

SECTION M

52.212-2 EVALUATION—Commercial Products and Commercial Services “ADDENDUM.”

1. BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD

- a. Unless all offers are rejected, the Government intends to award a single indefinite-delivery, indefinite quantity (IDIQ) contract to the responsible Offeror whose offer, conforming to the solicitation, will be most advantageous to the Government, taking into account price and other factors. The Government may select for award the Offeror whose Price is not necessarily the lowest, but whose technical Proposal is more advantageous to the Government and warrants the additional cost. Offerors must satisfy the requirements described in the Performance Work Statement (PWS) and other Request for Proposal (RFP) requirements.

Proposals shall be reviewed, evaluated, and awarded in accordance with the evaluation criteria identified in this document. Proposals that take exception to any requirement, state assumptions, or impose requirements not in or contrary to the solicitation or otherwise qualify the Proposal shall be deemed unacceptable for award and will not be considered. Proposals shall be evaluated on the factors listed below.

Factor 1: Technical Approach

Factor 2: Past Performance

Factor 3: Price

Technical Approach and Past Performance are equal, and when combined are significantly more important than Price, but Price is still a substantial factor. As the evaluation becomes more equal under Factors 1 and 2, Price will become more significant in the award decision.

2. PASS/FAIL CRITERIA

The Government will evaluate a proposal ONLY IF the proposal satisfies all of the following elements, which will be evaluated on a pass/fail basis:

- (1) (Volume II) The Government will evaluate the Offeror’s proposed letter from the Defense Counterintelligence and Security Agency (DCSA) that demonstrates the Offeror holds an active Top Secret Facility Clearance as identified on the DD 254 as part of their proposal.
- (2) (Volume II) The Government will evaluate the Offeror’s proposed commitment letters for all key personnel with the proposal submission by the proposal due date. All commitment letters shall be signed and dated by the proposed key personnel within 10 days of the proposal due date. The date of signature must accompany the signature in the signed commitment letter. The commitment letter shall affirmatively state: (1) that the key personnel granted permission to the prime contractor to use his/her resume, and (2) is willing to work for the proposing Offeror on the instant solicitation if the Offeror is selected for award. If revised proposals are required, commitment letters must be updated, signed, and dated within 10 days of the revised due date for submission.

- (3) (Volume II) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed Key Personnel to determine whether the individuals meet the minimum education, certification, and years of experience requirements identified in the Performance Work Statement (PWS).
- (4) (Volume II) The Government will evaluate whether the Offeror has a contract award reference for a Contract/task order where that contract value is at least \$100M FOR Integrated Security Support Services within the past five years.
- (5) (Volume III) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed Small Business Participation Commitment Document to confirm it meets the criteria listed below at Section 2.1.
- (6) (Volume III) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed Small Business Subcontracting Plan to confirm it meets the criteria listed below at Section 2.2.

2.1 SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION COMMITMENT DOCUMENT (SBPCD)

The Government shall evaluate the proposal to confirm the Offeror meets the criteria below:

- 2.1.1 Each firm as defined in FAR Part 19, Small Business (SB), Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB), Women-Owned Small Business (WOSB), Historically Underutilized Business Zone (HUBZone) small business, Veteran-Owned Small Business (VOSB), and Service-Disabled, Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB), are specifically identified in the proposal.
- 2.1.2 The Offeror demonstrates a substantive commitment with each firm (as defined in FAR Part 19) that the Offeror has specifically identified in the proposal, such as, letters of commitment, joint ventures, mentor/protégé agreements, or other demonstrations of commitment (i.e., binding commitments will become enforceable/contractual requirements)
- 2.1.3 Identify the type and variety of the work each firm(s) as defined in FAR Part 19 are to perform (i.e., binding commitments will become enforceable/contractual requirements)'
- 2.1.4 Identification of a minimum of 32.25% small business prime Offerors and/or small business subcontractors in terms of the value of the total acquisition (total contract value) (i.e., binding commitments will become enforceable/contractual requirements).

2.2 SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLAN

The Government shall whether the Offeror's proposal on the Small Business Subcontracting format provided at Attachment 4a addresses all fifteen elements in the attachment.

3 EVALUATION FACTORS

Factor 1 – Technical Approach. The Government will assign one overall adjectival rating to

the Offeror's proposed technical approach following its evaluation of Task Order 1, Task Order 2, and the Offeror's Program Management Plan for the IDIQ. There will be no individual ratings for each Task Order separately.

