

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

01 EVALUATION CRITERIA

- A. Information submitted in proposals will be evaluated using only the criteria listed below. As used herein, the term “proposal” is synonymous with the term “Offer.” The criteria are listed in descending order of importance with the first having the most weight and with each of the following criteria having equal or lesser weight than the one preceding it. Each criterion consists of all elements listed in the paragraph under each criterion. Please note that the elements listed in each of these paragraphs are not considered sub-criteria and will be evaluated collectively, not individually. In other words, when evaluating how well a Technical Proposal (which is the portion of the Offer described in 05 – Technical Proposal Submission Instructions) meets a particular criterion, the Authority will consider all the elements of that criterion together as a single criterion, not as separate sub-criteria. The Authority will base its evaluation on information provided by the Offeror in its proposal.
- B. The Authority reserves the right to establish a competitive range of Offerors based upon its initial evaluation of the Technical Proposals (the technical evaluation) and at subsequent points during the evaluation process. The Authority also reserves the right to conduct oral interviews with only the Offerors in the competitive range and to include the results of the interviews in its evaluation and to consider only these firms for a contract award. The Authority further reserves the right to request Best and Final Offers (BAFO) if in the best interest of the Authority. If BAFOs are desired, the Contracting Officer will issue a Solicitation amendment containing the BAFO request. This amendment will be issued to all Offerors still within the competitive range and will state a deadline for receipt of the BAFOs. Offerors are not required to change their Technical Proposal or Price Proposal (defined below) in response to the BAFO request but must acknowledge the BAFO amendment even if they do not change their proposals.

Contract award will be made to the Offeror whose offer is deemed to be lowest price, technically acceptable (LPTA) and that the Airports Authority deems responsible in accordance with the Airports Authority Contracting Manual.

- C. Capitalized terms used in this document are defined herein or in Section V of the Solicitation.

Definitions for Technical Evaluation

Technical Proposals will be evaluated against the evaluation criteria and these attributes will be communicated to the Offerors for follow-up action as appropriate.

Definitions:

- Clarifications:** Communications with an Offeror for the sole purpose of eliminating minor irregularities, informalities, or apparent clerical mistakes in the proposal. Unlike discussions, clarifications do not give the Offeror an opportunity to revise or modify its proposal, except to the extent that correction of apparent clerical mistake results in revisions.
- Discussions:** Oral or written communications, including negotiations, between the Authority and an Offeror (other than Clarifications) that involve information essential for determining the acceptability of the proposal or to cure identified deficiencies in the proposal.
- Deficiencies:** Defects in the proposal which preclude acceptance and involve any part of the Offeror's proposal which would not satisfy the Authority's minimum requirements established in the Solicitation, including failures to meet specifications, submit information, or questionable technical or management approaches. Deficiencies disclosed during Discussions are evaluated in two categories: (1) Material - basis for rejection of the proposal because further Discussions would be meaningless; or (2)

Curable – the Offeror may correct the deficiencies by Clarifications or Discussions and the proposal may be brought into the competitive range.

02 EVALUATION

A. Technical Proposal Evaluation Ratings

An adjectival rating will be given depicting how well the Offeror's Technical Proposal meets or exceeds the stated evaluation criteria, as follows:

Unacceptable The proposal fails to meet the evaluation standard and the Deficiency is uncorrectable. The proposal would have to undergo a major revision to become Acceptable. The proposal has a demonstrated lack of understanding of the Authority's requirements or omissions of major areas.

Marginal The proposal lacks essential information to support a rating of Unacceptable or Acceptable. Deficiencies found are not Material and are Curable with Clarification or Discussion. These communications are not intended as a re-write of the proposal. Marginal is not intended as a final rating but used as a placeholder.

Acceptable The proposal meets the evaluation standard. The proposal has no Deficiencies.

Technical Proposals will be evaluated based on the following Technical Evaluation Criteria:

1. Technical Capabilities and Experience

B. Price Proposal Evaluation

The Airports Authority will evaluate price proposals for reasonableness, completeness, and realism as appropriate.

03 TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criterion 1: Technical Capabilities and Experience

The Authority will evaluate the Offeror's Technical Proposal to ensure it sufficiently demonstrates the required Technical Capabilities and Experience to successfully perform the requirements outlined in the SOW.

04 TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

To facilitate evaluation of the technical evaluation criteria identified in 03 above, the Offeror shall submit the following information as part of its Technical Proposal:

Criterion 1: Technical Capabilities and Experience

1. Demonstration that the Offeror is, at a minimum, a Celona Gold-tier Partner or higher.
2. Demonstration that the Offeror has obtained the Celona Specialization Badges for both 1) Managed Services and 2) Security.
3. Demonstrated experience successfully deploying the Celona p5G solution similar in scope to the Authority's Statement of Work (SOW). To be considered similar in scope, Offerors must demonstrate experience that at least collectively meets the following:
 - a. Installation of the Celona solution with multiple Access Points for a client.
 - b. On premise installation of the Celona Edge appliance.
 - c. Integration of the Celona solution into a client's existing MPLS/VPNv4 infrastructure.

- d. Integration of the Celona solution with a client's existing Network Access Control platform.
- e. Utilization of WPA3-Enterprise encryption for protection of data in transit.
- f. Providing post Go-Live managed services support.

NOTE: for any experience examples referenced in your responses above, Offerors must include with their proposal client point of contact information. The Authority reserves the right to contact the client POC to verify the accuracy of these examples. The Authority will also use these reference POCs as a part of its responsibility determination prior to award.

05 TECHNICAL PROPOSAL SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

The Technical Proposal must demonstrate the Offeror's ability to meet all requirements in this Solicitation.

Submit complete Technical Proposal:

- a. As a single PDF file, with the following contents, in the following order, not to exceed 20 single-sided pages:
 - Cover/Title Sheet
 - Table of Contents
 - Section 1: Technical Capabilities and Experience
- a. Without reference to price.
- b. Using a minimum of 11-point font, with all pages numbered.