

M.1 BASIS FOR AWARD

M.1.1 The Government plans to award approximately 40 Multiple Award Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (MA IDIQ) contracts, which may consist of 25 contracts in the Restricted Suite and 15 contracts in the Unrestricted Suite, as a result of this solicitation, subject to the provisions contained herein. See M.1.1.1 for definitions of restricted and unrestricted suites. The Government reserves the right to award more or less than 40 MA IDIQ contracts. No partial MA IDIQ awards will be made. The Government reserves the right to make no award as a result of this solicitation. The evaluation of proposals submitted in response to this solicitation will be conducted on a Best Value basis using Source Selection Trade-Off Procedures.

This solicitation represents a Best Value acquisition using a Source Selection Trade-Off process. As such, the Source Selection Authority (SSA), in making the final Source Selection Trade-Off judgment, will weigh the merits of the Non-Cost/Price Factors against the evaluated Cost/Price in arriving at the final Source Selection Decision. As part of the Best Value determination, the relative strengths/weaknesses and risks of each Offeror's proposal in the Non-Cost/Price Factor as well as the total evaluated Cost/Price shall be considered in selecting the offers which are most advantageous and represents the Best Value to the Government. This determination may result in MA IDIQ awards that are not necessarily those with the lowest evaluated Cost/Price.

M.1.1.1 The Government will evaluate offers within two separate Suites, a Restricted Suite and an Unrestricted Suite. The Restricted Suite will contain all Offerors who certify as Small Businesses under North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code 541330, Engineering Services (except Military and Aerospace Equipment and Military Weapons). The Unrestricted Suite will contain all Offerors who do not qualify for the Restricted Suite.

M.1.2 Selection of the successful Offerors shall be made following an assessment of each proposal against the requirements described herein and the criteria set forth M.4.

M.2 GENERAL

M.2.1 The Government intends to award multiple contracts to those Offerors that represent the Best Value to the Government and meet all of the responsibility criteria at FAR Subpart 9.104.

M.2.2 Award Without Discussions. The Offeror's proposal, as required by this section, shall be evaluated as set forth in Section M of this RFP. FAR clause 52.215-1 advises Offerors that the Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with Offerors. Where awards will be made without discussions, exchanges with Offerors are limited to Clarifications as defined in FAR 15.306(a). Therefore, the Offeror's initial proposal should contain the Offeror's best terms with respect to the Cost/Price and Non-Cost/Price Factors. However, under FAR 52.215-1(f)(4), the Government reserves the right to hold discussions, if necessary. If the Contracting Officer determines that the number of proposals that would otherwise be included in the competitive range exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted, the Contracting Officer may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly rated proposals.

M.2.3 The Government reserves the right to discuss with any Offeror the information it included in its proposal pursuant to Section L, provision L.X, "Potential Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI) for

Proposed Contract.” This enables the Contracting Officer to express any concerns he/she may have about the sufficiency or effectiveness of the Offeror’s proposed mitigation strategy or strategies to deal with any potential OCIs. The Contracting Officer may initiate such dialog at any time during the evaluation of proposals. Should the Contracting Officer initiate such a dialog with an Offeror prior to establishment of the competitive range, such action by the Contracting Officer shall not represent the opening of negotiations or discussions. Similarly, should the Contracting Officer initiate such a dialog with an Offeror after any request for final proposal revisions, such action by the Contracting Officer shall not constitute a re-opening of negotiations or discussions.

M.3 EVALUATION AND SOURCE SELECTION PROCESS

M.3.1 Offerors shall carefully read, understand, and provide all the information requested in the Proposal Preparation Instructions contained in Section L. If there are parts of the Section L instruction you do not understand, request clarification from the PCO, in writing before the closing date of this solicitation. In accordance with FAR Subpart 52.215-1, Instructions to Offerors – Competitive Acquisition, the Government may reject any or all proposals if such action is in the Government's interests.

M.3.1.2 The Government may reject any Offeror’s proposal that fails to meaningfully comply with the Proposal Preparation Instructions specified in Section L of this solicitation. Examples of when an Offeror’s proposal fails to meaningfully comply include:

M.3.1.2.1 When an Offeror’s proposal merely offers to perform work according to the solicitation terms or fails to present more than a statement indicating its capability to comply with the solicitation terms and does not provide support and elaboration as specified in Section L of this solicitation.

