U.S. Army Corps of Engineers,
Huntsville Engineering and Support Center

SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Utility Monitoring and Control Systems Program
Multiple Award Task Order Contract
Generation VI

Solicitation#: W912DY26RA030
Estimated Value: $5.1 Billion

This document contains proprietary, or source selection information related to the conduct of a Federal Agency procurement. The office of Federal Procurement Policy restricts the disclosure and receipt of this information (41 U.S.C. Div. B of subtitle I). the unauthorized disclosure of this information may subject both the discloser and the recipient of the contractual, civil, and/or criminal penalties as provided by law.

SECTION M, EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

1. BASIS FOR AWARD.

The Contracting Officer intends to apply Revolutionary FAR Overhaul (RFO) 15.104(b)(1)(ii)(A)(3), Establishing Competitive Evaluation Factors and Significant Subfactors, utilizing a qualifying offer approach. Under this approach, the Government intends to award a Multiple Award Task Order Contract (MATOC) to **ALL** qualified offerors.

A qualifying offeror is an offeror that:

- Is determined to be a responsible source,
- Submits a technically acceptable proposal that conforms to the requirements of the solicitation, and
- Is an offeror for which the Contracting Officer "has no reason to believe" the offeror would be likely to propose other than fair and reasonable pricing.

In accordance with (IAW) RFO 15.104, Establishing Competitive Evaluation Factors and Significant Subfactors, **price will not be requested or evaluated as part of the base MATOC award determination, including the base ordering period or any optional ordering periods**. Award of the MATOC(s) will be made to all responsible offerors whose proposals are determined technically acceptable and otherwise meet the qualifying criteria for award.

To be eligible for award, qualifying offerors must receive a rating of "Acceptable" for all three factors. The Government will not award a contract to an offeror whose proposal contains a deficiency, as defined in RFO 15.001, Definitions.

Although price will not be evaluated at the base MATOC level, the Contracting Officer shall consider price or cost as one of the evaluation factors for each task order issued under the MATOC, IAW RFO 15.104(b)(1)(ii)(B), Establishing Competitive Evaluation Factors and Significant Subfactors.

Options. The MATOC option periods will be exercised at the discretion of the Contracting Officer IAW RFO 17.204-1, Exercise of Options. RFO 52.217-9, "Option to Extend the Term of the Contract" will be included in the contract to pursue the established option ordering periods. Additionally, RFO 52.217-8, "Option to Extend Services" will be included in the contract and pursued as needed, not to exceed an additional six months ordering period.

Negotiations and Award Procedures. The Government intends to make award(s) without negotiations; however, the Government reserves the right to hold negotiations if necessary IAW RFO 15.204, Competitive Award with Negotiation. The Government reserves the right to make staggered awards. Later awarded contracts will have an initial ordering period that will be less than the 36-month base period in duration; and will end on the same date as all other contractors which receive a basic award.

A written notice of award or acceptance of an offer, mailed or otherwise 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.

Applicable Regulations. This procurement is subject to RFO Part 12, Acquisition of Commercial Products and Commercial Services, and RFO 15, Contracting by Negotiation. Source selection will be IAW all applicable acquisition regulations, including agency supplements.

If the apparent successful Small Business offeror is determined to be non-responsible, the Contracting Officer shall refer the matter to the Small Business Administration for possible Certificate of Competency consideration, IAW RFO 19.101(d), Small Business Goals.

Proposal Evaluation. Proposals shall be prepared clearly and concisely and must demonstrate the offeror's complete understanding of the solicitation requirements. Offerors shall prepare proposals on the presumption that the Government has no previous knowledge of the offeror's capabilities. Proposals will be evaluated solely on the information contained in the proposal, except for information obtained during past performance evaluations.

2. FACTORS TO BE EVALUATED:

The following factors are of equal importance and shall be used to evaluate Offerors:

Volume 1 – W912DY26RA030_Offeror Name **Factor I: Technical/Management Approach**
Tab A (Subfactor I.A) – Technical Approach
Tab B (Subfactor I.B) – Management Approach
Volume 2 – W912DY26RA030_Offeror Name **Factor II: Past Performance**
Tab A (Subfactor II.A) – UMCS, ESS, HVAC, FAS and SCADA Projects
Tab B (Subfactor II.B) – System Security Engineering Projects
Tab C – Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS)
Tab D – Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQ)
Volume 3 – W912DY26RA030_Offeror Name **Factor III: Small Business Participation**
Tab A – Small Business Participation Plan

The designated Tabs under Factors I and II represent the evaluation subfactors. These subfactors will not be assigned individual or separate ratings. Instead, the Government will evaluate the information provided across all subfactors within a given Factor to establish a single consensus rating for that Factor.

