

Addendum to FAR 52.212-2 – Evaluation Criteria

1.0 GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1 Basis of Contract Award. The Government will award one contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible Offeror whose proposal conforming to the solicitation is determined to be the lowest price technically acceptable (LPTA) proposal with acceptable past performance. The Government may award without discussions, reserving the right to hold discussions if deemed necessary by the CO.

The Evaluation Factors are:

- (A) Factor 1 – Price
- (B) Factor 2 – Technical
 - Subfactor 1 – Past (Technical) Experience
 - Subfactor 2 – Management Approach
 - Subfactor 3 – Quality Control Plan
- (C) Factor 3 – Past Performance

Notice to Offerors: Funds are not presently available for this effort. No award will be made under this solicitation until funds are available. The Government reserves the right to cancel this solicitation, either before or after the closing date. In the event the Government cancels this solicitation, the Government has no obligation to reimburse an Offeror for any costs.

1.2 Factor 1 – Price. The Government will determine proposed prices by multiplying the quantities identified in the SF 1449 Continuation Sheet by the proposed unit price for each Contract Line Item Number (CLIN) to confirm the extended amount and the total amount. The price evaluation will document the reasonableness and completeness of the total evaluated price IAW FAR 15.305(a)(1) and other methods as described in FAR 15.404-1 as necessary.

The Government will evaluate proposals for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. The Government may determine that a proposal is unacceptable, if the option prices are significantly unbalanced. Evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

1.2.1 Arithmetic Discrepancies. For the purpose of initial evaluation of proposals, the following will be utilized in resolving arithmetic discrepancies found in pricing as submitted by the Offeror.

- (A) Obviously misplaced decimal points will be corrected;
- (B) Discrepancy between unit price and extended price, the unit price will govern;
- (C) Apparent errors in extension of unit prices will be corrected;
- (D) Apparent errors in extended prices per CLIN will be corrected.

1.2.2 For the purpose of the proposal evaluation, the Government will proceed on the assumption that the Offeror intends its proposal to be evaluated on the basis of the unit price. The totals arrived by resolution of arithmetic discrepancies listed above will be so reflected on the abstract of proposals. The correcting procedures shall not be used to resolve any ambiguity concerning which proposal is low.

1.2.3 The Government Evaluation Team will present a Total Evaluated Price (TEP) to the Source Selection Authority (SSA) for award decision purposes. The TEP will be derived from an Offeror's proposal by multiplying the quantities or months identified in the solicitation by the proposed unit price for each CLIN as follows:

Period	CLINS (incl. TEP)	Unit Price		Quantity		Extended Total
Base	0002	Provided by Offeror	X	As stated in RFP	=	
	0003	Provided by Offeror	X	As stated in RFP	=	
Option 1	1002	Provided by Offeror	X	As stated in RFP	=	
	1003	Provided by Offeror	X	As stated in RFP	=	
Option 2	2002	Provided by Offeror	X	As stated in RFP	=	
	2003	Provided by Offeror	X	As stated in RFP	=	
Option 3	3002	Provided by Offeror	X	As stated in RFP	=	
	3003	Provided by Offeror	X	As stated in RFP	=	
Option 4	4002	Provided by Offeror	X	As stated in RFP	=	
	4003	Provided by Offeror	X	As stated in RFP	=	
*FAR 52.217-8	4002	Provided by Offeror	X	6 (months)	=	
*FAR 52.217-8	4003	Provided by Offeror	X	3,200,000 (kg)	=	
	<u>Total Evaluated Price</u>					<i>Sum of all above</i>
	*For evaluation purposes only.					

Failure by the Offeror to propose all applicable CLINs will render the proposal as non-responsive.

1.2.4 Price Reasonableness and Completeness. The information submitted in the Offeror's price proposal, as required by the Addendum to FAR 52.212-1 – Instruction to Offerors – Commercial Items, will be evaluated to determine, if proposed prices are fair and reasonable IAW FAR 15.404. A contract will not be awarded to an Offeror whose price is not determined to be fair and reasonable. The Government may use any of the price analysis techniques IAW FAR 15.404-1(b) to determine price reasonableness. In addition, proposed unit prices may be evaluated for unbalanced pricing IAW FAR 15.404-1(g), if the proposal analysis techniques listed above are insufficient to make a determination of price reasonableness or, if the CO determines that adequate price competition no longer exists, the CO may request submission of data other than certified cost or pricing data, as appropriate, and/or may use other proposal analysis techniques as described in FAR 15.404, to the extent necessary, in order to make a determination of price reasonableness.

