

Solicitation VA261-13-R-0429 Surgical Lights, San Francisco, CA
~~Source Selection Information—See FAR 2.101 and 3.104~~

**Source Selection Evaluation Plan
VA261-13-R-0429
Surgical Lights with Installation
San Francisco VA Medical Center
San Francisco, CA**

1. **Objective:** To select an offeror that can provide the San Francisco VA Medical Center (SFVAMC) with Surgical Lights and installation.

2. **Definitions:** Per FAR 15.001

“Deficiency” is a material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.

“Weakness” means a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. A “significant weakness” in the proposal is a flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

3. **Selection Process:** The technical evaluation board (TEB) shall be comprised of the following individuals

Technical Evaluation Board



In addition, TEB members may be advised by non-voting technical users appointed to the TEB in an advisory capacity only.

The VA shall evaluate Hands-On Evaluation, Technical Approach, Past Performance, Subcontracting Plan, and Price as described below.

The Government will evaluate offers after the due date. The Government may then downselect those offerors most likely to receive award based on technical acceptability, past performance, subcontracting plan, and price. The Government may determine that the number of offerors most likely to receive award in the downselect group exceeds the number at which efficient competition can be conducted. Consequently, the Government may further limit the number of offerors in the Downselect Group to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among those offerors most likely to receive award.

The Contracting Officer/SSA will make award based on the tradeoff between the non-price factors and price. To be considered for award, an offeror’s response must be rated a **pass on Technical Approach and Past Performance, and Subcontracting Plan and Hands-On Evaluation must be rated adequate or better (including all subfactors).**

Solicitation VA261-13-R-0429 Surgical Lights, San Francisco, CA

~~Source Selection Information—See FAR 2.101 and 3.104~~

4. **Evaluation Factors:** 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 in descending order of importance:

- **Hands-On Evaluation** as described below. Only downselected offerors will be evaluated on this factor. This factor will be rated on a five-level Likert scale. Offerors must be rated adequate or better to be considered for Award (including on all subfactors).
- **Technical Approach** shall be evaluated on a pass/fail basis based on the specifications/specific tasks listed in paragraphs four and five of the attached statement of work (SOW).
- **Past Performance** shall be evaluated on a pass/fail basis. Any offeror with no past performance shall be rated as neutral.
- **Subcontracting Plan** shall be evaluated as described below.
- **Price**

Non-price factors, when combined, are significantly more important than price.

5. **Factor: Technical Approach.** The TEB shall evaluate Technical Approach using Pass/Fail rating on the offer's ability to meet those product and installation specifications listed in the SOW

For the installation specifications/specific actions:

Pass is defined as the offeror meeting or exceeding the minimum VA needs, as described in para five of the SOW.

Fail is defined as the offeror not meeting the minimum VA needs, as described in para five of the SOW.

6. **Factor: Past Performance.** Past performance will be evaluated using the following scheme

Rating Parameter	Description
Pass	<p>The offeror has fulfilled the solicitation requirements and has met or exceeded the needs of the VA or other Agencies. No deficiencies or weaknesses exist.</p> <p>-OR-</p> <p>Factor may require minor clarifications. The offeror has fulfilled the solicitation requirements and has met the needs of the VA. Weaknesses, if any, are minor and are easily correctable. Risk, if identified is very low to low.</p> <p>-OR-</p> <p>In accordance with FAR 15.305, proposals with no past performance (such as being unable to contact a reference) will be rated as neutral.</p>

Solicitation VA261-13-R-0429 Surgical Lights, San Francisco, CA

~~Source Selection Information - See FAR 2.101 and 3.104~~

Fail	<p>The Offeror's past performance cannot be verified (such as reference unable to recall or confirm contract) as given or data is missing. Performance risk(s) is moderate to high.</p> <p>-OR-</p> <p>Adverse data was provided by a verified source. This adverse past performance may put veterans and the VA at high risk if contract is awarded. The Government does not have confidence that the offeror can fulfill the requirements of this contract.</p>
------	---

An offeror's past performance will be evaluated as to its relevance and similarity to work under this solicitation. The VA will also evaluate performance risk based on past performance. The Government may contact the offeror's references for information and may review performance ratings on file for prior Government projects the offeror may have performed. Past performance information obtained from sources other than those identified by the offeror may be used. All relevant facts and circumstances gathered from information from the offeror's listed references and other sources of information available to the Government (e.g., National Institutes of Health [NIH] Contractor Performance System [CPS] and Past Performance Information Retrieval System [PPIRS]) will be used to evaluate the offeror's overall past performance and quality of performance. If an offeror has not had a chance to comment on negative past performance evaluations obtained VA for purposes of evaluating offers under this solicitation, the offeror may be given a chance during "exchanges" (clarifications, communications, or discussions) after receipt of proposals (FAR 15.306). If discussions are required, and past performance issues remain, these issues will be addressed during discussions.