Accordingly:

Task Order 1: Evaluation of Technical Approach
Task Order 2: Evaluation of Technical Approach
Evaluation of IDIQ Program Management Plan

Factor 2 – Past Performance. The Government will assign one overall confidence assessment for a total of three contract references submitted for the IDIQ, Task Order 1, or Task Order 2.

Factor 3 – Price. The Government will conduct an evaluation of the prices received for Labor Categories (Attachment 5), Task Order 1 (Attachment 8a), Task Order 2 (Attachment 8b) and Materials Schedule of Pricing (Attachment 9). The Government will calculate the vendor's Total Evaluated Price for use in the best value tradeoff, as detailed in Factor 3 below.

1. FACTOR 1 – TECHNICAL APPROACH

(1) Task Order 1: The Government will evaluate the adequacy of the Offeror's technical approach to performing the requirements in the Task Order 1 PWS. The proposal must sufficiently demonstrate how the Offeror will comply with PWS requirements throughout the performance period. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's technical approach in its proposed Phase-In Plan, Program Management Plan, Staffing Plan, Personnel Matrix, and Key Personnel resumes to perform the requirements for Task Order 1. Data previously submitted, or presumed to be known, i.e., descriptions of previous projects performed for the Government, will not be considered as a part of the proposal unless physically incorporated in the proposal. Clarity, completeness and conciseness are essential.

Phase-In Plan: The Government will evaluate the Offerors phase-in plan to provide a smooth, uninterrupted Phase-In, which shall take place during the initial 30 calendar days upon contract award.

Program Management Plan: The Government will evaluate the Program Management Plan for soundness of approach, understanding of the requirement, completeness, effectiveness, and efficiency.

Staffing Plan: The Government will evaluate and assess the Offeror's staffing approach to meet the Government's requirements and how the Offeror plans to manage unexpected turnover due to promotions, employees leaving the company, extended illnesses, military duty, etc., and how that plan minimizes the impact on contract performance.

Personnel Matrix: The Government will evaluate the Offeror's labor mix, consisting of proposed IDIQ LCATs and hours, to determine the extent to which the proposed labor mix

can satisfy the PWS requirements.

(2) Task Order 2: The Government will evaluate the adequacy of the Offeror's technical approach to performing the requirements in the Task Order 2 PWS. The proposal must sufficiently demonstrate how the Offeror will comply with PWS requirements throughout the performance period. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's technical approach in its proposed Phase-In Plan, Program Management Plan, Staffing Plan, Personnel Matrix, and Key Personnel resumes to perform the requirements listed in the solicitation. Data previously submitted, or presumed to be known, i.e., descriptions of previous projects performed for the Government, will not be considered as a part of the proposal unless physically incorporated in the proposal. Clarity, completeness and conciseness are essential.

Phase-In Plan: The Government will evaluate the Offeror's phase-in plan to provide a smooth, uninterrupted Phase-In, which shall take place during the initial 30 calendar days upon contract award.

Program Management Plan: The Government will evaluate the Program Management Plan for soundness of approach, understanding of the requirement, completeness, effectiveness, and efficiency. The offeror shall include in their plan for Task Order #2:

- a. Describe the methods and techniques used to ensure Authority to Operate (ATO) through the Risk Management Framework process is achieved through DISA for over 25 systems on the DoD Network.
- b. Provide methods and techniques for managing over 400 critical, 4,000 high, and 2,000 medium vulnerabilities in a large electronic security system environment with over 9,000 IP enabled devices supporting 100K field security devices
- c. Provide a technical process for ensuring CCRI score of under 2.5 for over 1000 assets across over 25 systems.

Staffing Plan: The Government will evaluate and assess the Offeror's staffing approach to meet the Government's requirements and how the Offeror plans to manage unexpected turnover due to promotions, employees leaving the company, extended illnesses, military duty, etc., and how that plan minimizes the impact on contract performance.

Personnel Matrix: The Government will evaluate the Offeror's labor mix, consisting of proposed IDIQ LCATs and hours, to determine the extent to which the proposed labor mix can satisfy the PWS requirements.

(3) Program Management Plan for IDIQ: The Government will evaluate the Program Management Plan for soundness of approach, understanding of the requirement, completeness, effectiveness, and efficiency. The Offeror shall submit sufficient information for the Government to make a comprehensive evaluation of the Offeror's technical approach in meeting the performance work statement requirements listed in the solicitation for successful performance.

