

3

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14



15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

LRDR Section M:  
Evaluation Factors for Award  
For  
**HQ0147-14-R-0002**

22	<b><u>Table of Contents</u></b>	
23	<b>M-1.0 GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR AWARD AND OFFEROR</b>	
24	<b>RESPONSIBILITY.....</b>	<b>3</b>
25	<b>M-1.1 CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY FULL TEXT .....</b>	<b>3</b>
26	<b>M-2.0 BASIS OF AWARD.....</b>	<b>4</b>
27	<b>M-2.1 COMPETITIVE, BEST-VALUE SOURCE SELECTION.....</b>	<b>4</b>
28	<b>M-2.2 FACTOR AND SUB-FACTOR WEIGHTING .....</b>	<b>5</b>
29	<b>M-3.0 EVALUATION OF FACTORS AND SUB-FACTORS.....</b>	<b>6</b>
30	<b>M-3.1 FACTOR AND SUB-FACTOR EVALUATION.....</b>	<b>6</b>
31	<b>M-3.2 TECHNICAL AND MANAGEMENT FACTOR RATING INFORMATION.....</b>	<b>6</b>
32	<b>M-3.3 EVALUATION DEFINITIONS APPLICABLE TO TECHNICAL AND</b>	
33	<b>MANAGEMENT FACTORS .....</b>	<b>6</b>
34	<b>M-4.0 FACTORS AND SUB-FACTORS.....</b>	<b>7</b>
35	<b>M-4.1 TECHNICAL FACTOR (FACTOR 1).....</b>	<b>7</b>
36	<i>M-4.1.1 Technical Sub-factor 1 (TS-1): Architecture and Design .....</i>	<i>7</i>
37	<i>M-4.1.2 Technical Sub-factor 2 (TS-2): Software Architecture and Development.....</i>	<i>9</i>
38	<i>M-4.1.3 Technical Sub-factor 3 (TS-3): Technology Maturity/Manufacturing Readiness .....</i>	<i>9</i>
39	<b>M-4.2 MANAGEMENT FACTOR (FACTOR 2).....</b>	<b>9</b>
40	<i>M-4.2.1 Management Sub-factor 1 (MS-1): Program Management.....</i>	<i>9</i>
41	<i>M-4.2.2 Management Sub-factor 2 (MS-2): Schedule .....</i>	<i>10</i>
42	<i>M-4.2.3 Management Sub-factor 3 (MS-3): Small Business Participation and Commitment.....</i>	<i>10</i>
43	<b>M-4.3 PAST PERFORMANCE (FACTOR 3) .....</b>	<b>10</b>
44	<i>M-4.3.1 Past Performance Evaluation .....</i>	<i>10</i>
45	<i>M-4.3.2 Past Performance Rating .....</i>	<i>10</i>
46	<b>M-5.0 PRICE FACTOR .....</b>	<b>12</b>
47	<b>M-5.1 TOTAL EVALUATED PRICE.....</b>	<b>13</b>
48	<b>M-5.2 ADDITIONAL COSTS TO THE GOVERNMENT.....</b>	<b>13</b>
49	<b>M-5.3 FUNDING LIMITATIONS .....</b>	<b>13</b>
50		

51 **M-1.0 GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR AWARD AND OFFEROR**  
52 **RESPONSIBILITY**

53

54 Pursuant to FAR 52.215-1 (Alt 1), the Government intends to award this contract to a single  
55 awardee after conducting discussions with Offerors whose proposals have been determined to be  
56 within the competitive range. The competitive range for this procurement is established to be  
57 those offerors whose proposal submission initially appears complete and includes information  
58 required by Section L of this Solicitation. Therefore, it is anticipated that discussions will be  
59 conducted soon after proposal receipt.

