

DAAA09-03-C-0181 (ATTACHMENT 14)
ADDITIONAL SOLICITATION CLAUSES

SECTION M, EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD, 15.204-5 (C) OCT 1997

M-2 The following are the evaluation factors for award:

(a) A best value, competitive, firm fixed price contract is contemplated for award. There will be a 75% evaluated option included in this award. The solicitation will be a competitive, unrestricted 100% Small Business Set Aside.

(b) An award will be made to the offeror whose Technical Ability, recent, relevant record of Past Performance, and Price provide the best value to the Government. 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, essential skills and unique techniques needed to produce the BSU-86A/B Fin Assembly. A like item shall also have performed under similar performance parameters and environmental conditions as the BSU-86 Fin. 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 narrative explanation of how/why they believe the experience is relevant.

(c) For the purpose of the acquisition, **offeror** is defined as prime contractor and key subcontractors identified by the prime contractor.

(d) The evaluation team may determine that an on-site visit or a Capability Study of the Offeror's facility (for those offeror's determined to be in the competitive range), may be necessary for clarification purposes to confirm or clarify information in the offeror's proposal, however, offeror's are 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.

(e) **Important Notice to Offerors:** For the purpose of this solicitation, offers must include best value data with the original proposal. Data requested for evaluation has been clearly identified in section L of the solicitation. Data submitted may represent either Government or commercial contracts; however, the data should be recent (within 3 years of the initial closing date of the solicitation; however the Government has the right to consider information up to the date of award) and relevant to the item being procured. If the offeror has no recent or relevant past performance, this information should be stated for evaluation purposes. Discussions will not be opened for the sole purpose of allowing offerors to submit their initial best value data. Proposals received with no Best Value information may be considered unacceptable and the offeror will be

rated poor and/or unknown without opening discussions to allow for the submission of data that should have been submitted with the initial proposal.

(End of Provision)

MF6012

**SECTION M, EVALUATION FACTORS AND SIGNIFICANT SUBFACTORS FOR
AWARD 15.304-5(C) OCT 1997**

M-3 The Government expects to award a contract to that offeror whose proposal is determined to represent the "best value" to the Government. Best Value is determined by an integrated assessment of the evaluation factors. Any area of the offer requiring clarification will be referred to the Procuring Contracting Officer for resolution. The Procuring Contracting Officer reserves the right to contact offerors for clarification, without opening discussions. The Government anticipates awarding a contract without opening discussions and without a site visit.

(a) Award will be based upon the following evaluation factors:

Factor 1: Technical Ability

Subfactor 1a: Skills, Processes and Procedures

Subfactor 1b: Quality System

Subfactor 1c: Testing and Inspection

Factor 2: Past Performance

Subfactor 2a: On-Time Delivery

Subfactor 2b: Quality and/or Quality Program Problems

Factor 3: Price

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

- (1) Technical Ability and Past Performance are of equal importance and when combined, they are significantly more important than Price.
- (2) Within Technical Ability, the sub-factors are equal in importance.
- (3) Within Past Performance, the sub-factors are equal in importance.
- (4) Price contains no sub-factors.

(c) Proposals will be rated on the basis of their response to the RFP. Only factors/sub-factors identified in Section M of the RFP and price will be evaluated. Proposals pertaining to Technical Ability shall be evaluated only on their content. Assumptions, preconceived ideas, and personal knowledge or opinions not supported by material provided in the proposal will not be considered or used as a basis for evaluation.

(d) The Government's evaluation of Past Performance may include data/information from sources other than those provided with the offeror's proposal. Sources such as, but not limited to, contracting and pre-award offices at other commands may be used to gather information. In addition, the Government has the right to consider information regarding contractor performance up to the date of award. For the purpose of submitting past performance information, "offeror" should also include subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement, team members, partners and other entities that comprise the offer. The government will consider past performance of subcontractors identified in offeror's proposal when assessing the offeror's Past Performance.

(e) Evaluation Factors/Process:

Factor 1: Technical Ability: The team members shall utilize the following sub-factors, to determine if the offeror and/or subcontractor has the technical knowledge, equipment, and personnel required to manufacture the product per requirements. Certifications, abilities, and/or capabilities that would demonstrate the technical expertise of the offeror to complete the product or service may also be considered. The technical rating will be determined through consideration of the individual subfactor ratings; including subfactor strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies, and risks; and their order of relative importance.

Subfactor 1a: Skills, Processes and Procedures (SPP): The offeror will be evaluated on their technical know how, equipment, processes and the personnel necessary to produce and delivery a quality product. Evaluators shall consider/review the following areas:

- (a) The offeror will be evaluated on their ability to demonstrate process controls associated with the fabrication and test of the shock absorber.
- (b) The offeror will be evaluated on their ability to demonstrate process controls for metal- working, i.e. stamping/forming fin blades; forging (bar stock); heat treating and surface treatment and application, and critical assembly operations.
- (c) The offeror will be evaluated on their ability to demonstrate the integration of primary raw material deliveries, fabrication plans and procedures and

inspection and testing requirements to meet the solicitation delivery requirements.

Subfactor 1b: Quality System: The offeror will be evaluated on their ability to establish and maintain a quality system in accordance with contract requirements. The offeror will be evaluated on their understanding and ability to implement the requirements described in the Quality Assurance Provisions of QAP 923AS346. 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.

Subfactor 1c: 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 will also be evaluated on their understanding of the First Article Test (FAT) and Lot Acceptance Test (LAT) requirements.

Factor 2: Past Performance: The team members shall utilize the following sub-factors 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, deficiencies, and risks; and their order of relative importance:

Subfactor 2a: 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 customers' needs will also be considered. Other sources, available to the Government other than the contractor's proposal, may be used to gather and evaluate On-Time Delivery. Sources may include, but are not limited to data gathered from pre-award offices, other major support commands, past customers, and/or previous contracting officials.

Subfactor 2b: Quality and/or Quality Program Problems: The offeror's recent performance on like or similar items in the area of quality assurance will be evaluated. In the event problems are noted, the offeror's process and timeliness to improve product quality will be considered. The offeror will be required to submit data explaining corrective 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 and timeliness of implementation. The offeror will also be evaluated on how well they worked with previous Government and technical representatives or other

customers 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 offeror's proposal, may be used to gather and evaluate Quality and/or Quality Program Problems. Such sources are cited above.

Factor 3: Price: The Contract Specialist will evaluate the proposed price in accordance with the schedule proposed and the related factors stated in the solicitation. All evaluation factors, including total basic price (for schedule proposed), option price and Government Property and Equipment will be applied to determine total evaluated price.

(End of Provision)

MF6025