

Section M - Evaluation Factors for Award

I. Basis for Contract Award

A. Source Selection Methodology: This acquisition will utilize the Tradeoff source selection procedures in accordance with FAR 15.101-2 and 15.3 as supplemented by the DoD Source Selection Procedures referenced in DFARS 215.300 and the AFFARS Mandatory Procedures 5315.3 to make an integrated assessment for a best value award decision. The Government intends to award one Firm Fixed Price with Cost Reimbursable CLINs contract to an 8(a) small business as a result of this solicitation. In using the best value approach, the Government seeks to award to the offeror who gives the Air Force the greatest confidence that it will best meet or exceed our requirements affordably in a way that will be advantageous to the Government. This may result in an award to a higher rated, higher priced offeror where the decision is consistent with the evaluation factors and the Source Selection Authority (SSA) reasonably determines that the technical superiority and/or overall business approach and/or superior past and present performance of the higher priced offeror outweighs the cost difference. To arrive at a best value decision, the SSA will integrate the source selection team's evaluations of the factors and subfactors described in this provision. While the Government will strive for maximum objectivity, the tradeoff process, by its nature, is subjective; therefore, professional judgment is implicit throughout the selection process. Offerors are reminded that the Government will only evaluate one proposal from each offeror. Award will be made to the responsible offeror whose proposal conforms to all required terms and conditions, includes all required representations and certifications, meets all requirements set forth in the RFP, has acceptable Small Business Participation, and also provides the best value to the Government based on the results of the evaluation as described in paragraph II below.

B. Factors, Subfactors and Relative Importance

1. Factors and Subfactors: A detailed and complete analysis of each offeror's proposal will be performed. The Government's evaluation will be based on the following factors and subfactors:

Factor I: Technical (which includes both Technical and Technical Risk Ratings)

Subfactor One: TECHNICAL APPROACH

Subfactor Two: MANAGEMENT APPROACH

Subfactor Three: PERSONNEL QUALIFICATIONS

Factor II. Past Performance

Factor III. Cost/Price

2. Relative Importance: Among the evaluation factors considered in the tradeoff decision, Technical, Past Performance and Cost/Price are listed in descending order of importance with Factor 1 (Technical) being most important, Factor 2 (Past Performance) next in importance and Factor 3 (Cost/Price) is last in importance. Within the Technical Factor, the subfactors are in equal order of importance.

In accordance with FAR 15.304(e) and DFARS 215.300, Technical, which includes the technical rating and technical risk rating, and Past Performance, when combined, are significantly more important than cost/price.

II. Proposal Evaluation: The evaluation process will be accomplished as follows (Organized by volume):

A. General

1. Discussions: The Government intends to award without discussions, but reserves the right to conduct discussions if determined necessary. Any discussions will be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.306. If the Contracting Officer determines that the number of proposals that would otherwise be in the competitive range exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted, the Contracting Officer, with the concurrence of the Source Selection Authority, 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.

B. Volume I, EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. General: Each offeror's written Volume I, Executive Summary, shall consist of the completed and signed RFP, to include any amendments issued, with a cover letter delineating any exceptions taken to the RFP terms and conditions with accompanying rationale. Offerors are cautioned that any noncompliance with the terms and conditions of the RFP may cause their proposal to be determined not eligible for award. **Offerors shall ensure that all clauses and provisions that require**

“fill in” information are appropriately completed, including the proposed prices associated with the contract line items in the Schedule of the RFP.

The executive summary shall contain a concise narrative summary of the offeror's entire proposal, and include addressing the significant risks, providing key personnel resumes, and a highlight of any key or unique features, excluding cost/price. The salient features should tie in with Section M evaluation factors/subfactors. Any summary material presented in the executive summary shall not be considered as meeting the requirements for any portions of other volumes of the proposal.

Offerors written Volume I, Executive Summary, shall clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and provide complete accompanying rationale. Each exception shall be specifically related to a PWS paragraph and/or specific part of the solicitation to which the exception is taken. Offeror's rationale in support of the exception shall fully explain its impact, if any, on the performance, schedule, cost, and specific requirements of the solicitation. This information shall be provided in the format and content of Table L-2, Solicitation Exceptions.