1.2.5 The six-month extension of services clause found at FAR 52.217-8 will only be utilized, if necessary. Inclusion of the aforementioned clause in the TEP will be used for evaluation purposes only. The six-month extension of services is not to be considered part of option four. Evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise such options.

1.3 Factor 2 – Technical. The Government will use the technical criteria below to evaluate proposals. The ratings applied to the Technical Proposal will be 'Acceptable' or 'Unacceptable'. Offerors must have an Acceptable rating on Subfactor 1 - Past (Technical) Experience, Subfactor 2 - Management Approach, and Subfactor 3 - Quality Control Plan to receive an overall 'Acceptable' rating for Factor 2.

Rating	Definition
Acceptable	Proposal clearly meets the minimum requirements of the solicitation.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not clearly meets the minimum requirements of the solicitation.

1.3.1 Subfactor 1 – Past (Technical) Experience. The Government will assess the Offeror's Past (Technical) Experience. In order to be considered technically acceptable, the Offeror shall demonstrate evidence of past (technical) experience of a minimum of twelve (12) consecutive months providing similar services of a similar magnitude within the last three (3) years from the date of issuance of this solicitation. Any proposal not demonstrating evidence of past (technical) experience as set forth in this paragraph will be technically unacceptable.

1.3.2 Subfactor 2 – Management Approach. The Government will assess the Offeror's proposed Management Approach. In order to be considered technically acceptable, the Offeror's Management Approach shall:

- A. Provide the location of the secure facility where performance will be conducted, located in Germany at the Frankfurt am Main International Airport (FRA). The Offeror shall provide a delivery point on FRA for USPS-contracted airlines to offload/ upload mail for the contractor to receive/dispatch mail to the GAMT to prevent disruption of mail movement due to German customs concerns, ensuring facility security, and the responsibilities associated for relocation of the GAMT IAW PWS paragraph 14.
- B. Address how the Offeror plans to satisfy the processing of Prograde and Retrograde Mail IAW PWS paragraph 5.

- C. Clearly identify lines of communication and explain how the Offeror plans to interface with Government Mail Control Activities and the onsite COR Staff on STMR issues, and meeting mail processing timelines IAW PWS paragraphs 4 and 5.

1.3.3 Subfactor 3 – Quality Control Plan. The Government will assess the Offeror's proposed Quality Control Plan. In order to be considered technically acceptable, the QCP shall:

- A. Explain how the Offeror will ensure a direct line of communication with the onsite COR Staff regarding the GAMT processes of mail handling and processing, and with the Mail Control Activity Staff for mail movement concerns to and from the Air Carriers, and Airline Ground Handlers IAW PWS paragraphs 4 & 5.
- B. Provide an Organizational structure to show accountability of the work to be performed, to include any applicable subcontractor(s) task to be performed.
- C. Provide a comprehensive approach to identification, and proposed mitigations or controls to prevent reoccurrences discrepancies.
- D. Provide a process to ensure the designated Critical Entry/Exit Timelines, and STMR Dispatch Schedule are met. Government QASP Inspection by the COR will validate this process against the Offeror's Quality Control Plan.
- E. Provide a process to ensure the Security, Safety, Integrity, and Accountability of the mail at all times within the Mail Handling Facility. Government QASP Inspection by the COR will validate this process against the Offeror's Quality Control Plan.

1.4 Factor 3 – Past Performance.

1.4.1 Evaluation Process. The Government will evaluate each offeror's demonstrated recent and relevant record of performance. In conducting the Past Performance evaluation, the Government reserves the right to use both the information provided in the offeror's Past Performance proposal Volume and information obtained from other sources available to the Government. The offeror's past performance efforts will be evaluated for: Recency, Relevancy and Performance Quality. The Government will only evaluate Performance Quality on past and present contracts that are determined to be both recent and relevant. An Offeror must receive an Acceptable Past Performance rating in order to be eligible for an award. The Government will evaluate the quality of the offeror's performance deemed both recent and relevant to the requirements of this RFP. The Government will use information submitted by the Offeror and other sources such as other Federal Government offices and commercial sources, to assess past performance. If services were performed as a subcontractor, teaming partner, key personnel, and joint venture state the overall contract value and associated subcontract value. In addition, the Offeror shall provide past performance information on any subcontractor, teaming partners, or joint venture partner who is anticipated to perform 25 percent or greater of the effort based on the total estimated cost, or who will perform efforts that are critical to the overall successful performance.

1.4.2 Recency Assessment. An assessment of the past performance information will be made to determine if it is recent. To be recent, past performance information on previous and current contracts for mail handling and distribution must demonstrate a minimum of twelve (12) consecutive months of service in the last five (5) years from the date of issuance of this solicitation. Past performance information that fails this condition will not be evaluated.

Past Performance Recency Rating	
Rating	Definition
Recent	Past performance information on previous and current contracts for mail handling and distribution demonstrates a minimum of twelve (12) consecutive months of service in the last five (5) years from the date of issuance of this solicitation.
Not Recent	Past performance information on previous and current contracts for mail handling and distribution did not demonstrate a minimum of twelve (12) consecutive months of service in the last five (5) years from the date of issuance of this solicitation.

1.4.3 Relevancy Assessment. The Government will conduct an evaluation of all recent past performance information obtained to determine the relevancy of the services performed under those contracts. For each recent past performance citation reviewed, the relevance of the work performed will generally be assessed “as to the relevancy of the effort” as defined in the table below. A relevancy determination of the Offeror’s past performance will be made based upon the aforementioned considerations, including joint venture partner(s), major and critical subcontractor(s), and key personnel. In determining the relevancy of effort performed under individual past performance contracts, the Government will only consider the specific effort or portion consistent with that proposed by the prime, subcontractor or teaming partner. The Past and Present Performance Questionnaire and information obtained from other sources will be used to establish the relevancy of past performance. The Government will use the following relevancy definitions:

Past Performance Relevancy Ratings	
Rating	Definition
Relevant	Past performance information involved both a similar scope as that identified in the PWS, and magnitude greater than or equal to 3,000,000 kilograms of mail processed annually.
Not Relevant	Past performance information did not provide both a similar scope as that identified in the PWS, and magnitude of greater than or equal to 3,000,000 kilograms of mail processed annually.

1.4.4 Performance Quality Assessment. The Government will determine how well the Offeror performed on past and present contracts that are both recent and relevant, and, based on an integrated assessment, assign a rating of “Acceptable” or “Unacceptable” as described in the table below.

Past Performance Evaluation Ratings	
Rating	Description
Acceptable	Based on the quality of the Offeror’s performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort, or the Offeror’s performance record is unknown. (See note below.)
Unacceptable	Based on the quality of the Offeror’s performance record, the Government has no reasonable 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 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. In the context of acceptability or unacceptability, “Unknown” shall be considered “Acceptable.”

The performance quality assessment consists of an evaluation of recent and relevant past performance information available, regardless of its source. The performance quality assessment may reveal positive or adverse past performance information. Adverse past performance is defined as past performance information that supports a less than satisfactory rating on any evaluation element or any unfavorable comment received from sources without a formal rating system. Multiple ratings of less than “Satisfactory” in Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) and/or Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs) may result in a performance quality assessment rating of “Unacceptable.” Offerors shall be given an opportunity to respond to adverse past performance information for which they have not previously had an opportunity to address in accordance with FAR 15.306.

1.5 Award Process. The Government intends to award a contract to the lowest priced, technically acceptable Offeror with an acceptable past performance rating. The Government reserves the right to hold discussions after establishing a competitive range and more than one competitive range may be established. The evaluation process is as follows:

1.5.1 The evaluation process will begin with a ranking of offerors based on the Total Evaluated Price (TEP) from the lowest to highest price of all proposals.

1.5.2 A technical and past performance evaluation will be performed beginning with the lowest priced offerors. Evaluations will stop when two technically acceptable proposals receive an acceptable past performance rating for price comparison purposes. Only those offerors determined to be technically acceptable with an acceptable past performance rating, either initially or as a result of discussions, will be considered for award.

1.5.3 A fair and reasonable determination will be made for the lowest priced, technically acceptable proposal with acceptable past performance.

2.0 AWARD

A written notice of award or acceptance of a proposal, mailed or otherwise furnished to the successful Offeror within the time for acceptance specified in the proposal, shall result in a binding contract without further action by either party. Before the proposal’s specified expiration time, the Government may accept an offer (or part of an offer), whether or not there are negotiations after its receipt, unless a written notice of withdrawal is received before award.