

## **Section M EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

### **Contract Field Teams (CFT)**

#### **Labor Augmentation Support Requirements (LASR)**

### **1.0 Source Selection (SS)**

#### **1.1 Basis for Contract Award**

(a) This is a best value source selection conducted in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.3 as supplemented. Within the best value continuum, FAR 15.101 defines best value as using any one or a combination of source selection approaches. For LASR, the best value basis for award will be determined by utilizing the Highest Technically Rated Offerors (HTRO) Minimum Technical Threshold Rating (MTTR) approach.

(b) In order to determine that a proposal represents the best value, the Government will also determine (1) if the Offeror is responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104-1; and (2) if the Offeror's proposal conforms to the solicitation's requirements (to include all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and all other information required by this solicitation).

(c) The Government seeks to award Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (ID/IQ) contracts in two (2) competition pools:

- (1) Small Business Set-Aside Competition Pool: ID/IQ contracts to Small Businesses whose offers represent the best value to the Government for task orders that will be set-aside under the special provision titled "Process and Criteria for Issuing Task Orders" (Local clause FA8108.52.216-9ZH1 of the contract to result from this solicitation). This pool is for smaller CFT requirements where there are less than (100) Full Time Equivalents (FTE) CONUS and less than (50) FTEs OCONUS.
- (2) Full and Open Competition Pool: ID/IQ contracts to either Small or Large Businesses whose offers represent the best value to the Government for orders that will not be set aside. This pool is for larger CFT requirements where there are greater than or equal to one hundred (100) FTEs CONUS and greater than or equal to fifty (50) FTEs OCONUS.

(d) Offerors competing for inclusion in the Small Business Set-Aside competition pool may elect to compete also for inclusion in the Full and Open competition pool. Small Businesses will be evaluated in the appropriate competition pool(s) based on the offeror's selection located on the front page of the RFP. Offerors competing in both pools shall submit offers for both pools as stated in paragraph 1.0 of Section L Instructions to Offerors.

(e) The Source Selection Authority (SSA) will base the source selection decision on the evaluation criteria described below. While the Government source selection evaluation team and the SSA will strive for maximum objectivity, the source selection process, by its nature, is subjective; therefore, professional judgement is implicit throughout the entire process.

(f) This source selection is conducted in accordance with FAR Part 15, “Contracting by Negotiation”, as supplemented by the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS), the Department of the Air Force Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DAFFARS), DoD Source Selection Procedures 20 Aug 2022, and Department of the Air Force Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement Mandatory Procedures (MP) 5315.3. These regulations are available electronically at the Acquisition.gov, <http://www.acquisition.gov>.

## **1.2 Number of Contracts to be Awarded**

The Government intends to award contracts to each Offeror that is technically acceptable by meeting the prerequisite AS9100D certification, meets HTRO MTTR and has both acceptable Past Performance and an acceptable Small Business Participation Commitment Document as stated in Section L Instructions to Offerors. The number of contracts to be awarded is not known at this time. The Government reserves the right not to award any contracts at all, depending on the quality of the proposals.

## **1.3 IDIQ Ceiling**

The ceiling of the IDIQ is \$7.08B. The total value of all task orders (TOs) awarded under the IDIQ will not exceed this amount.

## **1.4 Minimum Guaranteed Task Order**

The minimum guaranteed order is \$500.00. This amount represents the effort involved with a virtual post-award conference via Microsoft Teams. This is not a requirements contract and any Contractor that is awarded a LASR IDIQ contract is not guaranteed any task order beyond the minimum guaranteed order for the post-award conference.

## **1.5 Proposal Substantiation**

An Offeror’s submittal of unsubstantiated and/or misleading claims, for even a single Past Technical Experience evaluation criterion, could result in the Government determining that the Offeror’s proposed self-rated score is disingenuous and/or artificially inflated. If this were to occur, the Government reserves the right to adjust the Offeror’s score unilaterally downward, potentially down to zero (0) points.

