requirements.....( )2
- Less than minimum requirements..... ( )1

Comment:

\$ To what extent did the contractor respond positively and promptly to technical directions, contract change orders, etc.?

- Considerably surpassed minimum requirements.....( )4
- Exceeded minimum requirements.....( )3
- Met minimum requirements.....( )2
- Less than minimum requirements.....( )1

Comment:

\$ To what extent was the contractor effective in interfacing with the Government=s staff?

- Considerably surpassed minimum requirements... ( )4
- Exceeded minimum requirements.....( )3
- Met minimum requirements..... ( )2
- Less than minimum requirements.....( )1

Comment:

**B. TERMINATION HISTORY**

1. Has this contract been partially or completely terminated for default or convenience?

Yes     Default     Convenience     No

If yes, explain (e.g., inability to meet cost, performance, or delivery schedules).

2. Are there any pending terminations?

Yes                       No

If yes, explain and indicate the status.

**C. EXPERIENCE HISTORY**

1. How effective has the contractor been in identifying user requirements?

Considerably surpassed minimum requirements...  4  
Exceeded minimum requirements.....  3  
Met minimum requirements.....  2  
Less than minimum requirements.....  1

Comment:

2. To what extent did the contractor coordinate, integrate, and provide for effective subcontract management?

Considerably surpassed minimum requirements.. ( )4  
Exceeded minimum requirements..... ( )3  
Met minimum requirements..... ( )2  
Less than minimum requirements..... ( )1

Comment:

3. To what extent did the contractor coordinate provide timely technical assistance, both on-site and off-site, when responding to problems encountered in the field?

Considerably surpassed minimum requirements... ( )4  
Exceeded minimum requirements..... ( )3  
Met minimum requirements..... ( )2  
Less than minimum requirements..... ( )1

Comment:

#### D. COST MANAGEMENT

1. To what extent did the contractor meet the proposed cost estimates?

Considerably surpassed minimum requirements. . ( )4  
Exceeded minimum requirements..... ( )3  
Met minimum requirements..... ( )2  
Less than minimum requirements..... ( )1

Comment:

NARRATIVE:

Use this section to explain additional information not included above.