Acquisition and Material Management Division
Ford House Office Building, Room H2-263
Washington, DC 20515
202.226.2557

www.aoc.gov

Instructions to Offerors and Basis for Award

AOCSSB26R0048

Release Date: 7/1/2026

Amendment 01: 7/15/2026

Amendment 02: 7/30/2026

The Architect of the Capitol (AOC), Supplies, Services, and Material Management Division (SSMMD) is issuing Request for Proposals (RFP) # AOCSSB26R0048 for an agency-wide Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract for Elevator, Escalator, and Accessible Lifts Maintenance, Repair, Inspection, and Modernization Services. It is anticipated that this RFP will result in a single award, IDIQ contract with Firm Fixed Price, Labor Hour, and Time and Materials Task Orders to a responsible Offeror actively registered in the System for Award Management (SAM) and whose proposal provides the overall best value to the AOC in accordance with the requirements set forth by this solicitation and the Statement of Work (SOW). This solicitation will use the procedures in AOC Contracting Manual § 9.1 Negotiated Acquisitions. The AOC Contracting Manual can be found here: https://www.aoc.gov/sites/default/files/2023-01/AOC-Order-34-1_Contracting-Manual-2022.pdf

The North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code for this requirement is 238290 - Other Building Equipment Contractors. The Product Service Code is J039 - Maint/Repair/Rebuild Of Equipment- Materials Handling Equipment. The IDIQ period of performance will be 1 base year and 4 one-year options, for a total of five years from the date of award if all options are exercised. FAR 52.217-8 is also included at the IDIQ level.

Please see List of Attachments.

L.1 RFP GENERAL CONDITIONS

The submission of a proposal to the Government shall constitute the offeror's acknowledgment, agreement and compliance with the terms and conditions of the RFP. The Government will not be obligated to pay any cost incurred by a contractor in the preparation and submission of a proposal. Offerors are cautioned to ensure that their proposal submissions

are complete and reflective of the evaluation criteria and requirements described herein. Offerors are encouraged to provide their best terms with their initial proposal submission. Offerors shall not assume that the Government will afford an opportunity to clarify, discuss, or revise a proposal. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if it determines that it is in the best interest of the Government.

Proposals shall be valid for 120 days from the date of final proposal submission.

Any exceptions or conditional assumptions taken with respect to the requirements outlined in the RFP or SOW shall be fully explained in the offeror's Introductory Letter. The Government cautions offerors that taking exception to any term or condition may render their proposal non-responsive and the offeror will be ineligible for award, unless the RFP expressly authorizes such an exception with regards to a specific term or condition.

L.2 QUESTIONS AND PROPOSAL SUBMISSIONS

All correspondence in conjunction with this solicitation, including questions and proposal submittals, shall be directed to the Contracting Officer, Roman Davydov, via e-mail at roman.davydov@aoc.gov. E-mail messages shall not exceed 20 MB. If necessary, offerors shall compress files with a .zip extension.

L.2.1 Questions Due Date

Questions about the technical or contractual details of this procurement must be submitted in writing via e-mail by **July 16, 2026 at noon ET**. When submitting questions, please include the RFP #, Company Name and the word "Questions" in the subject line of the email. For example, "AOCSSB26R0048_ ABC Inc. Questions". Questions submitted after this cut off will be responded to at the discretion of the Contracting Officer.

Answers to questions will be provided as an amendment to the RFP.

L.2.2 Proposal Due Date

Proposals must be received no later than **August 31~~10~~, 2026 at noon ET**. When submitting your final proposal, please include the RFP #, Company Name and the word "Proposal" in the subject line of the email. For example, "AOCSSB26R0048_ ABC Inc. Proposal". Proposals received after this date and time shall be considered late and shall not be accepted by the Government unless it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government.

L.3 VOLUMES AND ORGANIZATION

Proposals shall be clearly and concisely written, as well as being neat, indexed and logically assembled as described herein. Offerors are advised to supply all information in the sequence

and format specified in the table below. The submitted proposal must provide a sufficient basis for a thorough evaluation and contain the information necessary for evaluation. The Government will not assume the offeror possesses any capability, understanding, or commitment not specified in the proposal. The proposal must not merely repeat the solicitation and Statement of Work requirements, but rather must provide convincing documentary evidence in support of conclusive statements of how contract requirements will be met.

