Solicitation Number FA226326Q0017
Section M

ADDENDUM
52.212-2 EVALUATION – COMMERCIAL PRODUCTS AND COMMERCIAL SERVICES

1.0 General Instructions

1.1 Basis for Contract Award
The Government intends to award a firm fixed-price contract under Simplified Acquisition Procedures (SAP) in accordance with RFO Part 12 – Acquisition of Commercial Products and Commercial Services, as supplemented by the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS). These regulations are available electronically at https://www.acqusition.gov/far-overhaul. A contract may be awarded to the offeror who is deemed responsible in accordance with the RFO Part 9.1, as supplemented, whose proposal conforms to the solicitation's requirements (to include all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and all other information required by Addendum 52.212-1 Instructions to Offerors-Commercial Products and Commercial Services of this solicitation) and is judged, based on the evaluation factors to provide the best overall offer to the Government. While the Government will strive for maximum objectivity, the evaluation process, by its nature, is subjective; and therefore, professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire process.

1.2 Award Decision
A single contract may be awarded to the offeror who is deemed responsible in accordance with RFO Part 9, as supplemented, whose proposal conforms to the solicitation's requirements (to include all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and all other information required by this solicitation), and is judged, based on the evaluation factors and subfactors, to represent the best value to the Government. The Government seeks to award to the offeror who gives the Air Force the greatest confidence that it will best meet the requirements. This may result in an award to a higher rated, higher priced offeror, where the decision is consistent with the evaluation factors, and the Contracting Officer (CO) reasonably determines that the superior technical performance of the higher priced offer outweighs the price difference. The CO will base the contract award decision on an integrated assessment of proposals against all evaluation criteria in the solicitation (described below). While the Government evaluation team and the CO will strive for maximum objectivity, the evaluation process, by its nature, is subjective; therefore, professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire process.

1.3 Number of Contracts to be Awarded
The Government intends to award one (1) contract for the AFMETCAL Program. However, based on price and other considerations, the Government reserves the right to not award a contract.

1.4 Correction Potential of Proposals
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 proposal does not meet the Government's requirements and is not considered correctable, the offeror may be eliminated from the competitive range.

1.5 Exclusion of Grossly Deficient Proposals

The Government may exclude a proposal from this competition prior to evaluating the proposal against the evaluation factors, if an initial assessment of the proposal shows the proposal to be grossly deficient. Grossly deficient proposals are proposals that fail to address essential requirements of the solicitation, fail to furnish information demonstrating compliance with mandatory requirements set forth in the RFQ, or in some other manner do not represent a reasonable initial effort by the offeror to address the instructions and evaluation criteria of the RFQ.

1.6 Discussions

The CO reserves the right to award without discussions. Therefore, each initial offer should contain the Offeror's best terms from both a technical and price standpoint.

If, during the evaluation period, it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government to hold discussions, offeror responses to Evaluation Notices (ENs) and the Final Proposal Revision (FPR) will be considered in making the final award decision. If the offeror's proposal has been evaluated as acceptable at the time discussions are closed, any changes or exceptions in the Final Proposal Revision are subject to evaluation and may introduce risk that the offeror's proposal be determined unacceptable and ineligible for award.

1.7 Solicitation Requirements, Terms, and Conditions

The Purchase Description (PD) contains requirements that must be contractually satisfied in order to be eligible for contract award. These requirements are essential characteristics for execution of this contract. Furthermore, 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 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 and the proposal, therefore, ineligible for award.

2.0 EVALUATION FACTORS

2.1 Evaluation Factors and Subfactors

The following evaluation factors and subfactors will be used to evaluate each proposal:

Factor 1: Technical
- Subfactor 1: Purchase Description Technical Requirements
- Subfactor 2: Enhanced Capabilities

Factor 2: Price

Relative Importance of Factors and Subfactors.
The Technical Factor is significantly more important than Price; however, Price will contribute substantially to the Contract Award Decision. Within the Technical Factor, Subfactors are listed in descending order from most important to least important.

2.2 Technical Factor (Subfactor 1)

The Government's technical evaluation team shall evaluate the proposed systems for subfactor 1 as Acceptable or Unacceptable as described in Table 1 below. If subfactor 1 is evaluated as "Unacceptable" it will render the entire proposal unacceptable and, therefore, not awardable. Only those proposed systems 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 reserves the right to award this effort based on the initial proposal, as received, without discussion.

