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# BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD THROUGH SOURCE SELECTION

## Source Selection Methodology

This acquisition will utilize the Lowest Price Technically Acceptable (LPTA) source selection procedures in accordance with (IAW) Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.101-2 and 15.3 as supplemented by the DoD Source Selection Guide – Appendix C, referend in Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) 215.300, DFARS 215, Air Force Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (AFFARS) 5315, and AFFARS Mandatory Procedures 5315.3 to make an integrated assessment for a best value decision. These regulations are available electronically at acquisition.gov. The Government will select the proposal(s) with the lowest total evaluated price from among those meeting the acceptability standards for the non-price factors. Offerors are reminded that the Government will only evaluate one proposal from each Offeror. Contract(s) may be awarded to the Offeror(s) who are deemed responsible IAW FAR 9.1, whose proposal is technically acceptable, conforms to the solicitation requirements (to include all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and all other information required by Section L of this solicitation) and is judged, based on all evaluating factors and subfactors, to represent the lowest price technically acceptable proposal. Subject to this LPTA evaluation, trade-offs are not permitted, and therefore, the statements required IAW FAR 15.304(e) are NOT prescribed, nor apply to this acquisition. While the Government will strive for maximum objectivity, the source selection process, by its nature, is somewhat subjective; therefore, professional judgement is implicit throughout the entire process.

## Number of Contracts to be Awarded

The Government intends to award approximately eight (8) contracts for the MACC IV effort; however, the Government reserves the right to award fewer or more contracts, or no contract at all, if the Source Selection Authority (SSA) determines that it is in the Government’s best interest considering the expected volume of work over the period of the contract, available funding, the need to sustain adequate competition, the quality of proposals and prices submitted, and the availability of best-value proposals following completion of evaluations of the proposals received.

If the Government determines to not award a contract, the Government will not be liable for costs incurred by Offeror(s). The Government intends to evaluate proposals and make award(s) without discussion; however, the Government reserves the right to hold discussions if it determines that doing so would be in its best interest. If during the evaluation period, it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government to hold discussions, Offeror responses to Evaluation Notices (ENs) and the Final Proposal Revision (FPR) will be considered in making the Source Selection decision.

## Correction Potential of Proposals

The Government may consider, throughout the evaluation, the "correction potential" of any proposal. The judgment of such "correction potential" is within the sole discretion of the Government. If an aspect of an Offeror's proposal not meeting the Government's requirements is not considered correctable within the Government’s time constraints, the Offeror may be eliminated from the competition in accordance with FAR 15.306(c).

Award will be made to the responsible Offeror whose proposal conforms to all required terms and conditions, includes all required representations and certifications, meets or exceeds all requirements set forth in the Request for Proposal (RFP), and also provides the best value to the Government based on the results of the evaluation as described in Section 2 below.

## Discussions

The Government intends to award without discussions, but reserves the right to conduct discussions if determined necessary. Any discussions will be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.306. If the Contracting Officer determines that the number of proposals that would otherwise be in the competitive range exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted, the Contracting Officer, with the concurrence of the Source Selection Authority, may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will provide an efficient competition among the most highly rated proposals. If during the evaluating period, it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government to hold discussions, Offeror responses to ENs and the FPR will be considered in making the source selection decision. If the offeror’s proposal remains in the competitive range at the time discussions are closed, any changes or exceptions in the FPR are subject to evaluation and may introduce risk that the offeror’s proposal be determined unacceptable and ineligible for award or may affect the offeror’s ratings.

# EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR FACTORS AND SUBFACTORS

A detailed and complete analysis of each offeror’s proposal will be performed. Award will be made to the offeror with the proposal that is the best value to the Government based upon integrated assessment of the evaluation factors and subfactors described below:

**Factor One –** Price

**Factor Two** – Technical

Subfactor 1 – Basic MACC IV Plans

1. Safety Plan
2. Construction Quality Control Plan (QCP)

Subfactor 2 - Subfactor 2 – Architect Engineer (A-E) Qualifications

Subfactor 3 - Contractor Requirements

Subfactor 4 – Sample Task Order

1. Milestone
2. Safety/Accident Prevention Plan
3. Construction Quality Control Plan (QCP)
4. Demolition Plan
5. Civil Plan
6. Architectural Plan
7. Security Plan
8. Concrete Structural Design
9. Concept Mechanical Drawings
10. Electrical Plan
11. Fire Protection Plan

**Factor Three** – Past Performance

## Initial Price Evaluation

The pricing criteria used for evaluation of the Cost/Price Factor are: (1) Completeness, (2) Price Reasonableness, (3) Balance, and (4) (TEP).