Proposals shall be prepared in separate volumes: Volume I – Technical and Volume II – Price. The offeror shall provide the requested information within the designated volume evaluation factor. Any requested information placed outside of the designated location shall not be considered or evaluated under that evaluation factor regardless of whether it is located somewhere else in the proposal. In order for the technical proposal to be strictly evaluated on the merit of the material submitted, Volume I and Volume II shall be submitted as separate documents. Pricing is prohibited in, and shall be omitted from, Volume I. Each volume shall be indexed by evaluation factor.

Volumes shall be organized in the following manner:

Volume	Factor	Title	Page Limit (Not to Exceed)
I	NA	Introductory Letter	No limit, however, keep to a minimum, since the Introductory Letter will not be evaluated
	1	Technical Approach	40 Pages
	2	Corporate Experience	10 Pages per contract
	3	Key Personnel	5 Pages per resume, 2 pages for L.3.6.1
	4	Past Performance	No limit – to be provided by past customers
II	5	Price	No Limit – see J.3 IDIQ Pricing Sheet
	NA	Standard Form 33 (Provision Fill-Ins)	No Limit

All pages in Volume I, except the introductory letter, shall include page numbering.

Content which is outside the Page Limits in the above chart will not be considered by the Government during evaluations.

The table of contents does not count towards the page limit.

L.3.1 Paper Size and Formatting

Written materials shall be submitted 1 sided single spaced pages using standard 8 ½" x 11" size paper with a minimum of 1" margins. Font size shall be Times New Roman or Calibri with a minimum of 12-point size for text and 10-point size for tables and graphics.

L.3.2 Introductory Letter

The following introductory information is required before the first index of Volume I:

- RFP Number & Title;
- Name and address of offeror;
- Unique Entity Identifier (UIE) & cage code;
- NAICS / PSC;
- Name, telephone number & e-mail address of offeror's main point-of-contact;
- Date of submission;
- Name, title and signature of authorized representative; and
- All technical factor assumptions to the RFP and SOW shall be identified in this section. Pricing assumptions shall be identified in Volume II. Exceptions identified in other areas of the proposal will not be considered.

L.3.3 Standard Form 33 (SF33)

The offeror shall complete Page 1 of the SF33 and all the provision fill-ins under Section K - Representations, Certifications, and other Statements of Offerors or Respondents. The entire form shall be returned in PDF format in Volume II. Any SF-30 associated with any amendments to this RFP shall be signed by the offeror and included in Volume II as well.

L.3.4 Factor 1 – Technical Approach

a) The Offeror shall provide a comprehensive description of the processes, methods, and procedures it will use to accomplish all requirements identified in the Statement of Work (SOW) sections C.5.1 through C.5.10. The Offeror shall provide description of quality management system, safety program, OSHA compliance procedures, incident reporting process, internal quality inspections, technician certification requirements, safety training frequency and identify job hazards.

b) The Offeror shall describe its capacity to perform simultaneous task orders associated with the requirements in Sections C.3.1 (Routine, Non-routine, and Emergency Maintenance and Repair Services) and C.3.2 (Modernization Services). For example, there could be 10 Task Orders for C.3.1 and 10 Task Orders for C.3.2 occurring at the same time. The Offeror shall describe the organizational structure and administrative resources supporting contract execution, including project coordinators, dispatch personnel, customer service representatives, estimators, contract administrators, and invoicing personnel. The Offeror shall

explain how these resources support timely scheduling, proposal preparation, invoicing, reporting, and contract administration.

c) The Offeror shall describe how it will be able to provide technical evaluation and price proposals within the following timeframes for Task Orders within the C.3.1 (Routine, Non-routine, and Emergency Maintenance and Repair Services) performance area.

1) 24 hours for the contractor to come on site and evaluate an emergency issue.
2) 24 additional hours for emergency proposals w/estimated repair time.
3) 1 week for general non-emergency response to a request for a quotation.
4) 2 weeks for a standard elevator modernization quotation
5) Additional time for multiple elevator modernizations with complexities like phasing.

d) For Task Orders issued under Section C.5.5 for the U.S. Botanic Garden (USBG), the Offeror shall describe its capability to meet the following response time requirements based on the priority level of the service request:

1) Emergency (Priority 1): The Offeror shall respond to life safety incidents, entrapments, or other emergency conditions requiring immediate action 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, 365 days per year basis. Technicians shall arrive on-site within 60 minutes of notification. A technical evaluation shall be completed and a Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) repair proposal submitted within 24 hours of the site evaluation. When firm pricing depends on OEM parts availability, the Offeror shall submit a finalized proposal within 48 to 72 hours.

