

SECTION M EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

1.0. Source Selection (SS)

1.1. Basis for Contract Award

(a) This acquisition will utilize Tradeoff Source Selection procedures, with technical proposals, to make an integrated assessment for a best value award decision. Tradeoffs will be made only between Past Performance and Price among those offerors who have been determined technically acceptable. The Government seeks to award approximately 13 Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (ID/IQ) contracts in two (2) competition pools:

(1) Small Business Set-Aside Competition Pool: Approximately ten (10) ID/IQ contracts to Small Businesses whose offers represent the best value to the Government for task orders that will be set-aside under the special provision titled “Process and Criteria for Issuing Task Orders” (Section H-1 of the contract to result from this solicitation).

(2) Full and Open Competition Pool: Approximately ten (10) ID/IQ contracts to either Small or Large Businesses whose offers represent the best value to the Government for orders that will not be set aside.

(b) Offerors competing for inclusion in the Small Business Set-Aside competition pool may elect to compete also for inclusion in the Full and Open competition pool. Small Businesses will be evaluated in the appropriate competition pool(s) based on the offeror’s selection located on the front page of the RFP.

(c) Contract award will only be made to Offerors who are deemed responsible in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation FAR Part 9, as supplemented, whose proposals conform to the solicitation’s requirements (to include all stated terms, conditions, representations, and certifications and all other information required by Section L– Instructions to Offerors of this solicitation) and are judged, based on the evaluation factors, to represent the best value 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 the technically acceptable proposal, and superior past performance of the higher priced offeror outweighs the price difference with lower priced offerors.

1.1.1. The SSA will base the source selection decision on an integrated assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria in the solicitation (described below). While the Government Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) and the SSA will strive for maximum objectivity, the Source Selection process, by its nature, is subjective and, therefore, professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire process.

1.1.2. This source selection is conducted in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 15.3, Contracting by Negotiation, as supplemented by the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS), the Air Force Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (AFFARS), DoD Source Selection Procedures dated 20 Aug 2022, and Air Force Mandatory Procedures 5315.3. These regulations are available electronically at <https://www.acquisition.gov/browse/index/far>.

1.2. Number of Contracts to be Awarded:

The Government intends to award approximately 20 ID/IQ contracts in two (2) competition pools, as described above, to Offerors who give the Air Force the greatest confidence they will best meet the requirements; however, the Government reserves the right to award more or fewer contracts if the SSA determines it is in the Government's best interests. The Government reserves the right not to award any contracts at all, depending on the quality of the proposals and prices submitted and the availability of funds.

1.3. Correction Potential of Proposals:

The Government will consider throughout the evaluation, the correction potential of any technical proposal aspect evaluated as a deficiency. The correction potential shall be based on the amount and/or complexity of the corrections needed to meet Government requirements.

1.4. Competitive Range Determination

If discussions are conducted, the Government shall establish a competitive range comprised of the most highly rated proposals, in accordance with FAR 15.306(c). During the evaluation process multiple competitive range determinations may be made that eliminate Offerors from the competition IAW FAR 15.505. The competitive range determination can be based on Factor 1 Technical, Factor 2 Past Performance, Factor 3 Price, or a combination of the three factors. A competitive range determination may eliminate Offerors based on their initial proposal evaluation results, after discussions (if necessary), prior to issuance of the Final Proposal Revision (FPR) request, or for efficiency. If Offerors are excluded from the competitive range they may request a debriefing IAW FAR 15.505 or 15.506.

1.6. Discussions

The Government intends to award without discussions, but reserves the right to conduct discussions if necessary. Therefore, it is imperative that the initial offer contain the Offeror's best terms from a price and technical standpoint. However, if during the evaluation period it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government to hold discussions, the Government will determine if responses to Evaluation Notices (ENs) received during discussions will be considered formal proposal revisions, or if offerors will be required to include EN responses in the Final Proposal Revision (FPR). The Request for FPR letter will include specific instructions on how offerors will submit FPRs. The Government also reserves the right to request Draft FPRs during discussions. Offeror responses to ENs for Volume II (Past Performance) shall not be included in the FPR. Offeror responses to Past Performance ENs during discussions will automatically be considered in the final evaluation

1.7. Reviews and Visits

Site visits are not planned. However, The SSEB may conduct site visits during the evaluation phase to gather information for judging the Offeror's potential for correcting deficiencies, quality of development of manufacturing practices/processes, or other areas useful in evaluating the offer. If conducted, the results will be assessed under the applicable factors/subfactors and will be used to validate and confirm the Offeror's written proposal.