## Technical Assessment

### Technical Acceptable/Unacceptable Rating

The Government’s technical evaluation team will evaluate the Technical factor on an acceptable or unacceptable basis as described in the DoD Source Selection Procedures, as excerpted below. An “Unacceptable” rating in this subfactors will be considered a deficiency and render the entire Technical Factor unacceptable. An Acceptable rating must be received in order for the Government to make award.

**Acceptable/Unacceptable Ratings:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Adjectival Rating** | **Description** |
| Acceptable | Proposal meets the requirements of the solicitation. |
| Unacceptable | Proposal does not meet the requirements of the solicitation. |

## Past Performance Assessment

In assessing present and past performance, the Government will employ several approaches, including, but not limited to:

### Other Sources of Information

Pursuant to FAR 15.305(a)(2)(ii), the Past Performance Team evaluation is not limited to review of the information provided in the offeror’s Present/Past Performance volume. Present/Past performance information may be obtained from the Government’s Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS) and the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS). The Government reserves the right to use performance information from other sources such as Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA), Fee Determining Officials, or commercial sources. Data from previous source selections may be used if the data is recent and relevant Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), or other databases; interviews with Program Managers, Contracting Officers (CO) and Fee Determining Officials; the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA), and commercial sources.

### Past Performance Ratings

Offerors shall be given an opportunity to address adverse past performance information if the offeror, joint venture member and/or critical subcontractor has not had a previous opportunity to respond to the information. Offeror’s past performance information shall be recent, within three (3) years of the date of the solicitation. Recent contracts will be examined to ensure that corrective measures have been implemented. The past performance evaluation assessment will consider issues including but not limited to the number and severity of the problems, the appropriateness and/or effectiveness of any corrective actions taken (not just planned or promised), and the overall work record. Prompt corrective action in isolated instances may not outweigh overall negative trends.

### Relevancy Definitions

The Government will perform an independent determination of relevancy of the data provided or obtained. A relevancy determination will be made for each of the recent three (3) submitted contracts. The Government is not bound by the offeror’s opinion of relevancy. The following relevancy criteria apply and will be assigned to each effort identified in an offeror’s Volume III of its proposal:

• RELEVANT: Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

• NOT RELEVANT: Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

### Past Performance Evaluation Ratings

As a result of the recency, relevancy and quality assessments of the contracts evaluated, one of the ratings as described in the DoD Source Selection Procedures will be assigned to the Past Performance factor.

The Past Performance Factor will receive an Acceptable/Unacceptable rating as described in the DoD Source Selection Procedures, excerpted below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Adjectival Rating** | **Description** |
| Acceptable | Based on the offeror’s performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort, or the offeror’s performance record is unknown. (See note above) |
| Unacceptable | Based on the offeror’s performance record, the Government does  not have a reasonable expectation that the offeror will be able to  successfully perform the required effort. |

Note: In the case of an offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available or is so sparse that no meaningful past performance rating can be reasonably assigned, the offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance (see FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv)). Therefore, the offeror shall be determined to have unknown (or “neutral”) past performance (see FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv)). In the context of acceptability/unacceptability, a neutral rating shall be considered “acceptable.”

# VOLUME I, FACTOR 1: PRICE

An initial price evaluation will be performed for all offerors IAW with this section and Section 3.4 below. The pricing criteria used for evaluation of the Cost/Price Factor are: (1) Completeness, (2) Price Reasonableness, (3) Balance, and (4) Total Evaluated Price (TEP). Proposals will be ranked from lowest to highest price based on a (TEP). In the event that a TEP cannot be calculated, the Government may elect to set the offeror aside and continue evaluating other offerors with TEPs that can be calculated as detailed below, or to continue with evaluations as described below without a TEP being calculated for the offeror. The TEP will be computed and provided to the Source Selection Authority for award purposes only and does not become part of the contract at award. However, the rates proposed in the TEP Matrix used to calculate the TEP will become contractually binding.