2. Cross Reference Matrix: The cross reference matrix will be utilized as a tool to show critical interrelationships and dependencies among the technical requirements document (Performance-Based Work Statement (PWS)), the Contract Line Item Number (CLIN), the Contract Data Requirements List (CDRL), Section L (ICNTO), and Section M (Evaluation Basis for Award). The cross reference matrix will help offerors ensure they have responded to all the evaluation criteria and proposal submittal requirements identified in the solicitation. If the matrix conflicts with any other requirement, direction, or provision of this solicitation, the other reference shall take precedence over this matrix. Section M references in the matrix are for informational purposes only, and the Government shall be obligated to evaluate proposals solely in conformance with the provisions of Section M of the solicitation.

C. Volume II, Technical Factor

1. General: Each offeror's written technical proposal shall be evaluated, based on the subfactors below, to determine if the offeror provides a sound, compliant approach that meets the requirements of the PWS and demonstrates a thorough knowledge and understanding of those requirements and their associated risks. The technical proposal addresses each of the following subfactors in sufficient detail. For each subfactor, the offeror identifies risks, if any, associated with the proposed approach and actions the offeror will take to mitigate the identified risks. If no risks/mitigations are identified in the offeror's proposal, it indicates the offeror does not consider there to be any risk associated with their proposed approach.

Subfactor One: TECHNICAL APPROACH. This subfactor is met when the offeror's proposal adequately demonstrates how the offeror will perform the technical services described in the PWS. The Government will favorably evaluate and consider as strengths the offeror's level of knowledge for implementing, maintaining and supporting projects with a similar complexity, to meet or exceed the SSMS II requirements. The Government will also favorably evaluate and consider as strengths any documented experience greater than three (3) years in the following technical disciplines:

- (a) Troubleshooting, removal, and replacement of subsurface seismic data acquisition equipment.
- (b) Troubleshooting and maintaining intra-site communications equipment
- (c) Performing preventative maintenance routines on field equipment

Subfactor Two: MANAGEMENT APPROACH. This subfactor is met when the offeror's proposal adequately demonstrates the organization's staffing plans, policies, and procedures to staff and maintain a highly skilled technical workforce to accomplish the PWS tasks as well as provide an organizational chart or figure depicting resource areas that are anticipated, or could be brought to support anticipated efforts within the scope of the PWS, to include offeror's personnel, subcontractors, and consultants. The Government will favorably evaluate and consider as strengths the offeror's level of knowledge for processes, procedures, scheduling and planning projects with a similar complexity, to meet or exceed the SSMS II requirements:

- a. A demonstrated minimum 3 years experience in management of large (\$5M + program) and technical maintenance and sustainment efforts with cost, schedule, and performance responsibilities
- b. A demonstrated minimum of 3 years experience in the management of multiple geographically remote sites that provide technical service(s)
- c. A demonstrated experience and familiarity with management of classified national security matters, and operational security (OPSEC) requirements
- d. A documented safety plan and philosophy demonstrating a commitment to the highest levels of personnel safety with an emphasis on a safety first culture

- e. Documented ability to recruit and retain personnel with highly specialized skillsets in accomplishment of mission requirements

Subfactor Three: QUALIFICATIONS. This subfactor is met when the offeror's proposal adequately demonstrates the ability to provide the staff needed to support the SSMS II requirement and include a completed Labor/Skill Mix spreadsheet. The Government will favorably evaluate and consider as strengths the offeror's ability to meet or exceed the following levels of labor experience:

- (a) The offeror must possess a SECRET facility clearance upon submission of their proposal. Secure storage is not required. (This is a pass/fail requirement)
- (b) The offeror's proposed staff shall have the appropriate US security clearance for the work to be performed on the first day of contract performance.
- (c) The offeror's proposed staff site leads will have a demonstrated minimum 5 years experience in troubleshooting, removal, and replacement of subsurface seismic data acquisition equipment. This experience may include, but is not required: performing maintenance on seismometers, seismometer cables, digitizers, authenticators, interface devices, Wellhead Termination Units, radios, lightning-arresting devices on power equipment, lightning-arresting devices on data transmission equipment, and seismometer free-period adjustments.
- (d) The offeror's proposed staff technicians will have a demonstrated minimum 3 years experience in troubleshooting, removal, and replacement of subsurface seismic data acquisition equipment. This experience may include, but is not required: performing maintenance on seismometers, seismometer cables, digitizers, authenticators, interface devices, Wellhead Termination Units, radios, lightning-arresting devices on power equipment, lightning-arresting devices on data transmission equipment, and seismometer free-period adjustments

2. Technical Rating: The technical rating evaluates the quality of the offeror's technical solution for meeting the Government's requirement. Each Technical subfactor identified above will receive one of the color ratings described in the DoD Source Selection Procedures excerpted below, which focuses on the strengths and deficiencies of the offeror's proposal. The color rating depicts how well the offeror's proposal meets the Technical subfactor requirements. Subfactor ratings shall not be rolled up into an overall color rating for the Technical factor. In arriving at a best value decision, the Government reserves the right to give positive consideration for performance in excess of threshold requirements.

Technical Ratings:

Color Rating	Adjectival Rating	Description
Blue	Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths.
Purple	Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength.
Green	Acceptable	Proposal indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements.
Yellow	Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements.
Red	Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation and, thus, contains one or more deficiencies and is unawardable.

3. Technical Risk Rating: Technical risk, which is manifested by the identification of weaknesses, assesses the degree to which an offeror's proposed approach for the requirements of the solicitation may cause disruption of schedule, increased costs, degradation of performance, the need for increased government oversight, and/or the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance. The evaluation shall address the Source Selection Team's identification of any weaknesses and/or significant weaknesses, as well as the offeror's identified risks and proposed mitigation (if applicable) and document why that is or is not manageable. Each technical subfactor will receive one of the Technical Risk ratings described in the DoD Source Selection Procedures, excerpted below.

Technical Risk Ratings:

Adjectival Rating	Description
Low	Proposal may contain weakness(es) which have little potential to cause disruption of schedule or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and normal Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.
Moderate	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which may potentially cause disruption of schedule or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome difficulties.
High	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which is likely to cause significant disruption of schedule or degradation of performance. Is unlikely to overcome any difficulties, even with special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring.
Unacceptable	Proposal contains a material failure or a combination of significant weaknesses that increases the risk of unsuccessful performance to an unacceptable level.

D. Volume III, Past Performance Factor

1. General: The past performance assessment will assess the offeror's/joint venture members' ability -- which includes, if applicable, the extent of its critical subcontractors' involvement -- to successfully accomplish the proposed effort based on the offeror's demonstrated present and past work record. A critical subcontractor is defined as an entity (subcontractor and/or teaming contractor), other than the offeror itself, that will perform 25 percent or more of the proposed effort based on the total proposed price/cost; or that will perform aspects of the effort the offeror considers critical to overall successful performance. The Government will evaluate the offeror's/joint venture members' and if applicable, the critical subcontractors' demonstrated record of contract compliance in supplying products and services that meet users' needs, including cost and schedule. The recency and relevancy of the information, the source of the information, context of the data and general trends in the contractor's performance will be considered. For purposes of this evaluation, **recency is defined as active or completed efforts performed within the past three (3) years from the issuance date of this solicitation.** The Government will take into account past performance information regarding predecessor companies (if used), affiliates, other divisions, or corporate management if such was provided for evaluation and if the offeror's past performance volume demonstrates the company, affiliate, or division will provide the offeror with resources for the instant proposed effort, such as workforce, management, facilities, or other capabilities demonstrating direct and meaningful involvement in the performance of the proposed instant effort.

2. Past Performance Assessment: In assessing present and past performance, the Government will employ several approaches, including, but not limited to:

a) **Other Sources of Information:** Pursuant to FAR 15.305(a)(2)(ii), the Past Performance Team evaluation is not limited to review of the information provided in the offeror's Present/Past Performance volume. Present/Past performance information may be obtained from the Government's Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIS) and the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS). The Government reserves the right to use performance information from other sources such as Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA), Fee Determining Officials, or commercial sources. Data from previous source selections may be used if the data is recent and relevant.

b) **Adverse Past Performance:** Offerors shall be given an opportunity to address adverse past performance information if the offeror, joint venture member and/or critical subcontractor has not had a previous opportunity to respond to the information. Recent contracts will be examined to ensure that corrective measures have been implemented. The past performance evaluation assessment will consider issues including but not limited to the number and severity of the problems, the appropriateness and/or effectiveness of any corrective actions taken (not just planned or promised), and the overall work record. Prompt corrective action in isolated instances may not outweigh overall negative trends.

3. Relevancy Definitions: The Government will perform an independent determination of relevancy of the data provided or obtained. A relevancy determination will be made for each of the recent three (3) submitted contracts. The Government is not bound by the offeror's opinion of relevancy. The following relevancy criteria apply and will be assigned to each effort identified in an offeror's Volume III of its proposal:

- **VERY RELEVANT:** Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
- **RELEVANT:** Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
- **SOMEWHAT RELEVANT:** Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities 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.

NOTE: **Programmatic/Logistical Scope and Magnitude of Effort and Complexities:** Scope and magnitude of effort and complexities in the above definitions not only includes the technical complexities identified for each effort, but also the programmatic and logistical considerations including but not limited to length of effort, dollar values, type and complexity of data deliverables, extent of international engagement, etc. When assigning a relevancy rating to a contract effort, the Government will consider the technical complexities, and the programmatic/logistical scope and magnitude of effort as separate aspects. If both of these aspects are not reflected in the submitted contract effort, the overall relevancy rating assigned to that contract will be affected. For example, if the submitted contract meets essentially the same technical complexities, but involves only some of the programmatic/logistical scope and magnitude of effort, a lesser relevancy rating will be assigned.

The Programmatic/Logistical Scope and Magnitude of Effort and Complexities to be used in the relevancy evaluation are based on expected magnitude of work and complexities for the instant acquisition, SSMS II. They are as follows:

Expected Magnitude of Work and Complexities:

- Duration of Time: Example: 5 Years
- Estimated Total Dollar Value: The Government's estimated acquisition value is not releasable; however, the offeror's efforts will be evaluated against the Government's estimate.
- Type of Data Deliverables: Example: As listed in the Contract Data Requirements List, RFP Exhibit A
- Extent of international engagement: Example: maintenance of site(s) outside the United States

4. Past Performance Evaluation Ratings: As a result of the recency, relevancy and quality assessments of the contracts evaluated, one of the ratings as described in the DoD Source Selection Procedures will be assigned to the Past Performance factor. The performance confidence assessment ratings are excerpted below.

<u>Adjectival Rating</u>	<u>Definition</u>
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: In the case of an offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available or is so sparse that no meaningful past performance rating can be reasonably assigned, the offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance (see FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv)). Therefore, the offeror shall be determined to have unknown past performance and will be assigned a performance confidence rating of "Neutral". A strong record of relevant past performance may be considered more advantageous to the Government than a "Neutral Confidence" rating.

E. Volume IV, Cost/Price Factor

The offeror's Cost/Price proposal will be evaluated for award purposes, based upon the total price proposed for basic requirements (basic award) and all options. Offerors whose total evaluated price is unreasonable (in accordance with FAR 15.404 and FAR 31.201-3), unbalanced (in accordance with FAR 15.404-1), or unaffordable may not be considered for award. Total evaluated price will be the calculated sum of all proposed prices excluding the Seismic Station Sustainment Cost CLINs (0005, 1005, 2005, 3005, 4005, 5005) and Travel Cost CLINs (0004, 1004, 2004, 3004, 4004, 5004), for separately priced line items, including options and government-established contract baseline amount for materials, other direct costs (ODCs),

training, and travel for each year of performance. The six month extension of services option will also be evaluated at the rate of the last option period.

Evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise such options.

CROSS REFERENCE MATRIX

<i>TECHNICAL RQMTS DOC</i>	<i>CLIN</i>	<i>Section L</i>	<i>Section M</i>	<i>CDRL</i>	<i>Proposal (Offeror Completes)</i>
<i>PWS para 2.1</i>	0001 0002 0003 0006	<i>II.C.2</i>	<i>II.C.1:1 II.C.1:2.a II.C.1:2.b</i>	<i>N/A</i>	
<i>PWS para 2.2.1</i>	0001 0002 0003	<i>II.C.2</i>	<i>II.C.1:1 II.C.1:3.c II.C.1:3.d</i>	<i>N/A</i>	
<i>PWS para 2.2.2</i>	0001 0002 0003	<i>II.C.2</i>	<i>II.C.1 II.C.1:3.c II.C.1:3.d</i>	<i>A001</i>	
<i>PWS para 2.2.8</i>	0001 0002 0003	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>A003</i>	
<i>PWS para 2.3.1</i>	0001 0002 0003	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>A001</i>	
<i>PWS para 2.3.2</i>	0001 0002	<i>II.C.2</i>	<i>II.C.1:3.c II.C.1:3.d</i>	<i>A001</i>	
<i>PWS para 2.3.3</i>	0002 0003	<i>II.C.2</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>A001</i>	
<i>PWS para 2.3.4</i>	0003	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>A001</i>	
<i>PWS para 2.3.7</i>	0005	<i>N/A</i>	<i>II.C.1:2.a II.C.1:2.b</i>	<i>A001 A002</i>	
<i>PWS para 2.3.8</i>	0005	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>A001 A002</i>	
<i>PWS para 2.3.9</i>	0005	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>A001 A002</i>	
<i>PWS para 2.4.1</i>	0001 0002 0003	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>A001</i>	
<i>PWS para 2.4.3</i>	0001 0002 0003	<i>N/A</i>	<i>II.C.1:1.f</i>	<i>N/A</i>	
<i>PWS para 2.5.1</i>	0001 0002 0003	<i>N/A</i>	<i>II.C.1:2.a II.C.1:2.b</i>	<i>A001 A002</i>	
<i>PWS para 5.2.2</i>	0003	<i>N/A</i>	<i>II.C.1:2.c II.C.1:3.a II.C.1:3.b</i>	<i>N/A</i>	

The cross reference matrix will be utilized as a tool to show critical interrelationships and dependencies among the technical requirements document (Performance-Based Work Statement (PWS), the Contract Data Requirements List (CDRL), Section L (ICNTO), and Section M (Evaluation Basis for Award). The cross reference matrix will help an offeror ensure it has responded to all the evaluation criteria and proposal submittal requirements identified in the solicitation. If the matrix conflicts with any other requirement, direction, or provision of this solicitation, the other reference shall take precedence over the matrix. Additionally, to the extent the matrix discloses details as to the manner by which the Government intends to evaluate the offeror's proposals for award, Section M references in the matrix are for informational purposes only, and the Government shall be obligated to evaluate proposals solely in conformance with Section M of the solicitation.

SSP Attachment 5

Plan and Procedures for Filing, Protection, Handling Maintenance, Retention, and Disposition of Source Selection Documents

Process:

Source selection materials will be secured in accordance with the following plan:

Evaluations will take place in a designated area with source selection team access only. All documentation will be secured in this area for the duration of the evaluation; or

If a designated source selection area is unavailable, the evaluation team(s) members will perform the evaluations in their work area providing there are no other government personnel or contractor personnel in the immediate area. Source selection materials will not be left unattended or unsecured at any time. Team members will secure all source selection materials in a locked overhead or file cabinet (with key access). If an overhead or file cabinet is not available, team members will return all source selection materials to the PCO who will ensure it is secured in either a locked overhead or file cabinet. All electronic source selection information will be stored in an electronic file with controlled SSEB member permissions. AFTAC/SDA will assist the Program Manager in setting up the electronic file, permissions for the team, and any other network needs of the team throughout the source selection. Any known security deviations or mishaps throughout the duration of the source selection process should be immediately reported to the PCO.

The PCO will control exchanges of source selection information between government and offerors. Exchanges with industry may include clarifications, communications, and discussions as defined in FAR 15.306, as supplemented. All such exchanges with industry will be documented in the source selection file. Exchanges with industry may be written with e-mail and/or U.S. Postal delivery, oral with telephonic or face-to-face meetings, or via the Federal Business Opportunities website. Controls to preserve the integrity of the source selection process, as described herein, shall be adhered to. Controls may include clarifications via solicitation amendments and/or approved Evaluation Notices (ENs). For government personnel communicating by e-mail, all e-mail shall be encrypted to ensure only the intended recipient can open/view the contents and the subject line shall include the words "Source Selection Information – See FAR 2.101 and 3.104."

Minimum Records Retention:

DoD Source Selection Procedures require, as a minimum, retention of the following Source Selection (SS) documents in the contract file:

- The SSP and all its revisions
- Non-disclosure and conflict of interest statements
- The draft RFP, all comments received and all government responses
- The RFP, all amendments, and the request for Final Proposal Revisions (FPR)
- Past performance information (e.g., questionnaires; interviews; CPARs)
- Offeror proposals, including all revisions, annotated with the date of receipt
- Competitive range determination and supporting documentation
- All Evaluation Notices (ENs), offeror responses, and government evaluation of responses
- Evaluation results (SSEB evaluation report)
- Any comparative analysis and recommendations provided to the SSA
- The Source Selection Decision Document (SSDD)
- Debriefing documents
- Approval documentation (e.g., determination to award without discussions, FPR approval)

Other Documents

- Working Papers – Working papers, calculations and personal notes must be clearly identified as such, and are not normally part of the official SS record, unless:
 - They include information relevant to the SS decision and the information has not been captured in the official records
- E-mails – Normally e-mails exchanged during a SS are considered records and must be retained unless:
 - Any relevant information contained is transferred to one of the official documents (part of the official record)
 - They have been reviewed by the PCO and legal counsel and determined to be irrelevant or superfluous to the SS.