Section M - Evaluation Factor for Award

M.1 Basis of Award. The award will be made based on the best overall proposal that is determined to provide the best value to the Government. Offerors must meet all entry gate criteria (See Section M.2 ENTRY GATE CRITERIA) to proceed to full proposal evaluation (See Section M.3 FACTORS TO BE EVALUATED). Consideration of those offerors meeting the entry gate criteria will be evaluated based on the following four (4) factors: Technical, Cost/Price, Past Performance, and Small Business Participation.

Evaluation Factors/Order of Importance
The Technical factor is the most important factor and is significantly more important than the Cost/Price factor.
The Cost/Price factor is more important than the Past Performance factor.
The Past Performance factor is more important than the Small Business Participation factor.
The non-Cost/Price factors combined are significantly more important than the Cost/Price factor.

Two contracts will be awarded from this one RFP: one for the East Region (AFM-East) and one for the West Region (AFM-West). To determine the best value offer for each regional contract, offerors are required to provide a separate proposal for each region IAW Section L of the RFP. If one offeror is determined to be the best value in both regions, that offeror may be awarded contracts for both regions. The individual overall regional ratings will be reviewed to assess the best value to the Government by region. The Source Selection Authority will make the final best value determination.

M.1.1 To receive consideration for award, a rating of no less than “Acceptable” must be achieved for the Technical factor. Additionally, any offeror, other than a small business offeror, must have an acceptable Small Business Subcontracting Plan to receive an award IAW RFO FAR 19.206-3(e). Offerors are cautioned the award may not necessarily be made to the lowest cost/price evaluated. The firm that represents the best value to the Government will be selected for award IAW RFO FAR 15.1 Source Selection Processes and Techniques.

M.1.2 To arrive at a Best Value decision, this acquisition will utilize the RFO FAR Part 15.103-1 tradeoff process. While the Government and the Source Selection Authority will strive for maximum objectivity, the evaluation process, by its nature, is subjective, and therefore, professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire evaluation process.

The source selection process will be conducted IAW RFO FAR Subpart 15.2, Evaluation and Award. Offers will be evaluated using the criteria listed in “Evaluation Factors for Award.” Noncompliance with the RFP requirements may raise serious questions regarding an offeror’s technical ability, past performance and/or pricing, and may be grounds to eliminate the proposal from consideration for contract award. Failure

to include all information requested may adversely affect the evaluation. A proposal that merely reiterates or promises to accomplish the requirements of the RFP will be considered unacceptable. A proposal that is orderly and sufficiently documented will be easy for the Government to understand and will enable the Government to perform a thorough and fair evaluation.
The Contracting Officer will begin the evaluation process by conducting a proposal compliance review for all timely-received proposals for determination of basic proposal adequacy prior to providing the proposals to the evaluators. Failure to provide a complete proposal may result in the proposal being removed from further consideration for award. Failure to address any factor, Technical, Past Performance and Price, shall be grounds for elimination from evaluation and consideration for award.

Offerors must ensure that no pricing information is displayed in Volume II-Technical and/or Volume III- Past Performance proposals.

Although the assessment of Past Performance as a specific evaluation factor is separate and distinct from the Determination of Responsibility required by RFO FAR Part 9, Past Performance information obtained herein will be used during the Government's responsibility determination. The Government also reserves the right to obtain additional information solely for the purpose of making a responsibility determination from all offerors after receipt of proposals. Requests for responsibility information do not constitute negotiations.

IAW RFO FAR 15.204, the Government shall conduct negotiations with each offeror orally, telephonically, and/or in writing, as determined by the Contracting Officer.

M.2 Entry Gate Criteria. Before a proposal will be eligible for evaluation under the four evaluation factors, the Government will evaluate entry gate criteria. The entry gate criteria will be evaluated on a pass/fail basis.

The Government will evaluate a proposal as PASS if the Offeror has submitted the required documentation as specified in Section L.2. If the proposal is evaluated to pass, the Government will proceed to evaluate Factors 1,2,3, and 4.

If the Government evaluates a proposal as FAIL, the Government will not evaluate the proposal any further. If the Government evaluates the proposal as FAIL, notice will be provided in accordance with RFO FAR 15.206-1(a), Notifications to Unsuccessful Offerors.

