

M3 EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criterion	EC	SWF	Offeror A	Offeror B	Offeror C			
SDVOB Participation per basic contract clause 9952.900-H904 (See Note 4)		1/0	0	0	0			
Maximum possible		1						
SDVBO Participation Weight (+3%/0% of Main Factor Weights)		Sums	0	0	0			
3		Weighted SDVOSB Participation Total	30	0	0			
Small Business Participation per basic contract clause 9952.900-H904 (See Note 5)		-1/1	0	0	0			
Maximum possible		1						
Small Business Participation Weight (+/-10% of Main Factor Weights)		Sums	0	0	0			
10		Weighted Small Business Participation Total	100	0	0			
Technical (See Note 6)								
1		Demonstrate/describe your technical approach and capability to satisfy the purpose and scope of this requirement (CET Sections 1.1 & 1.2). This shall include: (1) description of technical approach, capabilities and type/range of tasks to be performed by your own employees and those by subcontractors, (2) list of labor categories and labor hours by CLIN separated by prime and subcontractor, (3) list of item description and quantity of material/ODCs by CLIN and (4) request for Personnel Qualifications Waiver (if applicable).	C	8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2		Demonstrate/describe your technical approach and capability to satisfy CET Section (#)	C	8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
3		Demonstrate/describe your technical approach and capability to satisfy CET Section (#)	C	8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4		Demonstrate/describe your technical approach and capability to satisfy CET Section (#)	C	8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5		Demonstrate/describe your technical approach and capability to satisfy CET Section (#)	C	8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
6		Demonstrate/describe your technical approach and capability to satisfy CET Section (#)	C	8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7		Demonstrate/describe your technical approach and capability to satisfy CET Section (#)	C	10	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
8		Demonstrate/describe your technical approach and capability to satisfy CET Section (#)	NC	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
9		Demonstrate/describe your technical approach and capability to satisfy CET Section (#)	NC	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maximum possible				340				
Technical Weight (%) - minimum 25%		Sums	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
35		Weighted Technical Total	350	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Past Performance (See Note 7)								
		Provide past performance information on a minimum of one (1) but no more than three (3) recent and relevant contracts with U.S. Government Agencies. This shall include (1) the contract/task order number, (2) contract period of performance, (3) contract pricing arrangement, (4) performance as Prime or Subcontractor, (5) initial contract cost, (6) current/final contract cost, (7) reasons for difference between initial and final contract costs, (8) description of work provided and an explanation on what aspects of the contracts are deemed relevant to the proposed effort and to what aspects of the proposed effort they relate, and (9) current agency Program Manager's contact information (name, office, phone number, email),	C	10	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maximum possible				50				
Past Performance Weight (%) - minimum 25%		Sums	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25		Weighted Past Performance Total	250	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		Total Evaluated Price (TEP) (See Note 8)	C	10	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Maximum possible				50				
Price Weight (%) - minimum 25%		Sums	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
40		Weighted Price Total	400	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
100		Main Factor Weight Totals (%)						
		TOTALS		1130	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

M3 EVALUATION CRITERIA

INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS (ITO)

1. Content and Detail: The offeror's proposal must include all data and information requested in this ITO and the RFOP. The proposal shall be clear, concise and shall provide sufficient detail for effective evaluation and for substantiating the validity of stated claims. The proposal shall not simply rephrase, restate or reformulate the Government's requirements, but rather shall provide a convincing rationale to address how the offeror intends to meet these requirements. Offerors shall assume that the Government has no prior knowledge of their facilities and experience and will base its evaluation on the information presented in the offeror's proposal. Elaborate brochures, documentation, binding, detailed artwork or other embellishments are not desired. Non-conformance with the instructions provided in the ITO may result in an unfavorable proposal evaluation.

The Procurement Contracting Officer (PCO) is the sole point of contact for this acquisition. Address any questions, concerns or requests for clarification you may have to the PCO. If an offeror believes that the requirements in these instructions contain an error, omission, or are otherwise unsound, the offeror shall immediately notify the PCO in writing with supporting rationale. The offeror is reminded that the Government reserves the right to award this effort based on the initial proposals, as received, without discussions.

2. Format and Page Limitations: Offeror is to limit proposal to twenty-five (25) single spaced pages, font no smaller than times new roman 11 point. Table of Contents, cover pages and price volume **are not** included in the total page count, but technical and past performance volumes **are** included in the total page count. Personnel Qualifications Waiver Requests **are** considered part of the technical proposal volume; therefore, request for waiver forms (i.e. attachment 2 of the basic IDIQ PWS) **are** included in the total page count. If page limitations are exceeded, the excess pages will not be read or considered in the evaluation of the proposal and will be returned to the offeror as soon as practicable. Page 1 of the volume is defined as the first page after the table of contents. The offeror shall prepare their proposal with the titles and contents of the volumes as defined below.

