Section M - Evaluation factors for award

M.1 Evaluation Factors for Award

A. General Considerations. For the evaluation, the quotes will be evaluated under the following areas of consideration: price, technical capability, past performance and experience. The Government intends to evaluate quotes and make an award on initial quotes. Therefore, the offeror's initial quote shall contain the offeror's best price. If multiple line items are priced, each line item will be evaluated to ensure that balanced pricing exists. If the line items are determined to be unbalanced for the offeror that presents the lowest priced technically acceptable quote, the Government will allow that offeror the opportunity to balance the line items before award. If the offeror cannot, or chooses not to, balance the line items, the Government shall deem the offeror's quotes unacceptable. In addition to the evaluation of the quote for award determination, the Government may consider your past performance from data obtained from other sources.

B. Basis for Award. Award will be made to the selected contractor based on the "best value" Evaluated Lowest Price Technically Acceptable quote that the Government determines can best satisfy the objectives and requirements of this Request for Quote, in a manner most advantageous to the Government. The documents that each offeror submitted in response to the instructions for preparing the quote will receive a thorough evaluation. Offeror's must convey to the Government that they are capable to accomplish the work in a coordinated and timely fashion, such that all the needs of the requirement will be accomplished.

Respondents are required to address the acceptable and unacceptable Technical Factor as follows: Lowest Price Technically Acceptable Evaluation Process.

C. Evaluation Process. The Government will evaluate all technical quotes on an acceptable and unacceptable basis to determine all offers that meet the minimum technically acceptable requirements. Failure to meet a requirement may result in an offer being determined technically unacceptable. An unacceptable rating for any one factor makes the entire quote unacceptable. Any costs incurred by offerors in preparing or submitting offers are the offerors' sole responsibility; the United States Government will not reimburse any offeror for any quote preparation costs.

Contract will be awarded to the offeror who is deemed responsible in accordance with the FAR, as supplemented, whose quote conforms to the solicitation's requirements (to include all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and all other information required by the solicitation).

(1) Evaluation criteria: The offeror's quote will be evaluated under the following three (3) evaluation factors:

Factor 1 - Technical Approach and Capability
Factor 2 - Past Performance and Experience
Factor 3 - Price

Offerors technical approach and capability quotes shall present their management approaches to accomplish all applicable contract requirements; are realistic, appropriate, and efficient; and demonstrate logic and scope understanding that present low levels of risk. The Offeror's overall technical approach will be evaluated to assess the Government's level of confidence in the Offeror's understanding of, approach to, and ability to successfully perform the requirements as described in the Statement of Work. Approaches not demonstrating these attributes present higher levels of risk and will be rated as unacceptable.

Offeror's technical approach must provide details describing Offeror's overall technical approach to

conveying Offeror's understanding of, approach to, and ability to successfully perform the requirements as described in the Statement of Work. A detailed write-up is mandatory regardless of whether the Offeror conducted a site visit. The technical approach must not restate or parrot the SOW, but provide specific, actionable operational details on how the Offeror plans on performing the tasks listed in the attached Statement of Work (i.e., Performance Checklists: Quality control and task execution checklists. Staffing Plans: Anticipated number of employees assigned to the project. Labor Hours: Anticipated hours spent performing work at the facility. Logistics: Explicit confirmation of the supplies and materials being provided). Offeror's must provide the following: Written documentation directly from the roofing system manufacturer confirming the Offeror is authorized to install the system, is eligible to obtain the manufacturer's warranty, and that the manufacturer is willing and able to issue the required watertight roof warranty to the Government. Offerors must submit a comprehensive safety plan developed in strict accordance with Solicitation Attachment 0004.

To receive an acceptable rating, the proposed approach must be realistic, appropriate, efficient, and demonstrate logical scope understanding that presents a low risk to the Government. Approaches that fail to demonstrate these attributes present higher risk and will be rated as Unacceptable.

TECHNICAL RATINGS:

Technical Acceptable and Unacceptable Ratings	
Rating	**Description**
Acceptable	Quote clearly meets or exceeds the minimum requirements of the solicitation.
Unacceptable	Quote does not clearly meet the minimum requirements of the solicitation.

Factor 2 – Past Performance and Experience

Submit Past Performance and Experience information using the attached Past Performance Questionnaire.

Evaluation: This factor evaluates the past performance of the Offeror to determine the offeror's recency, relevance, experience, and quality of performance on the same or similar requirements. The Offeror's past performance on contracts performing the same or similar requirements as described in the Statement of Work. Include a brief description of the contract requirements, quality and timeliness of delivery of goods and services, cost management, communications between contracting officer and contracting officer representative, proactive project management, and customer satisfaction. Experience. Provide details describing the Offeror's background and past performance on contracts performing the same or similar requirements as described in the Statement of Work. Include a brief description of the contract requirements, project completion timeframe (i.e., start and final acceptance date), cost management, communications between contracting officer and contracting officer representative, project management, and customer satisfaction.

