Attachment 5 – RFO 52.212-2 Addendum

Evaluation—Commercial Products and Commercial Services (March 16, 2026)

ADDENDUM TO RFO PROVISION 52.212-2: Paragraph (a) is tailored as follows:

Evaluation:

IAW RFO 52.212-2, Evaluation—Commercial Products and Commercial Services, the Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible quoter whose quote conforming to the solicitation will be most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered. The following factors will be used to evaluate quotes:

1. Price

2. Technical

3. Past Performance

BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD: This is a competitive, best value continuum using the Lowest Price Technically Acceptable (LPTA) source selection process. RFO Part 15 will not be used for this requirement. Technical elements will be evaluated as acceptable or unacceptable for each solicitation response. Past performance will also be evaluated as acceptable or unacceptable for each solicitation response. Qualifications will be clear, and objectives will be outlined in the RFQ. The evaluation process shall proceed as indicated below:

Evaluation Approach:

Step 1: All contractors will be evaluated for responsiveness. Responsiveness is determined by verifying compliance with RFO 52.212-1 and its addendum.

Step 2: All responsive contractors will be ordered, by price, from the lowest to the highest Total Evaluated Price (TEP). A contractor's TEP is depicted in the Pricing Schedule Worksheet, on the Price Schedule Tab. The TEP is comprised of the total contract value (base and all options) plus the 6-month option available at RFO 52.217-8, Option to Extend Services. Pricing for RFO 52.217-8 is determined by taking the "amount" of the most recent option year exercised and dividing it by two (2).

Step 3: Technical evaluations will start with the lowest TEP offer and continue until two (2) solicitation responses are determined to be technically acceptable, or until all solicitation responses have been evaluated.

Step 4: The solicitation responses determined to be technically acceptable will then be evaluated for past performance until two (2) technically acceptable solicitation responses have been determined to have acceptable past performance. Steps three (3) and four (4) will continue until two (2) solicitation responses have been determined acceptable in both technical and past performance, or until all solicitation responses have been evaluated.

Step 5: The Government will make a determination that the price is fair and reasonable.

Evaluation Factors for Award:

Price Foreword: The government will evaluate offers for award purposes based on their TEP. The government may determine that a solicitation response is unacceptable if the option prices are significantly unbalanced. Evaluation of options shall not obligate the government to exercise the option(s).

Volume I Price:

a.) Initially, solicitation responses shall be ordered from lowest to highest TEP, as previously defined.

b.) For evaluation purposes, RFO 52.217-5, Evaluation of Options and Pricing will be evaluated and applied to this evaluation. To evaluate the impact of RFO 52.217-8, the Government will add the total price for the base period and all option periods, plus a six-month extension price calculated by taking the amount of the most recent option period and dividing it by two.

c.) The TEP will be evaluated to determine whether it is reasonable. A reasonable price/cost represents a price/cost that provides best value to the government, considering market prices, the technical and functional capabilities of the contractor, and risk. Additionally, the government reserves the right to, but is not required to, conduct a price realism analysis on offers that appear to be exceptionally low and not supported by the contractor's technical approach. In instances where a contractor's proposed price(s) appears exceptionally low, contractors may be requested to address this disparity by providing evidence of their capability and/or performance at similar price(s). The burden of proof as to price credibility rests with the contractor. An exceptionally or unrealistically low offer that's left unexplained may pose an unacceptable risk to the government and may be a reason to reject a contractor's solicitation response.

d.) The government anticipates adequate price competition and intends to award a contract without exchanges with respective contractors. The Government, however, reserves the right to conduct exchanges if deemed in its best interest.

Volume II Technical:

a.) The technical volume will be evaluated as either acceptable or unacceptable for each subfactor.

i. Acceptable is defined as: "Required documents clearly meet the minimum requirements of the solicitation".

ii. Unacceptable is defined as: "Required documents do not clearly meet the minimum requirements of the solicitation".

b.) The technical factor is comprised of three (3) subfactors, as listed below. An overall technical rating will be assigned; failure to be assigned an acceptable in any technical subfactor will render the entire factor unacceptable and, therefore, ineligible for award. Only those responses determined to be technically acceptable, either initially or as a result of exchanges, will be considered for award. However, the contractor is reminded that the government reserves the right to award this effort based on the initial solicitation response, as received, without exchanges, and may conduct exchanges with all, some, or none of the contractors.

