Attachment 5 – RFO 52.212-2 Addendum

Evaluation—Commercial Products and Commercial Services February 1, 2026)

ADDENDUM TO RFO PROVISION 52.212-2: Paragraph (a) is tailored as follows:

Evaluation:

IAW RFO 52.212-2, Evaluation—Commercial Products and Commercial Services, the Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible Quoters whose offer conforming to the solicitation will be most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered. The following factors will be used to evaluate offers:

1. Price

2. Technical

3. Past Performance

BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD: This is a competitive, best value continuum using the Lowest Price Technically Acceptable (LPTA) source selection process. RFO Part 15 will not be used for this requirement. Technical elements will be evaluated as acceptable or unacceptable for each solicitation response. Past performance will also be evaluated as acceptable or unacceptable for each solicitation response. Qualifications will be clear, and objectives will be outlined in the RFQ. The evaluation process shall proceed as indicated below:

Evaluation Approach:

Step 1: All contractors will be evaluated for responsiveness. Responsiveness is determined by verifying compliance with RFO 52.212-1 and its addendum.

Step 2 All responsive quoters will be ordered, by price, from the lowest to the highest Total Evaluated Price (TEP). A quoter's TEP is depicted in the Pricing Schedule Worksheet, on the Price Schedule Tab.

Step 3: The technical proposal of the lowest-priced responsive quote will be evaluated. If the proposal is rated "Acceptable," the evaluation proceeds to Step 4. If it is rated "Unacceptable," the quote will be removed from consideration, and the Government will proceed to evaluate the next lowest-priced quote.

Step 4: The solicitation responses determined to be technically acceptable will then be evaluated for past performance until two (2) technically acceptable solicitation responses have been determined to have acceptable past performance. Steps three (3) and four (4) will continue until two (2) solicitation responses have been determined acceptable in both technical and past performance, or until all solicitation responses have been evaluated.

Step 5: The Government will make a determination that the price is fair and reasonable.

Evaluation Factors for Award:

Price Foreword: The government will evaluate Quote for award purposes based on their TEP. The government may determine that a response to solicitation is unacceptable if the option prices are significantly unbalanced. Evaluation of options shall not obligate the government to exercise the option(s).

Volume I Price:

a.) Initially, solicitation responses shall be ordered from lowest to highest TEP, as previously defined.

b.) For evaluation purposes, RFO 52.217-5, Evaluation of Options, will be applied. To evaluate the impact of clause RFO 52.217-8, Option to Extend Services, the pricing proposed for the final option period will be divided by two (2) to calculate a six (6) month extension price. The TEP is comprised of the total contract value (base and all options) plus this 6-month option amount.

c.) The TEP will be evaluated to determine whether it is reasonable. A reasonable price/cost represents a price/cost that provides best value to the government, considering market prices, the technical and functional capabilities of the quoter, and risk. Additionally, the government reserves the right to, but is not required to, conduct a price realism analysis on quotes that appear to be exceptionally low and not supported by the quoter's technical approach. In instances where a quoter's proposed price(s) appears exceptionally low, quoters may be requested to address this disparity by providing evidence of their capability and/or performance at similar price(s). The burden of proof as to price credibility rests with the quoter. An exceptionally or unrealistically low quote that is left unexplained may pose an unacceptable risk to the government and may be a reason to reject a quote.

d.) The government anticipates adequate price competition and intends to award a contract without exchanges with respective contractors. The Government, however, reserves the right to conduct exchanges if deemed in its best interest.

Volume II Technical:

a.) The technical volume will be evaluated as either acceptable or unacceptable for each subfactor.

i. Acceptable is defined as: "Required documents clearly meet the minimum requirements of the solicitation".

ii. Unacceptable is defined as: "Required documents do not clearly meet the minimum requirements of the solicitation".

b.) The technical is comprised of four (4) subfactors, as listed below. An overall technical rating will be assigned; failure to be assigned an acceptable in any technical subfactor will render the entire factor unacceptable and, therefore, ineligible for award. Only those responses determined to be technically acceptable, either initially or because of exchanges, will be considered for award. However, the contractor is reminded that the government reserves the right to award this effort based on the initial solicitation response, as received, without exchanges, and may conduct exchanges with all, some, or none of the contractors.

Evaluation Criteria:

Subfactor 1 (Technical Approach): The standard is met when the quote provides effective and sufficient details summarizing the quoter's technical approach in ensuring performance per the PWS and solicitation requirements.

Subfactor 2 (Staffing & Transition): The standard is met when the quote provides a clear and effective summary of how assessments and analyses are conducted, the decision-making process, an unambiguous number of required personnel, the quoter's gap analysis, and a transition plan that effectively minimizes interruptions or delays.

Subfactor 3 (Quality Control): The standard is met when the quote details effective and logical processes for Quality Control to identify and prevent deficiencies during contract performance, including functional procedures for identifying unfavorable trends and implementing corrective actions.

Subfactor 4 (Mission Essential Plan): The standard is met when the quote sufficiently and clearly demonstrates the quoter's ability to perform essential Contractor services IAW R-DFARS 252.237-7024.

Volume III Past Performance:

Recent and relevant past performance is defined as past performance occurring within the last five (5) years preceding the date of solicitation issuance. Relevant past performance is defined as past performance providing candidates for services similar in scope to this requirement and complexity. The Government will consider relevancy, recency, extent of the past performance and the size and complexity of the past performance relative to this solicitation's requirement submitted by Quoter, as well as any information gathered by the Contracting Officer. Quoters that have no relevant past performance history will be assigned a neutral past performance evaluation rating; unknown will be rated as acceptable.

a.) An assessment of the past performance information will be made to determine if it is recent. Recent contracts are contracts which have been performed for at least six (6) months and within the last five (5) years from the date of the issuance of this solicitation.

Contract performance that does not meet these criteria will not be considered or evaluated.

b.) Relevant performance includes performance efforts involving Kitchen Hoods and Ducts Cleaning System that involved similar scope (to include a broad range: Kitchen Hoods and Ducts Cleaning System), magnitude of effort, contract type (Firm-fixed price), this solicitation requires, as identified in the table of Relevancy Definitions below:

Relevancy Definition:

Relevant: Present/past performance effort involved similar scope, magnitude of effort and contract type this solicitation requires.

Not Relevant: Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope, magnitude of effort and contract type this solicitation requires

Past Performance Rating Table:

Rating	Definition
Acceptable	Based on the Quoters performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the Quoters will successfully perform the required effort, or the Quoters performance record is unknown.
Unacceptable	Based on the Quoters performance record, the Government has no reasonable expectation that the Quoters will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

In the case of a contractor without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available or so sparse that no meaningful past performance rating can be reasonably assigned, the contractor may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance. Therefore, the Quoters shall be determined to have unknown past performance. Unknown or neutral past performance, in the context of acceptability/ unacceptability, a neutral rating shall be considered acceptable.

(End of provision)