ATTACHMENT 2 – EVALUATION CRITERIA

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

The Government will award this Contract using Lowest Priced Technically Acceptable Offer (LPTA) process. A single award will be made to that responsible Offeror whose total evaluated price of this Solicitation is the lowest and whose proposal meets or exceeds all technical and past performance evaluation criteria (non-cost factors). It is the intent of the Government to make an award based on the initial proposal without discussions.

TECHNICAL EVALUATION FACTORS

The following technical factors and evaluation criteria shall be used to determine technical acceptance:

(1) **FACTOR 1: EQUIPMENT MEETS MINIMUM TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION**
EVALUATION CRITERIA:
Offeror's proposal provides adequate documentation clearly demonstrating Offeror is proposing all new equipment (including hardware, accessories, wiring, components, furnishing, etc.) that meets or exceeds the specifications, features, standards, and applicable code compliance as defined in the Performance Work Statement.

(2) **FACTOR 2: EMPLOYEE QUALIFICATIONS WITH OEM CERTIFIED SUPERVISION**
EVALUATION CRITERIA: Offeror's proposal provides adequate documentation clearly demonstrating that proposed employees are qualified to perform their required the tasks under this solicitation and that at least one (1) employee proposed is OEM "Certified" to supervise the work performed.

(3) **FACTOR 3: TECHNICAL SUPPORT**
EVALUATION CRITERIA: Offerors proposal provides 24x7x365 support. As necessitated, support shall be provided on-site, via telephone or on-line, and shall be provided in Spanish. The support period begins upon final acceptance of the system and shall be in force for one (1) year thereafter. Maintenance and support is in accordance with the Statement of Work.

(4) **FACTOR 4: WARRANTY**
EVALUATION CRITERIA: Offeror's proposal provides an on-site warranty for at least one (1) year for all components delivered under this project. The on-site warranty period shall commence immediately upon written COR acceptance of the completed system and shall continue for at least one (1) year thereafter. The warranty shall cover all hardware, software, parts, and labor in accordance with the Statement of Work.

(5) **FACTOR 6: PROJECT SCHEDULE**
EVALUATION CRITERIA: Offeror's proposal adequately demonstrates that the delivery, installation, configuration, fine-tuning, testing and familiarization training for all systems shall be completed no later than 120 calendar days after award.

TECHNICAL RATING

The following technical ratings will be assigned to each technical proposal:

Rating Description

Acceptable: Proposal clearly **meets** the minimum requirements of the solicitation.

Unacceptable: Proposal **does not** clearly **meet** the minimum requirements of the solicitation.

PAST PERFORMANCE

(a) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's demonstrated recent and relevant record of past performance as well as the level of customer satisfaction and compliance with contract requirements in the areas of quality of product/service, adherence to contract schedule, cost control; history of reasonable and cooperative behavior and commitment to providing quality products/services. Under this LPTA solicitation process, the comparative assessment in FAR 15.305(a)(2)(i) does not apply. **Therefore, past performance will be rated on an "acceptable" or "unacceptable" basis.**

(b) 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. 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 Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), or other databases; interviews with Program Managers, Contracting Officers and Fee Determining Officials; the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA), and commercial sources.

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 so sparse that no meaningful past performance rating can be reasonably assigned, the offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance. Therefore, the offeror shall be determined to have unknown past performance and will berated as "Unknown Confidence (Neutral)".

(c) In determining the rating for the past performance evaluation factor, the Government will give greater consideration to the contracts which the Government feels are most relevant to the Government's requirement. There are two aspects to the past performance evaluation. The first is to determine how relevant a recent effort accomplished by the offeror is to the effort to be acquired under this solicitation. The second aspect of past performance evaluation is to determine how well the offeror performed on the contracts.

(1) Recency Assessment: An assessment of the past performance information will be made to determine if it is recent. To be recent, the effort must be ongoing or must have been performed

during the past 5 years from the date of issuance of this solicitation. Past performance information that fails this condition will not be evaluated.

(2) Relevancy Assessment: The Government will conduct an evaluation of all recent performance information obtained to determine how closely the products provided/services performed under those contracts relate to the requirements of this solicitation. Consideration will be given to similarity of services. The Government will use the following relevancy definitions when assessing past performance:

PAST PERFORMANCE RELEVANCY CONSIDERATIONS

Rating Definition

Very Relevant: Present/past performance effort involved comparable scope and magnitude of effort and complexities as 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 effort involved some of the 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.

PRICE EVALUATION

(a) The Government will evaluate price for award purposes by adding the total price for proposed cost as proposed in the Offerors Cost/Price Proposal.