ADDENDUM TO FAR 52.212-2
EVALUATION

I. BASIS FOR AWARD

A. It is the Government's express intent to award Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contracts on a best value basis to all responsive, responsible offerors giving consideration to the evaluation criteria listed herein. In accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Subpart 2.101, "Best value" is defined as the expected outcome of an acquisition that, in the Government's estimation, provides the greatest overall benefit in response to the requirement.

B. The following factors shall be used to evaluate proposals:

FACTOR 1: Technical Proposal (Most Important Factor)

Sub-factor 1: Experience / Capability
Sub-factor 2: Product Samples
Sub-factor 3: Treatment

FACTOR 2: Past Performance

C. Proposals will be evaluated using a gated, phased approach. Offerors not meeting the established criteria for factor 1, sub-factor 1, will be excluded from further evaluation in the second phase (See Table I-C.).

1. First Phase

Factor 1, sub-factor 1, Experience / Capability will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis. Proposals that do not pass this phase will not be further evaluated for factor 1, sub-factors 2 and 3, and factor 2, and the offeror will be sent an unsuccessful offeror letter in accordance with Revolutionary FAR Overhaul (RFO) FAR 15.206-1(a).

2. Second Phase

Only proposals that pass the first phase evaluation of factor 1, sub-factor 1 will be further evaluated under sub-factors 2 and 3, and factor 2 on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis.

Table I-C.

FACTOR 1 - SUB-FACTOR RATING				
	First Phase		Second Phase	
	Pass	Fail	Acceptable	Unacceptable
1. Experience / Capability	X			
2. Product Samples			X	
3. Treatment			X	
Factor 1 Overall Rating			X	

II. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation criteria (Factors & Sub-factors) and applicable rating standards and definitions for this acquisition are provided below: Technical Proposal (Factor 1) is ***more important*** than Past Performance (Factor 2). (Note: Pricing for establishment of IDIQ ordering vehicles is not requested and will not be considered).

Note: Pages submitted in excess of the limits allowed as outlined in Addendum to FAR 52.212-1, Table III-D will not be evaluated by the Government.

A. FACTOR 1 – TECHNICAL PROPOSAL

This factor is the ***most important*** factor and is comprised of three (3) sub-factors. Technical submissions will be evaluated to determine if the offeror's proposed capability, experience, and performance meets the Government's requirements and what level of indication exists in terms of technical approach and understanding of requirements. Technical proposals will be evaluated as detailed below based upon the descriptive elements offerors are required to address for each of these sub-factors as stated in Sections III and IV of ADDENDUM TO FAR 52.212-1.

1. **Sub-factor 1: Experience / Capability**

Submissions received for this sub-factor will be evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis. Sub-factor 1 proposals that do not receive a Pass rating for the first phase evaluation will not be further evaluated for the second phase sub-factors 2 and 3.

Pass: The proposal clearly meets the minimum requirements of the solicitation. The offeror provided all required documentation within the page limit, demonstrating the required magnitude/complexity of work, a description of staffing, equipment and facility capable of achieving a variety of projects simultaneously, 5+ years of experience, and evidence of serving with 100% responsibility for the performance of all phases of work on one or more relevant project(s) individually valued at $350,000 or greater within the last 60 months.

Fail: The proposal does not clearly meet the minimum requirements of the solicitation. The offeror failed to provide one or more of the mandatory elements, exceeded the strict page limit, or failed to demonstrate the minimum required years of experience, 100% responsibility for performance, or dollar-value threshold.

2. **Sub-factor 2: Product Samples**

The Product Sample sub-factor is only evaluated if the vendor's proposal for sub-factor 1 Capability / Experience has received a Pass rating. Sub-factor 2 proposals are evaluated and will be rated either Acceptable or Unacceptable. Proposals that do not receive a rating of Acceptable for this sub-factor will not be further considered for award.

Acceptable: The proposal meets all requirements of the sub-factor. It includes a minimum of (4) and no more than five (5) complete production samples from the correct categories, created within the last 5 years, where the offeror had 100% responsibility for production. Each sample includes a working YouTube/Vimeo link and the required 1-page descriptive document containing all six mandatory data points. The samples clearly demonstrate the purpose of the program was met, successful execution of advanced production techniques, and the ability to execute complex concepts.

Unacceptable: The proposal fails to meet one or more requirements of the sub-factor. Examples

include but are not limited to: broken links, submitting a "sizzle/demo" reel, submitting more than one sample per category, missing the 100% responsibility claim, or failing to include any of the six mandatory descriptive fields in the 1-page accompaniment. The samples fail to clearly demonstrate the purpose of the program was met, successful execution of advanced production techniques, or the ability to execute complex concepts.

Sub-factor 3: Treatment

The sub-factor 3, Treatment is only evaluated if the vendor's submission for sub-factor 1 has received a Pass rating. Sub-factor 3 proposals are evaluated and will be rated either Acceptable or Unacceptable. Proposals that do not receive a rating of Acceptable for this sub-factor will not be further considered for award.

Acceptable: The proposal provides a treatment for the mock scenario that does not exceed 2 pages. It includes a detailed description of the style, components, and elements planned for all 5 required vignettes. It addresses the theme and durations (2:00-3:00) specified in the scope and explicitly identifies whether or not government resources are requested. The proposed treatment demonstrates creativity and an understanding of the primary audience, engaging use of advanced production techniques, resourcefulness, and originality.

