Attachment 4 - FA441926Q0002

THIS SECTION IS FOR SOLICITATION PURPOSES ONLY. THIS SECTION WILL BE PHYSICALLY REMOVED FROM ANY RESULTANT AWARD.

52.212-2 Evaluation Factors

As prescribed in RFO 12.205(a)(2), insert a provision substantially as follows:

Evaluation—Commercial Products and Commercial Services

(a) Evaluation factors. The Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible Offeror whose offer conforming to the solicitation will be most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered. The following factors will be used to evaluate offers:

Price
Technical
Past Performance

(b) The Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by calculating total evaluated price (TEP) as outlined below in Factor 1 – Price. The Government may determine that an offer is unacceptable if the option prices are significantly unbalanced. The evaluation of options does not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

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

<u>ADDENDUM TO FAR 52.212-2</u>

Award will be made using a Competitive Best Value Tradeoff, meaning the Government seeks to award to an offeror who provides the greatest confidence that they will meet the Government's requirements affordably. Best value is expected to result from the selection of a technically acceptable quote with the lowest total evaluated price from a responsible vendor with acceptable past performance. Technical and past performance factors, when combined, are significantly more important than price. No contract award shall be made unless the Contracting Officer makes an affirmative determination of responsibility in accordance with RFO 9.104.

The Government intends to award without discussions; therefore, offerors should submit proposals that represent their best efforts. If, during the evaluation period, it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government to hold discussions, offeror responses will be considered in

making the source selection decision. In the event discussion are to be conducted, the competitive range will be established IAW RFO 15.204-1.

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 factors. Volume II - Technical submission shall not exceed a total of 15 pages. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the solicitation may result in the offeror being ineligible for award. Offerors must clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and must provide complete supporting rationale. The Government reserves the right to determine any such exceptions as unacceptable.

EVALUATION METHODOLOGY:

The evaluation will begin with a cursory review of all submissions for completeness. If an offeror fails to submit a complete submission, including a complete SF 1449, bid schedule, technical volume, and past performance records, the offeror will be rendered non-responsive, and no further evaluation will be conducted.

The evaluation team will rank complete quotes by Total Evaluated Price (TEP) from lowest to highest (see below detailed explanation on the calculation of TEP). The evaluation will begin by evaluating the technical submissions of the three (3) lowest ranked quotes.

If the technical submissions of the three (3) lowest ranked offers are acceptable, the evaluation process will proceed to the next step. If any of the three (3) lowest ranked offers results in an unacceptable rating, the evaluation team will evaluate the next lowest offeror, as initially ranked TEP, for technical acceptability. Evaluation at this step will continue until there are three (3) technically acceptable offerors.

The three (3) lowest priced, technically acceptable, responsive offers will then be evaluated for past performance. If these offers do not yield at least two (2) offerors with an overall rating of Substantial or Satisfactory Confidence, the evaluation process will continue until a minimum of two (2) offerors with an overall rating of Substantial or Satisfactory Confidence are identified or all quotes are evaluated.

The Source Selection Authority shall then make an integrated assessment to render the best value award decision. The Source Selection Authority may also make the determination that it is in the best interest of the Government to evaluate all offerors for technical acceptability and past performance prior to rendering the best value award decision. While the Government will strive for maximum objectivity, the acquisition process, by its nature, is subjective; and therefore, professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire process.

Award will be made to the responsible offeror whose quote conforms to all required terms and conditions, includes all required representations and certifications, meets all requirements set forth in the solicitation and provides the best value to the Government.

A detailed look at the evaluation criteria is below:

FACTOR 1 - PRICE

Prices will be evaluated on Total Evaluated Price (TEP). TEP will be calculated using the pricing submitted on Attachment 2 – Custodial Bid Schedule by adding the total of the Recurring Services for the Base Period, plus the total of Recurring Services for each of the four (4) Option Years, plus 50% of the total of the Recurring Services for Option Year Four. The additional 50% of the final option year price represents the total cumulative price of 52.217-8. Should IAW RFO 52.217-8 be exercised in the future, the price will be pro-rated to the actual performance required. Before a contract may be awarded, the contracting officer must determine the price fair and reasonable per RFO 12.204.

As Needed CLINs will not be used to determine TEP, however failure to submit pricing for these CLINs will result in removal from award consideration.

Price will be evaluated for fair and reasonableness in accordance with one or more of the proposal analysis techniques described in RFO 15.404-1. Adequate price competition in accordance with RFO 15.404-1(b)(1) is anticipated to determine price reasonableness, therefore, certified cost or pricing data are not required. However, if the Contracting Officer determines that adequate price competition no longer exists or reasonableness cannot be determined, offerors may be required to submit other than certified cost or pricing data to determine reasonableness. Unbalanced Pricing: The Government will analyze each offer to determine whether item prices are unbalanced with respect to prices proposed for similar items. An offer may be rejected if the Source Selection Authority determines prices are significantly unbalanced or if the unbalanced pricing poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.

FACTOR 2 – TECHNICAL

The term "technical," as used herein, refers to non-price factors other than past performance. The purpose of the technical factor is to assess whether the offeror's proposal demonstrates the capability to satisfy the Government's minimum requirements as outlined in the Performance Work Statement (PWS).

The offeror's technical proposal will be evaluated by assessing both subfactors below. A proposal must receive a rating of "Acceptable" in both subfactors to receive an overall technical rating of "Acceptable" and be considered for award. Failure to receive an "Acceptable" rating in any single subfactor will result in the entire technical proposal being rated "Unacceptable" and the evaluation of the proposal will stop.

Subfactor 2.1: Technical Approach and Quality Control Plan (QCP)

This subfactor evaluates the offeror's detailed narrative explaining their approach to meeting all PWS requirements and their separate, comprehensive QCP.

