Section M – Evaluation Factors for Award

1) General Considerations

a) The Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO) and Contract Specialist (CS) are the soles point of contact for this acquisition. Offerors are prohibited from engaging in discourse with DMEA technical personnel regarding this Request for Proposal (RFP). Offerors shall address any questions or concerns regarding this acquisition to the PCO and CS. Written requests for clarification shall be sent to the PCO and CS at the address located in the model contract/solicitation/questions and comments will be addressed via the SAM.gov posting, with the offerors identity removed. Most questions and comments will be generalized to apply to a broader audience.

2) Basic Principles

a) The results of the DMEA engineering task risk analysis have been used to develop the evaluation criteria. The R2A prime contractors are expected to have a significant technical role in all task orders issued under the R2A contract. Therefore, DMEA is strongly interested in the resources and program organization of the prime Offeror. The prime Offeror is the entity with which DMEA could have a resulting contract. As such, the prime would be held fully responsible for the contract performance, regardless of any arrangements between the prime Offeror and its proposed subcontractors, team members, vendors or other associates. In addition, the in-house experience level of the prime Offeror has a direct bearing on their ability to select, manage, and control any required subcontractors/team members. Therefore, the resources and management of the prime Offeror versus any proposed subcontractors/team members is an important part of the technical evaluation.

3) DEFINITIONS

a) Evaluation Definitions – The following definitions will be used in the evaluation:

i) ***Best Value*** means the expected outcome of an acquisition that, in the Government's estimation, provides the greatest overall benefit in response to the requirement. Revolution Federal Acquisition Regulation Overhaul (R-FAR) 2.101.

ii) ***Competitive Range*** A competitive range is the group of evaluated proposals that the contracting officer determines are best suited for further negotiation. Contracting officers must establish a competitive range if negotiations will occur after evaluating competitive proposals. See R-FAR 15.204-1(a).

iii) ***Deficiency*** is any part of an offer that does not conform to a material requirement of a RFP. A material requirement is one that affects price, quantity, quality, or delivery, or that the RFP requires to be met at the time of proposal submission. See R-FAR 15.001.

iv) ***Evaluation Notice (EN)*** is the PCO's written notification to the offeror for purposes of clarifications, communications, or discussions.

v) ***Performance Confidence Assessment*** is an evaluation of the likelihood (or Government's confidence) that the offeror will successfully perform the solicitation's requirements; the evaluation is based upon past performance information.

vi) ***Quality*** is the composite of materiel attributes including performance features and characteristics of a production or service to satisfy a customer's given need.

vii) ***Recency***, as it pertains to past performance information, is a measure of the elapsed time since the past performance reference occurred. Recency is generally expressed as a time period during which past performance references are considered relevant.

viii) ***Relevancy***, as it pertains to past performance information, is a measure of the extent of similarity between the service/support effort, complexity, dollar value, contract type, and subcontract/ teaming or other comparable attributes of past performance examples and the solicitation requirements; and a measure of the likelihood the past performance is an indicator of future performance.

ix) ***Requirements Documents*** are all aspects of the RFP that convey the needs of the Government to offerors, including any Statements of Objectives (SOO), Statements of Work (SOW), Performance Work Statements (PWS), technical requirement documents, and system requirement documents.

x) ***Requirements Owner*** is the entity (for example, a program management office or other organizational entity) responsible for providing requirements documents within the RFP that communicate those requirements to offerors.

xi) ***Risk***, as it pertains to source selection, is the potential for unsuccessful contract performance. The consideration of risk assesses the degree to which an offeror's proposed approach to achieving the technical factor or subfactor may involve risk of disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight, and the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance. (For firm-fixed-price contracts, the reference to increased cost may be removed from the risk definition.)

xii) ***Significant Strength*** is an aspect of an Offeror's proposal with appreciable merit or will exceed specified performance or capability requirements to the considerable advantage of the Government during contract performance.

xiii) ***Significant Weakness*** in the proposal is a flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. See R-FAR 15.001.

xiv) ***Source Selection Advisory Council (SSAC)*** is a group of individuals, appointed as needed by the SSA, who provide counsel during the source selection process, prepare the comparative analysis of the SSEB's final evaluation results, and make an award recommendation to the SSA.

xv) ***Source Selection Authority (SSA)*** is the official designated to make the source selection decision.

xvi) ***Source Selection Decision Document (SSDD)*** is the document of the SSA's independent, integrated, comparative analysis and decision.