M.3.1.2.2 When an Offeror’s proposal fails to provide any of the data and information required in Section L.

M.3.1.2.3 When an Offeror’s proposal provides some data and information, but omits significant material data and information required in Section L.

M.3.1.2.4 When an Offeror’s proposal merely repeats the contract’s Statement of Work (SOW) without elaboration.

M.3.1.3 The Government may reject any Offeror’s proposal that is unrealistically high or low in cost/price or that is unrealistic in terms of technical or schedule commitments, which implies the offer, (i) reflects an inherent lack of technical competence; (ii) a failure to comprehend the complexity and risks required to perform the solicitation's requirements; or (iii) an Offeror’s misunderstanding of the SOW.

M.3.1.4 The Government may reject any Offeror’s proposal that contains any unexplained significant inconsistencies between the proposed effort and the associated cost/price, which implies the Offeror, has (i) an inherent misunderstanding of the SOW or (ii) an apparent inability to perform the resultant contract at the cost/price proposed.

M.3.1.5 The Government may reject any Offeror's proposal that is considered to be unaffordable. An unaffordable proposal is a proposal in which the total offered cost/price is determined to be unrealistically high.

M.3.1.6 The Government may reject any Offeror's proposal that the proposal offers a product or service that does not meet all stated material requirements of the solicitation.

M.3.1.7 The Government may reject any Offeror's proposal that takes exceptions to the attachments, exhibits, enclosures, or other solicitation terms and conditions.

M.3.1.8 The Government may reject any Offeror's proposal that contains one or more OCI(s) for which sufficient negation or mitigation has not been proposed. Refer to Section L of this solicitation, provision L.X, "Potential Organizational Conflicts of Interest for Proposed Contract."

M.3.1.9 The Government may reject any Offeror's proposal that offers costs/prices lower than the prevailing wage rate for the SARET Task Order.

M.3.1.10 The Government may reject any Offeror's proposal that fails to propose to all three task orders under the technical factor.

M.3.2 SSA

The SSA is the official designated to direct the source selection process and select the offeror(s) for contract award.

M.3.3 Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB)

A SSEB has been established by the Government to evaluate proposals in response to this solicitation. The SSEB is comprised of technically qualified individuals who have been selected to conduct this evaluation in accordance with the Evaluation Criteria for this solicitation. Careful, full and impartial consideration will be given to the evaluation of all proposals received pursuant to this solicitation.

M.3.4 Responsibility

M.3.4.1. Determination of Responsibility and Eligibility for Award. Per FAR Subpart 9.103, contracts will be placed only with contractors that the Contracting Officer determines to be responsible, that is, those who can satisfactorily perform the necessary tasks and delivery of the required items on time. Prospective offerors, in order to qualify as sources for this acquisition, must be able to demonstrate that they meet standards of responsibility set forth in FAR Subpart 9.104. In addition, the Government may assess the Offeror's financial ability to meet the solicitation requirements. The Government reserves the right to conduct a Pre-Award Survey on any or all offerors (or its Significant Subcontractors) to aid the PCO in the evaluation of each Offeror's proposal and ensure that a selected Contractor is responsible. No award can be made to an offeror who has been determined to be not responsible by the Contracting Officer. To make sure that you meet the responsibility criteria at FAR Subpart 9.104, we may:

M.3.4.1.1 Perform a necessary Pre-Award Survey, or

M.3.4.1.2 Ask you to provide technical and/or financial information. If you do not provide us with the data, we ask for within 7 days from the date you receive our request, or if you refuse to have us visit your facility, we may determine you nonresponsible. If we visit your facility, please make sure that you have current data relevant to your proposal available for our team to review.

M.3.5 Importance of Cost/Price Factor

All the factors contained in each proposal will be evaluated. However, the closer the Offeror's evaluations are in the Non-Cost/Price Factors, the more important Cost/Price becomes in the decision. Notwithstanding the relative order of importance of the Evaluation Factors as stated, Cost/Price may be the controlling factor when:

M.3.5.1 Proposals are considered approximately equal in Non-Cost/Price Factors; or

M.3.5.2 An otherwise superior proposal is unaffordable; or

M.3.5.3 The advantages of a higher rated, higher Cost/Price proposal are not considered to be worth the Cost/Price premium.

