

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD rev 18 May 2021

1.0 Basis for Contract Award

This is a competitive best value source selection conducted in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.3, Source Selection, as supplemented by the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS), and the Air Force Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (AFFARS). These regulations are available electronically at the Air Force (AF) FAR Site, <https://www.acquisition.gov/content/regulations>.

Factor 2, Past Performance, is approximately equal to Factor 1, Price.

By submission of an offer, the Offeror accedes to all solicitation requirements, including terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as evaluation factors or subfactors. Failure to meet a requirement may result in an offer's proposal being unawardable. While the Government intends to award a contract without discussions, discussions or negotiations may be conducted. Offerors may be required to participate in telephone discussions or in face-to-face, oral discussions at the Eglin Source Selection Facility, 210 West D Avenue, Building 373, Eglin AFB, FL. **Offerors are cautioned to follow the detailed instructions fully and carefully, as the Government reserves the right to make an award based on initial offers received, without discussion of such offers. The Offeror's initial proposal should reflect their best effort.** The Government intends to award one contract but reserves the right to award none.

1.1 Evaluation Factors

Factor 1: Price

Factor 2: Past Performance

1.2 Process (Stepped Approach)

a. Step 1 – Proposals will be ranked from lowest total evaluated price (TEP) to highest TEP. Then, the Government will evaluate the two (2) lowest proposals under Factor 1 Price;

b. Step 2 – If either of the two (2) lowest proposals are found to be unreasonable or unbalanced under Factor 1 then the Government will review the next lowest TEP proposal until two (2) lowest TEP proposals are found to be reasonable and have balanced pricing under Factor 1 OR all offers have been evaluated.

c. Step 3 - Then, the lowest TEP proposal with reasonable and balanced pricing for Factor 1 will be evaluated for past performance confidence under Factor 2. If the lowest TEP proposal with reasonableness and balanced pricing for Factor 1 is found to have a Substantial Confidence performance assessment under Factor 2, this proposal represents the best value for the Government, and the evaluation process stops at this point. **Award shall be made to that Offeror without further consideration of any other Offerors.**

d. Step 4 - If the lowest TEP with reasonable and balanced pricing for Factor 1 does not receive a "Substantial Confidence" performance assessment rating under Factor 2, then the second lowest TEP proposal with reasonable and balanced pricing for Factor 1 will be evaluated for past performance confidence under Factor 2. If the second lowest TEP with reasonableness and balanced pricing for Factor 1 proposal does not receive a "Substantial Confidence" performance assessment rating under Factor, then this evaluation process will continue from Step 1 until an Offeror is found to have a "Substantial Confidence" performance assessment rating under Factor 2 OR all offers have been evaluated.

e. Step 5. The Source Selection Authority shall then make an integrated assessment best value award decision by determining if the best value to the Government is to pay a higher price for a higher past performance assessment rating. The Government reserves the following rights: to award a contract to the lowest price offeror who has Substantial Confidence Rating, to award to higher priced offeror who has Substantial Confidence Rating; award a contract to the lowest price offeror who has at least a Satisfactory Confidence Rating or award a contract to the lowest price offeror who has a Neutral Confidence Rating.

f. Step 6 – If the Government chooses to enter into discussions at any point during the evaluation process, discussions will be conducted with those Offerors whose proposals are in the competitive range. After discussions are closed and Final Proposal Revisions received, the process will begin again at Step 1.

1.3 Factors and Subfactors

1.3 Factor 1: Price

1.4.1 Price Evaluation. The Government shall rank, all offers by TEP from lowest to highest, including any option prices if applicable. The Total Evaluated Price will be the sum total of all Firm-Fixed Priced CLIN(s). The price evaluation will document reasonableness and balance pricing of the proposed TEP.

1.4.2 The Offeror's Volume I - Price portion of the proposal will not be rated or scored, but will be evaluated for fairness and reasonableness (in accordance with FAR 15.404 and FAR 31.201-3), and balanced pricing (in accordance with FAR 15.404-1). Offerors whose price is determined to be unreasonable or unbalanced may not be considered for award. Price will be evaluated for the Firm Fixed Price (FFP) CLIN(s) on the basic effort and all options (if applicable). ***The team will review the 50 Division Cost Estimating Worksheet(s) to ensure the major work elements are identified within each division and are sufficiently detailed to demonstrate that the included quantities for materials, labor and other services are not significantly overstated or understated.*** The evaluated price may include adjustments to offset any competitive advantage from the use of additional Government Furnished Equipment, Government Furnished Property, Government Furnished Facilities (not furnished to all Offerors) or other Government costs associated with the proposed approach. To facilitate the evaluation of proposal information requested in Section L of this solicitation, information may be obtained from other sources including, but not limited to, Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA), Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA), U.S. Department of Labor, Global Insight Indices and any other resource available to the Government.

1.4.3 If applicable, evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise such options.

1.4.4 The Offeror's Price Volume of the proposal will be evaluated, using one or more of the techniques defined in FAR 15.404, in order to determine if it is reasonable. Normally, price reasonableness is established through cost and price analysis techniques as described in FAR 15.404. 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. For additional information see FAR 31.201-3. Additionally, although adequate price competition is expected, if only one offer is received in response to this solicitation the responding offeror will be required to provide certified cost or pricing data in accordance with Table 15-2, at FAR 15.408 and DFARs Clause 252.215-7009.

The Offeror's Cost/Price Volume of the proposal **not found to be reasonable or balanced will render the Offeror's proposal un-awardable and that Offeror's proposal will be removed from any further considerations.**

1.5 Factor 2: Past Performance

1.5.1 The Contracting Officer shall seek recent and relevant performance information on all Offerors based on the information provided by the Offeror and data independently obtained from other Government sources.

1.5.2 Scope

The purpose of the past performance evaluation is to allow the Government to assess the Offeror's likelihood of meeting the solicitation requirements based on the Offeror's demonstrated past performance. The assessment process will result in an overall performance confidence assessment of Substantial Confidence, Satisfactory Confidence, Neutral Confidence, Limited Confidence or No Confidence as defined in DoD Source Selection Procedures, Table M3.

1.5.3 The Government reserves the right to give greater consideration to information on those contracts deemed most relevant to the effort described in this Request for Proposal.

1.5.4 Offerors are cautioned to submit sufficient information and in the format specified in Section L. 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 a less than satisfactory rating on any evaluation element (within the Past Performance Information Sheets (Attachment L2)) or any unfavorable comments received from sources without a formal rating system. Clarification 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.

1.5.5 Recency Assessment

Recent past performance is defined as ongoing contracts with a performance history, and contracts completed within three (3) years from the issue date of this solicitation. **Past Performance information submitted that does not meet the definition of recent SHALL NOT be evaluated.**

1.5.6 Relevancy Assessment

In determining relevancy for individual past performance submissions, consideration will be given to the effort, or portion of the effort, being proposed by the Offeror, joint venture partner, or major subcontractor whose contract is being reviewed and evaluated. The past performance information forms and information obtained from other sources will be used to establish the degree of relevancy of past performance. The Government will determine relevancy when assessing recent contracts According to Table M2 below:

TABLE M2 – RELEVANCY RATINGS				
Adjectival Rating	Description	Scope	Magnitude	Complexities
Very Relevant	Present/past performance effort <u>involved essentially the same</u> scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.	Have provided personnel, equipment, tools, materials, vehicles, supervision and logistics to perform work projects involving ALL of the type of construction and work elements described in the attached associated requirement documents.	Greater than \$2,000,000	Scope included replacement of fire suppression and fire alarm with specific experience IAW UFC 3-600-01, UFC 3-230-01, and AFMAN 91-201.
Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved <u>similar</u> scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires	Have provided personnel, equipment, tools, materials, vehicles, supervision and logistics to perform work projects involving MOST of construction and work elements described in the attached associated requirement documents.	Between \$1,000,000 and \$2,000,000	Scope included replacement of fire suppression or fire alarm and specific experience IAW UFC 3-600-01, UFC 3-230-01, and AFMAN 91-201.
Somewhat Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved <u>some</u> of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this	Have provided personnel, equipment, tools, materials, vehicles, supervision and logistics to perform work projects involving SOME of construction and work elements described in the attached associated requirement documents.	Less \$1,000,000	Scope included replacement of fire suppression or fire alarm but no experience IAW UFC 3-600-01, UFC 3-230-

	solicitation requires			01, and AFMAN 91-201.
Not Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved <u>little or none</u> of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.	Have provided personnel, equipment, tools, materials, vehicles, supervision and logistics to perform work projects involving the NONE of construction and work elements described in the attached associated requirement documents.	Less than \$1,000,000	No scope or experience included for replacement of fire suppression or fire alarm and no experience IAW UFC 3-600-01, UFC 3-230-01, and AFMAN 91-201.

1.5.7 Performance Confidence Assessment

The assessment process will result in an overall performance confidence assessment of Substantial Confidence, Satisfactory Confidence, Neutral Confidence, Limited Confidence and No Confidence, as defined in Table M3 below. Offerors with no recent and relevant past performance history, or if the Offeror’s performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned, shall receive the rating "Neutral Confidence."

TABLE M3 - PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENTS	
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.

2.0 SOLICITATIONS REQUIREMENTS, TERMS AND CONDITIONS

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 to any exceptions taken.

2.1 Number of Contracts to be awarded

The Government intends to award one contract; however, the Government reserves the right to make no award at all, depending on the quality of the proposals, the prices submitted and the availability of funds.

2.2 Correction Potential of Proposals

Offerors are cautioned to submit sufficient information and in the format specified in Section L. Offerors may be asked to clarify certain aspects of their proposal. Clarification conducted to resolve minor or clerical errors will not constitute discussions.

2.3 Discussions with Offerors

The Government reserves the right to award a contract based only on initial proposals without establishing a competitive range and conducting discussions. If, during the evaluation period, it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government to conduct discussions, the Government will establish a competitive range and conduct discussions with all Offerors included in the competitive range. Offeror responses to Evaluation Notices and the Final Proposal Revision will be considered in making the source selection decision.

3.0 RESPONSIBILITY

A Contractor Responsibility Determination will be made IAW FAR Subpart 9.1 for the prospective awardee.