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**1. Introduction**

1.1 Purpose

This guide provides general guidance on the Performance Price Tradeoff (PPT) technique for source selection, explains when and how to use PPT, and provides samples of provisions and documents for use with PPT. Keep in mind that each acquisition is different and the samples may not apply exactly to your situation. The Source Selection Authority (SSA) must exercise good business judgment in planning, executing and documenting a competitive acquisition.

1.2 Background

Representatives from Air Force Materiel Command (AFMC), Air Mobility Command (AMC) and Air Education and Training Command (AETC) developed this Air Force PPT guide by integrating existing guides from their individual commands.

1.3 What is PPT?

The PPT process is a simplified best value source selection strategy that permits a tradeoff between price and performance in reaching the award decision. It applies to both commercial and non-commercial acquisitions.

1.4 What are the Benefits of PPT?

The PPT strategy permits recognition of the good performer and thereby minimizes the risk of awarding to a contractor that will not perform at an acceptable level. A contractor that delivers what the contract requires without extensive follow-up effort is clearly delivering better value than a contractor that charges essentially the same price, yet needs constant surveillance to ensure performance. In short, the PPT process weeds out marginal to unsatisfactory performers in favor of offerors with proven records of providing quality products and/or services on time and at affordable prices. PPT also allows for SSA discretion in awarding to higher rated performers over lower rated performers if the price differential is warranted and considered to be best value.

1.5 Is an Acquisition Plan Required?

Acquisition planning is required for all acquisitions per [FAR 7.102(a)](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/07.htm). Dollar thresholds determine format and content, which are described in [DFARS 207.103](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/dfars/dfars207.htm#P55_1129), [AFFARS 5307.104-92](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/af_afmc/affars/5307.htm) and AFSPC/AFMC MAJCOM supplements thereto. The decision to use PPT should result from advance planning and thorough consideration of all aspects of the requirement and other available acquisition strategies. When applicable, complete the plan and provide to the review office as early in the acquisition process as possible.

1.6 Is a Source Selection Plan Required?

Source selection plans are not required for PPT source selections. However, when the SSA is other than the contracting officer a source selection plan is the recommended way to document the SSA’s establishment of the source selection team and approval of the evaluation factors. MAJCOM and other community advice guidance on the preparation of source selection plans are available in the [AFFARS Library – Part 15 (Source Selection)](https://cs.eis.af.mil/airforcecontracting/knowledge_center/Pages/5315-main.aspx).

1.7 Who is the Source Selection Authority?

See [AFFARS 5315.303](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/af_afmc/affars/5315.htm). Except for A-76 competitions, the contracting officer is the SSA for acquisitions of any dollar value using PPT procedures, unless the acquisition plan approving authority designates otherwise. For A-76 competitions using PPT procedures, the contracting officer is the SSA for actions $10M or less. For A-76 actions over $10M, the SSA designation depends on whether the program is within the AFPEO/CM portfolio. Refer to [AFFARS 5315.303 (a)(4)](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/af_afmc/affars/5315.htm) for specifics.

2. When to Use PPT

The PPT process can be used for any competitive negotiated acquisition (including A-76) for which it is unnecessary to distinguish levels of technical merit among the proposals to make an award decision.

2.1 Examples of appropriate PPT acquisitions

Replenishment spares

Non-complex operational contracting acquisitions

Some types of construction contracting

Non-developmental, noncomplex service or supplies

Service contracts with only pass/fail technical requirements

Low technical complexity “build to print” contracts

2.2 When not to use PPT

Sole source buys

Sealed bidding

Technically complex acquisitions

3. Two Basic PPT Best Value Models

**3.1 Without technical proposals**

This simpler model is structured *without* the use of technical evaluation factors and submission of technical proposals. The assessment of recent and relevant past performance, resulting in a performance confidence assessment rating, is based on the results of surveys sent to customers identified by the respective offerors and other sources of information available to the contracting officer.

**3.2 With technical proposals**

The second model *includes* technical evaluation factors and/or subfactors that must be considered to ensure the offeror can satisfy certain minimum requirements. The factors/subfactors are evaluated on an acceptable/unacceptable, pass/fail, or similar basis. As with the first model, the assessment of recent and relevant past performance, resulting in a performance confidence assessment rating, is based on the results of surveys sent to customers identified by the respective offerors and other sources of information available to the contracting officer.

**4. Developing the Solicitation**

**4.1 Overview**

Non-commercial acquisitions must follow the uniform contract format described in [FAR 15.204-1](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/15.htm). Commercial acquisitions are governed by the format in [FAR 12.303](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/12.htm). The FAR requires that the government evaluate competing proposals based solely on the factors described in the solicitation. Sections L and M of the RFP describe the information required to be in the contractors offer and sets the ground rules for evaluation. (For commercial acquisitions, the Instructions to Offerors and Description of Evaluation Factors are utilized). These sections form the *heart* of the solicitation. The basis for nearly all GAO protests stems from not following some aspect of the instruction to offerors or from not following the evaluation factors. It is therefore paramount that solicitations describe clearly and concisely the information required and the evaluation factors, including their relative order of importance. Past performance should be given sufficient evaluation weight to ensure that it is meaningfully considered throughout the source selection process and will be a valid discriminator among the proposals received.

***Note:*** *While stating that price is more important than past performance is one of the FAR prescribed statements, and it is mentioned in our sample Section M, it diminishes the flexibility for tradeoff and we do not recommend using it. Ii is more difficult to justify a tradeoff with a higher priced offer if price is more important than performance and consideration, in that instance, should be given for using Lowest Price Technically Acceptable*.

**4.2 PPT Models**

4.2.1 PPT *without* Technical Proposals: If the solicitation clearly identifies the product requirements or performance outcome objectives and there are no mandated qualification requirements, (e.g., employee certifications, license requirements, etc.), supplemental information is not needed. Every offeror promising to comply with the terms and conditions in the solicitation is offering something of equal technical merit and is acceptable; conversely, any offeror who does not is unacceptable. [Attachment 1](#a1) (non-commercial) and [Attachment 2](#a2) (commercial) are examples of this particular PPT strategy.

4.2.2 PPT *with* Technical Proposals. Technical factors should be used only when mandated performance requirements are identified in the solicitation. Such factors should be simple, easy to identify and evaluate, and be well suited to the use of a checklist to affirm compliance. Structure the checklist on a pass/fail basis to yield a rating of Acceptable/Reasonably Susceptible of Being Made Acceptable/Unacceptable, or similar assessment. [Attachment 3](#a3) is an example of this particular PPT strategy.

**4.3 Proposal Preparation Instructions**

It is best to develop the proposal preparation instructions (Section L or [FAR 52.212-1](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/52_000.htm)) concurrent with the development of the evaluation factors. This minimizes the possibility of identifying a technical evaluation factor without commensurate instructions as to information required for evaluation. The solicitation must specifically state what pricing information must be submitted by offerors, how price will be evaluated, and how the total evaluated price will be calculated.

**4.4 Past Performance**

Past performance information reveals how well the contractor performed work relevant to the type of effort and type of requirement described in the solicitation, and confirms whether the performance is current or recent. Recency and relevancy are two key items involved in the review of offerors past performance. During the early phase of the acquisition, the team should define what is relevant for this effort and how recent the contract performance should be in order to be applicable.

**4.4.1 Recency**

Current performance will generally have greater impact in the performance assessment than recent performance. Performance that is more recent will usually have more impact than less recent performance. Current is generally defined as performance that is taking place at the present time. Recent is generally defined as performance occurring within the last three years, but the time period can be tailored to fit the circumstances of your acquisition.

**4.4.2 Relevancy**

To help offerors decide whether to submit a proposal, the solicitation should describe the kind of performance considered relevant to the instant acquisition. “Relevant” means the performance being considered must have a logical connection to the work described in the solicitation. Normally, relevance would include such aspects as the product or service similarity, product or service complexity, contract type, program or lifecycle phase, contract environment, division of company proposing, subcontractor interaction and magnitude. Magnitude is important because it will define not only the scope but project similarity to the instant requirement. In determining relevancy for individual contracts, consideration should be given to the effort, or portion of the effort, being proposed by the offeror, teaming partner, or subcontractor. The evaluation should take into account past performance information regarding predecessor companies, key personnel who have relevant experience or subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement when such information is relevant to the instant acquisition. The following relevancy definitions are examples of general language that can be used, or tailored if appropriate:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Very Relevant | Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires. |
| Relevant | Present/past performance effort involved much of the magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires. |
| Somewhat Relevant | Present/past performance contractual effort involved some of the magnitude of effort and complexities than this solicitation requires. |
| Not Relevant | Present/past performance effort did not involve any of the magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires. |

**4.5 Developing Performance Questionnaires**

The sample questionnaire at [Attachment 4](#a4) is fairly generic and will suffice for many PPT acquisitions; however, it is not necessarily suited for all acquisitions. To maximize the usefulness of the information gathered during the evaluation stage, questions should be tailored to the specific circumstances of each individual acquisition. The questionnaire should include at least one question for each technical factor, if applicable, the price factor, as well as other relevant information. There is certain basic information that needs to be in all questionnaires. For example, the questionnaire should address the offeror’s record for on time delivery, delivery of quality goods and services, and cost control, if applicable, to determine the likelihood of success in performing the solicitation’s requirements. Other areas for consideration are:

***Note:*** *Most PPT acquisitions use Firm Fixed Price (FFP) contracts in which case cost control is within the purview of the contractor. The contracting officer would not collect cost control past performance information on a FFP contract, but if contractors are coming from a primarily cost contract environment into a fixed price environment, or if there are reimbursable CLINs, a survey question in the area of cost control might be pertinent.*

(a) The offeror’s record of conformance to contract specifications and standards of good workmanship.

(b) The offeror’s adherence to contract schedules, including the administrative aspects of performance.

(c) The offeror’s history for reasonable and cooperative behavior, commitment to customer satisfaction, timely award and management of subcontracts, and whether the offeror met any applicable subcontracting goals.

Following are some *examples* of effort/requirement specific questions. The AF Past Performance Evaluation Guide (see [paragraph 8.0](#p8)) has additional guidance and examples on drafting questionnaires for more complex PPT acquisitions.

* Environmental Requirements
* Was the contractor’s performance in compliance with all local, state, and federal laws and regulations?
* Were there any contractor-caused reportable environmental compliance violations?
* Were any fines levied against the owner as a result of contractor noncompliance?
* Did the contractor comply with all applicable OSHA requirements for protection of employees removing asbestos?
* Military Family Housing Maintenance Requirements
* Did contractor consistently respond to service calls within the required time frames?
* Did contractor assign personnel with the required skills (e.g., painting, HVAC, plumbing, etc.) to accomplish the work?
* Did contractor consistently accomplish change of occupancy maintenance within the required time frames and required minimal re-performance of services?
* Refuse/Recycling
* Did contractor empty dumpsters in a timely manner to ensure debris did not exceed the capacity of the dumpster?
* Did contractor consistently remove refuse in a timely manner?
* Was the contractor-operated recycling center consistently open for public drop-off of recyclable materials during the contractual required hours of operation?

**4.6 Other solicitation requirements**

Sections L and M (or equivalent commercial solicitation provisions) must inform offerors that they are required to meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions, representations and certification, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as evaluation factors or subfactors. ([AFFARS 5315.305(a)](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/af_afmc/affars/5315.htm))

**5.0 Proposal Evaluation**

**5.1 Overview**

The following three approaches to evaluating proposals have proved successful.  Selecting the method appropriate for an acquisition depends on many factors; for example, number of proposals anticipated, available resources, funding, and SSA preferences.

