

Evaluation

- A. Basis for Award: This is a competitive best value source selection in which Subjective Tradeoff, IAW FAR 15.101-1, will be utilized. For those offerors determined to be technically acceptable, a tradeoff may be made between past performance and price, with past performance significantly more important than price.
- B. Discussions: The Government reserves the right to award a contract without discussions or opportunity for proposal revisions. If, during the evaluation period, it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government to hold discussions, offeror responses to Evaluation Notices (ENs) and the Final Proposal Revision (FPR) will be considered in making the source selection decision. Offerors may be required to respond with their FPR within 24 hours. If the offeror's proposal has been evaluated as acceptable at the time discussions are closed, any changes or exceptions in the Final Proposal Revision are subject to re-evaluation and may introduce risk that the offeror's proposal will be determined unacceptable or the price is no longer fair and reasonable, the offeror may be ineligible for award. If the Government elects to open discussions, the competitive range may or may not include proposals rated as "Unacceptable" at the sole discretion of the Government. A competitive range, if required, may be further reduced for purposes of efficiency pursuant to FAR 15.306(c)(2).

C. Evaluation Factors:

1. **PART I – TECHNICAL:** Capability Statement

- i. Subfactor 1 – Detailed Requirements: Provide approach to accomplish Detailed Requirements, especially Engineering Services, Special Studies, Sustaining Engineering & Integrated Logistics Support, Technical Services, and Subject Matter Expertise functions as specified in the PWS, para. 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3, 4.2.6, and 4.2.8.
- ii. Subfactor 2 – Software Support Capability: Provide approach for full Software Support Capability as specified in the PWS, para. 4.1.10.
- iii. Subfactor 3 – Technical Report Study Services: Provide approach to deliver a Supportability Analysis Report (SAR) (CLIN 0004, CDRL A003) within the base year and update throughout the period of performance as specified in the PWS, para 4.1.2.1.
- iv. Subfactor 4 – Detailed Requirements: Provide approach for Phase in Transition and meet all contract requirements within first 30 days of contract performance as specified in the PWS, para. 4.2.9.
- v. Subfactor 5 – Small Business Participation: This Factor will be rated according to the following methodology:

Table 1 – Small Business Evaluation

Color Rating	Adjectival Rating	Description
Green	Acceptable	Proposal indicates an adequate approach and understanding of small business objectives.
Red	Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet small business objectives.

The Government will analyze the information in Table SB of the offeror's proposal and will:

- (1) Confirm that the amount stated in cell (A) is consistent with the price volume; and

(2) Confirm that the amount stated in cell (B) is identical to the amount reported in the offeror's Small Business Subcontracting Plan pursuant to FAR 52.219-9(d)(2)(ii), if required to be submitted; and

(3) Confirm that the amount stated in cell (D) is calculated in accordance with the instructions; and

*If the Government is unable to confirm the amount as indicated in (1), then the Government will resolve the discrepancy by revising the amount in Table SB to be consistent with the price volume and the instructions for cell (A).

*If the Government is unable to confirm the amount as indicated in (2), then the Government will resolve the discrepancy by revising the amount in Table SB to be consistent with the offeror's Small Business Subcontracting Plan and the instructions for cell (B).

If the Government is unable to confirm the amount as indicated in (3), then the Government will resolve the discrepancy by revising the amount in Table SB to be consistent with the instructions for cell (D).

Table 2 - Technical Acceptable/Unacceptable Rating Method

Adjectival Rating	Description
Acceptable	Proposal meets the requirements of the solicitation.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet the requirements of the solicitation.

2. **PART II – PAST PERFORMANCE:** Past performance will be rated using the confidence assessment described in DoD Source Selection Procedures, Table 5 – Performance Confidence Assessments as shown below.

The contracting officer shall seek recent, relevant, and quality of performance information on all offerors based on (1) the past efforts provided by the offeror and (2) data independently obtained from other Government and commercial sources. The purpose of the past performance evaluation is to allow the Government to assess the offeror's probability of meeting the solicitation requirements based on the offeror's demonstrated past performance.

The information gathered will be rated in two parts. First, the relevancy of the information will be rated as either "relevant" or "non relevant." Second, the overall quality will be evaluated to determine a Confidence Rating of "Substantial," "Satisfactory," "Neutral," "Limited," or "No" Confidence.