60

61 The Government will evaluate each Offeror's understanding of the Government's requirements  
62 and ability to perform the work on the basis of its proposal and the evaluation criteria. It is the  
63 Offeror's responsibility to provide information and evidence that clearly demonstrates its ability  
64 to satisfactorily perform the contract requirements in accordance with the factors listed in  
65 Section M. All information submitted as part of the proposal will be used to evaluate the  
66 Offeror's capability to perform and its understanding of the contract requirements. The  
67 Government also reserves the right to change any of the terms and conditions of this RFP by  
68 amendment at any time prior to contract award and to allow Offerors to revise their offers  
69 accordingly as authorized by FAR 15.306.

70

71 The Government plans to award one contract based on a best value analysis. The Government  
72 reserves the right to not award a contract depending upon the quality of proposal received and  
73 the availability of funds.

74

75 In accordance with DoD 5220.22-M, "National Industry Security Program Operating Manual,"  
76 dated February 28, 2006, Offerors shall be required to have access to classified information and  
77 thus companies under foreign ownership, control or influence (FOCI) will be excluded from  
78 contract award. A company is considered under FOCI whenever a foreign interest has the  
79 power, direct or indirect, whether or not exercised, and whether or not exercisable through the  
80 ownership of the U.S. company's securities, by contractual arrangement or other means, to direct  
81 or decide matters affecting the management of operations of that company in a manner which  
82 may result in unauthorized access to classified information or may adversely affect the  
83 performance of classified contracts.

84

85 Responsibility lies with the Offerors at time of proposal submission to ensure that its  
86 subcontractor(s) that require access to classified information are not restricted from participating  
87 in this acquisition due to FOCI or an OCI clause reference in any Federal Government contract.

88

89 **M-1.1 CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY FULL TEXT**

90

91 52.217-5 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (JUL 1990)

92

93 Except when it is determined in accordance with FAR 17.206(b) not to be in the Government's  
94 best interests, the Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price  
95 for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. Evaluation of options will not obligate  
96 the Government to exercise the option(s).

97 **M-2.0 BASIS OF AWARD**  
98

99 This is a best-value competitive source selection conducted in accordance with FAR 15, as  
100 supplemented by the Defense FAR Supplement (DFARS) 215. To be eligible for award, the  
101 Offeror must be deemed responsible in accordance with FAR 9.1; have an accounting system  
102 adequate for determining costs applicable to the contract in accordance with FAR 16.301-3(a)(3),  
103 FAR 16.403-1(c) and FAR 9.104-1 (e); meet all requirements of the solicitation, including  
104 delivery schedule requirements and Limitations on Subcontracting; conform to all required  
105 terms and conditions; and include applicable required certifications. Offerors must propose to  
106 provide all contract line items in order to be eligible for award.  
107

108 Alternate proposals are not allowed. Proposals with contingent terms and conditions may be  
109 deemed non-responsive and could result in the rejection of an Offeror's proposal. The  
110 Government may reject any proposal that is evaluated to be unrealistic, including contract terms  
111 and conditions, unrealistically high or low in cost/price, in excess of funding limits (see M-5.3),  
112 or deemed to reflect a lack of understanding/competence or failure to comprehend the  
113 complexity and risks of all stated requirements.  
114

115 The Government will consider, throughout the evaluation, the correction potential of any  
116 deficiency. The judgment of such "correction potential" is within the sole discretion of the  
117 Government. If any aspect of an Offeror's proposal not meeting the Government's requirements  
118 is not considered correctable, the Offeror may be eliminated from the competitive range, if  
119 applicable. The Government will use this information to support competitive range and contract  
120 award decisions, as applicable.  
121

122 Offerors should note that in this solicitation "initial" capability refers to the Offeror's capability  
123 to meet or exceed the threshold requirements.  
124

125 Offerors should also note that the Cost Addendum requested (see Section L-3.4.7) is for the  
126 Government's information only and shall not be considered in the best value source selection.  
127