xvii) ***Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB*)** is a group of individuals representing the various functional disciplines relevant to the acquisition that is responsible for evaluating proposals against the solicitation criteria.

xviii) ***Source Selection Information*** means any of the following information that is prepared for use by an agency for the purpose of evaluating a bid or proposal to enter into an agency procurement contract, if that information has not been previously made available to the public or disclosed publicly. See R-FAR 2.101 for a listing of source selection information.

xix) ***Source Selection Plan (SSP)*** is a plan describing how the source selection will be organized, how proposals will be evaluated and analyzed, and how source(s) will be selected.

xx) ***Source Selection Team (SST)*** is a team tailored to the specific acquisition, tasked with carrying out a source selection. Composition of the team generally consists of the SSA, PCO (if different from the SSA), SSAC, SSEB, Advisors, Cost or Price Experts, Legal Counsel, Small Business Professionals/Specialists, and other subject-matter experts.

xxi) ***Technically Acceptable-*** To be determined Technically Acceptable an offerors proposal must conform to the requirements of the solicitation and receive the following evaluation ratings:

(1) A Combined Technical/Risk Rating for Volume I of Green/Acceptable or better

(2) Rating for Volume II as relevant and satisfactory confidence or better

xxii) ***Threshold or Threshold Minimum (as used in this document)*** is the minimum acceptable value of an attribute considered achievable within the available cost, schedule, and technology at low-to-moderate risk. Performance below the threshold value is not operationally effective or suitable or may not provide an improvement over current capabilities.

xxiii) ***Uncertainty*** is any aspect of a non-cost/price factor proposal for which the intent of the offer is unclear (e.g., more than one way to interpret the offer or inconsistencies in the proposal indicating that there may have been an error, omission, or mistake).

xxiv) ***Weakness*** means a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. See R-FAR 15.001.

xxv) Please see the additional definitions within Section L

4) Basis for Award

a) The Government will award a contract (or more contracts under other provisions in this solicitation) resulting from this solicitation to the responsible offeror(s) whose offer, conforming to the solicitation, represents a best value to the Government, price and other factors considered, to be added to the pool of awardees. The Government anticipates only one offeror at the time of this original solicitation.

b) The best value tradeoff source selection evaluation procedures found in R-FAR 15 will be used to select the contractor whose proposal represents the best value to the Government. Pursuant to R-FAR 15.103-1, "The tradeoff approach to source selection is appropriate when it may be in the Government's best interest to consider award to other than the lowest priced offeror or other than the highest technically rated offeror. This process permits tradeoffs among cost or price and non-cost or non-price factors. The anticipated benefits of a higher priced proposal must merit the additional cost."

c) The Government reserves the right to eliminate from consideration for award any offers at any time prior to award of the contract, and to negotiate with offerors in the competitive range. The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with offerors (except clarifications as described in R-FAR 15.202(a)(2)).

d) The Government intends to make multiple awards under this Request for Proposal, Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity contracts will be awarded after proposals are evaluated. Awards may be done in batches as they are approved.

e) The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer later determines them to be necessary. In addition, if the Contracting Officer determines that the number of proposals that would otherwise be in the competitive range exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted, the Contracting Officer may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly rated proposals.

f) The Government's evaluation of the offeror's proposal will be based upon the information submitted by the offeror and any other relevant information available to the Government. The offeror's proposal must demonstrate to the Government that the offeror will satisfy all requirements for each evaluation factor. The Government will evaluate each factor on a stand-alone basis; however, proposal information provided for one factor may be used to assist the Government in evaluating other factors.

g) In determining the best value to the Government, proposals will be evaluated on the basis of price and the following non-price factors:

i) Volume I – Technical Capabilities (Process Technologies Phase I);

ii) Technical Capabilities;

iii) Past Performance.

h) For this solicitation, onshore manufacturing and facility control is an **acceptable/unacceptable factor**, and therefore, will not be weighed in terms of importance relative to the other factors.

i) For the remainder of the factors, the relative importance of the factors are as follows:

(1) Technical Capabilities are more important than Past Performance.

(2) All non-price evaluation factors, when combined, are significantly more important than the Price.

ii) Non-price evaluation factors will be evaluated and assigned adjectival ratings. Price will be evaluated for fair and reasonableness.

