AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE	OF	PAGES
J	1		17

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NUMBER	3. EFFECTIVE DATE	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQUISITION NUMBER	5. PROJECT NUMBER *(If applicable)*
0002	19 May 2026	See Continuation Sheet	

6. ISSUED BY CODE N40084

NAVFACSYSCOM FAR EAST
PSC 473 BOX 13, FPO AP 96349-0013
FPO, AP 96349-0013
UNITED STATES
Wencee Narvarte, Email: wencee.p.narvarte.civ@us.navy.mil Telephone: 315-243-5570

7. ADMINISTERED BY *(If other than Item 6)* CODE

SCD: PAS:

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR *(Number, street, county, State and ZIP Code)*

CODE FACILITY CODE

(X)

☒ 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NUMBER N4008426R1025

9B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 11)* 28 Apr 2026

☐ 10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NUMBER

10B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 13)*

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

☒ The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers ☐ is extended. ☒ is not extended.

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing items 8 and 15, and returning 1 copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or electronic communication which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by letter or electronic communication, provided each letter or electronic communication makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA *(If required)*

See Section G - Contract Administration Data

13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NUMBER AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

CHECK ONE	
☐	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: *(Specify authority)* THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NUMBER IN ITEM 10A.
☐	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES *(such as changes in paying office, appropriation data, etc.)* SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).
☐	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
☐	D. OTHER *(Specify type of modification and authority)*

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor ☐ is not ☐ is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (*Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)*

The purpose of this amendment is to revise Section M - Evaluation Factors for Award.

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER *(Type or print)*		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER *(Type or print)*	
		Wencee P. Narvarte	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	16C. DATE SIGNED
(Signature of person authorized to sign)		*(Signature of Contracting Officer)*	19 May 2026

Previous edition unusable

STANDARD FORM 30 (REV. 11/2016)
Prescribed by GSA FAR (48 CFR) 53.243

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

Section M - Evaluation Factors for Award

Miscellaneous text in this section has been modified to:

M1. BASIS FOR AWARD

1. The Government reserves the right to eliminate from consideration for award any or all offers at any time prior to award of the contract; to negotiate with offerors in the competitive range; and to award the contract to the offeror submitting the proposal determined to represent the best value--the proposal most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered.

2. The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer later determines them to be necessary. In addition, if the Contracting Officer determines that the number of proposals that would otherwise be in the competitive range exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted, the Contracting Officer 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.

3. The tradeoff process is selected as appropriate for this acquisition. The Government considers it to be in its best interest to allow consideration of award to other than the lowest priced offeror or other than the highest technically rated offeror.

4. Factor 1 (Safety) will be rated Acceptable or Unacceptable. If an Offeror is rated Unacceptable in Factor 1, then they will not be considered for award unless corrected through discussions. The relative order of importance of the non-cost/price evaluation factors is the technical factor (Factor 2 - Experience) is of equal in importance to the past performance evaluation/performance confidence assessment, Factor 3. When the proposal is evaluated as a whole, the technical factor and past performance/performance confidence assessment factor combined (i.e., the non-cost /price evaluation factors) are approximately equal to price.approximately equal to price.

5. Any proposal found to have a deficiency in meeting the stated solicitation requirements or performance objectives will be considered ineligible for award, unless the deficiency is corrected through discussions. A proposal containing an Unacceptable rating will be considered unawardable, unless the Unacceptable rating is corrected through discussions. Proposals may be found to have either a significant weakness or multiple weaknesses that impact either the individual factor rating or the overall rating for the proposal.

M2. EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

1. The solicitation requires the evaluation of price and the following non-cost/price factors:

Factor 1 - Safety

Factor 2 - Experience

Factor 3 - Past Performance

The distinction between experience and past performance is that experience pertains to the volume of work completed by a contractor that are comparable to the types of work described under the definition of recent, relevant projects, in terms of size, scope, and complexity. Past performance pertains to both the relevance of recent efforts and how well a contractor has performed on the contracts.

Factor 1 (Safety) will be rated Acceptable or Unacceptable. If an Offeror is rated Unacceptable in Factor 1, then they will not be considered for award unless corrected through discussions. The relative order of importance of the non-cost/price evaluation factors is the technical factor (Factor 2 - Experience) is of equal in importance to the past performance evaluation/performance confidence assessment, Factor 3. When the proposal is evaluated as a whole, the technical factor and past performance/performance confidence assessment factor combined (i.e., the non-cost/price evaluation factors) are approximately equal to price.