## **1.6 Rejection of Offers**

The Government may reject any evaluated proposal that fails to adequately address a significant portion of the requirement or contract terms and conditions.

## **1.7 Competitive Range Determination**

If discussions are conducted, the Government shall establish a competitive range comprised of the most highly rated proposals, in accordance with FAR 15.306(c). During the evaluation process, multiple competitive range determinations may be made

that eliminate Offerors from the competition IAW FAR 15.306(d)(5). The competitive range determination can be based on Factor 1 AS9100D Certification, Factor 2 Technical, Factor 3 Past Performance, or a combination of the three factors. A competitive range determination may eliminate Offerors based on their initial proposal evaluation results, after discussions (if necessary), prior to issuance of the Final Proposal Revision (FPR) request, or for efficiency. If Offerors are excluded from the competitive range, they may request a debriefing IAW FAR 15.505 15.506.

## **1.8 Discussions**

The Government intends to award without discussions but reserves the right to conduct discussions if necessary. Therefore, it is imperative that the initial offer contain the Offeror's best terms from a technical standpoint. However, if during the evaluation period it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government to hold discussions, the Government will determine if responses to Evaluation Notices (ENs) received during discussions will be considered formal proposal revisions, or if Offerors will be required to include EN responses in the Final Proposal Revision (FPR). The Request for FPR letter will include specific instructions on how Offerors will submit FPRs. The Government also reserves the right to request Draft FPRs during discussions. Note: Offeror responses to ENs for Volume II (Past Performance) shall not be included in the Draft FPR and/or FPR. Offeror responses to Past Performance ENs during discussions will automatically be considered in the final evaluation.

## **1.9 Solicitation Requirements (Terms and Conditions)**

Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and Performance Work Statement (PWS) requirements, in addition to those identified as factors. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the solicitation may result in the Offeror being ineligible for award. Offerors must clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and must provide complete supporting rationale. In the case a discrepancy exists between Section L- Instructions to Offerors and Section M - Evaluation Factors for Award, the evaluation criteria in Section M - Evaluation Factors for Award will take precedence.

## **2.0 Evaluation Factors**

### **2.1 Evaluation Factors Used to Evaluate Each Proposal**

Award will be made to the Offeror proposing the combination of factors deemed most advantageous to the Government based upon an integrated assessment of the evaluation factors described below.

- (1) Factor 1: AS9100D Certification
- (2) Factor 2: Technical
  - Subfactor 1: HTRO Self-Scoring Matrix
  - Subfactor 2: Small Business Participation Commitment Document (SBPCD)
- (3) Factor 3: Past Performance

### 2.1.1 Evaluation Methodology

**STEP 1:** The Government will initially evaluate Technical Factor 1 AS9100D Certification for compliance on a pass/fail basis in accordance with Table 2.2.1 below. Offerors who are determined as “meets the requirements” in Factor 1 will be considered Acceptable for Factor 1 and eligible for the remainder of the evaluation for Factor 2 Technical and Factor 3 Past Performance (as described in STEPs 2, 2a, 2b, and Step 3 below). Offerors who are determined as “does not meet the requirements” in Factor 1 will be documented as having a deficiency in Factor 1. In this instance the Government will document the deficiency and the Offeror will not be provided an opportunity to correct any deficiency in Factor 1 as part of discussions. The Offeror will be determined Technically Unacceptable in Factor 1, which will thus make the Offeror ineligible for award. The Government will not evaluate the remainder of the Offeror’s proposal for Factor 2 Technical or Factor 3 Past Performance. In instances where an offeror fails to provide a current AS9100D Certification as part of the offeror’s proposal, the Offeror will be evaluated using the same methodology for “does not meet the requirements” for Factor 1 as described above. At the conclusion of the initial evaluation, in the event the Government conducts an award without discussions, Offerors who are determined Unacceptable for Factor 1 AS9100D Certification, based on a deficiency in Factor 1, will be unawardable. In the event the Government determines discussions are necessary, Offerors with an evaluated deficiency in Factor 1 will be excluded from the Competitive Range. STEP 1 is a prerequisite in order to proceed to STEP 2.

