SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1 NOTICE Listing Contract Clauses Incorporated by Reference

NOTICE:

The following solicitation provisions and/or contract clauses pertinent to this section are hereby incorporated by reference:

FEDERAL ACQUISTION REGULATION (48 CFR CHAPTER 1)

NUMBER	DATE	TITLE
52.217-3	APR 1984	EVALUATION EXCLUSIVE OF OPTIONS

M.2 EPA SOURCE EVALUATION AND SELECTION PROCEDURES – NEGOTIATED PROCUREMENT (EPAAR 1552.215-70)(AUG 1999)

(a) The Government will perform source selection in accordance with FAR Part 15 and the EPA Source Evaluation and Selection Procedures in EPAAR Part 1515 (48 CFR Part 1515). The significant features of this procedure are:

(1) The Government will perform either cost analysis or price analysis of the offeror's cost/business proposal in accordance with FAR Parts 15 and 31, as appropriate. In addition, the Government will also evaluate proposals to determine contract cost or price realism. Cost or price realism relates to an offeror's demonstrating that the proposed cost or price provides an adequate reflection of the offeror's understanding of the requirements of this solicitation, i.e., that the cost or price is not unrealistically low or unreasonably high.

(2) The Government will evaluate technical proposals as specified in 1552.215-71, Evaluation Factors for Award.

(b) In addition to evaluation of the previously discussed elements, the Government will consider in any award decision the responsibility factors set forth in FAR Part 9.

M.3 EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD (EPA-M-15-101)

(a) The Government will make award to the responsible offeror(s) whose offer conforms to the solicitation and is most advantageous to the Government cost or other factors considered. For this solicitation, all evaluation factors other than cost or price when combined are significantly more important than cost or price.

(b) The evaluation factors in the chart below will be used to determine quality of product or service. The Government will evaluate timely submitted, responsive quotation submissions on a best value determination with technical evaluation being significantly more important than price. The evaluation criteria are listed in descending order of importance:

NOTE: The evaluation factors for this solicitation include technical (which encompasses general technical approach, quality assurance; key personnel, transition plan and past performance) and cost/price factors. Although technical factors are of paramount consideration in the award of the contract, cost/price is also important to the overall contract award decision. All evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are significantly more important than cost or price. In any case, the Government reserves the right to make award to the offeror whose proposal represents the overall best value to the Government. Where multiple offerors are rated essentially equal in their technical standing, the relative importance of price shall increase when determining the best value to the Government.

Exhibit A

Factors	Technical Evaluation Factor(s)	Rating
1	**General Technical Approach** **a. Remote Bandwidth Management** **b. Support of Existing EPA Equipment** **c. Equipment Maintenance** **d. Site Requirements** **e. Unlimited Communication**	
2	**Quality Assurance** **a. Infrastructure** **b. Bandwidth Capability**	
3	**Key Personnel**	
4	**Transition Plan**	
5	**Past Performance**	

Technical proposals will be evaluated using the following rating scheme:

Exhibit B

RATING	DESCRIPTION
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirement and contains one or more deficiencies. Proposal is unacceptable for purposes of an award.
Marginal	Proposal does not clearly meet requirements and has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirement. The proposal has one or more weaknesses which are not outweighed by strengths. Risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths and weaknesses do not outweigh one another or will have little or no impact on contract performance. Risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Good	Proposal meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal contains strengths which outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Outstanding	Proposal meets requirement and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths far outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is very low.

Offerors shall be evaluated in accordance with the Technical Evaluation Factors from Exhibit A and rated accordingly from Exhibit B. The evaluation factors are listed in a descending order of importance. The sub-factors associated with evaluation factor are equally weighted. Offerors shall be evaluated in accordance with the following:

FACTOR I - GENERAL TECHNICAL APPROACH

Sub-factor #1 Remote Bandwidth Management - Offeror will be evaluated on their demonstrated ability to manage a 5M x 2M bandwidth from a remote site.

Sub-factor #2 Support of Existing EPA Equipment - Offeror will be evaluated on their demonstrated ability to support existing EPA equipment into their proposed network without making any changes to existing EPA equipment.

Sub-factor #3 –Equipment Maintenance- Offeror will be evaluated on their demonstrated ability to maintain current equipment as well as any additional equipment supported under this contract.

Sub-factor #4 - Site Requirements - Offeror will be evaluated on their demonstrated ability to meet the line of site requirements for the Earth Orbiting Satellites (EOS) outlined in the Performance Work Statement (PWS).

Subfactor #5 – Unlimited Communication - Offeror will be evaluated on how they intend to provide unlimited data flow and Voice-Over-Internet-Protocol (VoIP) calls to include number porting and using existing phone numbers.

FACTOR II - QUALITY ASSURANCE

Subfactor #1 – Infrastructure - Offerors will be evaluated on their detailed infrastructure for help desk support, field deployment and response times to end-users within the Continental United States (CONUS) and Outside of the Continental United States (OCONUS) areas. Offeror will also be evaluated on their ability to provide an infrastructure as well as redundant systems for their proposed Network Operating Center (NOC) based on the need articulated in the PWS.

Subfactor #2 – Bandwidth Capability - Offerors will be evaluated on their demonstrated ability to provide a 5M x 2 M bandwidth with a 99.95% availability to the entire EPA fleet of Portable Satellite Units (PSUs).

FACTOR III - KEY PERSONNEL

Subfactor #1 – Project Manager – Offeror will be evaluated on their proposed Project Manager based on the years of experience (minimum five (5) years) demonstrated through their resume, training, certificates and licenses.

Subfactor #2 – Field Deployment Engineer – Offeror will be evaluated on their proposed Field Deployment Engineer based on the years of experience (minimum five (5) years) demonstrated through their resume, training, certificates and licenses.

FACTOR IV - TRANSITION PLAN

Offeror shall be evaluated on their transition plan that shall consist of a detailed project schedule including any site visits and the maximum downtime for each individual PSU during the transition process. A successful transition plan is one that will provide relative information on how the Offeror will have minimum downtime (ie: less that four (4) hours) at the individual PSU level as well as no scheduled network-wide blackouts during any time of the transition. Statements such as "work will be accomplished with 30 days" or "transition will be completed within the required timeframe" without sufficient supporting details describing how the Offeror plans (timing, staffing, travel, schedule, etc.) to accomplish the work is not acceptable.

FACTOR V - PAST PERFORMANCE

The Offeror will be evaluated on the demonstrated relevant performance for similar work from current and previous clients with respect to the PWS. Offerors with no relevant past performance history, or for whom information on past performance is not available, will be evaluated neither favorably nor unfavorably on past performance and will receive a neutral rating.