The importance of price will increase if the Offerors' non-cost/price proposals are considered essentially equal in terms of overall quality, or if price is so high as to significantly diminish the value of a non-cost/price proposal's superiority to the Government. Award will be made to the responsible Offeror(s) whose offer conforms to the solicitation and represents the best value to the Government, price and non-price factors considered.

2. Basis of Evaluation and Submittal Requirements for Each Factor.

(a) Price:

(1) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

Offerors shall submit an electronic proposal (price and technical shall be separate files) through the Department of Defense (DoD) Solicitation Module in the Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE). Each copy of the price proposal shall include a separate tab for each item specified below:

a. Standard Form 33, Solicitation, Offer, and Award, including price proposals, Part B. All prices shall be in US Dollar.

b. Copies of all amendments (if applicable) acknowledged.

c. Completed Exhibit Line Item Number (ELIN) Worksheet in Microsoft Excel format provided in Exhibit D to support the amounts specified for each Contract Line Item Number (CLIN) in Section B of the solicitation. In the event that there is a difference between the hard copy and the Microsoft Excel format version of the price proposal, the hard copy price proposal will be held to be the intended offer and the total of the CLINs, SLINs, ELINs will be recomputed accordingly.

Although not part of the price evaluation, Offerors should also include, in the English Language, the following items if available with their price proposals to assist the Government in validating eligibility to receive an award:

(i) Offeror Letter which includes at a minimum, but not limited to:

- Solicitation number

- Offeror's name, address, telephone, and email address

- CAGE Code

- Name, title, telephone number and email address of person(s) authorized to negotiate on behalf of the Offeror in connection with this solicitation.

- Name, title, telephone numbers and email address of person(s) authorized to sign contractual documents on behalf of the Offeror in connection with this solicitation and any resultant contracts, task orders, or modifications.

(ii) Joint Venture Agreement - If the Offeror is a Joint Venture, provide a copy of the fully executed Joint Venture Agreement.

(iii) Representations and Certifications - Offeror is to submit a conformed copy of Representations/Certifications in the system for Award Management (SAM) and any additional provisions contained within the Solicitation.

(iv) Latest Financial Statement.

- Offerors shall provide evidence of financial capability in accordance with, FAR 9.104-1, Responsibility Determination, a contractor must have adequate financial resources to perform the contract.

- Offerors shall submit the latest three years complete fiscal year financial statements for the prime contractor, certified by an independent accounting firm, if practicable or at least by an authorized officer of the organization.

- In additional to the above, submit evidence of availability of working/operating capital, which will be used for the performance of the resultant contract.

-For Joint Venture arrangements discuss the financial responsibilities among the companies and if the Joint Venture has been in existence for less than three years, also provide the latest three years complete fiscal year financial statements for each member of the Joint Venture.

- Completed IRS Form W-14, Certificate of Foreign Contracting Party Receiving Federal Procurement Payments, if applicable. If not submitted with the offer, excise tax exemptions will not be applied to any resulting contract and the Government will withhold a full 2 percent of each payment.

(2) Basis of Evaluation: The Government will evaluate price based on the total price. Total price consists of the total price of Recurring CLINs and the total price of Non-Recurring CLINs for the basic requirements and all option items (see Section B of the solicitation). For Non-Recurring CLINs and ELINs, the Government will establish the estimated quantity for evaluation purposes only. The proposed non-recurring ELINs will be used to establish an ordering price list. The Government intends to evaluate all options and has included the provision FAR 52.217-5, Evaluation of Options (JUL 1990) in Section M of the solicitation. In accordance with FAR 52.217-5, evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s). Analysis will be performed by one or more of the following techniques to ensure a fair and reasonable price:

(i) Comparison of proposed prices received in response to the RFP.

(ii) Comparison of proposed prices with the IGCE.

(iii) Comparison of proposed prices with available historical information.

(iv) Comparison of market survey results.

In accordance with Revolutionary FAR Overhaul (RFO) 15.404-6(b), separately priced line items or subline items will be analyzed to determine if the prices are unbalanced.

(b) Non-cost/price Factors:

1. Factor 1, Safety (Acceptable/Unacceptable):

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

The Offeror shall submit the following information using Exhibit C - Safety Narrative:

(1) The total numbers of Employee Labor Hours Worked for the specified five (5) Calendar Years (CY). The specified five (5) calendar years represents the most recent full calendar years covering January to December so Offerors should provide data from 2021 to 2025;

(2) The numbers of work-related "Fatal (death)" cases for the specified five (5) CY;

(3) The numbers of work-related "Lost Work Day*" injury/illness cases for the specified five (5) CY;

(4) The numbers of work-related "No-Lost Work Day" injury/illness cases beyond first-aid** and loss of consciousness for the specified five (5) CY; and

(5) A Technical Approach to Safety narrative.