Ensure the approach selected is clearly communicated and strictly followed throughout the evaluation process.  Use only the criteria identified in the solicitation to determine technical acceptability.  ALL criteria must be passed to be considered technically acceptable.  Technical evaluators rate the proposals as “acceptable,” “reasonably susceptible of being made acceptable,” or “not acceptable.” Ensure the technical evaluation is properly documented. See [Attachment 5](#a5) for a sample technical evaluation checklist.

A proposal is rated “reasonably susceptible of being made acceptable” when after the initial evaluation, the rater anticipates additional information that could be provided by an offeror during discussions or through a minor proposal revision, would result in a proposal rating of acceptable (“pass”). The offeror will need to revise or further explain their proposal. If, upon review of the new or revised information, the proposal does not meet the government’s requirements, a “fail” rating may be warranted. Reference [FAR 15.306](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/15.htm), Exchanges With Offerors After Receipt of Proposals, for an explanation of the different types of exchanges that can transpire with offerors.

***Note:*** *An example of this would be if the government required a manual override as part of an item being purchased and while the contractor may have alluded to one, the technical team needs definite assurance that such will be provided. Another example would be that an offeror provides a detailed description of their process for qualifying and monitoring the quality of new sources. However, they do not discuss their process for identifying sources to be qualified as required by the subfactor. In both cases, discussions would be held to obtain the required information.*

When technical proposals are not required, a proposal can be determined technically acceptable when the offeror states his/her intent to build a part or perform in accordance with the requirements in the solicitation.

See [paragraph 6.0](#p6), Exchanges Between the Government and Offerors, for an explanation of how proposal weaknesses/deficiencies are identified, documented, and resolved.

**5.1.1 Approach #1 - Evaluate Technical, Rank by Price, Assess Performance**

Step 1 - Evaluate all proposals for technical acceptability.

Step 2 - Evaluate price reasonableness of all technically “acceptable” or “reasonably susceptible of being made acceptable” proposals, then rank by total evaluated price.

Step 3 - Assess performance confidence for each offeror, or specified number of lowest priced technically acceptable offerors. SSA does an integrated best value assessment of the evaluated offerors.

***Note:*** *If a large number of proposals is anticipated, the contracting officer may plan to assess performance confidence on only a specified number of the lowest priced technically acceptable offerors (need at least two responsible offerors for adequate price competition). Make sure you address this in your description of the evaluation process in the solicitation.*

**5.1.2 Approach #2 - Rank by Price, Evaluate Specified Number for Technical, Assess Performance**

Step 1 - Rank all proposals by price.

Step 2 - Evaluate a specified number of the lowest priced proposals for technical acceptability, if applicable, and price reasonableness.

***Note:*** *The number of proposals selected and surveyed will depend on the total number and quality of proposals received. For purposes of efficiency consider reducing the number of offers to the lowest priced proposals (usually the first five to seven). The number selected is the choice of the contracting officer.*

Step 3 - Assess performance confidence for a specified number of the lowest priced technically acceptable offerors. SSA does an integrated best value assessment of the evaluated offerors.

**5.1.3 Approach #3 – Evaluate Technical, Rank by Price, Assess Performance until Proposal rated “Substantial Confidence**”

Step 1 - Evaluate all proposals for technical acceptability.

Step 2 - Evaluate price reasonableness of all technically “acceptable” or “reasonably susceptible of being made acceptable” proposals, then rank by total evaluated price.

Step 3 - Evaluate lowest priced offeror’s past performance. If past performance is “Substantial Confidence”, evaluation is complete. If the lowest priced offeror’s past performance is not “Substantial Confidence” evaluate the next lowest priced offeror’s past performance. Continue evaluating next lowest priced offeror’s past performance until an offeror is rated “Substantial Confidence” or until all offerors are evaluated. At this point, the evaluation is complete and the SSA proceeds to the integrated best value assessment of the evaluated offerors.

**5.2 Performance Confidence Assessment**

**5.2.1 Sources of Information**

The primary sources of past performance information will be that provided by offerors in the form of specific past and present efforts cited in their proposals. Asking the offeror to submit no more than 1 ten 2 of their most recent and relevant efforts generally provides an adequate sample size 3. However, the government is not limited to these ten efforts when evaluating past performance. In addition to government sources of information, such as the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) 4 and other DoD data bases, etc., information can be accessed from private sources such as Dun and Bradstreet as well as commercial sources.

***Note 1:*** *We advise against using the words “at least” in setting the number of efforts required.*

***Note 2:*** *The contracting officer must use discretion in selecting the number of efforts appropriate for their acquisition situation.*

***Note 3:*** *If critical subcontractors are anticipated, consider asking for five from the prime and five from each critical subcontractor. Rather than request references, another option is to place the questionnaire and cover letter (see* [*Attachment 4*](#a4)*) in the solicitation and require the offeror to send the questionnaire to his references and in turn submit the completed questionnaire to the government.*

***Note 4:*** *See web site in* [*paragraph 8.0*](#p8) *of this guide.*

**5.2.2 Objective**

The past performance evaluation should take into consideration the most recent data available. The best practice is to select similar efforts that are either just completed or still in progress and have at least one year of performance history. Remember that the purpose of the evaluation is to make a performance confidence assessment of the offeror's ability to perform the effort described in the solicitation. This assessment represents the government’s judgment of the probability of the offeror successfully accomplishing the proposed effort based on the offeror's demonstrated past performance history.

**5.2.3 Recency and Relevancy Screening**

Upon receipt of the questionnaires, screen the information provided for each of the referenced contracts to make an initial determination of its recency and relevance to the current requirement. The objective of this screening is to remove from consideration those efforts that are not within your definition of recency or are clearly unrelated to the type of effort or requirement sought. If in doubt as to the relevancy of a particular effort provided, ask the offeror to explain why the effort was considered relevant. Before determining a prior contract not relevant, consider whether the information obtained regarding a portion of the work may be used to determine relevancy (i.e., technical capability, management responsiveness, multi-tasking capability, proactive process improvements, and ability to handle complex technical or management requirements, etc.). Also, do not hesitate to consult with other members of the PPT evaluation team regarding performance relevancy determinations. Consulting with peers may expose additional areas for consideration. Applying the relevancy definitions consistently is of key importance. Always document the rationale supporting each rating.

**5.2.4 Following Up**

Follow up on any non-responses to questionnaires. The objective is to collect as much information as possible that will help in assessing the offeror’s ability to perform. Also, for those surveys received, in many instances additional insight can be gained by phoning the respondent. Generally, people will convey more information verbally than in writing. We highly encourage following up telephonically on all questionnaires rated lower than “Substantial Confidence.” Document these phone calls summarizing the conversations. If possible, get documented concurrence from the other person.

***Note:***In accordance with the [IG5315.305(a)(2)](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/af_afmc/affars/IG5315.305(a)(2).docx), recommend contacting two points of contact for each effort.

**5.2.5 Analyze Quality of Performance**

In analyzing survey information gathered, the contracting officer may find isolated site-specific problems. Provided all other reports are favorable, isolated problems may not carry as much weight in the assessment of confidence as when there is an identifiable trend of questionable performance, whether overall or in a particular area. When finding negative trends, the contracting officer should strive to gather additional performance information to support a meaningful confidence assessment.

**5.2.6 Ratings**

Each proposal evaluated at this stage will be assigned a rating. We recommend using the ratings below from [MP5315.3](https://cs.eis.af.mil/airforcecontracting/knowledge_center/Pages/5315-main.aspx#MP), Table 3. The performance confidence assessment is normally assessed at an overall factor level after evaluating aspects of the offeror’s recent past performance, focusing on performance that is relevant to the technical factors and price. Note that these ratings are subjective based on the performance information collected. **Do not use mathematical averaging to assign a performance confidence assessment rating.**

**Substantial Confidence**: Based on the offeror’s performance record, the government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

**Satisfactory Confidence**: Based on the offeror’s performance record, the government has an expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

**Limited Confidence**: Based on the offeror’s performance record, the government has a low expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

**No Confidence**: Based on the offeror’s performance record, the government has no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

**Unknown Confidence**: No performance record is identifiable or the offeror’s performance record is so limited that no confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned.

Document findings thoroughly, summarizing the information using a form similar to [Attachment 6](#a6) “Evaluation Matrix” or [Attachment 7](#a7) “Rating Team Worksheet,” depending on the complexity of the performance assessment.

**5.3 How to Evaluate an Unknown Past Performance**

In most cases, the contracting officer will find some related government or private performance information for each contractor or subcontractor. This is especially true if the evaluation approach allows a broad interpretation of relevance or takes into account information regarding the past performance of predecessor companies, key personnel who have relevant experience or subcontractors that will perform key aspects of the requirement. Occasionally the contracting officer will not find any relevant performance information or the offeror’s performance record is so limited that no confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned. In these cases, treat an offeror’s lack of past performance as an unknown degree of confidence, having no positive or negative evaluation significance.

**5.4 Disclosing Past Performance Information to Offerors**

The contracting officer must provide offerors (via clarifications, communications or discussions as described in [paragraph 6.0](#p6) below) with the opportunity to comment on negative past performance information on which they have not had a previous opportunity to comment either through the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), or other formal processes that allow for contractor comment as part of the assessment process. The validation process is particularly important when the negative information is provided by only one reference, or when there is any doubt concerning the accuracy of the information. Usually, negative information reflects performance that was less than satisfactory although this is a judgment call that will depend upon the circumstance of the acquisition. Note that while the government must disclose past performance problems to offerors it shall not disclose the names of the individuals who provided information about an offeror’s past performance. A special problem arises with respect to subcontractors. Past performance information pertaining to a subcontractor cannot be disclosed to a private party without the subcontractor’s consent. Because a prime contractor is a private party, the government needs to receive the subcontractor’s consent before disclosing its past performance information to the prime during negotiations (discussions). The language in [Attachments 1-3](#a1) requires the prime contractor to submit its subcontractor’s consent along with the prime’s proposal to the government.

**6.0 Exchanges Between the Government and Offerors** 1, 2

***Note 1:*** *Much of the information in this section was taken from the* [*U.S. Army’s Contracting for Best Value – A Best Practices Guide to Source Selection.*](http://www.amc.army.mil/amc/rda/rda-ap/ssrc/ssp_toc.htm)

***Note 2:*** *The form used to document exchanges between the government and the offeror is the Evaluation Notice (EN). A sample EN can be found in* [*Attachment 8*](#a8)*.*

**6.1 Clarifications**

Clarifications are limited exchanges between the government and offerors, which may occur when award without discussions is contemplated (see [FAR 15.306(a)](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/15.htm) for guidance). Under these circumstances, offerors are given the opportunity to clarify certain aspects of their proposals such as questions about the relevancy of their past performance or adverse past performance information on which the offeror has not yet had an opportunity to comment. These exchanges may be used to resolve minor irregularities, informalities, or clerical errors. Such clarifications provide minor explanations but shall not revise or modify the proposal.

**6.2 Communications**

Communications are exchanges between the government and offerors, after receipt of proposals, leading to the establishment of a competitive range (see [FAR 15.306(b)](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/15.htm) for guidance). Communications must be held with any offeror who will be excluded from the competitive range because of their adverse past performance information, unless offeror has previously had the opportunity to comment on such information. Otherwise, communications may only be held with those offerors who are neither clearly in nor clearly out of the competitive range. If it is clear an offeror will be included in the competitive range, then wait until opening discussions to address any concerns. When holding communications, ask only those questions necessary to understand the proposal and make the competitive range determination. Information obtained during communications may not be used to revise a proposal, correct any deficiencies or material omissions, or change any technical or cost elements of a proposal, except for correction of mistakes. Once you have enough information to decide if the proposal should be included or excluded from the competitive range, then STOP. Never accept a revision before opening discussions.

