ATTACHMENT 3 - SECTION M – BASIS FOR AWARD

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

Real Property Support Services Multiple Award Task Order Contract Generation III

Solicitation: W912DY26RA026
Estimated Value: $60 Million

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.

BASIS FOR AWARD

In accordance with (IAW) the instruction in Section L, the Contracting Officer intends to apply Revolutionary FAR Overhaul Federal Acquisition Regulation (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 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" would be likely to propose other than fair and reasonable pricing.

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 an "Acceptable" rating for both 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.

IAW RFO 15.203, Competitive award without Negotiation, the Government may make competitive awards without negotiations. IAW RFO 15.204-1(a), Establishing a competitive range, the Government **must** establish a competitive range if negotiations occur after evaluating competitive proposals. The Contracting Officer may conduct negotiations with All Qualifying offerors within the competitive range. However, the Contracting Officer will conduct negotiations with those Offerors whose proposals are unacceptable.

FACTORS TO BE EVALUATED

The following factors and elements shall be used to evaluate Offerors

VOLUME I (FACTOR 1) – TECHNICAL CAPABILITIES	**Maximum Page Count- 25 pages**
Tab 1 –Technical Approach **Tab 2** – Management Approach **Tab 3** – Key Personnel	Resumes not included in the page count. Organizational chart not included in the page count.
VOLUME II (FACTOR 2) – PAST PERFORMANCE	**Maximum Page Count – 10 pages**
Tab 1 – Past Performance Project Narratives	
Tab 2 – CPARS/Past Performance Questionnaires	No page limitation
VOLUME III – ADMINISTRATIVE DOCUMENTS	**Maximum Page Count – N/A**

Tab 1 – Representations and Certifications (Include a copy from SAM.gov)	
Tab 2 – Key Subcontractor Letters of Commitments	
Tab 3 – Joint Venture/Mentor Protégé Agreements and Approvals (if applicable)	
Tab 4 – SF1449 and Amendments (signed)	

EVALUATION APPROACH

VOLUME I - FACTOR 1: TECHNICAL CAPABILITIES

Tab 1– Technical Approach

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's technical approach based on the written narrative submitted and the quantitative amount of work completed, with particular emphasis on the number of projects completed, the total volume of data points analyzed, the total number of buildings assessed or the total square footage audited. The narrative will be evaluated on how clearly these project details connect to the PWS and solicitation requirements demonstrating the Offeror's capability, experience, and readiness to perform the work.

Tab 2 –Management Approach

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed management approach to include the hierarchical structure, the quality control process; and assess the extent to which the Offeror's internal management processes contribute to the likelihood of successful execution of projects IAW the PWS and solicitation. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed organizational structure that shows clear roles and responsibilities in the organizational chart, reporting structures, lines of authority, and resource allocation necessary to manage multiple projects concurrently.

Tab 3 – Key Personnel

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's key personnel resumes to determine the extent to which the proposed individuals possess the qualifications necessary to successfully perform the requirements of this solicitation. Proposals that merely restate solicitation requirements without meaningful explanation or method may receive an Unacceptable rating. The Government will evaluate a minimum of two to a maximum of four individual resumes who will function as Technical Managers having experience with the real property system of record as detailed in PWS paragraph 3.2 Real Property Systems of Record. Each resume will be evaluated based on the total cumulative years of relative work experience with real property systems of record, educational background, and areas of responsibility.

Factor I – Technical Capabilities will be expressed as an adjectival/color assessment of Acceptable or Unacceptable rating methodology as shown below:

TECHNICAL RATINGS	
Rating	**Description**
Acceptable	Proposal meets the requirements of the solicitation
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet the requirements of the solicitation

VOLUME II - FACTOR II- PAST PERFORMANCE RATING.

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, contract 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. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's likelihood of success in performing the solicitation's requirements and delivering high quality products and services as indicated by that Offeror's recent and relevant record of Past Performance. "Offeror" refers to the proposed prime Contractor and its proposed key Subcontractors.

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 PEFORMANCE RELEVANCY RATINGS	
Rating	**Description**
Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Not Relevant	Present/past performance involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

<u>Tab 1 – Past Performance Project Narratives</u>

The Government will evaluate the projects submitted/identified in Volume 2, Tab 1 for recency and relevancy. IAW Section L, to be determined recent, projects submitted, **shall** have at least twelve months of performance completed within three years from the closing date of the solicitation. A minimum of one project **shall** be identified as self-performed by the Prime Contractor. The Government shall only evaluate a minimum of three and up to five submitted projects using the criteria of recency, relevancy, and quality of products or services.

<u>Tab 2 – CPARS/Past Performance Questionnaires</u>

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.

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.

The rating will be expressed as an adjectival/color assessment of Acceptable or Unacceptable rating methodology.

PAST PEFORMANCE RATINGS	
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.
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.

Note: In the case of an Offeror without a record of 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 15.104(b)(3) Therefore, the Offeror shall be determined to have unknown (or " neutral") past performance. In the context of acceptability/unacceptability, a neutral rating shall be considered "acceptable."

The Government may review any available past performance information in addition to the CPARS evaluations submitted by the Offeror. Sources may include CPARS records for all CAGE/DUNS numbers associated with team members(partnership, joint venture, teaming arrangement, or parent company/subsidiary /affiliate, and key subcontractors) identified in the Offeror's proposal, inquiries of owner representative(s), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS) Data and subcontractors reports in SAM, and any other known sources not provided by the Offeror.

VOLUME III - ADMINISTRATIVE DOCUMENTS

Tab 1 – Representations and Certifications

The Government will review the Offeror's Representation and Certifications found on SAM.Gov.

Tab 2 – Key Subcontractor Letters of Commitment

The Government will review Key Subcontractor Letter of Commitment for each teaming partner or key subcontractor for their technical approach.

Tab 3 – Joint Venture/Mentor Protégé Agreements and Approvals

The Government will review a copy of the JV agreement, along with the signed agreement designating one firm with the authority to bind the members of the JV as applicable.

Tab 4 – SF1449 and Amendments

The Government will evaluate that the offeror has provided the SF 1449 and amendments duly executed by an official authorized to bind the offeror.

*** END OF NARRATIVE ***