Amendment 0001
Attachment 3
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

A. BASIS OF AWARD

Award will be made to the responsible small business offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government, based on a comparative evaluation of all timely-received proposals in accordance with RFO 12.203(c)(2). The Government will compare proposals against one another and against the requirements of the Statement of Work (SOW) to determine which proposal offers the overall best combination of technical approach, past performance, and price. Award may be made to other than the lowest-priced offeror if the Government determines that a higher-priced proposal offers superior technical approach or past performance that merits the price difference. Award may also be made to other than the highest technically rated offeror if the Government determines that the price premium associated with that offeror's proposal is not justified by the degree of technical superiority offered.

This acquisition is set aside exclusively for small businesses in accordance with RFO 19.104-1. Only offerors that are verified small businesses under the applicable North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code at the time of offer submission will be considered for award.

The Government will evaluate proposals under the following three (3) factors:

Factor 1 – Technical Approach

Factor 2 – Past Performance

Factor 3 – Price

Factor 1 and Factor 2 are equally important. Factors 1 and 2, when combined, are equally important as Factor 3.

B. EVALUATION APPROACH

The Government will conduct a comparative evaluation. There are no formal adjectival rating tables or color-coded scoring systems applied under this evaluation. Instead, the Contracting Officer (KO), with input from the technical evaluator(s), will document the relative strengths, weaknesses, and risks of each proposal under each factor and render a comparative best value determination, supported by a written narrative. The evaluation will not be a mechanical or mathematical exercise. The KO will exercise informed judgment consistent with the factors and criteria described in this section.

A proposal that merely restates or paraphrases the requirements of the SOW without providing substantive information about how the offeror intends to perform the work will be considered inadequate under Factor 1 and will receive no credit for technical approach.

The Government reserves the right to request clarifications from offerors in accordance with RFO 12.203(c)(2) and RFO 15.202(a)(2)(i) prior to making an award decision. Clarifications do not constitute discussions and will not be used to cure material deficiencies in a proposal.

C. FACTOR 1 – TECHNICAL APPROACH

1. GENERAL:

The Government will evaluate the comprehensiveness of each section of the offeror's technical approach and understanding of the requirements for successful execution of this project. Proposals with thorough, detailed, and complete narratives demonstrating the offeror's understanding of the project. Technical approach must demonstrate an understanding that will lead to successful completion of work associated with this solicitation.

2. EVALUATION CRITERIA:

a. Pre-Processing and File Conversion Approach. The Government will evaluate the offeror's proposed approach to processing Government-Furnished Information (GFI), provided in NavisWorks (NWD) and ~~STEP~~ Rivet (RFA) formats during the solicitation period, into fabrication-ready geometry. Proposals that demonstrate a realistic understanding of the pre-processing effort required, identify anticipated challenges specific to the furnished files, and describe concrete methods for resolving them may be evaluated more favorably.

b. Fabrication and Post-Processing Approach. The Government will evaluate the offeror's proposed fabrication and post-processing methodology. The Government will not prescribe printer type, material, or fabrication technology; however, the proposal must demonstrate that the offeror's chosen approach is capable of producing a finished model that meets all performance standards within the period of performance. Proposals that address material selection, finishing methods, and quality control checkpoints with specificity may be evaluated more favorably.

c. Segmentation and Transportability Plan. The Government will evaluate the offeror's proposed segmentation strategy and approach to transportability. Proposals that present a coherent, well-reasoned segmentation concept that credibly addresses the assembly, disassembly, and transport requirements may be evaluated more favorably.

d. Schedule and Production Plan. The Government will evaluate the offeror's proposed production schedule for realism, completeness, and logical sequencing. Proposals that present a detailed, activity-level schedule with a clearly identified critical path and realistic production durations that account for all deliverables and Government review periods may be evaluated more favorably than proposals that present only a summary-level timeline.

e. Quality Control Approach. The Government will evaluate the offeror's proposed approach to quality control throughout fabrication, post-processing, and pre-shipment inspection. Proposals that demonstrate a structured, credible quality control approach tailored to the specific requirements of this SOW may be evaluated more favorably.

D. FACTOR 2 – PAST PERFORMANCE

1. GENERAL:

The Government will evaluate the offeror's record of recent and relevant past performance to assess the probability that the offeror will successfully deliver a compliant model within the required period of performance. The Government will consider past performance information provided by the offeror in its proposal, as well as information available in the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), and any other available Government records or references.

2. RECENCY:

Past performance references will be considered recent if the contract or effort was performed, or is currently being performed, within the five (5) years preceding the date of this solicitation. References outside this window may be considered at the Government's discretion if the offeror demonstrates that no more recent relevant work is available. The Government recognizes that offerors responding to this solicitation may have limited or no federal contracting history. Accordingly, past performance references from state, local government, and commercial clients will be accepted and evaluated on equal terms with federal past performance references, provided the work is otherwise recent and relevant.

