

M001 EVALUATION CRITERIA

1.0 BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD

The Government will select the best overall offer, based upon an integrated assessment of Mission Capability/Proposal Risk, Past and Present Performance, and Price. This is a best value source selection conducted in accordance with Air Force Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (AFFARS) subpart 5315.3 Source Selection and the AFMC supplement (AFMCFARS) thereto. Contract(s) may be awarded to offerors who are deemed responsible in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR), as supplemented, whose proposal conforms to the solicitation's requirements (to include all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and all other information required by Section L) and is judged, based on the evaluation factors and subfactors, to represent the best value to the Government. Best value means the expected outcome of an acquisition that, in the Government's estimation, provides the greatest overall benefit. The Government seeks to award to the offerors who give the Air Force the greatest confidence that they will best meet or exceed the requirements affordably. This may result in an award to higher rated, higher priced offerors, where the decision is consistent with the evaluation factors and the Source Selection Authority (SSA) reasonably determines that the technical superiority and/or overall proposed approach and/or superior past and present performance of the higher price offerors outweighs the cost differences. To arrive at a best value decision, the SSA will integrate the source selection team's evaluations of the offerors' proposals against the evaluation factors and subfactors (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 and, therefore, professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire process. The Government intends to award without discussions.

1.1 Number of Contracts to be Awarded

This contract is intended as a multiple award, Indefinite Delivery, Indefinite Quantity (ID/IQ) contract. The Government intends to award a sufficient number of contracts that will allow the Government to provide a "fair opportunity" for awardees to compete for individual orders according to FAR 16.505(b). The Government reserves the right to make one, multiple, or no award as a result of this RFP.

1.2 Unrealistic Offers

The Government may reject any proposal that is evaluated to be unrealistic in terms of program commitment, including contract terms and conditions, or is unrealistically low or high when compared to Government estimates, such that the proposal is deemed to reflect an inherent lack of competence or an inherent failure to understand/comprehend the complexity and risks of the program.

1.3 Correction Potential of Proposals

The Government will consider, throughout the evaluation, the "correction potential" of any deficiency or proposal inadequacy. The judgement of such "correction potential" is within the sole discretion of the Government. If an aspect of an offeror's proposal not meeting the

Government's requirements is not considered correctable, the offeror may be rejected and/or eliminated from the competitive range.

1.4 Competitive Advantage from Use of Government Furnished Property (GFP)

The offerors may not propose to use any GFP other than that identified in the RFP.

2.0 EVALUATION CRITERIA

2.1 Evaluation Factors and Subfactors and their Relative Order of Importance

The Government will award to the offeror(s) whose proposal is deemed most advantageous to the Government based upon an integrated assessment of the evaluation factors and subfactors described below.

- Factor 1: Mission Capability/Proposal Risk
 - Subfactor 1: Technical Capability
 - Subfactor 2: Manufacturing Capability
- Factor 2: Past and Present Performance
- Factor 3: Price

Mission Capability/Proposal Risk and Past and Present Performance are of equal importance and together are slightly more important than the price factor. Within the Mission Capability/Proposal Risk factor, the subfactors are listed in descending order of importance. However, price will contribute substantially to the selection decision.

If the offeror is other than a small business, the offeror's Small Business Subcontracting Plan submitted in accordance with FAR 52.219-9 and Section L paragraph 4.1.9.1 shall also be evaluated to determine the extent to which the offeror identifies and commits to the participation of small business concerns, veteran-owned small business, service-disabled veteran-owned small business, HUBZone small business concerns, small disadvantaged business, and with women-owned small business concerns whether as joint venture members, teaming arrangement, or subcontractor. Failure to submit such a plan will render the offeror ineligible for award.