128 **M-2.1 Competitive, Best-Value Source Selection**  
129

130 Attention is directed to FAR 52.215-1, which provides that the contract will be awarded to that  
131 responsible Offeror whose proposal represents the best value after evaluation in accordance with  
132 the factors and sub-factors in the solicitation. "Factors" shall include all of those evaluation  
133 factors and sub-factors which are described in Section M.  
134

135 The Government will select for award the most advantageous proposal representing the best  
136 value to the Government based upon an integrated assessment of Non-Price factors (Technical,  
137 Management, and Past Performance) and the Price factor. A best value analysis will not be  
138 performed for any Offeror whose proposal is found to be unacceptable and will therefore be  
139 ineligible for award.  
140  
141  
142

143 **M-2.2 Factor and Sub-Factor Weighting**

144  
145 The Government intends to award one contract to the responsive and responsible Offeror whose  
146 proposal represents the best value to the Government based on consideration of the factors  
147 specified in Paragraph M-3.0 of this solicitation. In making its best value determination, the  
148 Government will consider the relative importance of the non-price factors as set forth below:  
149

<b>Evaluation Factors</b>
Factor 1 (F1): Technical
Sub-factor TS1: Architecture and Design
Sub-factor TS2: Software Architecture and Development
Sub-factor TS3: Technology Maturity/Manufacturing Readiness
Factor 2 (F2): Management
Sub-factor MS1: Program Management
Sub-factor MS2: Schedule
Sub-factor MS3: Small Business Participation & Commitment
Factor 3 (F3): Past Performance

150 **Table M-2-1 Non-Price Evaluation Factors/Sub-factors**

151  
152 The overall relative importance of the non-price evaluation factors is as follows:  
153

154 The Technical Factor is more important than the Management Factor. The Management Factor  
155 is more important than the Past Performance Factor.

156  
157 The overall relative importance of the sub-factors under the Technical and Management Factors  
158 is as follows:  
159

160 Within the Technical Factor, the Architecture and Design Sub-Factor is more important than the  
161 Software Architecture and Development or Technology Maturity/Manufacturing Readiness Sub-  
162 Factors. The Software Architecture and Development and Technology Maturity/Manufacturing  
163 Readiness Sub-factors are approximately equal in importance.  
164

165 Within the Management Factor, the Program Management Sub-factor is more important than the  
166 Schedule Sub-factor. Each of these Sub-factors is significantly more important than the Small  
167 Business Participation and Commitment Sub-factor.  
168

169 All evaluation factors other than price, when combined, are significantly more important than  
170 price. Even though price is a substantial factor in source selection, this competition may result in  
171 an award to a higher-rated, higher-priced Offeror. However, the significance of Price as an  
172 evaluation factor will increase with the degree of equality in overall merit of competing  
173 proposals in meeting solicitation requirements. Therefore, a price realism analysis will be  
174 conducted in order to measure the Offeror's understanding of the requirements and/or assess the  
175 risk inherent in an Offeror's proposal. Unrealistically low prices proposed initially or  
176 subsequently may be grounds for eliminating a proposal from competition either on the basis that  
177 the Offeror does not understand the requirement or the Offeror has submitted an unrealistic  
178 proposal.

179  
 180  
 181  
 182  
 183  
 184  
 185  
 186  
 187  
 188  
 189  
 190  
 191

**M-3.0 EVALUATION OF FACTORS AND SUB-FACTORS**

**M-3.1 Factor and Sub-Factor Evaluation**

The SSA will select the Offeror whose proposal is considered the best value to the Government based solely on the evaluation of the factors and sub-factors specified in M-4.0.

**M-3.2 Technical and Management Factor Rating Information**

Each Technical and Management sub-factor will be assigned one of the color ratings described in Table M-3-1 below.

Color	Rating	Description
BLUE	Outstanding	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths far outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
PURPLE	Good	Proposal meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal contains strengths which outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
GREEN	Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths and weaknesses are offsetting or will have little or no impact on contract performance. Risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
YELLOW	Marginal	Proposal does not clearly meet requirements and has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. The proposal has one or more weaknesses which are not offset by strengths. Risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
RED	Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies. The proposal is unawardable.