1.8 Solicitation Requirements (Terms and Conditions)

Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and Performance Work Statement (PWS) requirements, other than those identified as factors and subfactors. Requirements included in the factors and subfactors will be evaluated in accordance with the process described for each factor and subfactor. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the solicitation may result in the Offeror being ineligible for award. Offerors must clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and must provide complete supporting rationale. The Government reserves the right to determine any such exceptions unacceptable, and the proposal, therefore, ineligible for award.

2.0. Evaluation Factors

2.1. Evaluation Factors and Subfactors

2.1.1. Evaluation factors used to evaluate each proposal:

Award will be made to the offeror proposing the combination of factors deemed most advantageous to the Government based upon an integrated assessment of the evaluation factors described below.

Factor 1: Technical

Subfactor 1: Program Management

Subfactor 2: Resource Management

Subfactor 3: Quality Management

Subfactor 4: Small Business Subcontracting

Factor 2: Past Performance

Factor 3: Price

2.1.2. Relative Importance of Factors and Subfactors:

For this solicitation, technical acceptability is a prerequisite to the best value analysis and potential trade-off between Past Performance and Price. The Order of Importance is used to explain how the other factors will be traded off on technically acceptable proposals.

For all technically acceptable proposals, Factor 2 (Past Performance), will be evaluated on a basis approximately equal to Factor 3 (Price).

2.1.3. Evaluation Methodology:

The Government will evaluate all factors concurrently for all proposals. Initial ratings for all factors will be established for each offeror in determining the competitive range. The Government technical evaluation team will evaluate the technical proposals on a

pass/fail basis, assigning ratings of Acceptable, or Unacceptable. The proposals shall be evaluated against the subfactors listed in paragraph 2.2 below. Past Performance will be evaluated as described in paragraph 2.3 below. Price will be evaluated as described in paragraph 2.4 below. For the award decision, the SSA will assess the Past Performance ratings, along with supporting information, and Price for all technically acceptable offers to make an integrated assessment of which offeror provides the overall best value.

2.2. Factor 1 – Technical

The Technical evaluation will be based on each's offeror's approach for meeting the technical requirements listed below. The evaluation focuses on the technical approach as described in each offeror's technical volume. The technical evaluation does not consider price. Each subfactor within the technical factor will receive one of the ratings described below based on the criteria listed below. Individual subfactor ratings will be used to determine the overall technical acceptability of each offeror. To be determined technically acceptable at the factor level, the Offeror must be rated acceptable in each subfactor. A single deficiency within a subfactor will result in an unacceptable rating for that subfactor. A final unacceptable subfactor assessment will determine an overall technical unacceptable rating, and therefore, unawardable. Only those proposals determined to be technically acceptable, either initially, or as a result of discussions, will be considered for award. The technical evaluation will also consider risk in determining overall acceptability. Risk pertains to the potential for unsuccessful contract performance. Risk will not receive a separate rating, rather, it will be inherent within the subfactor ratings, and the overall Technical rating.

Rating	Description
Acceptable	Proposal meets the requirements of the solicitation.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet the requirements of the solicitation.

2.2.1. Subfactor 1: Program Management

The Government will assess the Offeror's proposed Program Management approach. Offerors are required to present the information as stated in Section L, Instruction to Offerors (ITO). The subfactor minimum is met when the Offeror's proposal indicates an adequate understanding of the requirements, and provides convincing rationale how their approach will meet the requirements for all of the following essential elements with little potential for disruption of schedule, or degradation of performance:

- a. The proposal must effectively describe how the Offeror will manage and accomplish transition of Task Order requirements to/from another service provider and stand-up of a new CFT site, which ensures the contractor will be fully operational by Task Order Period of Performance start date IAW PWS 4.3.
- b. The proposal must effectively describe the Offeror's management capability in weapon systems maintenance/modification/repair, which ensures the requirements of PWS para 2.0, 4.1 are met. In addition, the approach must

ensure the successful establishment of a contractor management structure by contract award, and the ability to successfully perform tasks, submit deliverables and resolve issues and discrepancies to meet requirements IAW PWS 4.1.

