SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

THIS SECTION IS FOR SOLICITATION PURPOSES ONLY. THIS SECTION WILL BE PHYSICALLY REMOVED FROM ANY RESULTANT AWARD.

This section outlines the criteria the Government will use in evaluating the Offeror's capabilities and proposals for this acquisition. The Government will compare each Offeror's capabilities and proposal elements against predetermined evaluation criteria to the Government's requirement defined herein.

M.1 GENERAL EVALUATION INFORMATION

M.1.1. Basis for Contract Award.

This is a competitive, Performance Price Tradeoff (PPT) with Technical Acceptability acquisition for Women Owned Small Business (WOSB) companies that will be conducted in accordance with Revolutionary FAR Overhaul (RFO), as supplemented by the Revolutionary FAR Overhaul Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (R-DFARS), and the Department of the Air Force (DAF) to make an integrated assessment for a best value award decision. These regulations are available electronically at https://acquisition.gov/. For those Offerors who are determined to be technically acceptable, tradeoffs may be made between past performance and price. Technical and Past Performance when combined are approximately equal to price. This may result in an award to a higher rated past performance, higher priced Offeror, where the decision is consistent with the evaluation factors, and it is reasonably determined that the technical and/or overall business approach and/or past performance of the higher priced offeror outweighs the cost difference. The Government evaluation team will strive for maximum objectivity, the selection process, by its nature, is subjective and, therefore, professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire process. In order to be considered for award, the Offeror must be determined responsible (as described in RFO 9.104), meet all solicitation requirements, terms, and conditions, be technically "Outstanding", "Good" or "Acceptable", be assessed a past performance confidence rating of "Substantial", "Satisfactory" or "Neutral", and have a price that is complete, fair, reasonable, and balanced.

M.1.2. Number of Contracts to be Awarded.

The Government intends to award a single Firm-Fixed Price contract as a result of this solicitation.

M.2. COMMUNICATION WITH OFFERORS

M.2.1. Intent to Award Without Discussions

The Government intends to award a contract as a result of this solicitation without discussions. Offerors are advised to submit their best offer and with sufficient information in the format specified. Despite the intent to award without discussions the Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if determined in the best interest of the Government and may do so in writing or orally. The scope and extent of discussions are a matter of Contracting Officer judgment. Offerors may be restricted to a short turnaround (less than 24 hours) in responding to the Contracting Officer.

M.2.2. Clerical Errors.
Communication conducted to resolve minor or clerical errors will not constitute discussions and the contracting officer reserves the right to award a contract without the opportunity for revisions.

M.2.3. Correction Potential of Proposal.
The Government will consider, throughout the evaluation, the "correction potential" of any deficiency or proposal inadequacy. The judgment of such "correction potential" is within the sole discretion of the Government. If an aspect of an Offeror's proposal not meeting the Government's requirements is not considered correctable, the Offeror may be removed for consideration for award.

M.3. Evaluation Factors and Subfactors

This evaluation will utilize the following evaluation factors

Factor 1: Technical
Factor 2: Past Performance
Factor 3: Price

M.3.1. Relative Importance of Factors
Technical and Past Performance, when combined, are approximately equal to price.

M.3.2. Factor 1- Technical (Construction Work Plan)
The Government will evaluate each Offeror's technical proposal, to determine if the Offeror's technical proposal demonstrates a sound Construction Work Plan and a thorough and comprehensive understanding of the acquisition requirements and solicitation.
The Construction Work Plan, in accordance with the Statement of Work, shall provide a description of an offeror's capabilities and overall execution strategy to ensure successful performance throughout all states of performance to include technical approach, management and schedule, and proposed equipment list. The narrative shall demonstrate an adequate set of processes and procedures detailing how the Offeror will execute all work diligently without any unnecessary or unauthorized delays, breaks or deviations from the SOW or subsequent modifications.

M.3.2.1 Technical Approach: The Government will evaluate the Construction Work Plan for a comprehensive understanding of the requirements for safe confined-space entry procedures, detailed cable pulling techniques, splicing methodologies, Fiber Optic Transport System (FOTS) integration, and adherence to Telecommunications Industry Association (TIA), Telecommunications Distribution Methods (TDM), and Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC) standards as stated in the SOW.

M.3.2.2 Management and Schedule: The Government will evaluate the Construction Work Plan for a comprehensive schedule that includes minimizing network downtime/outages, site cleanup and manhole/handhole restoration. The Government will determine a level of confidence that the contractor can maintain compliance with a confined space safety plan, a quality control plan, and key personnel listing to ensure OSHA compliance and safety adherence.

M.3.2.3 Proposed Equipment List: The Government will evaluate the Construction Work Plan for a detailed list of proposed equipment that demonstrates the ability to identify and access the mandatory, calibrated equipment required to safely execute underground fiber optic installation and testing.

Factor 1, Technical, will be evaluated and assessed with an overall rating in accordance with Table 3.2 Risk Rating Matrix below.

