Section M: Evaluation Factors

Comparative Evaluation

Per RFO PART 12.201-1 (d) evaluation will be conducted by comparative evaluation to select the contractor that is best suited and provides the best value considering the evaluation factors in this solicitation. This solicitation is not stating nor required to state the relative importance assigned to each evaluation factor and/or sub factor.

Technical: Technical is the factual documentation of the firm's ability to meet the specifications.

Factor 1: Technical Factors

To be rated as Technically Acceptable, the offeror's proposal must meet or exceed the following minimum standards across all subfactors:

Subfactor	Standard for Acceptability
Subfactor 1.1:NSA CSfC Status	The offeror (or their designated subcontractor) must provide verifiable proof of active status on the NSA's CSfC Approved Trusted Integrator list. *Failure to provide this proof at the time of proposal submission will result in an immediate rating of Unacceptable*.
Subfactor 1.2:Security Clearances	The offeror must explicitly certify that all personnel assigned to the project hold the required active clearances at the time of award: • Secret: Required for all general on-site personnel.• Top Secret (TS): Required for all personnel executing configuration tasks.*The government will not sponsor clearances for this effort*.
Subfactor 1.3:Technical Approach	The proposal must demonstrate a feasible, compliant, and detailed methodology to execute all tasks in the PWS: • CLIN 0001 (Study & Design): A viable plan for AP-on-a-stick surveys and HLD/LLD creation.• CLIN 0002 (Procurement & Install): A plan for deploying CAT6A shielded plenum cabling, installing equipment, and configuring 802.1x NAC/WIDS.• CLIN 0003 (Testing & Validation): A plan verifying RF coverage and full compliance with STIGs and CSfC standards.

Subfactor 1.4:Project Schedule	The offeror must submit a detailed milestone schedule showing full project completion, including final documentation delivery (CLIN 0004), within 120 calendar days or less from the date of contract award. The schedule must account for logical government review windows (e.g., 5 business days for deliverables).

Factor 2: Past Performance

Past Performance is the factual documentation or narrative of a firm's experience, qualifications, and capability, along with providing three examples of their firm's most recent projects within the past five years of similar size scope and location to this project.

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. *Requires at least two (2) reference projects completed within the last three (3) years of similar size, scope (enterprise wireless), and complexity (CSfC/DoD environments) with satisfactory or better performance.*
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. *Note: In the case of an offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the offeror will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance and will receive a rating of "Neutral," which is treated as "Acceptable" for LPTA purposes.*

Factor 3: Price

Price will not be rated technically, but will be evaluated for completeness, balance, and reasonableness.

- Award Criteria: Among those proposals determined to be "Technically Acceptable" under Factors 1 and 2, the contract will be awarded to the offeror with the lowest total proposed Price (including the FFP for CLIN 0001 and the NTE FFP for CLINs 0002 and 0003).
- Completeness: The government will verify that the offeror has priced all CLINs, included all travel costs within those CLINs, and provided a detailed Bill of Materials (BOM) for CLIN 0002.
- Reasonableness: Proposed pricing must be realistic, fair, and reasonable for the scope of work described in the PWS. Extremely low pricing that indicates a lack of technical understanding may be deemed a performance risk.