**STEP 2:** Offerors who are determined Acceptable as a result of STEP 1 for Factor 1 AS9100D Certification are eligible for the remainder of the evaluation for Factor 2 Technical and Factor 3 Past Performance as described in STEPs 2a, 2b, and Step 3 below. Initial ratings for the factors will be established for each offeror. Pricing is not being requested nor will it be evaluated for purposes of award of the LASR IDIQ contracts as authorized by FAR 15.304(c)(1)(ii)(A). Pricing will be evaluated at the task order level once the IDIQ contracts are awarded.

**STEP 2a:** Offerors who are determined Acceptable as a result of STEP 1 for Factor 1 AS9100D Certification, will be evaluated Factor 2 Technical, Subfactor 1 HTRO Self-Scoring Matrix. The Government will evaluate Subfactor 1 HTRO Self-Scoring Matrix in accordance with paragraph 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 below. The Government will only conduct a validation evaluation for Subfactor 1, Step 2a for Offerors that initially submit an HTRO Self-Scoring Matrix with a self-score equal to or above the MTTR of 43,400. Submitted self-score values below the MTTR will not be required to be validated if the Government is unable to find the substantiating information within the referenced page, paragraph, table, etc. of the work sample, the Government will not search further for the substantiating information. If the Government is unable to validate that Offeror’s self-rated score based on the work samples and work sample narratives, the Government will unilaterally downward adjust the Offeror’s self-rated score, potentially down to zero points. The Government will only adjust the Offeror’s self-rated score downward, not upward. Such adjustments are within the sole discretion of the Government

and are based upon the substantiation of the self-rated score provided by the Offeror. At the conclusion of the initial evaluation, in the event the Government conducts an award without discussions, Offerors who are determined to be below the MTTR of 43,400 points will not be further assessed and will not be considered in the best value award decision. In the event the Government determines discussions are necessary, Offerors below the MTTR of 43,400 will be excluded from the Competitive Range. Offerors who are determined to have a validated score at or above the MTTR of 43,400 points in Subfactor 1 will be eligible for the evaluation for Subfactor 2 as described in STEP 2b below.

**STEP 2b:** Offerors who are determined to have a validated score at or above the MTTR of 43,400 points Factor 2 Technical, Subfactor 1 HTRO Self-Scoring Matrix will be evaluated for Subfactor 2 Small Business Participation Commitment Document (SBPCD). The Government will evaluate Subfactor 2 SBPCD in accordance with paragraph 2.3.3 below for compliance on a pass/fail basis in accordance with Table 2.3.3.1 below. Offerors who are determined as “meets the requirements” in Subfactor 2 will be considered Acceptable for Subfactor 2 and eligible for the remainder of the evaluation for Factor 3 Past Performance (as described in STEP 3 below). Offerors who are determined as “does not meet the requirements” in Subfactor 2 will be documented as having a deficiency in Subfactor 2. In this instance the Government will document the deficiency and the Offeror will not be provided an opportunity to correct any deficiency in Subfactor 2 as part of discussions. The Offeror will be also be determined Technically Unacceptable in Factor 2 Technical, which will thus make the Offeror ineligible for award. The Government will not evaluate the remainder of the Offeror’s proposal for Factor 3 Past Performance. In instances where an offeror fails to provide a complete SBPCD document as part of the offeror’s proposal, the Offeror will be evaluated using the same methodology for “does not meet the requirements” for Subfactor 2 as described above. At the conclusion of the initial evaluation, in the event the Government conducts an award without discussions, Offerors who are determined Unacceptable for Subfactor 2 SBPCD, based on a deficiency in Subfactor 2, will not be further assessed and will not be considered in the best value award decision. In the event the Government determines discussions are necessary, Offerors with an evaluated deficiency in Subfactor 2 will be excluded from the Competitive Range.