TABLE 3.2. Risk Rating Matrix	
Rating	**Description**
OUTSTANDING	Proposal demonstrates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements, contains multiple strengths and/or at least one significant strength.
GOOD	Proposal demonstrates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength or significant strength.
ACCEPTABLE	Proposal demonstrates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements.
MARGINAL	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements.
UNACCEPTABLE	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation and, thus, contains one or more deficiencies and is un-awardable.

M.3.3. Factor 2 –Past Performance.

The Past Performance evaluation is a result of an assessment of the Offeror's probability of meeting the solicitation requirements. In conducting the Past Performance evaluation, the Government reserves the right to use both the information provided in the Offeror's Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS)/Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQ) proposal volume and information obtained from other sources available to the Government, to include, but not limited to, Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), or other databases; interviews with Project Managers, Contracting Officers; the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA), and commercial sources.

M.3.3.1. Adverse Past Performance

Offerors may be given an opportunity to address adverse past performance information if the Offeror has not had a previous opportunity to respond to the information.

M.3.3.2. Submissions

Each past performance submission will be determined as recent or not recent. Then, each recent past performance submission will receive a relevancy rating. As a result of recency, relevancy, of the individual contracts, and independent government review of contractors past performance, an overall Integrated Performance Confidence Assessment Rating will be assigned to Past Performance Factor 2. Only Offerors with a Past Performance rating of "Substantial Confidence", "Satisfactory Confidence" and "Neutral Confidence" will be

considered eligible for award. Any proposals receiving an Integrated Performance Confidence Assessment Rating of "Limited Confidence" or "No Confidence" for Factor 2 will not be eligible for award.

M.3.3.3. The Offeror shall submit a proposal that clearly identifies and supports recency and relevancy based on the following definitions:

M 3.3.3.1. Recency.

An evaluation of the present/past performance information will be made to determine if it is recent. Recency is defined as active contract performance during the three (3) years preceding the date of issuance of this solicitation. Contracts that were started prior to this time, but still in effect with active performance as of three (3) years from the date of this solicitation, will be considered recent. Ongoing projects may be used as long as they are at least 80% complete as of the date of issuance of this solicitation (A progress report signed by a Government Contracting Officer or Non- Federal Government equivalent must be provided to prove actual completion percentage). If a contract reference is determined recent (had some or all active performance in the three (3) years preceding the solicitation issuance date) and had active performance prior to the three (3) years preceding the date of issuance of this solicitation, the Government may evaluate the Offeror's performance record during the entire contract period. Past performance information that fails this condition will not be evaluated. A recency determination of the Offeror's past performance will be made based upon the aforementioned considerations, including joint venture partner(s). The Government will use the table below for recency ratings when assessing recent, relevant contracts.

Table M.3.3.3.1 PAST PERFORMANCE RECENCY RATING METHOD	
Rating	**Definition**
RECENT	Present/Past Performance effort is ongoing with 80% or more completion or has been completed during the past three years.
NOT RECENT	Present/Past Performance effort is not ongoing with 80% or more completion or has not been completed during the past three years.

M 3.3.3.2. Relevancy.

An evaluation of the present/past performance information will be made to determine if it has relevancy. Specifically, relevant is defined as contracts of similar size, scope, and magnitude, involving the type of construction and work elements described in the solicitation and attached Statement of Work (SOW). Relevant past performance project work elements include projects involving installation of fiber optic cable, installation of underground fiber optic cable infrastructure, splicing, terminating, and testing fiber optic cable, and FOTS integration. Relevant Present/Past project(s) cost should be in the range of $250,000 to $500,000. A relevancy determination of the Offeror's past performance will be made based upon the aforementioned considerations, including joint venture and teaming partner(s). The Government will use the table below for relevancy definitions when assessing relevant contracts.

Table M.3.3.3.2. PAST PERFORMANCE RELEVANCY RATING METHOD	
Adjectival Rating	**Description**
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.

M.3.3.3. Assigning Performance Confidence Assessment Ratings.

Performance confidence is assessed at the overall Past Performance factor level after evaluating aspects of the Offeror's recent past performance, focusing on performance that is relevant to this acquisition, taking into consideration their relative order of importance, IAW RFO 15.202(c)(3), the Government will consider recency and relevance of the information, source of the information, context of the data, and general trends in contractor's performance. This evaluation of the recent contracts will result in Offerors receiving an Integrated Performance Confidence Assessment Rating (IPCAR), as defined in Table M.3.3.3.

TABLE M.3.3.3. INTEGRATED PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE ASSESSEMENT RATINGS	
Adjectival Rating	**Description**
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.
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 the 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.

In evaluating past performance, the Government reserves the right to give greater consideration to information on those contracts deemed most relevant to the effort described in this solicitation. Past performance with a greater degree of recency or relevancy will have a greater impact on the IPCAR than less recent or relevant efforts.

M.3.3.4. Neutral Confidence

Offerors without a record of recent/relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance and, as a result, will receive a "Neutral Confidence" rating for the Past Performance factor. A strong record of recent and relevant past performance may be considered more advantageous to the Government than a" Neutral Confidence" rating.