Evaluation Criteria:

Instructions to Offerors	Evaluation Criteria
Subfactor 1: Technical Approach – Provide a detailed technical approach demonstrating how successful contract performance will be achieved in accordance with the PWS. Provide convincing rationale addressing how the technical portion of the quote meets the solicitation requirements. Do not simply restate PWS or use generic statements (e.g., "standard procedures will be employed"). Quotes shall provide convincing rationale addressing how the technical portion of the Quote meets solicitation requirements.	1. Effective and sufficient details and summarizes the offeror's technical approach in ensuring performance per the PWS and solicitation requirements. The standard is met when the conditions accurately describe performance in accordance with the PWS.
Subfactor 2: Staffing Plan - Submit a Staffing Plan that outlines the decision-making process, identifies required personnel numbers, and includes a gap analysis. Additionally, provide a Transition Plan detailing the phase-in/phase-out strategy and the method for transferring work control to minimize service interruptions.	2. Subfactor 2: A clear and effective summary of how assessments and analyses are conducted, the decision-making process, an unambiguous number of required personnel, offeror's gap analysis, and identification of factors that can impact personnel availability. Also sufficiently outlines the offeror's transition phase that most effectively minimizes interruptions or delays during the performance of the contract.
Subfactor 3: Quality Control Plan - Submit a Quality Control Plan (QCP). The QCP must identify methods to prevent deficiencies before performance becomes unacceptable and outline functional procedures for correcting unfavorable performance trends.	3. Effective and logical processes for Quality Control to identify and prevent deficiencies during contract performance. Functional procedures for identifying unfavorable performance trends, problem areas, and corrective actions.

Subfactor 4: Candidate Qualification Documentation: Relevant certifications for proposed key personnel (e.g., Technicians), demonstrating they meet or exceed the minimum qualifications stated in PWS Section 1.2.	4. Accurate documentation of technician qualification to meet requirements specified in the PWS.

Volume III Past Performance:

Recent and relevant past performance is defined as past performance occurring within the last five (5) years preceding the date of solicitation issuance. Relevant past performance is defined as past performance providing services similar in scope, magnitude, and complexity to this requirement. The Government will consider relevancy, recency, extent of the past performance and the size and complexity of the past performance relative to this solicitation's requirement submitted by offerors, as well as any information gathered by the Contracting Officer. Offerors that have no relevant past performance history will be assigned a neutral past performance evaluation rating; unknown will be rated as acceptable.

a.) An assessment of the past performance information will be made to determine if it is recent. Recent contracts are contracts which have been performed for at least six (6) months and within the last five (5) years from the date of the issuance of this solicitation. Contract performance that does not meet these criteria will not be considered or evaluated.

b.) Relevant performance includes performance efforts involving Fire Alarm Maintenance and Repair that involved similar scope (to include a broad range: Routine Maintenance, Service Repairs, Emergency Services. See full breakdown of services in section 1 of PWS.), magnitude of effort, contract type (Firm-fixed price), this solicitation requires, as identified in the table of Relevancy Definitions below:

Relevancy Definition:

Relevant: Present/past performance effort involved similar scope, magnitude of effort and contract type this solicitation requires.

Not Relevant: Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope, magnitude of effort and contract type this solicitation requires

Past Performance Acceptable/Unacceptable Rating Table:

Definition	Rating

Based on the Offeror's performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort, or the Offeror's performance record is unknown.	Acceptable
Based on the Offeror's performance record, the Government has no reasonable expectation that the Offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.	Unacceptable

In the case of a contractor without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available or so sparse that no meaningful past performance rating can be reasonably assigned, the contractor may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance. Therefore, the Offeror shall be determined to have unknown past performance. Unknown or neutral past performance, in the context of acceptability/ unacceptability, a neutral rating shall be considered acceptable.

(End of provision)