

ADDENDUM 52.212-2 – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

The Government will use FAR Part 12.602 Streamlined Evaluation of Offers vs. FAR 15.3 Source Selection to evaluate offers submitted in response to the solicitation. The factors that shall be used to evaluate proposals are **Technical Capability and Price**, as expounded below. All evaluation factors are equal in importance; however, a proposal is unawardable at any price if, after final evaluation, the Technical factor receives a rating of “Unacceptable.” The evaluation does not permit tradeoffs between price and non-price factors. Award shall be made to the responsible offeror who submits a proposal that (1) conforms to the requirements of the solicitation; (2) that receives a rating of “Acceptable” on the Technical evaluation factor; and (3) that submits the proposal with the lowest Total Evaluated Price (TEP), provided that the TEP is not unbalanced and is fair and reasonable. The Government reserves the right to award no contract at all depending upon (1) the quality of proposals received and (2) the fair and reasonableness of the pricing of proposals received

Rating	Description
Acceptable	Proposal clearly meets the minimum requirements of the solicitation.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not clearly meet the minimum requirement of the solicitation.

Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as factors or sub-factors. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the solicitation may result in the offeror being ineligible for award. Offerors must clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and must provide complete supporting rationale. The Government reserves the right to determine any such exceptions unacceptable and the proposal, therefore, ineligible for award.

1) TECHNICAL CAPABILITY

- A. A decision on the technical acceptability of each offeror’s Technical Capability Proposal shall be made. Each proposal will be assigned a rating of Acceptable or Unacceptable.
- B. Each offeror must show evidence of a capability to provide the mandatory requirements set forth in the Performance Work Statement (PWS) and elsewhere in this solicitation. A technical review team composed of key Government personnel shall use their technical skills, knowledge and experience to thoroughly review the adequacy of the proposals. In evaluating the Mission Capability Proposal, the Government shall use the following evaluation criteria:

1. Compliance with the requirements of the Performance Work Statement (PWS) and this entire solicitation.
 2. Understanding of the requirements of the Performance Work Statement (PWS) and this entire solicitation.
 3. Compliance and understanding of the requirements of the PWSs as applied specifically to each factor/sub-factor listed below.
- C. The following specific factors and sub-factors shall be evaluated in the Technical Capability Proposal. Any factor or sub-factor determined unacceptable shall render the entire Technical Capability Proposal as unacceptable. Upon final determination that a proposal is unacceptable, the Contracting Officer (CO) shall promptly notify the firm submitting the proposal that it shall not be considered for award and shall indicate in general terms the basis for the determination.
- D. Technical Capability Evaluation Factors and Sub Factors are as follows:

1. **SUBFACTOR 1** - Quality Control Plan (PWS 1.1.-1.6.)

Description: This element will evaluate the offeror's approach for ensuring performance will be in accordance with (IAW) the standards in the PWS throughout the life of the contract.

Measure of Merit: An acceptable rating is met when the offeror's proposal has provided a detailed QCP that is likely to ensure that performance will be in accordance with (IAW) the standards in the PWS throughout the life of the contract to include:

1. Identification of personnel responsible for quality control;
2. A description of the offeror's scheduling procedures IAW with the PWS.
3. Provide documentation of certification of capacity verification. (code symbol stamp)

2. **SUBFACTOR 2** - Reports (PWS 1.7)

Description: This element will evaluate the offeror's ability to provide detail reports on each safety valve IAW the PWS.

Measure of Merit: An acceptable rating is met when the offeror's proposal includes a realistic sample report to include all details listed in PWS.

3. **SUBFACTOR 3 - Prior Experience**

Description: This sub-factor will evaluate the offeror's ability to provide sufficient prior experience.

Measure of Merit: An acceptable rating is met when the offeror's proposal provides sufficient proof of at least (1) relevant contract performed within five years of the issue date of the solicitation. Provide your relevant experience as it relates in sufficient detail:

- a) Performing inspection of safety valves and relief valves for boilers.
- b) Maintaining and following a schedule for routine inspections/maintenance.
- c) Provide Certificate of Authorization in the National Board Valve Repair ("VR" Stamp) Program.
- d) For each relevant contract provided, please provide the following administrative data:
 1. Company/Division Name
 2. Program Title
 3. Contracting Agency
 4. Contract Number
 5. Type of Contract (Fixed Price)
 6. Dates Performed
 7. Contract Value (including any option years)

- E. The above specific technical factors/subfactors shall be evaluated in the Technical Capability Proposal. Any subfactor judged unacceptable shall render the entire Technical Capability Proposal as unacceptable. Upon final determination that a proposal is "unacceptable", the Contracting Officer shall promptly notify the firm submitting the proposal that it will not be considered for award.