Acceptability Standard: To be recent, the effort must be ongoing or must have been performed during the past three (3) years from the date of issuance of this solicitation. Past performance information that fails to meet this condition will not be evaluated. To be relevant, the effort must be similar in nature of work, size, and scope. The Government will conduct an in-depth evaluation of all recent performance information obtained to determine if it is the same or similar in nature of work, size, scope and magnitude to the services/products being procured under this solicitation. Scope: The type of work, technology, complexity, and duties performed. Size: The dollar value, staffing levels, and quantity of deliverables. Magnitude: The operational scale, geographical reach, and performance environment

To be Relevant: Relevant Experience and Past Performance must demonstrate roof and gutter

replacement. The offeror's past performance experience information will be evaluated to assess the offeror's experience level on recent contracts for similar work. Submit a narrative disclosing any instances of past performance that may be considered less than fully satisfactory. Describe pertinent facts, circumstances and any remedial action taken or to be taken to correct the deficiency. Failure to disclose such instances could result in an unfavorable assessment of the offeror's past performance record.

Past performance information, not demonstrating these attributes, presents higher levels of risk and will be rated as unacceptable.

Past performance information from other sources, including Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), may also be utilized in the determination of the past performance record. During proposal evaluations, limited exchanges between the Government and an offeror may occur to clarify the relevance of an offeror's past performance information and adverse past performance information to which the offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond.

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 as described under FAR 15.104 (3)(i).

References must email completed PPQs directly to the Contracting Office at Edward_dingle@ios.doi.gov. The Government must receive all PPQs directly from the references no later than the solicitation closing date and time. Subject Line Format: The email subject line must read: "PPQ for [Offeror Name] - RFQ [Insert Solicitation Number].

This factor will be evaluated on a pass/fail basis as Acceptable or Unacceptable. To receive an Acceptable rating, the offeror must meet the following minimum standard: Recent and relevant past performance and experience must explicitly demonstrate successful completion of roof and gutter replacement projects with an overall satisfactory or better-quality rating.

PAST PERFORMANCE RATING:

Past Performance Acceptable and Unacceptable 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.
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.

Factor 3 – Price

Proposed pricing will be evaluated for fair and reasonableness. Reasonableness will be determined considering comparisons to competitive pricing and to the independent Government estimate (IGE). Normally competition establishes price reasonableness, but it may also be based upon comparison with previously proposed prices, comparison with competitive published price lists, comparison with the independent Government estimate, and other measures. Proposed pricing that differs significantly from the competition or IGE, as an example, will be reviewed to assess potential performance risk and the offeror's understanding of the requirements. If any price component is found to be unreasonably high, or unrealistically low, an offeror's Price Quote may be rejected. If multiple contract line items are included in the price schedule, prices will be evaluated to determine whether any line items are unbalanced. Offerors are cautioned to distribute costs appropriately.

All the above Evaluation Criteria will be evaluated on an "Acceptable and Unacceptable" basis. To receive an Acceptable for Factor 1 (Technical), offerors must meet all criteria described in the Technical Approach and Capability paragraph. To receive an Acceptable rating for Factor 2 (Past Performance),

offerors must meet all criteria described in the past performance paragraph. For an offer to be rated as acceptable, an Acceptable rating must be received in both the technical and past performance evaluations.

An Offeror's quote must receive a rating of Acceptable under the evaluation factors to be considered for award. The Government reserves the right to reject any or all quotes if such action is deemed in the best interest of the Government.

The government will review all offers received in response to the solicitation for responsiveness to the terms and conditions of all material elements of the solicitation. Offers received not meeting the material elements of the solicitation will be deemed non-responsive and may not receive further consideration for evaluation and award.

The review and evaluation process will continue in this manner until. The lowest priced offer received and deemed responsive will be evaluated for technical acceptance, if the apparently lowest priced offer received is deemed technically unacceptable, the offeror will be notified, and the process will continue until an offer is deemed technically acceptable for award. If clarifications or negotiations are required and fail to produce a mutual agreement for award, the evaluation process will continue until an award is made or the requirement will be resolicited, if no award decision is made.

A written notice of award or acceptance of an offer mailed or otherwise furnished to the successful offeror within the time for acceptance specified constitutes an offer by the government. The contractor and Contracting Officer will both sign the final award to bind both parties. Before the offeror's specified expiration time, the Government may accept an offer (or part of an offer), whether or not there are exchanges or negotiations after its receipt, unless a written notice of withdrawal is received before award.