### Completeness

The offeror’s pricing submission will be evaluated for compliance with Section L and all other portions of the Request for Proposal (RFP). The offeror shall ensure that they have provided all requested pricing information. Incomplete price submissions may not be evaluated and the proposal may be eliminated from the competition.

### Price Reasonableness

The determination of reasonableness will consist of reviewing all the proposed Contract Line Item Numbers (CLINs). The offeror’s cost/price proposal will be reviewed for price reasonableness using one or more of the techniques described in FAR 15.404-1 – (Proposal Analysis Techniques). Generally, adequate price competition will satisfy the criteria for price reasonableness. For a price to be reasonable, it must represent a price to the Government that a prudent person would pay when consideration is given to prices in the market and its affordability. If adequate price competition is not obtained or if price reasonableness cannot be determined, additional information will be required to support the proposed price.

### Balance

The Government shall analyze offers to determine whether they are unbalanced with respect to CLIN and TEP. Offerors are cautioned against submitting an offer that contains unbalanced pricing. Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable TEP, the price of one or more CLIN is significantly overstated or understated as indicated by the application of analysis techniques such as those defined by FAR Part 15.404-1. Offers that are determined to be unbalanced may be rejected if the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.

### Total Evaluated Price

The TEP will be calculated as the sum of the proposed rates (Attachment 4, TEP Matrix), applied to notional hours/amounts for CLINs 0001 and 0002 for all years for the base period and options (including FAR 52.217-9, Option to Extend the Term of the Contract), and Sample Task Order. To determine the price for the period covered by FAR 52.217-9, the Government will include in the TEP a price for the option period. The TEP will be used for evaluation purposes only; evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise such options. **The Government has determined that the elements of the notional formula (hours/amounts) WILL NOT be disclosed to offerors.** **A no bid or an omitted rate may result in an incomplete price submission. An omitted rate may result in proposal elimination.** The TEP is for evaluation purposes only; however, all proposed rates are contractually binding as Not-to-Exceed prices for issuance of task orders.

#### Unacceptable Technical Subfactors

If at any time during the evaluation the Government finds a technical subfactor to be unacceptable, the evaluation of pricing will reflect, "Not Determined" for Reasonableness and Balance due to the offeror's price not reflecting an acceptable technical approach. The Government may also decline to consider the offeror's TEP for purposes of competitive range or award if the offeror has any unacceptable rating.

#### Approved Accounting System

Small Business’ are not required to be Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) compliant, however the Offeror must have an accounting system adequate for determining costs applicable to the contract.

### Construction Wage Rate Requirements Wage Determinations

The rates proposed for the various Wage Determinations (Section J Attachment 34-39) will also be evaluated to ensure they meet or exceed the rates in the applicable Construction Wage Rate Requirements Wage Determinations.

# VOLUME II, FACTOR 2: TECHNICAL

The technical volume will be evaluated to determine the degree to which the offeror addresses each element of the subfactors and shows evidence of meeting or exceeding the minimum requirements of each Technical subfactor. As part of Volume II the Government will evaluate the following four Technical subfactors and elements:

Subfactor 1 – Basic MACC IV Plans

1. Safety Plan
2. Quality Control Plan (QCP)

Subfactor 2 – Architect Engineer (A-E) Qualifications

Subfactor 3 – Contractor Requirements

Subfactor 4 – Sample Task Order

1. Demolition Plan
2. Civil Plan
3. Architectural Plan
4. Security Plan
5. Concrete Structural Design
6. Concept Mechanical Drawings
7. Electrical Plan
8. Communication Narrative
9. Fire Protection Plan

## Subfactor 1: Basic MACC IV Plans

### Safety Plan

This element is technically acceptable when the Contract Occupational Safety and Health Plan meets the requirements outlined in MACC IV Basic SOW Section 3.3.1 and Appendix C.

### Construction Quality Control Plan (QCP)

This element is technically acceptable when tailored Construction QCP meets the requirements outlined in MACC IV Basic SOW Section 3.1 and IAW UFGS 01 45 00. The Offeror’s Construction QCP shall comply with the UFGS specification and include a detailed and mature approach of task order project management to include procedures to identify and prevent defective services from reoccurring; interim status reports; and remediation and change management procedures to meet and maintain schedule milestones. In addition the Offeror’s CQP shall include in detail the testing necessary for material control; and includes how the mechanical systems will be commissioned.

