

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

FOR

BASE INFRASTRUCTURE MODERNIZATION - TASK ORDER 3

25 JUL 2024



Prepared By:

AFLCMC/HNIB

15 Eglin Street, Building 1607 Hanscom AFB, MA 01731-1700

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

1.1. Basis for Award

This is a competitive selection conducted in accordance with (IAW) Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part 16. The intent of this action is to award a single order to only one of the previously qualified offerors on the Basic IDIQ. It is not a source selection that is subject to FAR 15.3 procedures.

To arrive at a best value decision, the designated Fair Opportunity Decision Authority (FODA) will weigh the evaluation results of each factor against the stated criteria in Section 1.4. A best value decision may result in an award to a higher rated, higher priced Offeror, where the decision is consistent with the evaluation criteria and the designated FODA reasonably determines that the expected benefits of the non-price criteria outweigh the price difference. Conversely, the Government may select for award the Offeror whose proposed price is lower than the proposals that are not sufficiently more advantageous to justify the payment of a higher price. While the Government will strive for maximum objectivity, the selection process, by its nature, is subjective, and therefore, professional judgement is implicit throughout the entire evaluation process.

Offerors must be current BIM IDIQ holders, Offerors not BIM IDIQ holders are ineligible for a Task Order award. Proposals received from non-BIM IDIQ holders will not be evaluated.

By submission of its offer IAW the instructions provided in the Instructions to Offerors, Offerors agree to all solicitation requirements, including terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as evaluation factors or subfactors.

The Government reserves the right to award without interchanges. The Government reserves the right to hold interchanges if, during the evaluation, it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government. Interchanges are fluid exchanges between the PCO and the Offerors that may address any aspect of the proposal and may or may not be documented in real time. If the Government conducts interchanges, it will be through use of an interchange notice (IN). Offeror responses to IN's will be considered in making the award selection decision. Interchanges may be conducted with one, some or all Offerors, as the Government is not required to conduct interchanges with any or all contractors responding to this RFP. Therefore, each initial proposal shall contain the Offeror's best terms. While the Government will strive for maximum objectivity, the selection process, by its nature, is subjective and, therefore, professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire process. This is an acquisition under NAICS code 517111.

1.2. Rejection of Unreasonable Proposals

The Government may reject any proposal that is evaluated to be unreasonable in terms of program commitments, including contract terms and conditions when compared to Government

requirements, such that the proposal is deemed to reflect an inherent lack of competence or failure to comprehend the complexity and risks of the program.

1.3. Proposal Requirements, Terms, and Conditions

Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as factors and subfactors to be eligible. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the proposal may result in an Offeror being removed from consideration. Any exceptions to the solicitation's terms and conditions must be fully explained and justified.

1.4. Evaluation Factors for Award

The following evaluation factors in Table 1 will be used to evaluate each proposal. Offerors will be evaluated according to the contents of Volumes 2, and 3. If any Factor/Subfactor is found unacceptable, according to the criteria in Evaluation Factors for Award, the evaluation will cease, and the Government will not continue to evaluate; the Offeror will not be eligible for award.

Volume	Element	ID	Evaluation	Page Limit
Volume 1	Information	-	Contracting Information	1
Volume 2	Factor	1	Cost	N/A
Volume 3	Factor	2	Technical Proposal	90
	Subfactor	1	Network Proposal	-
	Subfactor	2	Program Management Plan	-

Table 1: Proposal Organization

1.5. Relative Importance

The Factor 2 Technical Proposal is more important than Factor 1 Cost. Within Factor 2, the Subfactors are of equal importance.

1.6. Evaluation Methodology

Offerors' proposals will be evaluated based on the criteria established and identified in the Instructions to Offerors and Evaluation Criteria.

2. CONTRACT INFORMATION

2.1. Volume 1: Information – Contract Information

The Government will verify the information provided.

3. COST EVALUATION

3.1. Volume 2: Factor 1 – Cost

The Government will evaluate each Offeror's Cost/Price Volume for reasonableness, balance, and cost realism.

3.1.1. Price Reasonableness

IAW FAR 31.201-3, a price is reasonable if, in its nature and amount, it does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person in the conduct of competitive business. A price analysis will be conducted IAW FAR 15.404-1 in order to ensure a fair and reasonable price has been proposed. The Government's concern in making a price reasonableness determination focuses primarily on whether the offered prices are higher than warranted. IAW FAR 15.403-1(b) the Government may require the submission of Data Other Than Certified Cost or Pricing Data to the extent necessary to support a determination of reasonableness. The Government may determine that an offer is unacceptable, and therefore un-awardable, if prices are found not to be fair and reasonable.