**STEP 3:** Offerors who are determined Acceptable as a result of STEP 2b for Subfactor 2 SBPCD, will be evaluated Factor 3 Past Performance. Factor 3 Past Performance will be evaluated as described in paragraph 2.4 below. At the conclusion of the initial evaluation, in the event the Government conducts an award without discussions, Offerors who are determined Unacceptable for Factor 3 will not be considered in the best value award decision.

**STEP 4:** For the best value award decision, the SSA will assess the Factor 1 AS9100D Certification and Factor 2 Technical and Factor 3 Past Performance evaluation results, along with supporting information to make an integrated assessment of which offeror(s) provides the overall best value. For this acquisition, in order to be eligible for award an Offeror must be determined Acceptable for Factor 1 AS9100D Certification, must have a validated score at or above the MTTR of 43,400 points, must be

Acceptable for Subfactor 2 SBPCD and must be determined Acceptable for Factor 3 Past Performance.

## 2.2 Factor 1 – AS9100D Certification

Factor 1 is pass or fail and will receive the ratings described below based on the criteria listed below. To be determined technically acceptable in Factor 1, the Offeror must provide a current AS9100D Certification. The Technical Factor 1 ratings are defined as follows:

**Table 2.2.1 AS9100D Certification**

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Description</b>
Acceptable	Proposal meets the requirements of the solicitation.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation.

## 2.3 Factor 2 – Technical

### 2.3.1 Subfactor 1 – HTRO Self-Scoring Matrix

The Government has established a Minimum Technical Threshold Rating (MTTR) that an Offeror must meet or exceed in order to be considered eligible for award. The Government has determined that an Offeror's Government validated score represents their level of prior demonstrated capability to perform similar work, and those with a high degree of prior demonstrated capability of the criteria contained in the HTRO Self Scoring Matrix (Attachment 6) present a lower risk to the Government of unsuccessful performance. The Government has set the MTTR at 43,400 points. The Government will only validate self-scored matrices at or above the MTTR.

### 2.3.2 HTRO Self-Scoring Matrix & Evaluation Criteria

There are twenty-one (21) evaluation criteria identified in Attachment 6, HTRO Self-Scoring Matrix. The Government will validate the Offeror's self-scoring based on the work samples and relevant work sample narratives provided in the proposal. The Government's validated HTRO score will be used to determine whether the offeror meets or exceeds the MTTR.

### 2.3.3 Subfactor 2 – Small Business Participation Commitment Document (SBPCD)

All offerors (both small businesses and other than small businesses) will be evaluated on the extent of the proposed participation/commitment to use of U.S. small businesses in the performance of this acquisition. The Offeror's proposed Small Business Participation Commitment Document must be successfully completed IAW Section L, paragraph 4.4.4 .

The Government will evaluate proposals on an acceptable/unacceptable basis to determine best value. The Small Business Participation Commitment Document will become part of the resultant contract. Offerors will receive one of the ratings below:

**Table 2.3.3.1 Small Business Participation Commitment Document**

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Description</b>
Acceptable	Proposal meets the requirements of the solicitation.

Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation.
--------------	--

## **2.4 Factor 3 – Past Performance**

The Past Performance evaluation assesses the degree of confidence the Government has in an offeror's ability to supply products and services that meet users' needs, based on a demonstrated record of performance. For the work samples provided IAW Section L paragraphs 4.5 and 4.5.1, the Government will assess Past Performance based on CPARs and/or Past Performance Questionnaires. The Government also reserves the right to identify additional work samples to be utilized in its evaluation of Past Performance. For identified work samples, the Past Performance evaluation will be conducted in three phases: recency assessment, relevancy assessment, and performance quality assessment and will not be applied towards the offeror's self-score matrix. For both offeror identified work samples IAW Section L paragraphs 4.5 and 4.5.1 and for Government identified work samples/, the Government will evaluate an overall performance confidence assessment for each offeror.

