SECTION L PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION 15.305(A) (2) (II) AUG/1995 AND OTHER REQUIRED INFORMATION

L-8 Offerors shall submit the following information for NAICS Code 332993, NSN: 1325-01-495-0239, as part of their proposal:

**Information to be Submitted:** Offerors shall provide Best Value information by addressing each factor/subfactor in the format and sequence identified in the solicitation. The offerors should provide information in sufficient detail to allow the Government to make Best Value assessment of the offerors technical abilities and past performance. The offeror shall also provide information related to key subcontractors identified in their proposal. Best Value information shall be submitted on single-write CD-ROM (13 copies), or (in hardcopy) an original and five copies. Separate volumes shall be prepared for each evaluation factor in severable parts. Information to be considered, specific to each volume / factor, shall be confined to that volume. Offerors are cautioned that failure to include the requested information in the applicable volume may result in the information not being considered. Each volume will be treated independently. The following information is to be submitted:

Factor 1: Technical Ability: Offerors shall provide information of their demonstrated ability to provide the technical expertise, equipment, processes, quality control, and the skilled personnel necessary to produce and deliver a quality product. All required equipment, process, quality, and personnel certifications and standards must be demonstrated. Other (non-required) certifications, abilities, and capabilities (such as solidification modeling) which would enhance the technical expertise of the offeror may be provided The offeror shall address the following subfactors:

Subfactor 1a: Critical Skills, Processes and Procedures: The offeror shall provide information on the following elements:

(1) Understanding Of The Casting Process: The offeror shall describe the raw materials and casting processes needed to produce grade 60-40-18 cast ductile iron in accordance with the procurement data package. In addition the proposal shall describe the factors influencing the mold, core and gating system, risers and chills, material selection, and pattern design. Alternative casting methods, if proposed, shall be described in detail. The offeror shall address factors affecting the relationship between chemical composition, microstructure, and mechanical properties, with respect to the critical chemical elements and the desired constituent composition; the desired microstructure features and methods used to control their formation; the critical processes, such as melting practice, pour temperature, nodulizing, and inoculation necessary to control significant metallurgical effects. The offeror shall describe the relative importance of all primary casting manufacturing procedures.

(2) Machining: The offeror shall describe machining processes, equipment and tooling necessary to manufacture and inspect all bomb body machined features as described in the procurement data package. In addition, the proposal shall describe any special or unique processes, equipment and tooling required to machine large iron castings. The offeror shall describe the monitoring and control of machining and inspection processes necessary to provide bomb bodies that meet the requirements of the procurement data package.

(3) Assembly: The offeror shall describe the processes, equipment and tooling necessary to perform final assembly, including the required coatings and preservation, of the finished parts and assembly.

(4) Engineering Management: The offeror shall describe the engineering management functions necessary to coordinate efforts between foundries, technical support facilities (i.e., nondestructive and metallurgical laboratories), and the machining/assembly facility.

Subfactor 1b: Quality Assurance, Testing, and Inspection: The offeror shall provide information on the following elements:

(1) Quality Assurance: The offeror shall submit their General Quality Manual. The manual must demonstrate that the offeror's quality system meets the requirements of ISO 9002:1994 (or ISO 9001:2000). The offeror shall provide specific input/information describing how they will comply with the requirements of the Quality Assurance Provisions (QAP) of QAP 4512207. The offeror shall describe use of indicators and or metrics designed to provide feedback relating to the quality and conformance of the product to its design requirements. The offeror shall also provide information relative to preventive action initiatives being implemented. Evidence of quality awards and/or quality certifications should be submitted for consideration.

(2) Testing and Inspection: The offeror shall address their approach and their ability to perform tests and inspections identified in the solicitation/technical data specifications, including, but not limited to, the First Article Test (FAT), Preproduction, and Lot Acceptance Test (LAT). The offeror shall also provide a time-phase schedule for the integration of inspection and testing to meet the solicitation delivery requirements. The offeror shall provide information related to the equipment necessary to perform the tests and inspections, as well certifications and traceabilty of measurement standards for such equipment, where applicable. The offeror shall specifically address required nondestructive inspection, mechanical properties, metallurgical tests and dimensional inspections. The offeror shall identify test or inspection acceptance criteria required by the procurement data package that may cause significant technical or schedule challenges.

Subfactor 1c: Production Capability: The offeror shall describe their foundry procedures for melting, treatment, inoculation processes, and target chemistries necessary to produce castings capable of meeting the requirements of the procurement data package. The proposed processes and procedures must be consistent with solicitation delivery requirements. The offeror shall describe their initial pattern and core box design capable of manufacturing molds, cores, gates, sprues, risers, traps, etc. consistent with the requirements of the procurement data package. The proposed designs must be consistent with solicitation delivery requirements. The offeror shall provide information on their proposed casting, machining, surface finishing, assembly, test and inspection facilities along with the proposed process flow sequence (including the transition of products between multiple facilities) and anticipated production rates. The offeror must identify rate capabilities for all manufacturing processes, tests, and inspections. The offeror must identify and address all potential rate limiting processes. The offeror shall identify and address the level of all risks regarding their ability to meet production rates. The offeror must demonstrate their ability to increase the production rate by 50% over solicitation delivery requirements for replenishment purposes.