Unacceptable: The proposal fails to provide a treatment, exceeds the 2-page limit, or fails to address the specific mock scenario components (e.g., misses one of the 5 vignettes, ignores the duration requirement, or fails to mention government resource needs). The proposed treatment fails to demonstrates creativity and an understanding of the primary audience, engaging use of advanced production techniques, resourcefulness, or originality.

B. **FACTOR 2 – PAST PERFORMANCE**

This factor is ***less important*** than factor 1, technical proposal and is **only** evaluated if vendor has received a rating of Pass for sub-factor 1 of factor 1 and a rating of Acceptable for sub-factors 2 and 3 of factor 1. The evaluation of past performance will be a subjective assessment of the degree of confidence the Government has in an offeror's ability to successfully meet contract requirements, based on a demonstrated recent and relevant record of performance. Offerors whose past performance does not receive a confidence rating of Substantial Confidence, Satisfactory Confidence, or Unknown Confidence (Neutral) will not be further considered for award.

1. **Recency**

   The first aspect of the past performance evaluation is to evaluate the recency of the offeror's past performance. Recent past performance is considered performance within the past 60 months from the issue date of the solicitation. Only recent performance will be evaluated further for relevancy and the confidence assessment.

2. **Relevancy**

   The Government will consider each offeror's demonstrated recent and relevant record of performance and experience within the past 60 months in providing similar work as anticipated under this solicitation. The Government will determine how relevant the effort accomplished by the offeror is to the effort to be acquired through the solicitation. Relevancy will be rated in accordance with the rating criteria outlined in Table II-B.1.

Table II-B.1

PAST PERFORMANCE CRITERIA - RELEVANCY RATINGS	
Rating	**Definition**
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.

3. **Confidence**

In conducting a performance and experience confidence assessment of exhibited quality, the offeror shall be assigned one of the following Performance Quality Confidence Assessments Ratings, the higher the offeror's confidence assessment the greater chance that the offeror will perform quality services in a satisfactory manner. This assessment may consider any/all of the following: compliance with requirements; technical excellence; quality awards or certificates; systematic evaluations such as CPARs or customer feedback; etc. Confidence will be rated in accordance with the following Rating (see Table II-B.2)

Table II-B.2

PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENTS	
Rating	**Description**
Substantial Confidence	Based on the quality of 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 quality of the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Unknown Confidence (Neutral)	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.
Limited Confidence	Based on the quality of 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 quality of the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

a. The Government may reject a proposal if it is found that the offeror misrepresented or withheld any information that might have a negative impact on its past performance record.

b. Offerors will be informed and may be provided the opportunity to address any adverse past performance information that they have not been able to previously respond to in accordance with the Revolutionary FAR Overhaul (RFO) 15.202(a)(2) only.

c. Offerors with no recent/relevant past performance will be rated "neutral" for the performance evaluation IAW RFO 15.202(c)(1). In the context of acceptability/unacceptability, a neutral rating shall be considered acceptable.

d. A confidence rating of Substantial Confidence, Satisfactory Confidence, or Unknown Confidence (Neutral) is required for a contract award. A confidence rating of Limited Confidence and No Confidence renders the offeror's proposal unawardable.

III. COMPETITIVE RANGE (IF APPLICABLE)

A. It is the Government's express intent to award without discussions. Offerors are ***strongly advised*** to submit their ***most competitive offer*** at time of proposal submissions If award is made without discussions, a competitive range will not be established. In the event that award(s) can be made without discussions the Government will request that the successful Offeror(s) submit sufficient evidence of responsibility for the Contracting Officer (KO) to make an affirmative determination of responsibility pursuant to the requirements of RFO FAR 9.104-1.

B. Although intent is to make award without discussions, the KO ***reserves the right*** to enter into discussions if doing so is in the best interest of the Government. Should discussions occur, a competitive range will be established and discussions held at a time and place designated by the KO.

C. Offerors are advised that the KO may determine that the number of most highly rated proposals that might otherwise be included in the competitive range exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted, and therefore may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range for purposes of efficiency. Proposals receiving an "Unacceptable" rating will not be included in the competitive range.

D. If the KO decides an offeror's proposal should not be included in the competitive range, the proposal will be eliminated from further consideration for award and the offeror promptly notified in writing. If an offeror's proposal is eliminated or otherwise removed from the competitive range, no further revisions to that offeror's proposal will be accepted.

E. Once discussions have been concluded, each offeror will be given an opportunity to submit a written Final Proposal Revision (FPR) by a submission date established by the KO. FPR's will be evaluated applying the same criteria used to evaluate initial proposal submissions.

F. After announcement of the competitive range and upon completion of discussions in accordance with RFO FAR 15.2, a request for FPR's will be issued to all offerors still within the competitive range. If, after discussions have begun, an offeror originally in the competitive range is no longer considered to be among the most highly rated offerors being considered for award, that offeror may be eliminated

from the competitive range whether or not all material aspects of the proposal have been discussed, or whether or not the offeror has been afforded an opportunity to submit a FPR.

After Discussions the Government will request that the successful Offeror(s) submit sufficient evidence of responsibility for the KO to make an affirmative determination of responsibility pursuant to the requirements of RFO FAR 9.104-1. This may include financial documentation, subcontractor agreements, etc. Accordingly, Offerors should seriously address each element of responsibility.

IV. NOTICE OF AWARD

A written notice of award or acceptance of a proposal, mailed or otherwise furnished to the successful offeror, within the time for acceptance specified in the proposal, shall result in a binding contract without further action by either party. Before the proposal's specified expiration time, the Government may accept a proposal (or part of a proposal), whether or not there are discussions after its receipt, unless a written notice of withdrawal is received before award.