SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD
Landing Gear Collaborative Supply Chain Integration
(LG-CSCI2)
SOURCE SELECTION

1. BASIS FOR AWARDS

1.1. This acquisition will utilize Tradeoff Source Selection Process in accordance with (IAW) FAR 15.101-1, as supplemented. The Landing Gear Collaborative Supply Chain Integration 2 (LG-CSCI2) contract will be awarded to the offeror who represents the best overall value to the Government, based upon an integrated assessment of Technical, Technical Risk, Price, and Past Performance evaluation Factors, that is deemed responsible in accordance with the FAR, as supplemented, whose proposal conforms to the solicitation requirements. The solicitation requirements include all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and all other information required by Section L and the Technical Requirements Document (TRD) of this solicitation. The Government intends to award to the offeror that gives the Government the greatest confidence that it will best meet, or exceed, the requirements. This may result in an award to a higher rated, higher priced offeror, where the decision is consistent with the evaluation factors, and the Source Selection Authority (SSA) reasonably determines that the Technical Ratings, Technical Risk ratings, of the higher priced offeror outweigh the cost difference. The SSA will base the source selection decision on an integrated assessment of proposals against the source selection criteria in Section M. While the Government Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) and the SSA will strive for maximum objectivity, the source selection process, by its nature, is subjective; therefore, professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire process. Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, including all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and Technical requirements, in addition to those identified as evaluation factors or sub-factors and all other information required by Section L, Instructions to Offerors (ITO), of this solicitation.

1.2. Number of Contracts to be Awarded – The Government intends to award one contract for the LG-CSCI2 program. However, the Government reserves the right to award no contract at all, if the SSA determines it is in the Government's best interest. If the Government determines not to award a contract, the Government is not liable for any costs incurred by potential offerors for proposal preparation and/or participation in the source selection process.

1.3. Correction Potential of Proposals – The Government will consider, throughout the evaluation, the "correction potential" of any deficiency or weakness. The judgment of such "correction potential" is within the sole discretion of the Government. If an aspect of an offeror's proposal does not meet the Government's requirements, the proposal may be considered "uncorrectable" and the offeror may be eliminated from the competitive range. A proposal will be considered "uncorrectable" if it is determined that a significant proposal revision will be required in order to meet the minimum requirements of the Request for Proposal (RFP).

1.4. Discussions – The Government reserves the right to award without discussions, if the SSA determines it to be in the best interest of the Government; therefore, each initial offer should contain the offeror's best terms from a price and technical standpoint. If, during the evaluation period, it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government to hold discussions, offeror responses to Evaluation Notices (ENs) and the Final Proposal Revision (FPR) will be the basis for making the source selection decision. If the offeror's proposal has been evaluated as acceptable at the time discussions are closed, any changes or exceptions in the Final Proposal Revision are subject to evaluation and may introduce risk that the offeror's proposal be determined unacceptable or receive a lower technical rating or higher technical risk, or all three.

1.5. Integrating Proposal Into the Contract – the Contracting Officer shall incorporate beneficial aspects of the selected offeror's proposal into the contract.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

2. EVALUATION FACTORS AND SUB-FACTORS

2.1. The following evaluation factors and sub-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 and sub-factors described below:

Factor One – Technical
- **Sub-factor One: Engineering**
- **Sub-factor Two: Program Management**
- **Sub-factor Three: Order Fulfillment**

Factor Two – Price
Factor Three – Past Performance

2.2. Relative Importance of Factors and Sub-factors – The relative importance of each factor and sub-factor is as follows (in descending order of importance): First in importance is Factor One (Technical), second is Factor Two (Price) and Factor Three (Past Performance) is last in importance. Within the Technical Factor, the sub-factors are listed in descending order of importance. IAW FAR 15.304(e)(1), all evaluation factors other than Price when combined, are significantly more important than price. In arriving at a best value decision, the Government reserves the right to give positive consideration, i.e., assign a strength, for technical merit in excess of the threshold requirements.

> The LG-CSCI2 Contract will be awarded to the offeror who represents the best overall value to the Government, based upon an integrated assessment (tradeoff) of Technical, Technical Risk, Price, and Past Performance.

