

SECTION M: EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

I. OVERVIEW:

A. The Government will make its award decision using two phases. Phase 1 (see paragraph II.A. below) will review the technical proposals submitted. Offerors receiving a "Go" in Phase 1 will be submitted for evaluation under Phase 2. Phase 2 will evaluate Performance Risk/Past Performance, Small Business Participation, and Price. Award will be based on these factors as outlined below:

- Performance Risk/Past Performance and Small Business Participation combined are slightly more important than Price. Performance Risk/Past Performance is the most important factor with Price slightly less important, and Small Business Participation substantially less important than either Performance Risk/Past Performance or Price.

B. In making its award determination, the Government will use a tradeoff process. This process permits tradeoffs among cost or price and the non-cost factors; and it allows the Government to accept other than the lowest priced proposal.

C. Award will be made to the offeror who provides the Government the Best Value considering any appropriate tradeoffs between Performance Risk/Past Performance, Small Business Participation, and Price. However, when the evaluation ratings for all offerors in the area of Performance Risk/Past Performance and Small Business Participation tend to equalize, Price may become more important.

D. The Government reserves the right to make an award to other than the low priced offeror.

E. The Government may reject any proposal that is unrealistically high or low in price.

F. Proposals which do not contain the information requested by Section L (Instructions to Offerors) risk rejection or "High Risk" rating by the Government.

G. The Government may award without discussions; consequently, it is your responsibility to submit a proposal that conforms to all of the terms and conditions of the solicitation and contains your best offer. However,

the Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer later determines them necessary.

II. EVALUATION CRITERIA -

A. PHASE 1 - TECHNICAL

1. The Government will review the technical proposals submitted by the offeror in Phase 1. The Government decision will be based on a Go/No-Go decision. Evaluations of the offeror's technical proposal shall be based on the following criteria:

a. Go Criteria: Offeror shows proof of having the capability or being able to subcontract for the capability to conduct electromagnetic forming/expanding, fusion, and spot welding on aluminum alloy to meet the required delivery schedule contained in the solicitation.

b. No-Go Criteria: Offeror does NOT show proof of having the capability or being able to subcontract for the capability to conduct electromagnetic forming/expanding, fusion, and spot welding on aluminum alloy to meet the required delivery schedule contained in the solicitation.

2. Offerors receiving a "Go" decision in Phase 1 will proceed to Phase 2. These offerors will then be evaluated for Performance Risk/Past Performance, Small Business Participation, and Price.

3. Offerors receiving a "No-Go" decision will be notified at the conclusion of the Phase 1 evaluation process.

B. PHASE 2 -

1. PERFORMANCE RISK/PAST PERFORMANCE:

a. The Government will evaluate and rate the performance risk/past performance of each offeror. Ratings will be based on the past performance information provided by the offeror and information obtained from other sources. In assessing an offeror's performance risk, the Government may consider the offeror's current and prior performance record of conforming to specifications, standards, quality and good workmanship; the contractor's adherence to contract requirements (such as delivery schedules) and administrative aspects of the contract; the general aspects of overall performance under the terms of the contract; the

contractor's business relations, history of reasonable and cooperative behavior and its commitment to customer satisfaction; and generally, the offeror's business-like concern for the interests of the customer. A significant achievement, problem/problem resolution or lack of relevant data in any element can become an important consideration in the selection process. A negative finding in any element may result in an overall high-risk rating. Offers under this factor will be rated as follows:

- Very Low Risk: Based on the offeror's past performance, very little doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
- Low Risk: Based on the offeror's past performance, little doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
- Moderate Risk: Based on the offeror's past performance, some doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
- High Risk: Based on the offeror's past performance, significant doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
- Neutral: A level of risk could not be determined and is unknown. No relevant performance record was identified or located.

b. In conducting the past performance risk evaluation, the Government may use relevant data and information extrinsic to the proposal, which is otherwise available to the Government. Since the Government may not necessarily interview all sources provided by offerors, it is incumbent upon the offeror to describe the relevance of the data provided. While the Government may elect to consider data obtained from other sources, the burden of providing thorough and complete past performance information rests with offerors. Therefore, offerors are reminded to include all relevant past efforts and necessary information, including demonstrated corrective actions in their proposal.

2. SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION EVALUATION: The Government will evaluate the extent to which offerors identify and commit to utilizing SBs, VOSBs, SDVOSBs, HUBZone SBs, SDBs, WOSBs and HUCs/MIs in the performance of

the contract. Such utilization may be as the prime contractor or as a subcontractor or as a member of a joint venture or teaming arrangement. The Government will also evaluate the extent of the offeror's compliance with FAR 52.219-8 and FAR 52.219-9. Evaluation will consider the following:

a. The extent to which the proposal specifically identifies SBs, VOSBs, SDVOSBs, HUBZone SBs, SDBs, WOSBs, and HBCU/MIs.

b. The complexity of the items/services to be furnished by SBs, VOSBs, SDVOSBs, HUBZone SBs, SDBs, WOSBs, and HBCU/MIs.

c. The extent of participation of such concerns in terms of the value of the total contract amount.

d. An assessment of the risk, based upon past performance, of the offeror actually achieving the involvement of small business concerns as proposed. Such assessment will include:

- For all offerors, an evaluation of performance over the past three (3) calendar years in complying with the requirements of FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns.

- For offerors who are large businesses as defined by the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Code applicable to this solicitation, an additional evaluation of past performance over the last three (3) calendar years in complying with the requirements of FAR 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan, will be done. Where a large business has not held a contract that included FAR 52.219-9, its prior performance will be evaluated against FAR 52.219-8 only.

e. The extent of substantive evidence indicating the level of past compliance with the requirements of FAR 52.219-8 and FAR 52.219-9.

f. Small Business Participation, Adjectival Scale (ATTACHMENT 009) is hereby attached and will be used for evaluation of the Small Business Participation portion of the proposals.

3. Price:

a. The Government will evaluate prices proposed for each CLIN, Ordering Period 1 and each Option, for all quantity ranges, First Article Test (FAT) cost, transportation cost, and any other price related factors required by the solicitation.

(1) For each CLIN, Ordering Period 1 and each Option, the evaluated price will be calculated by summing the multiplication of each range's unit price by its respective weight and the minimum quantity of the range. For evaluation purposes, the Government has weighted the ranges based on the likelihood that if an order is placed it will be placed in that range.

(2) FAT cost will be added as part of the evaluated price for Ordering Period 1 and for each Option. The FAT cost should include the full cost for the FAT samples, which will be destructively tested, and all other contractor FAT costs. Note, however, that the contractor's monthly testing of lot samples is separate from FAT costs and should be accounted for within the contractor's production unit prices.

(3) The Total Evaluated Price will be the sum of the evaluated prices for Ordering Period 1 and each Option Period, plus transportation costs.

(4) Since proposed prices will be on an FOB Origin basis, projected transportation costs will be evaluated. All Rocket Launchers will be shipped to Red River Army Depot, Texarkana, TX as stated in the narrative of Section A of the solicitation. For purposes of evaluation, a quantity of 1,000 M260s and 500 M261s will be utilized in determining the cost of transportation for each offeror.

b. If an offeror takes exception or fails to propose for any of the CLINs or First Article Test for Ordering Period 1 or each Option period, the Government may reject that offer as unacceptable.