Subfactor 1d: Experience: The offeror shall provide relevant information that reflects their performance of work similar to that required by this solicitation. The offeror shall address past experience related to the technical abilities required by this solicitation, including casting, machining, and assembly processes; engineering management; quality assurance; and testing and inspection. The offeror shall provide information from previous work scenarios, training situations, past mistakes and significant accomplishments as evidence of experience. Of particular value is past experience associated with the production of ductile iron castings whose service failure would have significant safety ramifications. (Note: Similar product or service experience from more than 3 years prior may also be offered as experience under this subfactor only.)

Factor 2: Past Performance: The offeror shall address the following subfactors.
Subfactor 2a: Quality: The offeror shall provide information on their recent and relevant performance in the area of quality assurance, including quality assurance standards applied on recent, relevant contracts. The Government will evaluate all quality issues which are discovered during the 3-year period of recent past performance, regardless of when the actual delivery was made. The offeror will be required to submit data explaining corrective/preventive actions that have been taken to improve their process(es) and/or resolve their quality problems. The offeror shall disclose information about previous Request for Waivers (RFWs), Request for Deviations (RFDs), Quality Deficiency Reports (QDRs), First Article Test failures, Lot Acceptance Test failures, and/or other product quality or Quality Program related problems. Offerors' submissions must be clear and concise when describing the deficiency and stating the corrective/preventive action, when it was implemented, and its effectiveness. Offerors shall also provide information regarding how well they worked with previous Government and/or commercial activities and their technical representatives by providing a brief narrative about past experiences where their responsiveness, thoroughness and

expertise were a significant factor in a problem's resolution. For verification purposes, offerors shall furnish a point of contact/name, phone number, contract number and dollar value relative to the examples provided.

Subfactor 2b: On-Time Delivery: The offeror shall provide information regarding recent, relevant past performance in the areas of timeliness of deliveries. The offeror must provide information on deliveries made, deliveries scheduled to be made and deliveries re-scheduled to be made during the 3-year period of recent past performance. Include all supporting information for verification purposes concerning all of these covered deliveries, even though this supporting information may fall outside of the 3-year period. The offeror should provide original contract schedule as well as actual deliveries. If there was a slippage, the offeror shall provide all pertinent information regarding the slippage. If the offeror accelerated deliveries or increased production rates to meet the Governments' or customers' needs, the offeror should describe how their delivery/performance exceeded contract delivery requirements. For verification purposes, offerors shall furnish a point of contact/name, phone number, contract number and dollar value of recent, relevant contracts.

Factor 3: Price: The offeror shall submit a firm fixed price in Schedule B of the solicitation. Also, the offeror may submit a separate price for the evaluated option clause in Section I of the solicitation. If the offeror does not quote an option price, the lowest price offered/bid in the schedule for Item 001 shall be the price used for evaluation/award of any option quantities. All evaluation factors, (total basic and option prices), will be applied to determine total evaluated price.

Factor 4: Small Business Utilization:

(1) All offerors (small, large and foreign) are required to identify the extent to which the following small businesses and educational institutions will be utilized in the contract:

(a) Small Businesses (SBs), Veteran-Owned Small Business (VOSB), Service Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB), Small Disadvantaged Businesses (SDBs), Women-Owned Small Businesses (WOSBs), Historically Underutilized Business Zone (HUBZone) Small Businesses, hereinafter all referred to as SB; and

(b) Historically Black Colleges, Universities and Minority Institutions (HBCU/MI's).

(2) For Small Businesses, as identified by the size standard for the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Code applicable to this solicitation, the offeror's own participation as a SB or HBCU/MI is to be identified and will be considered in evaluating small business utilization.

(3) Small Business Utilization:

(a) The offeror is to provide names, products/services and estimated dollar value and type of SB and HBCU/MI's who would participate in the proposed contract in the format

below.

| SB TYPE | ESTIMATED $ VALUE | PRODUCT/SERVICE | COMPANY NAME |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL SB $ | | | |

(b) Large business offerors, where FAR 52.219-9 applies, shall identify the total subcontracting dollars.

(c) Realism - All offerors are to provide a detailed description of their methods used to promote and utilize small business, as prescribed by FAR 52.219-8, in contracts performed within three years prior to the initial solicitation closing date for the same or similar items:

(i) A description and available documentation of the methods employed to promote small business utilization, and;

(ii) A description of the internal methods used to monitor small business utilization.

(iii)Large business offerors shall document their performance, using information prescribed by FAR 52.219-9 "Small Business Subcontracting Plan.", in contracts within three years prior to the initial solicitation closing date, for the same or similar items. This documentation shall include their actual performance in utilizing SB and HBCU/MI contractors. The documentation shall include the final or most recent SF 294 for each relevant contract. If the large business proposes substantially different small business utilization than experienced on similar work in the past, they must explain how they will accomplish that higher/lower proposed level. Large businesses that have not had a contract in the past three years incorporating FAR clause 52.219-9, shall so state.

