M.1 BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD

M.1.1 Award will be made utilizing Best Value Lowest Price Technically Acceptable source selection evaluation procedures in which competing proposals will be evaluated IAW FAR 15.101-2 and utilizing DoD Source Selection Procedures. The Government anticipates making award up to thirteen (13) MATOC holders, promoting healthy competition at the TO level. Awards will be made to the technically acceptable proposals with the lowest evaluated price. To receive consideration for award, a rating of no less than “Acceptable” must be achieved for the Technical Capability Approach Factor (to include all Sub-Factors), and the Past Performance Factor. If any Technical Sub-Factor is rated less than “Acceptable” it will render the factor unacceptable and therefore unawardable.

M.1.1.1 Evaluation criteria consist of factors and sub-factors. The proposals will be evaluated under three (3) evaluation factors:

- Volume I; Factor 1: Technical Capability Approach
  - Sub-Factor 1A: Management and Staffing
  - Sub-Factor 1B: Seed Project
  - Sub-Factor 1C: MATOC Program Management
- Volume II; Factor 2: Past Performance
- Volume III; Factor 3: Cost Price

M.1.1.1.1 Number of Awards. The Government anticipates awarding up to thirteen (13) FFP, IDIQ contracts. The Government reserves the right to increase the number of MATOC holders, or make no award at all, should that be in the best interest of the Government.

M.2 EXCHANGES WITH OFFERORS AFTER PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

M.2.1 Offerors are advised the Government may make award without clarifications, exchanges, or discussions, regarding the proposals received in response to this solicitation. Offerors are to submit its best offer, with its most favorable terms from all aspects, terms, and conditions of the requirement. Offerors must NOT assume an opportunity to clarify, discuss or revise proposals will occur, however, the Government reserves the right to discuss aspects of proposals with Offerors, as authorized and appropriate IAW FAR 52.215-1(f)(4).

M.2.1.1 Clarifications. The Government reserves the right to conduct clarifications with all Offerors not otherwise rejected. Clarifications are limited exchanges, between the Government and Offerors that may occur whether or not discussions are contemplated. The following are examples, but not an all-inclusive list, of clarification information that may be requested: minor or clerical errors, an Offeror’s response to the intent of its proposal where an inconsistency or ambiguity exists, the relevance of an Offeror’s past performance information, or adverse past performance information to which the Offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond.

M.2.1.1.1 Discussions. Upon conclusion of the initial proposal evaluation, if discussions are determined to be necessary, the KO may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly rated proposals. Discussions will only be conducted with Offerors determined to be within the competitive range. The Government reserves the right not to conduct discussions.

M.3 PROPOSAL EVALUATION

M.3.1 Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools in Proposal Evaluation.

M.3.1.1 Use of AI tools in Support of Evaluations: The Government reserves the right to employ AI as a tool to assist in the analysis and review of Offeror proposals. AI tools may be used to support tasks such as summarizing proposal content, identifying compliance with request for task order proposal / solicitation requirements, and highlighting areas of potential strength, weakness, or risk.

M.3.1.2 Maintaining Inherently Governmental Functions: Notwithstanding the use of AI tools to support the evaluation process, all final evaluation judgements, including the assignment or assessment of adjectival ratings, best value determinations, and source selection decisions, will be made exclusively by duly appointed Government personnel. The Government retains sole responsibility for all inherently Governmental functions and will not delegate decision-making authority to any AI tool.

M.3.1.3 Offeror Confidentiality and Data Protection: If used, the AI tools utilized by the Government will be employed in a manner consistent with applicable regulations that govern the protection of proprietary and source selection sensitive information. The AI tool will be an output-only system. Any generated report data is not saved. No proposal data will be transmitted to or processed by external, non-Government systems without appropriate safeguards and authorizations in place.

M.3.2 Ratings. The Government will evaluate the Technical Capability Approach Factor and Sub-Factors using the following Acceptable/Unacceptable rating method:

TABLE 1: TECHNICAL ACCEPTABLE/UNACCEPTABLE RATING METHOD

Adjectival Rating	Description
Acceptable	Proposal meets the requirements of the solicitation
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet the requirements of the solicitation

M.4 VOLUME I; FACTOR 1: TECHNICAL CAPABILITY APPROACH

M.4.1 SUB-FACTOR 1A: MANAGEMENT AND STAFFING

M.4.1.1 The Government will evaluate the Offeror’s proposed key personnel qualifications by reviewing submitted resumes for personnel identified in the NCR

MATOC SOW section 5 incorporated as RFP Attachment 0001. To be considered acceptable, submitted resumes for key personnel must meet the minimum standards provided for education, experience, and qualifications in the NCR MATOC SOW section 5.

M.4.1.2 SUB-FACTOR 1B: SEED PROJECT

M.4.1.2.1 The Government will evaluate the Offeror's technical capability approach in meeting the requirements of the Seed Project SOW, incorporated as Attachment 0004. To be considered acceptable, Offerors must provide evidence of a Performance Bond and Payment Bond in the amount proposed for the Seed Project, and detail how it plans to staff, permit, and complete the Seed Project with a schedule.