Rating	Description
Acceptable	The proposal provides a clear, logical, and detailed technical approach that addresses all major requirements of the PWS. The approach demonstrates a thorough understanding of the description of services. The submitted QCP is comprehensive, credible, and details a proactive system for self-inspection, performance monitoring, and implementing corrective actions tied to the PWS standards.
Unacceptable	The technical approach is vague, omits significant PWS requirements, or merely restates the Government's objectives without explaining how they will be achieved. The QCP is generic, lacks detail, fails to link inspections to PWS standards, or does not present a clear process for correcting deficiencies.

Subfactor 2.2: Transition Plan

This subfactor evaluates the offeror's plan for a smooth and efficient start-up of services by 1 September 2026.

Rating	Description
Acceptable	The Transition Plan is realistic, sufficiently detailed, and presents a logical timeline of key tasks and milestones. It clearly addresses all critical areas, including but not limited to: staffing/hiring, background checks, base access/id, training, logistics, and equipment/supply procurement, providing confidence that full performance will be achieved within the deadline requirement.
Unacceptable	The Transition Plan is unrealistic, lacks sufficient detail to be credible, or fails to account for key start-up tasks. The timeline is illogical or does not demonstrate that the offeror can achieve full operational capability by the deadline. The plan indicates a high risk of a disorderly or delayed start of services.

****Quotes must be rated as "acceptable" to be eligible for award. A subfactor rating of "unacceptable" will result in removal from award consideration. ****

FACTOR 3 – PAST PERFORMANCE

The past performance evaluation is an assessment of the Government's confidence in the offeror's ability to successfully perform the requirements of this solicitation based on their performance record. The evaluation will consist of assessing three aspects of this record: Recency, Relevancy, and Performance Quality. The ratings from these three subfactors will then be used to determine a single, overall past performance confidence assessment per offeror.

Offerors shall submit detailed information for no more than three (3) contract references. These references must be for recent and relevant work performed as the prime contractor for Federal agencies or commercial customers, demonstrating the ability to successfully perform the requirements described in the PWS. For each reference, offerors must provide company name, company point of contact, contact information, contract number, contracting agency, service provided, contract dollar value, and period of performance. Each contract listed is limited to no more than two (2) pages. The Government will only evaluate the first three (3) contract references.

The Government will gather past performance information from the references submitted by the offeror, from the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), and from any other reasonable sources that 97 CONF can obtain (surveys, telephone interview, etc.).

Subfactor 3.1: Recency

Recent is defined as efforts where performance is ongoing or performed within the past three (3) years from the date of issuance of this solicitation. Each vendor's present/past performance will also be evaluated to determine whether it is relevant to the effort being acquired.

Rating	Description
Acceptable	All submitted contract references meet the definition of recent.
Unacceptable	One or more of the submitted contract references were completed more than three (3) years prior to the solicitation's issuance date.

****If a present/past performance record is determined to be Unacceptable for Recency, the evaluation of that record will stop.****

Subfactor 3.2: Relevancy:

Relevant is defined as efforts involving requirements that are similar or greater in scope and/or complexity than the effort described in this solicitation.

Rating	Description
Very Relevant	Present/past performance efforts involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Relevant	Present/past performance efforts 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 efforts involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

****If a present/past performance record is determined to be "Not Relevant", the evaluation of that record will stop.****

Subfactor 3.3: Performance Quality

This subfactor assesses the quality of the offeror's past performance to determine if there is a reasonable expectation they will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

Evaluation will be made using contract reference information provided by the offeror, records in the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), and any other reasonable source that 97 CONF can obtain (surveys, telephone interview, etc.).

Rating	Description
Exceptional	Performance far exceeded requirements with no meaningful issues and included highly effective corrective actions for any minor problems.
Very Good	Performance exceeded some contractual requirements and was accomplished with only minor problems that were handled effectively.
Satisfactory	Performance met all contractual requirements, with only minor issues that the contractor recovered from without impacting the customer.
Neutral	No recent/relevant performance record is available or the offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful quality assessment rating can be reasonably assigned. **The offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on the factor of past performance**
Marginal	Performance missed requirements in significant ways and needed government oversight, though recovery remains possible.
Unsatisfactory	Performance failed to meet most contractual requirements, with serious problems and ineffective corrective actions.

****NOTE: in the case of an offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance. Therefore, the offeror shall be determined to have unknown (or "neutral") past performance.**

Past performance regarding predecessor companies, key personnel who have relevant experience, or sub-contractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement will not be considered as highly as past performance information for the principal offeror. Offerors are cautioned to submit sufficient information in the format specified in the proposal preparation instructions to permit a meaningful assessment of past performance. Offerors may be asked to clarify certain aspects of their proposal or respond to adverse past performance information to which the offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond. Adverse past performance is defined as past performance information that supports a less than satisfactory confidence rating on any evaluation element or any unfavorable comments received from sources without a formal rating system. Communication conducted to resolve minor or clerical errors will not constitute discussions and the contracting officer reserves the right to award a contract without the opportunity for proposal revision.

PAST PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT

Based on the evaluation of the subfactors above, an overall rating for the Past Performance Confidence Assessment factor will be assigned. This assessment is an evaluation of the likelihood that the offeror will successfully perform the solicitation's requirements based upon the offeror's past performance information. To be eligible for award, an offeror must receive an overall rating of Substantial or Satisfactory Confidence.

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

At a minimum, the first three (3) lowest priced, technically acceptable offers will be evaluated for past performance. Evaluations will continue as necessary until at least two (2) offers are determined to have an overall past performance confidence assessment of Substantial or Satisfactory Confidence or until all quotes have been evaluated. The Government will then make an integrated assessment to render the best value award decision or may open discussions if determined to be in the best interest of the Government.

(End of addendum)