(End of Provision)

LF6048

SECTION M EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD (BASIS FOR AWARD, FACTORS AND SUBFACTORS TO BE EVALUATED, EVALUATION APPROACH) 15.204-5© SEP 1995

M-2

1. Basis of Award:

a. The BDU-50C/B will be procured using a competitive, best value award that will be split between the two best-qualified offerors, with 100% evaluated options. Awards are intended to be made to the offerors having the best value and second best value proposals from the best value evaluation. The greater partial quantity award, as defined in the solicitation, will be made to the offeror whose technical ability; recent, relevant record of past performance; price; and small business utilization provide the best value to the Government. The lesser partial quantity award, as defined in the solicitation, may be made to the offeror whose technical ability; recent, relevant record of past performance; price; and small business utilization provide the second best value to the Government. The Government may choose to award to only one offeror instead of splitting the award under the following conditions:

(1) Only one offeror's proposal achieves a Technical Ability rating of "GOOD" or greater.

(2) All but one offeror's prices are determined excessive, provided that the offeror's proposal has a Technical Ability rating of "GOOD" or greater.

b. Recent is defined as occurring within the past three (3) years prior to the solicitation's initial closing date. In addition, the Government has the right to consider information regarding contractor performance up to the date of award. Relevant is defined as having previously produced like or similar items. Like or similar items are defined as items that have been produced utilizing similar manufacturing processes, critical skills and unique techniques needed to produce the BDU 50C/B. The Government reserves the right to determine whether an item is like or similar and whether production quantities apply to the current requirement for evaluation purposes. Offerors shall provide a brief narrative explanation of how/why they believe the experience is relevant.

c. For the purpose of this acquisition, offeror is defined as prime contractor and key subcontractors identified by the prime contractor. Evaluation factors will be rated based on the circumstances and status of the offeror at the time of proposal submission.

d. The evaluation team may determine that an on-site visit or a Capability Study of the offeror's facility (of those offeror's determined to be in the competitive range), may be necessary to confirm offerors proposal or obtain clarification, however, offeror's are to be cautioned that the Government intends to award without site visits, if practical. The competitive range shall include all of the most highly rated proposals unless the range is further reduced for purposes of efficiency.

2. Evaluation Factors and Rankings:

a. Evaluation Factors: The following evaluation factors and significant subfactors will be used in determining the Best Value selection:

Factor 1: Technical Ability
- Subfactor 1a: Critical Skills, Processes and Procedures
- Subfactor 1b: Quality Assurance, Testing, and Inspection
- Subfactor 1c: Production Capability
- Subfactor 1d: Experience

Factor 2: Past Performance

- Subfactor 2a: Quality
- Subfactor 2b: On-Time Delivery

Factor 3: Price

Factor 4: Small Business Utilization (SBU)

b. Evaluation Factors Rankings: The following relative ranking of the evaluation factors will be used in determining the Best Value selection:

(1) Technical Ability is more important than either Past Performance or Price. Past Performance and Price are of equal importance. Past Performance and Price, individually, are more important than Small Business Utilization. Technical Ability, Past Performance, and Small Business Utilization, when combined, are significantly more important than Price.

(2) Within Technical Ability, subfactors are in descending order of importance.

(3) Within Past Performance, all subfactors are of equal importance.

(4) Price contains no subfactors.

(5) SBU contains no subfactors.

3. Evaluation Factor Criteria: The following evaluation factor criteria will be applied to the offeror and key subcontractors identified within their proposal:

Factor 1: Technical Ability: The proposal shall be evaluated to determine if the offeror and/or subcontractors have the technical knowledge, equipment, and personnel required to manufacture the product defined in the procurement data package. The proposal shall also be evaluated on the basis of the offeror's ability to control processes and quality. The technical rating will be determined through consideration of the individual subfactor ratings; including subfactor strengths, weaknesses, and risks; and their order of relative importance.

Subfactor 1a: Critical Skills, Processes and Procedures:

(1) Understanding Of The Casting Process: The proposal will be evaluated on the following cast ductile iron casting practices and principles:

(a) Discussion of raw materials and cast ductile iron manufacturing processes needed to manufacture the 60-40-18 grade described in the procurement data package.

(b) Description of how the mold, core, riser, and gating system design affects casting solidification and soundness. Description of a pattern design showing location of gates, risers, and chills necessary to obtain the required soundness.

(c) Description of effects of chemical composition and microstructure on mechanical properties. An awareness and understanding of relative importance of critical processes, such as sand strength, melting practice, treatment, inoculation, pour time and temperature, and heat treatment.

(d) Description of melting, treatment, and inoculation processes necessary to produce BDU-50C/B bomb bodies that meet the requirements of the procurement data package. This should include, as a minimum, pouring temperature, treatment and inoculant types, and chemical composition necessary to achieve desired metallurgical effects.

