AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE	OF	PAGES
J	1		20

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NUMBER	3. EFFECTIVE DATE	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQUISITION NUMBER	5. PROJECT NUMBER *(If applicable)*
0001	08 Jul 2026	See Continuation Sheet	

6. ISSUED BY CODE N00189

NAVSUP FLT LOG CTR NORFOLK
ATTENTION CODE 301, 1968 GILBERT STREET SUITE 600
NORFOLK, VA 23511-3392
UNITED STATES
MARISSA VARELA, Email: marissa.d.varela.civ@us.navy.mil Telephone: 771-229-2997

7. ADMINISTERED BY *(If other than Item 6)* CODE

SCD: PAS:

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR *(Number, street, county, State and ZIP Code)*

CODE FACILITY CODE

(X)

☒ 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NUMBER N0018926RL022

9B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 11)* 14 Jun 2026

☐ 10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NUMBER

10B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 13)*

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

☒ The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers ☒ is extended. ☐ is not extended.

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing items 8 and 15, and returning 2 copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or electronic communication which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by letter or electronic communication, provided each letter or electronic communication makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA *(If required)*

See Continuation

13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NUMBER AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

CHECK ONE	
☐	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: *(Specify authority)* THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NUMBER IN ITEM 10A.
☐	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES *(such as changes in paying office, appropriation data, etc.)* SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).
☐	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
☐	D. OTHER *(Specify type of modification and authority)*

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor ☐ is not ☐ is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (*Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)*

Extended

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER *(Type or print)*		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER *(Type or print)*	
		Christopher Whiteside	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	16C. DATE SIGNED
(Signature of person authorized to sign)		*(Signature of Contracting Officer)*	08 Jul 2026

SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

Solicitation/Contract Form Continuation

The following changes have been made:

INFORMATION	FROM	TO
Response Due Date	13 Jul 2026	20 Jul 2026

Evaluation - Commercial Products and Commercial Services

Additional Information/Notes

The following clauses were modified:

52.212-2 Evaluation-Commercial Products and Commercial Services. (Deviation 2026-O0038) Feb 2026
hereby reads as follows:

INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES TO OFFERORS:

The Government intends to award a single Firm, Fixed-Price (FFP) task order as a result of this solicitation in accordance with FAR Part 16.5. Award will be made to that offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government under the selection criteria set forth in this solicitation. The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a task order based on initial proposals. Therefore, the offeror's initial proposal should contain the offeror's best terms from a Facilities Security Clearance, Technical, Past Performance, and Price standpoint.

The Government intends to award the task order without exchanges. The establishment of a competitive range is not anticipated. Accordingly, each Offeror should submit its most favorable terms from a Facilities Security Clearance, Technical, Past Performance, and Price standpoint. The Government reserves the right to award a FFP task order to other than the lowest priced offeror; award a FFP task order without exchanges; or award a FFP task order after exchanges, whichever is in the best interest of the Government.

Offerors are hereby instructed that, regardless of any language that may be used in this solicitation, the Government is NOT conducting this procurement under FAR Part 15. This procurement is being conducted under FAR Part 16.5.

QUESTIONS: Offerors may submit questions regarding clarification of solicitation requirements via email to Marissa Varela at marissa.d.varela.civ@us.navy.mil and Samantha Ballance at Samantha.a.ballance.civ@us.navy.mil. It is requested that all questions be received by **13 July 2026** by **1000 Eastern Time**, as time may not permit responses to questions received after that date to be prepared and issued prior to the receipt of proposals.

FOR SUBMISSIONS OF OFFERS:

(1) Proposals shall be submitted electronically no later than the due date of the solicitation via Marissa Varela at marissa.d.varela.civ@us.navy.mil and Samantha Ballance at Samantha.a.ballance.civ@us.navy.mil. Offerors shall comply with the detailed instructions for the format and content of the proposals contained herein; proposals that do not comply may be considered unacceptable and may render the proposal ineligible for award. All electronic files and versions of offerors' proposals shall be compatible with the current release of Adobe Acrobat and Microsoft Office Suite version 2016. The offeror shall be responsible for ensuring that their electronic proposals are virus free.

2) Offerors shall comply with all instructions for submitting proposals and attachments.