7. **Factor: Subcontracting Plan.** Subcontracting Plan will be evaluated by the Contracting Officer/Designee using the following ratings:

Rating Parameter	Description
Excellent	The offeror has fulfilled the subcontracting goals in the solicitation and has greatly exceeded the goals in a manner beneficial to the VA. No deficiencies or weaknesses exist. This rating is the automatic rating for Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business Concerns (SDVOSBs).
Good	The offeror has fulfilled the subcontracting goals in the solicitation and has exceeded the goals in a manner beneficial to the VA. Weaknesses, if any, are minor and are easily correctable. There are no deficiencies. This rating is the automatic rating for Veteran-Owned Small Business Concerns (VOSBs) (or minimum rating for VOSBs that choose to submit a subcontracting plan).
Adequate	Factor may require minor clarifications. The offeror has fulfilled the subcontracting goals in the solicitation. Weaknesses, if any, are minor and are easily correctable. There are no deficiencies. This rating is the automatic rating for Small Business Concerns (or minimum rating for Small Business Concerns that choose to submit a subcontracting plan).
Poor	The offeror does not meet the subcontracting goals in the solicitation; however, any deficiencies and/or weaknesses are correctable. The proposal is susceptible to being made acceptable.
Unacceptable	The offeror does not meet the subcontracting goals in the solicitation, and the deficiencies and/or weaknesses are not correctable in a way that would allow the proposal to be among the mostly highly-rated offers. This proposal is not susceptible to being made acceptable.

The VA shall evaluate Subcontracting Plan with respect to the requirements of the clause at FAR 52.219-9 Alternate II and how closely it meets the stated subcontracting Goals on a five-tiered scale: Excellent,

Solicitation VA261-13-R-0429 Surgical Lights, San Francisco, CA
~~Source Selection Information – See FAR 2.101 and 3.104~~

Good, Adequate, Poor, and Unacceptable. Small business concerns may submit subcontracting plans; however, they are not required to do so. Small business concerns will automatically receive an “Adequate” should they choose to not submit a subcontracting plan. Small business concerns submitting a subcontracting plan may receive a higher rating, but will receive no less than an “Adequate” rating. VOSBs and SDVOSBs are treated the same as small business concerns with following changes: VOSBs will automatically receive a “Good” rating (but may receive a higher rating if they submit a subcontracting plan). SDVOSBs will automatically receive an “Excellent” rating under this factor.

8. Factor: Hands-On Evaluation. This factor will be evaluated using the following scheme:

Rating Parameter	Description
Excellent	Allows surgeon to perform essential functions during surgery with significantly less effort than expected and/or performs as expected with significantly less effort and/or performs notably better than expected. Notably decreases risk to patients.
Good	Allows surgeon to perform essential functions during surgery with less effort than expected and/or performs as expected with less effort and/or performs better than expected. Decreases risk to patients.
Adequate	Allows surgeon to perform essential functions during surgery and/or performs as expected with a reasonable amount of effort.
Poor	Allows surgeon to perform essential functions during surgery with more effort than expected and/or performs as expected with a greater than normal effort and/or performs worse than expected. Increases risk to patients
Unacceptable	Required a great deal of effort by the surgeon to perform essential functions during surgery and/or performs notably worse than expected. Notably increases risk to patients.

Those vendors in the previously-mentioned downselect group shall provide and install their offered product in a SFVAMC surgical room for a period of one week for hands-on demonstration purposes. The non-voting Advisory TEB members shall complete a closed-ended questionnaire regarding the offered product’s ability to meet their needs while performing surgery, using a Likert scale. These completed questionnaires will advise the voting TEB members with regards to the evaluation of the proposed equipment. The following subfactors shall be evaluated in the hands-on portion of the demonstration. The sub-factors are of equal importance.

- (1) **Color Rendering:** (How do the objects in the surgical field appear?)
- (2) **Focal Spot:** (How well is the surgical field properly illuminated?)
- (3) **Light Arm Movement / Adjustability:** (How are human factor elements incorporated with respect to movement, ease of use, and light positioning?)
- (4) **Light Quality:** (How well is the surgical field illuminated with the appropriate intensity, adjustability, and effective manner required?)
- (5) **Shadow Resolution:** (How well does the light have adequate shadow management control?)

Solicitation VA261-13-R-0429 Surgical Lights, San Francisco, CA

~~Source Selection Information—See FAR 2.101 and 3.104~~

(6) **In-Light Surgical Camera:** (How well is the picture quality, focused, crisp, and clear?)

9. **Factor: Price.** This factor shall be evaluated by the Contracting Officer/designee to determine if it is fair and reasonable.
10. **Discussions.** The Government intends to make award without discussions. However, the Government reserves the right to designate a competitive range—based on evaluation of Technical Approach, Past Performance, Subcontracting Plan, and Price; if hands-on demonstration has already occurred, this factor shall also be utilized in designating a competitive range—and hold discussions, if necessary. The decision to designate a competitive range and hold discussions is solely within the Government's discretion. The Government further reserves the right to limit the competitive range in accordance with FAR 15.306(c)(2).
11. **Other.** The Government will evaluate the offers on the basis of information furnished by the offeror or identified in the offer and reasonable available to the Contracting Officer. The Government is not responsible for locating or obtaining any information not identified in the offer.
12. **Conflicts.** Where there is a conflict in evaluation procedures between the solicitation and the source selection plan, the source selection plan shall take precedence.

Reviewed by,

Approved

DANIEL E. CZECH,
Contracting Officer
NCO 21, Source Selection Authority

4/5/2013