Offerors are cautioned to submit sufficient information instructed above. Offeror's may be asked to clarify certain aspects of their proposal (for example, the relevance of past performance information) or respond to adverse past performance information to which the offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond. Adverse past performance is defined as past performance information that supports an unacceptable rating on any evaluation element or any unfavorable comments received from sources without a formal rating system. Communication conducted to resolve minor or clerical errors will not constitute discussions and the contracting officer reserves the right to award a contract without the opportunity for proposal revision.

RECENCY/RELEVANCY: Recent past performance is defined as past performance having occurred in the last 5 years preceding the date of the solicitation issuance. Relevant past is defined as performance of efforts similar in scope, complexity, dollar value, and extent of subcontracting/teaming. The Government will consider relevancy and recency of the past performance, as well as any information gathered by the Contracting Officer.

Table 3 - The following ratings will be used to rate the relevance of Past Performance provided

Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Not Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

Past performance regarding predecessor companies, key personnel who have relevant experience, or subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement will be rated equal to past performance information for the principal offeror. Offerors with no recent/ relevant performance history or if the offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence rating can be reasonably assigned shall receive the rating "Neutral Confidence," meaning the rating is treated neither favorable nor unfavorable.

The third aspect of the past performance evaluation is to establish the overall quality of the offeror's past performance. The past performance evaluation process gathers information on how well the offeror performed those past contracts. Past performance information will be collected and reviewed to determine the quality of the offeror's performance, general trends, and usefulness of the information, and incorporate these into the performance confidence assessment.

The past performance confidence assessment rating will be based on the offeror's overall record of recency, relevancy, and quality of performance.

In evaluating past performance, the Government reserves the right to give greater consideration to information on those contracts deemed most recent and relevant to the effort described in this solicitation.

The following ratings will be used in rating past performance:

Table 4- Performance Confidence Assessments Rating Method

Adjectival Rating	Description
Substantial Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Satisfactory Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Neutral Confidence	No recent/relevant performance record is available or the offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned. The offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on the factor of past performance.
Limited Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
No Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

TECHNICAL/PAST PERFORMANCE TRADEOFF/ANALYSIS: In determining the awardee for this solicitation, the past performance ratings will be used during the technical/past performance analysis. If the lowest priced technically acceptable offer is judged to have a "Substantial Confidence" performance confidence assessment, that offer represents the best

value for the Government and the evaluation process stops at this point. However, if the lowest priced offer is not judged to have a “Substantial Confidence” the evaluation continues until a technically acceptable offeror is judged to have “Substantial Confidence” (or until all offers have been evaluated). At this point the Contracting Officer will perform an integrated assessment to determine best value; award shall be made to that offeror without further consideration of any other offers. If the Contracting Officer determines discussions are not required, the Contracting Officer, relying on the non-priced factors evaluation and independent business judgment, will decide which offeror is to be awarded the contract. This decision will be based on the proposal that offers the best value to the Government in terms of their combined non-priced factor ratings and price. This may result in award being made to a higher rated, yet higher priced offeror where the decision is consistent with the solicitation's evaluation factors and the Contracting Officer reasonably determines that the superiority of the higher priced offeror’s proposal justifies the additional costs.

3. **PART III – PRICE:** Government will first rank proposals according to price with the base year and option year combined, from lowest to highest. The offeror’s proposal will be evaluated for Reasonableness and Total Evaluated Price.

REASONABLENESS: The existence of adequate price competition is expected to support a determination of reasonableness. Price analysis techniques may be used to further validate price reasonableness. If adequate price competition is not obtained or if price reasonableness cannot be determined using price analysis, other techniques will be used.

4. **TRANSITION/CONTINUITY OF OPERATIONS PLAN** will be evaluated on the following areas:
 - a. Challenges associated with maintaining essential contractor services during an extended event, such as a pandemic that occurs in repeated waves.
 - b. The time lapse associated with the initiation of the acquisition of essential personnel and resources and their actual availability on site.
 - c. The components, processes, and requirements for the identification, training, and preparedness of personnel who are capable of relocating to alternate facilities or performing work from home.
 - d. Any established alert and notification procedures for mobilizing identified "essential contractor service" personnel.
 - e. The approach for communicating expectations to contractor employees regarding their roles and responsibilities during a crisis.

Table 5 – Transition/Continuity Plan Acceptable/Unacceptable Rating Method

Adjectival Rating	Description
Acceptable	Proposal meets the requirements of the solicitation.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet the requirements of the solicitation.