M.3 Factors to Be Evaluated. The following evaluation factors will be used to evaluate each proposal. Award will be made to the Offeror whose proposal is most advantageous to the Government based upon an integrated assessment of the evaluation factors described below. The Government reserves the right to make award based upon the Cost/Price factor if the Technical, Past Performance, and Small Business Participation

evaluation results of all the offerors' proposals are substantially the same. The following evaluation factors will be used to evaluate each proposal:

M.3.1 Factor 1: Technical. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's CMP for providing aviation maintenance support services as well as the application of this to the sample scenarios. A detailed explanation of the evaluation criteria is set forth in the "Evaluation Approach" (Section M.4.1).

M.3.2 Factor 2: Past Performance. The Government will evaluate each Offeror's record of past and/or current performance to assign a Confidence Assessment. This assessment will determine the probability of the Offeror's successful performance of the PWS requirements. The Confidence Assessment will be based on the recency, relevancy, and quality of the Offeror's past performance.

M.3.3 Factor 3: Cost/Price. The Offeror's cost/price proposal will be evaluated for compliance, business system status, reasonableness, cost realism (CPFF and CNF CLINs only), and unbalanced pricing.

M.3.4. Factor 4: Small Business Participation Commitment Proposal. All Large Business Offerors are to propose a Small Business Participation Commitment Proposal. The proposed commitments will be evaluated on the level of participation of U.S. small businesses in the performance of this acquisition (as small business prime Offerors and small business subcontractors). The Small Business participation commitment will be incorporated into and become part of any resulting contract.
IAW 13 CFR 125.3(g)(3), small businesses are not required to submit any information in connection with the small business participation evaluation factor or required to submit a proposed Small Business Participation Commitment Document.

M.4 Evaluation Approach. All proposals shall be evaluated by the Source Selection Team (SST).

The overarching evaluation approach for all factors is as follows:

1. Adequacy of Response. The proposal will be evaluated to determine whether the offeror's methods and approach have adequately and completely considered, defined, and satisfied the requirements specified in the RFP. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which each requirement has been addressed in the proposal IAW the proposal submission section of the RFP.

2. Feasibility of Approach. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which proposed approach is workable and the end results achievable. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which successful performance is contingent upon proven devices and techniques. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the offeror is expected to be

able to successfully complete the proposed tasks and technical requirements within the required schedule.

M.4.1 Factor 1: Technical. The technical evaluation approach will evaluate the CMP as follows.

1. Completeness. The proposal will be evaluated to determine whether the Offeror's methods and approach completely consider, defines, and satisfies the requirements specified in the CMP (Section L.3.1.).

2. Feasibility of Approach. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the feasibility of the Offeror's proposed approaches identified in the CMP (Section L .3.1.) are realistic and effective.

3. Risk. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the level of risk with the Offeror's proposed approaches identified in the CMP (Section L.3.1.).

The Offeror's scenario responses will be evaluated on their overall interpretation of the PWS requirements and the approach to accomplish each scenario's effort, identification of appropriate resources, and application of processes and resources to provide timely and cost-effective solutions to the presented problems. The technical evaluation approach will evaluate the responses to the sample scenarios as follows:

1. Completeness. The proposal will be evaluated to determine whether the Offeror's responses to the scenarios completely consider, define, and satisfy the requirements specified in the CMP (Section L.3.1.1).

2. Feasibility of Approach. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the feasibility of the Offeror's proposed responses to the scenarios are realistic and effective resolutions (Section L.3.1.1).

3. Risk. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the level of risk with the Offeror's proposed responses to the scenarios (Section L.3.1.1).

4. Consistency. The proposal will be evaluated to determine whether the Offeror's response to the scenarios is consistent with the Offeror's approaches identified in the CMP (Section L.3.1.1).

M.4.2. Factor 2: Past Performance. The Government will evaluate each Offeror's record of past and/or current performance to assign a Confidence Assessment. This assessment will determine the probability of the Offeror's successful performance of the PWS requirements. The Confidence Assessment will be based on the recency, relevancy, and quality of the Offeror's past performance.