**Table M-3-1 Technical and Management Sub-Factor Ratings**

192  
 193  
 194  
 195  
 196  
 197  
 198

**M-3.3 Evaluation Definitions Applicable to Technical and Management Factors**

The following definitions in Tables 3-2 and 3-3 are applicable to the terms specified in the color rating descriptions applicable to the Technical and Management evaluation.

	Definition
<b>Significant Strength</b>	An aspect of an Offeror’s proposal that has appreciable merit or appreciably exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be appreciably advantageous to the Government during contract performance.

<b>Strengths</b>	An aspect of an Offeror’s proposal that has merit or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Government during contract performance.
<b>Uncertainties</b>	Uncertainty is a doubt regarding whether an aspect of a proposal meets a material performance or capability requirement.
<b>Weaknesses</b>	A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
<b>Significant Weaknesses</b>	A flaw in the proposal that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
<b>Deficiencies</b>	A material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.

**Table M-3-2 Evaluation Definitions**

199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205

The Government assessment of risk is manifested by the identification of weakness(es), considers the potential for disruption of schedule, increased cost, degradation of performance, and the need for increased Government oversight, or the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance.

Rating	Description
Low	Has little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and normal Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.
Moderate	Can potentially cause some disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome difficulties.
High	Is likely to cause significant disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Is unlikely to overcome any difficulties, even with special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring.

**Table M-3-3 Risk Evaluation Definitions**

206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212

**M-4.0 FACTORS AND SUB-FACTORS**

**M-4.1 Technical Factor (Factor 1)**

**M-4.1.1 Technical Sub-factor 1 (TS-1): Architecture and Design**

**M-4.1.1.1 System Architecture**

213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221

The Government will assess how, under CLIN 0001, the Offeror’s proposed architecture results in a producible design which accommodates the Future Growth sensitivity and Objective raid size capacity levels as defined in the LRDR Element Specification without requiring structural modifications. The Government will assess the initial LRDR capability offered for CLIN 0001. The Government will also evaluate how well the Offeror’s approach addresses the Threat Scenarios sample problem.

222 The Government will assess the performance of the Objective Capability offered (base CLIN  
223 0001 plus option CLINs 1000 & 1200) against the Objective raid scenario.

224  
225 Initial LRDR capability that is offered for CLIN 0001 that has merit (such as enhanced battle  
226 space coverage and/or flexibility to participate in future BMDS flight tests) may be assigned a  
227 strength or a significant strength. The Government may assign a strength or a significant  
228 strength for capacity and performance of the initial CLIN 0001 capability against the Objective  
229 raid as set forth in the LRDR Element Specification. The Government may also assign a  
230 strength or a significant strength for the extent to which the initial CLIN 0001 capability exceeds  
231 the Threshold radar sensitivity up to the Objective radar sensitivity as set forth in the LRDR  
232 Element Specification.

233  
234 Proposals for CLIN 0001 will not be eligible for award unless they satisfy the following  
235 conditions:

- 236 • radar sensitivity and raid size capacity meets the Threshold levels
- 237 • LRDR architecture and design accommodate the Future Growth sensitivity and Objective  
238 raid capacity levels as set forth in the LRDR Element Specification.

#### 239 **M-4.1.1.2 Hardware Architecture, Design and Development**

240  
241 The Government will evaluate how well the LRDR hardware design realizes the proposed  
242 architecture and provides a fielded system that is capable, resource efficient, producible, reliable  
243 and supportable which at least meets the requirements in the LRDR Element Specification (ES)  
244 and this solicitation.

#### 245 **M-4.1.1.3 Reliability, Availability, Maintainability and Testability (RAM-T)**

246  
247 The Government will evaluate how the LRDR design (hardware and software) at least meets all  
248 LRDR Reliability, Availability, Maintainability and Testability (RAM-T) requirements as  
249 defined in the LRDR Element Specification. The Government will also assess the Offeror's  
250 approach to logistics and the proposed content of the logistics demonstrations. The Government  
251 will evaluate how well the Offeror's approach addressed the RAM-T sample problem.