- a. The proposal shall describe the methods and techniques used to manage and execute 200+ installation projects ranging from small (\$1,500-\$2,500 credit card purchases), such as door replacement project to large (\$2M+ task orders) such as a full system life cycle replacement. The Offeror shall describe how they will execute these projects

(multiple task orders with competing periods of performance) being awarded during end of the fiscal year FY. In addition, the offeror shall provide the following in its technical approach:

- b. Describe personnel mix needed to support these multiple task orders while maintaining other requirements in Task Orders 1 and 2 such as preventative maintenance, repairs, and ensuring system operability. Describe your work breakdown structure for support, how you manage project schedule and dependencies, and resource allocation.
- c. Also describe your technical approach for life cycle replacement of a complete video management system, to include 500 cameras and infrastructure. Describe your work breakdown structure for support, how you manage project schedules, updates, dependencies, quality control, verification tests, resource allocation, and project closeout.
- d. Offerors are precluded from cross-referencing tabs or sections for the various Task Orders. Offerors shall submit a technical approach for each Task Order and under Volume IV. Offerors shall not cross-reference the Task Orders for technical approach and may not share pages among the Task Orders.

2. FACTOR 2 – PAST PERFORMANCE

The Government will evaluate the Past Performance of the Offerors in complying with requirements of the clauses at FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns, and 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan; and the extent of participation of such firms in terms of the value of the total acquisition.

The Government will evaluate how well the Offeror has performed on contracts that have been determined to be both recent and relevant for the overall IDIQ and Task Orders 1 and 2. The Government will evaluate how well the Offeror has performed on contracts that have been determined to be both recent and relevant to the PWS.

Past performance is a measure of the degree to which the Offeror satisfied its customers in the past as the Prime Contractor/Subcontractor. The Government may contact some, all or none of each Offeror's customers to ask, among other things, whether: (1) the Offeror is capable, efficient, and effective; (2) the Offeror's performance conformed to the terms and conditions of its contract; (3) the Offeror was reasonable and cooperative during performance; (4) the Offeror was committed to customer satisfaction; (5) the Offeror was able to hire and retain qualified personnel to the satisfaction of the customer; and (6) if they would select the same Contractor or a different Contractor, given the opportunity.

The Government may also use other information available from other sources to evaluate the Offeror's past performance, which may include, but not limited to: Past Performance Questionnaire, Federal, State and local Government agencies, Better Business Bureaus, published media, electronic databases such as the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS). The Government reserves the right to limit or expand the number of references it decides to contact and to contact references other than those provided by the Offeror.

In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom no

information on Past Performance is available, the Offeror will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance.

3. FACTOR 3 – PRICE

To be eligible for contract award, the offeror's pricing must be found to be fair and reasonable. The Government will determine whether the offeror's price is fair and reasonable based on one or more of the techniques listed at FAR 15.404-1. Where an Offeror's pricing is found other than fair and reasonable, the offer will not be eligible for award.

The Government will calculate a Total Evaluated Price for each Offeror. This figure will represent the Offeror's proposal under Factor 3 (Price) in the best value tradeoff. The Offeror's Total Evaluated Price will be the sum of the following:

- The total proposed price of Task Order 1, which is the sum of:
 - The Offeror's total proposed Task Order 1 labor pricing (CLIN x001) across the base period and the four 12-month option periods.
 - The Offeror's total proposed Task Order 1 materials pricing (CLIN x002) across the base period and the four 12-month option periods.
 - The expected price of the 52.217-8 extension period, to be calculated as one-half of the Offeror's proposed labor and materials prices for the fourth 12-month option period (i.e., one-half the price of CLINs 4001 and 4002).
- The total proposed price of Task Order 2, which is the sum of:
 - The Offeror's total proposed Task Order 2 labor pricing across the base period and the four 12-month option periods.
 - The expected price of the 52.217-8 extension period, to be calculated as one-half of the Offeror's proposed labor price for the fourth 12-month option period (i.e., one-half the price of CLINs 4001).
- For each labor category listed in the Attachment 05 Labor Categories Template, the Government will multiply the Offeror's proposed maximum labor rate for each contract period by the Government's estimated number of hours to produce the extended price of the labor category. The Government will then add together the extended pricing of all of the labor categories in order to calculate the Offeror's total extended pricing of its IDIQ labor categories.
- The total extended pricing of the Offeror's proposed material unit prices: For each item listed in the Attachment 9 Materials Schedule of Pricing, the Government will multiply the Offeror's proposed maximum unit price for each contract period by the Government's estimated quantity to produce the extended price of the item. The Government will then add together the extended pricing of all of the items in order to

calculate the Offeror's total extended pricing for Materials.

NOTE: The Government's evaluation of pricing for option periods does not obligate the Government to exercise any options.