2.2 Factor and Subfactor Rating

A color rating will be assigned to each subfactor under the Mission Capability/Proposal Risk factor as described in AFFARS 5315.305(a)(3)(A) based on the assessed strengths and proposal inadequacies of each offeror's proposal. The color rating depicts how well the offeror's proposal meets the Mission Capability/Proposal Risk subfactor requirements in accordance with the stated evaluation criteria and solicitation requirements. Subfactor ratings will not be rolled up into an overall color rating for the Mission Capability/Proposal Risk factor. The Mission Capability/Proposal Risk subfactors are described in paragraph 3.1 below. A proposal risk rating will be assigned to each of the Mission Capability/Proposal Risk subfactors as described in AFFARS 5315.305(a)(3)(B). Proposal risk represents the risks identified with an offeror's proposed approach as it relates to the Mission Capability/Proposal Risk subfactor. A Performance Confidence Assessment will be assigned to the Past and Present Performance factor. Performance Confidence represents the Government's assessment of the probability of an

offeror successfully performing as proposed and is derived from an evaluation of the offeror's past and present work record. Proposed prices will be evaluated as described in paragraph 3.3 below. When the integrated assessment of all aspects of the evaluation is accomplished, the color ratings, proposal risk ratings, performance confidence assessment, and evaluated price will be considered as described in Section M.

3.0 EVALUATION FACTORS

3.1 Mission Capability/Proposal Risk

The Government will use the offeror's written proposal and Government's plant visit to evaluate the Mission Capability/Proposal Risk factor. In general, the evaluation will assess the extent to which the offeror understands the requirements, proposes a sound solution, and demonstrates a capability to implement the solution. In arriving at a best value decision, the Government reserves the right to give positive consideration for performance in excess of that required by the Baseline Requirements Documents (BRD).

Proposal Risk will be evaluated at the Mission Capability subfactor level. The Proposal Risk assessment focuses on the risks and weaknesses associated with an offeror's proposed approach and includes an assessment of the potential for disruption of schedule, degradation of performance, and the need for increased Government oversight, as well as the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance. For each identified risk, the assessment also addresses the offeror's proposal for mitigating the risk and why that approach is or is not manageable. Each Mission Capability subfactor will receive one of the Proposal Risk ratings defined at AFFARS 5315.305(a)(3)(B).

3.1.1 Subfactor 1: Technical Capability

The Government will evaluate the following:

- The offeror's proposed technical solution for each module and kit to meet the requirements of the BRD.
- The offeror's proposed technical solution for all proposed retrofit kits, including method for retrofitting, to validate that the proposed solution meets the requirements of the BRD and that the implementation methodology is reasonable.
- If the proposal includes the network control equipment category, the offeror's approach to install and configure software that meets the requirements of the BRD.
- If the proposal includes the voice, data, muxing, or transmission categories, the offeror's plan to comply with DoD directives regarding the safeguarding of COMSEC equipment required for integration and/or test.

- The offeror's engineering processes to successfully complete the integration engineering, build and test a first production unit, and transition the product to manufacturing/production.

3.1.2 Subfactor 2: Manufacturing Capability

The Government will evaluate the following:

- The offeror's ability to assemble a module that demonstrates a high level of workmanship and quality construction. This includes use of quality components such as cables, connectors, and distribution/patch panel; use of appropriate cable lengths and dressing; fasteners, stiffeners, and other hardware; application of suitable marking and labeling; and implementation of proper grounding.
- The offeror's processes to integrate and deliver modules and kits that meet the Government's technical requirements within the required schedule and at an acceptable level of quality. This includes the processes to ensure quality and consistency; change control, documentation/drawing management, incoming inspection, and proper electrostatic discharge (ESD) procedures.
- The offeror's production facility and capacity to integrate and deliver modules and kits that meet the Government's technical requirements within the required schedule and at an acceptable level of quality. This includes availability of appropriate dedicated facilities – integration/manufacturing space, bonded/secure storage, and shipping/handling areas.
- The offeror's organization to execute a manufacturing/production program that meets the Government's technical requirements within the required schedule and at an acceptable level of quality. This includes organizational capabilities, relationships, and roles and responsibilities of the various organizations such as material management/buying, quality assurance.

3.2 Past and Present Performance Factor

Under the Past and Present Performance factor, the Performance Confidence Assessment represents the evaluation of an offeror's and associated key or major subcontractors', teaming partners', and joint venture partners' present and past performance to assess the Government's confidence the offeror will successfully perform as proposed. The Government will evaluate the offeror's and all key or major subcontractors', teaming partners', and joint venture partners' demonstrated record of contract compliance in supplying products and services that meet user's needs, including cost and schedule. The Past and Present Performance Evaluation is accomplished by reviewing the aspects of an offeror's and all key or major subcontractors', teaming partners', and joint venture partners' present and past performance, focusing on and targeting performance which is relevant to the Mission Capability/Proposal Risk subfactors and the requirements of the solicitation. The Government may consider as relevant efforts performed for agencies of federal, state, or local Governments and commercial customers. As a result of an analysis of this past/present work history and identified risks and strengths, each offeror will receive a Performance Confidence Assessment, which is the rating for the Past and Present

Performance factor. Although the past and present performance evaluation focuses on performance that is relevant to the Mission Capability/Proposal Risk subfactors, the resulting Performance Confidence Assessment is made at the factor level and represents an overall evaluation of the likelihood of successful contractor performance. The Government will evaluate present and past performance to determine the Government's confidence in each offeror's ability to successfully perform the TDC Modules and Kits effort. The Government will assess the performance and relevancy of each offeror's work on present and past contracts, both Government and commercial. This information may include data on efforts performed by other divisions, critical subcontractors, or teaming contractors, if such resources will be brought to bear or significantly influence the performance of the proposed effort. Past and present performance for other divisions, critical subcontractors, or teaming contractors must be for the same type of effort as is proposed for the TDC Modules and Kits effort. The Performance Risk Assessment Group will determine relevancy in accordance with the following criteria.

Each prime contractor and/or any of its proposed subcontractors, teaming partners, or joint venturers who will be performing significant integration efforts under the contemplated contract must have performed contracts by the same division and location within the past three (3) years ending with the date of the Final Proposal Revision (FPR), if discussions are conducted, or the date of the last proposal submission if there are no discussions, and that contract performance must have been the same type of effort proposed for the TDC Modules and Kits contract. In determining recency, the Government will only consider work performed within the three-year period ending with the date of the Final Proposal Revision (FPR) if discussions are conducted, or the date of the last proposal submission if there are no discussions. This will allow offerors to provide the most current performance information possible for consideration. Additionally, each contractor and its proposed subcontractors, joint venturers, or teaming partners who will be performing integration work under the contemplated contract will be determined to have had past or present performance that is either Somewhat Relevant, Relevant, or Very Relevant as defined below:

In determining relevancy, the following criteria will be used:

- (1) Commercial communications equipment in at least one of the functional areas (voice, data, muxing, transmission, network control)
- (2) Military communications equipment in at least one of the functional areas (voice, data, muxing, transmission, network control)
- (3) Assembly/integration of equipment into racks/transit cases

In order to be considered Very Relevant, the contract must meet Criteria (1) or (2) and (3) listed above. To be considered Relevant, the contract must meet Criteria (1) or (2) but not (3) of the criteria listed above. To be considered Somewhat Relevant, the contract must meet Criteria (3) but not (1) or (2) of the criteria listed above. A determination of Very Relevant will be given more consideration in the overall Performance Confidence Assessment than either Relevant or Somewhat Relevant. Likewise, a determination of Relevant will be given more consideration in the overall Performance Confidence Assessment than a rating of Somewhat Relevant.

Pursuant to DFARS 215.305(a)(2), the assessment will consider the extent to which the offerors evaluated past and present performance demonstrates compliance with FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns and pursuant DFARS 215.304(c)(i) the extent to which the offeror's evaluated past and present performance demonstrates compliance with FAR 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan.