#### 252 **M-4.1.1.4 Technical Data and Computer Software Rights**

253  
254 The Government will evaluate the extent to which proprietary or otherwise limited or restricted  
255 components, subsystems, devices, interfaces, and software within the system architecture are  
256 used. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's intellectual property and technical data rights  
257 assertions including: DFARS 252.227-7017 Technical Data Rights List (Attachment J-09);  
258 DFARS 252.227-7028 Technical Data Rights List (Attachment J-09); Supplemental  
259 Information—Noncommercial Technical Data, Noncommercial Computer Software,  
260 Noncommercial Computer Software Documentation (Attachment J-09); Commercial Technical  
261 Data, Commercial Computer Software, and Commercial Computer Software Documentation-  
262 Government Use Restrictions in the Commercial Restrictions List (Attachment J-09); as well as  
263 other information required in Section L pertaining to use of proprietary or otherwise limited or  
264 restricted information.

265  
266 Evaluation will include both the hardware and software concept design. In the event an Offeror  
267 proposes to deliver any commercial or noncommercial Technical Data/Computer  
268 Software/Computer Software Documentation (TD/CS/CSD) with less than GPR, the  
269 Government will evaluate the impact on the Government's ability to use, modify, release, or  
270 disclose such TD, CS, or CSD. Use of proprietary algorithms, designs, processes, or interfaces  
271 will be evaluated based on the extent to which they affect the Government's overall goal and  
272 ability to acquire and support the LRDR design. Justification and rationale for all intellectual  
273 property and technical data rights assertions will be evaluated. Any proposal which asserts less  
274 than GPRs at any system/subsystem interface or other interface (e.g., including, but not limited  
275 to, mechanical, electrical and thermal) may result in the assignment of a weakness or significant  
276 weakness.

277

#### 278 **M-4.1.2 Technical Sub-factor 2 (TS-2): Software Architecture and Development**

279

280 The Government will evaluate how the proposed Software Architecture and Development at  
281 least meets the technical and compliance requirements of the LRDR Element Specification, the  
282 Statement of Work, and the terms and conditions of this solicitation. The Government will also  
283 evaluate the suitability and results of radar algorithms and related products submitted as  
284 substantiation of the Offeror's performance claims for acquisition, track, discrimination, hit  
285 assessment and raid handling.

286

#### 287 **M-4.1.3 Technical Sub-factor 3 (TS-3): Technology Maturity/Manufacturing Readiness**

##### 288 **M-4.1.3.1 Technology Maturity**

289

290 The Government will evaluate the Offeror's understanding of technological maturity issues and  
291 anticipated risks to LRDR performance, delivery and reliability requirements. The Government  
292 will also assess the offeror's metric-based processes and plans to achieve at least a Technology  
293 Readiness Level (TRL) of 6 by System PDR for all mission critical, safety critical, and other key  
294 components, and the plan to achieve at least a TRL of 7 by System CDR.

##### 295 **M-4.1.3.2 Manufacturing Readiness**

296

297 The Government will evaluate the Offeror's manufacturing readiness level claims and its  
298 understanding of the manufacturing challenges, anticipated risks and risk mitigations to LRDR  
299 performance, delivery and reliability requirements. The Government will assess the Offeror's  
300 metric-based processes and plans to achieve at least a Manufacturing Readiness Level (MRL) of  
301 6 for all mission critical, safety critical, and other key components by System PDR, and plans to  
302 achieve at least MRL level 7 by System CDR.

303

#### 304 **M-4.2 Management Factor (Factor 2)**

305

##### 306 **M-4.2.1 Management Sub-factor 1 (MS-1): Program Management**

307

308 The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed program management approach for  
309 accomplishing the SOW requirements and the terms and conditions of the contract. The  
310 Offeror's management approach will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the Offeror  
311 has developed a strategy for the effective and efficient management of contract activities,  
312 business operations and program management activities including subcontract management, key  
313 personnel, facilities, and System and Specialty Engineering.

314  
315 **M-4.2.2 Management Sub-factor 2 (MS-2): Schedule**

316  
317 The Government will evaluate the effectiveness of the Offeror's proposed approach for  
318 accomplishing the SOW requirements for development of the Integrated Master Schedule. The  
319 Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed approach and understanding of the entire effort  
320 as demonstrated in the proposed Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) and accompanying Schedule  
321 Risk Analysis.

322  
323 **M-4.2.3 Management Sub-factor 3 (MS-3): Small Business Participation and**  
324 **Commitment**

325  
326 The Government will evaluate the Offeror's Small Business Participation and Commitment Plan.  
327 As part of the evaluation for this sub-factor the Government will consider each Offeror's  
328 commitment to use small businesses in terms of the type of work to be performed, the extent to  
329 which specific companies are named in the proposal; and whether documented commitments are  
330 demonstrated in their proposal.

331  
332 **M-4.3 Past Performance (Factor 3)**

333  
334 **M-4.3.1 Past Performance Evaluation**

335  
336 The Past Performance evaluation assesses the probability of meeting the solicitation  
337 requirements based on an Offeror's demonstrated record of recent and relevant quality work  
338 performance in meeting contract requirements.

339  
340 For the purposes of evaluating past performance, the following definitions apply:

- 341 (a) "Major Subcontractors" is defined as proposed subcontractors that contribute \$25 million or  
342 more of the effort as proposed by the Prime Offeror for all CLINs combined. Past  
343 performance information related to predecessor companies or subcontractors will be  
344 considered the same as past performance information of the principal Offeror.  
345 (b) "Recent" is defined as the five (5) year period preceding the date of issuance of this  
346 solicitation.  
347 (c) "Relevant" is defined as similar in size, scope, and complexity to LRDR.

348  
349 The Government may obtain past performance information from various sources known or  
350 identified by the Government. The Government may consider past performance information  
351 from individual references, or in the aggregate.

352  
353 **M-4.3.2 Past Performance Rating**

354  
355 Based on an integrated assessment of recency, relevancy, and quality of work, the Government  
356 will assign an overall Past Performance Rating as follows:  
357

Rating	Definition
Acceptable	Based on the Offeror’s recent/relevant/quality performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Unacceptable	Based on the Offeror’s recent/relevant/quality performance record, the Government has no reasonable expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Neutral	No recent/relevant/quality performance record is available, or the Offeror’s performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned.

**Table M-4-1 Past Performance Rating Definitions**

358  
359

**M-4.3.2.1 Recency Assessment**

360  
361  
362 The Government will assess past performance information to determine if it is recent. Past  
363 performance information that does not meet the definition of “recent” (M-4.3.1(b)) will be  
364 considered “not recent” and will not be evaluated. If any part of performance falls within the  
365 “recent” timeframe, the Government may consider the entire performance in its evaluation of  
366 past performance  
367

**M-4.3.2.2 Relevancy Assessment**

368  
369  
370 The Government will assess past performance information that has been determined to be recent  
371 to ascertain its relevancy to the scope of this solicitation. The Government is not bound by the  
372 Offeror’s opinion of relevancy.  
373

374 In assessing relevancy, the Government may consider all information it receives or obtains, such  
375 as contract type and dollar value, program phase, division of company, and major subcontractors,  
376 as well as performance information related to efforts the Offeror or major subcontractors  
377 performed for other agencies of Federal, State, or local Government, and commercial customers.  
378

379 A record of more relevant past performance will typically be a stronger predictor of future  
380 success and may have more influence on confidence assessment than a favorable record of less  
381 relevant past performance.  
382