*****Tab C and D under Factor II: Past Performance are not considered rated subfactors but rather supporting documentation for Subfactors II.A and II.B.***

3. EVALUATION APPROACH

VOLUME 1, FACTOR I – TECHNICAL/ MANAGEMENT APPROACH

Volume 1, Tab A – Technical Approach: The Government will evaluate the offeror's technical expertise narrative to assess the offeror's understanding of the requirements and soundness of their proposed approach to performing the work outlined in the PWS. The evaluation will be based on the level of detail, clarity, and feasibility of the methodologies described. The evaluation will consider the following:

- **Core Technical Approach:** The Government will evaluate the soundness and feasibility of the offeror's proposed approach to the required technical tasks (design, engineering, security, installation, commissioning, and testing) for the specified systems (UMCS, ESS, HVAC, FAS, and SCADA).
- **Cybersecurity Implementation Approach:** The narrative will be evaluated on the offeror's described methodology for applying the DoD Risk Management Framework and the credibility of its plan to achieve an Authority to Operate (ATO) for DoD Information Systems (IS). The depth of understanding of cybersecurity controls and their proposed application to Facility Related Control Systems (FRCS) will be a key consideration.
- **FRCS and Alternative Energy Systems Integration:** The Government will assess the offeror's demonstrated capability to integrate both conventional FRCS and alternative energy systems. The evaluation will focus on the technical approach to installation, security, and system interfacing.
- **Foreign Project Capability:** The narrative will be evaluated for demonstrated experience and a clear understanding of the complexities of executing projects in foreign locations.
- **Concurrent Project Management:** The Government will evaluate the offeror's described management plan for handling multiple, concurrent projects. The evaluation will assess the soundness of the proposed organizational structure, project management methodologies, and risk mitigation strategies for ensuring all projects are completed successfully and on schedule.

Offerors are advised that for a proposal to be considered technically acceptable, the technical narrative must address all elements requested in Section L.7. Failure to provide a complete narrative that addresses all the requested elements may result in the proposal being determined **unacceptable** and therefore ineligible for award.

Capability attributed to a teaming partner or key subcontractor shall be identified and Letters of Commitment shall be submitted IAW Section L, Volume 0, Tab D.

Volume 1, Tab B – Management Approach:

Management Approach: The Government will evaluate the Offeror's Management approach to assess whether the approach is sufficiently detailed, feasible, and demonstrates an understanding of contract requirements. This evaluation will focus on the Offeror's understanding of the

requirements and the quality of the following proposed processes IAW section L: Program Management, Contract Administration, Project Management, Risk Management, Quality Management, Schedule Control, and Cost Control.

Organizational Structure: The Government will evaluate the Offeror's Organizational Structure to assess the extent to which the proposal demonstrates a clear understanding of requirements, an effective organizational approach, and the capability to successfully perform the work with minimal risk to the Government. The evaluation will consider the following:

- **Clarity and Effectiveness of Organizational Structure:** The Government will evaluate the clarity of the proposed organizational structure, the effectiveness of the lines of authority and communication, and the integration of prime and subcontractor team members. The evaluation will assess whether the proposed structure is logical and conducive to efficient contract performance.
- **Resource Availability and Staffing Plan:** The Government will evaluate the adequacy and commitment of the proposed personnel as detailed in the resource chart. The evaluation will assess whether the number of personnel and the mix of labor categories are appropriate and realistic for the scope of this contract. The plan will be assessed for the degree of confidence it provides the Government that the Offeror can supply qualified personnel to meet contract requirements.
- **Organizational Approach and Communication:** The Government will evaluate the feasibility of the Offeror's organizational approach. This includes the clarity of the defined roles, responsibilities, and the effectiveness of the proposed methods for project execution, supervision, and problem resolution. The evaluation will assess whether the Offeror's proposed processes for communication and issue resolution are likely to be effective and efficient.