(2) Machining: The offeror will be evaluated on their ability to select and perform the various steps associated with the machining and dimensional inspection of the bombs. The offeror will be evaluated on their proposed machining and dimensional inspection processes and procedures to be used to manufacture and inspect critical, major, and minor dimensional features. The offeror will also be evaluated on monitoring and control of their proposed machining and dimensional inspection processes and procedures.

(3) Assembly: The offeror will be evaluated on their ability to perform final assembly, including the required coatings and preservation, of the finished parts.

(4) Engineering Management: The offeror will be evaluated on their ability to coordinate efforts between foundries, technical support facilities (i.e. nondestructive and metallurgical laboratories), and the machining/assembly facility.

Subfactor 1b: Quality Assurance, Testing, and Inspection.

(1) Quality Assurance: The offeror will be evaluated on their ability to establish and maintain a quality system that meets the requirements of ISO 9002-1994 (or 9001-2000.) The offeror will be evaluated on their understanding and ability to implement the requirements described in the Quality Assurance Provisions (QAP). The offeror will be evaluated as to whether they have implemented preventive action initiatives as part of their overall Quality System. Evidence of quality awards and/or quality certifications will also be considered.

(2) Testing and Inspection: The offeror will be evaluated on their understanding and ability to perform the examinations and tests identified in the solicitation and technical data specifications as well as required production rates. The offeror shall demonstrate knowledge of the equipment and techniques necessary to perform the tests and inspections, as well as provide certifications and traceability of measurement standards for such equipment where applicable.

(a) First Article (FAT) and Pre-Production/Lot Acceptance Test (LAT): The offeror will be evaluated on their understanding of the FAT and Pre-Production/LAT requirements, which form an integral part of the acceptance of the end item. A misunderstanding of the FAT and/or Pre-Production/LAT requirements could result in an improper price quote or in a financial loss to the offeror after award.

(b) Nondestructive Inspection: The offeror will be evaluated on their ability to perform nondestructive inspections (i.e. radiographic, magnetic particle, ultrasonic, lug load, hydrostatic, and visual) identified in the solicitation. The offeror's equipment, procedures, facilities and personnel and/or those provided by a sub-vendor, will be evaluated for accuracy and capability to perform the required inspections. The offeror will be evaluated on their understanding of the inspection requirements to ensure that casting quality requirements are met.

(c) Mechanical Properties and Metallurgical Tests: The offeror will be evaluated on their ability to perform the Mechanical and Metallurgical tests (i.e., tensile, Charpy impact / DBTT, microstructure and composition) identified in the solicitation. The offeror's equipment, procedures, facilities and personnel and/or those provided by a sub-vendor, will be evaluated for accuracy and capability to perform the required tests. The offeror will be evaluated on their understanding of the test requirements to ensure that solicitation requirements are met.

(d) Dimensional: The offeror will be evaluated on their ability to perform dimensional inspection of characteristics identified in the solicitation. The offeror's equipment, procedures, facilities and personnel and/or those provided by a sub-vendor, will be evaluated for accuracy and capability to perform the required inspections. The offeror will be evaluated on their understanding of the inspection requirements to ensure that dimensional requirements are met.

Subfactor 1c: Production Capability: The offeror will be evaluated on their proposed casting, manufacturing, assembly, test and inspection facilities along with the proposed process flow sequence (including the transition of products between multiple facilities). The offeror will be evaluated on their ability to produce bombs at the required production rate. The evaluation will include an assessment of the level of risk identified by the offeror regarding production. The offeror must address all of the rate sensitive factors identified such as heat treatment, machining, assembly, molding, core making, melting, shake-out and cleaning, nondestructive inspection, mechanical/metallurgical testing and process flow sequence. The offeror will also be evaluated on their ability to increase the production rate by 50% over solicitation requirements for replenishment purposes. The proposal will also be evaluated on the following details related to production capability: Description of an initial pattern and core box design suitable for the required production rate and dimensional requirements; Description of all equipment and facilities to be used to meet the production rate and quality requirements specified in the procurement data package; Process flow charts outlining intended manufacturing, test, inspection, and delivery sequences; and Description of production rate capabilities and limitations.

Subfactor 1d: Experience: The team members shall review the relevant experience of the offeror. Substantive data from previous work, training situations, past mistakes and significant accomplishments can be entered as evidence of experience. Of particular interest is past experience associated with the production of ductile iron castings whose service failure would have significant safety ramifications.

Factor 2: Past Performance: The team members shall utilize the following subfactors, to evaluate the offeror's past performance. The past performance rating will be determined through consideration of the individual subfactor ratings; including subfactor strengths, weaknesses, and risks; and their order of relative importance.

