

April 1, 2004

NOTICE TO ALL OFFERORS

REFERENCE: AMENDMENT NO. 1
 RFP-DCS-04-13

Additional information has been requested by prospective offerors and it has been determined by the Contracting Officer that this information is made available to all bidders. The closing date and time for the receipt of proposals has been extended to a new expiration date of April 23, 2004, by 2:00 p.m. local time.

Keith A. Bond

KEITH A. BOND
Contracting Officer

Attachment(s)

| | | | |
|---|---------------------|-----------|----------------|
| AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT | 1. CONTRACT ID CODE | PAGE 1 | OF PAGES 23 |
|---|---------------------|-----------|----------------|

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0001 | 3. EFFECTIVE DATE April 1, 2004 | 4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. | 5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable) |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|

| | | | |
|--|-------------|--|------|
| 6. ISSUED BY U.S. Department of Labor/ETA Division of Contract Services 200 Constitution Avenue, N.W. Room S-5206 Washington DC 20210 | CODE ETA | 7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6) TBD | CODE |
|--|-------------|--|------|

| | | |
|--|-----|--|
| 8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP Code) To all Offerors/Bidders | (X) | 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. RFP-DCS-04-13 |
| | X | 9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) |
| | | 10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO. |
| | | 10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13) |
| CODE | | FACILITY CODE |

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers is extended, is not extended. Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:
(a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning 0 copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment of each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified. ** HOUR & DATE for Receipt of Offers is EXTENDED to: PM EST 04/23/2004

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required) N/A

13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS, IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

| | |
|-----|---|
| (X) | A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A. |
| | B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b). |
| | C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF: |
| | D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority) |

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor is not, is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)
(See Attachment)

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

| | |
|--|--|
| 15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print) | 16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print) KEITH A. BOND Contracting Officer |
| 15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR _____ (Signature of person authorized to sign) | 15C. DATE SIGNED |
| 16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer) | 16C. DATE SIGNED 04-01-2004 |

14. RESPONSES TO TECHNICAL QUESTIONS

Based on the questions received, many offerors appear confused over the format, meaning, and conduct of the Oral Presentation. Therefore, to respond to all of the questions concerning this area, and to avoid repetition, the following clarification is provided.

In accordance with Section L.7, the oral presentation and the question and answer session are not part of the offer and are not themselves offers. The sole purpose of the oral presentation and questions and answer session is to test an offeror's understanding of the work that the Government will require under the prospective contract.

However, in accordance with Sections L.6 and L.7, the offeror shall submit, as part of their offer, a set of overhead transparencies and five (5) copies in a sealed package. These transparencies, which are part of the offeror's technical proposal, shall form the basis of the offeror's Oral Presentation. Both the transparencies and the Oral Presentation will be used to evaluate the offeror's capability to perform the contract (See Section M.2 (D)).

The sealed package containing the offeror's transparencies will not be open until the scheduled date for an offeror's presentation, in the presence of the Contract Specialist and a representative of the offeror.

The Government will provide blank flipchart paper and an overhead projector for the offeror to use during the presentation caucus time period (1/2 hour before oral presentation) as stated in Section L.6, item 8 – Documentation. The purpose of the flipchart paper is for the offerors convenience if they wish to use them during their presentation to clarify points, during the caucus period, and or the question and answer session. The clarifying or explanatory charts and transparencies will be left with the Government following the oral presentation. The Government will not accept for evaluation any additional documentation which may or may not have been referenced during the presentation.

Offerors shall use black and white overhead transparencies (slides) to document key points of its presentation. The purpose of limiting the use of black and white overhead transparencies is to reduce the bid and proposal costs, keep focus on content, and to keep the playing field level.

- 1.** What is the scope of the project-national, regional, or statewide?
 - a.** For each part of the evaluation, data, information and analyses are expected to be provided on national, regional areas, and state basis, to the extent possible within budgetary and methodological constraints.
- 2.** How many grant awards will be made?
 - a.** There will be one contract award.
- 3.** What is the funding amount?
 - a.** Pursuant to Section F.3 – Level of Effort, the level of effort for this project is between 59 and 60 professional years. A professional person year is estimated to be between \$90,000 and \$100,000. This includes all costs. These government provided estimates are provided for contractor planning guidance only and do not bind the government to a specific level of effort nor are they guaranteed or warranted by the government in any manner. The contractor must use its best judgment to determine an appropriate level of effort for the contract work regardless of the accuracy of these estimates." There are 2080 hours in a work year, this includes hours for vacation, sick leave and holidays. Offerors should use their best business judgment when proposing the number of hours for this project.
- 4.** How can I obtain copies of the publications that are listed in appendix A, Section M of the above-referenced RFP?
 - a.** Publications produced by DOL are available at the website provided in the RFP; others can be obtained through NTIS, academic libraries, the publishing organizations, or from Internet.
- 5.** Does the Department of Labor expect contractors to use simultaneous multi-equation macro-models or single-equation simulations for Task (d)? Should these models use data derived from administrative and survey data and/or estimates from other sources?
 - a.** DOL expects contractors to propose the most rigorous and reliable methodology and data possible and to explain why particular approaches are proposed, including the benefits and problems associated with any particular methodology. Creative solutions to methodological problems will be credited in the scoring of proposals, as indicated in the criteria to the evaluation factors.
- 6.** What is the policy motivation for Task (e)? Is there a policy document or journal article that spells out the policy concerns raised by Task (e)? Is the key goal for this task to evaluate UI effectiveness with respect to employers, employees, or