Corporate Safety: The Government will evaluate the completeness and successful safety performance of the Offeror's Safety and Health Program submission, including EMR, OSHA violations or incidents, and the signed certification required under Section L.

Ratings:

The Government will evaluate whether the Offeror's proposal provides sufficient detail to demonstrate understanding. Proposals that merely restate solicitation requirements without meaningful explanation or method may receive an Unacceptable rating.

Factor I "Technical/Management Approach" will be evaluated on an Acceptable or Unacceptable basis using the ratings and definitions in the table below:

TEHCNICAL/MANAGEMENT APPROACH RATINGS	
Rating	**Definition**
Acceptable	Proposal meets the requirements of the solicitation.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet the requirements of the solicitation.

VOLUME 2, FACTOR II - PAST PERFORMANCE

There are three aspects to the past performance evaluation: recency, relevance and quality of products or services. Recency is defined as a time period during which Past Performance references are considered relevant. Relevancy is defined as projects that are similar and logically connected to the context of this solicitation in terms of scope (dollar value, size, project type) and in the magnitude of effort and complexities of the work outlined in this solicitation. Quality is defined as the overall quality of the Past Performance. For the overall Past Performance rating, the Government will evaluate whether or not the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the solicitation's requirements as indicated by that offeror's recent and relevant record of past performance (including the past performance of the proposed prime Contractor and its proposed key subcontractors).

The Government will utilize the project reporting forms for each project identified in Volume II, Past Performance. Past Performance references will first be reviewed to determine the recency of the Past Performance information. IAW section L, to be considered recent, projects must have at least 12 months of performance within three years from the closing date of this solicitation. Past Performance information considered not recent will not be evaluated for relevancy. Recent and relevant Past Performance will be treated as a predictor of future success.

First, the projects that are submitted for Factor II "Past Performance" will be individually evaluated for recency as defined in Section L. Next, the projects will be individually evaluated for relevancy using the ratings and definitions in the table below:

PAST PERFORMANCE 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.

Volume 2, Tab A – UMCS, ESS, HVAC, FAS and SCADA Projects: The Government will evaluate whether the Offeror submitted a minimum of three and a maximum of five DoD collectively demonstrating experience across all five FRCS types identified in Section L: UMCS, ESS, HVAC control systems, FAS, and SCADA systems. The Government will verify that each submitted project represents a single, discrete contract action (e.g., task order, delivery order, stand-alone contract, or other individually awarded effort) and is not merely an overarching IDIQ contract, MATOC, SATOC, BPA, or similar ordering vehicle without identification of the specific effort performed.

The Government will also verify that at least one submitted project demonstrates work self-performed by the Prime Contractor for one of the FRCS types identified in Section L. If the Offeror is a small business concern, the Government will accept a project performed as a key subcontractor in lieu of Prime Contractor self-performance, provided the submission demonstrates meaningful participation in execution of the referenced effort.

Volume 2, Tab B – System Security Engineering Projects: The Government will evaluate the three submitted projects to ensure they demonstrate successful implementation of applicable Government Cybersecurity requirements. This includes verifying the utilization of the DoD Risk Management Framework (RMF), confirming the projects resulted in an Authority to Operate (ATO) for DoD Information Systems (IS), and ensuring the inclusion of at least one FRCS (UMCS, ESS, HVAC, FAS, or SCADA).

The prime Contractor and proposed key subcontractors **shall** be assessed individually, and the results will then be assessed in their totality to derive the offeror's overall Past Performance rating. Past performance of prime contractors or key subcontractors whose firms are divided into severable segments (e.g., division, group, unit, etc.) shall only be evaluated as it relates to those segments of the firm(s) that will actually perform the work. An entity may not establish past performance based on the past performance of its proposed key personnel.

Volume 2, Tab C – Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS):

To evaluate the quality of an Offeror's past projects, the Government will evaluate the CPARS reports submitted by the Offeror for the same project examples provided in this volume.

Volume 2, Tab D – Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ): For projects with no CPARS rating, PPQs will be evaluated when determining the overall past performance rating for an Offeror.