383 Based on an assessment of the Offeror’s recent performance history and its relevancy to this  
384 solicitation, the Government will assign a Relevancy Rating. The following rating definitions  
385 apply:

386

Rating	Definition
Very Relevant (VR)	Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires
Relevant (R)	Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires
Somewhat Relevant (SR)	Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Not Relevant (NR)	Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires

**Table M-4-1 Past Performance Relevancy Ratings**

387  
388

**M-4.3.2.3 Performance Quality Assessment**

390

391 The Government will conduct an in-depth evaluation of the Offeror’s recent and relevant  
392 performance history in order to assess the Offeror’s quality of performance on past contracts.  
393 This assessment will not change the existing record or history of the Offeror’s past performance;  
394 rather, the evaluation process will review information from customers on how well the Offeror  
395 performed on those past contracts.

396

397 Based on its evaluation, the Government will assign a Performance Assessment Quality Rating.  
398 The following rating definitions apply:

399

Rating	Definition
Satisfactory (S)	Performance met contractual requirements. Performance contained some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the Offeror appeared or were satisfactory.
Unsatisfactory (U)	Performance did not meet most contractual requirements. Performance contained problem(s) for which the Offeror’s corrective actions did not appear in a timely manner, or were ineffective.
Not Applicable (NA)	Unable to provide an assessment due to lack of information.

**Table M-4-2 Performance Quality Assessment Rating**

400  
401

**M-5.0 PRICE FACTOR**

403

404 The Price Factor will not receive a color rating. The Cost Volume shall be evaluated, but shall  
405 not be scored or otherwise combined with other aspects of the proposal evaluation. The  
406 Government will evaluate each Offeror’s price proposal using one or more of the techniques  
407 described in FAR 15.404 and DFARS 215.404. Information in the proposal and information  
408 from other sources such as DCAA, DCMA, and information obtained by the past performance  
409 evaluation team may be considered under the cost factor.

410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453

**M-5.1 Total Evaluated Price**

The Government will evaluate the Offeror’s price proposal to determine a Total Evaluated Price (TEP).

The Total Evaluated Price (TEP) shall include all CLINs, including the option CLINs. The Cost Addendum requested (see Section L-3.4.8) shall not be included or considered in the Government’s establishment of Total Evaluated Price.

The Total Evaluated Price is comprised of:

1. The proposed ceiling price for CLIN’s 0001, 0010, 1000, 1010, 1200 and 1210.
2. For all cost reimbursement CLINs, the probable cost (reflecting any Government adjustments to proposed cost as a result of cost realism analysis) and associated fee at that probable cost (excluding performance incentives) determined in accordance with applicable RFP fee language.
3. The maximum potential Performance incentive fees.
4. The total amount of any additional costs to the Government (see Section M-5.2).

**M-5.2 Additional Costs to the Government**

The amount of any additional costs to the Government which are necessary to support the Offeror’s unique approach will be considered by the Government when making the best value determination. Items such as increased operating cost resulting from data assertions, government furnished equipment, information, facilities, and any other government property proposed by the Offeror that may be included in this category of cost. Even if the proposed GFP is available on a rent free basis the amount of rent would otherwise be charged in accordance with FAR 52.245-9, Use and Charges, will be considered. However, Additional Costs to the Government does not include the GFP items listed in Section J of this RFP. These items are intended to be available to all Offerors and the use of these items will not be considered a discriminator during selection.

**M-5.3 Funding Limitations**

The Government will perform a cost realism analysis of the Target Cost proposed for CLINs 0001, 0010 and the Estimated Cost for CLIN 0030. The results of the cost realism analysis will be used to assess the Target Prices and Estimated cost proposed in each Government Fiscal Year accordingly. Applicable incentive fee and the proposed fixed fee will also be included in the Government's analysis of funding requirements. Any proposal that is evaluated to require funding at any time during performance in excess of the cumulative funding established in L-3.4.5.2 (for each Government fiscal year) shall be considered ineligible for award.