**6.3 Establishing the Competitive Range**

Establishing the competitive range results in greater efficiency by limiting the number of offerors with whom the government must hold discussions (see [FAR 15.306(c)](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/15.htm) for guidance).  Determine the competitive range only after an initial evaluation of each proposal in accordance with all cost and non-cost factors in the solicitation.  Limit the range to all of the most highly rated proposals.  The SSA must determine what constitutes an efficient competitive range for each acquisition.  Document the competitive range determination and the supporting rationale in the contract file.  For proposals excluded from the competitive range, the contracting officer must promptly notify unsuccessful offerors, in writing, of their exclusion (see [FAR 15.503](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/15.htm) for guidance).

**6.4 Discussions**

Discussions are exchanges between the government and offerors in a competitive acquisition after establishment of the competitive range (see [FAR 15.306(d)](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/15.htm) for guidance). Discussions are the most detailed and extensive form of exchanges with offerors. When it is determined that discussions are necessary the contracting officer must hold meaningful discussions with each offeror in the competitive range. Discussions may include technical issues which affect technical acceptability, past performance issues, and/or cost/price issues.

**6.5 Obtaining Proposal Revisions**

Confirm all information obtained through discussions by requesting or allowing proposal revisions, as appropriate, from all offerors in the competitive range still eligible for selection. Ask offerors to submit written changes to their proposals resulting from discussions before requesting final proposal revisions, particularly if a number of significant issues need resolution. This allows further discussions, if necessary before the final cutoff date. After receiving responses to all issues raised to the offerors during discussions, re-evaluate the proposals. Ensure that all issues are resolved or understood by each offeror and the government prior to concluding discussions. At the conclusion of discussions give all offerors remaining in the competitive range an opportunity to revise their proposal within a common cutoff date and time. However, there should be no surprises at this point. If, after receipt of final proposal revisions it becomes necessary to subsequently clarify minor irregularities, it can be done without any additional request for final proposal revisions from all offerors. However, to discuss or negotiate any issues further, a second revision opportunity must be extended to all offerors remaining in the competitive range.

**7.0 Making the Award Decision**

If, after the initial evaluation of offers, the lowest priced technically acceptable offer is judged to have a performance confidence assessment of "Substantial Confidence," that offeror represents the best value to the government and the contracting officer will award the contract to that offeror without discussions, if permitted by the solicitation.

The government reserves the right to award a contract to a higher priced offeror if the lower priced offeror(s) has a lower performance confidence assessment. In such cases, the SSA must decide whether the past performance advantage of a particular offeror is worth the difference in price. The SSA must make an integrated best value assessment documenting the merits of the trade-off in price and that the price is fair and reasonable. The decision document must succinctly and accurately explain the basis for selecting the successful offeror including an explanation of any performance-price tradeoff judgments and identification of benefits associated with any additional cost. (See [Attachment 9](#a9) for a sample decision document). This document becomes part of the official contract file and can be released, provided that any information exempt under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) is redacted. Additional decision document samples can be found in the [AFMC Source Selection Decision Document (SSDD) Guide](https://www.afmc-mil.wpafb.af.mil/HQ-AFMC/PK/pkp/polvault/guides/ssddguide.doc) at the site identified in [paragraph 8.0](#p8).

***Note:*** *For further guidance on SSDDs and file documentation, see* [*MP5315.3*](https://cs.eis.af.mil/airforcecontracting/knowledge_center/Pages/5315-main.aspx#MP)*, paragraphs 7.11 and 7.12. A Simplified Source Selection Report is not required, but may be used for PPT acquisitions.*

**8.0 Useful Web Sites**

[Air Force Past Performance Evaluation Guide](IG5315.305(a)(2).doc)

[Guide to Collection and Use of Past Performance Information](http://www.acq.osd.mil/dpap/Docs/PPI_Guide_2003_final.pdf)

[Instructions for accessing Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS)](http://www.ppirs.gov/)

[AFMC Performance Price Tradeoff Training](https://afkm.wpafb.af.mil/ASPs/docman/DOCMain.asp?Tab=0&FolderID=OO-AQ-PK-S1-6&Filter=OO-AQ-PK-S1)

[AFMC Source Selection Decision Document (SSDD) Guide](https://www.afmc-mil.wpafb.af.mil/HQ-AFMC/PK/pkp/polvault/guides/ssddguide.doc)

#### Attachment 1

**SAMPLE SECTION L**

**(No Technical Proposal Required)**

***Note:*** *Be sure to include any required FAR, DFARS, AFFARS, and MAJCOM FARS provisions in addition to the following.*

L-XX. **PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS**

***Note:*** *In commercial acquisitions, this information will be included in* [*FAR 52.212-1*](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/52_000.htm)*, Instructions to Offerors—Commercial Items.*

A. To assure timely and equitable evaluation of proposals, offerors must follow the instructions contained herein. Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, including terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements. Failure to meet a requirement may result in an offer being ineligible for award. Offerors must clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and provide complete accompanying rationale. The response shall consist of two (2) separately bound parts, **Part I** - Price Proposal, and **Part II** - Past Performance Information.

***Note:*** *If requiring electronic proposals, alter the instructions to provide specific details.*

B. The contracting officer has determined there is a high probability of adequate price competition in this acquisition. Upon examination of the initial offers, the contracting officer will review this determination and if, in the contracting officer's opinion, adequate price competition exists no additional cost information will be requested and certification under [FAR 15.406-2](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/15.htm) will not be required. However, if at any time during this competition the contracting officer determines that adequate price competition no longer exists; offerors may be required to submit information to the extent necessary for the contracting officer to determine the reasonableness and affordability of the price.

***Note:*** *Prior to seeking information from the offeror the contracting officer must first seek it elsewhere. See* [*FAR 15.403-3(b)*](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/15.htm)*, which states, “When adequate price competition exists…generally no additional information is necessary to determine the reasonableness of price. However, if there are unusual circumstances where it is concluded that additional information is necessary to determine the reasonableness of price, the contracting officer shall, to the maximum extent practicable, obtain the additional information from sources other than the offeror…”*

C. Specific Instructions:

1. **PART I – PRICE PROPOSAL -** *Submit original and one (1) copy*

(a) Complete blocks 13, 15, 16, 17 and 18 of the RFP Section A, [SF33](http://www.gsa.gov/Portal/gsa/ep/formslibrary.do?viewType=DETAIL&formId=884DE4C90A9F054C85256A1F005ABDB1) (or [SF1442](http://www.gsa.gov/Portal/gsa/ep/formslibrary.do?viewType=DETAIL&formId=4E179AB32AF6652285256A260054D101), [SF1449](http://www.gsa.gov/Portal/gsa/ep/formslibrary.do?viewType=DETAIL&formId=E331497A1FE0AE1F85256A260055A47B), etc.) In doing so, the offeror accedes to the contract terms and conditions as written in the RFP Sections A through K. These sections constitute the model contract.

***Note:*** *Adjust the block numbers in accordance with the specific form you use.*

(b) Insert proposed unit prices in Section B for each Contract Line Item Number (CLIN) or SubClin (SCLIN), including all option periods. The extended amount must equal the whole dollar unit price multiplied by the number of units.

(c) Complete the necessary fill-ins and certifications in Sections I through K. Section K shall be returned in its entirety. For Sections C through I, the offeror shall submit only those pages that require a fill-in.

(d) If applicable, provide a letter from the Small Business Administration (SBA) showing proof of Section 8(a) status.

2. **PART II – PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION** *- Limited to no more than \_\_\_\_ pages per contract listed. Only references for same or similar type contract desired. Submit original plus three (3) copies.*

***Note:*** *The number of copies of past performance information will depend on the number of evaluators.*

(a) **Quality and Satisfaction Rating for Contracts Completed in the Past Three Years**: Provide any information currently available (letters, metrics, customer surveys, independent surveys, etc.) which demonstrates customer satisfaction with overall job performance and quality of completed product for same or similar type contract. In addition, explain corrective actions taken in the past, if any, for substandard performance and any current performance problems such as cost overruns, extended performance periods, numerous warranty calls, etc.

(b) **Performance Surveys**: The government will evaluate the quality and extent of offeror's performance deemed 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 performance. Provide a list of no more than ten (10), 1 of the most relevant contracts performed for Federal agencies and commercial customers within the last three (3) years 2. Relevant contracts include \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. 3 The evaluation of past performance information will/will not 4 take into account past performance information regarding predecessor companies, key personnel who have relevant experience, or subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement when such information is relevant to the instant acquisition. Furnish the following information for each contract listed:

(i) Company/Division name

(ii) Product/Service

(iii) Contracting Agency/Customer

(iv) Contract Number

(v) Contract Dollar Value

(vi) Period of Performance

(vii) Verified, up-to-date name, address, FAX & telephone number of the contracting officer

(viii) Comments regarding compliance with contract terms and conditions

(ix) Comments regarding any known performance deemed unacceptable to the customer, or not in accordance with the contract terms and conditions. 5

***Note 1:*** *This number is not hard and fast. The numbers will depend on the kind and nature of the contract.*

***Note 2:*** *Suggested number of years is three, but it depends on the product/service/technology.*

***Note 3:*** *Work with the customer to develop examples of relevant efforts and to define levels of relevancy for your acquisition. See the general relevancy definitions in* [*paragraph 4.4.2*](#p442) *of this guide for a starting point. Remember, the purpose is to help offerors discern those projects/programs for which they are best suited and will receive the greatest consideration.*

***Note 4:*** *Choose “will” or “will not”. While FAR certainly provides the flexibility to consider or not consider such information, there are few instances where “will not” is appropriate. However, this does not mean such information must be given greater, or even equal, “weight” than the relevant experience of the principal offeror.*

***Note 5:*** *If this is a* [*FAR Part 12*](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/12.htm) *acquisition, most of this information is included in provision* [*FAR 52.212-1*](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/52_000.htm)*. This provision can be tailored to add the rest of the information requested (e.g., the “comments” request) if they are standard commercial practices.*

***If a teaming arrangement is contemplated, provide complete information as to the arrangement, including any relevant and recent past/present performance information on previous teaming arrangements with same partner. If this is a first time joint effort, each party to the arrangement must provide a list of past and present relevant contracts.***

(c) **Subcontractor Consent**: Past performance information pertaining to a subcontractor cannot be disclosed to the prime offeror without the subcontractor’s consent. Provide with the proposal a letter from all subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement, consenting to the release of their past performance information to the prime contractor.

D. Documents submitted in response to this RFP must be fully responsive to and consistent with the following:

1. Requirements of the RFP (Contract Line Items Numbers (CLINs) & Performance Work Statement (PWS)), and government standards and regulations pertaining to the PWS.

2. Evaluation Factors for Award in Section M of this RFP.

3. Any limitation on the number of proposal pages. Pages exceeding the page limitations set forth in this Section L will not be read or evaluated, and will be removed from the proposal.

4. **Format for proposal Part II shall be as follows**:

***Note:*** *The following may need to be altered if soliciting electronic proposals.*

(a) A page is defined as one face of an 8 ½” x 11” sheet of paper containing information.

(b) Typing shall not be less than 12 pitch.