## Subfactor 2: Architect-Engineer (A-E) Qualifications

The Offeror’s proposal for this subfactor is technically acceptable for the Basic MACC IV SOW Section 1.5.1.5. when the Offeror provides detailed and complete documentation described within each element. Past project examples shall be formatted IAW Section L, Appendix C. If required, the Government is prepared to sign a Non-Disclosure Agreement to view example projects.

1. The offeror shall provide one (1) example of the A-E firm’s past project which must include a short circuit, coordination, arc flash, and voltage drop calculations. Additionally, the example project must be similar in scope in regards to complexity, cost, and size of the Sample Project (Subfactor 4). The example project shall be less than five (5) years old from the issue date of the RFP. The project example, including calculations, must be signed and stamped by a licensed Professional Electrical Engineer.
2. The offeror shall complete the Standard Form (SF) 330, Section L Appendix D, to validate the offeror possesses at least one licensed individual who has a minimum of 15 years of experience as a licensed Professional for each Engineer of Record in each of the disciplines of Architectural, Civil, Structural, Electrical, Mechanical Engineering, and Fire Protection Engineering. SF 330, Section L Appendix D will be evaluated to ensure the experience and professional requirements.
3. The proposal demonstrates a past project that was designed by the partnered A-E firm and was successfully certified as Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver or higher certification. The A-E team shall have one or more LEED Accredited Professional(s) (AP) IAW Basic MACC IV SOW Section 1.5.1.5. Example project shall be contractually complete (See Section L, Appendix C) and less than five (5) years old from the issue date of the RFP.
4. The proposal includes successfully designed and constructed examples of three (3) past projects similar in scope with regards to complexity, cost, and size of the Sample Project. The example projects shall be contractually complete (See Section L, Appendix C) and less than five (5) years old from the issue date of the RFP.
5. The proposal includes the Fire Protection Engineering Plan that demonstrates compliance and is IAW AFI 32-10141, Page 6, Table 2.1, and also the following:
   1. Qualified Fire Protection Engineer (QFPE) IAW UFC 3-600-01. Five years of experience as a licensed Fire Protection Engineer is required.
   2. Technical qualifications and engineering services for the design of a Fire Alarm System IAW UFC 3-600- 01.
   3. Technical qualifications and engineering services for the design of combined fire alarm and mass notification systems IAW UFC 4-021-01.
   4. Technical qualifications and engineering services for the design of High Expansion Foam Systems in hangars IAW UFC 4-211-01.

## Subfactor 3: Contractor Requirements

Minimum criteria is met when the offeror demonstrates the following:

1. The proposal includes a signed partnership agreement with an established A-E firm to meet requirements IAW basic SOW X1.5.1.5.
2. The proposal includes three (3) example projects that were successfully completed demonstrating design-build experience as a Prime Contractor per the requirements in MACC IV SOW section 1.3.3. One (1) example must be from a US military installation. The other two (2) examples can be in one of two ways: 1) on a US military installation or 2) on commercial or municipal aviation infrastructure within airport secured areas or industrial production facilities. One project must be over $5M and the other two must be at least $2M. Example project shall be contractually complete (See Section L, Appendix C) and less than five (5) years old from the issue date of the RFP.
3. The proposal includes a maximum of three (3) example projects documenting the capability to design and build projects involving Architectural, Civil, Electrical, Mechanical, Fire Suppression, Structural, Security and Communication construction disciplines per the requirements in MACC IV Basic SOW Section(s) 1.3.3 & 1.5.1.5. Each example project does not have to be inclusive of all disciplines, but the combination of all example projects must demonstrate experience in each of the disciplines above. Submission of multiple examples will not be considered any more favorable than a single project submission. Example project shall be contractually complete (See Section L, Appendix C) and less than five (5) years old from the issue date of the RFP.
4. The Offeror has provided Total Case Incident Rate (TCIR) and Days Away, Restricted and/or Transferred (DART) rates, (See MACC IV Basic SOW 3.4.2) or, injury and illness rates are equal to or lower than the most recently published Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) national average for North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) 236220 – Commercial and Institutional Building Construction. The TCIR/DART rates provided on the OSHA form 300A must be for the last three (3) years from the date of submission.
5. The proposal includes a prequalification letter from an A.M. Best “A” rated surety (not a bonding agent) verifying the Offeror’s bonding relationship demonstrating the capability to obtain a minimum bond amount of $10 Million per project and $40 Million aggregate for (Basic MACC SOW Section 1.3.2.).

