1. GENERAL
   (a) Offerors shall direct their attention to FAR 52.215-1(f) in Section L, titled "Instructions to Offerors –Competitive Acquisition," which provides that: The Government intends to award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible Offeror(s) whose proposal(s) represents the best value after evaluation in accordance with (IAW) the factors, as applicable, in the solicitation. This section contains specific evaluation factors for award of a contract pursuant to this solicitation.

   (b) Offerors are advised that the Government intends to make an award on the basis of initial proposals without conducting discussions with Offerors, but reserves the right to conduct discussions if determined by the PCO to be necessary (see paragraph (f)(4) of FAR 52.215-1). Therefore, each initial offer should contain the Offeror's best terms from a cost or price and technical standpoint. Statements and representations made in the Offeror's proposal may be subject to verification by DCAA, other sources, or through an onsite survey by Government evaluators. Reliance on prior DCAA audits for rate verification and justification is an accepted Government practice.

   (c) The Government will evaluate each Offeror's understanding of the Government's requirements and ability to perform the work on the basis of its proposal. It is the Offeror's responsibility to provide information and evidence that clearly demonstrates its ability to satisfactorily perform the contract requirements as stated in the solicitation and based upon factors in paragraph 2.

   (d) Each factor will be evaluated on a stand-alone basis; however, information contained in one (1) factor of the proposal may be used to assist the Government in evaluating other factors of the proposal. If it is determined that an offer is not in compliance with the page limitation of that volume of the proposal, pages above the specified page limit within each volume will be removed and not evaluated as addressed within Section L.

   (e) Evaluation of the proposal will consider completeness and clarity, degree of compliance with the solicitation, and the Offeror's approach to meeting the Government's needs.

   (f) Award will be made to the Offeror whose proposal is determined to represent the best value to the Government. Offerors are cautioned that an evaluation of "unacceptable" in any single factor may result in the Offeror's proposal being rated unacceptable overall, and may impact the evaluation of the Offeror's submission. An unacceptable rating in any factor can result in an Offeror's elimination for consideration for award.

   (g) The proposal must state the Offeror's assent, without exception, to the terms and conditions of the RFP, including attachments, to be eligible for award. If an Offeror takes exception to any of the terms and conditions of the RFP, the Government may consider its offer to be unacceptable and the offer may not be further evaluated and may be disqualified for award.

   (h) The awardee must be granted a SECRET facility security clearance by a military department within forty-five (45) days of contract award.

(i) The Government may determine that a proposal is unacceptable if the costs proposed are materially unbalanced between line items or subline items. Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable TEC, the cost of one or more contract line items is significantly overstated or understated by the application of cost or price analysis techniques. A proposal may be rejected if the Contracting Officer determines that the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government (FAR 52.215-1(f)(8)). The Government may eliminate an Offeror whose cost proposal is inconsistent with its technical proposal.

(j) The Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by analyzing the projected cost for the requirement.

(k) The PCO will arrange for the debriefing of successful or unsuccessful Offerors. After contract award, Offerors may request a debriefing regarding their respective proposals. All requests for debriefing shall be made in writing to the PCO, as required by FAR 15.506.

2. RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THE EVALUATION FACTORS

The Government will evaluate each Offeror's proposal based on the following factors, which are listed in descending order of importance:

Factor 1: Management Approach
Factor 2: Technical Approach
Factor 3: Resource Capabilities
Factor 4: Past Performance
Factor 5: Cost

When combined, Factors 1 through 4 are significantly more important than Factor 5: Cost. The importance of the Cost as an evaluation factor will increase with the degree of equality in overall technical merit (non-price factors) of competing proposals.

3. TECHNICAL, PAST PERFORMANCE, AND COST EVALUATION PROCESS

Contract award under this RFP will be the result of an integrated assessment of the results of the evaluation based on the evaluation factors and their relative order of importance. The Government intends to make a best value determination for contract award.

EXPLANATION OF RATINGS

Table M1: Definitions	
Rating	**Definitions**
Significant Strength	An aspect of an Offeror's proposal with appreciable merit or will exceed specified performance or capability requirements to the considerable advantage of the Government during contract performance
Strength	An aspect of an offeror's proposal with merit or will exceed specified performance or capability requirements to the advantage of the Government during contract performance
Weakness	A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance
Significant Weakness	A flaw in the proposal that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance
Deficiency	A material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level
Risk	The potential for unsuccessful contract performance. The consideration of risk assesses the degree to which an Offeror's proposed approach to achieving the technical factor or subfactor may involve risk of disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight, and the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance.