Subfactor 2a: Quality: The offeror's recent performance on like or similar items in the area of quality assurance will be evaluated. Evidence of quality awards and/or quality certifications presented to the offeror can be submitted for consideration. In the event problems are disclosed, the offeror's process and timeliness to improve product quality will be considered. The offeror will be required to submit data explaining corrective/preventive actions taken to improve their processes and/or solve quality problems. The offeror will be required to disclose information about previous Requests for Waivers (RFWs), Requests for Deviations (RFDs), Quality Deficiency Reports (QDRs), First Article Test failures, and/or other quality or Quality Program problems. The offeror's submission must be clear and concise when describing deficiencies, stating

corrective actions, timeliness of implementation, and effectiveness. The offeror will also be evaluated on how well they worked with previous Government and technical representatives in accordance with a narrative provided about past experiences where his responsiveness, thoroughness and expertise were a significant factor in a problem's resolution. Other sources, available to the Government other than the contractor's proposal, may be used to gather and evaluate predetermined factors. Such sources are cited below.

Subfactor 2b: On-Time Delivery: Information provided by the offeror for recent performance on like or similar items will be evaluated. The offeror will be rated based on their record of on-time delivery. The original contract delivery schedule will be compared to the actual deliveries to determine whether deliveries were made on time. If slippages occurred, the offeror will be given an opportunity to present reasons why they did not meet original delivery schedules. Reasons for schedule slippages and whether a revised delivery schedule was incorporated will be considered. Accelerated deliveries or increased production rates to meet the Governments' needs, will also be considered. Other sources, available to the Government other than the contractor's proposal, may be used to gather and evaluate predetermined factors. Sources may include, but are not limited to data gathered from pre-award offices, other major support commands, past customers, government databases, and/or previous contracting officials.

Factor 3: Price: The Contract Specialist will evaluate the proposed total evaluated price which includes the basic CLIN and option prices, transportation of Government-Furnished Material, and the evaluation factor for use of government-owned equipment.

Factor 4: Small Business Utilization:

(1) The Government will evaluate all offerors (small, large and foreign) proposed utilization of:

- Small Business (SB)
- Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB)
- Women-Owned Small Business (WOSB)
- Veteran-Owned Small Business (VOSB)
- Service Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB)
- Historically Underutilized Business Zone Small Business (HUBZone) hereinafter all to be referred to as SB; and
- Historically Black Colleges and Universities/Minority Institutions (HBCU/MI).

(2) For Small Businesses, as identified by the size standard for the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) applicable to this solicitation, the offeror's own participation as a SB or HBCU/MI is to be identified and will be considered in evaluating small business utilization.

(3) The Government will evaluate the extent to which an offeror identifies and commits to utilizing SB and HBCU/MI in the performance of the proposed contract as well as how

well it has performed in this regard in the past. Such utilization may be as the contractor, a subcontractor, or as a member of a joint venture or teaming arrangement. The elements to be evaluated are:

(a) Complexity of specific products or services that will be provided by those SB's and HBCU/MI's.

(b) Estimated total dollar amount to Small Businesses, as well as in each of the Small Business categories and HBCU/MI's.

(c) Realism - The Government will evaluate the offeror's actual past performance in achieving the proposed small business utilization on contracts performed within three years prior to the initial solicitation closing date for same or similar items to assess the realism of proposed small business utilization. This evaluation will include an assessment of:

(i) The offeror's performance as prescribed by the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) clause 52.219-8, "Utilization of Small Business Concerns". SB's and HBCU/MI's are reminded to include their own performance on their contracts.

(ii) For large business offerors, their performance as prescribed by FAR 52.219-9, "Small Business Subcontracting Plan". This includes evaluation of the offeror's actual performance in meeting SB and HBCU/MI subcontracting goals. Large businesses that have not held a contract in the past three years that included FAR 52.219-9, will be evaluated against FAR 52.219-8 only.

(iii)Offerors without a record of past performance will not be considered favorably or unfavorably in developing a realism assessment. The fact that the offeror has no past performance will be noted for the Source Selection Authority.

4. Evaluation Factor Ratings: The following evaluation factor ratings will be applied to the offeror and key subcontractors identified within their proposal. An offeror does not have to match every criterion within an adjectival rating to be assigned the particular adjectival rating/risk.

Factor 1: Technical Ability: Technical Ability, including the subfactors of Critical Skills, Processes and Procedures; Quality Assurance, Testing, and Inspection; Production Capability; and Experience will each be rated as Poor, Marginal, Good, or Excellent based on the following:

Subfactor 1a: Critical Skills, Processes and Procedures:

POOR/Very High Proposal Risk: The offeror has few or no critical skills that relate to the product or service. Few or none of the required technical personnel are available and or trained. Few or none of the required certifications are in place. There is substantial doubt that the offeror has the overall critical skills to complete the product or service. The offeror has few or none of the critical processes and procedures in place and documented. The offeror has not used or used very few of these critical processes and procedures in past manufacturing contracts. There is substantial doubt that the offeror can maintain control of the manufacturing system.