(3) Volume I - Facilities Security Clearance

This volume shall address the Facilities Security Clearance and include all information required for proposal evaluation. This volume of the proposal shall exclude any price information. Each page of each copy shall be affixed with the following legend**:**

Source Selection Information

See FAR 2.101 and FAR 3.104

(4) Volume II - Technical

This volume shall address the Technical factor and subfactors and include all information required for proposal evaluation. This volume of the proposal shall exclude any price information. Each page of each copy shall be affixed with the following legend**:**

Source Selection Information

See FAR 2.101 and FAR 3.104

(5) Volume III - Past Performance

This volume shall address the past performance factor and include all information required for proposal evaluation. This section shall exclude any reference to the price aspects of the proposal. Each page of each copy shall be affixed with the following legend:

Source Selection Information

See FAR 2.101 and 3.104

(6) Volume IV-Price Proposal

This volume shall include the completed solicitation documents and a complete and detailed price breakdown with all supporting information. Each page of each copy shall be affixed with the following legend:

Source Selection Information

See FAR 2.101 and 3.104

II. REQUIREMENTS FOR PROPOSAL CONTENT:

The proposal should contain the following items in addition to other information required by this solicitation.

The cover page should indicate the following:

- Title of the proposal
- Volume Number (I, II, III or IV)
- Proposal Category (Factor/Subfactor)
- Request for Proposal Number
- Name and Address of Offeror, CAGE Code, UEI number, and applicable Tax I.D. Number (TIN)
- Identification if original or a copy of the proposal
- Point of Contact name, telephone number, and email address
- Proposal valid for 180 days

Volumes:

- Volume I, Factor I-Facility Security Clearance
- Volume II, Factor II-Technical Approach
    - Subfactor I- Performance Approach
    - Subfactor II-Staffing and Management Approach
- Volume III, Factor III-Past Performance
- Volume IV, Factor IV-Price

Table of Contents: The table of contents should provide sufficient detail as to allow the important elements to be easily located.

1. Requirements for Style: Each offeror shall submit a proposal that clearly and concisely describes and defines the contractor's response to the requirements contained in the RFP. Unnecessary elaboration or other presentations beyond that sufficient to present a complete and effective proposal are not desired and may be construed as an indication of the offeror's lack of understanding of price consciousness. The proposal shall contain all the pertinent information in sufficient detail in the one area of the proposal where it contributes most critically to the discussion of the same information. When necessary, the offeror shall refer to the initial discussion and identify its location within the submitted proposal.

2. Proposal Page Limitations

The following page limitations are established:

Title	Proposal Quantities	Page Limit*

Volume I - Factor I: Facility Security Clearance	1 Electronic Submission	No Limit
Volume II - Factor II, Subfactor I: Performance Approach	1 Electronic Submission	20 Pages**
Volume II - Factor II, Subfactor II: Staffing and Management Approach	1 Electronic Submission	
Volume III - Factor III, Past Performance	1 Electronic Submission	12 Pages
Volume IV - Factor IV: Price	1 Electronic Submission	No Limit

* Page limits represent the maximum pages the Government will evaluate and are not construed as de facto standards for the amount of material expected in the proposal.

**The total of 20 Pages for Factor II is inclusive of Subfactors I-II.

All submission and attachments shall be in Microsoft Office Word or Excel. Submissions are page limited to the maximum number of pages as defined in the Proposal Page Limitation charts. These page limitations are inclusive of the executive summary and any charts, diagrams, and/or other graphics. Graphics (including tables) in the proposal may use an alternative font with 8-point size type or larger. Each "page" is defined as one sheet, 8 1/2" x 11", with at least one inch margins on all sides, using a font with a point size of 12 or greater (e.g., "Times New Roman" style with 12-point font). Lines shall, at a minimum, be selected as single-spaced in Microsoft Word with Microsoft Word Normal character spacing. Pages shall be consecutively numbered. Multiple pages, double pages, two-sided pages, or foldouts will count as an equivalent number of 8 1/2" x 11" pages. The offeror is permitted to submit no more than one page for each of the following, which will not be included in the page count: a cover sheet, list of tables, list of figures, compliance matrix, table of contents, acronyms, tabs, and dividers.

Pages submitted in excess of the page limitations described within will not be evaluated.

The Price proposal is not page limited; however, the Price proposal is to be strictly limited to price information and completed solicitation documents as described in the General Section at the beginning of this text.