The Offeror is cautioned that in conducting the performance evaluation the Government may use data obtained from other sources and other relevant projects in addition to data provided in the Offeror's proposal. Since the Government may not necessarily obtain information on all of the listed contract references and/or may not contact all of the identified points of contact provided by the Offeror, it is incumbent upon the Offeror to explain the relevance of the data provided.

If 1) the Government obtains adverse past performance information from sources other than those identified by the offeror and the offeror was never provided a prior opportunity to respond to the adverse past performance information and 2) the Government conducts clarifications or negotiations IAW RFO 15.202, Evaluating Competitive Proposals, and 15.204-2 Competitive Negotiations, then the offeror will be afforded an opportunity to respond to such referenced adverse past performance information.

In addition to the above, the Government may review any other sources of information for evaluating past performance. Other sources may include, but are not limited to, past performance information retrieved through CPARS (https://www.cpars.gov), using the Commercial and Government Entity/Unique Entity Identifier number of all team members (partnership, joint venture, teaming arrangement, or parent company, subsidiary, affiliate) identified in the Offeror's proposal, inquiries of owner representative(s), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System, Electronic Subcontract Reporting System, and any other known sources not provided by the Offeror. While the Government may elect to consider data from other sources, the burden of providing detailed, current, accurate and complete past performance information rests with the Offeror.

Note: In the case of an offeror without a record of recent and relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available or so sparse that no meaningful past performance rating can be reasonably assigned, the offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance (see RFO 15.202(c)(1), Evaluating Competitive Proposals). Therefore, the offeror shall be determined to have "neutral" past performance. In the context of acceptability/unacceptability, a neutral rating shall be considered acceptable.

The overall Factor II "Past Performance" will be evaluated on an Acceptable or Unacceptable basis using the ratings and definitions in the table below:

PAST PERFORMANCE RATINGS	
Rating	**Definition**
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.
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.

VOLUME 3, FACTOR III - SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION

Volume 3, Tab A - Small Business Participation Plan:

All offerors, regardless of business size, will be evaluated on their commitment to small business participation. This evaluation will cover both the proposed acquisition and the demonstrated use of small businesses in performing prior, relevant contracts. The Government's evaluation will focus on:

- The Offeror's proposed commitment to utilizing small businesses, whether as a prime contractor, joint venture, teaming arrangement or subcontractor.
- The complexity and variety of work the small businesses are able to perform.
- The extent of SB participation in terms of the total acquisition value, which will be measured against the Minimum Quantitative Requirement (MQR).
- The extent to which the Offeror's proposal meets or exceeds the MQR goals identified in the table below.

The Small Business Participation MQRs for this procurement are listed below:

SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION MINIMUM QUANTITATIVE REQUIREMENTS						
Small Business Categories	**SB**	**SDB**	**WOSB**	**HUBZone**	**VOSB**	**SDVOSB**
Small Business Participation	20%	4%	4%	2%	5%	2%

In order to receive a rating of Acceptable, an Offeror's Small Business Participation Plan must demonstrate a thorough approach and commitment to utilize small business concerns. A thorough approach by a potential offeror reflects the offeror's inclusion of small businesses based on the percentages reflected above under each small business category. Offerors **shall** meet or exceed the target percentages in the table above to receive an acceptable rating. The proposed Small Business Participation Plan will be incorporated into any resulting contract.

The Small Business Proposal format (Attachment 2) is designed to streamline and bring uniformity to responses and evaluations for Small Business Participation (RFO 15.104, Establishing Competitive Evaluation Factors and Significant Subfactors). The format provides clarity in that it is distinctly different from the Small Business Subcontracting Plan required for other than small businesses only (RFO 52.219-9).

- Other than small business contractors may achieve the small business participation commitment through subcontracting to small businesses.
- Small business contractors may achieve small business participation goals through their own performance/ participation as a prime and through a joint venture, teaming arrangement, and subcontracting to other small businesses.
- The Government will monitor the Contractor's compliance with the Small Business Participation Plan to ensure compliance with the terms and conditions stated within. These goals will be assessed at the contract level, commencing in the first performance year of the contract.

Factor III "Small Business Participation" will be evaluated on an Acceptable or Unacceptable basis using the ratings and definitions in the table below:

SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION RATINGS	
Rating	**Definition**
Acceptable	Proposal meets the requirements of the solicitation.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet the requirements of the solicitation.