- c. The proposal must ensure the Offeror can successfully transition and manage multiple requirements or teams at multiple locations concurrently. Also, the proposal must ensure , the Offeror can meet the requirements of PWS 2.0, 4.1 and 4.3 within the following FTE levels for the respective competition pools.
 - i. (Small Business Set-Aside Competition Pool) Two or more requirements or teams concurrently totaling 100 FTEs, with at least one example from a CONUS location
 - ii. (Full & Open Competition Pool) Two or more requirements or teams concurrently totaling 1200 FTEs, with at least one example from a CONUS location and at least one example from an OCONUS location
- d. The proposal must ensure the Offeror can successfully track, monitor, manage, control and audit task order cost down to the Contract Line Item Number (CLIN) & sub-CLIN level in accordance with the requirements of PWS 4.1.1, 4.1.2
- e. The proposal must present a sound organizational and management structure which ensures the PWS requirements will be met IAW PWS 2.0, 4.1, 4.2, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.2.3.
- f. The proposal must describe a sound procedural approach to aviation maintenance which ensures a safe and effective understanding of Flight and Ground Aircraft Operations. Simply restating the DCMAI 8210.1 series in the sample "Core Procedures" provided does not demonstrate the offeror can produce a set of safe and effective Flight and Ground Procedures and would be rated unacceptable. The approach must show how their aviation procedures meet the requirements of Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) 8210.1 series IAW PWS 4.7.1, 4.7.1.1

2.2.2. Subfactor 2: Resource Management

The Government will assess the Offeror's proposed Resource Management approach. Offerors are required to present the information as stated in Section L, Instruction to Offerors (ITO). The subfactor minimum is met when the Offeror's proposal indicates an adequate understanding of the requirements, and provides convincing rationale how their approach will meet the requirements for all of the following essential elements with little potential for disruption of schedule or degradation of performance:

- a. A sound approach for obtaining and retaining qualified personnel which ensures the requirements of PWS paragraphs 4.2, Attachment A are met.

- b. A sound approach which meets rapid response requirements at both Continental United States (CONUS) and Outside the Continental United States (OCONUS) locations in accordance with PWS paragraph 4.2. The approach must ensure the Offeror can successfully respond to task order solicitations within 72 hours, when required, and must ensure timely availability of appropriate personnel to meet accelerated delivery schedules or surge requirements at both CONUS and OCONUS locations.
- c. A security clearance process which ensures all personnel have the required mix of skills and clearance levels necessary to accomplish the CFT mission. The proposed process must meet the requirements of PWS paragraph 5.2.

2.2.3. Subfactor 3: Quality Management

The Government will assess the Offeror's proposed Quality Management approach. Offerors are required to present the information as stated in Section L, Instruction to Offerors (ITO). The subfactor minimum is met when the Offeror's proposal indicates an adequate understanding of the requirements, and provides convincing rationale how their approach will meet the requirements for all of the following essential elements with little potential for disruption of schedule, or degradation of performance:

- a. A verifiable Quality Management System (QMS) that is Aerospace Standard (AS) 9100D compliant. This QMS must effectively describe how the Offeror's quality management plan is compliant with AS9100D and show verifiable objective evidence to demonstrate compliance. The Offeror's AS9100 compliance must be supported by verifiable objective evidence IAW PWS 4.6, 4.6.1, 4.6.2, 4.6.3.
- b. Acceptable Standard Operating Procedures/Local Operating Instructions (SOPs/LOIs) as required IAW PWS 4.6.3.1, 4.6.3.1.1, 4.6.3.1.2. Offerors must have verifiable SOPs, which are compliant with AS9100, and include acceptable quality procedures for the following AS9100D clauses.
 - i. QMS processes as defined in AS9100D Clause 4 (quality manual, control of documents/records);
 - ii. Management responsibility as defined in AS9100D Clause 5 (management commitment, customer focus, quality policy, quality planning);
 - iii. Resource management as defined in AS9100d Clause 6 (provisions for resources, human resources, infrastructure, work environment);
 - iv. Product realization as defined in AS9100D Clause 7 (planning, customer- related processes, design and development [if applicable], purchasing, production and service provision, control of monitoring and measuring equipment, configuration management);

- v. Measurement, analysis and improvement as defined in AS9100 Clause 8 (monitoring and measurement, control of nonconforming product, analysis of data, improvement).
- c. An effective quality management approach that describes how the QMS clauses above will be implemented at the site level. The quality management approach must be compliant with AS9100D. SOPs must describe when the development and submission of LOIs would be required and what circumstances would dictate the generation of site specific LOIs IAW PWS 4.6.2, 4.6.3.2, 4.6.3.2, 4.6.3.2.1