5) Evaluation of Offerors' proposals will occur in two phases as summarized below:

a) **Phase 1**, the Government will first evaluate non-price **Factor 1: Volume I – Technical Capabilities (Process Technologies Phase I)**.

i) This factor will be evaluated on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis based on the offeror's submission of proof/verification documentation (e.g., deeds, facility leases, operating agreements, intra-company binding agreements) demonstrating that the prime offeror owns or controls the facility or formally accessed via approved cooperative agreements by the prime offeror will qualify.

ii) Evaluation on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis will use the Technical Acceptable/Unacceptable ratings in Table 1 of Section 6.

iii) Offerors receiving an "Acceptable" rating shall move on to Phase 2. Offerors receiving an "Unacceptable" rating will no longer be considered for award and no further evaluation will be conducted.

b) **Phase 2**, the Government will evaluate price and non-price factors 2 –Technical Capabilities and 3 - Past Performance, in accordance with the evaluation process described in Section 3.0 below.

i) To be eligible for award, the offeror's proposal must meet all solicitation requirements, conform to all required terms and conditions, and include all the information required by Section L of this solicitation. Failure to comply with any terms and conditions of this solicitation may result in the offeror being ineligible for award.

c) It is anticipated that multiple contract awards will be made as a result of the solicitation. In accordance with R-FAR 15.104(b)(1)(ii)(B) the Government will not include price or cost as an evaluation factor for award and as such intends to make an award to each and all qualifying offerors as per R-FAR 15.104(b)(1)(ii)(A)(3).

i) A qualifying offeror means an offeror that is determined to be a responsible source, submits a technically acceptable proposal that conforms to the requirements of the solicitation, and the contracting officer has no reason to believe would be likely to offer other than fair and reasonable pricing 10 U.S.C. 3206(c)(4).

ii) The solicitation will also include a notice to offerors that, pursuant to R-FAR 15.204-1(b), the contracting officer may also limit the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest

number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly rated proposals Offerors must meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as factors and subfactors to be eligible for award.

iii) Failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the solicitation may result in the offeror being removed from consideration for award.

6) Evaluation Ratings

a) An adjectival rating of Acceptable or Unacceptable will be issued depending on whether an offeror's submittal meets the minimum criteria. The minimum requirement for contract award is offeror demonstrates ownership and control of an onshore manufacturing facility.

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

Table 1 - Technical Acceptable/Unacceptable Rating Table

b) Factors that have subfactors will be rated at an overall factor-level rating.

c) Combined Technical/Risk Rating Evaluation. The combined technical/risk rating includes consideration of risk in conjunction with the significant strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, and deficiencies in determining technical ratings. These ratings will apply to Volume 1 - Technical Capabilities and Management Proposal. In order to achieve the technical/risk rating, the proposal must achieve at least all the mandatory characteristics identified for that rating.

d) The combined technical/risk ratings will be based off the ratings listed in the table below:

Combined Technical/Risk Ratings		
Color Rating	Adjective Rating	Description
BLUE	Outstanding	Proposal demonstrates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths and/or at least one significant strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
PURPLE	Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength or significant strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low to moderate.
GREEN	Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
YELLOW	Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
RED	Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation and, thus, contains one or more deficiencies and is unawardable, and/or risk of performance is unacceptably high.

Table 2 - Combined Technical/Technical Risk Table

e) Past Performance Relevancy and Confidence Assessment Rating Evaluation.

i) The Past Performance Team will conduct a structured past performance assessment that examines an offeror's relevant present and past work record to determine its ability to perform what is promised in the proposal.

ii) The past performance assessment will consider the number and severity of problems, the effectiveness of any corrective actions taken, and the offeror's overall work record and will be applied at the factor level.

iii) Potential sources of performance data are government sources such as tailored questionnaires and non-government sources that span beyond the proposal.

iv) There are three aspects of past performance that will be evaluated for this effort.

(1) The first aspect of the past performance evaluation is determining the relevancy of the past performance.

(a) An evaluation will be completed regarding recent efforts accomplished by the offeror and their relevancy to the R2A effort. The criteria to establish what is recent and relevant is stated in the solicitation at Section L

Adjectival Rating	Description
Very Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Somewhat Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved some of the 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.

Table 3 - Past Performance Relevancy Table

(2) The second aspect of the past performance evaluation is determining the Government's confidence assessment.

(a) An evaluation of the past performance information will be completed in order to determine how confident the Government believes the offeror will be in performing the R2A effort.

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.