2) Urgent (Priority 2): The Offeror shall respond to non-emergency outages that significantly impact building operations but do not constitute a life safety emergency. Qualified personnel shall arrive on-site within 4 hours during normal business hours or within 6 hours after normal business hours. The Offeror shall provide a technical evaluation and repair recommendation in accordance with the requirements of Section C.5.5.

3) Routine (Priority 3): The Offeror shall respond to routine maintenance requests and other non-critical service requests by the next business day. Technical evaluations and price proposals shall be provided in accordance with the timeframes established in Section (c) above.

e) The Offeror shall describe how it will be able to provide technical and price proposals within 1 to 2 weeks for Task Orders within the C.3.2 (Modernization Services) performance area. For more complex modernization efforts, additional time may be permitted.

f) The Offeror shall confirm that it maintains a fully operational business office within a 50-mile radius of Washington, DC. The Offeror shall provide the physical address of this office and describe the functions performed at that location to demonstrate its capability to support contract requirements, including routine, non-routine, emergency maintenance, and modernization services.

g) The Offeror shall describe its strategy for obtaining replacement parts and equipment necessary to support routine maintenance, emergency repairs, and modernization activities. The description shall identify local inventory capabilities, warehouse locations, stocking practices for critical components, and procedures for obtaining obsolete or long-lead-time parts.

L.3.5 Factor 2 – Corporate Experience

The Offeror shall describe five (5) recent and relevant contracts completed within the past five (5) years, or those on going which have been performed for the past 3 years. Contracts will be considered recent and relevant if they document completed work of a similar size, scope, magnitude, and complexity for a government or private entity. Offerors shall use Attachment J.5 Corporate Experience Template to submit Corporate Experience.

L.3.6 Factor 3 – Key Personnel

The Offeror shall submit one resume for the Account/Program Manager (Section C.15.1) and one resume for the Senior Field Engineer/Supervisor (Section C.15.2). Each resume shall clearly describe the individual's relevant experience, including dates of employment, as well as education, certifications, and any additional qualifications that demonstrate the individual's capability to perform the duties identified in the Statement of Work.

The Offeror shall also submit a resume for a designated alternate (backup) Account/Program Manager and alternate Senior Field Engineer/Supervisor who are qualified to assume the responsibilities of the primary personnel during periods of leave, illness, emergency, or vacancy.

L.3.6.1 The Offeror shall describe its succession and transition plan to ensure continuity of operations, starting on a separate page following the resumes.

L.3.7 Factor 4 – Past Performance

The Government is providing a Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) as an attachment to this solicitation (Attachment J.6) which the offeror shall provide to the past customer POC's for the five past contracts identified under the Corporate Experience factor (L.3.5) for completion. The Government requests that the offeror submit the questionnaire to the POCs via email. All completed questionnaire forms must be emailed by the past customer POC directly to the Contracting Officer, Roman Davydov, at roman.davydov@aoc.gov by the due date and time of proposals.

L.3.8 Factor 5 – Price

Offerors shall fill in the hourly rates for each IDIQ Labor Category in Attachment J.3 IDIQ Pricing Sheet (the cells with the yellow background and blue text).

Offerors shall not change any other cell in the price sheet.

For price evaluation purposes, this sheet indicates that labor is 60% of the price, and materials are 40%. Assume 7 modernizations per year, which equals the Modernization subtotal for each year. For SOW C.3.1, the Subtotal Materials row is has data based on Government estimates, to arrive at the Maintenance and Repair Subtotal.

The total evaluated price will auto-calculate in cell C32.

M.1 BASIS FOR AWARD

Evaluations will be conducted in accordance with the procedures defined below. The Government will first verify the on-time submission of all proposals. The Contracting Officer will then verify the proposals meet the Volume and Organization structure described in Section L.3. Volume I of the proposals that meet the requirements of Section L.3 will be submitted to the Source Selection Evaluation Panel (SSEP) for evaluation. The proposal submission is the date on the offeror's Volume 1 proposal indicated on its Introductory Letter. The SSEP will evaluate each proposal against the evaluation criteria individually, then as a group. Each non-price factor will be assigned an adjectival rating as established in Section M.2 herein. Once all Volume I proposals are evaluated, the SSEP will evaluate Volume II, Price in accordance with the evaluation criteria for this factor.