2.2.4. Subfactor 4: Small Business Subcontracting

The Government will assess the Offeror's proposed Small Business Subcontracting approach. Offerors are required to present the information as stated in Section L, Instruction to Offerors (ITO). The subfactor minimum is met when the Offeror's proposal indicates an adequate understanding of the requirements, and provides convincing rationale how their approach will meet the requirements for all of the following essential elements with little potential for disruption of schedule or degradation of performance:

- a. A Small Business Subcontracting Plan that adequately responds to each of the requirement elements of FAR clause 52.219-9(d) paragraphs (1) through (11) and DFARS 252.219-7003 (or DFARS 252.219-7004 if the offeror has a comprehensive subcontracting plan) and that is reflective of and consistent with the commitments offered in the Small Business Participation Plan. Proposed percentages of total subcontracted dollars to be performed by small business must meet requirements for the following small business socioeconomic categories: Small Disadvantaged, Women-Owned, HUBZone, and Service Disabled Veteran-Owned. (PWS 4.8) (Applicable to large businesses only).
- b. A Small Business Participation Plan that adequately responds to the items in Section L, paragraph 4.8, 6.2.2. (Applicable to both large and small businesses).

2.3. Factor 2 – Past Performance:

The Past Performance evaluation assesses the degree of confidence the Government has in an offeror's ability to supply products and services that meet users' needs, including cost and schedule, based on a demonstrated record of performance.

2.3.1. Ratings:

The Past Performance factor will receive one of the following performance confidence assessment ratings IAW the Department of Defense (DoD) Source Selection Procedures:

TABLE 5- PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENTS	
Rating	Description
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: With regards to the best value award decision, all offerors rated as "Substantial Confidence" will be considered equal for the Past Performance Factor.

2.3.2. Evaluation Process:

The Past Performance evaluation considers the Offeror's demonstrated record of performance in providing products and services that meet users' needs. Performance confidence is assessed at the overall Past Performance factor level after evaluating aspects of the Offeror's recent past performance, focusing on performance that is relevant to the Technical subfactors, price assessment, performance quality and complexity. More relevant performance may have a greater impact on the Performance Confidence Assessment than less relevant effort. More recent performance may have a greater impact on the Performance Confidence Assessment than less recent performance. The Government may consider past performance in the aggregate in addition to on an individual contract basis. 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, such as, but not limited to, the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) or similar systems, Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) and commercial sources. The Government reserves the right to use all information available to fully assess the Offeror's past performance.

2.3.2.1. Recency Assessment:

An assessment of the past performance information will be made to determine if it is recent. To be recent, the effort must have been performed during the past three (3) years from the date of issuance of this solicitation. If any part of the performance falls within the above timeframe, the contract in its entirety may be evaluated for past performance. Past performance information that fails this condition will not be evaluated.

2.3.2.2. Relevancy Assessment:

The Government will conduct an in-depth evaluation of all recent performance information obtained to determine how closely the products provided/services performed under those contracts relate to the Technical subfactors and Price assessment. Consideration will be given to things such as similar service, similar complexity of the effort, breadth and depth of skills, similar contract scope and type, contract magnitude and schedule. A relevancy determination of the Offeror's (including joint venture partner(s) and major and critical subcontractor(s), as defined in paragraph 4.3.1 of Section L) past performance will be made based upon the aforementioned considerations. In determining relevancy for individual contracts, consideration will be given to the effort, or portion of the effort, being proposed by the Offeror, teaming partner, or subcontractor whose contract is being reviewed and evaluated. The Government will consider the portion of the effort accomplished on previous/current contracts compared to the portion to be performed on the proposed effort. For example: Past Performance for a subcontractor for Program Management will only be considered if that same subcontractor is to perform Program Management on the proposed effort.

The past performance information submitted by offerors along with information obtained from other sources will be used to establish the degree of relevancy of past performance. The Government will use the following degrees of relevancy described in the DoD Source Selection Procedures, when assessing recent, relevant contracts:

Degree	Description
VERY RELEVANT (VR)	Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
RELEVANT (R)	Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
SOMEWHAT RELEVANT (SR)	Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
NOT RELEVANT (NR)	Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

Scope, magnitude, complexity, and price (contract type) will be assessed based on the prime or subcontractor/teaming partners proposed role or effort as it relates to the past performance effort. The Government may or may not utilize all or some of the following to determine the elements examined within scope, magnitude, complexity, and price:

Scope: Relevancy in regard to scope may be assessed based on, but not limited to, the similarities between a given Past Performance effort and the CFT maintenance requirements.