M.3.6 Evaluation Criteria

M.3.6.1 The Government will assess each Offeror on four Factors: (1) Experience; (2) Technical; (3) Cost/Price; and (4) Small Business Participation.

M.3.6.2 The Experience Factor is more important than the Technical Factor. Within the Technical Factor, the SARET Subfactor is approximately equal to the NIE Subfactor, which is approximately equal to the Blast Mitigation Subfactor. When combined, the Technical Subfactors are somewhat more important than the Cost/Price Factor. The Cost/Price Factor is somewhat more important than the Small Business Participation Factor. As required by FAR Subpart 15.304(e), the Non-Cost/Price Factors, when combined, are significantly more important than the Cost/Price Factor.

M.4 TRADEOFF PROCESS EVALUATION FACTORS AND RELATIVE IMPORTANCE

M.4.1 Selection of the successful Offeror shall be made following an assessment of each proposal, based on the response to the information called for in Section L and against the solicitation requirements and the evaluation criteria described herein. Proposals will be evaluated as specified herein, to include developing narrative support for the evaluation conclusions under each Factor.

M.5 EVALUATION OF VOLUME II - EXPERIENCE FACTOR (reference the proposal information submitted in response to Section L.5)

The Government will assess the expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. This assessment will result in the application of a Confidence Rating which will be based upon the extent to which recent prior experience is relevant to the following solicitation requirements:

M.5.1 Contracts performed as the prime contractor which required teaming arrangements or subcontractors in excess of three firms in addition to the prime contractor;

M.5.2 Contracts which required deployment and management of greater than five deployed individuals simultaneously to more than two OCONUS locations

M.5.3 Even where the Offeror's proposal identifies experience for itself, the Government will consider whether the benefits of this experience will ever be employed/realized should the offeror subsequently be awarded a contract. Accordingly, any prime experience which is identified in the Offeror's Experience Factor proposal, but the Offeror's proposal under the Cost/Price Factor does not clearly support that this experience is intended to be used by the offeror during contract performance, will be discounted in whole or in part. The offeror may also be evaluated based on other internal Government or private source information.

M.6 EVALUATION OF VOLUME III - TECHNICAL FACTOR (reference the proposal information submitted in response to Section L.6)

M.6.1 Within the Technical Factor, the SARET Subfactor is approximately equal to the NIE Factor, which is approximately equal to the Blast Mitigation Subfactor.

M.6.1.1 Technical Subfactor 1: SARET Task Order

This subfactor will be evaluated in terms of the extent to which and probability that the Offeror's proposed approach will meet the schedule and performance requirements of the task order, through effective and detailed planning as follows:

M.6.1.1.1 The extent to which and risk that the Offeror's analysis of the PWS, and discussion the key success drivers and risks (performance, schedule and cost), will successfully result in achievement of work directive requirements.

M.6.1.1.2 Based on the Offeror's analysis of the scope of work, the extent to which and risk that the specific technical approach proposed, to include identification of necessary tasks and details on task performance plans, will successfully result in achievement of work directive requirements.

M.6.1.1.3 Based on the proposed technical approach, the extent to which and risk that the offeror has specifically identified the labor mix required to execute the technical approach to meet task order requirements.

M.6.1.2 Technical Subfactor 2: NIE Task Order

This subfactor will be evaluated in terms of the extent to which and probability that the Offeror's proposed approach will meet the schedule and performance requirements of the task order, through effective and detailed planning as follows:

M.6.1.2.1 The extent to which and risk that the Offeror's analysis of the scope of work, and discussion the key success drivers and risks (performance, schedule and cost), will successfully result in achievement of work directive requirements.

