

PART IV – REPRESENTATIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS

SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Section M – Evaluation Factors for Award

M-1

As of Amendment 7

Part IV – REPRESENTATIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS

SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1 PROCEDURES FOR AWARD

Proposals shall be submitted in accordance with the instructions in Section L. A Proposal may be rejected as grossly deficient if the Contracting Officer determines that the Proposal does not materially comply with the instructions.

M.2 BASIS FOR AWARD

The Government will select for award the proposal that is most advantageous and represents the best overall value to the Government, based on the evaluation factors and subfactors in Section M.5. Within the best value continuum, the Government will employ a tradeoff analysis. The Source Selection Authority will determine which proposal is most advantageous to the Government.

In order to be eligible for award, a proposal must comply in all material respects with the requirements of law, regulation and the terms and conditions set forth in this solicitation; and the Offeror must be determined responsible according to the standards set forth in FAR Subpart 9.1. To be determined responsible, the division(s) or branch(es) of the Offeror responsible for the NAIS development shall have a system development and software development capability process, formally assessed by an independent organization to at least SEI CMMI-DEV v1.2, Level 3, and have received ISO 9001 certification.

M.3 SOURCE SELECTION PROCESS

Upon receipt, the Government will review proposals for compliance with the solicitation, focusing on the instructions set forth in Section L, Instructions, Conditions and Notices to Offerors. Following this initial review an in-depth evaluation of the proposals will be performed. The Government intends to award one contract based on the overall best value to the Government, price and other factors considered by using a tradeoff analysis.

M.4 EVALUATION

Each proposal will be evaluated to assess the Offeror's ability to design, develop, integrate, implement and provide initial support of the Nationwide Automatic Identification System in accordance with the Government requirements. Proposals will not be scored or ranked. Proposals will be evaluated based on the Technical Capability and Approach, Management Capability and Approach and Cost/Price factors and their subfactors identified below.

Section M – Evaluation Factors for Award

M-2

As of Amendment 7

The Technical Capability and Approach Factor is more important than the Management Capability and Approach Factor. Within the Technical Capability and Approach Factor, all the subfactors are of equal importance. Within the Management Capability and Approach Factor, Project Management Approach and Corporate Experience and Past Performance subfactors are of equal importance and are each more important than the Small Business Utilization subfactor. When combined, the Technical Capability and Approach and Management Capability and Approach factors are significantly more important than cost/price.

The evaluation of all factors and subfactors will assess the risk associated with the proposal.

M.5 FACTORS AND SUBFACTORS TO BE EVALUATED

M.5.1 Factor 1 – Technical Capability and Approach

- Subfactor A: System Capability
- Subfactor B: Systems Engineering
- Subfactor C: Deployment and Transition

M.5.2 Factor 2 – Management Capability and Approach

- Subfactor A: Project Management Approach and Corporate Experience
- Subfactor B: Past Performance
- Subfactor C: Small Business Utilization

M.5.3 Factor 3 – Cost/Price

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's Cost/Price Volume for completeness (i.e., compliance with the Cost/Price instruction in Section L), price reasonableness, cost realism, and unbalanced pricing. Proposals will not be scored, ranked, nor rated.

Cost/Price reasonableness will be established by competition and determined primarily by comparison with other offers submitted. The proposed costs/prices also will be compared with the Independent Government Cost Estimate (IGCE).

Cost realism analyses will be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.404-1(d). Cost realism will be established by analysis of the costs submitted in the Cost/Price Volume to determine whether the estimated proposed cost elements reflect a clear understanding of the requirements; are realistic for the work to be performed; and are consistent with the methods of performance and materials described in the Offeror's technical proposal. Proposed costs may be adjusted to reflect probable costs, and if such an adjustment is made, the probable costs shall be used in the evaluation to determine best value.

Unbalanced Pricing will be established through the application of cost and/or price analysis techniques. Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable total evaluated price, the cost of one or more contract line items is significantly overstated or

Section M – Evaluation Factors for Award

understated and poses an unacceptable risk to the Government. The Government may determine that a proposal is unacceptable if the proposed costs/price is materially unbalanced between line items or sub-line items within a pricing period, or between line items or sub-line items for the basic requirement and any option period.

In evaluating offers, the Government will use a Total Evaluated Price (TEP), based on the Total Offered Price (TOP), which includes FFP, CPIF, CPFF and cost only (travel) CLINs.

Total Offered Price (TOP) will be calculated by summing the Base Period and Option Periods One through Six under Section B. The CLINs below represent options for Sectors which appear in two contract periods. To calculate the TOP, we will use half of the offered CLIN cost/price for each of the two periods. The affected CLINs are as follows:

0011 – 0013; 1011 – 1013
1018 - 1021; 2018 – 2021
2024 – 2027; 3024 – 3027
3030 – 3033; 4030 – 4033
4036 – 4039; 5036 – 5039
5041 – 5043; 6041 – 6043

The Total Evaluated Price (TEP) will be the Total Offered Price (TOP) plus or minus any adjustments for probable cost, plus any adjustment in accordance with FAR 52.219-4 Notice of Price Evaluation Preference for HUBZone Small Business Concerns; and in accordance with FAR 52.219-23 Notice of Price Evaluation Adjustment for Small Disadvantaged Business Concerns as incorporated in Section I.1 and the following adjustments:

The CLINs below represent options for Sectors which appear in two contract periods. To calculate the TEP, we will use half of the evaluated CLIN cost/price for each of the two periods. The affected CLINs are as follows:

0011 – 0013; 1011 – 1013
1018 - 1021; 2018 – 2021
2024 – 2027; 3024 – 3027
3030 – 3033; 4030 – 4033
4036 – 4039; 5036 – 5039
5041 – 5043; 6041 - 6043

M.6 CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY FULL TEXT

52.217-5 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (JUL 1990). Except when it is determined in accordance with FAR 17.206(b) not to be in the Government's best interests, the Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all

Section M – Evaluation Factors for Award

M-4

As of Amendment 7

options to the total price for the basic requirement. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

END OF SECTION M