2.3. Definitions – For purposes of this evaluation the following definitions will be used:

2.3.1. Strength – Is an aspect of an offeror's proposal that has merit or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Government during contract performance

2.3.2. Weakness – Is a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance

2.3.3. Significant Weakness – Is a proposal flaw that appreciably increases the risk on unsuccessful contract performance

2.3.4. Deficiency – Is a material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level

2.3.5. Team Member – Is any critical subcontractor that will have program level responsibility and oversight whose capability, certifications, or qualifications are utilized to satisfy the Technical Factor.

2.4. FACTOR ONE, TECHNICAL - The technical evaluation provides for two distinct but related assessments (Technical and Technical Risk). These two ratings impact the rating of each technical sub-factor.

2.4.1. Technical Rating - The Technical Rating provides an assessment of the quality and feasibility of the offeror's solution for meeting the Government's requirement.

2.4.1.1. Technical sub-factors will be evaluated and given a Technical Color Rating IAW Table 1A, and a separate Technical Risk Rating IAW Table 2 below. An "Unacceptable" Rating IAW Table 1A or Table 2, for these sub-factors will render a proposal un-awardable.

2.4.2. Technical Risk Rating - Assessment of Technical Risk, considers potential for disruption of schedule, increased costs, degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight, or the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance.

Table 1A - Technical Color Ratings

Color	Rating	Description
Blue	Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths.
Purple	Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength.

Green	Acceptable	Proposal indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements.
Yellow	Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements.
Red	Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation and, thus, contains one or more deficiencies and is unawardable.

Table 2 - Technical Risk Ratings

Rating	Description
Low	Proposal may contain weakness(es) which have little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and normal Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.
Moderate	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which may potentially cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome difficulties.
High	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which is likely to cause significant disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Is unlikely to overcome any difficulties, even with special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring.
Unacceptable	Proposal contains a material failure or a combination of significant weaknesses that increases the risk of unsuccessful performance to an unacceptable level

2.5. FACTOR TWO, PRICE – A price evaluation will be performed for all offerors IAW Section 4 (Volume II – Factor Two, Price) of this document, and proposals will be evaluated based on a Total Evaluated Price (TEP).

2.6. FACTOR THREE, PAST PERFORMANCE – A past performance evaluation will be performed for all offerors. Past performance will be evaluated for Recency (IAW 5.3.1), Relevancy (IAW 5.4 and Table 4), and will receive a Past Performance rating based on the definitions in Table 3.

3. VOLUME I – FACTOR ONE, TECHNICAL

3.1. Sub-factor One, Engineering: This sub-factor is acceptable when it demonstrates the knowledge, experience, and expertise to meet the requirements of TRD Section 7.0,

Section L 3.5, and all sub-paragraphs and provides a feasible approach to quality escape incidents. In addition the plan must:

3.1.1. Provide resumes and a feasible workload analysis for the key personnel that meet the experience and technical requirements of TRD Sections 6.3.1, 6.3.2, 6.3.3, and 6.3.4.

3.1.2. Provide evidence of current AS9100 certification

3.1.3. Provide a timely and realistic solution to the scenario in Section L Paragraph 3.5.1.3. that demonstrates a technically accurate and detailed understanding of the landing gear manufacturing processes while addressing and mitigating the immediate issues, the supply chain impacts, and the systemic quality issues that the scenario prompts.

3.1.4. The sub-factor is exceeded when, IAW current Air Force Landing Gear Engineering policy, it provides and substantiates viable, executable, and broad-reaching innovations that will likely improve manufacturing processes and achieve higher quality.

3.2. Sub-factor Two, Program Management: This sub-factor is acceptable when the approach demonstrates experience, knowledge, and a viable approach to landing gear program management while addressing all requirements of Section L and leveraging the purchasing approach identified in TRD 4.3 and 4.4. and 5.5.