The Government will focus its inquiries on the Prime and major subcontractors, records of performance as they relate to all solicitation requirements, including cost/price, schedule, performance and management of subcontractors. Major subcontractors are defined as members of an Offeror's overall team who are expected to perform fifteen (15) percent or more of the proposed cost. A significant achievement, problem, or lack of relevant data in any element of the work can become an important consideration in the evaluation process. The Government may use data provided by the Offeror in its proposal as well as data obtained from other sources, including data in Government files or data obtained through interviews with personnel familiar with the contractor and their current and past performance under Federal, State, or Local government, or commercial contracts for same or similar services encompassed by the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code 488190, Aircraft Maintenance, Repair, and Overhaul.

Recency and Relevancy. The past performance factor considers each Offeror's demonstrated recent and relevant record of performance in supplying similar services that meet the contract requirements. The criteria to establish what is relevant may include, but is not limited to, similarity of service/support; the level of complexity; performance under AR 95-20, AS9100 or AS9110 (any revision); dollar value; contract type; location and degree of subcontract/teaming; the Offeror's past performance in utilizing small businesses in complying with RFO FAR 52.219-8 and RFO FAR 52.219-9, as well as maximizing opportunities for U.S. small business subcontractors. Data used in conducting performance risk assessments shall not extend past five years prior to the issue date of the solicitation but may include performance data generated during the past five years without regard to the contract award date. The first aspect of the past performance evaluation is to evaluate the recency of each submitted past performance effort. Next, the government will evaluate how relevant assess how relevant a recent effort accomplished by the Offeror is to the effort to be acquired through the source selection. Relevancy is not separately rated; however, the following criteria will be used to establish what is relevant which shall include similarity of service/support, complexity; dollar value, contract type, and degree of subcontract/teaming.

To be considered "Very Relevant," contracts must have been performed utilizing the following certifications: AS9110 Revision C (or higher); plus, Government approved Ground and Flight Risk procedures that comply with DCMA 8210.1 and/or Army regulation 95-20.

Quality Assessment. Assess the quality of the Offeror's past performance on those recent efforts identified as relevant by determining how well the contractor performed on the contracts. Documented results from Past Performance Questionnaire (Attachment 0024), interviews, CPARS, and other sources form the support and basis for this assessment.

Performance Confidence Assessment. The final step is for the team to arrive at

a single consensus performance confidence assessment for the Offeror, selecting the most appropriate rating. This assessment evaluates the government's level of confidence in an offeror's ability to successfully perform the contract requirements based on recent and relevant past performance. The combination of how relevant an offeror's past work is and how well they performed that work leads to the final Performance Confidence Assessment rating. Ensure the rationale for the conclusions reached are included.

If the Offeror is truly a new entity and none of the company principals have relevant work experience, the Offeror is considered to have no past performance. Also, Offerors who otherwise have satisfactory performance on previous construction projects may be rated “Unknown Confidence” (Neutral) if those projects are not considered relevant to the proposed acquisition and relevancy cannot be obtained through the evaluation of key personnel and/or subcontractors. Projects that are not current will not be considered in the evaluation.

M.4.3 Factor 3: Cost/Price Factor. Adjectival ratings shall not be used in the Cost/Price proposal evaluation. For award purposes, the total proposed price for all CLINs will be added together into a total sum (contract value). The evaluation of all option CLINs will not obligate the Government to exercise any option.

The offeror’s Cost proposal will be evaluated using one or more of the techniques described in RFO FAR 15.404-1 in order to determine if it is fair and reasonable. The offeror’s Cost proposal will be evaluated for the following:

M.4.3.1 Compliance with Section L.3.3 Cost/Price: The Cost proposal submitted by the offeror will be evaluated for compliance based upon the requirements contained in RFP Section L.3.3 Cost/Price instructions.

M.4.3.2 Business Systems Status: The Government will verify the status of the offeror’s accounting system and purchasing system discussed in Section L-3.3 Cost/Price Instructions.