Table 4 - Performance Confidence Assessment Table

(3) The third aspect of the past performance evaluation is determining if the reference is recent.

(a) Recent is defined as having a performance record of at least six (6) months and are currently on-going or have been performed within the last three (3) years from the issuance date of this solicitation. Six (6) months of the contract must have been performed within the last three (3) years from issuance date of this solicitation in order for the contract to be considered recent.

f) The proposed pricing arrangements will be analyzed for completeness and reasonableness.

i) IAW R-FAR 15.104(b)(1)(ii)(B) price will be considered for each order placed under any awarded contract.

7) Evaluation Approach

a) Factor 1: Volume I – Technical Capabilities (Process Technologies Phase I)

i) The Government will strictly evaluate the Offeror's proof of onshore manufacturing and facility control on an acceptable/unacceptable (pass/fail) basis.

b) Factor 1: Volume I - Technical Capabilities

i) Section 1: Technical Capability

(1) Process Technologies

(a) The Government will evaluate the completeness and adequacy of the Offeror's detailed description of their specific, production-qualified, domestic (U.S. manufactured) semiconductor foundry technologies to ensure they meet minimum program requirements.

(b) The Government will evaluate the specified lithographic generation, supported wafer sizes (150mm, 200mm, 300mm), operating temperature ranges, and the provided ISO 9001:2015 certification for technical compliance, maturity, and quality assurance suitability.

(i) The commercial operating temperature (0-70 degrees Celsius) is required, Industrial or Automotive operating temperature indicates a thorough approach, Military/Aerospace operating temperature indicates an exceptional approach.

(2) Photomask Sourcing

(a) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's capability and methodology for producing or sourcing production-qualified photomasks to ensure it is technically sound and meets domestic manufacturing requirements.

(b) The Government will verify the physical location (City, State) of the photomask manufacturing facility to confirm compliance with domestic sourcing requirements.

(i) Domestically manufactured photomasks indicates an exceptional approach.

(3) Intellectual Property (IP)

(a) The Government will evaluate the completeness and technical maturity of the Offeror's detailed list of foundational base IP (e.g., standard cell libraries).

(b) The Government will evaluate the viability and relevance of the described reference designs (e.g., LNAs, Power Amplifiers) and flows to determine their capability to support the required technologies and mitigate development risk.

(i) For semiconductor technologies, access to foundational IP that are silicon-proven physical design building blocks used for integrated circuit development, which consists of core components such as standard cell libraries, embedded memories, inputs and outputs (I/O) libraries indicates a thorough approach.

(ii) For compound semiconductor technologies, standard logic cells and component library, power integration, RF and Microwave, I/O, and protection and control blocks indicate a thorough approach.

(iii) Reference design flows for analog, mixed-signal, digital, and RF indicates a thorough approach. A reference design flows with advanced features (e.g., 3D-IC, Multi-Die) indicates an exceptional approach.

(4) Process Design Kit (PDK) Support

(a) The Government will evaluate the availability, completeness, and industry compatibility of the described PDKs and supported Electronic Design Automation (EDA) tools (e.g., Cadence, Keysight) to ensure they facilitate efficient design processes.

(i) Access to mature Process Design Kit (PDKs) that are production-ready in v1.0 release version from the foundry that has run several test chips through the fab and has verified silicon yields with models updated to match real-world measurements, indicates a thorough approach.

(5) IP Enablement

(a) The Government will evaluate the viability, efficiency, and lack of barriers in the Offeror's proposed legal mechanism to allow TAPO's clients (DIB and program offices) access to necessary IP for design and tape-in.

(6) Ancillary Services

(a) The Government will evaluate the depth, breadth, and adequacy of the Offeror's capability to perform or source ancillary services (design, simulation, test, failure analysis, and packaging) to ensure comprehensive lifecycle support for the offered technologies.

(i) Ancillary: The capability to provide ancillary design services indicates a thorough approach.

(7) Multi-Project Wafer (MPW) Runs

(a) The Government will evaluate the feasibility, frequency, and commercial availability of the Offeror's proposed MPW runs to support cost-effective prototyping and low-volume production.

(i) MPW Support: The capability to provide access to MPW runs indicates a thorough approach.

(8) Demonstrated Market Capabilities

(a) The Government will evaluate the completeness, feasibility and proactiveness of the Offeror's lan to sustain and grow during the lifecycle of this contract.