## Subfactor 4: Sample Task Order

The offeror’s response to Subfactor 4 is technically acceptable when it contains a detailed design narrative of their approach to address each of the following elements, and their response meets the specified, required information outlined for each element.

### Milestone Schedule

This element is technically acceptable when the milestone schedule provide details of project of project design and construction completion within 24 months for all the requirements IAW Sample Project SOW, Section 5.2.

### Safety/Accident Prevention Plan

This element is technically acceptable when the tailored Safety/Accident Prevention Plan meets the requirements outlined in the Sample Project SOW Section 5.4., and provides a letter stating that all contractor employees have been or will be provided hazardous material (e.g. asbestos, lead based paint, and fuels, etc.) identification training prior to being allowed to perform work on this project.

### Construction Quality Control (CQC) Plan

This element is technically acceptable when the tailored Quality Control Plan meets the requirements outlined in the Sample Project SOW Section 5.5.

### Demolition Plan

This element is technically acceptable when the demolition plan provides a detailed approach and schedule that meets all requirements identified in Sample Project Statement of Work (SOW) Section 2.1 and (Unified Facilities Guide Specifications) (UFGS) 02 41 00. The demolition plan includes any analysis and procedures necessary to assure the existing building structure is not compromised; and demolition plan includes how dust control for personnel and networking equipment will be accomplished. Demolition plan must include an approach to demolish large concrete door, rails, and foundation.

### Civil Plan

This element is technically acceptable when civil plan provides a detailed narrative approach on how the Contractor plans to repave the parking area to meet the requirements stated in Sample Project SOW Section 2.3.

### Architectural Plan

This element is technically acceptable when detailed Architectural Plan is submitted that conforms, coordinates with all disciplines, and meets all requirements IAW Sample Project SOW Section 2.2. The Architectural Plan must include a pdf concept drawing (30%). The concept drawings shall meet all current code requirements, including a code analysis that is to be provided by the Architect. The analysis shall contain information such as (but not limited to) the type of construction, occupancy classification(s), allowable area calculations, fire area, exiting (path of travel), fire sprinklers, occupant load, seismic design category, wind loads, design criteria, etc. Architectural plan shall be dimensioned and with a north arrow. The Offeror shall also provide an existing floor plan with elevations showing what is to be demolished. The offeror’s Architectural Plan shall also include a new floor plan, a reflected ceiling plan, a finish floor plan, restroom layout, office/break room layout, systems furniture layout, elevations, window/door schedule, and project specific details.

### Security Plan

This element is technically acceptable when the Security Plan provides a detailed narrative approach that meets all requirements specified in the Seed Project SOW Section 2.4. Additionally, a concept drawing is required to show placement of all Intrusion Detection System (IDS) and security related items as specified.

### Concrete Structural Design

This element is technically acceptable when concrete structural design meets all requirements identified in Seed Project SOW paragraph 2.1, which includes accurate footing and foundation structural calculations with detailed sketches prepared by a licensed Professional Structural Engineer that clearly illustrate reinforcing size, placement, dimensions, and pertinent foundation information along with details showing rail and closing mechanism for large door.

#### Concrete Door

This element is technically acceptable when Concrete door product data shows that it meets all requirements in Sample Project SOW 2.8 and 2.9.

### Concept Mechanical Drawing

This element is technically acceptable when Concept Mechanical Drawing includes proposed locations of mechanical equipment and duct runs serving each room in each zone. Concept Mechanical Drawing shall include rough equipment outlines with duct runs clearly represented. Concept Mechanical Demolition drawing shall show demolition of mechanical equipment as described in Sample Project SOW section 2.6. Minimum criteria for Concept Mechanical Demolition drawing is met when Concept Mechanical Demolition drawing shows demolition of all pieces of mechanical equipment outlined in Sample Project SOW Section 2.6.  Concept Mechanical Drawing shall also include heating and cooling load calculations. Concept Mechanical Drawing and Concept Mechanical Demolition drawings shall be completed IAW Sample Project SOW Section 2.