* Lost Work Day:

The date of injury or onset of illness is not counted as lost workday.

** First-aid:

- Using a non-prescription medication at nonprescription strength (for medications available in both prescription and non-prescription form, a recommendation by a physician or other licensed health care professional to use a non-prescription medication at prescription strength is considered medical treatment for recordkeeping purposes);

- Administering tetanus immunizations (other immunizations, such as Hepatitis B vaccine or rabies vaccine, are considered medical treatment);

- Cleaning, flushing or soaking wounds on the surface of the skin;

- Using wound coverings such as bandages, Band-Aids(TM), gauze pads, etc.; or using butterfly bandages or Steri-Strips(TM) (other wound closing devices such as sutures, staples, etc., are considered medical treatment);

- Using hot or cold therapy;

- Using any non-rigid means of support, such as elastic bandages, wraps, non-rigid back belts, etc. (devices with rigid stays or other systems designed to immobilize parts of the body are considered medical treatment for recordkeeping purposes);

- Using temporary immobilization devices while transporting an accident victim (e.g., splints, slings, neck collars, back boards, etc.).

- Drilling of a fingernail or toenail to relieve pressure, or draining fluid from a blister;

- Using eye patches;

- Removing foreign bodies from the eye using only irrigation or a cotton swab;

- Removing splinters or foreign material from areas other than the eye by irrigation, tweezers, cotton swabs or other simple means;

- Using finger guards;

- Using massages (physical therapy or chiropractic treatment are considered medical treatment for recordkeeping purposes); or

- Drinking fluids for relief of heat stress.

1. Submit the numbers of Labor Hours and Fatal (death), Lost Work Day (Lost D) and No-Lost Work Day (No-Lost D) cases using the table below.

1

Calendar Year (Jan - Dec)	20XX	20XX	20XX	20XX	20XX
(1) Labor Hrs	hrs _____	hrs _____	hrs _____	hrs _____	hrs _____

(2) Fatality	case(s)	case(s)	case(s)	case(s)	case(s)
(3) Lost D	case(s)	case(s)	case(s)	case(s)	case(s)
(4) No-Lost D	case(s)	case(s)	case(s)	case(s)	case(s)

a. If the Offeror has no data, for any year, affirmatively state so and explain why.

b. Any fatalities (death cases) experienced within this 5-year period must be explained in detail to include root cause and corrective actions.

Note 1: For a partnership or joint venture, the Offeror shall submit separate numbers of hours and cases for the specified five (5) CY for each contractor who is part of the partnership/joint venture; however, only one safety narrative is required.

Note 2: Hours and cases for subcontractors shall not be included.

2. Technical Approach to Safety (5): Submit a narrative that addresses the following:

a. Describe the Offeror's approach to implementing and executing a Safety Management System (SMS) including 1) Management/Leadership involvement, 2) Employee involvement, 3) Hazard prevention, 4) Hazard control, 5) Worksite analysis, and 6) Safety and health training, to include the standard(s) used to benchmark the SMS.

b. Describe the evaluation process used to select potential subcontractors.

c. Describe the processes of how the Offeror will oversee safety compliance of subcontractors at all levels throughout performance of the contract (to include the Offeror's own employees).

d. The Technical Approach to Safety narrative shall be limited to two (2) single-sided pages or one (1) double-sided page.

Note : For a partnership or joint venture, only one safety narrative is required.

3. The Government reserves the right to review other available sources (public and Government internal) of information. These may include but are not limited to NAVFAC's Contractor Incident Reporting System (CIRS), Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), Electronic Contract Management System (eCMS), and public information of suspension of eligibility for participation in bid on public works contracts, etc.

2. Basis of Evaluation:

The Government is seeking to determine whether the information contained in the Offeror's proposal demonstrates a commitment to safety and that the Offeror plans to properly manage and implement safety procedures and accident prevention methods for itself and its subcontractors.

An Offeror will be rated "Acceptable" if it demonstrates a commitment to safety and that the Offeror plans to properly manage and implement safety procedures and accident prevention methods for itself and its subcontractors.

An Offeror will be rated "Unacceptable" if it fails to meet the requirements to be rated acceptable described above.

(2) Factor 2 - Experience

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

The Offeror shall submit the following information:

Submit a MINIMUM of one (1) and a MAXIMUM of four (4) contracts or task orders for the Offeror that best demonstrates your experience on relevant projects that are similar in size, scope, and complexity to the RFP. The Offeror's submittal for Factor 2 - Experience should demonstrate experience performing work on each functional annex/sub-annex described below.