SAMPLE SECTION M

**(No Technical Proposal Required)**

M-XX **BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD** 1: This is a competitive best value source selection in which competing offerors' past performance history will be evaluated on a basis *significantly more important than, approximately equal to, or significantly less important than* 2, cost or price considerations. By submission of its offer, the offeror accedes to all solicitation requirements, including terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements. All such offers shall be treated equally except for their prices and performance records. Failure to meet a requirement may result in an offer being determined technically unacceptable. Offerors must clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and provide complete accompanying rationale. The evaluation process shall proceed as follows:

***Note 1:*** *Note that in commercial acquisition, this information will be included in* [*FAR 52.212-2*](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/52_000.htm)*, Evaluation — Commercial Items.*

***Note 2:*** *In accordance with* [*FAR 15*](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/15.htm)*, choose one of these phrases to express the relative order of importance.*

A. Initially offers shall be ranked according to price, including any option prices if applicable. An offeror’s proposed prices will be determined by multiplying the quantities identified in Section B by the proposed unit price for each Contract Line Item Number or Subcontract Line Item Number to confirm the extended amount for each. The extended amounts will be added together to determine the total evaluated price. When applicable, the price evaluation adjustment for HUBZone small business concerns will be applied in accordance with [FAR 52.219-4](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/52_000.htm), Notice of Price Evaluation Preference for HUBZone Small Business Concerns, to arrive at an evaluated price. The price evaluation will document (for the offers evaluated under paragraph B below) the reasonableness and affordability of the proposed total evaluated price.

B. Using questionnaires, the contracting officer shall seek relevant performance information on (*fill in based on PPT approach* 1) based on (1) the past and present efforts provided by the offeror and (2) data independently obtained from other government and commercial sources. Relevant performance includes performance of efforts involving (insert type of requirement) that are similar or greater in scope, magnitude and complexity than the effort described in this solicitation. The government reserves the right to seek information on higher priced offerors if none of the lower priced offerors receive a Substantial Confidence performance assessment 2. The purpose of the past performance evaluation is to allow the government to assess the offeror’s ability to perform the effort described in this RFP, based on the offeror’s demonstrated present and past performance. The assessment process will result in an overall performance confidence assessment of Substantial Confidence, Satisfactory Confidence, Limited Confidence, No Confidence, or Unknown Confidence as defined in [MP5315.3](https://cs.eis.af.mil/airforcecontracting/knowledge_center/Pages/5315-main.aspx#MP), Table 3. Past performance regarding predecessor companies, key personnel who have relevant experience, or sub-contractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement will/will not be considered as highly as past performance information for the principal offeror. Offerors with no relevant past or present performance history or the offeror’s performance record is so limited that no confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned shall receive the rating "Unknown Confidence," meaning the rating is treated neither favorably nor unfavorably.

***Note 1:*** *For Approach #1 use “each offeror” or specify the number of lowest priced offerors you will initially assess. For Approach #2, specify the number of lowest priced offers you will initially assess, usually the lowest five to seven. For Approach #3, use “all offerors.”*

***Note 2:*** *Delete this sentence if it’s not applicable (i.e., if you are assessing all offerors, not just a specified number of lowest priced offerors).*

C. In evaluating past performance, the government reserves the right to give greater consideration to information on those contracts deemed most relevant to the effort described in this RFP.

D. If the lowest priced evaluated offer is judged to have a Substantial Confidence performance assessment, that offer represents the best value for the government and the evaluation process stops at this point. Award shall be made to that offeror without further consideration of any other offers.

***Note 1:*** *Discussions must be held if any of the offerors in the competitive range have been determined to be "Reasonably Susceptible of being Made Acceptable" and that the competitive range consists only of those offerors whose past performance has been evaluated in Step 3.*

*(Use this paragraph if following Approach #1 or #2)*

E. The government reserves the right to award a contract to other than the lowest priced offeror if the lowest priced offeror is judged to have a performance confidence assessment of "Satisfactory Confidence" or lower. In that event, the Source Selection Authority shall make an integrated assessment best value award decision.

*(Use this paragraph if following Approach #3)*

E. If the lowest priced offeror is not judged to have a Substantial Confidence performance confidence assessment, the next lowest priced offeror will be evaluated and the process will continue (in order by price) until an offeror is judged to have a Substantial Confidence performance confidence assessment or until all offerors are evaluated. The Source Selection Authority shall then make an integrated assessment best value award decision.

F. Offerors are cautioned to submit sufficient information and in the format specified in Section L. Offerors may be asked to clarify certain aspects of their proposal (*for example*, the relevance of past performance information) or respond to adverse past performance information to which the offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond. Adverse past performance is defined as past performance information that supports a less than satisfactory rating on any evaluation element or any unfavorable comments received from sources without a formal rating system. Communication conducted to resolve minor or clerical errors will not constitute discussions and the contracting officer reserves the right to award a contract without the opportunity for proposal revision.

G. The government intends to award a contract without discussions with respective offerors. The government, however, reserves the right to conduct discussions if deemed in its best interest.

**Attachment 2**

**SAMPLE PROVISIONS FOR ACQUISITION OF COMMERCIAL ITEMS**

THIS SECTION IS FOR SOLICITATION PURPOSES ONLY. THIS SECTION WILL BE PHYSICALLY REMOVED FROM ANY RESULTANT AWARD, BUT WILL BE DEEMED INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE.

[**52.212-1 INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS--COMMERCIAL ITEMS**](../far/FAR52.000.doc#b522121)

Addendum to 52.212-1(c), Period for Acceptance of Offers. The paragraph is tailored as follows: “The offeror agrees to hold the prices in its offer firm for 90 calendar days from the date specified for receipt of offers.”

ADDENDA TO 52.212-1 PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS

A. To assure timely and equitable evaluation of the proposal, the offeror must follow the instructions contained herein. The proposal must be complete, self-sufficient, and respond directly to the requirements of this solicitation. The response shall consist of two (2) separate parts; Part I – Price Proposal, and Part II – Past Performance Information.

B. The contracting officer has determined there is a high probability of adequate price competition in this acquisition. Upon examination of the initial offers, the contracting officer will review this determination and if, in the contracting officer’s opinion, adequate price competition exists no additional cost information will be requested and certification under [FAR 15.406-2](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/15.htm) will not be required. However, if at any time during this competition the contracting officer determines that adequate price competition no longer exists offerors may be required to submit information other than cost or pricing data to support a determination of price reasonableness.

C. Specific Instructions:

**1. PART I – PRICE PROPOSAL -** Submit original and one (1) copy

(a) Complete blocks 12, 17a, and 30a, b, and c of the [SF1449](http://www.gsa.gov/Portal/gsa/ep/formslibrary.do?viewType=DETAIL&formId=E331497A1FE0AE1F85256A260055A47B). In doing so, the offeror accedes to the contract terms and conditions as written in the SOLICITATION, with attachments. The SOLICITATION constitutes the model contract.

(b) Insert proposed unit and extended prices in the Pricing Schedule. The extended amount must equal the whole dollar unit price multiplied by the number of units. The proposal(s) must be submitted for a base year plus four (4) Option Years.

***Note:*** *Edit to your delivery schedule or period of performance.*

(c) Complete the necessary fill-ins and certifications in provisions. The provisions [FAR 52.212-3](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/52_000.htm) shall be returned along with the proposal.

**2. PART II – PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION -** Only references for same or similar type contracts are desired. Submit original and one (1) copy.

***Note:*** *The number of copies of past performance information will depend on the number of evaluators.*

(a) Quality and Satisfaction Rating for Contracts Completed in the Past Three Years: Provide information currently available (letters, metrics, customer surveys, independent surveys, etc.) which demonstrates customer satisfaction with overall job performance and quality of completed product for same or similar type contract. In addition, explain corrective actions taken in the past, if any, for substandard performance and any current performance problems such as cost overruns, extended performance periods, numerous warranty calls, etc.

(b) Past Performance Surveys: The government will evaluate the quality and extent of offeror’s performance deemed relevant to the requirements of this solicitation. The government will use information submitted by the offeror and other sources such as other Federal government offices and commercial sources, to assess performance. Provide a list of no more than ten (10) 1, of the most relevant contracts performed for Federal agencies and commercial customers within the last three years 2. Relevant contracts include 3. The evaluation of past performance information will/will not 4 take into account past performance information regarding predecessor companies, key personnel who have relevant experience, or subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement when such information is relevant to the instant acquisition. Furnish the following information for each contract referenced:

(i) Company/Division name

(ii) Product/Service

(iii) Contracting Agency/Customer

(iv) Contract Number

(v) Contract Dollar Value

(vi) Period of Performance

(vii) Verified, up-to-date name, address, FAX and telephone number of the contracting officer

(viii) Comments regarding compliance with contract terms and conditions

(ix) Comments regarding any known performance deemed unacceptable to the customer, or not in accordance with the contract terms and conditions.

***Note 1:*** *This number is not hard and fast. The numbers will depend on the kind and nature of the contract.*

***Note 2:*** *Suggested number of years is three, but it depends on the product/service/technology.*

***Note 3:*** *Work with the customer to develop examples of relevant efforts and to define levels of relevancy for your acquisition. See the general relevancy definitions in* [*paragraph 4.4.2*](#p442) *of this guide for a starting point. Remember, the purpose is to help offerors discern those projects/programs for which they are best suited and will receive the greatest consideration.*

***Note 4:*** *Choose “will” or “will not”. While the FAR certainly provides the flexibility to consider or not consider such information, there are few instances where “will not” is appropriate. However, this does not mean such information must be given greater, or even equal, “weight” than the relevant experience of the principal offeror.*

If a teaming arrangement is contemplated, provide complete information as to the arrangement, including any relevant and recent past/present performance information on previous teaming arrangements with same partner. If this is a first time joint effort, each party to the arrangement must provide a list of past and present relevant contracts.

(c) Subcontractor Consent: Past performance information pertaining to a subcontractor cannot be disclosed to the prime offeror without the subcontractor’s consent. Provide with the proposal a letter from all subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement, consenting to the release of their past performance information to the prime contractor.

(d) Documents submitted in response to this solicitation must be fully responsive to and consistent with the following:

1. Requirements of the solicitation (Item Numbers) and Performance Work Statement (PWS), and government standards and regulations pertaining to the PWS.

2. Evaluation Factors for Award.

General Information

INFORMATION REGARDING SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL: Hand carried proposals must be deposited in the bid depository located at 110 W. Ent St., Suite 200, Anywhere AFB, XX. The sealed envelope or package used to submit your proposal must show the time and date specified for receipt, the Solicitation Number, and the name and address of the offeror.

Offerors are cautioned that Anywhere AFB, XX has visitor control procedures requiring individuals not affiliated with the installation to obtain a visitor pass prior to entrance. SOME DELAY SHOULD BE ANTICIPATED WHEN HANDCARRYING PROPOSALS. Offerors should allow sufficient time to obtain a visitor pass and arrive at the bid depository PRIOR to the time specified for receipt. Late proposals will be processed in accordance with [FAR 52.212-1(f)](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/52_000.htm) “Late submission, modifications, revisions, and withdrawals of offers.”

FEDERAL HOLIDAYS: The following Federal Legal Holidays are observed by this base:

New Year’s Day 1 January

Martin Luther King’s Birthday Third Monday in January

Presidents Day Third Monday in February

Memorial Day Last Monday in May

Independence Day 4 July

Labor Day First Monday in September

Columbus Day Second Monday in October

Veterans Day 11 November

Thanksgiving Day Fourth Thursday in November

Christmas Day 25 December

JOINT VENTURE AGREEMENTS - Joint Ventures are allowable on competitive 8(a) set-asides, however, the joint venture agreement must be received by SBA prior to proposal due date and approved before award of any resulting contract. If you are contemplating a joint venture on this project, you must advise your assigned SBA Business Opportunity Specialist (BOS) as soon as possible. It is also recommended that the agreement be submitted as soon as practicable to ensure compliance with established regulations. Any corrections and/or changes needed can be made only when your BOS has adequate time for a thorough review before the proposal due date. NO CORRECTIONS AND/OR CHANGES ARE ALLOWED AFTER TIME OF SUBMISSION OF PROPOSAL OR BIDS.

