SECTION M

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

1. GENERAL

1.1 – Basis for Contract Award

This is a Lowest Price Technically Acceptable (LPTA) source selection conducted in accordance with Revolutionary FAR Overhaul (RFO) Part 15.103-2.

Award will be made to the lowest priced offeror whose quote conforms to the solicitation requirements and who is found to be Technically Acceptable. The Government will organize the quotes in order of Total Evaluated Price (TEP). The Government will evaluate quotes in ascending order of price until a technically acceptable quote is found. The lowest priced quote will be reviewed for technical acceptability. If that quote is awardable, no other quotes will be evaluated. If the lowest priced quote isn't awardable, the next lowest quote shall be evaluated. This process will be repeated until a technically acceptable quote is determined.

1.2 – Number of Contracts to be awarded

The Government intends to award one P-type contract for the Local Telecommunications Services II (LTS II)

1.3 – Correction Potential of Quotes

The Government will consider, throughout the evaluation, the "correction potential" of any deficiency. The judgment of such "correction potential" is within the sole discretion of the Government. If an aspect of an offeror's quote does not meet the Government's requirements and is not considered correctable, the offeror may be eliminated from the competitive range.

1.4 – Discussions

The Government reserves the right and fully intends to award this contract without discussions based on the initial quote received. If, during the evaluation period, it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government to hold discussions, a competitive range will be established in accordance with RFO 15.204-1.

In the event, Offeror responses to discussion Evaluation Notices (ENs) and the Final Revision will be considered in making the source selection decision. If the offeror's quote has been evaluated as Acceptable at the time discussions are closed, any changes or exceptions in the quote are subject to evaluation and may introduce risk that the offeror's quote be determined Unacceptable, and thus, ineligible for award.

The Government may reject any quote from this competition prior to evaluating the quote against the Evaluation Factors if an initial assessment of the quote shows the quote to be grossly deficient. A grossly deficient quote is a quote that fails to address essential

requirements of the RFQ or fails to furnish information demonstrating compliance with mandatory requirements set forth in the RFQ and does not represent a reasonable initial effort by the Offeror to address the requirements of the RFQ.

1.5 – Solicitation Requirements, Terms, and Conditions

Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as factors or subfactors. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the solicitation may result in an 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 and the quote, therefore, ineligible for award.

2. EVALUATION FACTORS

2.1 – Overview

The following evaluation factors and subfactors will be used to evaluate quotes as needed. The Government will evaluate Technical subfactors for acceptability.

Factor 1: Price

Factor 2: Relevant Performance History

Factor 3: Technical

Subfactor 1: Installation, Cutover, and Demarcation

Subfactor 2: Managed IP Voice Services and Features

Subfactor 3: Service Levels, Maintenance, and Reporting

Subfactor 4: Contract Management and Security

3. FACTOR 1: PRICE

3.1 – Price Overview

Price quotes will be evaluated for (1) completeness, (2) reasonableness, (3) unbalanced pricing, and (4) Total Evaluated Price (TEP). Offerors whose price is determined to be unreasonable will not be considered for award. Quotes that are determined to be incomplete may be ineligible for award. If the Contracting Officer (CO) determines that the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government, the offeror may not be eligible for award.

3.2 – Completeness

The Government will review the pricing submissions for completeness and compliance with Section L, Additional Instructions to Offerors of the solicitation and RFO 52.212-2, Evaluation Commercial Products and Commercial Services. If not complete and in compliance, the quote may make the Offeror's quote ineligible for award.

3.3 – Reasonableness

The offeror's Price quote will be evaluated, using one or more of the techniques defined by RFO 15.404 to determine if it is reasonable. For a price to be reasonable, it must represent a price to the Government that a prudent person would pay in the conduct of competitive business. Normally, price reasonableness is established through price analysis techniques as described in RFO 15.404. For additional information see RFO 31.201-3.

3.4 – Unbalanced Pricing

The Government will conduct an analysis for unbalanced pricing in accordance with RFO 15.404-6. Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable TEP, a proposed line item is significantly overstated or understated as indicated by the application of price analysis techniques. Unbalanced pricing may increase performance risk and could result in payment of unreasonably high prices. Offerors are cautioned that a quote may be rejected if unbalanced pricing exists and the Contracting Officer determines that the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government. The burden of proof for demonstrating balanced pricing rests with the Offeror.

3.5 – Total Evaluated Price (TEP)

The Offeror's Price Volume will be evaluated based upon the Pricing Matrix (Attachment 3). The TEP will be the summation of all total prices listed for the base period and each of the option periods.