M.4.1.3 SUB-FACTOR 1C: MATOC PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

M.4.1.3.1 The Government will evaluate the Offeror's technical capability approach in managing multiple TOs simultaneously by reviewing its submitted MATOC Program Management Plan. To be considered acceptable, the submitted MATOC Program Management Plan must meet the following minimum standards:

(a) Program-Level Organization and Staffing: The Government will evaluate the Offeror's program-level organizational chart that identifies the key personnel IAW NCR MATOC SOW, paragraph 5, responsible for the overall management of the MATOC program; distinct from project-level staff. The plan must describe the roles and responsibilities of the program-level key personnel and detail the authority of the single point of contact responsible for communicating with the Government's Contracting Officer and COR for the MATOC.

(b) Management of Concurrent Task Order: The Government will evaluate the Offerors corporate process for managing multiple, concurrent TOs across geographically dispersed locations. The corporate process must describe the systems and/or tools utilized for tracking schedules, costs, and deliverables for the entire portfolio of active TOs.

(c) Resource Allocation Plan: The Government will evaluate the Offerors methodology for ensuring key personnel, particularly the Project Superintendent and Site Safety and Health Officer required by the NCR MATOC SOW, are assigned to each TO. The plan must describe the Offerors' intent on staffing concurrent and newly awarded TOs when existing personnel are already engaged.

(d) Quality Management System: The Government will evaluate the Offerors corporate Quality Management System (QMS) to be implemented across all TOs. Offerors must describe how the corporate Quality Control Manager intends to provide consistent application of quality standards and procedures across all seven (7) installations, regardless of which project team is performing the work.

M.5 VOLUME II; FACTOR 2: PAST PERFORMANCE

The past performance evaluation results in an assessment of the Offeror's probability of providing SRM IAW the NCR MATOC SOW as defined in this RFP. The past performance evaluation considers the Offeror's Recent and Relevant record of performance in completing projects of similar scope, complexity, and task/contract type as those described in the NCR MATOC SOW. One performance rating is assigned for each Offeror after evaluating the Offeror's recent past performance with a focus on performance that is relevant to the Solicitation's requirements.

M.5.1 Offerors are reminded that both data submitted by the Offeror and data independently obtained by the Government may be used to evaluate past performance. It is incumbent upon the Offeror to explain fully the Relevance of the data provided and to ensure that the data is current, accurate, and complete. The Government does not assume the duty to search for clarifications or cure problems it finds in the proposal. Proposals that do not contain the requested information specified in Section L, Factor 2, may risk not receiving credit for aspects of its past performance submission.

M.5.1.1 The Prime Offeror and/or any legal associated affiliate(s) of the Prime Offeror, if the Prime Offeror is able to successfully demonstrate meaningful involvement by the associated affiliate(s) in the proposed effort, will be assessed, evaluated, and provided a past performance rating. In the case of an Offeror 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 Offeror will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance. Therefore, the Offeror shall be determined to have unknown (or "neutral") past performance. In the context of acceptability/unacceptability, a neutral rating shall be considered "acceptable".

M.5.1.1.1 The past performance evaluation will assess the Offeror's probability of meeting the minimum past performance solicitation requirements. This assessment is based on the Offeror's record of Relevant and Recent past performance information that pertain to the requirements outlined in this solicitation. Past Performance will be rated as provided in Table 2 below:

TABLE 2: PAST PERFORMANCE RATING METHOD

Adjectival 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, or the Offeror's performance record is unknown
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.

An Offeror must receive an "Acceptable" Past Performance rating to be eligible for award.

M.6 VOLUME III; FACTOR 3: COST/PRICE

The Cost/Price Factor will be evaluated but not adjectively rated. The FAR requires that contracts be awarded at prices that are fair and reasonable. The KO is responsible for the determination of price reasonableness. Price will be evaluated on the following:

- Completeness, IAW RFP Section L
- Balanced Pricing, IAW FAR 15-404-1(g); and
- Price Reasonableness, IAW FAR 15.404-1(a-c)

M.6.1 The Government intends to evaluate price reasonableness IAW FAR 15.404-1(b), relying primarily upon competition. The Government expects adequate competition, and a comparison will be made of total evaluated prices received in response to this RFP. However, the Government reserves the right to require submission of certified cost or pricing data and/or data other than certified cost or pricing data from the Offeror adequate to determine the reasonableness of a price if competition was inadequate for that purpose.

M.6.1.2 The Offeror's total price, for the purpose of this evaluation, will be a FFP proposal submitted as Attachment 0006 – Contractor Bid Sheet, reflecting all labor, material, bonds, permits, equipment, etc., necessary to complete the requirements of the Seed Project SOW incorporated as RFP Attachment 0004.

M.6.1.3 A Cost/Price Proposal which is determined to be Unbalanced, Unreasonable, or Incomplete shall be ineligible for award.