- both? Can we be given specific examples as to what dispersal of workers, sacrifice of skills, and breakdown of labor standards means?
- a.** The information from this evaluation is intended for eventual use by policy makers but there is no specific policy motivation related to asking how well the UI program is able to meet the objectives defined in its authorizing legislation. Please note that Section M.1.A.1 asks the proposer to provide an overview of the UI system which will be evaluated on its "clarity and completeness" in describing "key features of the UI system currently and historically, of the assumptions, rationales and goals that influenced the development of the program historically and the policy issues that have arisen from different parts of the political spectrum."
 - 7.** Will the evaluator have an opportunity to provide input to wording and content of the CPS questions, or are they finalized already? If they are finalized already, will DOL make them available? If the evaluator has an opportunity to provide input, what is the limit to the number of questions that can be included? Similarly, is the schedule for the four interviews already finalized, or will the evaluator have an opportunity to provide input?

 - a.** Because of timing considerations, the questions in the CPS will be finalized prior to contract award. The questions will likely follow similar surveys of nonfilers in the past and will be made available after the contract is awarded. The schedule for the interviews is currently under negotiation and will be finalized prior to contract award. The evaluator will thus not have input into the final scheduling
 - 8.** Section C.4.c of the RFP states that an unedited public use data file would be provided 6 months after the data collection for the CPS (around mid-2006). Will this data file contain all 4 monthly supplements? Will data from the other monthly surveys for these groups of respondents also be made available, either at the same time or subsequently?

 - a.** Data from all four monthly supplements will be provided and will include responses by nonfilers and all others on all questions, including the UI and non-UI questions. Other monthly data will not be supplied.
 - 9.** Do DOL and the BLS plan to try to obtain the Social Security number of unemployed workers in the CPS, as was attempted for the 1993 supplement examined by Wandner and Stettner in the June 2000 "Monthly Labor Review"?

 - a.** No
 - 10.** M-10 Do you want all modified resumes to be condensed as the illustration provided within this RFP? Please provide a more detailed description. Also, must all resumes come with a letter of intent and since I am the offering Contractor must I be the authorize countersignature?

- a.** Resumes must follow the format described in Section M.1.B of the RFP. Resumes do not have to be condensed, though it would be helpful to reviewers to limit resumes' content to those experiences, publications and education that are relevant to the roles proposed for the individual in the project. There must be a letter of intent for all individuals proposed for the contract, signed by the individuals and the offeror.

- 11.** G-3 Will Government supply ACH form?
 - a.** ACH (Automated Clearing House) is a type of electronic funds transfer system that allows payments to be made to contractors. If a contractor (awardee) is a new enrollee to the ACH system, a "Payment Information Form," SF-3881 must be completed, and this form will be provided by the government.

- 12.** L-5 I am presently working on a Government contract, must I submit a copy of my contract? Or just materials on Past Performance?
 - a.** Offerors are to submit relevant contract information completed during the past 3 years on the Past Performance Reference Information sheets (Attachment J.7).

- 13.** Must Amendment of Solicitation/Modification of Contract be completed and enclosed in RFP?
 - a.** No.

- 14.** Do you have a model and a target market to be used?
 - a.** There is no specific model or target market that DOL is expecting to be included.

- 15.** If you do not have a model or a target market do you need to approve the one we use?
 - a.** The approaches proposed will be subject to final approval by DOL after completion of the study's design phase.'

- 16.** The start date for this proposal is it for the year 2004 or 2005 or the date we give you?
 - a.** The project will begin upon contract award which is anticipated for late June 2004.

- 17.** If you do not have a past performance will you lose 25 points?