4. FACTOR 2: RELEVENT PERFORMANCE HISTORY

4.1 – Overview: This evaluates whether the offeror has relevant performance history.

4.2 – Measure of Merit This is passed when the quote provides evidence demonstrating that they have completed the following four criteria within a single contract or no more than (3) prior contracts as highlighted in Section L 4A:

A. Provide evidence of no less than one (1), but no more than three (3) prior contracts, each with a total value greater than $50,000, completed within the past five years that demonstrates one (1) year of recent experience. This experience can be peformance of greater than one (1) year on a currently ongoing contract.~~Prior Contract greater than $50,000 in total value demonstrating one (1) year of recent experience, within the past five years of the RFQ release date, that~~ Evidence should represent~~s~~ the ability to provide all necessary transmission facilities, equipment, materials, maintenance, and engineering required to deliver a fully managed voice service as identified in the PWS and Appendix 10.

B. Demonstrated experience delivering service to two distinct physical sites on an installation to ensure redundancy and continuity of operations. These services must be routed through a vendor-managed private VPN and delivered via an Ethernet hand-off.

C. Demonstrated experience to provide and install all necessary equipment to convert the service to a T1/Primary Rate Interface (PRI) presentation at two distinct physical sites.

D. Demonstrated experience providing a solution that must include, but is not limited

to: Direct Inward Dialing, Direct Outward Dialing, Caller-ID Delivery of Name and Number, emergency 911/E911 services, Government Emergency Telecommunications Service (GETS) access, and national/international dialing capabilities.

This will be rated on a pass/fail basis per the table below. If the Evaluation is rated Acceptable, the quote will proceed for technical evaluation. **If the Evaluation is rated as Unacceptable, the quote will be eliminated from consideration for award, and no further evaluation will be conducted.**

5. FACTOR 3: TECHNICAL

5.1 – Technical Overview

The Government's technical evaluation team will evaluate the technical quotes on a pass/ fail basis, assigning one of the ratings described below for each subfactor. Quotes must meet the Measure of Merit within a given subfactor in order for the subfactor to be rated "Acceptable." Any subfactor evaluated as "Unacceptable" will render the entire quote unacceptable and, therefore, unawardable. Only those quotes determined to be technically acceptable, either initially or as a result of discussions, will be considered for award. However, the offeror is reminded that the Government intends to award this effort based on the initial quote, as received, without discussion.

5.2 – Technical Ratings Table

Rating	Description
Acceptable	Quote meets the requirements of the solicitation.
Unacceptable	Quote does not meet the requirements of the solicitation.

5.3 –Subfactor 1: Installation, Cutover, and Demarcation (PWS Paragraphs 2.1, 2.2, 2.3)

Description: This subfactor will evaluate the offeror's approach to managing the contract.

Measure of Merit: The measure of merit is met when the offeror's quote describes a sound approach to management of Installation, Cutover, and Demarcation in execution of the contract.

5.4 –Subfactor 2: Managed IP Voice Services and Features (PWS Paragraphs 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5)

Description: This subfactor will evaluate the offeror's proposed approach to Managed IP Voice Services and Features throughout the life of the contract.

Measure of Merit: The measure of merit is met when the offeror's quote describes a sound approach for Managed IP Voice Services and Features.

5.5 –Subfactor 3: Service Levels, Maintenance, and Reporting (PWS Paragraphs 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4)

Description: This subfactor will evaluate the offeror's proposed approach to Service Levels, Maintenance, and Reporting throughout the life of the contract.

Measure of Merit: The measure of merit is met when the offeror's quote describes a sound approach for Service Levels, Maintenance, and Reporting.

5.6 –Subfactor 4: Contract Management and Security (PWS Paragraphs 5.1, 5.2, 5.3)

Description: This subfactor will evaluate the offeror's proposed approach to Contract Management and Security throughout the life of the contract.

Measure of Merit: The measure of merit is met when the offeror's quote describes a sound approach for Contract Management and Security.

Other:

List of Attachments: Section L attachments listed below are provided as separate files.

- Attachment 1: Performance Work Statement (PWS)
- Attachment 2: Appendix 10
- Attachment 3: Pricing Matrix
- Exhibit A: Contract Data Requirements List (CDRLs)

Notice to Offeror: Funds are not presently available for this effort. No award will be made under this solicitation until funds are available. The Government reserves the right to cancel this solicitation, either before or after the closing date. In the event the Government cancels this solicitation, the Government has no obligation to reimburse an offeror for any costs.