Magnitude: Relevancy in regard to magnitude may be assessed based on, but not limited to, the similarities between a given past performance effort and the CFT maintenance requirements. Consideration may be given when determining relevant past performance that demonstrates the capacity to manage multiple teams of varying size and complexity at locations worldwide. This demonstration may include concurrent management of multiple contracts with varying numbers of personnel and locations. It may also include contract value as it relates to the portion of effort proposed to perform.

Complexity: Relevancy in regard to complexity may be assessed based on, but not limited to, the similarities between a given past performance effort and the technical subfactors, along with CFT maintenance requirements. Consideration may be given when determining relevant past performance with regard to complexity.

- (1) Support of requirements with varying levels of Organizational, Intermediate/Field, and Depot/Sustainment level maintenance.
- (2) Support of multiple types of modification, maintenance, inspection and repair of active systems in the US Government inventory, such as aircraft; vehicles; aerospace equipment; missile systems; subsystems such as engines, communications and cryptologic equipment; and ground support equipment.
- (3) Support of multiple contracts at locations both in the CONUS, and OCONUS.

Price Assessment Past Performance Relevancy: Relevancy in regard to price will be assessed primarily based on similarity between contract type (i.e. Firm- Fixed-Price (FFP), Cost Reimbursable (CR), Time and Materials (T&M)) of previous effort as compared to the CFT requirement

2.3.2.3. Performance Quality Assessment:

The Government will consider the performance quality of recent, relevant efforts. The quality assessment consists of an in-depth evaluation of the past performance questionnaire responses, PPIRS information, Contractor Performance Assessment Reports (CPARS) (including ratings and supporting narratives), interviews with Government customers and fee determining officials and, if applicable, commercial clients. It may include interviews with DCMA officials or other sources known to the Government. The quality assessment may result in positive or adverse findings. Adverse is defined as past performance information which the Government determines to be less than satisfactory performance quality. For adverse information identified, the evaluation will consider the number and severity of the problem(s), mitigating

circumstances, and the effectiveness of corrective actions that have resulted in sustained improvements when determining the quality assessment. Taking mitigating corrective actions may or may not result in a higher quality rating. The Government will use the following quality levels when assessing recent, relevant efforts:

Quality Assessment	Description
EXCEPTIONAL (E) (BLUE)	During the contract period, contractor performance is meeting (or met) all contract requirements and consistently exceeding (or exceeded) some or many. Very few, if any, minor problems encountered. Contractor took immediate and effective corrective action.
SATISFACTORY (S) (GREEN)	During the contract period, contractor performance is meeting (or met) all contract requirements. For any problems encountered, contractor took effective corrective action.
MARGINAL (M) (YELLOW)	During the contract period, contractor performance is not meeting (or did not meet) some contract requirements. For problems encountered, corrective action appeared only marginally effective, not effective, or not fully implemented. Customer involvement was required.
UNSATISFACTORY (U) (RED)	During the contract period, contractor performance is failing (or fail) to meet most contract requirements. Serious problems encountered. Corrective actions were either ineffective or non-existent. Extensive Customer oversight and involvement was required.
UNKNOWN (UK)	Unknown Performance rating due to lack of sufficient information to assign a rating.

2.4.3. Assigning Ratings:

As a result of the relevancy and quality assessments of the recent contracts evaluated, offerors will receive an integrated performance confidence assessment rating based on the definitions provided in paragraph 2.3.1 above. Although the past performance evaluation focuses on performance that is relevant to the Technical subfactors and Price assessment, the resulting performance confidence assessment rating is made at the factor level and represents an overall evaluation of contractor performance. Offerors without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance and, as a result, will receive a "Neutral Confidence" rating for the Past Performance factor.

More relevant performance will have a greater impact on the Performance Confidence Assessment than less relevant effort. A record of Somewhat Relevant to Very Relevant past performance, which may result in Substantial, Satisfactory, or Limited Confidence, may be considered more advantageous to the Government than a Neutral Confidence rating. Likewise, a more relevant past performance record may receive a higher confidence rating and be considered more favorably than a less relevant record of favorable performance.

2.5. Factor 3 –Price

***THIS WILL BE UPDATED BY AN RFP AMENDMENT WHEN AVAILABLE**