Attachment 6
Section M - Evaluation Factors for Award

ADDENDUM to 52.212-2 - EVALUATION-COMMERCIAL ITEMS (a) 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 shall be used to evaluate offers:

(1) PRICE

(2) TECHNICAL ACCEPTABILITY

(3) PAST PERFORMANCE

Past Performance is significantly more important than price when being evaluated. Technical acceptability will be pass/fail and will determine whether an offer is considered at all.

(a) Offers will be evaluated to ensure contractor meets regulatory compliance requirements described in paragraph 4.9.2. of the PWS. Offerors who fail to furnish a copy of the A-901 license will be determined to be technically unacceptable and will be removed from consideration for award.

(b) Options. The Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. The Government may determine that an offer is unacceptable if the option prices are significantly unbalanced. Evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s). The Government will evaluate the price of any possible extension in accordance with RFO 52.217-8, Option to Extend Services by dividing the price of the final period of performance by two and adding it to the total price of the base and all options.

(c) 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.

BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD: This is a competitive best value source selection where **past performance is rated significantly more important than price.** By submission of its offer, the offeror accedes to the terms and conditions of this solicitation. Offerors must clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and provide complete accompanying rationale. The evaluation process shall proceed as follows:

A. Initially, offers shall be sorted by price, including option prices and the price of a full 6 month extension in accordance with RFO 52.217-8. An offeror’s proposed prices will be determined by multiplying the quantities identified in the pricing schedule by the proposed unit price for each item to confirm the extended amount for each. Proposal evaluation will then proceed

according to this addendum. Offerors whose total evaluated price is unreasonable (in accordance with RFO 15.404 and RFO 31.201-3), unbalanced (in accordance with RFO 15.404-6), or unaffordable (not within any budgetary information included in the solicitation) may not be considered for award.

B. The SSEB will then review proposals from all offerors to ensure technical requirements have been met and will rate each proposal as acceptable/unacceptable.

C. Next, the contracting officer shall review recent and relevant performance information pertaining to the lowest priced technically acceptable offeror. This review will include references provided by the offeror and data independently obtained from other government and commercial sources.

D. Relevant present/past performance includes performance of efforts similar or greater in scope, magnitude and complexity than the effort described in this solicitation. The purpose of the past performance evaluation is to allow the government to assess the offeror's probability of meeting the solicitation requirements based on the offeror's demonstrated past performance period. The assessment process will result in an overall performance confidence assessment rating of *Substantial Confidence, Satisfactory Confidence, Limited Confidence, No Confidence,* or *Neutral Confidence* as defined in DoD Source Selection Procedures, Table 5, Performance Confidence Assessments. 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 be rated as highly as past performance information for the principal offeror. Offerors with no recent/relevant performance history or if the offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned shall receive the rating "Neutral Confidence", meaning the rating is treated neither favorably nor unfavorably.

TABLE 5 – PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENTS	
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.

*SUBSTANTIAL or SATISFACTORY confidence rating is worth more than a NEUTRAL.

D. In evaluating past performance, the government reserves the right to give greater consideration to information on those contracts deemed most relevant to the effort described in this solicitation. The government will use the following relevancy definitions as defined in DoD Source Selection Procedures, Table 4, Past Performance Relevancy Ratings, when assessing recent/relevant contracts.

TABLE 4. PAST PERFORMANCE RELEVANCY RATINGS	
Rating	Definition
Very Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Relevant	Present/past performance 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 effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

E. If the lowest priced evaluated offer is judged to have a “Substantial Confidence” performance rating, that offer represents the best value for the government and the evaluation process stops at this point. Award shall be made to that offeror without further consideration of any other offers.

F. If the lowest priced offeror is not judged to have a “Substantial Confidence” performance confidence assessment, the next lowest priced offeror will be evaluated and the process will continue (in order by price) until an offeror is judged to have a “Substantial Confidence” performance confidence assessment, or until all offerors are evaluated. The Source Selection Authority shall then make an integrated assessment best value award decision.

G. Offerors are cautioned to submit sufficient information and in accordance with the instructions specified in Attachment 3 - (Section L - Instructions, Conditions, and Notices to Offerors), to permit a meaningful evaluation of their proposals. 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 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.

H. The government intends to award a contract without discussions. The government, however, reserves the right to conduct discussions if deemed in its best interest.