M.4.3.3 Reasonableness: The total proposed price will be evaluated to determine if it is reasonable. IAW RFO FAR 31.201-3, a cost/price is reasonable if, in its nature and amount, it does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person in the conduct of competitive business. Normally price reasonableness is established through adequate competition but may also be determined through cost and price analysis techniques as described in RFO FAR 15.404-1.

M.4.3.3 Cost Realism: A cost realism analysis will be performed on the CPFF term CLINs to determine whether specific estimated proposed cost elements are realistic for the work to be performed; reflect a clear understanding of contract requirements; and are consistent with the unique methods of performance described in the offeror’s

technical proposal. The realism analysis will also be used to evaluate the offeror's understanding of the contract's technical requirements and the risk associated with the offeror's technical proposal. Therefore, the offeror is advised to clearly show justification for unique practices that significantly lower costs. The offeror's CPFF term estimates will be traced from the Cost proposal volume basis of estimates to the performance requirements addressed in the technical proposal. The Government will perform an evaluation of the technical elements contained within the offeror's Cost proposal to perform the SOW requirements. The results of the Government's evaluation of the CPFF CLIN proposal's technical elements may be incorporated into the cost realism evaluation.

The offeror's proposed fixed fee dollars will be utilized in the Government's evaluation of the CPFF term CLINs. The offeror's proposed fixed fee dollars will be verified to ensure compliance with statutory limitations. For a CPFF contract, the fee shall not exceed 10 percent of the contract's estimated cost, excluding fee.

The results of the cost realism evaluation will determine the probable cost of performance as it relates to the technical approach proposed by each offeror and will be utilized in the selection of the offer that provides the best value to the Government. As part of the cost realism analysis to determine the probable cost, the Government will calculate an evaluated cost by adjusting each offeror's proposed costs for the CPFF CLINs to reflect any additions or reductions in cost elements to realistic levels based on the results of the cost realism analysis. The evaluated cost may differ from the proposed cost and will reflect the Government's best estimate of the cost that is most likely to result from the offeror's proposal. If the total evaluated cost is higher than the proposed cost, the total evaluated cost will be used in the probable cost. If the total evaluated cost is lower than the proposed cost, the proposed cost will be used in the probable cost. Price realism will not be conducted on FFP or T&M CLINs.

M.4.3.4 Unbalanced Pricing: The offeror's Cost proposal will be evaluated for unbalanced pricing as defined in RFO FAR 15.404-6. Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable total evaluated price, the price of one or more CLINs/SLINs is significantly over or understated as indicated by the application of cost and price analysis techniques. Offerors are cautioned that a proposal the Government assesses to be unbalanced as to price may either be rejected or determined unacceptable for award.

M.4.3.5 Total Evaluated Price: The TEP consists of summing the following:

- The offeror proposed price for the FFP CLINs;
- The offeror proposed price for each T&M CLIN;
- The probable cost amounts plus proposed fixed fee dollars for the CPFF term CLINs and;
- The offeror proposed costs for the Cost (no fee) CLINs. The TEP shall be used in the trade-off analysis to determine the best value.

M.4.4 Factor 4: Small Business Participation Commitment Proposal: All Large Business Offerors will be evaluated on the extent of proposed commitment to use U.S. small businesses in the performance of this acquisition relative to the objectives and requirements established herein. There are no subfactors within the Small Business Participation Commitment Factor.

The Government will evaluate the following to determine if the Offeror met or exceeded the requirements:

1. The extent to which such firms, as defined in RFO FAR Part 19, are specifically identified in proposals;

2. The extent of commitment to use such firms (and enforceable commitments will be considered more favorably than non-enforceable ones);

3. Identification of the complexity and variety of the work small firms are to perform;

4. The extent of overall management and oversight of subcontractors; and

5. The extent of evidence to which the Offeror complied with requirements of RFO FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business, and RFO FAR 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan, in support of small business goal attainment on similar work effort to ensure realistic and attainable goals.

6. The extent of participation of small business subcontractors in terms of the value of the total acquisition (total proposed contract value).

M.4.4.1 Evaluation Ratings: IAW the DoW Source Selection Procedures, the Army methodology for evaluating the extent of participation is to utilize the small business rating method. This methodology considers meeting small business objectives in conjunction with the strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, uncertainties, and deficiencies in determining small business ratings.