<u>Volume</u>	<u>Volume Title</u>
I	Price Proposal
II	Technical Proposal
III	Past Performance Proposal

3. Basis for Award & Discussions: Award will be made to the offeror with the highest M3 score at an affordable and reasonable price as the best-value offeror. In the event the highest M3 score offeror is not affordable and reasonable, then best-value award will be made to the next highest M3 score at an affordable and reasonable price. It is the Government's intent to award without discussions; therefore, it is imperative that offerors submit their best proposal initially. However, if during the evaluation period, it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government to hold discussions, offeror responses to Evaluation Notices (ENs) and Final Proposal Revisions (FPRs) will be considered in making the award decision.

4. Service Disable Veteran Owned Small Business Participation: **This is a mandatory evaluation criteria. It will be evaluated for every task order utilizing the M3 Criteria as the evaluation method.** The purpose of this factor is to promote Service Disable Veteran Owned Small Business participation and provide greater incentives for large businesses to achieve their small business subcontracting goals. The score is assigned as a +1 or 0 which equates to +3% or no additional percentage of the task order proposal evaluation total score. If a Contractor who has not received a previous order submits a proposal, they will receive a +1 until they have received an order at which point, their compliance will be evaluated and their score will be assigned accordingly. Please review the User's guide for further information and details. The scoring for this is determined based on the CDRLA001 submission and the terms and conditions of the basic DESPIII contract.

Small Business Participation will be monitored and tracked on a semi-annual basis, IAW CDRLA001. "Small Business Participation" as used in this clause is defined as the cost of contract performance of the small business prime combined with the dollars subcontracted to small business concerns. DESP III small business prime contractors shall manage their Small Business Participation Strategy to ensure Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business Participation, as defined in this paragraph, is no less than 3% of the total annual contract dollars. Total Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business participation of 3% is a requirement.

M3 EVALUATION CRITERIA

5. Small Business Participation: **This is a mandatory evaluation criteria. It will be evaluated for every task order utilizing the M3 Criteria as the evaluation method.** The purpose of this factor is to promote small business participation and provide greater incentives for large businesses to achieve their small business subcontracting goals. The score is assigned as a +1 or – 1 which equates to +10% or -10% of the task order proposal evaluation total score. If a Contractor who has not received a previous order submits a proposal, they will receive a +1 until they have received an order at which point, their compliance will be evaluated and their score will be assigned accordingly. Please review the User's guide for further information and details. The scoring for this is determined based on the CDRL A001 submission and the terms and conditions of the basic DESPIII contract. In addition to being evaluated for every requirement, if two contractors have the exact score on the M3, the small business participation score will also be used as a tie breaker for award determination.

Small Business Participation will be monitored and tracked on a semi-annual basis, IAW CDRLA001. "Small Business Participation" as used in this clause is defined as the cost of contract performance of the small business prime combined with the dollars subcontracted to small business concerns. DESP III small business prime contractors shall manage their Small Business Participation Strategy to ensure Small Business Participation, as defined in this paragraph, is no less than 20% of the total annual contract dollars. Total Small Business Participation of 20% is a requirement. Furthermore, apportionment of the 20% among the types of small business goals will be monitored to ensure that they meet the targets set forth in the contractor's Small Business Participation Strategy attached to this contract.

6. Technical Evaluation: The offeror's technical proposal shall demonstrate/describe their technical approach and capability to satisfy all the technical criterion listed above. Personnel Qualifications Waiver Requests (i.e. attachment 2 of the basic IDIQ PWS) are considered part of the technical proposal volume and must be approved by the Contracting Officer prior to award of the task order. Within each waiver request, the contractor shall demonstrate the benefits of using personnel that do not meet the requirements within the labor categories. The waivers are limited to years of experience and/or education - the labor category itself cannot be waived. The offeror's technical proposal shall be evaluated on their stated ability to satisfy all the technical criterion listed above, which are the most critical aspects of the program. Each proposal will be scored from 0 to 5 in association with each technical criterion, using the following scale:

- 0 = Unacceptable
- 1.0 = Acceptable with High Performance risk
- 1.5 = Acceptable with Moderate Performance Risk
- 2.0 = Acceptable with Low Performance Risk
- 2.5 = Some requirements Exceeded with High performance Risk
- 3.0 = Some requirements Exceeded with Moderate performance Risk
- 3.5 = Some requirements Exceeded with Low performance Risk
- 4.0 = Exceptional with High Performance Risk
- 4.5 = Exceptional with Moderate Performance Risk
- 5.0 = Exceptional with Low Performance Risk

Note 1: The Total scores are automatically calculated in the spreadsheet using the identified weighting factors .
Note 2: A proposal with an "unacceptable" rating in any one of the evaluation criteria areas is not awardable.
Note 3: Reference attachment "DESPIII M3 Evaluation Criteria: Ratings Descriptions" for additional information.

