EVALUATION – COMMERCIAL PRODUCTS AND COMMERCIAL SERVICES

1 **Addendum to RFO 52.212-2, EVALUATION – COMMERCIAL PRODUCTS AND COMMERCIAL SERVICES**

2 **Evaluation Factors.** The following evaluation factors 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 assessment of the evaluation factors described below.

Factor 1 – Technical
- Subfactor A – Subcontractor Relationships
- Subfactor B – Key Personnel Qualifications

Factor 2 – Past Performance
Factor 3 – Price

2.1 The Government will conduct a review of all proposals received to ensure they are complete and consistent with the terms of the solicitation and proposal preparations. The Contracting Officer may conduct clarifications to address the completeness of any volume.

3 **FACTOR 1 – TECHNICAL**

3.1 **Subfactor A – Subcontractor Relationships**

3.1.1 An acceptable rating is given when the Offeror has clearly identified the area of work, *and* has a minimum length of relationship of two (2) years, *and* has a minimum of two (2) relevant projects for each subcontractor, *and* has submitted a plan on how future relationships with subcontractors will be established and maintained as described in Addendum to RFO 52.212-1, Instructions to Offerors – Commercial Products and Commercial Services, Section 11.5, Subfactor A – Subcontractor Relationships.

Table 3.1 Technical A / U Rating Method	
Rating	**Description**
Acceptable	Subcontractor Relationships meet the requirements of the solicitation.
Unacceptable	Subcontractor Relationships do not meet the requirements of the solicitation

3.2 **Subfactor B – Key Personnel Qualifications**

3.2.1 An acceptable rating is given when the Offeror has provided position description qualifications for each key personnel, Project Manager, Superintendent, Quality Control Manager, Historic Preservation Architect, and Qualified Fire Protection Engineer, *and* has provided a written statement as described in Addendum to RFO 52.212-1, Instructions to Offerors – Commercial Products and Commercial Services, Section 11.5.3, Subfactor B – Key Personnel Qualifications.

Table 3.2 Technical A/U Rating Method	
Rating	**Description**
Acceptable	Key Personnel Qualifications meet the requirements of the solicitation.
Unacceptable	Key Personnel Qualifications do not meet the requirements of the solicitation.

3.3 Offerors must receive an Acceptable rating for both subfactors above to be considered for further evaluation.

4 **FACTOR 2 – PAST PERFORMANCE**

4.1 **Recent and Relevant Projects**

4.1.1 The Government will evaluate the Offeror's recent, relevant, and quality of past performance to determine the extent to which it demonstrates the ability to successfully perform the Summary of

Work (SoW) and specifications.

4.1.2 The Offeror must provide recent and relevant projects similar in magnitude, scope, and complexity as described in Addendum to RFO 52.212-1, Instructions to Offerors – Commercial Products and Commercial Services, Section 12.6, Past Performance Evaluation Factors. Past performance that is not recent or relevant will not be considered.

4.1.3 **Past Performance Relevancy Rating System**

Table 4.1 Past Performance (PP) Relevancy Rating Method	
Rating	**Description**
Very Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Relevant	Present/past performance effort 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.

4.1.4 *Quality of Performance.* This factor is assessed as the third aspect of the past performance evaluation to establish the overall quality of the offeror's past performance. The past performance evaluation conducted in support of a current source selection does not establish, create, or change the existing record and history of the offeror's past performance on past contracts; rather, the past performance evaluation process gathers information from customers on how well the offeror performed those past contracts. Information collected determines the quality of the offeror's performance, general trends, and usefulness of the information and incorporates these into the performance confidence assessment.

4.1.5 In conducting the Past Performance evaluation, the Government reserves the right to use both the information provided in the Offeror's Past Performance Proposal Volume and information obtained from all sources, including sources outside the Government. Other sources may include, but are not limited to, the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) and/or similar systems, Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) using all CAGE/DUNS numbers of contractors who are part of the partnership or joint venture identified in the Offerors proposal, inquiries of owner representative(s), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity (FAPIIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System and any other known sources not provided by the Offeror. The evaluation must consider the source of the information, context of the data, and general trends in the contractor's performance, including how problems identified were corrected.

4.1.6 The Government will not apportion past performance differently among parent companies that teamed or formed a joint entity for the purposes of said contract. Rather, all parent companies under a contract will be equally credited (positively and negatively) for past performance for that contract.

4.1.7 In the case of an Offeror without a meaningful record of recent and relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror will receive a Neutral Confidence score for this factor.

4.2 All information above will be used to provide an overall confidence assessment for each Offerors past performance evaluation. Ratings will be assigned as described below in Table M3.2, Past Performance

Confidence Assessment Rating Method.

4.2.1 **Past Performance Confidence Assessment Rating System**

Table 4.2 Past Performance (PP) Confidence Assessment Rating Method	
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 PP.
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 successfully perform the required effort.

4.3 Offerors must receive a Substantial or Satisfactory Confidence rating to be considered for further evaluation.

5 <u>FACTOR 3 – PRICE</u>

5.1 Price is evaluated to ensure fair and reasonable pricing but is not assigned a rating.

5.2 *Please reference R-DFARS Provision 252.205-7008, Only One Offer, for evaluation requirements if only one offer is received for this solicitation.*

6 <u>SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES</u>

6.1 **BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD**

Best Value will be determined based upon a Performance Price Tradeoff Source Selection Procedure. Tradeoffs will be made only between past performance and price among those Offerors who have been determined to be technically acceptable for Volume I – Technical. Past performance will be considered significantly more important than price, which may result in an award to a higher rated, higher priced Offeror. Where the Source Selection Authority (SSA) reasonably determines the superior past performance of a technically acceptable higher priced Offeror outweighs the price difference. Contract will be awarded to the one (1) Offeror deemed responsible in accordance with RFO Part 9 and whose proposal conforms to the solicitation requirements and is determined, based on the evaluation factors, to represent the best value to the Government.

6.1.1 While the Government Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) and the SSA will strive for maximum objectivity, the source selection process by its nature is subjective and, therefore, professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire process. The Government reserves the right to award without negotiations; therefore, each initial offer should contain the Offeror's best terms from a price and technical standpoint.

6.1.2 The Government intends to award one (1) contract to a Certified 8(a) small business or Certified 8(a) joint venture/team.

6.2 **NEGOTIATIONS**

6.2.1 The Government intends to award without negotiations but reserves the right to conduct negotiations if determined necessary.

62.2 *If, during the evaluation period,* it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government to hold clarifications or negotiations, Offeror responses to Evaluation Notices (ENs) and the Final Proposal Revision (FPR) will be considered in making the source selection decision. If the proposal has already been evaluated when clarifications end, any subsequent changes or exceptions in the Final Proposal Revision will undergo additional evaluation. If necessary, negotiations will be conducted in accordance with RFO Part 15.204, Competitive award with negotiation.

6.3 **SOLICITATION REQUIREMENTS, TERMS AND CONDITIONS**

6.3.1 Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, including terms and conditions, representations and certifications and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as evaluation factors. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the solicitation may result in the Offeror being ineligible for award. Offerors must clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and must provide complete supporting rationale. The Government reserves the right to determine any such exceptions unacceptable.

6.3.2 The proposal shall present a complete, coherent presentation of team abilities as applicable.

7 **PERFORMANCE PRICE TRADEOFF WITH TECHNICAL EVALUATION PROCESS**

7.1 **ORDER OF IMPORTANCE.** Award will be made to the Offeror proposing the combination most advantageous to the Government based upon an integrated assessment of the evaluation factors described in this addendum Sections 3 through 5. In this Performance Price Tradeoff process, technical acceptability is a prerequisite to the trade-off between past performance and price. For all technically acceptable proposals, Past Performance will be evaluated on a basis significantly more important than Price.

7.2 **EVALUATION/TRADEOFF METHODOLOGY.** The Government must evaluate offers to identify the best value to the Government for award according to specific steps as follows:

7.2.1 **Step 1: Completeness**. The Government will review all proposals for completeness to ensure each is consistent with the terms and conditions of the solicitation and proposal preparations. The Contracting Officer may conduct clarifications to address the completeness of deliverables. The Government reserves the right to eliminate proposals that are determined to be incomplete or not conforming to the solicitation without conducting clarifications.

7.2.2 **Step 2: Evaluate Technical Acceptability**. Proposals that are determined complete and meet the requirements of the Terms & Conditions of the solicitation will then be evaluated for technical acceptability of Volume I - Technical. In the absence of negotiations, if a proposal is deemed technically unacceptable, it will be eliminated from competition and past performance will not be evaluated.

7.2.3 **Step 3: Evaluate Past Performance**. For proposals found technically acceptable in Step 2, the respective Past Performance Information will be evaluated and assigned an overall "Confidence Assessment" rating. Only Offerors rated Substantial or Satisfactory on the Confidence Assessment will then be evaluated for price.

7.2.4 **Step 4: Evaluate Price.** Proposals found technically acceptable and have received a Substantial or Satisfactory Past Performance Confidence Rating will then be reviewed for unbalanced and fair and reasonable pricing IAW RFO 15.404-1, Price Analysis, and RFO 15.404-6, Unbalanced Pricing. The Total Evaluated Price (TEP) is the aggregate dollar amount for the total proposed price. If the proposed price is deemed fair and reasonable the proposal will be deemed eligible for selection. Proposals not determined fair and reasonable will not be eligible for selection. In the absence of competition, the Government reserves the right to request certified cost and pricing data.

7.2.5 **Step 5: Source Selection Team Decision.** At this point, the Offerors will be evaluated by the Source Selection Team, which will make a comprehensive determination if it is in the best interest of the Government to consider a performance-price tradeoff. The Government reserves the right to trade up for an Offeror with a higher TEP that has been assigned a higher Integrated Performance Confidence Assessment Rating. The Source Selection Authority will conduct an independent, integrated, comparative assessment to determine which technically acceptable offer provides the best past performance to represent the best value to the Government.

7.2.6 **Step 6: Source Selection Authority's Decision.** The SSA will make a single award to the Offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government.