SECTION M

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 Basis for Contract Award:

This is a best value source selection conducted in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation Overhaul (RFO) 15.2, Evaluation and Award. The Government will select the best overall offer, based upon an integrated assessment of Technical/Technical Risk and Price. This acquisition will utilize qualified sources. A contract may be awarded to the offeror who is deemed responsible in accordance with the RFO, as supplemented, whose proposal conforms to the solicitation's requirements (to include all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and all other information required by Section L of this solicitation) and is judged, based on the evaluation factors and subfactors to represent the best value to the Government. The Government reserves the right to award without negotiations; therefore, each initial offer should contain the offeror's best price. The government does however, reserve the right to conduct negotiations if determined necessary by the Contracting Officer.

1.2 Number of Contracts Awarded:

The Government intends to select one contractor for award, however; the Government reserves the right to award no contract at all, depending on the quality of the proposals, prices submitted and the availability of funds.

1.3 Correction Potential of Proposals:

The Government will consider, throughout the evaluation, the "correction potential" of any proposal uncertainty. The judgment of such "correction potential" is within the sole discretion of the Government. If an aspect of an offeror's proposal not meeting the Government's requirements is not considered correctable, the offeror may be eliminated from the award.

1.4 Clarifications:

If, during the evaluation period, it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government may conduct clarifications IAW RFO 15.202(a)(2).

2.0 EVALUATION FACTORS AND METHODOLOGY

2.1. Evaluation Factors:

The following evaluation factors and subfactors will be used to evaluate each proposal: Award will be made to the offeror proposing the combination most advantageous to the Government based upon an integrated assessment of the evaluation factors and subfactors described below.

Factor 1: Technical

Subfactor 1: Qualified Vendor

Subfactor 2: Schedule

Factor 2: Price

In accordance with RFO 15.104(d), all evaluation factors other than Cost/Price, when combined, are significantly more important than cost or price.

1. Technical Rating: The technical rating evaluates the quality of the offeror's technical solution for meeting the Government's requirement. Subfactor 1 will receive an acceptable or unacceptable rating. Technical subfactor 2 will receive one of the color/adjectival ratings described in DoD Source Selection Procedures, Table 2A – Technical Rating Method, excerpted below. The technical ratings focus on the strengths and deficiencies of the offeror's proposal. The color/adjectival rating depicts how well the offeror's proposal meets the Technical subfactor requirements. Subfactor ratings shall not be rolled up into an overall color/adjectival rating for the Technical factor.

Subfactor 1

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

Subfactor 2

Color Rating	**Adjectival Rating**	**Description**
Blue	Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths.
Purple	Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength

Green	Acceptable	Proposal indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements.
Yellow	Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements.
Red	Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet the requirements of the solicitation and, thus, contains one or more deficiencies and is unawardable.

2. Technical Risk Rating. Assessment of technical risk considers the risk associated with the technical approach to meeting the requirement which is manifested by the identification of weaknesses. It considers the potential for disruption of schedule, increased costs, degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight, and/or the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance.

Rating	**Description – Technical Risk**
Low	Proposal may contain weakness(es) which have little potential to cause disruption of schedule, or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and normal Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.
Moderate	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which may potentially cause disruption of schedule, or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome difficulties.
High	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which is likely to cause significant disruption of schedule, or degradation of performance. Is unlikely to overcome any difficulties, even with special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring.
Unacceptable	Proposal contains a material failure or a combination of significant weaknesses that increases the risk of unsuccessful performance to an unacceptable level

Factor 1 Technical

Subfactor 1: Qualified Vendor (Acceptable/Unacceptable)

The contractor must be a qualified source prior to the contract award in accordance with the source qualification requirements referenced in Section J of the solicitation. The government maintains a list of qualified vendors for this requirement. During the solicitation period, any potential offeror can contact the contracting officer to verify if it is on/not on the qualified vendors list. A copy of this confirmation email may be submitted with the offerors proposal but is not necessary.

A proposal will be considered technically acceptable if a potential offeror can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the contracting officer (or, in the case of a contract for the procurement of an aviation critical safety item, the head of the design control activity for such item) that the potential offeror or its product meets the standards established for qualification or CAN MEET SUCH STANDARDS BEFORE THE DATE SPECIFIED FOR AWARD OF THE CONTRACT." 10 USC 3243(c)(3) .

If all qualification steps are not completed and approved prior to time of award, then award of the contract will not be delayed, and an otherwise qualified vendor will receive the award.

Subfactor 2: Schedule (Trade-off)

This subfactor will be evaluated to the degree to which the schedule submitted by the contractor demonstrates a clear understanding of project scope requirements, a reasonable approach to project execution, and detail and completeness commensurate with the proposal stage.

The schedule must include a Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) which will be evaluated to the degree to which it shows manageable work packages, provides insight into major phases and key activities, and identifies major deliverables. (SOO Section 4, paragraph B)

The schedule must include clearly defined milestones which will be evaluated to the degree to which it shows the major phases, key deliverables and logical progression of work. (SOO Section 4, paragraph B)

The schedule must include task duration which will be evaluated for the degree to which it shows realistic durations for identified tasks and work packages. (SOO Section 4, paragraph B)

The submission must be readable by Microsoft Excel (.xls, .xlsx), Word, PowerPoint or Project (.mpp) format and contains no more than 10 pages.

Factor 2 Price Proposal

Completion of the RFP, Section B Schedule will represent the price proposal.

2.2. Evaluation Methodology:

Only qualified offerors will be considered for award. Then, technical and technical risk and then price will be evaluated.

The offeror's cost/price proposal will be evaluated for Reasonableness and Total Evaluated Price (TEP), including all prime and major subcontractors. The TEP will be a consideration in the best value tradeoff award decision. The Contract Line Item Number (CLIN) prices proposed used to calculate the TEP will become contractually binding.

1. Reasonableness

The offeror's price proposal will be evaluated, using one or more of the techniques defined in RFO 15.404, to determine if it is reasonable. For a price to be reasonable, it must represent a price to the Government that a prudent person would pay in the conduct of competitive business. Reasonableness is established through adequate price competition, as described in RFO 15.403-2(c)(1) or through price and cost analysis.

2. Total Evaluated Price

The Government will use the total for all CLINs to evaluate price.