4 RATING METHODS

A. FACTOR 1 – TECHNICAL APPROACH

Combined Technical/Risk Rating Method: The combined technical/risk rating includes consideration of risk in conjunction with the strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, uncertainties, and deficiencies in determining technical ratings. Each proposal shall be given a rating identified in Table 1 that reflects the degree to which the

proposed approach meets or does not meet the threshold performance or capability requirements through an assessment of the relative strengths, deficiencies, weaknesses and significant weaknesses, and risks to successful performance.

Table 1. Combined Technical/Risk Rating Method	
Rating	Description
Outstanding	The Proposal demonstrates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements, contains multiple strengths and/or at least one significant strength, and has a low risk of unsuccessful performance.
Good	The Proposal demonstrates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements, contains at least one strength or significant strength, and has a low to moderate risk of unsuccessful performance.
Acceptable	Proposal meets the requirements, indicates an adequate approach and understanding of them, and has a risk of unsuccessful performance no worse than moderate.
Marginal	The Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and/or the risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Unacceptable	The Proposal does not meet the requirements of the solicitation and, thus, contains one or more deficiencies and is unawardable, and/or the risk of unsuccessful performance is unacceptably high.

NOTE: If an Offeror is determined to be "Marginal" or "Unacceptable" under Factor 1 – Technical Approach, the Offeror's proposal will be considered unawardable, shall not be further evaluated, and will not be considered for award.

Definitions:

- A significant strength is an aspect of an Offeror's Proposal that has appreciable merit or will exceed the specified performance or capability requirements to the considerable advantage of the Government during contract performance.

- A strength is an aspect of an Offeror's Proposal that merits or will exceed specified performance or capability requirements to the advantage of the Government during contract performance.
- A weakness is a flaw in the Proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
- A significant weakness is a flaw in the Proposal that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
- A deficiency is 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.

B. FACTOR 2 – PAST PERFORMANCE

For the overall IDIQ, Task Orders 1 and 2, there are three aspects to the past performance evaluation: recency, relevancy, and quality (including general trends in Offeror performance and source of information).

Step 1 – Recency. The first step is to evaluate the recency of the Offeror's past performance. Recency is generally expressed as a time period during which past performance references are considered relevant and is critical to establishing the relevancy of past performance information.

Step 2 – Relevance. The second step is to determine how relevant a recent effort accomplished by the Offeror is to the effort to be acquired through the source selection. The relevancy rating evaluates the aspects of an Offeror's recent history of contract performance that would provide the most context and give the greatest ability to measure whether the Offeror will successfully satisfy the current requirement. There are four levels of relevancy as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Past Performance Relevance Rating Method	
Rating	Definition
Very Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope, magnitude, and complexity as this solicitation requires.
Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved a similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities as this solicitation requires.
Somewhat Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope, magnitude, and complexity this solicitation requires.
Not Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

If the Offeror submits recent and relevant projects performed by a subOfferor as a past performance reference, the Offeror must also explain how the subOfferor significantly contributed to the performance of the referenced project and how the Offeror expects the

subOfferor to contribute significantly to the successful performance of the solicited work.

Step 3 – Quality of Products or Services. The third aspect of the past performance evaluation is to establish the overall quality of the Offeror's past performance (see FAR 15.304(c)(2)). The past performance evaluation conducted in support of a current source selection does not establish, create, or change the Offeror's existing record and history of past performance on past contracts; rather, the past performance evaluation process gathers information from customers on how well the Offeror performed those contracts. The past performance confidence assessment rating is based on the Offeror's overall record of regency, relevancy, and quality of performance. In conducting a performance confidence assessment, each Offeror shall be assigned a rating from Table 3.

No past performance information. An Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance (see FAR 15.202 (c)(1)).

Table 3. Performance Confidence Assessment Rating Method	
Rating	Definition
Substantial Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Satisfactory Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Neutral Confidence	No recent/relevant performance record is available, or the Offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned. The Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on the factor of past performance.
Limited Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
No Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the Offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

NOTE: Offerors that receive a rating of “No Confidence” under Factor 2 shall be considered unawardable, shall not be evaluated further, and will not be considered for award.

C. FACTOR 3 – PRICE

The price factor will not receive a rating, but the evaluated Price must be found fair and reasonable to be eligible for an award, as indicated in Factor 3 – Price Proposal. The pricing evaluation will be based on the price analysis techniques found in FAR 15.404-1, *Price Analysis*, to determine whether the proposed price is fair and reasonable. If an Offeror's price is not found to be fair and reasonable, the Offeror will not be eligible for award.

(End of provision)