- a.** No. As stated in Section M.1 (C), offerors without relevant past performance history or for whom information past performance is not available may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance. In this instance the offeror would receive a neutral score.
- 18.** What are the chances of an organization with no past performance winning this proposal?
 - a.** Please see answer to question no. 17. Offerors should use their best business judgment when responding to this solicitation.
- 19.** Was there a pre-bid meeting related to this rfp?
 - a.** No. The Division of Contract Services did not provide a pre-proposal conference for this RFP.
- 20.** Is this a state to state RFP or Nationwide RFP?
 - a.** Please see answer to question 1 above.
- 21.** Will we be assisting the already in place UI program as an outreach/ research manager? Or what additional structures will we be responsible for conducting?
 - a.** This project will focus on evaluating the UI program and will follow the scope of work as defined in the RFP.
- 22.** Could a small business, proposed as the prime contractor bid, but not has 50 percent of the work, so long as they had another small or SDB in the bid, which combined, equaled more than 50 percent.
 - a.** This is not acceptable to DOL. However, if the small business presented as a joint venture, both being qualified small or small-disadvantaged businesses, and having 51 percent or more of the work, and their annual average receipts for the 3 preceding fiscal years fall within the size standard applicable to the industry under the North American Industry Classification System code designated for this solicitation, that would be acceptable to DOL.
- 23.** As a follow-up, I took a look at the FAR, concerning Team Arrangements, and found a discussion at 48 CFR 9.601, that defined contractor team arrangements to include the following: "Contractor team arrangement" means an arrangement in which--(a) Two or more companies form a partnership or joint venture to act as a potential prime contractor; or (b) A potential prime contractor agrees with one or more other companies to have them act as its subcontractors under a specified Government contract or

acquisition program. Consequently, we pushed our discussion back and forth a bit and decided that it might be useful to send you an email that describes what we found and what we plan to do. If there is a problem with any of it, just let me know, and we will try to deal with it. Meanwhile, it is our expectation that we will join such a team and assume that if their bid is predicated upon the following arrangement, it would be acceptable to DOL as a response to a set-aside procurement, but would like your response to this form of presentation, before we get to far down the road:

_____ Corporation, and its joint venture partner, _____ Corporation, both or which are qualified small (or small-disadvantaged) businesses, submit this response to RFP _____, in which the role of the joint venture is to perform a proportion allocation of the work that will be __ (51 percent or more) _____ percent of the total prime contract work. In accordance with 48 CFR 9.601(b), the Contractor Team Arrangement selected by this joint venture bid team is that of prime contractor/sub-contractor wherein _____ Corporation will act a prime contractor, and _____ Corporation will act a subcontractor in the joint venture team arrangement. In addition to the joint venture agreement and proportion of work distribution, the bid team is joined by a third subcontractor, which will perform approximately _____ percent of the work of the subject acquisition."

- a.** Joint Ventures are allowed as long as their annual average receipts for the 3 preceding fiscal years fall within the size standard applicable to the industry under the North American Industry Classification System code designated for this solicitation.

- 24.** Would it be DOL's expectation that the project director must be employed by the small-business joint venture, either prime or subcontract, or whether it can be a subcontractor employee. This may be relevant because of the qualification requirement defined for the project director. Please advise us of DOL's preference in this regard.
 - a.** The proposed project director must be an employee of the prime contractor or subcontractor. The project director must have the required qualifications, experience, and time commitments as stated in Sections C.5, and M.1 (B).

- 25.** In Section L.6 of RFP DCS-04-13 it states: "Offerors may not use company senior or general managers or consultants to make any part of the oral presentation." If an offeror is employing consultants as functional experts who are identified as "key" personnel in the proposal, can these consultants participate in the oral presentations?
 - a.** No consultants will be allowed to participate in the oral presentation.

- 26.** How would the Department of Labor support the contractor's ability to obtain state agency cooperation in acquiring data? If states are reluctant to furnish data, and since this study is being done on behalf of the Secretary of Labor, would ETA utilize Title III of the Social Security Act regarding the provision that states must provide requested data to the Secretary?
- a.** DOL will provide contact information to the contractor and other assistance as appropriate given the situation. Section 303(a) (6) of the Social Security Act is the authority under which DOL will request data and reports from states.
- 27.** The RFP references that agreements between the states and the contractor would be signed regarding the provision of data. Are these agreements seen as being solely for confidentiality purposes, or would such agreements also cover financial concerns regarding state costs to provide data? If the latter, does ETA have any data regarding such costs?
- a.** The agreements will cover both confidentiality issues and appropriate reimbursement of data acquisition costs borne by the state workforce agency. Costs will vary by the requests being made in terms of scope and size by state and what the contractor can negotiate with the states. DOL has not gathered data on these costs and therefore cannot provide an accurate estimate of them.
- 28.** Is the Department of Labor anticipating that the telephone surveys will be one-time or a series of surveys to provide a time-series analysis?
- a.** The telephone surveys are intended to be conducted once, and are not anticipated to be a series over time.
- 29.** Will the contractor have input into the questions provided on the CPS for the non-filers?
- a.** No, the questions will have already been developed prior to the contract being let.
- 30.** Is the Department of Labor anticipating that the contractor will pay for expenses; *i.e.*, "pay honorariums and/or expenses" of the members of the Advisory Board as part of this contract?
- a.** Consultants, Experts or Honorarium hired to perform under this contract may be compensated at a rate for time actually worked. However, for the use and payment to consultants, etc., prior written approval must be obtained by the Contracting Officer. The amount or rate of payment will be determined on a case-by-case basis.