(i) Scalability & Capacity: The realism and minimal-risk nature of the Offeror's approach to rapidly scaling capacity and resources to absorb increased demand without degrading performance, quality, or delivery schedules.

(ii) Technology Roadmap: The viability of the Offeror's technology roadmap to determine their commitment and capability to continuously offer relevant, modernized technologies and IP that meet evolving DoD requirements.

(iii) Outreach & Adoption: The effectiveness and viability of the Offeror's strategy to engage the DIB and DoD Program Offices, assessing the likelihood that their approach will successfully drive widespread adoption.

(9) Statement of Work (SOW)

(a) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed Statement of Work (SOW) to determine how effectively it translates the Government's Statement of Objectives (SOO) into actionable, measurable tasks.

(i) The proposed SOW will be evaluated for clarity, completeness, and feasibility of the detailed scope, methodology, specific deliverables, and performance standards, ensuring they successfully achieve the program objectives with minimal risk to the Government.

ii) **Section 2: Program Management**

(1) **Management Plan**

(a) The Government will evaluate the comprehensive management plan for the R2A program to determine the effectiveness and efficiency of the proposed organizational structure and the qualifications of key personnel, including the Program Manager, in successfully executing the requirements.

(1) Program Management Reviews (PMRs)

(a) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's approach for conducting PMRs and providing required status updates (per SOO Section 6.1) to ensure adequate oversight, communication, and risk tracking.

(2) Data Management

(a) The Government will evaluate the robustness, transparency, and security of the proposed data management system and the process for providing the USG with necessary access to Work in Progress (WIP) and Wafer Acceptance Criteria (WAC) data.

(3) Technology Discontinuance

(a) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's process for providing the required 12-month advance notice for technology discontinuance (per SOO Section 5.8) to ensure it provides sufficient time for the Government to execute risk mitigation and transition plans.

ii) Section 3: Corporate Experience and Market Capability

(1) The Government will evaluate the depth and relevance of the company's corporate experience in providing semiconductor foundry services.

(2) The Government will evaluate the demonstrated ability to support the aerospace and defense market, assessing past/current DIB and government projects to determine the Offeror's capability to operate within DoD-specific constraints and requirements.

b) Factor 2: Volume II - Past Performance:

i) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's narrative and submitted examples of past or current projects (specifically with Government or Defense Industrial Base clients) to determine the relevance and quality of the Offeror's past performance in supporting the aerospace and defense market segment. The assessment will focus on the relevance, confidence and recency of past projects with government or DIB clients.

c) Factor 3: Volume III - Price:

i) Price is not evaluated IAW R-FAR 15.104(b)(1)(ii)(B), the Government will considered proposed pricing structures and the establishment of proposed pricing agreements.

ii) This is a commercial engagement utilizing Firm-Fixed-Price (FFP) task orders, the Government will evaluate the proposed pricing structure and methodology for reasonableness, completeness, and clarity as a baseline for future Task Orders.

iii) The Government will evaluate the comprehensive pricing structure based on the following elements:

(1) Commercial Rate Card/Catalog: Standard commercial pricing for process technologies and MPW runs will be evaluated for fair and reasonable commercial pricing.

(2) NRE Methodology: The proposed pricing methodology for Non-Recurring Engineering (e.g., photomask sourcing) will be evaluated for clarity and reasonableness.

(3) Ancillary Services Pricing: Rates and models for design, simulation, test, failure analysis, and packaging will be evaluated for completeness and reasonable commercial alignment.

(4) IP Access & Licensing: The cost structure associated with IP access mechanisms for DIB/program offices will be evaluated for clarity and affordability.

(5) Order Fulfillment: The pricing methodology for shipping and logistics will be evaluated for reasonableness.

(6) Discounts: Any proposed volume discounts or government concessions will be evaluated to determine the overall value to the Government.

iv) **Alternative Pricing:** If proposed, alternative pricing structures will be evaluated to ensure they clearly align with standard commercial practices and provide a reliable, understandable methodology for pricing future task orders.

d) **Volume IV - Administrative and Teaming Arrangements**

i) Volume IV will not be adjectivally rated.

ii) The Government will evaluate teaming or subcontracting agreements to ensure a clear delineation of roles, responsibilities, and firm commitments between the prime Offeror and its partners. The Government will assess the agreements to ensure they do not introduce unacceptable execution risk, organizational conflicts of interest (OCI), or ambiguity regarding the Prime Contractor's control of the effort.