7. Past Performance: The Government reserves the right to use both the past performance information provided by the offeror and information obtained from other sources, such as the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) or similar systems, Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) and commercial sources. The evaluation of the offeror's past performance information shall consider recency, relevancy (similarity in technical capability) and overall performance. To be recent, the previous contracts must be ongoing or must have been performed during the last five (5) years (60 months) from the date of issuance of this RFP. Past performance information that fails this condition **WILL NOT** be evaluated and shall be considered unacceptable. An in-depth assessment of all recent performance information obtained will be made to determine how closely the efforts performed under those contracts relate to experience, competence and technical capability required under this requirement/CET. In determining relevancy for individual contracts, consideration will be given to the effort, or portion of the effort, being proposed by the offeror. The Government may contact personnell, such as the current program manager, to determine recency, relevancy and overall performance. An overall composite score for the past performance criterion will be given after evaluating information provided by the offeror and information obtained from other sources. Each proposal will be scored from 0 to 5 for past performance, using the following scale:

- 0 = Unacceptable – past performance is unacceptable and/or not relevant
- 1.0 = Acceptable Performance with Somewhat Relevant Work
- 1.5 = Acceptable Performance with Relevant Work
- 2.0 = Acceptable Performance with Very Relevant Work
- 2.5 = Very Good Performance with Somewhat Relevant Work
- 3.0 = Very Good Performance with Relevant Work
- 3.5 = Very Good Performance with Very Relevant Work
- 4.0 = Exceptional Performance with Somewhat Relevant Work
- 4.5 = Exceptional Performance with Relevant Work
- 5.0 = Exceptional Performance with Very Relevant Work

Note 1: The Total scores are automatically calculated in the spreadsheet using the identified weighting factors .
Note 2: Reference attachment "DESPIII M3 Evaluation Criteria: Ratings Descriptions" for additional information.

M3 EVALUATION CRITERIA

8. Price (TEP Calculations): The total evaluated price (TEP) will be calculated as the sum of the Firm-Fixed Price (FFP) and Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee (CPFF) Contract Line Item Numbers' (CLINs) unit/extended prices for the basic period and option periods/optional tasks if applicable. **Note:** The unit/extended prices for Cost Reimbursable No-Fee (CRNF) CLINs **WILL NOT** be included in the TEP calculations. Provided below is a summary of how the FFP and CPFF CLINs will be evaluated.

FFP Labor CLINs:

- Cost reimbursable no-fee (CRNF) CLINs will not be included in the TEP calculations.
- No adjustments will be made to the proposed hours
- Verification of the rates will be made to ensure the proposed rates are not greater than the NTE rates in the basic contract. **Note:** Personnel Qualifications Waivers do not change this term and condition.

CPFF Labor CLINs:

- Cost reimbursable no-fee (CRNF) CLINs will not be included in the TEP calculations.
- Upward adjustments may be made to the proposed hours to satisfy the criteria of cost realism, consequently, and for evaluation purposes only, the TEP may be different than proposed price. Downward adjustments will not be made to the highest proposed hours since the criteria of affordability will be implemented.

Definition of Affordable/Reasonable:

A price must be both reasonable and affordable. A proposed price is reasonable if it is not considered insufficient or excessive to perform the required effort. A price is affordable if it is within the Government's funding profile.

Definition of Realism of DESP III:

Cost realism analysis is an evaluation to ascertain potential cost understatement. Cost realism in the DESP III is determined by examining the proposed labor expense for cost reimbursable orders (labor hours and labor rates) to assess whether the estimated labor costs 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. In accordance with FAR 15.404-1(d), cost realism analysis shall be performed on all cost-reimbursement contracts [orders] to determine the probable cost of performance for each offeror.

TEP Points Calculation

The offeror with the lowest TEP price will receive a maximum score of five, and each of the other offerors will receive a percentage of that maximum score based on the ratio of the lowest TEP to an offeror's TEP.

Definition of Total Evaluated Price (TEP) Adjustments:

On DESP III, for evaluation purposes, the TEP prices may be adjusted during the government evaluation for Cost Reimbursement orders. If the cost realism analysis reflects that there is a significant difference between the proposed line item cost estimates for the labor CLINs and the government's evaluation assessment, then adjustments will be made. The TEP on Firm Fixed Priced Orders will be calculated without adjustment to the proposed prices. The TEP on CR may be calculated using the adjusted prices.

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION – See FAR 2.101 and 3.104

M3 EVALUATION CRITERIA

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION – See FAR 2.101 and 3.104