MARGINAL/High Proposal Risk: The offeror has some of the critical skills that relate to the product or service. Some of the required technical personnel are hired and trained. Some of the required certifications are in place. There is some doubt that the offeror has the overall critical skills to complete the product or service. The offeror has some of the critical processes and procedures in place and documented. The offeror has used a few of these critical processes and procedures in past manufacturing contracts. There is some doubt that the offeror can maintain control of the manufacturing system.

GOOD/Moderate Proposal Risk: The offeror has most or all of the critical skills that relate to the product or service. The required technical personnel are mostly hired and trained. Most of the required certifications are in place. There is little doubt the offeror has the overall critical skills to complete the product or service. The offeror has most of the critical processes and procedures in place and documented. The offeror has successfully used most of these critical processes and procedures in past manufacturing contracts. There is little doubt that the offeror can maintain control of the manufacturing system.

EXCELLENT/Low Proposal Risk: The offeror has extensive critical skills that relate to the product or service. The required technical personnel are hired and trained. All of the required certifications are in place. There is very little doubt the offeror has the overall critical skills required to complete the product or service. The offeror has all necessary critical processes and procedures in place and documented. The offeror has successfully used these critical processes and procedures in past manufacturing contracts. There is very little doubt the offeror can maintain control of the manufacturing system.

Subfactor 1b: Quality Assurance, Testing, and Inspection:

POOR/Very High Proposal Risk: The offeror has few or none of the required quality system processes and procedures in place and documented. There is little or no use of indicators and or metrics designed to provide feedback relating to the quality and conformance of the product to its design requirements. The offeror is not aware of or

does not understand the Quality Assurance Provisions of QAP 4512207. The offeror does not understand the concept of preventive action and has failed to incorporate preventive action initiatives into their quality system. There is little or no evidence of quality awards and/or quality certifications. There is substantial doubt that the offeror can maintain a quality system in accordance with contract requirements.
The offeror has a poor working knowledge and ability to test and inspect the product. The offeror has little or no understanding of the technical requirements and function of the product. The offeror's test and measurement equipment is barely applicable. Certifications and traceability of measurement standards are poor or nonexistent. Not all required technical personnel are trained or hired. There is substantial doubt that the offeror has the ability to test and inspect for conformance of the product to design requirements. The offeror's first article/pre-production/lot acceptance test input creates substantial doubt that they understand the requirement associated with these tests.

MARGINAL/High Proposal Risk: The offeror has some of the quality system processes and procedures in place and documented. A few of these utilize indicators and or metrics designed to provide feedback relating to the quality and conformance of the product to its design requirements. The offeror demonstrates some knowledge/understanding of the Quality Assurance Provisions of QAP 4512207. The offeror understands and has plans to incorporate preventive action initiatives into their quality system. There is little evidence of quality awards and/or quality certifications. There is some doubt that the offeror can maintain a quality system in accordance with contract requirements. The offeror has a fair working knowledge and ability to test and inspect the product. The offeror somewhat understands the technical requirements and function of the product. The offeror's test and measurement equipment is moderately applicable, available and some are calibrated. Certifications and traceability of measurement standards are not all current. Not all required technical personnel are trained and hired. There is some doubt that the offeror has the ability to test and inspect for conformance of the product to design requirements. The offeror's first article/pre-production/lot acceptance input creates some doubt that they understand the requirements associated with these tests.

GOOD/Moderate Proposal Risk: The offeror has most of the quality system processes and procedures in place and documented. Most of these utilize indicators and or metrics designed to provide feedback relating to the quality and conformance of the product to its design requirements. The offeror demonstrates a good understanding of the Quality Assurance Provision of QAP 4512207. The offeror has implemented a few preventive action initiatives as part of their quality system. There is some evidence of quality awards and/or quality certifications. There is little doubt that the offeror can maintain a quality system in accordance with contract requirements. The offeror has a good working knowledge and ability to test and inspect the product. The offeror seems to understand the technical requirements and function of the product. The offeror's test and measurement equipment is mostly applicable, available and calibrated. Certifications and traceability of measurement

standards are current. Technical personnel are trained and hired. There is little doubt that the offeror has the ability to test and inspect for conformance of the product to design requirements. The offeror's first article/pre-production/lot acceptance input leaves little doubt that they understand the requirements associated with these tests.

EXCELLENT/Low Proposal Risk: The offeror has all of the necessary quality system processes and procedures in place and documented. The applicable processes utilize indicators and or metrics designed to provide feedback relating to the quality and conformance of the product to its design requirements. The offeror demonstrates an excellent understanding of the Quality Assurance Provisions of QAP 4512207. The offeror embraces the concept of preventive action as the cornerstone of their quality system. There is applicable evidence of quality awards and/or quality certifications. There is very little doubt the offeror can maintain a quality system in accordance with contract requirements. The offeror has extensive knowledge and ability to test and inspect the product. It is clear that the offeror understands the technical requirements and function of the product. The offeror's test and measurement equipment is applicable, available and calibrated. Certifications and traceability of measurement standards are current. Technical personnel are trained and hired. There is very little doubt that the offeror has the ability to test and inspect for conformance of the product to design requirements. The offeror's first article/pre-production/acceptance test input leaves very little doubt that they understand the requirements associated with these tests.