M.6.1.2.2 Based on the Offeror's analysis of the scope of work, the extent to which and risk that the specific technical approach proposed, to include identification of necessary tasks and details on task performance plans, will successfully result in achievement of work directive requirements;

M.6.1.2.3 Based on the proposed technical approach, the extent to which and risk that the offeror has specifically identified the minimum qualifications for all labor categories required to execute the technical approach to meet task order requirements;

M.6.1.3 Technical Subfactor 3: Blast Mitigation Task Order

This subfactor will be evaluated in terms of the extent to which and probability that the Offeror's proposed approach will meet the schedule and performance requirements of the task order, through effective and detailed planning as follows:

M.6.1.3.1 The extent to which and risk that the Offeror's analysis of the scope of work, and discussion the key success drivers and risks (performance, schedule and cost), will successfully result in achievement of work directive requirements.

M.6.1.3.2 Based on the Offeror's analysis of the scope of work, the extent to which and risk that the specific technical approach proposed, to include identification of necessary tasks and details on task performance plans, will successfully result in achievement of work directive requirements.

M.6.1.3.3 Based on the proposed technical approach, the extent to which and risk that the offeror has specifically identified and substantiated the realism for all proposed labor resources required to execute the technical approach to meet work directive requirements.

M.7 EVALUATION OF VOLUME IV – COST/PRICE FACTOR (reference the proposal information submitted in response to Section L.7)

M.7.1 SARET Task Order

M.7.1.1 The Cost/Price Factor evaluation will consider the total evaluated cost/price to the Government, as calculated in Attachment 0001, to accomplish the technical approaches for the three representative Task Orders. The assessment of the total evaluated cost/price will include consideration of the reasonableness of the proposed prices of each representative Task Order. The assessment of the total evaluated cost/price will also include consideration of the cost realism of the proposed cost/price of the SARET Task Order and the Blast Mitigation Task Order. Reasonableness and realism are defined as follows:

M.7.1.1.1 Reasonableness. The assessment of the proposed total evaluated cost/price will include the consideration of reasonableness. A cost/price is considered reasonable if it does not exceed what would be incurred by a prudent person in the conduct of competitive business.

M.7.1.1.2 Realism. Realism means that the Offeror's proposed total evaluated cost/price is consistent with its approach and reflects a clear understanding of the requirements. The Government will evaluate the realism of the Offeror's proposed total evaluated cost/price by reviewing the Offeror's proposal, as supported by the proposal's cost element build-up, to assess whether the proposed total evaluated cost/price reflects the Offeror's proposed approach. Where the Offeror's proposed total evaluated cost/price lacks realism relative to its approach, a most probable cost estimate will be derived by the Government considering the unique characteristics of the Offeror and the technical proposal. The most probable cost/price will be used to calculate the total evaluated cost/price to the Government.

M.7.1.1.2.1 The results of the cost realism assessment may also be used in the assessment of proposal risk under the Technical Factor. In the event that the Offeror's Cost/Price Factor Volume is inconsistent with, and/or reflects a lack of cost realism regarding the Offeror's Technical Factor Volume, the Technical Factor evaluation results may be downgraded commensurate with the extent and impact of the realism shortfalls.

M.7.2 NIE Task Order

M.7.2.1 The Cost/Price Factor evaluation will consider the total evaluated cost/price to the Government, as calculated in Attachment 0002, to accomplish the technical approaches for the three representative Task Orders. The assessment of the total evaluated cost/price will include consideration of the reasonableness of the proposed prices of each representative Task Order. The assessment of the total evaluated cost/price will also include consideration of the cost realism of the proposed cost/price of the SARET Task Order and the Blast Mitigation Evaluation Task Order. Reasonableness and realism are defined as follows:

M.7.2.1.1 Reasonableness. The assessment of the proposed total evaluated cost/price will include the consideration of reasonableness. A cost/price is considered reasonable if it does not exceed what would be incurred by a prudent person in the conduct of competitive business.

M.7.2.1.2 Realism. Realism means that the Offeror's proposed total evaluated cost/price is consistent with its approach and reflects a clear understanding of the requirements. The Government will evaluate the realism of the Offeror's proposed total evaluated cost/price by reviewing the Offeror's proposal, as supported by the proposal's cost element build-up, to assess whether the proposed total evaluated cost/price reflects the Offeror's proposed approach. Where the Offeror's proposed total evaluated cost/price lacks realism relative to its approach, a most probable cost estimate will be derived by the Government considering the unique characteristics of the Offeror and the technical proposal. The most probable cost/price will be used to calculate the total evaluated price to the Government.

