**52.212-2 ADDENDUM**

**52.212-2 EVALUATION – COMMERCIAL ITEMS (OCT 2014)**

## 1. BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD:

Unless all offers are rejected, the Government intends to award a Firm-Fixed Price (FFP) contract to the responsible offeror whose offer, conforming to the solicitation, is determined to be the best overall value, price and other factors considered. The Government may select for award the Offeror whose price is not necessarily the lowest, but whose technical proposal and/or past performance is more advantageous to the Government and warrants the additional cost. Offerors must satisfy the requirements described in the Performance Work Statement (PWS), as well as other Request for Proposal (RFP) requirements.

Proposals will be reviewed, evaluated, and awarded in accordance with the evaluation criteria identified in this document. Proposals that take exception to any requirement, state assumptions or impose requirements not in or contrary to the solicitation or otherwise qualify the proposal will not be considered and will be deemed unacceptable for award.

## 2. PASS/FAIL CRITERIA (VOLUME II):

The Government requests the following information, which will be evaluated on a pass/fail basis. If an Offeror receives a "fail" for any of the below criteria the Offeror's Proposal will not be evaluated any further and will be deemed ineligible for award.

**1)** The Government will evaluate the Offeror's commitment letters for all key personnel submitted with the proposal submission by the proposal due date. All commitment letters shall be signed and dated by the proposed key personnel within 10 days of the proposal due date. The date of signature must accompany the signature in the signed commitment letter. The commitment letter shall affirmatively state: (1) that the key personnel granted permission to the prime contractor to use his/her resume, and (2) is willing to work for the proposing Offeror on the instant solicitation. If revised proposals are required, commitment letters must be updated, signed, and dated within 10 days of the revised due date for submission.

If the Offeror learns, or has reason to believe, of the unavailability (e.g., death or disqualification) of its proposed key personnel, Offeror shall notify the Contracting Officer in writing no later than the next business day. Upon timely notice, the Agency may accept a signed Commitment Letter of the Offeror's proposed substitute key personnel.

**2)** The Government will evaluate the Offeror's evidence that their business size standard corresponds to the NAICS code assigned to this contract. This requirement is a total Small Business (SB) set-aside under NAICS code 561920 Convention and Trade Show Organizations. If the government determines that an offeror is not a business concern under NAICS code 561920 on the proposal due date and time, no further evaluation will be performed, and the offeror will not be considered for the award.

## 3. EVALUATION FACTORS:

The award of the FFP contract will be determined by evaluations and ratings under the below Factors. The overall award total proposed price will be based upon Attachment 4 - Pricing Template.

The evaluation of the award will be based on an assessment of the Offeror's Proposal. Proposal shall be evaluated on the factors listed below. Factor 1 (Technical Approach & Capability), and Factor 2 (Past Performance) are equal, and when combined are significantly more important than Factor 3 (Price); however, Price is still a substantial Factor. As offerors become more equal under Factors 1 and 2; Factor 3 will become more significant in the award decision.

Factor 1 – Technical Approach & Capability

Factor 2 – Past Performance
Factor 3 – Price

## 4. FACTOR 1 - TECHNICAL APPROACH & CAPABILITY (VOLUME III)

The proposal shall describe the methods and techniques used in its technical approach to complete the tasks of PWS Section 5. The Offeror but must address all critical tasks with enough detail to demonstrate the ability to successfully perform the requirements. Proposals that omit or merely reiterate identified tasks may be rejected. Offerors shall map all proposed labor categories to the positions proposed and include this information in Volume III – Technical Approach and Capability, and Volume V – Price.

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's technical approach and capabilities to perform the requirements listed in the solicitation. Data previously submitted, or presumed to be known, i.e., descriptions of previous projects performed for the Government, cannot be considered as a part of the proposal unless physically incorporated in the proposal. Clarity, completeness and conciseness are essential.

## 5. FACTOR 2 - PAST PERFORMANCE (VOLUME IV)

Past performance is a measure of the degree to which the Offeror satisfied its customers in the past and complied with Federal, State, and local laws and regulations, as identified as the Prime Contractor. The Government may contact some, all or none of each Offeror's customers to ask, among other things, whether: (1) the Offeror is capable, efficient, and effective; (2) the Offeror's performance conformed to the terms and conditions of its contract. (3) the Offeror was reasonable and cooperative during performance; (4) the Offeror was committed to customer satisfaction; (5) the Offeror was able to hire and retain qualified personnel to the satisfaction of the customer; and (6) if they would select the same Contractor or a different Contractor, given the opportunity.

The Government may also use other information available from other sources to evaluate the Offeror's past performance, which may include, but not limited to: Past Performance Questionnaire, Federal, State and local Government agencies, Better Business Bureaus, published media, electronic databases such as the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) and the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS). The Government may include firsthand experience of the evaluators with the Offerors in this evaluation. The Government reserves the right to limit or expand the number of references it decides to contact and to contact references other than those provided by the Offeror.