### **2.4.1 Recency Assessment**

An assessment of the past performance information will be made to determine if it is recent. For the work samples provided IAW Section L paragraphs 4.5 and 4.5.1, the Government's recency assessment will be included within the Government's validation process of an offeror's self/score matrix within IAW Section M paragraph 2.3. For all other Government identified work samples/efforts, to be considered recent, the effort must have been performed during the past five (5) years from the date of issuance of this solicitation. If any part of the performance falls within the above timeframe, the contract in its entirety may be evaluated for past performance. The Work Samples and Narratives provided in Volume II and information obtained from other sources will be used to establish the degree of recency of past performance. The Government's assessment of recency will be included in the overall performance assessment rating. Government identified work samples/efforts that fail to meet the requirements of recency will not be further evaluated for recency, performance quality or included in the overall confidence assessment.

### **2.4.2. Relevancy Assessment.**

In determining relevancy for each contract reference determined to be recent, consideration will be given to the effort, or portion of the effort, being performed by the Offeror, joint venture, teaming partner or subcontractor whose contract is being reviewed and evaluated. Table 1 ratings below will be assigned. For the work samples provided IAW Section L paragraphs 4.5 and 4.5.1, the Government's relevancy assessment will be included within the Government's validation process of an offeror's HTRO Self-Scoring Matrix IAW Section M paragraph 2.3. This solicitation requires for the work samples provided IAW Section L paragraphs 4.5 and 4.5.1, in which the offeror's self-score can be validated by the Government IAW Section M 2.3, the Offeror's work sample/effort will also be determined "Relevant" in regard to Factor 3, Past Performance. However, for the work samples provided IAW Section L paragraphs 4.5 and 4.5.1, in which the offeror's self-score cannot be validated by the Government IAW Section M 2.3, the Offeror's work sample will be determined "Not Relevant" in regard to Factor 3, Past Performance. For all other Government identified work samples/efforts, the Government will evaluate relevancy and assign a relevancy rating for each recent PPI contract reference in accordance with the following criteria:

**Table 2.4.2.1**

<b>RATING</b>	<b>DEFINITION</b>
<b>Relevant</b>	<b>Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.</b>
<b>Not Relevant</b>	<b>Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities.</b>

**2.4.3 Performance Quality**

The Government will consider the performance quality of recent, relevant efforts. Performance Quality consists of an in-depth evaluation of the past performance questionnaire responses, Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) information, Contractor Performance Assessment Reports (CPARS), interviews with Government customers and fee determining officials and, if applicable, commercial clients. It may include interviews with DCMA officials or other sources known to the Government. Performance Quality may result in positive or adverse findings. Adverse is defined as past performance information which the Government determines to be less than satisfactory performance quality. For adverse information identified, the evaluation will consider the number and severity of the problem(s), mitigating circumstances, and the effectiveness of corrective actions that have resulted in sustained improvements when determining the quality assessment. Taking mitigating corrective actions may or may not result in a higher quality rating.

**Table 2.4.3.1**

<b>RATING</b>	<b>DEFINITION</b>
<b>Satisfactory (S) Green</b>	<b>During the contract period, contractor performance is meeting (or met) all contract requirements. For any problems encountered, contractor took effective corrective action.</b>
<b>Unsatisfactory (U) Red</b>	<b>During the contract period, contractor performance is failing (or fail) to meet most contract requirements. Serious problems encountered. Corrective actions were either ineffective or nonexistent. Extensive Customer oversight and involvement was required.</b>
<b>Unknown (UK)</b>	<b>Unknown performance rating due to lack of sufficient information to assign a rating.</b>

**2.4.4 Past Performance Confidence Assessment.**

The Past Performance factor will receive one of the following performance confidence assessments IAW the Department of Defense (DoD) Source Selection Procedures:



**Table 2.4.4.1**

RATING	DEFINITION
ACCEPTABLE	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record and performance quality, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
UNACCEPTABLE	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record and performance quality, the Government has no expectation that the Offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

NOTE: Offerors who are determined to have an overall Unacceptable rating for Factor 3, Past Performance will not be considered in the best value award decision.

## **2.5 Government Field Support Agencies**

Compliance with the requirement for cognizant DCAA/DCMA field office information provided in Section 1 will be noted, if such information is applicable to the Offeror