3.1 ADJECTIVAL RATINGS FOR FACTOR 1 (MANAGEMENT APPROACH), FACTOR 2 (TECHNICAL APPROACH), AND FACTOR 3 (RESOURCE CAPABILITIES)

Table M2: - Combined Technical Risk Rating	
Rating	**Definitions**
Outstanding	Proposal demonstrates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths and/or at least one significant strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength or significant strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low to moderate.
Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation and, thus, contains one or more deficiencies and is unawardable, and/or risk of performance is unacceptably high.

3.2 CONFIDENCE RATINGS FOR FACTOR 4 (PAST PERFORMANCE)

The past performance evaluation results in an assessment of the Offeror's probability of meeting the solicitation requirements. The past performance evaluation considers each Offeror's demonstrated recent and relevant record of performance in supplying products and services that meet the contract's requirements. The Government will assess one performance confidence rating for each Offeror after evaluating the Offeror's recent past performance, focusing on performance that is relevant to the contract requirements.

For all Offerors, the Government will consider historical compliance with the requirements of FAR Part 52.219-8 (Utilization of Small Business Concerns). In addition, for large businesses, the Government will consider historical compliance with the requirements of FAR Part 52.219-9 (Small Business Subcontracting Plan), and DFARS 252.219-7003 (Small Business Subcontracting Plan, DOD Requirements).

Table M3: - Relevancy Ratings

Rating	**Definitions**
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.

Table M4: - Performance Confidence Assessment Ratings

Rating	**Definitions**
Substantial Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Satisfactory Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Limited Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
No Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the Offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.
Unknown Confidence (Neutral)	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.

3.3 BEST VALUE AWARD CONSIDERATION

The Government intends to award a contract to the responsible Offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government after evaluation IAW the factors in this solicitation. The best value proposal will be selected using a tradeoff process, as defined in FAR 15.101-1, which permits tradeoffs among cost and non-cost factors. Accordingly, the Government may award to other than the lowest cost proposal where the perceived benefits of the higher cost proposal merit the additional cost. Conversely, the Government may select a lower-cost, lower rated proposal if the Government determines the higher cost associated with the higher rated proposal is not justified. In making its best value determination, the Government shall consider Technical and Past Performance (i.e., all non-cost factors taken together) to be significantly more important than the cost. However, the importance of cost as an evaluation factor will increase with the degree of equality in overall technical merit of competing proposals. All information requested in Section L under 3.5 thru 3.7.2 will be evaluated IAW definitions and ratings in Tables M1 through M4.

3.4 EVALUATION FOR FACTOR 5 (COST)

A detailed review of each Offeror's cost proposal will be made to assess and evaluate the realism of the Offeror's estimated costs for performance of the requirements of this solicitation which will include an evaluation as to the consistency between the submitted cost and technical proposals. The evaluation will consider the Offeror’s proposed labor hours and skill mix (to ensure alignment with Attachment L-3), labor rates, material costs, travel costs, burden rates and other costs in light of information available to the PCO, including Government estimates for: (1) direct labor hours; (2) material costs; (3) direct labor costs; (4) travel cost; (5) indirect costs; and (6) any other costs which are likely to be incurred by the Offeror in performance of the requirements of the RFP.

For cost realism purposes, if the Offeror does not utilize the government escalation provided in Section L for direct labor prime or subcontractor rates, the Government will adjust utilizing the Government provided escalation rates to calculate the TEC.

For cost realism purposes, if indirect rate data does not exist for out years, and the indirect rate data is not substantiated, the Government will take the last full year (all twelve (12) months) of available indirect rate data/FPRA/FPRR and flat line for future years within the POP of this effort. If actuals are not provided, the Offeror’s proposal may be deemed UNACCEPTABLE.

CPFF Labor CLIN 0001

A cost-realism evaluation will be performed by the Government on CPFF items to calculate the probable costs that would be incurred in the course of performance. A cost realism analysis will be made of the Offeror's costs to determine if the overall costs are realistic for the work to be performed as described by the Offeror. The information presented in the Cost proposal for the CPFF items will be evaluated by the Government to determine: (i) the extent to which the Offeror understands the government's requirements, with realistic labor hour phasing and labor skill mix and (ii) what the government should realistically expect to pay for the Offeror's performance should the Offeror receive the award.