## 6. FACTOR 3 - PRICE (VOLUME V)

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed price and determined it to be fair and reasonable based on one of the techniques identified in FAR 15.404-1 *Proposal Analysis Techniques.* The Offeror's price must be found to be fair and reasonable in order to be eligible for award in accordance with FAR 15.404-1, Proposal Analysis Techniques. Price will not be scored or received an adjectival rating. The Total Evaluated Price (TEP) will include all Contract Line-Item Numbers (CLINS), the base period and all options.

For evaluation purposes only, the total evaluated price is the sum of the following for the contract:

a. The TEP will be calculated using the Government-provided Microsoft Excel Spreadsheet, entitled "Pricing Proposal". The spreadsheet contains specific instructions for completion. Offers received without the completed spreadsheet may be considered nonconforming and may not be considered for contract award.
b. The spreadsheet multiplies the offered Unit Price by the Quantity to produce a subtotal amount for each period of services. The subtotals for the base and all option periods will be totaled. This amount will be the Total Evaluated Price.
c. Firm Fixed Price (FFP) CLINs: Total prices submitted for (a) the base period, and (b) all option periods.

## 7. RATING METHODS

### (1) FACTOR 1 - TECHNICAL APPROACH (VOLUME II)

**Combined Technical/Risk Rating Method:** The combined technical/risk rating includes consideration of risk in conjunction with the strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, and deficiencies in determining technical ratings. Each proposal shall be given a rating identified in Table 1 that reflects the degree to which the proposed approach meets or does not meet the threshold performance or capability requirements through an assessment of the relative strengths, deficiencies, weaknesses and significant weaknesses, and risks to successful performance.

| **Table 1. Combined Technical/Risk Ratings** | | |
|---|---|---|
| Color | Rating | Description |
| Blue | Outstanding | Proposal meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths far outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is very low. |
| Purple | Good | Proposal meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal contains strengths which outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is low. |
| Green | Acceptable | Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths and weaknesses are offsetting or will have little or no impact on contract performance. Risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate. |
| Yellow | Marginal | Proposal does not clearly meet requirements and has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. The proposal has one or more weaknesses which are not offset by strengths. Risk of unsuccessful performance is high. |
| Red | Unacceptable | Proposal does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is unacceptable. Proposal is unawardable. |

***NOTE: If an Offeror is determined "unacceptable" or "marginal" under Factor 1 – Technical Approach, the Offeror's proposal will be considered unacceptable overall and shall not be evaluated further and shall not be considered for award.**

Definitions:

- A strength is a significant, outstanding, or exceptional aspect of the proposal that increases the likelihood of successful contract performance.
- A weakness is a flaw in the proposal that decreases the Government's confidence in the Offeror's ability to successfully perform the requirements of the contract.
- A significant weakness is a flaw in the proposal that appreciably decreases the Government's confidence in the Offeror's ability to successfully perform the requirements of the contract.
- A deficiency is a material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.

**(2) FACTOR 2 – PAST PERFORMANCE**

There are three aspects to the past performance evaluation: recency, relevancy, and quality (including general trends in contractor performance and source of information).

Step 1 – Recency. The first step is to evaluate the recency of the offeror's past performance. Recency is generally

expressed as a time period during which past performance references are considered relevant and is critical to establishing the relevancy of past performance information. Performance of each reference must be completed within the last three (3) years of the proposal due date to be considered recent.

Step 2 – Relevance. The second step is to determine how relevant a recent effort accomplished by the offeror is to the effort to be acquired through the source selection. The relevancy rating evaluates the aspects of an offeror's recent history of contract (or subcontract) performance that would provide the most context and give the greatest ability to measure whether the offeror will successfully satisfy the current requirement. There are four levels of relevancy as shown in Table 2.

| **Table 2. Past Performance Relevancy Rating Method** | |
|---|---|
| **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. |

If the offeror submits recent and relevant projects performed by a subcontractor as a past performance reference the offeror must also explain how the subcontractor significantly contributed to the performance of the referenced project and how the offeror expects the subcontractor to significantly contribute to the successful performance of the solicited work.

Step 3 - Quality of Products or Services. The third aspect of the past performance evaluation is to establish the overall quality of the offeror's past performance (see FAR 15.304(c)(2)). The past performance evaluation conducted in support of a current source selection 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 customers on how well the offeror performed those past contracts. The past performance confidence assessment rating is based on the offeror's overall record of regency, relevancy, and quality of performance. In conducting a performance confidence assessment, each Offeror shall be assigned one of the ratings in Table 3.

In the case of offerors for which there is no information on past contract performance or where past contract performance information is not available, the offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on the factor of past contract performance (see FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv)). In this case, the offeror's past performance is unknown and assigned a performance confidence rating of "neutral."

| **Table 3. Performance Confidence Assessment Rating Method** | |
|---|---|
| **Rating** | **Definition** |
| Satisfactory Confidence | Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror shall 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 shall successfully perform the required effort. |

**Offerors that receive a rating of Limited Confidence under Factor 2 shall be considered unacceptable overall and shall not be further evaluated or considered for award.**

**(3) FACTOR 3 - PRICE (VOLUME V)**
Price will not be scored or receive an adjectival rating, but the evaluated price must be found to be fair and reasonable in order to be eligible for award as indicated in Factor 3-Price Proposal.

(End of 52.212-2 Addendum)