Functional annexes/sub-annexes for Factor 2 evaluation purposes are identified as:

Annex 1400000 - Housing

1401000 Family Housing

Annex 1500000 - Facilities Support

1502000 Facility Investment

Annex 1600000 - Utilities

1604000 Wastewater

Annex 1800000 - Environmental

For purposes of this evaluation, a relevant project is further defined as:

1. Scope: Performance of services in at least one (1) functional annexes/sub-annexes mentioned under Paragraph C.3.(b)(2)(i) above. Performance in functional annexes/sub-annexes is described as performance in other than performance of Annex 0100000 - General Information and Annex 0200000 - Management and Administration. A contract or task order that demonstrates at least one (1) functional annexes/sub-annexes being evaluated may be used to satisfy the functional annexes/sub-annexes requirements. Any project submitted to satisfy the scope will be subject to the size and recency requirements in Factor 2 - Experience.

Contracts or task orders submitted with only Annex 0100000 - General Information and/or Annex 0200000 - Management and Administration services shall NOT be considered to demonstrate relevant experience.

2. Size: A contract or task order award value of at least $50,000,000. Combining contracts or task orders to meet the $50,000,000 size standard is not allowed. If a contract/task order is submitted in Japanese yen then it will be converted to USD at a rate of 150.4415 yen / USD.

3. Recency: Be completed within the past five (5) years of the issuance of the RFP or have at least one (1) year of performance completed by the closing date of RFP. Contracts or task orders completed more than five (5) years before the closing date for proposals will not be considered recent and relevant.

Notes:

Any contract or task order submitted in excess of four (4) will not be considered. If more than four (4) contracts or task order are submitted, only the first four (4) shall be considered.

The attached Experience Project Data Sheet (EXHIBIT A) is MANDATORY and SHALL be used to submit project information. Except as specifically requested, the Government will not consider information submitted in addition to this form. Individual blocks on this form may be

expanded; however, the total length for each project data sheet shall not exceed three (3) single-sided pages (or one and half (1.5) double-sided pages). If an Offeror's is using a combination of projects to satisfy the scope and size standards, the Offeror shall identify the specific projects combined.

For all submitted projects, the description of the project on the Experience Project Data Sheet SHALL:

1. Clearly describe the scope of work performed

2. Clearly describe the relevancy to the project requirements of this RFP (i.e., the relevant Annex(s) in this RFP)

3. Clearly indicate the relevant work's project value performed by the Offeror*.

*The "Offeror" is defined as the exact name in Block 15A of the Standard Form 33, Solicitation, Offer and Award. If the Offeror is a Joint Venture (JV), relevant project experience should be submitted for projects completed by the Joint Venture entity. If the JV does not have shared experience, projects may be submitted for the JV members. If a project was performed by a JV, and not all partners from that JV are on the JV proposed for this contract, the Offeror shall clearly demonstrate what portion of the work was performed by the JV member offering on this contract and shall not include work performed by the JV as a whole. The JV member proposed for this contract shall specifically address field work performed by that JV member including field staffing and direct field work oversight. The Offeror shall also submit a SIGNED copy of the Joint Venture agreement indicating the proposed participation of each Joint Venture member. Offerors are still limited to a total of four (4) projects combined.

If an Offeror is utilizing experience information of affiliates/subsidiaries/parent/LLC/LTD member companies (name is not exactly as stated on the SF33), the proposal shall clearly demonstrate that the affiliate/subsidiary/parent/LLC/LTD member companies will have meaningful involvement in the performance of the contract. The proposal shall state specific commitments of technical resources (e.g. personnel, equipment) that the affiliate /subsidiary/parent/LLC/LTD member companies shall commit to the performance of this contract. In particular, the proposal will clearly state the specific commitments of resources of the affiliate/subsidiary/parent/LLC/LTD member companies that will be located at the worksites and company offices in the city/area of the project. The proposal shall also describe specific roles of the affiliate/subsidiary/parent/LLC/LTD member companies in terms of the work it will either self-perform or manage on behalf of the Offeror in performance of the contract.

The Offeror may utilize experience of a subcontractor that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement to demonstrate experience under this evaluation factor. The Offeror must provide a supporting joint venture agreement, partnership agreement, teaming agreement, or letter of commitment, for the term of the basic contract and all options if exercised, and an explanation of the meaningful involvement that the subcontractor will have in performance of this contract.

