

EVALUATION OF OFFERORS

NOTE: This is supplemental information to FAR clause 52.212-2, "Evaluation-Commercial Items" contained in the solicitation.

An award will be based on the evaluation of four factors: (1) Technical, (2) Price, (3) Past Performance, and (4) Small Business Participation. Trade-off procedures between price and non-price factors will be used to determine which offer represents the best value.

1. Technical contains two subfactors: (1) Performance and (2) Configuration. Performance is more important than Configuration. Technical as a whole is significantly more important than Price.

2. Price is slightly more important than Past Performance and Small Business Participation combined.

3. Past Performance and Small Business Participation are of equal importance to one another and when combined they are slightly less important than price.

4. All non-price evaluation factors when combined are more important than price.

However, as ratings for all offerors in the non-price criteria tend to equalize, price may become more important. Although price is not the most important consideration, it could be controlling. When an otherwise superior proposal is not affordable, is unreasonably priced, or is not worth the premium; price could be the deciding factor. Also, award may be made to other than the lowest evaluated price proposal or the highest rated proposal based on the best value determination.

1. TECHNICAL:

This factor consists of two subfactors: Performance and Configuration. Offerors have the burden of demonstrating the merits of their proposed systems and the Government will rate the proposals considering the level and clarity of the evidence provided. Considerations for each subfactor are set forth as follows:

Performance Subfactor: The Government will evaluate the extent to which an offeror's proposed system meets or exceeds performance requirements. Special attention will be focused on paragraphs 3.3.3,

3.3.4, 3.3.6, 3.4.1, 3.4.2, 3.4.3, 3.4.4, 3.4.5, and 3.4.6 of Description For Purchase 002 (DFP). The offeror must provide strong evidence that the proposed system is capable of meeting the offered capabilities. The Performance Subfactor will be rated as follows:

Excellent: The proposed system significantly exceeds the performance requirements. The following are examples of what would be considered significant:

(a) The proposed system can generate an output capacity of 125% or greater than the required output capacity (3.4.2).

(b) The proposed system's shock tube adapter is replaceable and is adaptable to accommodate different shock tube diameters (0.085, 0.090, and 0.118).

(c) The proposed system contains an internal self-test mechanism. (3.3.6)

(d) Both of the lead wires and the shock tube are capable of sustaining a pull force of 10 lbs. or greater horizontal force without separating from the blasting machine when horizontal force is exerted on them while the blasting machine is held stationary. (3.3.4)

Good: The proposed system exceeds the performance requirements. The following are examples of what would be considered exceeding the performance requirements:

(a) The proposed system can generate an output capacity between 100% to 125% of the required output capacity (3.4.2).

(b) The proposed system provides an integral shock tube initiation capability adapter.

(c) Offeror's proposed system is capable of being operated between 100% and 125% of the specified temperature range (3.6.1).

(d) Both of the lead wires and the shock tube are capable of sustaining a pull force of between 7 lbs. and 9.9 horizontal force without separating from the blasting machine when horizontal force is exerted on them while the blasting machine is held stationary. (3.3.4)

Adequate: The proposed system meets the performance requirements.

Unacceptable: Either the offeror does not provide strong evidence that the proposed system is capable of meeting the offered capabilities or the proposed system does not meet the requirements of the solicitation.

Configuration Subfactor: The Government will evaluate the extent to which the offeror's proposed system meets or exceeds the configuration requirements. The offeror must provide strong evidence that the proposed system is capable of meeting the offered capabilities. Special attention will be focused on Paragraphs 3.3.5, 3.5.1, 3.5.2, 3.5.3, and 3.6 (inclusive) of the Description For Purchase 002 (DFP), in the following areas:

- System weight and physical envelop
- System capability of being operated and stored under respective required temperature ranges and environmental conditions
- System Waterproofness requirement
- Long-term storage capability of the proposed system
- Double positive safety feature

The Configuration Subfactor will be rated as follows:

Excellent: The proposed system significantly exceeds the configuration requirements. The following are examples of what would be considered significant:

- (a) The proposed system weighs between 0.75 lb. (12 ounces) and 0.90 lb. (14.4 ounces).
- (b) The volume of the proposed system is equal to or less than 100 cubic inches (3.3.5).
- (c) Offeror's proposed system is capable of being operated and stored at temperature 125% or greater than specified in 3.6.1 and 3.6.3.
- (d) The offeror's proposed system is capable of being submerge in 10 ft. of water for a minimum

of 30 minutes or more with no degradation of performance.