The Government will make an award to the offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government. Within the best value continuum, the Government will use the Tradeoff process of non-price and price factors in evaluating the proposals approved for evaluation. The Government will reserve the right to make an award without discussions if there is a fully acceptable proposal received in the initial submissions. If not, the Government may enter into discussions with offerors. The Government also reserves the right to make no award.

In the event that two or more proposals are determined not to have any substantial technical differences (i.e., are technically equivalent), price becomes the determining factor and award may be made to the lower priced proposal. In the event that proposals are not technically equal, award may be made to other than the offeror with the lowest priced proposal, if the Government determines that a price premium is warranted due to technical merit. The Government may also award to other than the highest technically rated proposal, if the government determines that a price premium is not warranted.

Evaluations will be based on a complete assessment of the proposal submission. Proposals will be evaluated on the following factors listed in descending order of importance. All non-price factors when combined are more important than Factor 5, Price.

Non Price Factors:

Factor 1: Technical Approach
Factor 2: Corporate Experience
Factor 3: Key Personnel
Factor 4: Past Performance

Price Factors:
Factor 5: Price

The evaluation criteria for each factor is as follows:

M.1.1 Factor 1 – Technical Approach

a) The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's description of its processes, methods, and procedures for accomplishing SOW Sections C.5.1 through C.5.9 demonstrates:

1) A comprehensive understanding of the requirements.

2) A logical, effective, and feasible approach to performing the required services.

3) The capability to ensure quality, safety, and timely performance through documented quality assurance procedures, OSHA-compliant safety programs, employee training, supervisory oversight, inspection processes, corrective action procedures, and continuous quality improvement practices.

4) The Government will evaluate whether these programs demonstrate a proactive approach toward minimizing risk while ensuring compliance with contract requirements.

b) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's demonstrated capacity to manage and execute concurrent task orders under Sections C.3.1 and C.3.2, the evaluation will assess:

1) The adequacy and scalability of staffing, resources, and management systems. The effectiveness of the Offeror's proposed scheduling and workload management processes, including work order management, dispatch procedures, resource allocation, workload balancing, supervisory oversight, ability to shift resources among jurisdictions to meet response requirements.

2) The Offeror's ability to support simultaneous workloads comparable to ten (10) C.3.1 task orders and ten (10) C.3.2 task orders occurring concurrently.

3) The effectiveness of the Offeror's proposed methods for scheduling, coordination, and workload management. The Government will evaluate the extent to which the Offeror provides specific examples demonstrating implementation of its proposed processes, including examples of similar successfully completed work, lessons learned, and corrective actions taken during contract performance.

c) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's ability to reliably provide technical evaluation and price proposals within timeframe listed above for task orders in the C.3.1 Maintenance and Repair performance area. The evaluation will consider the practicality and soundness of the processes, tools, staffing, and decision workflows proposed.

d) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's ability to provide technical evaluations and price proposals within 1 to 2 weeks for task orders in the C.3.2 Modernization performance area. The evaluation will consider the feasibility, clarity, and effectiveness of the proposed approach to meeting this requirement.

e) The Government will evaluate whether the Offeror:

Confirms the existence of a fully operational business office within a 50-mile radius of Washington, DC.

1) Provides a physical address that meets this requirement.

2) Demonstrates that the functions performed at the location meaningfully support the performance of routine, non-routine, emergency maintenance, and modernization services.

Failure to meet this requirement may render the proposal ineligible for award.

The Government will evaluate the adequacy of the Offeror's parts management strategy, including:

1) availability of locally stocked critical spare parts;
2) ability to procure OEM and non-proprietary replacement components;
3) procedures for managing obsolete equipment;
4) expected lead times for emergencies and planned repairs.