- 31.** The RFP states that the evaluation of the UI benefits program will “focus on regular not extended benefits”. The prospect of receiving extended benefits can, however, influence how unemployed workers behave in response to the regular benefits that are available to them. Accurate evaluation of policy options relating to regular benefits might therefore require accounting for the availability of or prospects for extended benefits, even though no change in extended benefits policy is considered in the analysis. Is such accounting permissible within the stated focus of the evaluation?
- a.** Yes, proposals can discuss how extended benefits might affect the claimant’s motivation total maximum duration and other factors.
- 32.** Section L.5 –“Past Performance” of the RFP indicates that, “a list of ten (10) ‘relevant’ contracts and subcontracts completed during the past three (3) years” may be provided as a reflection of past performance. Is the Department considering this number (10) as the total across all teaming companies in a proposal, or 10 per company?
- a.** The total is (10) past performance references across all teaming companies in a proposal (5 for the prime contractor and 5 for the primary subcontractor). A joint venture is considered a prime contractor.
- 33.** Is there an incumbent company working on this project? If so, who is the incumbent?
- a.** There is no incumbent. This is a new procurement.
- 34.** Section M is hereby deleted in its entirety and is replaced with the following.

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1 BASIS FOR AWARD (BEST VALUE)

The Government intends to evaluate proposals using a two-step methodology. The first step will involve the evaluation of the offeror's UNDERSTANDING/TECHNICAL APPROACH, INDIVIDUAL STAFF EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS, MANAGEMENT PLAN, and PRICE (evaluation factors A, B, E and F listed below). Based on these evaluations, a Competitive Range (FAR Part 15) consisting of the most highly rated proposals will be established.

The second step will involve evaluation of CONTRACTOR’S PAST PERFORMANCE of each offeror within the Competitive Range. Past Performance will be evaluated in accordance with Section L.7 of the solicitation and evaluation factor C listed below. The second step will also involve evaluation of an ORAL PRESENTATION presented by each of the offerors within the Competitive Range. Evaluation of oral presentations will

consist of the offeror's CAPABILITY TO PERFORM THE WORK (evaluation factor D listed below). Therefore, each offer should contain the best terms from a cost or price and technical standpoint.

A cost realism analysis and a Field Pricing Review will be performed for all technically acceptable offerors. Contract award will be based on the combined evaluations of the Understanding/Technical Approach, Individual Staff Experience and Qualifications, Contractor's Past Performance, Contractor's Capability to Perform the Work, Management Plan, and Price. The contract resulting from this solicitation will be awarded to the responsible offeror whose offer, conforming to the solicitation, is determined to provide the "best value" to the Government, which may not necessarily be the proposals offering the lowest cost nor receiving the highest technical score. It should be noted that cost is not a numerically weighted factor.

Although non-cost factors are significantly more important than cost, cost is an important factor and should be considered when preparing responsive offers (proposals). The importance of cost as an evaluation factor will increase with the degree of equality of the proposals in relation to the remaining evaluation factors.

When the offerors within the competitive range are considered essentially equal in terms of technical, past performance and other non-cost factors (if any), or when cost is so significantly high as to diminish the value of the technical superiority to the Government, cost may become the determining factor for award. In summary, cost/non-cost trade offs will be made, and the extent to which one may be sacrificed for the other if governed only by the tests of rationality and consistency with the established factors.

Prospective contractors are advised that the selection of a contractor for contract award is to be made, after a careful evaluation of the offers (proposals) received, by a panel of specialists chosen by DOL/ETA. Each panelist will evaluate the proposals for technical acceptability using a range of scores assigned to each factor. The factors are presented in the order of emphasis that they will receive (i.e., Factor A has the greatest weight, Factor B the second greatest weight, etc.). The scores will then be averaged to select a contractor for award on the basis of their proposal being the most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered.

Proposals for this evaluation of the UI program should address each of the factors and criteria below. As a courtesy to reviewers, it is requested that the technical proposal be organized according to those factors and criteria, in the order listed, to the extent feasible.

M.2 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND BASIS FOR AWARD (BEST VALUE)

A. UNDERSTANDING/PROSPECTIVE EVALUATION DESIGN (60 POINTS)

1. UNDERSTANDING (20 points)

For this section, offerors should provide: an overview of the UI program currently and its origins; a broad-ranging discussion of policy issues that have been and are of interest in regard to UI benefits; a partial exploration of the demographic, economic and labor market trends that affect the UI program and implications for this evaluation and for other further study; a discussion of past research and its implications for this evaluation.

PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT OFFERORS WILL BE EVALUATED UNDER THIS FACTOR BASED ON THE FOLLOWING:

- a. The clarity and completeness of the description of: key features of the UI system currently and historically, of the assumptions, rationales and goals that influenced the development of the program historically and the policy issues that have arisen from different parts of the political spectrum;
- b. The thoroughness and coherence of the discussion of past research on the UI program and its implications for this evaluation. To obtain the highest score, the proposal must demonstrate mastery of the past research (including the foundational literature in Appendix A and from other sources) and clarify how this evaluation will update, improve, and extend this body of knowledge.
- c. The relevance and completeness of the description of the economic and labor market trends identified as bearing on the UI benefits program and of areas that need further analysis or research; and

2. TECHNICAL APPROACH (40 points)

In this section, the offeror should provide a prospective design for the evaluation covering tasks b-e, in Section C.4, including the Analysis of Labor Market Changes and Their Implications for UI; Data Collection and Analysis of Characteristics and Trends in UI Reciprocity; Simulations and Analyses Re: Macro- and Micro-economic Impacts; and Analyses Re: Re-employment, Dispersal, Skills, and Labor Standards. A separate description for each task should be provided.

PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT OFFERORS WILL BE EVALUATED UNDER THIS FACTOR BASED ON THE FOLLOWING:

- a) The degree to which the **Analysis of Labor Market Changes and Their Implications for UI** is sound and comprehensively covers:
 - the remaining questions to explore
 - the data sources and types of analyses, and
 - the implications of this section for other parts of the technical approach and the final report on UI,

- b) The degree to which the design for the **Data Collection and Analysis of Characteristics and Trends in UI Recipients** is sound, comprehensive and innovative regarding:
- which questions and issues in the Objectives will be covered,
 - other related questions,
 - how the surveys will be conducted and question lists developed,
 - methodological or statistical issues (including the size and specifications of each sample, sampling strategy, precision, error rates, how to assure high response rates),
 - types of data analysis and specific statistical interactions that will be explored; and
 - potential limitations of the data and the technical analysis, and
 - how the research is related to other components of the evaluation.
- c) The degree to which the design(s) for the **Data Collection and Analyses Re: Macro- and Micro-economic Impacts** is sound, comprehensive, and innovative regarding:
- which questions and issues discussed in the Objectives will be covered,
 - other related questions,
 - data sources and data quality,
 - analytical methods to be used,
 - hypotheses and interactions to be explored,
 - methodological or statistical issues,
 - potential limitations to the data, and
 - the relevance of this research to other parts of the evaluation and how it will be linked to them.
- d) The degree to which the design for the **Data Collection and Analyses Re: Re-employment, Dispersal, Skills, and Labor Standards** is sound, creative, and comprehensive regarding:
- the questions and issues that will be covered,
 - the methodology or strategies to be used and issues relating to the methodology;
 - the quantitative and qualitative data sources, including existing databases and new sources, if any,
 - types of data analysis and statistical interactions that will be explored,
 - potential limitations of the data and the analysis, and
 - the relevance of this part of the evaluation to other components of the evaluation.
- e) The degree to which technical approach as a whole as well as all parts of it are clear, concise, coherent and internally consistent.

B. INDIVIDUAL STAFF EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS (25 points)

Successful performance of the proposed work depends heavily on the qualifications of the individuals committed to this project and the adequacy of the time commitment for

each individual in relation to the specific tasks that they will perform. This section of the proposal shall provide sufficient information for judging the quality and competence of staff proposed to be assigned.

Proposals shall include:

Modified resumes for all key personnel, with information that will make it possible for reviewers to determine if the criteria have been met. An example of part of the modified resume is included in Appendix B to this solicitation. In addition to standard information on individuals' work history, educational background, honors and awards, and publications, modified resumes should include the following:

- Proposed title/position(s), component or task of the evaluation in which these will be performed, functional role(s), activities, number of hours and percentage (of 10,400 hour) for each functional role, and total hours and total percentage of hours for the individual. Each position in the project should be separately listed.
- Current employment status, title, and the activities or projects on which the individual is currently working;
- Start and stop dates (by month/year) and roles for each item under work experience and a brief description of activities for each role.

Loading charts showing the number and percentage of hours for each staff for the total duration of the project (based on a total of 10,400 hours), staff time for each year (based on a year of 2,080 hours) and staff time by task or project subpart (as per the management plan).

Signed letters of intent for all professional staff, including consultants (and excluding clerical staff) with a countersignature from the contractor/offeror.

PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT OFFERORS WILL BE EVALUATED UNDER THIS FACTOR BASED ON THE FOLLOWING:

- 1). The experience and qualifications of the Project Director(s), to include a minimum of five years of experience in managing large, multi-part social science research, program evaluations, or demonstration projects; 2 years experience in projects related to unemployment insurance, and a Masters Degree in field related to social science research (such as economics, statistics, sociology, political science or public administration).
- 2). The experience and qualifications of the Principal Investigator(s) to include a minimum of ten years experience in performing social science research, including five years of experience designing and coordinating large, multi-part research projects. The principle investigator(s) will at a minimum have a PhD in economics, political science, statistics, or mathematics. In addition, the

Principle Investigator(s) must collectively demonstrate extensive knowledge of the UI system and extensive experience in analyzing complex data sets, econometric modeling, development and management of surveys, use of data in natural experiments, and practical issues surrounding collection of data.