(e) Provides detailed assessment of long-term storage capability, supported by analysis and data indicating 20 year life.

Good: The proposed system exceeds the configuration requirements. The following are examples of what would be considered exceeding the configuration requirements:

(a) The proposed system weighs between 0.91 lb. (14.56 ounces) and 1.7 lbs (23 ounces).

(b) The volume of the proposed system is between 101 to 125 cubic inches (3.3.5).

(c) Offeror's proposed system is capable of being operated and stored at temperature of 101% to 124% of the required temperature specified in 3.6.1 and 3.6.3.

(d) The offeror's proposed system is capable of being submerge in 5.1 to 9.9 ft. of water for a minimum of 15 minutes with no degradation of performance.

(e) Provides reasonable assessment of long-term storage capability, supported by analysis and data indicating 20-year life.

Adequate: The proposed system meets the configuration requirements.

Unacceptable: Either the offeror does not provide strong evidence that the proposed system is capable of meeting the offered capabilities or the proposed system does not meet the requirements of the solicitation.

2. PRICE:

a. The Government will evaluate offers based on the unit prices and Design Verification Test costs proposed for the Blasting Machine (CLIN 0001) for all pricing periods and any other price related factors required by the solicitation. If an offeror takes exception to any of the pricing periods, the Government may reject that offer as unacceptable.

b. The evaluated price will be calculated by summing the multiplication of each order quantity unit price by its respective weight and the maximum order quantity of the range. The Design Verification Test costs will be added to the evaluated price to arrive at the Total Evaluated Price.

c. For evaluation purposes, the Government has weighted the ranges based on the likelihood that if an order is placed, it will be in that range.

d. The contract will have a maximum quantity limit, per order, of 3,600 units and a total contract maximum limit of 18,000 units; which the contractor may be obligated to deliver over the length of the contract.

3. PAST PERFORMANCE:

Past performance information is evaluated as a predictor of future contract performance. Using past performance information for each offeror, the Government will assess the probability that the instant requirement will be successfully completed in accordance with contract terms.

In evaluating performance history, the Government may review the offeror's current and prior performance record of complying with all aspects of its contractual agreement: conformance to technical requirements; timeliness of deliveries/performance; and quality of performance.

In conducting the past performance evaluation, the Government may use information obtained from other sources.

The Government may consider the currency, degree of relevance, source, and context of the past performance information it evaluates as well as general trends in performance, and demonstrated corrective actions

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.

The Government may also consider past performance information regarding predecessor companies, key personnel, other corporate entities or subcontractors where such information is relevant to this acquisition.

Offerors' past performance 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.

Unknown Risk: The offeror had little or no recent/relevant past performance upon which to base a meaningful performance risk prediction.

The Government is not required to interview all points of contact identified by offerors.

It is the responsibility of the offeror to provide complete past performance information and thorough explanations as required by the Instructions to Offerors' clause. The Government is not obliged to make another request for the required information.

Failure to provide in one's initial proposal the full factual information required by the Instructions to Offerors' clause of this solicitation may reflect negatively on an offeror's cooperativeness and commitment to customer satisfaction.

4. SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION

The Government will evaluate the extent to which offerors (both large and small businesses) identify and commit to utilizing small business (sb), veteran-owned small business (vosb), service-disabled veteran-owned small business (sdvosb), HUBZone small business, small disadvantaged business (sdb), woman-owned small business (wosb), and historically black college and university/minority institution (HBCU/MI) participation in the contract, whether as the contractor or a subcontractor, or as a member of a joint venture or teaming arrangement. The Government will also evaluate the extent of the offeror's past compliance with FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns, and FAR 52.219-9, and Small Business Subcontracting Plan. The evaluation will consider the following:

(a) The extent to which the proposal specifically identifies SBs, VOSBs, SDVOSBs, HUBZone SBs, SDBs, WOSBs and HBCUs/MIs;

(b) The extent of participation of such concerns in terms of the value of the total contract amount; and

(c) 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 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 calendar years in complying with the requirements of FAR 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan. Where a large business has not held a contract that included 52.219-9, its prior performance will be evaluated against 52.219-8 only.

