

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 acceptable technically, with the lowest price 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 by their strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies 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. Any Weaknesses the proposal has are correctable. The proposal has no Deficiencies. |

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

1. Ability to Meet the Authority's Requirements
2. Past Performance
3. Qualifications and Experience of the Proposed Team

B. Price Proposal Evaluation

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

03 TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criterion 1: Ability to Meet the Authority's Requirements

This criterion will be evaluated based on the Offeror's demonstrated ability to provide the services described in Attachment 1, Statement of Work. Offerors will be evaluated on their ability to develop, prepare, and support an annual Indirect and Central Services Cost Allocation Plan, including supporting allocation methodologies, documentation, annual certification activities, and coordination with applicable federal and state agencies.

Criterion 2: Past Performance

This criterion will be evaluated based on the Offeror's previous continuous experience in developing, preparing, supporting and certifying an annual Indirect and Central Services Cost Allocation Plan, for clients in similar size and complexity to the Airports Authority. Offerors will also be evaluated on their demonstrated experience developing cost allocation methodologies, allocating personnel and indirect

costs, preparing supporting documentation, and successfully presenting and obtaining approval from federal, state, or other oversight agencies.

Criterion 3: Qualifications and Experience of the Proposed Team

This Criterion will be evaluated based on the qualifications, experience, and demonstrated ability of the proposed team to perform the services described in Attachment 1, Statement of Work. Offerors must identify at least one senior lead who will be assigned to the Airports Authority and demonstrate that the proposed senior lead possesses significant experience developing, preparing, and supporting cost allocation plans for organizations of similar size and complexity to the Airports Authority.

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: Ability to Meet the Authority's Requirements

The Offeror shall demonstrate an understanding of the Airports Authority's requirements and its ability to perform the services described in Attachment 1, Statement of Work.

The Offeror shall provide the following:

1. A detailed description of the Offeror's ability to perform the work contemplated in Attachment 1, Statement of Work, including the development, preparation, and support of an annual indirect and central services cost allocation plan.
2. A discussion demonstrating the Offeror's understanding of the requirements associated with preparing and supporting cost allocation plans, including: (i) supporting allocation methodologies; (ii) data collection, worksheets; (iii) allocation bases, indirect cost pools, methods of cost distribution; and (iv) annual certification activities.
3. A discussion of the Offeror's ability to support the review, presentation, and approval of cost allocation plans with applicable federal and state agencies.

Criterion 2: Past Performance

The Offeror shall identify and present details of Offeror's previous experience performing services similar in scope and complexity to those described in Attachment 1, Statement of Work.

The Offeror shall provide the following:

1. Three client engagements performed within the past five (5) years where the Offeror developed, prepared, supported and certified an annual indirect and central services cost allocation plan for an organization of similar size and complexity. For each client engagement identified, the Offeror shall provide: (i) Client Name; (ii) Contact name, telephone number, and email address; (iii) Description of the services provided; (iv) Contract period; (v) Description of the cost allocation plan developed, prepared, supported or certified, including the allocation of personnel costs, indirect costs, central services costs, or other shared expenses; and (vi) Description of any federal, state, or other oversight agency review, approval, or acceptance associated with the engagement.

Criterion 3: Qualifications and Experience of the Proposed Team

The Offeror shall demonstrate the qualifications and experience of the proposed team and their ability to perform the services described in Attachment 1, Statement of Work.

The Offeror shall provide the following:

1. Identification of the proposed Senior Lead who will be responsible for overall contract performance and serve as the primary point of contact for the Airports Authority.
2. A discussion of the proposed Senior Lead demonstrating a minimum of five (5) years of experience in a Senior Lead role developing, preparing, supporting, and certifying cost allocation plans for organizations of similar size and complexity. Offeror must identify as a part of their discussion a minimum of three client engagements where the proposed Senior Lead successfully developed, prepared, supported, and certified cost allocation plans for organizations of similar size and complexity to the Airports Authority.
3. Identification of other proposed team members and a brief description of their roles, responsibilities, qualifications and relevant experience supporting cost allocation services.

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 single PDF file, with the following contents, in the following order, not to exceed ten (10), single sided pages:
 - Cover/Title Sheet
 - Table of Contents
 - Section 1: Demonstrated Experience and Success of the Firm
 - Section 2: Demonstrated Experience and Success of the Proposed Team
- b. Without reference to price.
- c. Using a minimum of 11-point font, with all pages numbered.

Note: Attachments, exhibits, resumes and samples of previous work are excluded from the page limit and are exempt from the font and page size restrictions.