3.2.1. The sub-factor is exceeded when the approach also provides realistic and achievable solutions to the following supply chain challenges; comprehensive sub-contractor and material management, production and management of forged parts, and DMSMS (the offeror may address additional supply chain challenges not listed). Further the approach must provide comprehensive and viable process and procedural solutions to identified challenges, that will likely result in significant and long term improvements to the supply chain for competitive landing gear spare parts.

3.3. Sub-factor Three, Order Fulfillment: This sub-factor is acceptable when the approach for each NSN:

3.3.1. Specifically and accurately describes each process IAW the applicable Technical Data Package requirements to include all tooling, equipment, material, and processing necessary for proper manufacture.

3.3.2. Accurately indicates times required for each step in the process, (receipt of order to delivery) provides feasible solutions to bottlenecks, demonstrates proactive and constant interface with all subvendors in the supply chain ensuring parts are moving through the manufacturing process efficiently.

3.3.3. Clearly and accurately identifies where any new purchases, manufacturing, subcontracting, or shipping is performed for the NSNs identified in Section L Paragraph 3.7.1 (a), and (b).

3.3.4. Clearly and accurately addresses the manufacturing processes as specified in the TDP.

3.4. Accurately defines the new source qualification process IAW TRD Paragraph 5.2.

3.5. The sub-factor is exceeded when the contractor's approach reflects process and procedure improvements that will likely result in; improved asset availability, improved asset reliability, and significant long term enhancements to the the 417th supply chain.

4. VOLUME II – FACTOR TWO, PRICE

4.1. The criteria used for evaluation of the Price Factor will be (1) Completeness, (2) Reasonableness, (3) Balance, and (4)Total Evaluated Price (TEP). The TEP will be computed and provided to the Source Selection Authority (SSA) for award purposes only and does not become part of the contract at award. However, all proposed prices provided by the contractor and used to calculate the TEP will be contractually binding.

4.2. Evaluation of potential Options shall not obligate the Government to exercise such Options.

4.3. Completeness: The Government will review the pricing submissions for completeness and compliance with Section L of the RFP. Incomplete price submissions may not be evaluated, and the proposal may be eliminated from the competition.

4.4. Reasonableness: For a price to be considered reasonable, it must represent a price to the Government that a prudent person would pay when consideration is given to prices in the market. Generally adequate price competition is sufficient to satisfy the requirement for ensuring price reasonableness. If adequate price competition is not obtained or if price reasonableness cannot be determined, additional information will be required to support the proposed price. All CLINs will be reviewed for price reasonableness IAW the techniques described in FAR 15.404-1.

4.5. Balance: Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable TEP, the price of one or more line items is significantly overstated or understated as indicated by the application of analysis techniques such as those defined by FAR Part 15.404-1, Proposal Analysis Techniques. The Government will analyze proposals to determine whether they are unbalanced with respect to prices, disclosed elements of price, and separately priced line items in accordance with FAR 15.404-1. An offer may be rejected if the CO determines that the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.

4.6. Realism: The Government may conduct a price realism analysis IAW FAR 15.404-1, in order to measure the offerors understanding of the contract requirements and support

the assessment of risk inherent to the proposed approach. If a price realism analysis is conducted, it will not result in any adjustment to the offerors price.

4.7. Total Evaluated Price (TEP) will be comprised of the following:

4.7.1. The sum of the contractors proposed Fixed Prices for each NSN identified in the TEP worksheet "Bid-AF Parts" and "Bid-DLA Parts" tabs, multiplied by Government derived notional quantities applied to those NSNs. The notional quantity for each NSN will determine which price range is applied to that part.

4.8. Notional NSN quantities will be established using descriptive statistics to derive realistic expectations from historical requirements data. An annual order simulation will apply fixed notional quantities to each priced item, the notional number for a given NSN will automatically populate to the appropriate quantity range. The notional simulation may split quantities to simulate multiple orders within the year. Although offerors will be proposing one year of pricing, the TEP simulation will notionally escalate the proposed pricing for the 10-year period of performance using historical data from the indices identified in the TEP worksheet. Notional quantities and escalation will be fixed and applied equally to all proposals.

4.9. Proposed Prices shall be fully burdened and include all direct costs, indirect costs (Overhead, General and Administrative, etc.) and profit necessary for the performance of the entire requirement.

4.10. A no price or an omitted rate may result in an incomplete price submission.

5. VOLUME III – FACTOR THREE, PAST PERFORMANCE

5.1. Evaluation Process: The past performance evaluation considers each offeror's demonstrated recent and relevant record of performance in supplying products and services that meet the LG-CSCI2 solicitation requirements. In conducting the past performance evaluation, the Government reserves the right to use both the information provided in the offeror's past performance proposal volume and information obtained from other sources available to the Government. Other sources include, but are not limited to: the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS); Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS); Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), or other databases; and interviews/questionnaires with Government personnel, e.g. Program Managers and Contracting Officers (COs), Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA), as well as commercial sources.

5.2. The past performance evaluation results in an assessment of the offeror's probability of meeting the LG-CSCI2 solicitation requirements. The Past Performance rating is based on the offeror's overall record of recency, relevancy, and quality of performance. For the past performance factor offerors will receive one of the performance ratings IAW Table 3.

Table 3 – Past Performance Ratings

Adjectival Rating	Description
Acceptable	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 (see note above 5.2).
Unacceptable	Based on the offeror's performance record, the Government does not have a reasonable expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

5.3. When evaluating offeror's past performance, only recent and relevant past performance information will be considered.

5.3.1. Recency is defined as contract performance less than five years from the date of issuance of the solicitation.

5.4. Relevancy Assessment: The Government will conduct an evaluation of all recent performance information obtained to determine whether the products provided/services performed under those contracts relate to the technical sub-factors. For each recent past performance citation reviewed, the relevance of the work performed will be assessed for the Technical sub-factors. (However, all aspects of performance that relate to this acquisition may be considered). A relevancy determination of the offeror's past performance will be made based upon the aforementioned considerations, including all sub-factors identified in RFP, Attachment 18 (Team Roles and Responsibilities). In determining the relevancy of effort performed under individual past performance contracts, the Government will only consider the specific effort or portion consistent with that proposed by the prime, subcontractor or teaming partner. The Past Performance Information Sheets (PPISs) and information obtained from other sources will be used to establish the relevancy of past performance. The Government will use the following relevancy definitions when assessing recent contracts.

Table 4 - Relevancy Ratings

Rating	Descriptions
RELEVANT	Present/past performance effort involved similar 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.

5.5. Assigning Ratings: As a result of the relevancy and quality assessments of the recent contracts evaluated, offerors will receive a performance rating IAW Table 4. The Past

Performance Evaluation Team will review all past performance, general trends, and usefulness of the information and incorporate these into the performance rating. Although the past performance evaluation focuses on performance that is relevant to the Technical sub-factors, the resulting performance rating is made at the factor level and represents an overall evaluation of contractor performance. Past performance regarding predecessor companies, or subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement will be evaluated on an equal basis to the evaluation of the prime contractor's past performance. Offerors without a record of recent/relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance and, as a result, will receive an "Unknown Confidence" rating for the Past Performance factor.

6. VOLUME V, CONTRACT DOCUMENTATION

6.1. This volume will be reviewed for completeness. The offeror's proposal shall include a signed copy of the SF 1447, Sections A through K, signed amendments to the solicitation (if any), and all other information required by Section L - ITO, Volume IV - Contract Documentation. An incomplete package may be excluded from the competitive range and award.

6.2. The proposal shall contain evidence of adequate financial resources. Acceptable evidence consists of a commitment or explicit arrangement that will be in existence at the time of contract award, to acquire the needed materials, equipment, personnel and other resources necessary to sustain operations.

7. SOLICITATION REQUIREMENTS, TERMS, AND CONDITIONS

7.1. 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 evaluation factors or sub-factors. Failure to meet a requirement may result in an offer being ineligible for award. Offerors must clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and provide complete accompanying rationale.

8. PRE AWARD SURVEY

8.1. The Government may conduct a Pre-Award Survey (PAS) as part of this source selection. Results of the PAS (if conducted) will be evaluated to determine each Offeror's capability to meet the requirements of the solicitation.