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

(e) Attachment 006, Proposal Submission for Small Business Participation Blasting Machine, to the solicitation must be completed and returned as part of your proposal

Excellent: Proposal includes a substantial portion of the work, in terms of dollar value (more than 20%) to be performed in the Small Business (SB), Veteran-Owned Small Business (VOSB), Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB), HUBZone Small Business (HUBZone SB), Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB), Women-Owned Small Business (WOSB), and Historically Black Colleges and University/Minority Institution (HBCU/MI) sector by the prime (if so qualified) and/or as subcontractors or team members. Offeror has substantive evidence suggesting prior achievement of subcontracting plans or policy goals. Based on the proposal and past performance history, the offeror's proposed goals and/or actions are substantial and are considered very realistic (very low risk). There is substantive evidence indicating past compliance with the requirements of FAR 52.219-8 and FAR 52.219-9.

Good: Proposal includes a significant portion of the work, in terms of dollar value (more than 15%) to be performed in the Small Business (SB), Veteran-Owned Small Business (VOSB), Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB), HUBZone Small Business (HUBZone SB), Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB), Women-Owned Small Business (WOSB), and Historically Black Colleges and University/Minority Institution (HBCU/MI) sector by the prime (if so qualified) and/or as subcontractors or team members. Offeror has evidence suggesting prior achievement of most subcontracting plans or policy goals. Based on the offeror's proposal and past performance history, the offeror's proposed goals and/or actions are significant and are considered realistic (low risk). There is significant evidence indicating past compliance with the requirements of FAR 52.219-8 and FAR 52.219-9.

Adequate: Proposal includes a reasonable portion of the work, in terms of dollar value (more than 10%) to be performed in the Small Business (SB), Veteran-Owned Small Business (VOSB), Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB), HUBZone Small Business (HUBZone SB), Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB), Women-Owned Small Business (WOSB), and Historically Black Colleges and University/Minority Institution (HBCU/MI) sector by the prime (if so qualified) and/or as subcontractors or team members. Offeror has evidence suggesting prior achievement of some subcontracting plans or policy goals. Based on the offeror's proposal and past performance history, the offeror's proposed goals and/or actions are adequate and could be met if the offeror focuses attention on them (moderate risk). There is reasonable evidence indicating past compliance with the requirements of FAR 52.219-8 and FAR 52.219-9.

Marginal: Proposal includes a minimal portion of the work, in terms of dollar value (less than 10%) to be performed in the Small Business (SB), Veteran-Owned Small Business (VOSB), Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB), HUBZone Small Business (HUBZone SB), Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB), Women-Owned Small Business (WOSB), and Historically Black Colleges and University/Minority Institution (HBCU/MI) sector by the prime (if so qualified) and/or as subcontractors or team members. Offeror has evidence suggesting prior achievement of some subcontracting plans or policy goals. Based on the offeror's proposal and past performance history, there is little

likelihood that more than a minimal portion of the work will be performed in this sector (High risk). There is minimal substantive evidence indicating past compliance with the requirements of FAR 52.219-8 and FAR 52.219-9.

Poor: Offeror demonstrates little or no commitment to using (SB), (VOSB), (SDVOSB), (HUBZone SB), (SDB), (WOSB), and (HBCU/MI). There is no evidence that the offeror met their prior goals and/or shows no serious commitment and did not provide adequate justification for not doing so. Based on the proposal and/or past performance history, there is negligible likelihood that anything other than a token portion of the work will be performed in this sector (Very high risk). There is little or no substantive evidence indicating past compliance with the requirements of FAR 52.219-8 and FAR 52.219-9.

Neutral: Foreign firm (offeror) has held no past Government contract(s) subject to FAR 52.219-8 or 52-219-9. Foreign firm (offeror) indicates no opportunity for using (SB), (VOSB), (SDVOSB), (HUBZone SB), (SDB), (WOSB), and (HBCU/MI) as all contract work will be performed completely outside the United States or no meaningful subcontract opportunities exist.