[**52.212-2 EVALUATION--COMMERCIAL ITEMS**](../far/FAR52.000.doc#b522122)

(a) The government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible offeror whose offer conforming to the solicitation will be most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered. The following factors shall be used to evaluate offers:

(1) PAST PERFORMANCE

(2) PRICE

Past Performance is significantly more important than, approximately equal to, or significantly less important than Price when being evaluated.

***Note:*** *In accordance with* [*FAR 15*](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/15.htm)*, choose one of these phrases to express the relative order of importance.*

(b) Options. The government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. The government may determine that an offer is unacceptable if the option prices are significantly unbalanced. Evaluation of options shall not obligate the government to exercise the option(s).

(c) A written notice of award or acceptance of an offer, mailed or otherwise furnished to the successful offeror within the time for acceptance specified in the offer, shall result in a binding contract without further action by either party. Before the offer'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.

**Addendum to** [**FAR 52.212-2**](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/52_000.htm)**:**

**BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD**: This is a competitive selection in which competing offerors past and present performance history will be evaluated on a basis significantly more important than price. By submission of its offer in accordance with the instructions provided in clause [FAR 52.212-1](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/52_000.htm), Instructions To Offerors, the offeror accedes to the terms of this model contract and all such offers shall be treated equally except for their prices and performance records. The evaluation process shall proceed as follows:

A. Initially offers shall be ranked according to price, including option prices. An offeror’s proposed prices will be determined by multiplying the quantities identified in the Pricing Schedule by the unit price for each item to confirm the extended amount for each. Copies of the Pricing Schedule will be necessary in order to submit a proposal for each Option Year.

B. Using questionnaires, the contracting officer shall seek relevant performance information on (fill in based on PPT approach) based on (1) the references provided by the offeror and (2) data independently obtained from other government and commercial sources. Relevant performance includes performance of efforts involving (insert type of requirement) that are similar or greater in scope, magnitude and complexity than the effort described in this solicitation. The government reserves the right to seek information on higher priced offerors if none of the lower priced offerors receive a “Substantial Confidence” performance assessment rating. The purpose of the past performance evaluation is to allow the government to assess the offeror’s ability to perform the effort described in the solicitation, based on the offeror’s demonstrated present and past performance. The assessment process will result in an overall performance confidence assessment rating of Substantial Confidence, Satisfactory Confidence, Limited Confidence, No Confidence, or Unknown Confidence as defined in [MP5315.3](https://cs.eis.af.mil/airforcecontracting/knowledge_center/Pages/5315-main.aspx#MP), Table 3. Past performance regarding predecessor companies, key personnel who have relevant experience, or sub-contractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement will/will not be considered as highly as past performance information for the principal offeror. Offerors with no relevant past or present performance history or the offeror’s performance record is so limited that no confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned shall receive the rating “Unknown Confidence”, meaning the rating is treated neither favorably nor unfavorably.

***Note:*** *For Approach #1 use “each offeror” or specify the number of lowest priced offerors you will initially assess. For Approach #2, specify the number of lowest priced offerors you will initially assess, usually the lowest five to seven. For Approach #3, use “all offerors.”*

C. In evaluating past performance, the government reserves the right to give greater consideration to information on those contracts deemed most relevant to the effort described in this solicitation.

D. If the lowest priced evaluated offer is judged to have a “Substantial Confidence” performance rating and is determined to be responsible, that offer represents the best value for the government and the evaluation process stops at this point. Award shall be made to that offeror without further consideration of any other offers.

*(Use this paragraph if following Approach #1 or #2)*

E. In the event that the government does not make an award pursuant to paragraph D above, the government reserves the right to award a contract to other than the lowest priced offer if that offeror is judged to have a performance assessment rating of “Satisfactory Confidence” or lower. In that event, the Source Selection Authority shall make an integrated assessment best value award decision.

*(Use this paragraph if following Approach #3)*

E. If the lowest priced offeror is not judged to have a “Substantial Confidence” performance assessment, the next lowest priced offeror will be evaluated and the process will continue (in order by price) until an offeror is judged to have a “ Substantial Confidence” performance assessment or until all offerors are evaluated. The Source Selection Authority shall then make an integrated assessment best value award decision.

F. Offerors are cautioned to submit sufficient information and in the format specified in the proposal preparation instructions to permit a meaningful assessment of past performance. Offerors may be asked to clarify certain aspects of their proposal or respond to adverse past performance information to which the offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond. Adverse past performance is defined as past performance information that supports a less than satisfactory rating on any evaluation element or any unfavorable comments received from sources without a formal rating system. Communication conducted to resolve minor or clerical errors will not constitute discussions and the contracting officer reserves the right to award a contract without the opportunity for proposal revision.

G. The government intends to award a contract without discussions with respective offerors. The government, however, reserves the right to conduct discussions if deemed in its best interest.

**Attachment 3**

**SAMPLE SECTION L**

**(Technical Proposal Required)**

***Note:*** *Be sure to include any required FAR, DFARS, AFFARS, and MAJCOM FARS provisions in addition to the following.*

L-XX. **PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS**

***Note:*** *Note that in commercial acquisitions, this information will be included in* [*FAR 52.212-1*](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/52_000.htm)*, Instructions to Offerors—Commercial Items.*

A. To assure timely and equitable evaluation of proposals, offerors must follow the instructions contained herein. Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, including terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as evaluation factors or subfactors. Failure to meet a requirement may result in an offer being ineligible for award. Offerors must clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and provide complete accompanying rationale. The response shall consist of three (3) separate parts; Part **I** - Price Proposal, **Part II** - Technical Proposal, and **Part III** - Past Performance Information.

***Note:*** *If requiring electronic proposals, alter the instructions to provide specific details.*

B. The contracting officer has determined there is a high probability of adequate price competition in this acquisition. Upon examination of the initial offers, the contracting officer will review this determination and if, in the contracting officer's opinion, adequate price competition exists no additional cost information will be requested and certification under [FAR 15.406-2](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/15.htm) will not be required. However, if at any time during this competition the contracting officer determines that adequate price competition no longer exists; offerors may be required to submit information to the extent necessary for the contracting officer to determine the reasonableness and affordability of the price.

***Note:*** *Prior to seeking information from the offeror the contracting officer must first seek it elsewhere. See* [*FAR 15.403-3(b)*](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/15.htm)*, which states, “When adequate price competition exists…generally no additional information is necessary to determine the reasonableness of price. However, if there are unusual circumstances where it is concluded that additional information is necessary to determine the reasonableness of price, the contracting officer shall, to the maximum extent practicable, obtain the additional information from sources other than the offeror…”*

C. Specific Instructions:

1. **PART I – PRICE PROPOSAL -** *Submit original and one (1) copy*

(a) Complete blocks 13, 15, 16, 17 and 18 of the RFP Section A, [SF33](http://www.gsa.gov/Portal/gsa/ep/formslibrary.do?viewType=DETAIL&formId=884DE4C90A9F054C85256A1F005ABDB1) (or [SF1442](http://www.gsa.gov/Portal/gsa/ep/formslibrary.do?viewType=DETAIL&formId=4E179AB32AF6652285256A260054D101), [SF1449](http://www.gsa.gov/Portal/gsa/ep/formslibrary.do?viewType=DETAIL&formId=E331497A1FE0AE1F85256A260055A47B), etc.) In doing so, the offeror accedes to the contract terms and conditions as written in the RFP Sections A through K. These sections constitute the model contract.

***Note:*** *Adjust the block numbers in accordance with the specific form you use.*

(b) Insert proposed unit and extended prices in Section B for each Contract Line Item Number (CLIN) or Sub CLIN (SCLIN), including all option periods. The extended amount must equal the whole dollar unit price multiplied by the number of units.

(c) Complete the necessary fill-ins and certifications in Sections I through K. Section K shall be returned in its entirety. For Sections C through I, the offeror shall submit only those pages that require a fill-in.

(d) If applicable, provide a copy of the letter from the Small Business Administration (SBA) showing proof of Section 8(a) status.

2. **PART II – TECHNICAL PROPOSAL -** *Limited to no more than \_\_\_\_\_\_ pages. Submit original plus three (3) copies.*

***Note:*** *The following two subfactors are examples only. Also, the number of copies of the technical proposal will depend on the number of technical evaluators.*

(a) **Subfactor - System Block Diagram and System Description:** Provide a system block diagram to include as a minimum MCR equipment (CCU, CCC, operations console, MCR console), FIDs, MUXs, and DTCs. This diagram shall convey the system configuration for this project. System description shall be a narrative, supplementing the system block diagram, that describes each major component (those required in the system block diagram) of the system. The description shall explain how the equipment will operate as a system to meet the performance of the specification. Include description of failure modes and automatic restart modes.

***Note:*** *Subfactor examples are for an Energy Monitoring Control System (EMCS).*

(b) **Subfactor - Equipment Description**: Submit manufacturer’s data sheets for each of the items shown on the block diagram and identified in the system description. Also, submit data sheets on the FID/MUX portable tester. The data sheets shall be supplemented as necessary to convey the following information (*continue with list of equipment*).

3. **PART III – PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION** **-** *Limited to no more than \_\_\_\_\_\_ pages per contract listed. Only references for same or similar type contract desired. Submit original plus three (3) copies.*

***Note:*** *The number of copies of PPI will depend on number of evaluators.*

(a) **Quality and Satisfaction Rating for Contracts Completed in the Past Three Years**: Provide any information currently available (letters, metrics, customer surveys, independent surveys, etc.) which demonstrates customer satisfaction with overall job performance and quality of completed product for same or similar type contract. In addition, explain corrective actions taken in the past, if any, for substandard performance and any current performance problems such as cost overruns, extended performance periods, numerous warranty calls, etc.

(b) **Performance Surveys**: The government will evaluate the quality and extent of offeror's performance deemed 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 performance. Provide a list of no more than ten (10) 1, of the most relevant contracts performed for Federal agencies and commercial customers within the last three (3) years.2 Relevant contracts include \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. 3 The evaluation of past performance information will/will not 4 take into account past performance information regarding predecessor companies, key personnel who have relevant experience, or subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement when such information is relevant to the instant acquisition. Furnish the following information for each contract listed:

(i) Company/Division name

(ii) Product/Service

(iii) Contracting Agency/Customer

(iv) Contract Number

(v) Contract Dollar Value

(vi) Period of Performance

(vii) Verified, up-to-date name, address, FAX & telephone number of the contracting officer

(viii) Comments regarding compliance with contract terms and conditions

(ix) Comments regarding any known performance deemed unacceptable to the customer, or not in accordance with the contract terms and conditions. 5

***Note 1:*** *This number is not hard and fast. The numbers will depend on the kind and nature of the requirement.*

***Note 2:*** *Suggested number of years is three, but it depends on the product/service/technology.*

***Note 3:*** *Work with the customer to develop examples of relevant efforts and to define levels of relevancy for your acquisition. See the general relevancy definitions in* [*paragraph 4.4.2*](#p442) *of this guide for a starting point. The purpose is to help offerors discern those projects/programs for which they are best suited and will receive the greatest consideration.*

***Note 4:*** *Choose “will” or “will not”. While the FAR certainly provides the flexibility to consider or not consider such information, there are few instances where “will not” is appropriate. However, this does not mean such information must be given greater, or even equal, “weight” than the relevant performance of the principal offeror.*

***Note 5:*** *If this is a* [*FAR 12*](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/12.htm) *acquisition most of this information is included in provision* [*FAR 52.212-1*](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/52_000.htm)*. This provision can be tailored to add the rest of the information requested (e.g. the “comments” request) if they are standard commercial practices.*

***If a teaming arrangement is contemplated, provide complete information as to the arrangement, including any relevant and recent past performance information on previous teaming arrangements with same partner. If this is a first time joint effort, each party to the arrangement must provide a list of past and present relevant contracts.***

(c) **Subcontractor Consent**: Past performance information pertaining to a subcontractor cannot be disclosed to the prime offeror without the subcontractor’s consent. Provide with the proposal a letter from all subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement, consenting to the release of their past performance information to the prime contractor.