2) **PRICE:**

- A. Price proposals will be evaluated for (1) completeness, (2) unbalanced pricing, (3) fair and reasonableness, and (4) Total Evaluated Price (TEP). Offerors whose price is determined to be incomplete, significantly unbalanced or contains otherwise unbalanced pricing that poses an unacceptable risk to the Government, or unreasonable will not be considered for award.

1. **Completeness:** The Government shall review the pricing submissions for completeness and compliance with solicitation clause FAR 52.212-1 and Attachment 1- Additional Instructions to Offerors.

2. **Unbalanced Pricing:** The Government shall analyze each proposal to determine whether they are unbalanced with respect to prices proposed on bid schedules for the same or similar services and/or supplies in the same or similar quantities and with respect to option pricing. An offer may be rejected if the Contracting Officer (CO) determines that the option prices are significantly unbalanced or that otherwise unbalanced pricing poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.
3. **Fair and Reasonableness:** The offeror's Price proposal will be evaluated using one or more of the techniques defined in FAR 15.404, Proposal Analysis, in order to determine if it is reasonable. For a price to be reasonable, it must represent a price to the Government that a prudent person would pay in the conduct of competitive business. Normally, price reasonableness is established through price analysis techniques as described in FAR 15.404-1(b), Price analysis for commercial and non-commercial items. For additional information, reference FAR 31.201-3, Determining Reasonableness.
4. **Total Evaluated Price (TEP): Total Evaluated Price (TEP):** The Government will add the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement to arrive at a total evaluated price (TEP). The TEP will be calculated as:
 - a. The sum of the extended prices (unit quantity multiplied by unit price) for CLINs 0001 through 2006 for the base performance period and option periods I and II; and
 - b. To account for the maximum six (6) month extension possible under the clause at FAR 52.217-8, Option to Extend Services, the Government will use the sum of the proposed prices of the final option period (CLINs 2001 through 2006), prorate it to a six (6) month value, and add that amount to the sum of all CLINs (Base performance period and option periods I and II). Please note that this calculation is used for evaluation purposes only. After award, the Government reserves the right to exercise the Option to Extend Services at any time allowed by 52.217-8, and at the price allowed by 52.217-8.
 - c. The table below illustrates calculation of a proposal's TEP using the methodology described above. The table is provided for illustration purposes only. Prices reflected in the table are notional and in no way reflect the actual value of the requirement or an actual evaluation of proposed prices submitted in response to this solicitation or any other solicitation for the same or similar requirements.

Period of Performance	POP Length	CLINS (Example)	Notional Proposed Price (Example)
Base	12 Months	0001-0006	\$100,000
Option I	12 Months	1001-1006	\$103,000
Option II	12 Months	2001-2006	\$106,000
6 Month Option	6 Months	3001-3006	\$53,000
Total Evaluated Price			\$362,000.00

3) EVALUATION PROCESS

- a. The Government shall initiate concurrent evaluation of all evaluation factors on all proposals. The Government shall consider, throughout the evaluation, the "correction potential" of a proposal including whether any proposal deficiency can be rectified and whether any uncertainty can be resolved. The judgment of such "correction potential" is within the sole discretion of the Government.
- b. If pursuant to initial evaluation, the Government rates the Technical factor as "Unacceptable" or if the Government determines that there is some other deficiency or uncertainty relative to an offeror's proposal, and in the Government's judgment, the deficiency is rectifiable or the uncertainty is resolvable; the Contracting Officer (CO) may open discussions and may continue discussions as long as, in the Government's judgment, the deficiency is rectifiable or the uncertainty is resolvable.
- c. For the purpose of conducting discussions, if the Government rates the Technical factor as "Unacceptable" or if the Government determines that there is some other deficiency or uncertainty relative to an offeror's proposal, the entire proposal shall be rated "Unacceptable." At the conclusion of discussions, if the Technical factor is rated "Unacceptable" or if any deficiency or uncertainty relative to the proposal has not been unresolved, evaluation of that proposal shall be considered final. The entire proposal shall be rated "Unacceptable" and no further consideration shall be given to that proposal for award.
- d. For the purpose of award without discussions, if pursuant to initial evaluation, the Government rates the Technical factor as "Unacceptable" or if the Government determines that there is some other deficiency or uncertainty relative to an offeror's proposal, notwithstanding that any deficiency may be rectifiable or any uncertainty may be resolvable, the entire proposal shall be rated "Unacceptable," the initial evaluation will be the final evaluation, and no further consideration will be given to that proposal for award.

- e. The Government reserves the right to award without discussions.

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.

(This page left intentionally blank)