(ii) Basis of Evaluation:

Offerors will be evaluated on recent and relevant experience involving the four (4) functional annexes/sub-annexes identified under Paragraph C.3.(b)(2)(i) included in the PWS excluding work for Annex 0100000 - General Information, Annex 0200000 - Management and Administration, Sub-Annex 1501000 - Facility Management, and Sub-Annex 1503040 Other (Training Pools).

Proposals demonstrating experience across multiple functional annexes will be rated more favorably. Experience limited to a single functional annex may be considered less favorable.

Experience performing contracts in Japan is considered advantageous and may result in a more favorable evaluation.

Experience gained as a prime contractor or a joint venture partner will be weighted more heavily than experience gained as a subcontractor.

For joint ventures, failure to provide relevant experience for all individual members may result in a less favorable evaluation for this factor.

(3) Factor 3- Past Performance:

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

Offerors shall clearly demonstrate a history of performance on contracts/projects that demonstrates experience in performing work similar to that described in the definition of a relevant project shown above in Factor 2. The offeror shall submit past performance information for each project included in its proposal for Factor 2, Experience. If a completed Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) evaluation is available, it shall be submitted with the proposal. If there is not a completed CPARS evaluation, the Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) (Exhibit B) included in the solicitation is provided for the offeror or its team members to submit to the client for each project the offeror includes in its proposal for Factor 2, Experience. An offeror should not submit a PPQ when a completed CPARS evaluation is available. Ensure correct phone numbers and email addresses are provided for the client point of contact on the PPQ.

Completed PPQs should be submitted with your proposal. If the offeror is unable to obtain a completed PPQ from a client for a project(s) before proposal closing date, the offeror should complete and submit with the proposal the first page of the PPQ (Exhibit B), which will provide contract and client information for the respective project(s). Offerors should follow-up with clients/references to ensure timely submittal of questionnaires. If the client requests, questionnaires may be submitted directly to the Government's point of contact, Ms. Wencee Narvarte, via email at wencee.p.narvarte.civ@us.navy.mil, Mr. Ross Yamato, via email at ross.w.yamato.civ@us.navy.mil, Mr. Kyong Yu, via email at kyong.h.yu2.civ@us.navy.mil prior to proposal closing date. Offerors shall not incorporate by reference into their proposal PPQs or CPARS previously submitted for other RFPs. However, this does not preclude the Government from utilizing previously submitted PPQ information in the past performance evaluation.

Offerors may provide any information on problems encountered and the corrective actions taken on projects submitted under Factor 2 - Experience. Offerors may also address any adverse past performance issues. Explanations shall not exceed 1 double-sided page or 2 single-sided pages in total.

The Government reserves the right to contact references for verification or additional information. The Government's inability to contact any of the Offeror's references or the references unwillingness to provide the information requested may affect the Government's evaluation of this factor.

Performance recognition/award(s) or additional similar information submitted will not be considered.

In addition to the above, the Government may review any other sources of information for evaluating past performance. Other sources may include, but are not limited to, past performance information retrieved through the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) using all CAGE /DUNS numbers of team members (partnership, joint venture, teaming arrangement, or parent company/subsidiary/affiliate) identified in the offeror's proposal, inquiries of owner representative(s), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), and any other known sources not provided by the offeror.

While the Government may elect to consider data from other sources, the burden of providing detailed, current, accurate and complete past performance information rests with the Offeror.

(ii) Basis of Evaluation:

The Government is seeking to determine if the Offeror has recent and relevant past performance information that pertain to the requirement outlined in the solicitation. The past performance evaluation results in an assessment of the Offerors probability of meeting the solicitation requirements. The evaluation will consider how well the Offeror performed recent and relevant projects submitted under Factor 2 and may also consider past performance on other projects currently documented in known sources.

The Government will consider the recency and relevancy of the information, the source of the information, context of the data, and general trends in the Offeror's performance. This evaluation is separate and distinct from the Offeror's responsibility determination. The assessment of the Offeror's past performance will be used as a means of evaluating the Offeror's probability to successfully meet the requirements of the solicitation.

The Government will evaluate the degree to which past performance evaluations and all other past performance information reviewed by the Government (e.g., PPIRS, Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), performance recognition documents, and information obtained from any other source) reflect a trend of satisfactory performance record in terms of quality, schedule and management.

In the case of an offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available or is so sparse that no meaningful past performance rating can be reasonably assigned, the offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance (see FAR 15.305 (a)(2)(iv)). Therefore, the offeror shall be determined to have unknown past performance.

Offerors with unknown past performance history will receive a NEUTRAL Confidence rating.

Past performance ratings of "Substantial Confidence" or "Satisfactory Confidence" hold more value than a "Neutral Confidence" rating and will be considered more favorably in the evaluation of past performance.