3). The experience and qualifications of Task Leaders (as defined in the organizational plan). Each task leader must demonstrate at least 3 years prior experience directly relevant to their proposed role, familiarity with the UI program, and graduate education in relevant areas of social science (economics, political science, public administration, mathematics, or statistics).

4). The experience and qualifications of all senior staff, demonstrating at least 3 years of relevant experience and, where necessary, a strong familiarity with the UI program.

5). The adequacy of the time commitment of all personnel assigned to the project, according to each task and sub-task (the number of hours per year that each individual will devote to each aspect of the project). It is expected that the Project Director(s) will devote a minimum of 40% of time; the Principal Investigator(s) a total of 30% of time; and Task Leaders, 20% of their time per task (as identified in the organizational plan). If an individual is performing more than one function or leading more than one task, the time commitment should be commensurate (i.e., 40% for two tasks, etc.). Where an individual is performing multiple tasks but time is not fully additive to the requirements noted here, a full explanation must be provided for a lesser amount of time. Where needed, time commitments far above the minimum should be identified. When leadership roles are shared among two or more individuals, the combined time commitment may equal the minimum.

6). Information on all key professional personnel is supplied in the modified resume format.

7). Letters of intent are provided for each professional personnel, including employees, contractors or contingency hires (defined as person not currently employed but who have executed a binding letter for commitment for employment with the offeror, if the offeror receives award under this solicitation). Letters of intent must be dated and include signatures from the individual and the offeror/contractor. The letter must state that the individual will be available for the number of hours stated in the proposal.

C. CONTRACTOR'S PAST PERFORMANCE (25 POINTS)

Past performance shall include evaluating offerors with no relevant performance history, and shall provide offerors an opportunity to identify past or current contracts (Federal, State and local government, and private) for efforts similar to the Government requirement. Offerors will be provided the opportunity to address unfavorable reports of past performance, if the offeror has not had a previous opportunity to review the

rating. Offerors shall provide information on problems encountered on the identified contracts and the offerors' corrective actions. The Government shall consider this information, as well as information obtained from any other sources, when evaluating the offeror's past performance. The contracting officer shall determine the relevance of similar past performance information. Offerors shall submit past performance information regarding predecessor companies, key and subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement. Offerors without relevant past performance history or for whom information on past performance is not available may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance. In this instance the offeror would receive a neutral score.

D. CONTRACTOR'S CAPABILITY TO PERFORM THE CONTRACT (25 points)

The Government will evaluate each offeror's capability to perform the contract on the basis of its oral presentation and the responses it gives during the question and answer session that will follow the oral presentation. In making this evaluation, the government will consider the quality of: (1) the evaluation design, methodologies, tasks, deliverables and other activities, as well as of interrelationships and interdependencies among different parts, and whether these are likely to lead to successfully meeting evaluation objectives (See Section L.6 (5b)); (2) the sequence and realistic duration of the work activities (See Section L.6 (5c)); (3) the adequacy of resources required to perform the work activities (See Section L.6 (5d)); (4) the knowledge of the difficulties, uncertainties, and risks associated with the work and the quality of the plans to address or mitigate these risks (See Section L.6 (5e)); and (5) knowledge of the personnel and subcontractor qualifications necessary to the performance of the work (See Section L.6 (5f)).

E. MANAGEMENT PLAN (15)

This evaluation will include multiple, overlapping activities, involving many people and data sets. A management plan must be provided that includes the following:

- A 1–page chart or diagram showing how the project will be organized, including all tasks and deliverables and the overall leadership, business management, task or team leaders, and staff for each part. The organizational affiliations for all staff should be identified. Please note that the organization of the project does not have to conform strictly to the tasks in C.4, but must clearly show all tasks and deliverables and who will be responsible for them.
- A timeline or schedule of task startups, endings, and milestones;
- A list of key products, their delivery dates and the lead person responsible for each.
- A brief overview of how the project will be managed.

- Brief descriptions of how tasks f -h under Section C.4 (Data Acquisition, Advisory Board, and Reports and Oral Briefings) will be conducted. Offerors should demonstrate their familiarity with key activities associated with administrative acquisition and managing an advisory board. Examples of possible members of the Advisory Board should be included, but no resumes, time allocations, or letters of commitment are expected. Offerors should also describe their internal process for writing, reviewing, and editing the reports under the deliverables.

PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT OFFERORS WILL BE EVALUATED UNDER THIS FACTOR BASED ON THE FOLLOWING:

- 1) The organizational plan covers all parts of the evaluation design and is likely to be effective and efficient with reporting relationships that are clear and reasonable;
- 2) The timeline and schedule cover all major tasks, are reasonable, and appear likely to result in meeting all deadlines.
- 3) Plans for Data Acquisition, the Advisory Board, and for producing reports and briefings demonstrate an awareness of the key variables for success, possible problems and contingencies and strategies for addressing them.

F. PRICE

Cost Realism will be performed on all acceptable business management proposals as part of the proposal evaluation process. The purpose of this evaluation shall be to (a) verify the offeror's understanding of the requirement; (b) to assess the degree to which the cost/price proposal reflects the approaches and/or risk assessments made in the technical proposal as well as the risk that the offeror will provide the services for the offered price/cost; and (c) assess the degree to which the cost reflected in the cost/price proposal accurately represents the work effort included in the technical offer (proposal).

M.3 DETERMINING BEST OVERALL VALUE

In order to determine which offeror represents the best overall value, the Contracting Officer will make a series of paired comparisons among only those offerors that submitted acceptable offers (proposals). If, in any paired comparison, the offeror with the higher technical score also has the lower price, then the Contracting Officer will consider that offeror to represent the better overall value. If the offeror with the higher technical score has the higher price, then the Contracting Officer will decide whether the difference in expected value is worth the difference in price. If the Contracting Officer decides that it is, then they will consider the offeror with the higher technical score and the higher price to represent the better overall value. If not, then the Contracting Officer will consider the offeror(s) with the lower technical score and the lower price to represent the better value. The Contracting Officer will continue to make

paired comparisons in this way until they have identified the best overall value. Please be advised that in the event that the offerors within the competitive range are essentially technically equal in terms of technical, past performance other non-cost factors, and price, the Government reserves the right to award multiple contracts under this solicitation.

Pursuant to FAR Subpart 52.215-1 Instructions to Offerors - Competitive Acquisition, the Contracting Officer reserves the right to award without discussion to the source(s) whose offer is the most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered.

Appendix A:

UI Literature Relevant to this Solicitation

Demographic and Economic Changes Relevant to the UI Program

1. Recipients

Vroman, W. (1998) "Labor Market Changes and Unemployment Insurance Benefit Availability" (UI Occasional Paper 98-3). Washington DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service. NTIS PB98-157563

Davidson, Carl and Stephen A. Woodbury. (1995) "Optimal Unemployment Insurance," Staff Working Papers 95-35, W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

2. Exhaustees

Gritz, R. Mark, et al. (1999) "Dynamic Models of Unemployment Insurance Benefit Receipt: Survival Rate Analysis Report." ETA Occasional Paper 1999-01. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

Corson and Dynarski (1990) "A Study of Unemployment Insurance Recipients and Exhaustees: Findings from a National Survey" UI Occasional Paper 90-3. Washington, D.C. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

Needles, K., Corson, W., and Nicholson, W. (2002). "Left out of the Boom Economy: UI Recipients in the Late 1990s." ETA Occasional Paper 2002-03. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Office of Policy Development, Evaluation and Research.

3. Ineligible Claimants

Fishman, Michael, et al. "Unemployment Insurance Non-Monetary Policies and Practices: How Do They Affect Program Participation? A Study of Eight States." ETA Occasional Paper 2003-01. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

Vroman, Wayne. "Low Benefit Reciprocity in State Unemployment Insurance Programs." ETA Occasional Paper 2002-02. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

4. Non-filers

Wandner, Stephen, and Andrew Stettner (2000) "Why are many jobless workers not applying for benefits?" Washington, D.C.: Monthly Labor Review. United States Department of Labor. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Vroman, Wayne, "The Decline in Unemployment Insurance Claims Activity in the 1980's." UI Occasional Paper 91-2. Washington, DC: US Department of Labor. Unemployment Insurance Services.

Effectiveness of UI - Macroeconomic Issues

Vroman, Wayne and Stephen Woodbury. "Trend and Cycle Analysis of Unemployment Insurance and the Employment Service." The Urban Institute. Forthcoming.

Black, T.E. et al. (1999) "Unemployment Insurance as an Automatic Stabilizer: Evidence of Effectiveness over Three Decades." ETA Occasional Paper 1999-08. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration.

Dunson, B.H., et al. (1991) "The Cyclical Effects of the Unemployment Insurance (UI) Program" (UI Occasional Paper 91-3). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service. NTIS PB91-197897

Oaxaca, R.L., and Taylor, C.A. (1983) "The Effects of Aggregate Unemployment Insurance Benefits in the U.S. on the Operation of a Local Economy." (UI Occasional Paper 83-3). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service. NTIS PB84-150317

Denzau, A. et al, (1979) "The Impact of Unemployment Insurance Benefits on Local Economics – Tuscon." (UI Occasional Paper 79-2). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service. NTIS PB 83-169912

Effectiveness of Microeconomic Issues

1. Consumption

Gruber, Jonathan. "The Consumption Smoothing Benefits of Unemployment Insurance." American Economic Review. 1997.