3. RELEVANCY:

The Government will assess the relevance of each past performance reference based on the degree to which the prior effort is similar to the requirements of this SOW across three dimensions: scope, complexity, and nature. References that demonstrate similarity across all three dimensions may be evaluated more favorably than references that demonstrate similarity across fewer dimensions. References reflecting work with little or no similarity to the requirements of this SOW will be afforded little or no weight.

a. Scope. Scope refers to the overall scale, size, and fabrication method of the prior effort relative to the requirements of this SOW. The Government will assess whether the prior effort involved the design and fabrication of a large-format, 3D-printed physical model or assembly using additive manufacturing processes and plastic-based materials, originating from a client-furnished or externally sourced digital 3D model, which can include, but is not limited to, assembled models or multi-component physical assemblies exceeding four (4) feet in any assembled dimension. References that demonstrate experience with large-format additive fabrication and delivery efforts of comparable scale and method may be evaluated more favorably.

b. Complexity. Complexity refers to the technical difficulty and precision demands of the prior effort relative to the requirements of this SOW. The Government will assess whether the prior effort required the offeror to manage technically demanding fabrication challenges, which can include, but is not limited to, multi-segment assembly with precision alignment requirements, fabrication of functional or removable modular components, conversion of digital design data into fabrication-ready geometry, or the application of controlled finishing standards across a large-format assembly. References that demonstrate experience managing multiple, simultaneous technical challenges of this nature may be evaluated more favorably than references that reflect technically straightforward fabrication work.

c. Nature. Nature refers to the type of work performed and the delivery environment of the prior effort relative to the requirements of this SOW. The Government will assess whether the prior effort involved custom, one-of-a-kind physical fabrication delivered to an external client under defined acceptance criteria, which can include, but is not limited to, government, institutional, or commercial clients with formal submittal, inspection, or approval requirements. References that demonstrate experience performing custom fabrication work under structured client oversight and defined quality or acceptance standards may be evaluated more favorably.

4. QUALITY OF PERFORMANCE:

For each recent and relevant reference, the Government will assess the quality of the offeror's performance, including on-time delivery, conformance to technical or contractual requirements, responsiveness to client direction, and resolution of any deficiencies. Because offerors responding to this solicitation may have limited or no federal contracting history, the Government will not rely exclusively on CPARS records or federal Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs) to assess quality. Instead, offerors shall submit a completed PPQ, using the template provided at Attachment ~~[X]~~ 2, for each reference submitted. The PPQ shall be completed and signed by the client point of contact identified in the reference submission. The Government reserves the right to conduct direct reference interviews by phone or

email to supplement or verify PPQ responses. References that reflect successful performance with no significant deficiencies, or deficiencies that were promptly and effectively resolved, may be evaluated more favorably.

5. UNKNOWN PAST PERFORMANCE:

In accordance with RFO 12.203(c)(3) and RFO 15.202(c)(1), an offeror with no recent and relevant past performance record, or with a record too sparse to permit a meaningful assessment, will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on Factor 2. Such an offeror will be treated as presenting a neutral past performance record, which will neither advantage nor disadvantage the offeror relative to competitors with documented relevant experience.

6. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS FOR FACTOR 2:

Offerors shall submit a minimum of three (3) and a maximum of five (5) past performance references. For each reference, the offeror shall provide, at a minimum:

a. Contract number or project identifier.

b. Client name, point of contact name, phone number, and email address.

c. Brief description of the work performed and its relevance.

d. Contract value and period of performance.

e. Delivery outcome (on time, early, or delayed) with explanation.

f. A completed and signed PPQ using the template provided in Attachment ~~[X]~~ 2.

The Government reserves the right to contact any or all provided references and to use information from sources other than those provided by the offeror.

E. FACTOR 3 – PRICE

1. PRICE REASONABLENESS:

The Government will evaluate all proposed prices for reasonableness in accordance with RFO 12.203 and RFO 15.404-1. Price reasonableness will be assessed by comparing proposed prices among competing offerors and against the Government's Independent Government Estimate (IGE). A proposed price that is significantly higher than competing offers and the IGE, without a documented technical or performance justification, may be considered unreasonable and may be grounds for elimination from consideration.

2. PRICE REALISM:

Because this is a technically complex, custom fabrication requirement, the Government will also assess proposed prices for realism. A proposed price that is significantly below competing proposals may indicate that the offeror does not fully understand the scope of work or has priced the effort in a manner that creates a performance risk. An unrealistically low price will not be viewed as advantageous to the Government and may be considered a risk factor in the comparative evaluation. The Government may request supporting price or cost information from any offeror whose proposed price raises realism concerns, prior to making an award decision.

3. PRICE EVALUATION:

Price will be evaluated based on the offeror's total proposed price as submitted on the pricing schedule. The Government will not normalize or adjust proposed prices for evaluation purposes, except as necessary to correct arithmetic errors or resolve ambiguities. Price will be considered in the comparative best value determination alongside Factor 1 and Factor 2.