When relevant performance record indicates performance problems, the Government will consider the number and severity of the problems and the appropriateness and effectiveness of any corrective actions taken (not just planned or promised). The Government may review more recent contracts or performance evaluations to ensure corrective actions have been implemented and to evaluate their effectiveness.

Each offeror will receive one of the ratings described in AFFARS 5315.305(a)(2)(E) for the Past and Present Performance factor. Offerors without a record of relevant past and present performance or for whom information on past and present performance is not available will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past and present performance and, as a result, will receive a "Neutral/Unknown Confidence" rating for the Past and Present Performance factor.

More recent and relevant performance may have a greater impact on the Performance Confidence Assessment than less recent or less relevant effort. A strong record of relevant past and present performance may be considered more advantageous to the Government than a "Neutral/Unknown Confidence" rating. Likewise, a recent relevant record of favorable performance may receive a higher confidence rating and be considered more favorably than a less recent relevant record of favorable performance.

Past and present performance information may be obtained through the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting Systems (CPARS), similar systems of other Government departments and agencies, questionnaires tailored to the circumstances of this acquisition, Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) channels, interviews with program managers and contracting officers and other sources known to the Government, including commercial sources. Offerors are to note that, in conducting this assessment, the Government reserves the right to use both data provided by each offeror and data obtained from other sources.

3.3 Price Factor

In accordance with (IAW) FAR 15.404-1(d), the Government will evaluate the realism of the offeror's proposed prices. This evaluation will include an assessment of the extent to which the offeror's proposed prices and supporting information is consistent with the offeror's technical (Mission Capability/Proposal Risk) proposal, indicates a clear understanding of the solicitation requirements, and reflects a sound approach to satisfy the same. In the final analysis, the total evaluated price of the offeror's proposal will be the basis considered by the decision authority along with Mission Capability/Proposal Risk and Past and Present Performance evaluation results.

We will determine the total evaluated price separately for each of the five equipment categories as follows:

3.3.1 Voice Equipment

The total evaluated price will be calculated as the total of the following:

The total price proposed for the voice module and kit non-recurring engineering and first article qualification for the basic effort, up to the contract maximum allowable price of \$150,000.

The total price proposed for all voice modules and kits at the BEQ quantities for all ordering periods. If you are proposing a different baseline from that in the RFP, the BEQ quantities may be changed, as necessary, to reflect the requirement to not have more than two versions of any module or kit in the field at a given time in accordance with the Statement of Objectives (SOO). The Government may determine that an offer is unacceptable and otherwise excluded from the competitive range if the option unit prices are materially unbalanced when compared to basic year quantity unit prices.

The total price proposed for all voice retrofit kits at the BEQ quantities. If you are proposing a different baseline from that in the RFP, the BEQ quantities may be changed, as necessary, to reflect the requirement for not more than two versions of any module or kit in the field at a given time in accordance with the SOO.

3.3.2 Data Equipment

The total evaluated price will be calculated as the total of the following:

The total price proposed for the data module and kit non-recurring engineering and first article qualification for the basic effort, up to the contract maximum allowable price of \$50,000.

The total price proposed for all data modules and kits at the BEQ quantities for all ordering periods. If you are proposing a different baseline from that in the RFP, the BEQ quantities may be changed, as necessary, to reflect the requirement to not have more than two versions of any module or kit in the field at a given time in accordance with the SOO. The Government may determine that an offer is unacceptable and otherwise excluded from the competitive range if the option unit prices are materially unbalanced when compared to basic year quantity unit prices.

The total price proposed for all data retrofit kits at the BEQ quantities. If you are proposing a different baseline from that in the RFP, the BEQ quantities may be changed, as necessary, to reflect the requirement to not have more than two versions of any module or kit in the field at a given time in accordance with the SOO.

3.3.3 Muxing Equipment

The total evaluated price will be calculated as the total of the following:

The total price proposed for the muxing module and kit non-recurring engineering and first article qualification for the basic effort, up to the contract maximum allowable price of \$250,000.

