EVALUATION CRITERIA

M.1. General: This is a lowest price technically acceptable source selection conducted in accordance with Revolutionary FAR Overhaul (RFO) Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.103-2. Award will be made to a single Offeror who is deemed responsible in accordance with the FAR, and whose proposal conforms to the solicitation requirements and whose proposal, judged by an overall assessment of the evaluation criteria and other considerations specified in the solicitation, represents the Lowest Price Technically Acceptable offer.

M.2. Compliance: The Government intends to award to the Offeror whose proposal, conforming to the Request for Proposal (RFP) and the Statement of Work (SOW), provides the overall best benefit to the Government and found to be technically acceptable and offering the lowest price to the Government.

M.3. Trade-Offs: Trade-off between cost/price and non-cost/price factors is not permitted. Inaccurate or Incomplete price proposals may be the grounds for eliminating a proposal from competition.

M.4. Discussions: Offers received for less than the stated number of items listed in the Pricing Schedule will be considered ineligible for award. The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award without discussions with Offerors. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer determines discussions to be necessary.

M.5. Evaluation Factors and Criteria.

All Evaluation Factors, except for Price must be rated "Acceptable" by the Government in order for a proposal to be considered for award.

M.5.1. Factor 1: Technical Approach.

The purpose of the Technical Approach Evaluation Factor is to assess the Offeror's proposed approach, to satisfy the Government's minimum requirements as stated in the Statement of Work (SOW).

TABLE 1. TECHNICAL CAPABILITY RATINGS:

Technical Acceptable/Unacceptable Ratings	
RATING	**DESCRIPTION**
ACCEPTABLE	Proposal clearly meets the minimum requirements of the solicitation.
UNACCEPTABLE	Proposal does not clearly meet the minimum requirements of the solicitation.

M.5.2. Factor 2: Past Performance:

The Past Performance evaluation assesses the degree of confidence the Government has in an Offeror's ability to supply products and services that meet the users' needs based on a

demonstrated record of performance. Failure to provide the information may result in the Offeror being removed from consideration for award. Projects must be similar to this project in scope. (Note: An Offeror with no past performance experience should submit the Volume with an explanation that they have no recent or relevant experience). The Contracting Officer will evaluate past performance of the Offeror's recent and relevant contracts and give the Offeror a rating based on the scheme below. In evaluating the Offeror's past performance record, the Contracting Officer may use past and present performance information gathered from various sources.

The sources may include, but are not limited to, the Past Performance Questionnaire submitted, Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) reports, and interviews. The Contracting Officer may also place more weight and consideration on more relevant past performance information. For the purpose of this evaluation, the term "offeror" includes the prime Offeror and/or team members and major subcontractors performing 25% or more of the proposed effort based on the total proposed price or perform aspects of the effort the Offeror considers critical to overall successful performance.

Offerors are cautioned that the Contracting Officer will use data provided by each Offeror in this volume and data obtained from other sources in the evaluation of past performance.

M.5.2.1. Recency:

Contracts submitted for review should also be recent. In determining recency, the Contracting Officer will only consider work performance under an effort existing within the past five (5) years from formal release date of the RFP.

M.5.2.2. Relevancy:

Projects must be similar to this project in scope. Offerors shall include the rationale supporting the assertion of relevance on the contracts submitted for consideration in demonstrating their ability to perform the proposed effort. The Contracting Officer is not bound by the Offeror's interpretation of relevancy. The Contracting Officer may contact references other than those identified by the Offeror and use the information received to evaluate the Offeror's past performance.

M.5.2.3. Rating:

The Past Performance factor will receive one of the past performance assessments included in the below table based upon the Offeror's past performance during prior contracts. Performance is measured based upon the quality, timeliness, and cost controls exhibited by the Offeror's performance on previous contracts.

TABLE 2. PAST PERFORMANCE ACCEPTABLE/UNACCEPTABLE RATING METHOD:

Past Performance Acceptable/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, or the Offeror's performance record is unknown. (See note above)
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.

M.5.3. Factor 3: Price.

The purpose of the price factor is to determine if the proposed price is fair and reasonable. In no event will the Government make an award against an offer that the Government does not find to be fair and reasonably priced. The price submission will be evaluated but not rated.

The techniques and procedures described under RFO FAR Part 15.404 will be the primary means of assessing price reasonableness. To be viable for award, an Offeror's price must be determined fair and reasonable. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's price proposal for reasonableness based on the following:

a. Reasonableness will be determined by comparing the Offeror's total price proposed to the total price proposed by the other Offerors, comparing the Offerors total price proposed to the Independent Government Estimate, and/or comparing the Offeror's total price proposed to recently awarded contracts of similar nature. Additionally, the government may utilize other techniques identified in RFO FAR 15.404-1(b) to determine the reasonableness of price.

b. The Offeror's price submission shall represent the Offeror's best efforts to respond to the RFP. Any inconsistency between proposed performance and price shall be explained in the submission. For example, if unique, innovative approaches are the basis for an unusually low price, the nature of these approaches and their impact on price shall be explained. If an Offeror proposes to absorb a portion of the price, the Offeror shall also explain the impact on the estimated price. Any significant inconsistency left unexplained, may raise a fundamental question of the Offeror's understanding of the nature and scope of the work required in the task order, and of the Offeror's ability to perform the tasks within the fiscal constraints thereof. This may be just cause for rejection of the proposal. The burden of proof for price credibility rests with the Offeror.