Subfactor 1c: Production Capability:

POOR/Very High Proposal Risk: The offeror has inadequate production capacity. The offeror does not identify production risks. The offeror has little or no understanding of the production and functional requirements of the product. The offeror's ability to evaluate production capabilities is inadequate. Production capacity measurement tools are poor or non-existent. Not all required production-engineering personnel are trained and hired. There is substantial doubt that the offeror has the ability to evaluate production capabilities for conformance to solicitation requirements.

MARGINAL/High Proposal Risk: The offeror has barely adequate production capacity. The offeror identifies very few production risks. The offeror has a fair working knowledge and ability to evaluate production capabilities. The offeror somewhat understands the production and functional requirements of the product. The offeror's ability to evaluate production capabilities is barely adequate. Production capacity measurement tools are used but not effectively. Few required production-engineering personnel are trained and hired. There is some doubt that the offeror has the ability to evaluate production capabilities for conformance to solicitation requirements.

GOOD/Moderate Proposal Risk: The offeror has adequate production capacity to

meet solicitation requirements. The offeror identifies most production risks including risk mitigation and trade studies. The offeror has a working knowledge of the production and functional requirements of the product. The offeror is able to evaluate production capabilities. Production engineering personnel are fully trained and on-hand. There is little doubt that the offeror has the ability to evaluate production capabilities for conformance to solicitation requirements.

EXCELLENT/Low Proposal Risk: The offeror has adequate production capacity to meet solicitation requirements plus 50% more if necessary. The offeror identifies all production risks including risk mitigation and trade studies. The offeror has extensive knowledge and ability to produce the product. It is clear that the offeror understands the production and functional requirements of the product. Production engineering personnel are fully trained, experienced and on-hand. There is very little doubt that the offeror has the ability to evaluate production capabilities for conformance to solicitation requirements.

Subfactor 1d: Experience:

POOR/Very High Proposal Risk: Offeror has little or no past experience, which would relate to the product or service. Offeror has little or no data, previous work scenarios, training situations, past learning mistakes and significant accomplishments, which relate to the product or service. There is substantial doubt whether the offeror has the sufficient experience to complete the product or service.

MARGINAL/High Proposal Risk: Offeror has some past experience, which would relate to the product or service. Offeror has some substantive data, previous work scenarios, and training situations, past learning mistakes and significant accomplishments, which relate to the product or service. There is some doubt whether the offeror has sufficient experience to complete the product or service.

GOOD/Moderate Proposal Risk: Offeror has experience, which relates to the product or service. Offeror has substantive data, previous work scenarios, training situations, past learning mistakes and significant accomplishments, which relate to the product or service. There is little doubt the offeror has sufficient experience to complete the product or service.

EXCELLENT/Low Proposal Risk: Offeror has extensive experience relating to the product or service. Offeror has much substantive data, previous work scenarios, training situations, past learning mistakes and significant accomplishments, which relate to the product or service. There is very little doubt the offeror has sufficient experience to complete the product or service.

Factor 2: Past Performance: Past Performance, including the subfactors of Quality and On-Time Delivery will each be rated as Poor, Marginal, Good, Excellent or Unknown based on the following:

Subfactor 2a: Quality:

POOR/Very High Performance Risk: There is substantial doubt that the offeror will successfully perform in accordance with the quality provisions. The offeror has recent, relevant past performance with a history of experiencing many quality related problems such as QDRs, RFDs, RFWs, First Article Test failures, and/or lot acceptance test failures, which were the fault of the offeror. The offeror has a history of unsatisfied customers. Previous customers and contract officials found the offeror to be non-responsive and difficult to work with regarding problems and their resolutions.

MARGINAL/High Performance Risk: There is some doubt that the offeror will successfully perform in accordance with the quality provisions. The offeror has recent, relevant past performance, with a history of experiencing some quality related problems such as QDRs,

RFDs, RFWs, First Article Test Failures and/or lot acceptance test failures, which were the fault of the offeror. The offeror has some history of unsatisfied customers. Previous customers and contract officials found the offeror to be somewhat non-responsive and difficult to work with regarding problems and their resolutions.

GOOD/Moderate Performance Risk: Little doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform in accordance with the quality provisions. The offeror has recent, relevant past performance and/or has a history of experiencing few quality related problems such as QDRs, RFDs, RFWs, First Article Test Failures, and/or lot acceptance test failures which were the fault of the offeror. The offeror has little or no history of unsatisfied customers. Previous customers and contract officials found the offeror to be mostly responsive and easy to work with regarding problems and their resolutions.

EXCELLENT/Low Performance Risk: Very little doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform in accordance with the quality provisions. The offeror has had recent, relevant past performance and any history of quality related problems such as QDRs, RFDs, RFWs, First Article Test Failures and/or lot acceptance test failures were not the fault of the offeror or will not affect performance risk. The offeror has a history of satisfied customers. Previous customers and contract officials found the offeror consistently responsive and extremely easy to work with and has, in the past, responded proactively to problems and their resolutions.