Burgess, P.L. et al, (1981) "Changes in Spending Patterns Following Unemployment." (UI Occasional Paper 81-3). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service. NTIS PB83-14883

Burgess, P.L. et al, (1981) "Can Benefit Adequacy be Predicted on the Basis of UI Claims and CWBH Data?" Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service. NTIS PB83-140566

Kingston, J.L. et al, (1980) "Benefit Adequacy and UI Program Costs: Simulations with Alternative Weekly Benefit Formulas." (UI Occasional Paper 80-4). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service. NTIS PB84-217595

Kingston, J.L. et al, (1978) "The Adequacy of Unemployment Insurance Benefits: An Analysis of Adjustments Undertaken through Thirteen and Twenty-Five Weeks of Unemployment." (UI Occasional Paper 78-5). Arizona Department of Economic Security and Arizona State University. NTIS PB83-149823.

Burgess, P. et al, (1978) "The Adequacy of Unemployment Insurance Benefits: An Analysis of Weekly Benefits Relative to Pre-unemployment Expenditure Levels." (UI Occasional Paper 78-2). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service. NTIS PB83-149633

2. Disincentives

Decker, Paul T. (1997) in O'Leary and Wandner eds. *Unemployment Insurance in the United States: Analysis of Policy Issues*. "Work Incentives and Disincentives." Kalamazoo, Michigan: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research

Moffitt, R. (1984) "The Effect of the Duration of Unemployment Benefits on Work Incentives: An Analysis of Four Data Sets." (UI Occasional Paper 85-4). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Unemployment Insurance Service. NTIS PB 85-170546

Klausner, M. (1977). Unemployment Insurance and the Work Disincentive Effect: An Examination of Recent Research. (UI Occasional Paper 77-4). Washington,

DC: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration,
Unemployment Insurance Service.

Offerors not listed on the bidder's list below are still eligible to submit proposals for this RFP.

**BIDDERS/NETWORKING
LIST**

Tracye Turner
Optimal Solutions Group
6 North Broadway
Suite 2
Baltimore, Maryland 21231
410.342.8674

Todd R. Anderson
HeiTech Services, Inc.
4200 Forbes Boulevard
Suite 202
Lanham, Maryland 20706
301.918.9500

Sharon Christenson
Abt Associates, Inc.
55 Wheeler Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
617.492.7100

Terri Williams
Legal Personnel, Inc. – Messiah
5615 Landover Road
Cheverly, Maryland 20784
301.277.5711

Michael Dardia
Acumen LLC
1415 Rollins road
Suite 110
Burlingame, California 94010
650.558.3980 x32

Apurva Shah
Lyceum Professional Services
140 Part Street SE
Suite 300
Vienna, Virginia 22180
571.338.1775

JJ Nathan
Symphony Corporation –
Symphony Government Solutions

9205 Kingsbury Drive
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910
202.413.5201

Cheri Jackson
Integrated Management
Resources Group, Inc.
4550 Forbes Boulevard
Suite 140
Lanham, Maryland 20706
301.306.0502

Loren C. Scott
Loren C. Scott & Assoc., Inc.
743 Woodview Court
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70810
225.751.1707

Patty Kelley
Denali Associates
324 Gambrills Road
Suite F
Gambrills, Maryland 21054
410.923.4505

Darrell Benvenuto
DAH Consulting, Inc.
99 Wall Street
New York, New York 10005
212.514.6862

Donald Hutson
Jack Faucett Associates, Inc.
4550 Montgomery Avenue
Suite #300N
Bethesda, Maryland 20814
301.961.8789

Steve Taylor
SysTeam, Inc.
1804 Highway
231 South
Lacey's Spring, Alabama 35754
256.650.2500 ex521

Harry W. Miley, Jr., PhD
Miley & Associates, Inc.
P.O. Box 11227
Columbia, South Carolina 29211
803.782.0040

Martin M. Franklin
Ceenex LC
2010 Corporate Ridge
Suite 700
McLean, Virginia 22102
703.749.7714

Judi Hay
Mathematica Policy Research
600 Alexander Park
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
609.799.3535

Jane Shea
PACS Companies
4928 Bridgeport Way
Norcross, Georgia 30092
800.243.2572

John Lonergan
SBSI
1202 Pawnee Terrace
Indian Harbour Beach, FL 32937
321.773.7484

Michelle L. Carthen
CLW, Inc.
Mercantile Lane
#150
Largo, Maryland 20774
301.925.9363

Bennet Pudlin
The Charter Oak Group, LLC
860.324.3555

Wayne Vroman
The Urban Institute
2100 M Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037
202.857.8573

Ronald Szoc, PhD
Information Technology
International, Inc.
10000 Falls Road
Suite 214
Potomac, Maryland 20854
1.301.765.0060

Mary Reiter
CONSAD Research Corporation
121 North Highland Avenue
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15206
412.363.5500 ex210