### Electrical Plan This element is technically acceptable when the Electrical Narrative provides a detailed description of how the electrical survey is to be conducted by a qualified electrician and what information will be documented with this investigation. In addition, the Electrical Plan shall provide a detailed description of how the Main Distribution System will be replaced and meet the requirements for electrical loads and equipment. A One Line Diagram shall be provided and include wire and conduit sizing between the Main Distribution Panel and the new panel boards for the various bays as shown in Seed Project SOW Appendix. All requirements of the Electrical Plan shall be IAW Sample Project SOW Section 2.7. Include the applicable Communication Narrative to address required communications cabling. Fire Protection

### Fire Protection Plan

This element is technically acceptable when a Basis of Design for Fire Protection prepared by a Qualified Fire Protection Engineer (QFPE) meets the requirements of this paragraph. In accordance with Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC) 3-600-01, the QFPE must be an individual who is a registered professional engineer (P.E.), has passed the fire protection engineering written examination administered by the National Council of Examiners for Engineering and Surveying (NCEES), and has relevant/applicable fire protection engineering experience with Fire Suppression and combination Mass Notification Fire Alarm Systems. The QFPE must be identified on the Basis of Design documents along with their state of licensure. The Basis of Design shall include all major subsystems required to meet UFC 1-200-01, UFC 3-600-1, UFC 4-021-01, all relevant/applicable National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) codes, and the HAFB Base Facility Design Standard. The Basis of Design must represent intended work of the contractor under this contract and not theoretical options outside of their proposed scope of work and associated costs. All requirements for Fire Protection shall be IAW Sample Project SOW Section 2.5 and Appendices.

# VOLUME III, FACTOR 3: PAST PERFORMANCE

The past performance assessment will assess the offeror’s/joint venture members’ ability (which includes, if applicable, the extent of its critical subcontractors’ involvement) to successfully accomplish the proposed effort based on the offeror’s demonstrated present and past work record. A critical subcontractor is defined as an entity (subcontractor and/or teaming contractor), other than the offeror itself, who are proposed to perform a significant portion of the effort (20% or more of the contract effort). The Government will evaluate the offeror’s/joint venture members’ and if applicable, the critical subcontractors’ demonstrated record of contract compliance in supplying products and services that meet users’ needs, including cost and schedule. The recency and relevancy of the information, the source of the information, context of the data and general trends in the contractor’s performance will be considered. For purposes of this evaluation, recency is defined as active or completed efforts performed within the past three (3) years from the issuance date of this solicitation.

The Past Performance Evaluation considers each offeror’s demonstrated recent and relevant record of performance in supplying construction services that meet the contract’s requirements. Any past performance records with an overall rating of Unsatisfactory or Marginal will result in an automatic rating of unacceptable for the Past Performance Factor and disqualification for award. In addition any information regarding Offeror’s current having one (1) or more current Cure Notices at the time of the RFP issue date will result in an automatic rating of unacceptable for the Past Performance Factor and disqualification for award.

In conducting the Past Performance Evaluation, the Government reserves the right to use both the information provided in the offeror’s past performance proposal volume and information obtained from other sources available to the Government, to include, but not limited to, the (PPIRS), (FAPIIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), or other databases; interviews with Program Managers, Contracting Officers (CO) and Fee Determining Officials; the (DCMA), and commercial sources.

# VOLUME IV – CONTRACT DOCUMENTATION

The Government will review the completeness and correctness of the offeror’s contract documentation submission as part of Volume IV. The offeror’s proposal shall include a signed copy of the Solicitation, Sections A through K, signed amendments to the solicitation (if any), and all other information required in Section L Instruction to Offerors. An incomplete package may exclude the offeror from competition.

# SOLICITATION REQUIREMENTS, TERMS AND CONDITIONS

Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as factors or subfactors. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the solicitation may result in the offeror being ineligible for award.

## Exceptions to Solicitation Requirements

Offerors must clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and must provide complete supporting rationale.