The total price proposed for all muxing modules and kits at the BEQ quantities for all ordering periods. If you are proposing a different baseline from that in the RFP, the BEQ quantities may be changed, as necessary, to reflect the requirement to not have more than two versions of any module or kit in the field at a given time in accordance with the SOO. The Government may determine that an offer is unacceptable and otherwise excluded from the competitive range if the option unit prices are materially unbalanced when compared to basic year quantity unit prices.

The total price proposed for all muxing retrofit kits at the BEQ quantities. If you are proposing a different baseline from that in the RFP, the BEQ quantities may be changed, as necessary, to reflect the requirement to not have more than two versions of any module or kit in the field at a given time in accordance with the SOO.

3.3.4 Transmission Equipment

The total evaluated price will be calculated as the total of the following:

The total price proposed for the transmission module and kit non-recurring engineering and first article qualification for the basic effort, up to the contract maximum allowable price of \$250,000.

The total price proposed for all transmission modules and kits at the BEQ quantities for all ordering periods. If you are proposing a different baseline from that in the RFP, the BEQ quantities may be changed, as necessary, to reflect the requirement to not have more than two versions of any module or kit in the field at a given time in accordance with the SOO. The Government may determine that an offer is unacceptable and otherwise excluded from the competitive range if the option unit prices are materially unbalanced when compared to basic year quantity unit prices.

The total price proposed for all transmission retrofit kits at the BEQ quantities. If you are proposing a different baseline from that in the RFP, the BEQ quantities may be changed, as necessary, to reflect the requirement to not have more than two versions of any module or kit in the field at a given time in accordance with the SOO.

3.3.5 Network Control Equipment

The total evaluated price will be calculated as the total of the following:

The total price proposed for the network control module and kit non-recurring engineering and first article qualification for the basic effort, up to the contract maximum allowable price of \$50,000.

The total price proposed for all network control modules and kits at the BEQ quantities for all ordering periods. If you are proposing a different baseline from that in the RFP, the BEQ quantities may be changed, as necessary, to reflect the requirement to not have more than two versions of any module or kit in the field at a given time in accordance with the SOO. The Government may determine that an offer is unacceptable and otherwise excluded from the competitive range if the option unit prices are materially unbalanced when compared to basic year quantity unit prices.

The total price proposed for all network control retrofit kits at the BEQ quantities. If you are proposing a different baseline from that in the RFP, the BEQ quantities may be changed, as necessary, to reflect the requirement to not have more than two versions of any module or kit in the field at a given time in accordance with the SOO.

3.3.6 Funding Limitations

The Government funding profile for non-recurring engineering/first article qualification is limited to the amounts identified in paragraphs 3.3.1 (CLIN 0001), 3.3.2 (CLIN 0006), 3.3.3 (CLIN 0011), and 3.3.4 (CLIN 0016), and 3.3.5 (CLIN 0021). Proposals above the stated amounts are unawardable.

4.0 DISCUSSIONS

If, during the evaluation period, it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government to hold discussions, offeror responses to Evaluation Notices (ENs) and the Final Proposal Revision (FPR) will be considered in making the source selection decision. The Government reserves the right to award without discussions.

5.0 PRE-AWARD SURVEY

The Government may conduct a pre-award survey (PAS) as part of this source selection. Results of the PAS (if conducted) will be evaluated to determine each offeror's capability to meet the requirements of the solicitation.

6.0 PLANT VISITS

The Source Selection Evaluation Team (SSET) intends to conduct plant visits during the evaluation phase to gather information for judging the offerors' mission capabilities. The Plant Visit will include the required briefing and module demonstration. The results of the Plant Visit will be used in the evaluation of the Mission Capability/Proposal Risk factor and may affect the color rating and/or proposal risk assessed for either subfactor.

7.0 SOLICITATION REQUIREMENTS, TERMS AND CONDITIONS

Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as factors and subfactors to be eligible for award. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the solicitation may result in the offeror being removed from consideration for award. Any exceptions to the solicitation's terms and conditions must be fully explained and justified.