3.1.2. Unbalanced Pricing

Offerors are cautioned against submitting a materially unbalanced offer. Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable Total Evaluated Price, the price of one or more items is significantly over or under-stated as indicated by the application of cost and price analysis techniques. An offer may be rejected if the Government determines the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.

3.1.3. Cost Realism

A Cost Realism analysis will be performed IAW FAR 15.404-1(d). Cost realism is the process of independently reviewing and evaluating specific elements of each offeror's proposed cost estimate to determine whether the estimated proposed cost elements are realistic for the work to be performed, reflect a clear understanding of the requirements, and are consistent with the unique methods of performance described in the offeror's technical proposal. The burden of proof for cost realism rests with the offeror. Accordingly, proposals will be evaluated to assess the likelihood that the proposed technical and managerial approach can successfully be accomplished at the proposed cost for all the CPFF CLINs/Info Sublines. The Government will perform a cost realism analysis on the CPFF CLINs/Info Sublines only.

A Government Estimate of Most Probable Cost (GEMPC) is the result of the cost realism analysis of the costs based on each Offeror's proposed approach and unique proposal. The GEMPC may differ from the proposed cost and will reflect the Government's best estimate of the cost that is most likely to result from the offeror's proposal. The GEMPC for the CPFF CLINs/Info Sublines will be used for the purpose of making a determination of best value.

3.1.4. Total Evaluated Price (TEP)

The total evaluated price for award purposes will be the sum of the following:

- a) FFP CLIN (X111)/Info Sublines SLINs (X11101, X11102, X11103) will be evaluated at the Total Proposed Price.
- b) CPFF CLINs (X123, X132, X142, X152, X162, X171, X0171) /Info Sublines (X12301, X12302, X12303, X13201, X13202, X13203, X14201, X14202, X14203, X15201,

X15202, X15203, X16201, X16202, X16203, X17101, X17102, X17103) will be evaluated at the GEMPC plus the proposed fixed fee amount.

- c) CR CLIN (X181)/Info Sublines (X30001, X30002, X30003) will be evaluated at the Government established values for each respective contract period.
- d) NSP CLINs/Info Sublines are not separately priced nor separately evaluated.

The Pricing Workbook is provided within the FOPR Bidders Library. Offerors shall ensure this Excel Workbook submittal remains editable and contains the formulas used for computation.

3.1.5. Evaluation of Options

All options under the contract will be evaluated as indicated above; however, evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise such options.

4. TECHNICAL EVALUATION

The Government will evaluate the remaining Factor proposal using the following adjectival rating. If an Offeror is rated “Unacceptable” the evaluation will cease, and they will not be eligible for award.

Rating	Adjectival	Description
Blue	Exceptional	Exceeds all minimum requirements of the criteria; has a high probability of success; contains no weaknesses or deficiencies.
Green	Good	Exceeds some of the minimum requirements of the criteria; has an above average probability of success; contains no significant weaknesses or deficiencies.
Yellow	Acceptable	Meets all the minimum requirements of the criteria; has an average probability of success; no deficiencies exist.
Red	Unacceptable	Fails to meet a minimum requirement of the criteria; proposal needs major revisions; very low probability of success. Deficiencies exist.

Table 2: Adjectival Rating Scale

4.1. Volume 3: Factor 2 – Technical Proposals

This factor will be evaluated on an adjectival rating basis, as defined in Table 2. Evaluations will occur at the Subfactor, not the Factor, level. Used throughout this factor, an “explanation” means a response which demonstrates a working knowledge of the topic, and a “plan” (whether used generally or for a specifically named plan) means a formal strategy or approach to address the topic. The technical proposal should clearly address all identified locations under one overall approach; however, any quantities, materials, and labor laydowns shall be presented by individual location. Subfactors will be reviewed and assigned a rating as applicable. If any Subfactor is assessed a deficiency evaluation will cease and the Offeror will not be eligible for award.

4.1.1. Factor 2: Subfactor 1 – Network Proposal

The Offeror’s network proposal, inclusive of the Network Design and Operations Plan, will be evaluated for their viability, comprehension, clarity, and completeness to determine whether the design and plan are acceptable and executable, demonstrates an understanding of the processes,

presents an effective knowledge of, and effective solution for meeting the requirements, and clearly identifies compliance with Service Level Agreements at each location, and Disaster Recovery examples.