If the Offeror's proposed cost is considered unrealistic, the Government may adjust the Offeror's proposed cost upward. Pertinent cost information, including but not limited to independent government cost estimates, comparisons of the Offeror's proposed approaches and efforts to historical cost data from similar programs and effort, cost modeling programs, DCAA/DCMA input, DCAA/DCMA recommended rates, and data from other cognizant Government agencies for such costs as direct labor, overhead, General and Administrative, etc., as necessary and appropriate, may be used to arrive at the Government's determination of the actual/most probable costs to be incurred by the Offeror if awarded the resultant contract. If proposed direct labor and indirect rates are considered to be unrealistic, the Offeror's proposed rates may be adjusted upward. Based on such analysis, an adjusted cost for the Offeror will be calculated to reflect the government's estimate of the Offeror's most probable costs. The burden of proof for cost credibility rests with the Offeror. Poor or inadequate supporting cost data may negatively impact the government's cost evaluation of the Offeror.

The evaluated total estimated cost-plus fixed fee will be determined by adding the proposed estimated cost, cost realism adjustment (where appropriate), and proposed fixed fee. The projected cost to the Government will be based upon an analysis of the completeness, realism, and reasonableness of the cost proposal (per FAR 15.404-3).

CPFF Materials CLIN 0002

The Government will add the Offerors proposed indirect costs and proposed fixed fee values to the estimated base cost identified in Attachment L-3 to determine the total evaluated cost for this CLIN. The rates will be independently evaluated to determine whether they are realistic.

COST Other Direct Costs CLIN 0003

The Government will add the Offerors proposed indirect costs to the estimated base cost identified in Attachment L-3 to determine the total evaluated cost for CLIN 0003. The rates will be independently evaluated to determine whether they are realistic.

SIF/SBPIF Incentive fee CLIN 0004
CLIN 0004 will not be evaluated separately for cost realism. The incentive fee will be calculated and provided by the ACO order; however, for evaluation purposes, Offerors do not need to apply a fee (as it's unrealized until performance).

NOT SEPARATELY PRICED DATA CLIN 0005
CLIN 0005 is not separately priced and will not be evaluated separately for cost realism.

The Government will obtain and may utilize information obtained from the cognizant DCAA/DCMA office in determining the validity of proposed labor rates and indirect costs projected in the cost proposal.

The Government will analyze and review the Offeror's cost estimates and supporting cost data. This analysis will be performed for each CLIN, as well as on the Offeror's total proposal. The Government may also make adjustments to the Government estimates at any time prior to award if, in the Government's judgment, more accurate cost information becomes available. An amendment to the RFP will be issued if this is applicable.

On the basis of the above analysis, the Government will develop a TEC which represents, in the Government's judgment, the overall cost (projected costs plus a proposed fixed fee to the Government), which will result from the Offeror's actual performance of the contract requirements of each CLIN set forth in Section B for which a proposed cost is required to be submitted. The Government will then evaluate offers for award purposes by adding together the projected cost plus proposed fixed fee for CLINs 0001-0003, to arrive at a TEC to the Government. Fixed fee percentages will not be adjusted during the cost realism analysis. The SBPIF and SIF values will not be evaluated and are not included in the TEC to the Government. For cost realism purposes, the Government will utilize the proposed fixed fee for CLINs 0001 and 0002. The FFP profit will not be calculated in the TEC.

Experience in Government programs indicates a contract awarded to a contractor submitting an unrealistically low cost/price proposal (whether resulting from a decision on the part of the Contractor to submit a price below anticipated costs; from inaccurate, incorrect or improper assumptions in the cost, technical, or other areas; from a lack of understanding of the contract requirements, or other circumstances) may cause problems for the Government as well as the Contractor during contract performance. Such problems may include the incurrence of significant cost overruns that may substantially impair the Contractor's ability to perform scheduled availabilities in a timely manner and cause significant disruptions in Fleet operations. Accordingly, Offerors' are cautioned that SHOULD THE GOVERNMENT, IN THE EXERCISE OF ITS JUDGMENT, DETERMINE THAT A COST PROPOSAL SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO THIS SOLICITATION IS UNREALISTICALLY

LOW, THE GOVERNMENT MAY REJECT THE PROPOSAL, REGARDLESS OF ITS TECHNICAL MERIT (TECHNICAL CAPABILITY AND PAST PERFORMANCE) AND/OR EVALUATED COST TO THE GOVERNMENT.