UNKNOWN PERFORMANCE RISK: There is no performance record identifiable. This rating will not help or hurt the offeror's rating; however, it will be taken into consideration during the best value trade-off process.

Subfactor 2b: On-Time Delivery:

POOR/Very High Performance Risk: There is substantial doubt that the offeror will

perform the required effort in accordance with the delivery schedule. Deliveries were rarely on time. The offeror has a history of unsatisfied customers. Previous customers and contract officials found the offeror to be non-responsive and difficult to work with regarding problems and their resolutions.

MARGINAL/High Performance Risk: There is some doubt that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort in accordance with the delivery schedule. Deliveries were often late. The offeror has some history of unsatisfied customers. Previous customers and contract officials found the offeror to be somewhat non-responsive and difficult to work with regarding problems and their resolutions.

GOOD/Moderate Performance Risk: Little doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort in accordance with the delivery schedule. The offeror has little or no history of unsatisfied customers. Previous customers and contract officials found the offeror to be mostly responsive and easy to work with regarding problems and their resolutions.

EXCELLENT/Low Performance Risk: Very little doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort and meet or exceed the delivery schedule. The offeror has a history of satisfied customers. Previous customers and contract officials found the offeror consistently responsive and extremely easy to work with and has, in the past, responded proactively to problems and their resolutions.

UNKNOWN PERFORMANCE RISK: There is no performance record identifiable. This rating will not help or hurt the offeror's rating; however, it will be taken into consideration during the best value trade-off process.

Factor 3: Price: An adjectival rating is not applicable to this factor.

Factor 4: Small Business Utilization. A rating will be assigned to each offeror's (small, large and foreign) proposal. This rating considers both the proposed small business utilization and the likelihood of attaining that participation based on the small business utilization past performance. Offeror's that have: 1) no experience over the past three years using SBs and/or HBCU/MIs, and 2) no contractual performance over the past three years which required compliance with FAR 52.219-8 or FAR 52.219-9, will be treated neither favorably nor unfavorably. The following adjectival ratings will be used to rate proposals:

POOR/Very High Risk: The offeror demonstrates little or no commitment to using SBs and HBCU/MIs. There is no evidence that the offeror met prior goals and/or shows no serious commitment and did not provide adequate justification for not doing so. Based on the proposed SB utilization and/or SB utilization past performance, there is negligible likelihood that anything other than a token portion of the work will be performed in this sector.

MARGINAL/High Risk: Proposal includes a minimal portion of work, in terms of:

1. The complexity of work performed by SBs.
2. The total proposed dollar value for work to be performed by SBs
3. The subcontracting goals (for large businesses only) that have 8% - 12% of the work to be performed in the SB or HBCU/MI sector.

Based on the offeror's proposed SB utilization and/or SB utilization past performance, there is little likelihood that more than a minimal portion of the work will be performed in this sector.

ADEQUATE/Moderate Risk: Proposal includes a reasonable portion of work, in terms of:
1. The complexity of work performed by SBs
2. The total proposed dollar value for work to be performed by SBs
3. The subcontracting goals (for large businesses only) that have 13% - 17% of the work to be performed in the SB or HBCU/MI sector.

Based on the offeror's proposed SB utilization and SB utilization past performance, the offeror's proposed utilization and/or actions are adequate and could be met if the offeror focuses attention on them.

GOOD/Low Risk: Proposal includes a significant portion of work, in terms of:
1. The complexity of work performed by SBs
2. The total proposed dollar value for work to be performed by SBs
3. The subcontracting goals (for large businesses only) that have 18% - 22% of the work to be performed in the SB or HBCU/MI sector.

Based on the offeror's proposed SB utilization and SB utilization past performance, the offeror's proposed utilization and/or actions are significant and are considered very realistic.

EXCELLENT/Very Low Risk: Proposal includes a substantial portion of work, in terms of:
1. The complexity of work performed by SBs
2. The total proposed dollar value for work to be performed by SBs
3. The subcontracting goals (for large businesses only) that meet or exceed 23% of the work to be performed in the SB or HBCU/MI sector.

Based on the offeror's proposed SB utilization and SB utilization past performance, the offeror's proposed utilization and/or actions are substantial and are considered very realistic.

TECHNICAL ABILITY IS MORE IMPORTANT THAN EITHER PAST PERFORMANCE OR PRICE. PAST PERFORMANCE AND PRICE ARE OF EQUAL IMPORTANCE. PAST PERFORMANCE AND PRICE, INDIVIDUALLY, ARE MORE IMPORTANT THAN SMALL BUSINESS UTILIZATION. TECHNICAL ABILITY, PAST PERFORMANCE, AND SMALL BUSINESS UTILIZATION, WHEN COMBINED, ARE SIGNIFICANTLY MORE IMPORTANT THAN PRICE.