Table 1

TECHNICAL RATINGS	
Rating	**Description**
Acceptable	Proposal meets the requirements of the solicitation.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet the requirements of the solicitation.

The proposed systems shall be evaluated against the following technical subfactor:

<u>Subfactor 1</u>: PD Technical Requirements

Description: This subfactor evaluates the ability to offer a complete description of the proposed system and its ability to meet the PD requirements. The evaluation shall take into account the level of detail, theory, analysis, and test data used to substantiate the proposed claims.

Measure of Merit: This requirement is Technically Acceptable when the offeror's proposed system meets all the PD requirements. A line-by-line response to the PD is expected.

2.3 Technical Factor (Subfactors 2)

If Subfactor 1 is found to be Acceptable, the Government's technical evaluation team shall evaluate the proposed systems by assigning one of the ratings described in Table 2 below for only subfactor 2. If Subfactor 1 is found to be Unacceptable, the Government's technical evaluation team shall mark the proposed system's Subfactor 2 as not evaluated. Only those proposed systems determined to be technically acceptable, either initially or because of discussions, will be considered for award. However, the offeror is reminded that the Government reserves the right to award this effort based on the initial proposal, as received, without discussion.

Table 2

TECHNICAL RATINGS		
Color Rating	**Adjectival Rating**	**Description**
BLUE	Outstanding	Proposed system indicates an acceptable approach and understanding of the requirements and contains greater than three strengths.
PURPLE	Good	Proposed system indicates an acceptable approach and understanding of the requirements and contains one to three strengths.
GREEN	Neutral	Proposed system indicates an acceptable approach and understanding of the requirements.

The proposed systems shall be evaluated against the following technical subfactor:

Subfactor 2: Enhanced Capabilities

Description: This subfactor evaluates the proposed system's ability to provided additional value.

Measure of Merit: If additional value is observed and determined to be suitable, this will result in an Outstanding or Good rating, otherwise it will result in a Neutral rating, as long as it met Subfactor 1.

General strength opportunities may include, but not limited to Usability, Functionality, Stability, Ergonomics, Long Term Supportability, Quality, Warranty, and Manual.

2.4 Price Factor

Price proposals will be evaluated for (1) completeness, (2) reasonableness, (3) unbalanced pricing, and (4) Total Evaluated Price. Offerors whose price is determined to be incomplete, and/or unreasonable will not be considered for award. Additionally, an offer may be rejected if the CO determines unbalanced pricing poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.

2.4.1 Completeness

The Government will review the pricing submissions for completeness.

2.4.2 Reasonableness

The offeror's Price proposal will be evaluated in order 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. For additional information, see RFO 31.201-3.

2.4.3 Unbalanced pricing

Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable total evaluated price, the price of one or more line items is significantly over or understated.

2.4.4 Total Evaluated Price (TEP)

Offeror's TEP will be evaluated by using offeror's completed TEP worksheet. Prices on the TEP worksheet shall match prices listed in Supplies or Services and Prices/Cost Section. The total evaluated price will be calculated as follows:

(a) On the basic year, the evaluated price will be the unit price proposed multiplied by the specified unit quantity (e.g. 2 EACH).

(b) For the option Contract Line Item Numbers (CLINs), the evaluated price will be the yearly unit price proposed multiplied by the anticipated quantity for that year on the Option CLIN. Offeror's are advised that the evaluation of options shall not obligate the government to exercise such options.

(c) The sum of all CLINs (Basic Year and Options) will represent the total evaluated price.

For price proposals that have quantity ranges for CLINs (only used if proposal has quantity ranges): the Government will multiply the proposed range price(s) by the quantity included in each range to obtain an evaluated price for each time period (as defined on the TEP worksheet). The sum of all the time periods defined on the TEP worksheet for each CLIN will represent the CLIN price.

For Illustration Only for Quantity Range Calculations:

Quantity Range Example					
CLIN	*From*	*To*	*Quantity per Range*	*Unit Price*	*Total Price*
X00X	*1*	*10*	*10*	*$100*	*$1,000*
	11	*30*	*20*	*$90*	*$1,800*
	31	*60*	*30*	*$85*	*$2,550*
Evaluated Price for CLIN					*$5,350*

3.0 Solicitation Requirements

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, subfactors, to be eligible for award.