M.1.2 Factor 2 – Corporate Experience

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's corporate experience to determine the extent to which the submitted contracts demonstrate the Offeror's capability to successfully perform work of similar size, scope, magnitude, and complexity to the requirements of this solicitation. The evaluation will be based solely on the five (5) contracts submitted in accordance with Section L.

a) The Government will evaluate each contract for recency and relevance.
   1) Recency: Contracts performed or completed within the past five (5) years.
   2) Relevance: Contracts similar in size, scope, magnitude, and complexity to the services described in the solicitation.

b) The Government will evaluate the extent to which each contract description demonstrates experience performing work that is:
   1) Similar in scale and complexity;
   2) Performed for Government or private-sector clients;
   3) Comparable to the technical and operational requirements under this contract.
   4) Contracts showing direct, highly relevant experience will be assessed more favorably.

c) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's description of significant issues, challenges, or problems encountered during contract performance and the effectiveness of the corrective actions taken, this evaluation will consider the Offeror's demonstrated ability to:
   1) Mitigate risk;
   2) Manage unexpected conditions;
   3) Resolve technical or operational problems effectively.

d) The Government will evaluate whether the Offeror provided all required information listed in Section L, including:
   1) Organization name and address;
   2) Point-of-contact information;
   3) Contract dollar value;
   4) Contract type;
   5) Period of performance;

6) Work description addressing similarity, customer type, and issue resolution.
7) Incomplete or unclear submissions may reduce the Government's confidence in the Offeror's corporate experience.

In addition to evaluating the information submitted by the Offeror, the Government may contact the identified references to verify the accuracy of the information provided to evaluate this factor.

M.1.3 Factor 3 – Key Personnel

The Government will evaluate the qualifications of the proposed Key Personnel: the Account/Program Manager and the Senior Field Engineer/Supervisor, to determine the extent to which their experience, education, and capabilities demonstrate the ability to successfully perform the responsibilities identified in Sections C.15.1 and C.15.2 of the Statement of Work, respectively.

a) The Government will evaluate each resume for:

1) The relevance of prior experience to the duties required under this contract.
2) The depth and breadth of demonstrated technical, managerial, and operational experience.
3) The extent to which the experience reflects work of similar size, scope, and complexity.

b) The evaluation will consider the degree to which the submitted resumes demonstrate:

1) The knowledge, skills, and abilities necessary to perform the key duties assigned.
2) Experience leading, managing, or supervising work similar to elevator, escalator, and lift maintenance, repair, and modernization activities.
3) Any certifications, training, or technical credentials that strengthen the individual's qualification for the role.

c) The Government will evaluate the extent to which each resume:

1) Includes employment dates;
2) Clearly describes relevant experience;
3) Provides education and any applicable credentials;
4) Is complete, accurate, and aligned with Section L submission instructions.
5) Incomplete or unclear résumé information may reduce the Government's confidence in the Offeror's proposed Key Personnel.

d) The Government will evaluate the adequacy of the Offeror's continuity of operations plan, including the qualifications and availability of backup personnel for key positions.

M.1.4 Factor 4 – Past Performance

Past performance will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the offeror's past performance demonstrates successful performance on the contracts identified under the corporate experience evaluation factor.

The Government will evaluate the Past Performance Questionnaires received from customer references to determine the extent to which the offeror has demonstrated at a satisfactory record of customer satisfaction. The Government may contact these references or use other references/information to verify past performance, such as CPARS. See Attachment J.6 Past Performance Questionnaire for the contents that the Government will evaluate from the offeror's past customers when using the Past Performance Questionnaire to evaluate past performance. Offerors without a record of relevant past performance, or for whom information on past performance is not available, shall not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably, but shall instead receive an overall rating of "neutral."

In addition to evaluating the information submitted by the Offeror, the Government may contact the identified references to verify the accuracy of the information provided. The Government may consider feedback obtained from these references regarding, at a minimum:

1) Overall quality of services performed;
2) Technical competence and workmanship;
3) Schedule compliance and timeliness of performance;
4) Contract management and communication;
5) Responsiveness to Government requests and customer concerns;
6) Ability to resolve technical, operational, or contractual issues;
7) Cost control and management, where applicable; and
8) Overall customer satisfaction and willingness to recommend the Offeror for similar work.

Information obtained from reference checks may be considered in the Government's overall assessment of the Offeror's Past Performance and may be used to validate, supplement, or clarify information contained in past performance reports, as well as information in the Corporate Experience section of the offeror's proposal.

M.1.5 Factor 5 – Price

The Government will evaluate the price proposals of all offerors receiving an Acceptable rating or above for Factors 1, 2, and 3. Price criterion will measure not only actual dollars but reasonableness of the offeror's proposed price and its position in the range of all offeror prices.

The offeror's price proposal shall be evaluated for price reasonableness to prevent the Government from paying too much for the services outlined in the SOW. Additionally, a price realism analysis may be performed to determine whether a offeror's price is unrealistically low. An unrealistically low proposal may question whether a offeror fully understands the size,

magnitude, complexity, and scope of service outlined in the SOW. An unrealistic price proposal may serve as a rejection for the proposal.

The offeror's proposal will be evaluated for unbalanced pricing utilizing price analysis techniques. The Government may determine that a proposal is unacceptable if the prices proposed are materially unbalanced. A proposal may be rejected if the Contracting Officer determines that the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.

Price will not be rated adjectivally, but will be evaluated based on a comprehensive review. Price proposals shall be evaluated with respect to accuracy and completeness based on information submitted in the offeror's written submission. This process will involve verification that figures are correctly calculated, prices are presented in the requested format, and that proposed rates and any applicable discounts are accurate. Additionally, the Government may utilize one or more of the following methods to evaluate price:

- Comparison to other proposals received;
- Comparison and/or analysis based on Independent Government Cost Estimate; or
- Comparison/analysis to historical prices.

As part of the price evaluation, the Government will evaluate the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) clause 52.217-9, Option to Extend the Term of the Contract and FAR 52.217-8, Option to Extend Services. The offeror's total evaluated price shall include the base period and all option periods. FAR 52.217-8 will be evaluated by dividing the price of option period 4 by two and including that amount in the evaluated price.

M.2 RATING AND DEFINITIONS

The Government will evaluate non-price factors 1, 2, and 3 of Volume I using the following adjectival ratings and definitions scale:

Rating	Description
Outstanding	The quotation provides a very clear, comprehensive and detailed response that meets all requirements and may include significant strengths with no deficiencies or significant weaknesses. The risk of unsuccessful performance is very low as the quotation demonstrates a clear understanding of the requirements and can be expected to result in outstanding performance.
Good	The quotation provides a sound response that meets all requirements and may include strengths with no deficiencies and few weaknesses. The risk of unsuccessful performance is low as the quotation demonstrates an

	understanding of the requirements and can be expected to result in satisfactory performance.
Acceptable	The quotation provides a response that is capable of meeting all requirements but may include both strengths and weaknesses with no deficiencies. Strengths are not outweighed by the weaknesses. The risk of unsuccessful performance is moderate as the quotation demonstrates a general understanding of the requirements and can be expected to result in satisfactory performance. If no strengths or weaknesses are found, i.e., quotation plainly meets all requirements, the quotation will be rated Acceptable under this definition, the quotation can be expected to result in satisfactory performance.
Marginal	The quotation provides a response that does not meet all requirements and may include strengths, weaknesses and/or deficiencies. Strengths are outweighed by the weaknesses and/or deficiencies. The risk of unsuccessful performance is high as the quotation does not demonstrate an understanding of the requirements and can be expected to result in unsatisfactory performance.
Unacceptable	The quotation provides a response that does not meet all requirements and may include significant weaknesses and/or deficiencies that far outweigh any strengths. The risk of unsuccessful performance is very high as the quotation does not demonstrate an understanding of the requirements and will result in unsatisfactory performance.

Definitions of Strengths and Weaknesses are as follows:

Significant Strengths: A strength that appreciably enhances the merit of a quotation or appreciably increases the probability of successful contract performance.

Strengths: Any aspect of a quotation which exceeds a requirement and increases the probability of successful performance of the contract. Also, any aspect of a quotation which meets a requirement, however, must be presented in a manner which is very clear, comprehensive, and convincing i.e., not merely repeat the solicitation requirements.

Weaknesses: A flaw in the quotation that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Significant Weaknesses: A weakness that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Deficiencies: A material failure of a quotation to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a quotation that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.

Offerors who rate below Acceptable under Factors 1, 2, or 3 will not be eligible for award and their price (Factor 5) will not be evaluated.

The Government will rate factor 4, Past Performance, using the following adjectival ratings and definitions scale, NLT means "No Later than":

Rating	Description
Substantial Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent (NLT 5 Years) and relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform.
Satisfactory Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent (NLT 5 Years) and relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform.
Limited Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent (NLT 5 Years) and relevant performance record, the Government has a limited expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform.
No Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent (NLT 5 Years) and relevant performance record, the Government has a no expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform.