Section M - Evaluation Factors for Award

SECTION M

PARAGRAPH NO.	TITLE
M.1	SELECTION FACTORS/BEST VALUE SECTION
M.2	COMPETITIVE RANGE
M.3	ENFORCEABILITY OF PROPOSALS

M.1. SELECTION FACTORS/BEST VALUE SELECTION

A. Selection Factors/Best Value Selection

1. Best value selection shall be made to the responsible Offeror whose proposal, conforming to the solicitation, represents the best value and is the most advantageous to the Government, cost and non-cost (technical) factors considered. The Government shall select the best value offer whose proposed approach provides a high degree of confidence that the contractor is capable of meeting or exceeding the performance objectives and standards at a realistic and reasonable cost to the Government. Award may be made to other than the lowest priced proposal or other than the highest technically rated proposal. Business judgments and tradeoffs may be used to determine the proposal offering the "best value." Business judgments and tradeoffs shall be documented; however, the documentation need not quantify the tradeoffs that led to the best value decision. Proposals that are unrealistic in terms of technical or schedule commitments may be considered lacking in technical competence or comprehension of the complexity and risks of the contract requirements.

2. The Government reserves the right to eliminate from consideration for award any or all proposals at any time prior to award of the contract; to negotiate with Offerors in the competitive range; and to award the contract to the Offeror submitting the proposal determined to represent the best value—the proposal most advantageous to the Government, cost and other factors considered.

3. The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with Offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer later determines them to be necessary. In addition, if the Government determines that the number of proposals that would otherwise be in the competitive range exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted, the Government may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly rated proposals.

4. The tradeoff process is selected as appropriate for this acquisition. The Government considers it to be in its best interest to allow consideration of award to other than the lowest priced proposal or other than the highest technically rated proposal.

B. Relative Importance of Non-Cost (Technical)/Price Evaluation Factors

1. All non-cost (technical) factors (Factors B, C, D, E and F) when combined are of equal importance to the past performance confidence assessment (Factor A); and all non-cost (technical) factors and the performance confidence assessment (past performance) rating, when combined are significantly more important than cost.

C. Cost Evaluation Factors

1. Cost proposals will not be assigned an adjectival rating but shall be evaluated for completeness, cost reasonableness, and cost realism. Proposal's cost for evaluation purposes shall be Mobilization/Demobilization/Base/Service Extension and all Option Periods. The following will be evaluated:

a. Completeness: All information/data required by the RFP has been submitted, tracks to the PWS requirements and supports the proposal.

b. Cost Reasonableness: Costs are fully justified and supported and are considered fair under current market conditions and reasonable to the government. Reasonableness may also be determined by comparison with the Government Estimate, and/or other proposals received.

c. Cost Realism: Cost Realism will be evaluated based on the cost information provided in support of the proposed costs to determine whether the estimated proposed cost elements are realistic for the work to be performed; reflect a clear understanding of the requirements; are consistent with the various elements of the Offerors Non-Cost (Technical) proposal; and are neither excessive nor insufficient for the effort to be accomplished.

2. Equipment. Because the Government will not take title to contractor furnished equipment, the accounting/billing method shall be through depreciation or a use rate of contractor provided equipment.

3. Unrealistically low (or high) proposed costs or costs unbalanced between the various option years, initially or subsequently, may be grounds for eliminating a proposal from competition either on the basis that the Offeror does not understand the requirement, or has made an unrealistic proposal.

4. The cost proposal volume will also be evaluated to ensure the completion of the representations and certifications in Section K of the RFP and the inclusion and submission of other information required.

5. The Offeror will be evaluated to determine which Contractor Business Systems are sufficiently adequate and compliant with government regulations and standards. Contractor Business Systems are approved by cognizant contract administration offices such as the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) or the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA). The Offeror's demonstrated ability to maintain government approved systems in the following areas will be evaluated: accounting, estimating, purchasing, government property, Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) disclosure statements, and its demonstrated ability to maintain CAS compliant status.

6. The Offeror will be evaluated to ensure that they have the financial capability to perform the contract given the magnitude of the proposed work.

7. The proposed indirect rate ceilings will be reviewed for reasonableness and the degree to which it accomplishes the Government's desire to control costs.

8. The Government will not accept any assumptions in the Offeror's cost proposal.

D. Non-Cost (Technical) Evaluation Factors:

Factor A, Past Performance

The Government will evaluate how well the Offeror performed on recent relevant projects submitted under Factor A, Past Performance, and on other recent relevant contracts. The Government will evaluate the relevancy and overall quality of the Offeror's past performance and how well the Offeror performed on the recent relevant projects. The past performance evaluation 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 other sources on how well the Offeror performed on those contracts.

The Government will evaluate the degree to which past performance evaluations and all other past performance information reviewed by the Government (e.g. CPARS or PPQ (Attachment JL-3), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), and information obtained from any other source) reflect a general trend of satisfactory performance in areas that will assist the Government in determining whether an Offeror will successfully perform the required effort such as:

- Technical/Quality of Product or Service
- Schedule/Timeliness of Performance or Delivery
- Cost Control and Management
- Management and/or Business Relations
- Small Business Subcontracting
- Regulations Compliance
- Safety and Security

In the case of an Offeror without a record of recent relevant past performance or for whom information on past contract performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv). In this case, the Offeror's past performance is unknown and

will be assigned a confidence rating of "Neutral." However, an Offeror with favorable recent relevant past performance may be considered more favorably than an Offeror with no past performance information.

Notes for Factors A and B:

(1) The distinction between "corporate experience" and "past performance" is corporate experience pertains to the types of work and volume of work completed by a contractor that are comparable to the types of work covered by this requirement, in terms of size, scope, and complexity. Past performance relates to how well a contractor has performed.

(2) Definition of "recent relevant project" is as follows:

In order to be considered recent, a project must have involved work performed within the five (5) years from the issuance date of the solicitation.

In general, relevant means sufficiently similar to the current acquisition to provide indicators of expected performance. For example, relevancy may be established by: similar product or service type, product or service complexity, contract type, contract dollar value, contract location, and the extent to which the entity performing the work is the same as the entity that will do the work under this solicitation.

For multi-function projects to be considered somewhat relevant, each project shall demonstrate past performance in a minimum of two of the following Annexes:

Annex 6	*Port Operations*
Annex 15	*Facilities Support (1501000 Facilities Management or 1502000 Facilities Investment)*
Annex 16	*Utilities (1601000 Utilities Management or 1602000 Electrical or 1604000 Wastewater or 1605000 Steam or 1606000 Water)*
Annex 17	*Base Support Vehicles & Equipment*

(3) Evaluation preference will be given for demonstration of favorable past performance and experience on cost-type multi-function support service contracts (similar product or service type).

(4) Projects must be stand-alone contracts or task orders, performed within the past five (5) years from issuance date of the solicitation, which demonstrate its ability to perform the proposed effort. The submission of information on a basic IDIQ contract will not be considered. The offeror must demonstrate in its proposal how a project is relevant to this acquisition.

(5) The term "offeror" typically refers to a single corporation submitting a proposal either as a prime contractor or a joint venture composed of multiple organizations submitting a proposal as joint-venture partners. "Offeror" may refer to other legal entities such as joint ventures (JV), Limited Partnerships (LTD), and Limited Liability Companies (LLC). In its evaluation of past performance and experience, the Government's evaluation will generally focus on the entities submitting the proposal (single-corporation, individual joint venture partners, the LTD or the LLC).

(6) A subcontractor's past performance will not be given the same weight as either a prime contractor or a joint venture partner because there is no direct legal relationship between the Government and the subcontractor. The Government will consider the past performance of a subcontractor where the prime contractor provides, in its proposal, evidence of a binding teaming agreement or other contractual agreement, which creates legal responsibility on the part of the subcontractor. The teaming agreement or other contractual agreements shall, at a minimum (1) be signed by the offeror and subcontractor, (2) specifically reference this solicitation/contract, and (3) specify the work to be performed by the subcontractor such that it is clear that the subcontractor will be meaningfully involved in this contract in a role that is consistent with the subcontractor's role in the project submitted. However, the level of consideration will depend on the extent to which the proposal demonstrates the subcontractor's commitment to the project and legal accountability.

(7) If an Offeror is utilizing past performance or corporate experience information of LLC/LTD member companies (name not exactly as stated on the SF33), the proposal shall clearly demonstrate that the LLC/LTD member companies will have meaningful involvement in the performance of the contract in order for the past performance or corporate experience information of the LLC/LTD member companies to be considered. The proposal shall state the specific resources (e.g., workforce, management, facilities, or other resources) that the LLC/LTD member companies will commit towards the performance of this contract. Prime contractor-subcontractor teams/Joint Ventures/LLCs/LTDs with a demonstrated history of working successfully together on prior projects may be considered more favorably than those without such history.

Factor B, Corporate Experience

The proposal must completely address all submission requirements in Section L, Factor B. Offerors will be evaluated on recent relevant experience performed by the Offeror to determine indicators of expected performance. The Government will take into consideration the complexity and quantity of experiences.

Evaluation of corporate experience as listed in Attachment JL-9, will consider: (1) depth (extent of experience in each Annex/Sub-Annex); (2) breadth (expertise across all Annexes/Sub-Annexes); and (3) multi-function management (experience managing/coordinating work across multiple Annexes/Sub-Annexes). The Offeror shall be evaluated on its experience in planning and executing the required services.

Offerors possessing experience in cost-type, multi-function support service contracts may be considered more favorably. Offerors that demonstrate depth and breadth of experience and multi-functional management experience in a greater number of Annexes/Sub-Annexes from the list below will likely be considered more favorably. Lack of experience in one or more Annexes/Sub-Annexes from the list below will likely result in a lower rating for this factor.

Annex 6 Port Operations
Annex 15 Facility Support
1501000 Facility Management
1502000 Facility Investment
Annex 16 Utilities
1601000 Utilities Management
1602000 Electrical
1604000 Wastewater
1605000 Steam
1606000 Water
Annex 17 Base Support Vehicles & Equipment

Factor C, Management

The proposal shall completely address all submission requirements in Section L, Factor C and meet the minimum requirements specified in the Performance Work Statement. The Government will evaluate the degree to which the proposal demonstrates an effective and resource-efficient management plan using Attachment JL-4. The management plan shall demonstrate a clear understanding of the requirements of the entire project. The Government will evaluate the effectiveness of the approach, considering general management and administrative structure, to determine the likelihood that the work will be performed in accordance with the requirements of the Performance Work Statement. The Government will evaluate the effectiveness of the approach to workforce management, quality management, scheduling, and mobilization/demobilization.

Key personnel will be evaluated in accordance with the minimum requirements specified in the Performance Work Statement. Proposals will not be assigned strengths for key personnel who exceed minimum education requirements because it is not considered advantageous to the Government.

Factor D, Technical Approach

The proposal shall completely address all submission requirements in Section L, Factor D and meet the minimum requirements specified in the Performance Work Statement. The Government will evaluate Factor D considering the degree to which the Offeror's technical approach demonstrates a clear understanding of the Performance Work Statement requirements including realistic labor quantities (direct and indirect), necessary skills needed to successfully perform, equipment, and materials in relation to the work required for each Annex/Sub-Annex, and Spec. Item. The technical approach will be evaluated to assess whether there is a clear understanding of the requirements consistent with the other portions of the proposal (e.g. Attachments JB-2 and JL-4), and shall be supported by a reasonable Basis of Estimate (BOE). Offerors who fail to provide a completed hard copy and MS EXCEL (Microsoft Office Version 2016 compatible) of the Attachment JL-4 for the total effort to include the prime contractor and all subcontractors for the base period will be considered unacceptable.

Demonstrates an adequate resource efficient approach/methodology to effectively achieve performance objectives and standards for each Annex/Sub-Annex, and Spec. Item that utilizes the best industry practices and procedures for each major task. The approach demonstrates an adequate understanding of supply chain management necessary to ensure materials, supplies, and equipment availability meet contractual delivery timelines. The approach demonstrates an adequate understanding of statutes, regulations, policies, procedures, and processes utilized in accomplishing the complexity and magnitude of requirements set forth in the Performance Work Statement.

Demonstrates a clear understanding of the potential risks to be encountered during contract performance and an adequate approach/contingency plan to effectively mitigate risks across all Annexes/Sub-Annexes.

Factor E, Safety

The evaluation will collectively consider the following:

- Experience Modification Rate (EMR)
- OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) and Total Recordable Case (TRC) Rates
- Offeror Technical Approach to Safety
- Other sources of information available to the Government

Experience Modification Rate (EMR): For the three previous complete calendar years the Offeror will submit EMR. If no EMR exists, the Offeror may submit an insurance company-provided equivalent rate explaining why not. If an insurance company-provided equivalent rate is provided, it will be treated the same as an EMR. Any extenuating circumstances that affected the EMR and negative trends should be addressed as part of this selection factor. The board will evaluate the EMR to determine if the Offeror has demonstrated a history of safe work practices taking into account any negative trends and extenuating circumstances that impact the rating.

OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) and Total Recordable Case (TRC) Rates: For the three previous complete calendar years, the Offeror will submit their OSHA DART and TRC, as defined by the U.S. Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration. If unable to submit OSHA DART and TRC rates, affirmatively state so, and an explanation must be provided. Any extenuating circumstances that affected the OSHA DART and TRC rate data and negative trends should be addressed as part of this element. The board will evaluate the OSHA DART and TRC rates to determine if the Offeror has demonstrated a history of safe work practices taking into account any upward trends and extenuating circumstances that impact rates.

Technical Approach to Safety: The Offeror will describe their plan to evaluate their safety performance and that of potential subcontractors. Also, describe any innovative methods that the Offeror will employ to ensure and monitor safe work practices at all subcontractor levels. The Safety Narrative shall be limited to two pages. The board will evaluate the narrative to determine the degree to which subcontractor safety performance will be considered in the selection of all levels of subcontractors on the upcoming project. The board will evaluate the narrative to determine the degree to which innovations are being proposed that may enhance safety on this procurement and validate the contractor has addressed methodology to be used in the execution of an effective program that facilitates sound

mishap prevention techniques/processes, employee reporting of unsafe conditions, unsafe activities, and near-miss mishaps. Those Offerors whose plan demonstrates a commitment to hire subcontractors with a culture of safety and who propose innovative methods to enhance a safe working environment may be given greater weight in the evaluation.

Other Sources of Information Available to the Government: Other sources for safety may include but are not limited to OSHA data, NAVFAC's Contractor Incident Reporting System (CIRS) in Enterprise Safety Applications Management System (ESAMS), Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) and other related databases.

Factor F Small Business Utilization

Offerors will be evaluated on the extent to which their proposals and other performance information available to the Government demonstrate a history of successfully supporting Government policies concerning utilization of small business concerns as subcontractors including, when applicable, achievements against established small business subcontracting plan goals. Offerors will also be evaluated on the levels of small business participation proposed and the degree of commitment to use named sources. The anticipated benefits of proposed initiatives and tools to enhance small business participation and capabilities will be considered. The Government will assess proposal realism and the likelihood of success in achieving the small business objectives of this acquisition.

Forms to be used for offeror submission of Small Business Utilization Factor information are:

Attachment JL-5 – Small Business Subcontracting Record
Attachment JL-6 – Small Business Participation and Commitment Strategy

E. Adjectival Ratings/Descriptions:

1. The following are the non-cost (technical)/price ratings to be used in the evaluation of the proposals for all factors except Factor F, Small Business Utilization and Factor A, Past Performance.

Table 1. Combined Technical/Risk Rating Method

Adjectival Rating	**Description**
Outstanding (**O**)	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Good (**G**)	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low to moderate.
Acceptable (**A**)	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Marginal (**M**)	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Unacceptable (**U**)	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation, and thus, contains one or more deficiencies, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is unacceptable. Proposal is unawardable.

2. The following are the Small Business ratings to be used in the evaluations for Factor F, Small Business Utilization:

Table 2. Small Business Rating Method	
Adjectival Rating	Description
Outstanding (**O**)	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the small business objectives.
Good (**G**)	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the small business objectives.
Acceptable (**A**)	Proposal indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the small business objectives.
Marginal (**M**)	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the small business objectives.
Unacceptable (**U**)	Proposal does not meet small business objectives.

3. The following are the past performance relevancy ratings and confidence assessments to be used in the evaluations for Factor A, Past Performance:

Table 3. Past Performance Relevancy Rating Method	
Adjectival 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 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.

Table 4. Performance Confidence Assessments	
Adjectival 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.

4. Rating Scheme. The following information is pertinent to the rating of the non-cost or technical proposals:

a. Strength: An aspect of an Offeror's proposal that has merit or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Government during contract performance.

b. Weakness: A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

c. Significant Weakness: A flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

d. Deficiency: A material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.

M.2 COMPETITIVE RANGE

The Government intends to evaluate all proposals received and to award a contract without discussions. Therefore, the Offeror's initial proposal shall contain the Offeror's best terms from a cost and non-cost standpoint. Discussions will be held with those Offerors within a competitive range if discussions are deemed necessary to maximize the Government's ability to obtain the best value. The Government may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly rated proposals.

M.3 ENFORCEABILITY OF PROPOSAL

The proposal must set forth full, accurate and complete information as required by this solicitation. The Government will rely on such information in the award of a contract. By submission of the proposal, the Offeror agrees that all items proposed (e.g., subcontractors, approach, key personnel, etc.) will be utilized for the duration of the contract and any substitutions shall require prior Contracting Officer's approval.

CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

52.217-5	Evaluation Of Options	JUL 1990