M.3.4. Factor 3 – Price

Complete the Standard Form 1442 and all the pages originally included in the RFP. Offerors must complete all Scheduled B pricing information and complete all Representations and Certifications in Section K or in SAM.gov. Offerors should complete Section B, for CLIN 0001 with the price in the unit price and total price columns. Complete blocks 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20a, 20b, and 20c of the SF 1442, Solicitation, Offer, and Award. In doing so, the Offeror agrees to the contract terms and conditions as written in the RFP, Sections A through K.

M.3.4.1. Completeness

The Offeror's proposed price and other information will be evaluated to ensure continuity and traceability of prices to the technical volume and between the initial proposal and any revisions thereafter.

M.3.4.2. Unbalanced Pricing.

The Government will analyze proposals to determine whether proposed prices are unbalanced pursuant to RFO 15.404. Offerors are cautioned against submitting an offer that contains unbalanced pricing. Unbalanced pricing may increase performance risk and could result in payment of unreasonably high prices. The Government will analyze proposals to determine whether they are unbalanced. A proposal may be rejected if the Contracting Officer determines that the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.

M.3.4.3. Reasonableness.

The government will analyze proposals to determine whether proposed prices are reasonable IAW RFO 31.201-3 and 15.404, the Offeror's Total Price proposal will be evaluated to ensure it is fair and reasonable. Pursuant to RFO 15.404, the Government may use various price analysis techniques and procedures to ensure a fair and reasonable price.

M.4. Evaluation Steps.

The Government will not search for data to cure problems or address inconsistencies in an Offeror's proposal. Proposals will be evaluated using the following evaluation process steps:

Step 1 – SAM registration and SBA certification: The Government will evaluate the contractor for active registration in the System for Award Management (SAM) at SAM.gov and certification as a Small Business Administration Women Owned Small Business (WOSB). If a contractor does not have an active registration and certification or pending certification from the SBA as a WOSB they will be eliminated from competition.

Step 2 – Proposal Adequacy: The Government will review proposals for completeness

(adhering to all information/instructions). If an Offeror fails to comply with instructions in Section L - Instructions, Condition, and Notices to Offeror, the Offeror's proposal may be deemed incomplete and may receive no further consideration and could be eliminated from the competition.

Step 3 – Contractor Responsibility: Offeror's contractor responsibility will be determined in accordance with RFO subpart 9.1 and if found responsible, will move on to Step 3 - Evaluation Factor 1, Technical evaluation.

Step 3 – Evaluate Factor 1, Technical: The Government will evaluate all responsible offerors with complete proposals for technical acceptability. A rating of "Outstanding", "Good", "Acceptable", "Marginal" or "Unacceptable" will be assigned for each proposal. To be eligible for award, an Offeror must receive a rating of "Outstanding", "Good", or "Acceptable" for Factor 1. Only proposals determined "Outstanding", "Good", or "Acceptable" on Factor 1 will proceed to be evaluated for Factor 2, Past Performance. If a proposal is deemed technically "Marginal" or "Unacceptable" for Factor 1, it will be eliminated, and past performance will not be evaluated. Thus, the proposal will be eliminated from the competition.

Step 4 – Evaluate Factor 2, Past Performance: The Government will evaluate the past performance information for recency and relevancy for those proposals deemed "Outstanding", "Good", or "Acceptable" on Factor 1. A rating of "Recent" or "Not Recent" will be assigned for each Contractor's Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) or Past Performance Questionnaire and any information obtained from other sources per Table M.3.3.3.1. All past performance information with a "Recent" rating will be evaluated for relevancy and given a rating of "Very Relevant", "Relevant", "Somewhat Relevant", or "Not Relevant" per Table M.3.3.3.2. After a recency and relevancy rating has been assigned, each Offeror's whole past performance information will be given an Integrated Performance Confidence Assessment Rating (IPCAR) per Table M.3.3.3.

Step 5 –Grouping: Offerors will be assigned to groups based on the IPCAR rating. A proposal with a "No Confidence" or "Limited Confidence" IPCAR will be eliminated from the competition. A proposal with a "Neutral Confidence", "Satisfactory Confidence" or "Substantial Confidence" IPCAR will proceed to be evaluated for Factor 3, Price.

Step 6 –Evaluate Factor 3, Price: The proposal with the highest rated technical proposal with the highest Integrated Performance Confidence Assessment Rating (IPCAR) and the lowest total price will be the apparent successful offeror upon determination that the total price is complete, balanced and fair and reasonable IAW RFO 15.404. In the event of a large price disparity existing between the IPCAR rating groups, the Government reserves the right to perform an integrated best value determination and award the contract to other than the highest IPCAR rating group since non-price factors are approximately equal to price.

Step 7 – Contracting Officer's Decision: The offeror that is determined to have provided the most advantageous offer to the Government, will be the apparent successful offeror.