M.7.2.1.2.1 The results of the cost realism assessment may also be used in the assessment of proposal risk under the Technical Factor. In the event that the Offeror's Cost/Price Factor Volume is inconsistent with, and/or reflects a lack of cost realism regarding the Offeror's Technical Factor Volume, the Technical Factor evaluation results may be downgraded commensurate with the extent and impact of the realism shortfalls.

M.7.3 Blast Mitigation Task Order

M.7.3.1 The Cost/Price Factor evaluation will consider the total evaluated cost/price to the Government, as calculated in Attachment 0003, to accomplish the technical approaches for the three (3) Evaluation Task Orders. The assessment of the total evaluated cost/price will include consideration of the reasonableness of the proposed cost/prices of each Evaluation Task Order. The assessment of the total evaluated cost/price will also include consideration of the cost realism of the proposed cost/price of the SARET Task Order and the Blast Mitigation Evaluation Task Order. Reasonableness and realism are defined as follows:

M.7.3.1.1 Reasonableness. The assessment of the proposed total evaluated cost/price will include the consideration of reasonableness. A cost/price is considered reasonable if it does not exceed what would be incurred by a prudent person in the conduct of competitive business.

M.7.3.1.2 Realism. Realism means that the Offeror's proposed total evaluated cost/price is consistent with its approach and reflects a clear understanding of the requirements. The Government will evaluate the realism of the Offeror's proposed total evaluated cost/price by reviewing the Offeror's proposal, as supported by the proposal's cost element build-up, to assess whether the proposed total evaluated cost/price reflects the Offeror's proposed approach. Where the Offeror's proposed total evaluated cost/price lacks realism relative to its approach, a most probable cost estimate will be derived by the Government considering the unique characteristics of the Offeror and the technical proposal. The most probable cost will be used to calculate the total evaluated cost/price to the Government.

M.7.3.1.2.1 The results of the cost realism assessment may also be used in the assessment of proposal risk under the Technical Factor. In the event that the Offeror's Cost/Price Factor Volume is inconsistent with, and/or reflects a lack of cost realism regarding the Offeror's Technical Factor Volume, the Technical Factor evaluation results may be downgraded commensurate with the extent and impact of the realism shortfalls.

M.8 EVALUATION OF VOLUME V - SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION FACTOR (reference the proposal information submitted in response to Section L.8)

M.8.1 The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed extent of Small Business Participation in the performance of the contract for U.S. small businesses (SBs), small disadvantaged businesses (SDBs), woman-owned small business (WOSBs), HUBZone small business (HUBZone SBs), veteran-owned small business (VOSBs) and service disabled veteran-owned small businesses (SDVOSBs). The Offeror's extent of small business participation will be calculated using 'Dollars for portion of work to be performed by Small Business Prime' plus 'Dollars for portion of work to be performed by First Tier Small Business Subcontractors' divided by 'Total Contract Amount' of \$3.2 billion to obtain a percentage. Therefore, if the Offeror is itself a U.S. small business concern under NAICS Code 541330 to this solicitation (to include U.S. small business concerns who are proposing as part of a joint venture or teaming arrangement), the Government will consider the Offeror's own portion of the work to be performed as Small Business Participation for purposes of this evaluation.

M.8.2 The evaluation will consist of the following:

M.8.2.1 The extent to which the proposal identifies participation by U.S. small business concerns to achieve the Government's goals for SB, SDB, WOSB, HUBZone SB, VOSB and SDVOSB, expressed as percentage of Total Contract Value, shown below:

- 13% for SBs
- 2% for SDBs
- 2% for WOSBs
- 1% for HubZone SBs
- 1% for VOSBs
- 1% for SDVOSBs

M.8.2.1 An assessment of the probability that the Offeror will achieve the levels of Small Business Participation identified in the proposal. This assessment will be based upon a proposal risk assessment of the Offeror's proposed Small Business Participation Factor Submittal.

DRAFT