D. Documents submitted in response to this RFP must be fully responsive to and consistent with the following:

***Note:*** *The following may need to be altered if soliciting electronic proposals.*

1. Requirements of the RFP (CLINs & PWS) and government standards and regulations pertaining to the PWS.

2. Evaluation Factors for Award in Section M of this RFP.

3. Any limitation on the number of proposal pages. Pages exceeding the page limitations set forth in this Section L will not be read or evaluated, and will be removed from the proposal.

4. **Format for proposal Parts II and III shall be as follows**:

(a) The proposals will be 8 1/2” x 11” paper except for fold-outs used for charts, tables, or diagrams, which may not exceed 11” x 17”.

(b) A page is defined as one face of a sheet of paper containing information.

(c) Typing shall not be less than 12 pitch.

(d) Elaborate formats, bindings or color presentations are not desired or required.

SAMPLE SECTION M

**(Technical Proposal Required)**

M-XX **BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD** 1: This is a competitive best value source selection in which competing offerors' past performance history will be evaluated on a basis *significantly more important than, approximately equal to, or significantly less important than* 2, cost or price considerations. By submission of its offer, the offeror accedes to all solicitation requirements, including terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as evaluation factors or subfactors. All technically acceptable offers shall be treated equally except for their prices and performance records. Failure to meet a requirement may result in an offer being determined technically unacceptable. Offerors must clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and provide complete accompanying rationale. The evaluation process shall proceed as follows:

***Note 1:*** *Note that in commercial acquisition, this information will be included in* [*FAR 52.212-2*](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/52_000.htm)*, Evaluation—Commercial Items.*

***Note 2:*** *Choose one of these phrases to express the relative order of importance IAW* [*FAR Part 15*](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/15.htm)*.*

*(As described in* [*paragraph 5.0 Proposal Evaluation*](#p5) *of this guide, determine which evaluation approach you will follow and then select the appropriate paragraphs below.)*

*(For Approach #1 – Evaluate Technical, Then Rank by Price, Assess Performance on all (or specified number))*

A. **Technical Acceptability**. Initially, the government technical evaluation team shall evaluate the technical proposals on a pass/fail basis, assigning ratings of Acceptable, Reasonably Susceptible of Being Made Acceptable, or Unacceptable. The proposals shall be evaluated against the following subfactors:

1. **System Block Diagram and System Description:** System block diagram will be evaluated for completeness in conveying system configuration, including as a minimum MCR equipment, CCU, CCC, operators console, MCR console, FIDs, MUXs, and DTCs.

2. **Equipment Description:** Manufacturer’s data sheets will be evaluated for each of the items shown on the block diagram and identified in the system description.

B. **Price Evaluation**. Next, the government shall rank all technically Acceptable and Reasonably Susceptible of Being Made Acceptable offers by price, including any option prices if applicable. An offeror’s proposed prices will be determined by multiplying the quantities identified in Section B by the proposed unit price for each Contract Line Item Number or Subcontract Line Item Number to confirm the extended amount for each. When applicable, the price evaluation adjustment for HUBZone small business concerns will be applied in accordance with [FAR 52.219-4](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/52_215.htm), Notice of Price Evaluation Preference for HUBZone Small Business Concerns, to arrive at an evaluated price. The price evaluation will document the reasonableness and affordability of the proposed total evaluated price.

C. **Performance Confidence Assessment**. Using questionnaires, the contracting officer shall seek relevant performance information on all (or a specified number of lowest priced offerors i.e., five to seven) based on (1) the past and present efforts provided by the offeror and (2) data independently obtained from other government and commercial sources. *(Include the following sentence if limiting the assessment to a specified number of lowest priced offerors)* The government reserves the right to seek information on higher priced offerors if none of the lower priced offerors receive a Substantial Confidence performance confidence assessment.

*(For Approach #2 – Rank by Price, Evaluate Specified Number Technically, Assess Performance)*

***Note:*** *As mentioned in the guide, the contracting officer must use discretion in selecting this number.*

A. **Price Evaluation**. Initially, offers shall be ranked according to price, including any option prices if applicable. An offeror’s proposed prices will be determined by multiplying the quantities identified in Section B by the proposed unit price for each Contract Line Item Number or Subcontract Line Item Number to confirm the extended amount for each. When applicable, the price evaluation adjustment for HUBZone small business concerns will be applied in accordance with [FAR 52.219-4](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/52_215.htm), Notice of Price Evaluation Preference for HUBZone Small Business Concerns, to arrive at an evaluated price. The price evaluation will document for the offers evaluated under the following subparagraph B, the reasonableness and affordability of the proposed total evaluated price.

B. **Technical Acceptability**. Next, the government technical evaluation team shall evaluate the technical proposals submitted by the lowest priced offerors (usually, the lowest 5-7 proposals) on a pass/fail basis, assigning a rating of Acceptable, Reasonably Susceptible of Being Made Acceptable or Unacceptable. The proposals shall be evaluated against the following subfactors:

1. **System Block Diagram and System Description:** System block diagram will be evaluated for completeness in conveying system configuration, including as a minimum MCR equipment, CCU, CCC, operators console, MCR console, FIDs, MUXs, and DTCs.

2. **Equipment Description:** Manufacturer’s data sheets will be evaluated for each of the items shown on the block diagram and identified in the system description.

***Note:*** *As mentioned in the guide, the contracting officer must use discretion in selecting this number.*

C. **Performance Confidence Assessment.** Using questionnaires, the contracting officer shall seek relevant performance information on the lowest priced offerors (usually the lowest five to seven) based on (1) the past and present efforts provided by the offeror and (2) data independently obtained from other government and commercial sources. The government reserves the right to seek information on higher priced offerors if none of the lower priced offerors receive a Substantial Confidence performance confidence assessment.

*(For Approach #3 – Evaluate Technical, Then Rank by Price, Assess Performance until Substantial Confidence proposal)*

A. **Technical Acceptability**. Initially, the government technical evaluation team shall evaluate the technical proposals on a pass/fail basis, assigning ratings of Acceptable, Reasonably Susceptible of Being Made Acceptable, or Unacceptable. The proposals shall be evaluated against the following subfactors:

1. **System Block Diagram and System Description:** System block diagram will be evaluated for completeness in conveying system configuration, including as a minimum MCR equipment, CCU, CCC, operators console, MCR console, FIDs, MUXs, and DTCs.

2.  **Equipment Description:** Manufacturer’s data sheets will be evaluated for each of the items shown on the block diagram and identified in the system description.

B. **Price Evaluation**. Next, the government shall rank all technically Acceptable and Reasonably Susceptible of Being Made Acceptable offers by price, including any option prices if applicable. An offeror’s proposed prices will be determined by multiplying the quantities identified in Section B by the proposed unit price for each Contract Line Item Number or Subcontract Line Item Number to confirm the extended amount for each. When applicable, the price evaluation adjustment for HUBZone small business concerns will be applied in accordance with [FAR 52.219-4](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/52_215.htm), Notice of Price Evaluation Preference for HUBZone Small Business Concerns, to arrive at an evaluated price. The price evaluation will document reasonableness and affordability of the proposed total evaluated price.

C. **Performance Confidence Assessment**. Using questionnaires, the contracting officer shall seek relevant performance information on all based on (1) the past and present efforts provided by the offeror and (2) data independently obtained from other Government and commercial sources.

*(The next paragraphs are applicable to all approaches, except for paragraph G.)*

D. Relevant performance includes performance of efforts involving \_(insert type of requirement) that are similar or greater in scope, magnitude and complexity than the effort described in this solicitation. The purpose of the past performance evaluation is to allow the government to assess the offeror’s ability to perform the effort described in this RFP, based on the offeror’s demonstrated present and past performance. The assessment process will result in an overall performance confidence assessment of Substantial Confidence, Satisfactory Confidence, Limited Confidence, No Confidence, or Unknown Confidence as defined in [MP5315.3](https://cs.eis.af.mil/airforcecontracting/knowledge_center/Pages/5315-main.aspx#MP), Table 3. Past performance regarding predecessor companies, key personnel who have relevant experience, or sub-contractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement will/will not be rated as highly as past performance information for the principal offeror. Offerors with no relevant past or present performance history or the offeror’s performance record is so limited that no confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned shall receive the rating "Unknown Confidence," meaning the rating is treated neither favorably nor unfavorably.

E. In evaluating past performance, the Government reserves the right to give greater consideration to information on those contracts deemed most relevant to the effort described in this RFP.

F. If the lowest priced evaluated technically acceptable offer is judged to have a Substantial Confidence performance confidence assessment, that offer represents the best value for the government and the evaluation process stops at this point. Award shall be made to that offeror without further consideration of any other offers.

***Note 1:*** *Discussions must be held if any of the offerors in the competitive range have been determined to be "Reasonably Susceptible of being Made Acceptable" and that the competitive range consists only of those offerors whose past performance has been evaluated in Step 3.*

*(Use this paragraph if following Approach #1 or #2)*

G. The government reserves the right to award a contract to other than the lowest priced offer if the lowest priced offeror is judged to have a performance confidence assessment of "Satisfactory Confidence" or lower. In that event, the Source Selection Authority shall make an integrated assessment best value award decision.

*(Use this paragraph if following Approach #3)*

G. If the lowest priced offeror is not judged to have a Substantial Confidence performance confidence assessment, the next lowest priced offeror will be evaluated and the process will continue (in order by price) until an offeror is judged to have a Substantial Confidence performance assessment or until all offerors are evaluated. The Source Selection Authority shall then make an integrated assessment best value award decision.

H. Offerors are cautioned to submit sufficient information and in the format specified in Section L. Offeror’s may be asked to clarify certain aspects of their proposal (*for example*, the relevance of past performance information) or respond to adverse past performance information to which the offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond. Adverse past performance is defined as past performance information that supports a less than satisfactory rating on any evaluation element or any unfavorable comments received from sources without a formal rating system. Communication conducted to resolve minor or clerical errors will not constitute discussions and the contracting officer reserves the right to award a contract without the opportunity for proposal revision.

I. The government intends to award a contract without discussions with respective offerors. The government, however, reserves the right to conduct discussions if deemed in its best interest.

#### Attachment 4

**PAST AND PRESENT PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE**

When Filled In This Document Is Source Selection Sensitive IAW [FAR 2.101](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/02.htm) and [FAR 3.104](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/03.htm)

SUBJECT: Request for Past Performance Evaluation

TO:

You have been identified as a point of contact for a past and/or present performance evaluation of the firm listed on the attached questionnaire. This firm is currently being considered for a (Describe type of contract.) contract at \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_AFB, \_\_\_.

Your prompt attention to this questionnaire will be greatly appreciated. If you have any questions concerning this request, I can be contacted at \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Contracting Officer

1 Atch

Past and Present Performance Questionnaire

**PAST AND PRESENT PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE**

A. **GENERAL INFORMATION**: Please correct any information below known to be inaccurate:

Contractor’s Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Telephone Number: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Fax Number: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Point of Contact: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*(The government enters the following information based on list of references provided by the offeror. The offeror will enter this information if the solicitation requires him to submit questionnaires to the references.)*

Project Title and Brief Description of Work: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\*

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\*

Contract Number Provided by Offeror: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Dollar Amount: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\*

Contract Period or Dates of Performance Provided by Offeror: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\* Contractor performed as the 🞏 **Prime** Contractor 🞏 **Sub**-Contractor 🞏 **Key** Personnel.

***\* Note: If offeror holds or has held other contracts with your agency/organization in the last 3 years, please complete separate evaluation forms for those contracts as well.***

B. **RESPONDENT INFORMATION**:

Name of Respondent: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Title: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Telephone Number: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Fax Number: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Email Address: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

C. **FAX COMPLETED SURVEY FORM TO**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

D. **PERFORMANCE INFORMATION**: Choose the appropriate letter on the scale (E, G, S, M, U, and N) that most accurately describes the contractor’s performance or situation***. PLEASE PROVIDE A NARRATIVE EXPLANATION FOR ANY RATINGS OF M or U.***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **E** | **G** | **S** | **M** | **U** | **N** |
| **Exceptional** | **Good** | **Satisfactory** | **Marginal** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Neutral** |
| Performance meets contractual requirements with many exceeded to the Government’s benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with no more than a few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were highly effective. | Performance meets contractual requirements with some exceeded to the Government’s benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with no more than some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the  contractor were effective. | Performance meets contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were satisfactory. | Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions or the contractor’s proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented. | Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains a serious problem(s) for which the contractor’s corrective actions appear or were ineffective. | Performance was not observed or not applicable to the current effort being reported against. |

CONTRACTOR’S NAME: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ CONTRACT NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

***Note:*** *Include this information on each page of the questionnaire form to ensure there is no mix up in information among contracts surveyed for respective primes/subs, etc.*

**Place an “X” in the appropriate column using the definitions matrix above.**

|  | **The contractor:** | E | G | S | M | U | N |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. | Provided experienced managers and supervisors with the technical and administrative abilities needed to meet contract requirements. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. | Demonstrated ability to hire, maintain, and replace, if necessary, qualified personnel during the contract period. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. | Delegated authority to project managers and supervisors commensurate with contract requirements. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. | Home office participated in solving significant local problems. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. | Followed approved quality control plan. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. | Provided effective quality control and/or inspection procedures to meet contract requirements. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. | Corrected deficiencies in timely manner and pursuant to their quality control procedures. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. | Provided timely resolution of contract discrepancies. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. | Identified problems as they occurred. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. | Suggested alternative approaches to problems. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. | Displayed initiative to solve problems. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12. | Developed realistic progress schedules. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13. | Met established project schedules. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 14. | Provided timely resolution of warranty defects. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15. | Was responsive to contract changes. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 16. | Provided adequate project supervision. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 17. | Obtained consent of surety for increases in bonding as work-in-progress increased. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18. | Paid subcontractors/suppliers in a timely manner. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19. | Provided accurate and complete line item cost proposals including all aspects of work required for each task. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20. | Cooperated with Government personnel after award. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21. | How would you rate the contractor's overall performance? |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22. | Was the contractor ever issued a cure or show cause notice under the referenced contract? If yes, explain outcome in “remarks.” | | | | YES/NO | | |
| 23. | Would you award another contract to this contractor? If not, explain in “remarks.” | | | | YES/NO | | |
| 24. | Is the contractor rated in CPARS? | | | | YES/NO | | |

CONTRACTOR’S NAME: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ CONTRACT NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Remarks:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

***Note:*** *While these questions are generic and will work as written in many acquisitions, consider them as they relate to each individual acquisition and tailor them as needed and appropriate. Also, when tailoring the form, consider leaving space between questions for comments.*

#### Attachment 5

**INDIVIDUAL TECHNICAL EVALUATION CHECKLIST**

Initial/Final

(Circle one)

OFFEROR \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ EVALUATOR: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Technical evaluation ratings for the criteria listed under paragraphs \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ of Section M of the RFP 1 shall be entered below and a complete justification provided for each rating of *susceptible to being made acceptable* or *unacceptable*.

**FACTOR – Equipment Description** 2

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | **Acceptable** | **Reasonably Susceptible to being made Acceptable** | **Unacceptable** |
| 1. Manufacturer’s data sheets provided for each of the items shown on the block diagram and identified in the system description. |  |  |  |
| 2. Data sheets provided for FID/MUX portable tester. |  |  |  |
| 3. Manufacturer’s data sheets convey compliance with the requirements of the specifications. |  |  |  |

***Note 1:*** *For commercial solicitations the evaluation standards are listed in* [*FAR 52.212-2*](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/52_000.htm)*, Evaluation – Commercial Items.*

***Note 2:*** *Prepare a separate Evaluation Rating Record for each factor.*

Document specific reason(s) below if a factor is rated susceptible to being made acceptable or unacceptable.

Areas needing additional information:

Deficiencies noted:

#### Attachment 6

PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE RATING EVALUATION MATRIX

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **OFFEROR’S NAME** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Name of Questionnaire Respondent and Agency** | **Name of Project** | **Dollar Amount of Project** | **Completion**  Date | **Recent** | **Relevant** | Overall Rating | **Remarks** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **OVERALL RATING** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Source Selection Information – See [FAR 2.101](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/02.htm) and [FAR 3.104](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/03.htm)

**Attachment 7**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| RATING TEAM WORKSHEET Performance Price Tradeoff (PPT) | |
| OFFEROR: | INITIAL EVALUATION FINAL EVALUATION |
| **PAST PERFORMANCE** (*Relevancy ratings per contract reviewed are attached hereto.)*  ASSESSMENT**:**     SUBSTANTIAL CONFIDENCE  LIMITED CONFIDENCE   SATISFACTORY CONFIDENCE  NO CONFIDENCE   UNKNOWN CONFIDENCE  NARRATIVE**:** Substantiation of rating is required (use reverse or additional sheets as necessary). Also attach questionnaires, interviews, MOCAS, CPARS data, etc., as back-up: | |
| **PRICE / COST**  TOTAL PRICE / COST**:** $ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  NARRATIVE**:** | |
| **EXCHANGES WITH OFFERORS** (Attach Evaluation Notices issued, if any. Explain, as necessary, how this information impacts confidence). All negative/adverse information not previously provided (even if a substantial confidence or satisfactory confidence rating is given) must be provided to the contractor via an EN. | |
| \_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_  SIGNATURE (Contracting Officer) SIGNATURE ( Performance Chair, if different) | |

Source Selection Information – See FAR [2.1](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/02.htm) and [3.104](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/03.htm)**CONTINUATION OF WORKSHEET**

RECENCY

For all contracts submitted the performance periods were within the last three years.

RELEVANCY

(Offeror) submitted # relevant contracts: (list contract numbers). Offeror also included \_\_\_ subcontract efforts involving \_\_\_ critical subcontractors. Each of these contracts/subcontracts were reviewed for a relevancy determination described below:

(Offeror) was contracted under contract to remanufacture two passenger ferries for the U.S. Army. The efforts involved the comprehensive overhaul of the crafts to include complete disassembly, replacement of major portions of the hull, installation of computer controlled engines, rebuilt transmissions, update power generators, refurbished and balanced propellers, and installation of new wiring and other miscellaneous items. The magnitude and complexities of the efforts are essentially what this solicitation requires. Therefore, the work is considered to be very relevant.

Contract \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ was for complete rebuild and re-power of five landing craft used by the Army. The program required comprehensive disassembly, repair, and reassembly of all critical subsystems such as engines, transmissions, and some hull replacement. In addition, offeror installed new wires, fixtures, lights, and exhaust system. The magnitude and complexity of the effort are essentially what this solicitation requires. As such, the work is considered very relevant.

(Offeror) performed various tasks for the Transportation Dept. The project did not involve any significant aspects that dealt with this effort even though the scope and complexity was comparable to the effort solicited. Hence, a not relevant rating was assigned.

Synopsis of Performance Information Received:

The feedback from all customers ranged from Satisfactory assessment of the performance to Exceptional performance feedback , with the majority of assessments listed as Good. There were no Unknown, Unsatisfactory, or Marginal assessments provided. Strengths were identified as timely, quality products, excellent performance, and skilled staff. There was CPARS data as follows:

Contract # XXXXX-04-C-XXX (Address Relevancy)

Rating period 10/03-09/04 (Address Recency)

Quality green/satisfactory

Schedule green/satisfactory

Cost control purple/very good

Business Relations blue/excellent

Mgt of key personnel green/satisfactory

SUBCONTRACTORS:

(Offeror) has proposed using two critical subcontractors, \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

Subcontractor #1 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ will perform work as necessary on the following components: XYZ diesel engines, Johnson transmissions, and ABC transmissions. In addition to work for (offeror’s name), (subcontractor) has performed engine and transmission overhaul work for the Navy. The type and complexity of the engine/transmission work performed by (subcontractor) is very similar to the engine/transmission work required in the current solicitation. Therefore, all of these efforts are considered very relevant.

Synopsis of Performance Information Received:

The feedback from all customers was very positive and ranged in feedback from Satisfactory to Exceptional , with the majority of feedbacks reflecting Good performance. There were no assessments submitted that were less than Satisfactory. Strengths were identified as responsive, reliable, fair, experts at their own trade.

Subcontractor #1 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ has sold and performed repair work on engines for (offeror) over the last eight years. However, sale and repair of engines fall well short of the overhaul effort solicited. Repair infers removal and replacement of the failed part. On the other hand, overhaul is a comprehensive effort to make the engine like new. Therefore, the effort is considered to be not relevant.

Synopsis of Performance Information Received:

The feedback from all customers was very positive and ranged in feedback from Satisfactory to Exceptional , with the majority of feedbacks reflecting Good performance. There were no assessments submitted that were less than Satisfactory. . Strengths were identified as respectable and excellent trained staff in technical aspects of production and service.

EN Responses: EN \_\_\_\_\_ was issued providing the relevancy ratings of contracts reviewed. No response was received.

CONCLUSION:

**Attachment 8**

**EVALUATION NOTICE (EN)**

**\_\_\_\_\_ [FAR 15.306(a)](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/15.htm) Clarification\* Offeror\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**\_\_\_\_\_ [FAR 15.306(b)](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/15.htm) Communications\* Control#\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**\_\_\_\_\_ [FAR 15.306 (c)](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/15.htm) Discussions**

**\_\_\_\_\_ Deficiency**

\* Government will not accept proposal revisions as a result of Clarification or Communication exchanges

**Request for Proposal REFERENCE** *(Specify Request for Proposal paragraph number, Section M and Section L reference, etc.)*

**GOVERNMENT COMMENT**:

Factor \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Subfactor \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**PROPOSAL REFERENCE**: *(Specify offeror’s document, Proposal Volume, paragraph, and page number)*

**SUMMARY:** Description of issue in question and specific request for additional/supplemental information needed to clarify or correct the issue. Include references to the solicitation if necessary.

**EVALUATOR: (Note: The evaluator's name should not be included on the copy sent to the offeror.)**

**OFFEROR RESPONSE:**

**EVALUATOR ASSESSMENT OF OFFEROR RESPONSE:** Address impact (including impact on offeror ratings, if any) and evaluate response.

**Attachment 9**

**SOURCE SELECTION DECISION DOCUMENT**

Solicitation Number:

Short Title of Requirement or Project

**This Document Is Source Selection Sensitive Information IAW** [**FAR 2.101**](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/02.htm) **and** [**3.104**](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/03.htm)

1. This source selection was conducted in accordance with [Air Force Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (AFFARS) 5315.3](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/af_afmc/affars/5315.htm), Performance Price Tradeoff (PPT) procedures. As the Source Selection Authority (SSA) for this acquisition, I have determined the proposal submitted by \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ provides the best overall value to satisfy the Air Force requirement. This decision is based upon the criteria established in Section M (*If this is a commercial acquisition, revise each reference to “Section M” to “*[*FAR 52.212-2*](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/52_000.htm)*, Evaluation – Commercial Items.”)* of the solicitation, an integrated assessment of the proposals submitted in response to the solicitation, the terms and conditions agreed upon during discussions (if conducted) and the capability (i.e., Technical, Past Performance Confidence Assessment, and Cost/Price) of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ to fulfill the subject requirement. (*Tailor this sentence to describe the exact scenario, i.e., delete “technical” if there were no technical factors for evaluation, and do not mention “discussions” if none were conducted, nor integrated assessment if lower priced substantial confidence offeror selected..)*

2. Section M of the solicitation set forth the following areas for evaluation, with past performance being evaluated on a basis *significantly more important than, approximately* *equal to*, or *significantly less important than*, the cost considerations *(Take the statement from Section M of the solicitation):*

Past Performance

Price

List technical factors, if any

*Describe the evaluation approach followed.* To be eligible for the comparison assessment of Past Performance and Price, offerors must have received an acceptable technical rating, i.e. all requirements of the technical factor had to be met for an offeror’s technical proposal to be determined acceptable. Offerors technical proposals were assigned an adjectival rating of Acceptable, Reasonably Susceptible of Being Made Acceptable or Unacceptable. Past Performance was not evaluated for offerors rated as unacceptable, i.e. not awardable. *If only a specified number of lowest priced proposals were evaluated for technical acceptability, tailor the above and specify how many proposals were evaluated.*

3. Technical Acceptability. Of the \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ proposals received, \_\_\_\_\_\_\_offerors were rated acceptable, with \_\_\_\_\_\_\_offerors rated as susceptible of being made acceptable, and \_\_\_\_\_ rated unacceptable. *Or, if no technical proposals were required, state that offerors were determined technically acceptable by submission of an offer in accordance with the terms, conditions and technical requirements of the solicitation. Explain if any offeror’s proposal was not compliant and therefore unacceptable.*

4. Price Evaluation. Information in the price proposal was limited to the Contract Line Item Number(s) (CLINs) as specified in the Schedule. Each offeror’s *(or specify how many offerors’ prices were evaluated)* CLIN prices were evaluated for reasonableness and total price, as detailed in Section M of the solicitation. (*Insert awardees’ name)* price proposal was determined to be reasonable based on adequate price competition. The government estimate compared to the offerors’ proposed prices is shown below. *(Explain how the government estimate was developed. Provide the government estimate, total proposed prices and/or total evaluated prices for each offeror, as applicable. Discuss differences between the government estimate and the offerors’ prices.)*

*Paragraph 5 below describes the Source Selection Authority’s judgment of the probability of the offeror successfully accomplishing the proposed effort based on the offeror's demonstrated past performance and supports why the contractor selected is the best value for the Government. Usually, the performance confidence assessment will screen for recency and relevancy, and then consider such areas as contractor personnel, quality of the product or service provided, and the contractor’s quality control procedures. There are no standard “templates” for this portion of the documentation. Each determination must be based on the particulars of the situation and must present a clear and convincing argument for the position taken. Under the PPT strategy, there are only three possible award scenarios. These scenarios and some suggested “starter” or “opening” paragraphs are as follows:*

**Award to the lowest priced, most highly rated (substantial confidence) offeror**

5. Past performance questionnaires were sent to references provided by the \_\_\_\_ lowest priced offerors *(or by all technically acceptable/reasonably susceptible of being made acceptable offerors)*. These offerors were rated as follows, *in order of price*:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Offeror** | **Price** | **Performance Confidence Rating** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Based on the responses received plus other sources of information obtained and documented in the file, the lowest priced offeror is found deserving of a substantial confidence performance rating. I have therefore determined this offer represents the best value to the government. Further consideration was not given to any other offeror.

**Award to lowest priced offeror rated less than substantial confidence (satisfactory confidence or lower)**

6. Past performance questionnaires were sent to references provided by the \_\_\_\_ lowest priced offerors *(or by all technically acceptable/reasonably susceptible of being made acceptable offerors)*. These offerors were rated as follows, *in order of price*:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Offeror** | **Price** | **Performance Confidence Rating** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Based on the responses received plus other sources of information obtained and documented in the file, the lowest priced offeror is found deserving of a \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ performance confidence rating. While the selected proposal did not receive the best rating in terms of performance confidence, I have determined the offer represents the best value to the government for the following reasons:

***Note:*** *Discuss all factors considered in the decision, i.e., cost differential, criticality of the project or service, potential consequences to the government in the event of poor contractor performance or failure to perform. Explanations must present a clear and convincing argument.*

**Award to higher priced, more highly rated offeror**

7. Past performance questionnaires were sent to references provided by the \_\_\_\_ lowest priced offerors *(or by all technically acceptable/reasonably susceptible of being made acceptable offerors)*. These offerors were rated as follows, *in order of price*:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Offeror** | **Price** | **Performance Confidence Rating** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Based on the responses received plus other sources of information obtained and documented in the file, the \_\_\_\_\_ lowest priced offerors were found deserving of the ratings indicated above. While the selected proposal is not the lowest priced proposal received, it has received the best rating in terms of performance confidence. I have determined this offer represents the best value to the government and I conclude it is worth the additional cost/price due to the greater likelihood the offeror will successfully perform because of its better past performance rating for the following reasons:

***Note:*** *Discuss all factors considered in the decision, i.e., cost differential, criticality of the project or service, potential consequences to the government in the event of poor contractor performance or failure to perform. Explanations must present a clear and convincing argument.*

8. In summary, based on my assessment of the proposals as described herein, it is my decision that the proposal submitted by \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ represents the best overall value to the government.

Source Selection Authority

Signature Block

**SAMPLE**

SOURCE SELECTION DECISION DOCUMENT

F88888-05-R-9999

Replace Military Family Housing, Phase XV

Any AFB, USA

**This Document Is Source Selection Sensitive Information IAW** [**FAR 2.101**](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/02.htm) **and** [**3.104**](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/03.htm)

1. As the Source Selection Authority (SSA) for this acquisition, I have determined the proposal submitted by **Bo Peep Constructors**, Freedom Falls MN, provides the best overall value to satisfy the Air Force requirement. This decision is based upon the criteria established in Section M of the solicitation, an integrated assessment of the proposals submitted in response to the solicitation, and the capability (i.e., Past Performance Confidence Rating, and Cost/Price) of **Bo Peep Constructor** to fulfill the subject requirement.

2. Section M of the solicitation set forth the following areas for evaluation, with past performance being evaluated on a basis approximately equal to the cost considerations. Past performance information was sought on only the two lowest price offerors.

Past Performance

Price

3. Five proposals were received in response to the solicitation. All offerors were determined technically acceptable by submission of an offer in accordance with the terms, conditions and technical requirements of the solicitation.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Newstart Construction** | $2,434,371 |  |
| **Bo Peep Constructors** | $2,538,747 |  |
| Independent Government Estimate | $2,575,000 |  |
| Allway Brothers, Inc. | $4,827,000 |  |
| Jon Doughboy d.b.a. Building Away | $4,878,345 |  |
| The House Builder | $5,000,000 |  |

4. Information in the price proposal was limited to the Contract Line Item Numbers (CLINs) as specified in the Schedule. Each offeror’s CLIN prices were evaluated for reasonableness and total price, as detailed in Section M of the solicitation. Bo Peep’s price proposal was determined to be reasonable based on adequate price competition. A government estimate of $2,575,000 was developed by comparison with previous efforts of similar magnitude and complexity and application of adjustments for inflation. The difference between the government estimate and Bo Peep’s price is not significant.

5. Past performance questionnaires were sent to references provided by the two lowest priced offerors. Based on the responses received and documented in the file, these offerors were rated as follows, *in order of price*:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Offeror** | **Performance Confidence Rating** |
| Newstart Construction | Unknown Confidence |
| Bo Peep Constructors | Substantial Confidence |
|  |  |

Following is a summary and analysis of performance information gathered on these offerors:

a. Newstart Construction:

(1) **Newstart Construction**, formerly d.b.a. Tomthumb Construction, provided 5 references to which questionnaires were provided. The buyer, MSgt Smart, requested an expanded list of references, to include references as Tomthumb Construction. The second list included such references as building inspectors, real estate agents, and home residents. Of the 5 questionnaires sent out, 4 were returned, with one project still in progress. MSgt Smart made telephone contact with 3 of the references shown on the second list. Attachment 1 is a brief synopsis of his conversations with references, and the responses given by **Newstart Construction**.

(2) Though **Newstart Construction** has a record of mostly satisfactory performance, the preponderance of their work has been one-at-a-time, single-family residential houses. Through clarifications with the contractor, and those references in paragraph 1 above, it was shown that the offeror’s method is to buy a building site, build a house and then list the house for sale through a real estate agent. The offeror has never attempted a project to include demolition (removal of old houses) and rebuild.

(3) The contractor showed no experience in large projects such as that described in the instant requirement. After clarifications with this contractor, I was left with the impression that the contractor felt the government would be more understanding on schedules and design changes than individual homebuyers would.

(4) While the offeror’s past performance in building single homes on empty lots was satisfactory, I do not feel the risk associated with the offeror’s lack of past experience with projects of this magnitude and complexity warrant award. Although the offeror has performed similar work just in building houses, it is my opinion that the difference in magnitude and complexity of projects completed is so great, it makes the offeror’s past experience irrelevant. Based on this opinion, the offeror was rated **“unknown confidence”** overall. This project is high visibility and is critical to the quality of life for military personnel residing on base. It requires a contractor with experience in coordinating multiple homes being built simultaneously. It is critical to have the project completed on time and the risk of having performance problems, caused by a lack of relevant experience, is an unacceptable risk to the government.

### b. Bo Peep Constructors

(1) **Bo Peep Constructors** initially provided 4 references, along with letters of reference. MSgt Smart requested additional references, and was provided another 6 references. Eight questionnaires were sent out, 5 were returned.

(2) **Bo Peep Constructors** received numerous favorable comments. **Bo Peep Constructors** has experience in large projects to include planning, designing, and constructing homes. Their experience in this area ranges from construction of 11 homes to the development of a 92-lot housing development in the local area. **Bo Peep Constructors’** experience includes the financing, development, management, and superintendence of projects. Based on this and feedback received from the questionnaires, this offeror has been assigned a rating of “substantial confidence.”

6. While **Bo Peep Constructors** proposed prices are higher than **Newstart Construction**, I found the trade off of higher price for less risk represents the best value to the government. **Bo Peep Constructors** has shown a very good history of performance, as well as the capability to manage a project of this magnitude. Based on this record, I have little doubt that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

***Note:*** *Anytime the Source Selection Authority trades off price for a higher rated performer, the decision document must address the trade off assessment and analysis of all offerors between the low priced offeror and the selected offeror, not just the low priced and higher priced.*

7. In summary, based on my assessment of the proposals as described herein, it is my decision that the proposal submitted by **Bo Peep Constructors** represents the best overall value to the government. Further, the difference of $104,376.00 in additional costs offsets the risk associated with the lack of relevant experience of the lower priced offeror.

Holda A. Brightstar

Source Selection Authority