SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Clauses Incorporated by Reference.

FAR 52.217-5, Evaluation of Options (JUL 1990)

M.1 EVALUATION PROCESS

a. The Government intends to award multiple contracts resulting from this solicitation to the responsible offerors whose offers, conforming to the solicitation, will be the most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered. The Government anticipates awarding ten contracts under the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Support LoB. However, the Government reserves the right to award more, less, or no contracts for this LoB. Only small businesses are eligible for award under the ERP Support LoB.

b. Options. The Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. Evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

c. A written notice of award or acceptance of an offer, mailed or otherwise furnished to the successful offeror within the time for acceptance specified in the offer, shall result in a binding contract without further action by either party. Before the offer's specified expiration time, the Government may accept an offer, whether or not there are negotiations after its receipt, unless a written notice of withdrawal is received before award.

M.2 BASIS FOR AWARD

Any award to be made will be based upon best value and made to offerors whose offers, conforming to the solicitation, will be the most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered. Offerors are cautioned that an award may not necessarily be made to the lowest price offeror. However, if non-price factors are evaluated as comparatively equal between two or more offerors, price may become a determinative factor.

a. Relative Order of Importance Terminology.

Evaluation criteria consist of factors. In order to provide the offeror with an understanding of the significance assigned by the Government, the factors are assigned a relative order of importance. The following terminology is used:

Significantly More Important. The criterion is substantially more important than another criterion. The criterion is given far more consideration than another criterion.

More Important. The criterion is greater in value than another criterion, but not as much as a significantly more important criterion. The criterion is given more consideration than another criterion.

Approximately Equal. The criterion is nearly the same in value as another criterion; any difference is very slight.

b. Factors to be Evaluated.

Management Factor
Corporate Capabilities Factor
Past Performance Factor
Price Factor

There are no subfactors to be evaluated.

c. Relative Order of Importance of Factors.

Factor Order of Importance: The Management Factor is More Important than the Corporate Capabilities Factor. The Corporate Capabilities Factor is More Important than the Past Performance Factor. The Past Performance Factor is More Important than the Price Factor.

All non-Price evaluation factors, when combined, are Significantly More Important than the Price Factor.

M.3. EVALUATION APPROACH

Factors to be evaluated are:

FACTOR 1 – MANAGEMENT

Proposals will be evaluated to assess the offerors' understanding of the management requirements. In conducting this assessment, the following will be considered as applicable: understanding of the BTA mission, feasibility of approach, and completeness of the proposal. The assessment of proposals under this factor will include an assessment of the Offerors' Performance Work Statement (PWS).

a. Understanding of the Business Transformation mission. The extent to which the proposal demonstrates a clear understanding of the mission, objectives and goals of the Business Transformation Agency (BTA).

b. Feasibility of Approach. The extent to which the proposed approach is workable and the end results achievable. The extent to which successful performance is contingent upon proven services and techniques compliment the BTA objectives. The proposal will be evaluated to determine whether the Offeror's methods and approach in meeting the

objectives adheres to sound practices, and reflects significant relevance to the BTA objectives, environment, and constraints while providing the Government with a high level of confidence to ensure successful performance.

c. Completeness. The extent to which the proposal adequately and completely considers, defines, and satisfies the requirements specified in the solicitation. The extent to which each requirement of the solicitation has been addressed in the proposal in accordance with the proposal instructions in the solicitation.

The Government's evaluation will consider the following:

- The Government will evaluate the Offeror's methodology for recruitment, training, and retention of qualified personnel to support the BTA mission throughout the performance period.

- The management proposal will be evaluated on how it demonstrates the implementation of the proposed solutions with reference to the timely delivery of reliable, secure, flexible, responsive, and compliant services

- The Government will evaluate the Offeror's overall program management approach to assess its understanding of the scope and support required for the BTA mission.

- The Government will evaluate the Offeror's approach to manage and coordinate its subcontractor efforts.

- The Government will evaluate the Offeror's processes for internal team communication, monitoring team performance, and resolving team conflict.

- The Government will evaluate the Offeror's organizational approach to the extent that it demonstrates clear lines of communication with delegated authority, which allows for timely accomplishment of tasks, timely submission of deliverables, immediate resolution of task discrepancies and establishes corrective action plans.

FACTOR 2 – CORPORATE CAPABILITIES

Proposals will be evaluated to assess the offerors' corporate capabilities. The assessment of proposals under this factor will include an assessment of the Offerors' Performance Work Statement (PWS).

The Government's evaluation will consider the following:

- The Government will evaluate the Offeror's Corporate Capabilities in Performance-Based Acquisitions, Program Management, Business Processes, Task Management, and Customer Relationship Management on similar efforts of the same or similar scope and magnitude.

- The Government will evaluate the Offeror's knowledge of and experience with commercial and DoD policies and processes as it relates to the LoB.

- The Government will evaluate the Offeror's ability to resource and manage simultaneous Task Orders.

- The Government will evaluate the Offeror's business processes and quality certifications to be used in performing taskings under the LoB.

Factor 3: PAST PERFORMANCE

The Government will conduct a performance risk assessment based on the quality, relevancy and currency of the offeror's past performance, as well as that of its major subcontractors, as it relates to the probability of successful accomplishment of the required effort. The source of information regarding past performance, the context of the data and general trends in performance may also be considered.

When assessing past performance, the Government will focus its inquiry on the past performance of the offeror and its proposed major subcontractors as it relates to all solicitation requirements. These requirements include all aspects of cost, schedule and performance, including the offeror's record of: 1) conforming to specifications and standards of good workmanship; 2) adherence to contract schedules, including the administrative aspects of performance; 3) commitment to customer satisfaction; 4) business-like concern for the interest of its customers; 5) establishing and maintaining adequate management of subcontractors; and, 6) ability to resolve problems quickly and effectively.

A significant achievement, problem, or lack of relevant data in any element of the work can become an important consideration in the source selection process. A negative finding under any element may result in an overall high risk rating. Therefore, offerors are reminded to include all relevant past efforts, including demonstrated corrective actions, in their proposal. Offerors are cautioned that in conducting the past performance assessment, the Government may use data provided in the offeror's proposal and data obtained from other sources. Since the Government may not necessarily contact all of the sources provided for the offerors, it is incumbent upon the offeror to explain the relevance of the data provided. Offerors are reminded that while the Government may elect to consider data obtained from other sources, the burden of proving good past performance rests with the offerors. In addition to the past performance of the offeror and its major subcontractors, the Government may consider the past performance of predecessor companies and key personnel with relevant past performance. If there is no

relevant past performance, the offeror will be evaluated neither favorably nor unfavorably and such lack of relevant past performance will be considered an unknown risk.

Factor 4 – PRICE

a. The price factor consists of the Total Contract Life Price (TCLP). The TCLP is calculated by multiplying the evaluation quantity times the unit price for each priced CLIN/SLIN in the CLIN List, and by adding all extended prices for the base year and all option years.

b. The price evaluation period will begin with the anticipated date of contract award, which is thought to be *{insert date}*. The evaluated contract life for this requirement is 60 months.