Viability	considers the likelihood of the Offeror's network design and operations plan, and strategies therein, of being successful
Comprehension	considers whether the Offeror demonstrates, through their explanations, that their understanding of processes represents effective working knowledge of the related topics
Clarity	considers whether the design and plan clearly address all required aspects.
Completeness	considers whether the plan addresses all the aspects detailed in the Instructions to Offerors and compliance with the requirements.
These elements will be used to determine the probability of success/risk based on the USG's interpretation of the proposal material.	

Evaluation of Subfactor 1 will focus on the specific requirements listed below; the proposed solution should not disregard other requirements for this effort.

Requirements Section – Appendix A	Part
Section 3.5 - Redundancy	3.5.1, 3.5.2, 3.5.5, 3.5.9, 3.5.10
Section 4.1 - WLAN Solution Requirements	4.1.4
Section 4.2 - WLAN APs	4.2.3, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, 4.2.10, 4.2.11
Section 4.3 - WLAN Controllers	4.3.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.3, 4.3.5
Section 7.1 - Core Node (CN)	7.1.2, 7.1.3, 7.1.4, 7.1.7, 7.1.9, 7.1.11
Section 7.2 - Backbone Distribution Node (BDN)	7.2.1, 7.2.2, 7.2.3, 7.2.4, 7.2.5, 7.2.6, 7.2.9, 7.2.11
Section 7.3 - Critical Distribution Node (CDN)	7.3.1, 7.3.2, 7.3.3, 7.3.7, 7.3.8
Section 7.4 - Critical Access Nodes (CAN)	7.4.6
Section 7.5 - Distribution Node (DN)	7.5.1, 7.5.2, 7.5.3
Section 7.6 - Access Node (AN)	7.6.1
Section 7.7 - Network Topology	7.7.1 - 7.7.9, 7.7.11, 7.7.12
Section 7.10 - Node Redundancy	All
Section 7.11 - Connections to External Systems	7.11.2, 7.11.4, 7.11.5, 7.11.6, 7.11.7
Section 7.12 - Server Farm Connectivity	7.12.2 - 7.12.6
Section 7.13 - SIPRNet	7.13.7, 7.13.8
Section 7.15 - Other Network Enclaves	All
Section 8 - Virtual Local Area Networks	8.1.1, 8.1.10, 8.1.11, 8.1.12, 8.1.20
Section 8.2 - VLAN Trunking	8.2.11, 8.2.12, 8.2.14
Section 8.3 - Management VLANs	8.3.3, 8.3.5
Section 8.6 - Internet Protocol	All
Section 9 - Quality of Service	9.1.2 - 9.1.6
Section 9.2 - Layer 3 Traffic Separation	9.2.3
Section 10.1 - Network Device Security	All
Section 10.2 - Wireless Systems Authentication Mechanisms	10.2.1 - 10.2.3
Section 10.3 - Network Access Control (NAC)	10.3.3 - 10.3.7, 10.3.11, 10.3.16, 10.3.19, 10.3.23, 10.3.35, 10.3.36, 10.3.37

Section 10.4 - Network Timing	10.4.1, 10.4.2
Section 11.1 - Multi-factor Authentication	All

The evaluation of the Operations Plan will assess the ability to operate and perform on this Task Order.

4.1.2. Factor 2: Subfactor 2 – Program Management Plan

This subfactor assesses the Offeror's Program Management Plan (PMP) in response to the PWS requirements. All the programmatic plans, and administrative solutions provided within the PMP as defined in the ITO will be assessed.

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's PMP for viability, comprehension, clarity, and completeness to determine whether the plan is acceptable and executable.

Viability	considers the likelihood of the Offeror's network proposal, and strategies therein, of being successful
Comprehension	considers whether the Offeror demonstrates, through their explanations, that their understanding of processes represents effective working knowledge of the related topics
Clarity	considers whether the plan clearly addresses all required aspects.
Completeness	considers whether the plan addresses all the aspects detailed in the Instructions to Offerors and compliance with the requirements.
These elements will be used to determine the probability of success/risk based on the USG's interpretation of the proposal material.	

5. OMBUDSMAN

IAW AFFARS 5352.201-9101, Ombudsman (JUN 2016), an Ombudsman has been appointed to hear and facilitate the resolution of concerns from Offerors, potential Offerors, and others for this acquisition. If resolution cannot be made by the CO, concerned parties may contact the following: Deputy Director, Acquisition Excellence & Program Execution Directorate at AFLCMC/AQAZ Workflow (email: ASCA@us.af.mil) or at 937-255-5512/DSN 785-5512, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH.