

Evaluation Factors
Barrancas National Cemetery
Shrine Project
36C78618Q0273

- A. This proposal is being evaluated for award on a TRADEOFF basis. This means that a full qualitative analysis will be undertaken by the VA's evaluation team to identify the proposed offer that is most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered.
- B. The tradeoff factors of I. technical rating, II. technical risk, and III. past performance when combined is significantly more important than price. (Definitions are listed below).
- C. The following award factor(s) will be considered in the order of importance:

I. Technical Rating

Sub-Factor I

Period of Performance / Schedule of Proposed Work

Describe how your company will meet or surpass the 270 calendar days period of performance, using a Critical Path Method (or similar) the site visit, scope of work and Barrancas Drawings Section 50, 51, 52 will provide the guidance needed to meet or exceed this evaluation factor. Propose a critical path schedule (or similar) for a completion date of September 30,2018, if feasible. (More than one schedule can be submitted to show you can meet one or both time frames, the change in the schedule of values must be included in the proposal in accordance with Section IV Price).

Sub-Factor II

Technical Approach and Understanding of the Work

This factor considers whether the Offeror demonstrates an understanding of the complexity and magnitude of requirements set forth in the Statement of Work at a minimum, the proposal shall include a detailed narrative that clearly demonstrates an understanding of the requirements of the solicitation and shall address how the Offeror will perform, develop and implement the work plan in accordance with the schedule that has been proposed in Sub- Factor 1. It shall not exceed two pages.

Sub-Factor III

Experience of Company

This factor considers the level of experience your company has in this similar type of work, at Federal/State or Private Cemeteries. The narrative shall address in detail the magnitude (dollar range) , complexity, period of performance, if there were any barriers (positive or negative) and how your company overcame them. This factor will allow the source selection team to evaluate your experience relevant to the period of performance/ Schedule (Sub Factor -I) and the technical approach (Sub-Factor II)

II. Technical Risk Rating

Assessment of technical risk, which is manifested by the identification of weakness(es), considers potential for disruption of schedule, increased costs, degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight, or the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance.

III. Past Performance

Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) forms provided in the solicitation shall be completed and submitted as specified in the Instructions to Offerors. They will be evaluated to assess the degree of confidence the Government has in an Offeror's ability to supply products and services that meet users' needs based on a demonstrated record of recent and relevant work similar to the work described in this solicitation. Recent or relevant work is defined as similar work within the past four (4) years.

The Contracting Officer shall deem the offeror non-responsive if they fail to provide recent and relevant past performance prior to award IAW FAR 52.212-1(b)(11). The offeror must submit a

Evaluation Factors
Barrancas National Cemetery
Shrine Project
36C78618Q0273

PPQ with a satisfactory or higher rating to be deemed eligible for award. The Government reserves the right to evaluate past performance based on such information as the contracting officer's knowledge and previous experience with the item or service being purchased, customer surveys, or other reasonable basis, without the existence of a formal database.

IV. Price

The offeror shall submit pricing information to support the completeness and reasonableness of their proposed prices. A breakdown should also be provided for price traceability which shows the skill mix, labor categories, estimated number of hours, and estimated fully burdened labor rates. A total price for each CLIN as specified in the solicitation.

Description of Ratings:

In order of importance:

Technical Rating

The offeror's technical solution will be rated separately from the risk associated with its technical approach. The technical rating evaluates the quality of the offeror's technical solution for meeting the Government's requirement. The risk rating considers the risk associated with the technical approach in meeting the requirement.

Technical Risk Rating

Assessment of technical risk, which is manifested by the identification of weakness(es), considers potential for disruption of schedule, increased costs, degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight, or the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance.

Past Performance Evaluation

The past performance evaluation results in an assessment of the offeror's probability of meeting the solicitation requirements. The past performance evaluation considers each offeror's demonstrated recent and relevant record of performance in supplying products and services that meet the contract's requirements. One performance confidence assessment rating is assigned for each offeror after evaluating the offeror's recent past performance, focusing on performance that is relevant to the contract requirements. See FAR 15.305. Past performance information may be obtained from questionnaires tailored to the circumstances of the acquisition.

Past performance information shall be obtained from any other sources available to the Government, to include, but not limited to, the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), and information obtained Contracting Officer.

The Past Performance Evaluation Team will review this past performance information and determine the quality and usefulness as it applies to performance confidence assessment.

Price Rating

The Government will evaluate each price offer using price analysis techniques delineated in FAR 13.106-3(a). Accordingly, the analytical techniques prescribed in FAR 13.106-3(a) may be used singularly or in combination to ensure the price is fair and reasonable. Proposed prices evaluated as unreasonable may be grounds for eliminating an offer for competitions.