3. Volume I - Factor I - Facilities Security Clearance

The offeror shall provide proof and verification that it possesses a current Secret facilities clearance at time of proposal submission as identified in PWS. The proof/verification shall be in the form of Defense Counterintelligence and Security Agency (DCSA) verification certifying it possesses a current **Secret** Facilities Clearance. The verification shall be dated no earlier than 30 days before the solicitation's closing date. The submission shall include the following:

- CAGE code
- Facility name
- Physical location/facility
- Clearance status/level
- Status date/Issue date
- Safeguarding level

- Authorized access to
- Facilities clearance level limitation(s)
- Facility security officer and phone number
- DSCA field office location and phone number

4. Volume II, Factor II - Technical Approach: Factor II will consist of two subfactors: Subfactor I, Staffing Approach, Subfactor II, Performance and Management Approach.

Factor II, Subfactor I - Staffing Approach

Offeror shall provide a performance approach that details how the offeror intends to meet the specific services and requirements identified in the PWS. Offerors shall demonstrate a thorough understanding of, as well as its ability to implement and execute the tasks/requirements specified within Section 4.0 of the PWS. The offeror shall describe any risks associated with the solicitation, including the PWS and any risks associated with implementation of the offeror's performance approach; describe any techniques and actions to mitigate such risks; and explain whether the technique and actions identified for risk mitigation have been successfully used by the offeror in the past.

NOTE: The above bullets provide guidance for what should be addressed in the approach and are not considered to be subfactors nor should this be considered an all-inclusive list.

Note: Offerors simply providing general statements or paraphrasing/parroting the PWS in whole or in any part shall result in a rating of unacceptable.

Factor II, Subfactor II - Performance and Management Approach

Offeror shall provide a staffing and management approach that details how the offeror intends to meet the specific services and requirements identified in the PWS. To establish to the Government that the offeror is capable of fully providing these services at the level of quality required, the offeror shall also provide a:

a. Plan that clearly describes the management controls, techniques, and procedures that will be used to ensure required work is performed in a timely, responsive, professional, and efficient manner and clearly details how this effort will be managed within the offeror's corporate organizational structure.

b. Detailed staffing approach for utilization of the offeror's personnel resources that demonstrates an understanding of the labor mix, skill sets, qualifications, certifications, background, expertise, needed to accomplish the tasks/requirements specified within Section 4.0 of the PWS and/or clearance requirements detailed in Section 10.0 of the PWS.

1. Methodology for identifying, recruiting, preparing, training, replacing, and retention of qualified personnel that demonstrates the offeror's plan to minimize staff turnover as well as ensuring personnel have the appropriate qualifications and security clearance. Provide historical attrition rates for the past three (3) years for similar work.
2. Approach to personnel performance monitoring, skill maintenance, and skill improvement.
3. The offeror should describe any risks associated with the solicitation, including the PWS and any risks associated with implementation of the offeror's management approach; describe any techniques and its actions to mitigate such risks; and explain whether the techniques and actions identified for risk mitigation have been successfully used by the offeror.

NOTE: The above bullets provide guidance for what should be addressed in the approach and are not considered to be subfactors nor should this be considered an all-inclusive list.

Note: Offerors simply providing general statements or paraphrasing/parroting the PWS in whole or in any part shall result in a rating of unacceptable.

5. Volume III, Factor III-Past Performance

To demonstrate its past performance, the offeror shall identify up to three (3) of its most relevant contracts performed within five (5) years of the solicitation issuance date. Those contracts must also reflect one year of completed performance by the closing date of the solicitation. Offerors shall provide a detailed explanation demonstrating the relevance of the contracts to the requirements of the solicitation.

For purposes of this solicitation, a contract is defined as a single contract or a single task order placed under an ID/IQ contract, a Blanket Purchase Agreement (BPA), or a Federal Supply Schedule. Offerors shall not submit the IDIQ contract, FSS contract, or BPA itself as a reference. Offerors may submit a combination of no more than three (3) delivery orders (DOs), task orders (TOs), technical direction letters (TDLs), and/or technical area tasks (TATs) placed under an ID/IQ or BPA as one of the three examples of past performance. Such a combination must also meet the requirements stated above: each individual example in the combination must have been performed within five (5) years of the solicitation issuance date and demonstrate at least one (1) year of completed performance by the closing date of the solicitation. If a combination of DOs, TOs, TDLs and or TATs are used as a past performance example, the offeror shall state the specific experience claimed, period of performance, and dollar value of each. A Past Performance example that does not provide the level of detail required may not be evaluated. No more than one combination of DOs, TOs, TDLs and or TATs is permitted in the past performance submittal. One (1) year of completed performance is defined as twelve (12) consecutive months of performance. References with less than twelve (12) consecutive months of service will not be considered.

If a proposed subcontractor's past performance is provided as part of the three (3) of its most relevant contracts or efforts, the percentage and type of work to be done by the subcontractor on the solicitation requirement must be stated. The offeror's submittal shall also detail clearly the aspects of the work in the solicitation that the subcontractor is proposed to perform. A Past Performance example which does not detail clearly the aspects of the work in the solicitation that the subcontractor is proposed to perform may not be evaluated.

If the prime offeror or intended subcontractor/partner submits a past performance example in which it served as a subcontractor, the prime/sub /partner shall detail clearly the work that it performed and the magnitude (dollar value) of that subcontracted work only. A Past Performance example that does not differentiate between the overall contract effort and the subcontractor effort may not be evaluated.

The past performance of subcontractors who will be performing major or critical aspects of the solicitation will be considered as highly as a prime contractor's past performance.

Failure of offerors to provide the required information and level of specificity may result in the contract reference not being evaluated.

With respect to joint ventures, the procuring activity will consider work done individually by each member of the joint venture as well as any work done by the joint venture itself previously. Joint venture references must meet the temporal requirements described in section L (within five years and must reflect at least one year of completed performance prior to the closing date of this solicitation). Additionally, if a joint venture member submits a past performance reference, the joint venture member shall detail clearly the work that it performed in that effort and the magnitude (dollar value) of that work. A reference that does not differentiate between the overall contract effort and the joint venture member's effort for that reference will may not be evaluated. The past performance of a joint venture member who will be performing major or critical aspects of the solicitation will be considered as highly as the joint venture's past performance.

The offeror shall complete a "Past Performance Information Form" for each reference submitted. The form is an attachment to the solicitation.

In addition to the information requested above, offerors shall contact their past performance references and request that each reference complete the Past Performance Report Form attached to the solicitation and e-mail the completed survey form directly to Marissa Varela at marissa.d.varela.civ@us.navy.mil and Samantha Ballance at samantha.a.ballance.civ@us.navy.mil by the closing date of the solicitation**.** The Government reserves the right to consider past performance report forms received after the due date of the solicitation and to contact references for verification or additional information.

6. Volume IV, Factor IV - Price

The Price Proposal shall include the completed solicitation documents. The price proposal shall include all elements of price and such other price information considered appropriate to support the proposal. This submittal shall include the following:

- RFP Section B "Schedule of Supplies/Services" completed by the offeror. For the purpose of preparing a price proposal, the offeror shall assume that the period of performance consists of a 12-month base period, four (4) 12-month option periods, and FAR clause 52.217-8, Option to Extend Services up to six months, as established in the Schedule.

- The price proposal shall include all supporting data to illustrate/explain the methodology on how labor prices were developed. This information shall include a breakdown of the labor categories, labor hours, and labor rates anticipated and shall be submitted in Microsoft Excel format.

- A completed and signed page 1 of the most current version of the solicitation;

- Unless completed in SAM, RFP Section, "Representation, Certification and Other Statements of Offerors" completed by the offeror in accordance with FAR 52.204-8, FAR 52.204-24, FAR 52.204-26 and DFARS 252.204-7007 Alt. A.

- All price and price supporting information shall be contained in the price submittal. No price or pricing information shall be included in any other volume including cover letters. Offerors are responsible for submitting sufficient information to enable the Government to fully evaluate their price proposal.

Evaluation-Commercial Products and Commercial Services (Feb 2026) (Deviation 2026-O0038)

(a) 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 will be used to evaluate offers:

[Insert evaluation factors in the relative order of importance. For requests for proposals, state: Evaluation factors other than price when combined are [significantly more important than price/approximately equal to price/significantly less important] than price. For invitations for bids, list only price and price-related factors.]

EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Government intends to award a single Firm, Fixed-Price (FFP) task order as a result of this solicitation in accordance with FAR Part 8, and FAR 19.108. Award will be made to that offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government under the selection criteria set forth in this solicitation. The evaluation will consist of Factor I: Facilities Security Clearance, Factor II: Technical Approach, Factor III: Past Performance, and Factor IV: Price. Offers receiving a rating of 'Unacceptable' for Factor I -Facilities Security Clearance are considered un-awardable and will not be further evaluated. Factor II - Technical Approach will consist of two subfactors: Subfactor I - Performance Approach and Subfactor II - Staffing and Management Approach, which are equal of importance. The evaluation of proposals will consider the Non-Price Proposal to be significantly more important than the Price Proposal. Within the Non-Price Proposal, Factor II - Technical is more important than Factor III - Past Performance.

Offerors simply providing general statements or paraphrasing/parroting the PWS in whole or in any part may result

in a rating of unacceptable. Offerors should be aware that a complete understanding as to technical, price, and all

terms and conditions of the proposed contract must exist between the offeror and the Government at the

conclusion of exchanges, if held. Material changes to proposals submitted in any final proposal revisions, if made,

may not be subject to further exchange and may render the offer unacceptable to the Government. All offeror and

team member/subcontractor information must be incorporated into one coherent proposal to be considered complete.

Although price is not the most important evaluation factor, it has the potential to become more significant during the evaluation process. The degree of importance of price will increase with the degree of equality of the proposals in relation to the other factors on which selection is to be based. The importance of price will also increase when an offeror's price is so significantly high as to diminish the value to the Government that might be gained under the other aspects of the offer. If, at any stage of the evaluation, all offerors are determined to have submitted equal, or virtually equal, proposals, price could become the factor in determining which offeror shall receive the award.

All proposals will be reviewed for timeliness. Timely proposals will also be reviewed for compliance to the solicitation. If the proposal is not compliant with the material terms of the solicitation, it may not be evaluated and the offeror will be notified that the proposal is non-responsive.

Non- Price Proposal Evaluation Criteria

-

Factor I: Facilities Security Clearance

Factor I will be evaluated during Phase I and the offeror will receive a rating of Acceptable/Unacceptable based on its submission of the verification of its **Secret** Facilities Clearance Level meeting the requirements as detailed in Section L. This will be evaluated utilizing the "Acceptable /Unacceptable" rating Table below. Offerors receiving an 'Acceptable' rating in Phase I will move on to Phase II. Offerors receiving an 'Unacceptable' rating will be considered un-awardable and will not be further evaluated.

Volume II - Factor II - Technical Approach

The purpose of the technical factor is to assess the offeror's proposed approach to satisfy the Government's requirements. The technical rating reflects the degree to which the proposed approach meets or does not meet the threshold performance or capability requirements. The risk associated with the offeror's technical approach will also be assessed. Risk, as it pertains to source selection, is the potential for unsuccessful contract performance. The consideration of risk assesses the degree to which an offeror's proposed approach to achieving the technical factor or sub-factor may involve risk of disruption of schedule, degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight, and the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance.

The technical/risk rating includes consideration of risk in conjunction with the significant strengths, strengths, deficiencies, uncertainties, weaknesses, and significant weaknesses in determining technical ratings. Combined technical/risk evaluations will utilize the combined technical/risk ratings listed in the Technical Ratings Table and the risk descriptions in the Risk Descriptions Tables below. The overall assigned technical factor and sub-factor ratings will be from Table 2.

Subfactor I - Performance Approach: The offeror's Performance Approach will be evaluated on its feasibility, comprehensiveness, and the degree to which the offeror demonstrates an understanding of, and capability to successfully accomplish, all requirements contained above in Section L for Sub-factor I to include, but not limited to, addressing tasks/requirements in Section 4.0 of the PWS.

Subfactor II - Staffing and Management Approach: The offeror's Staffing and Management Approach will be evaluated on its feasibility, comprehensiveness, and the degree to which the offeror demonstrates an understanding of, and capability to successfully accomplish, all requirements contained above in Section L for Sub-factor II, including but not limited to, addressing Section 4.0 of the PWS.

NOTE: A rating of "Marginal" for any Technical factor or subfactor means that the vendor's proposal is not awardable without a change or changes to the vendor's proposal. A proposal which includes a "Marginal" rating is not eligible for award if award is made on initial offers. Offerors that receive a "Marginal" rating are considered to be susceptible to correction if the Contracting Officer determines that an exchange is appropriate and said exchange is conducted; and as such, an offeror that receives a rating of "Marginal" in the technical factor or any sub-factor is not awardable and will not be further evaluated unless exchanges are conducted. Offerors receiving a rating of "Unacceptable" for any Technical factor or subfactor will not be considered for an award and will not be further evaluated.

Factor III - Past Performance

The past performance evaluation factor assesses the degree of confidence the Government has in an offeror's ability to meet the contract's requirements based on the quality of a demonstrated record of recent and relevant performance. There are three aspects to the past performance evaluation: recency, relevancy, and quality. These are combined to establish a single performance confidence assessment rating for each offeror.

Past Performance Recency: Recency is the first aspect of the past performance evaluation and is the time period during which past performance references are considered relevant. Recency is critical to establishing the relevancy of past performance information. For purposes of this solicitation, recent past performance is performance that has taken place within five (5) years of the issuance date of this solicitation. Evaluation will focus only on work experience already performed. Work yet-to-be performed, and work prior to the last five years, will not be considered. In addition, performance data will only be assessed for those references demonstrating at least one year of completed performance prior to the closing date of the solicitation within the past 5 years.

Past Performance Relevancy: Regarding relevancy, each past performance reference under each offeror's Past Performance submission will be evaluated to determine its scope, and magnitude relative to the instant requirement as detailed in table 4 below.

The following definitions will apply to this evaluation:

- Scope: Experience in the areas described in the PWS.

- Magnitude: The similarity of the dollar value of actually performed work that exists between the PWS and the offeror's referenced contracts during the stated five-year period established by the solicitation.

The relevancy rating assigned to each past performance reference will be considered in determining the weight to be given to that reference in the overall Past Performance Confidence Assessment. References determined to be "Not Relevant" will not be further considered. Similarly, the quality of performance under a past performance reference that has no relevance to the instant requirement will not be considered in the overall assessment of past performance confidence. In determining the rating for the past performance factor, past performance of greater relevancy will have more influence on the past performance confidence assessment than past performance of lesser relevance.

The aggregate of each offeror's past performance references in terms of scope and magnitude will result

in the assessed overall relevance of that offeror's past performance.

Past Performance Quality: The third aspect of the past performance evaluation is to establish the overall quality of

the offeror's past performance. The Government will review all past performance information collected and determine the quality of the offeror's performance, including general trends and usefulness of the information, and will incorporate this into the performance confidence assessment.

Past Performance Confidence Assessment: The overall assigned rating for past performance will be the Past

Performance Confidence Assessment rating, defined in table 5 below. The assignment of this rating will be based on the overall quality of the recent and relevant past performance and will also consider the source of the information, the context of the data, and general trends in the offeror's performance. The quality of performance under a past performance reference that has no relevance to the instant requirement will not be considered in the overall assessment of past performance confidence. Evaluation will focus only on work already performed. Work yet-to-be performed by the solicitation closing date will not be considered.

If the offeror's aggregated past performance is determined to be not relevant as defined in the solicitation, then the

quality of the offeror's past performance will not be evaluated through a confidence assessment and the past

performance factor will be rated as "Neutral Confidence." If an offeror's aggregate past performance is determined

to be relevant, then each past performance reference under the offeror's past performance submission that

contributed to the determination of aggregate relevance (i.e., each reference that is rated at least somewhat relevant)

will be evaluated to determine the quality of the offeror's performance under that reference. The quality of

performance on contract references that are rated Not Relevant is not evaluated even when the overall past

performance is found to be relevant.

In the case of offerors for which there is no information on past contract performance or where past contract

performance information is not available, the offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on the past

performance factor. In this case, the offeror's past performance is unknown and assigned a performance confidence

rating of "Neutral Confidence." Although an offeror that lacks recent, relevant past performance may not be rated

favorably or unfavorably with regard to past performance, the Government may determine that a "Substantial Confidence" or "Satisfactory Confidence" past performance rating provides better value to the Government than a

"Neutral Confidence" past performance rating.

In order to evaluate Past Performance, the Government may also utilize existing data sources, including the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), the Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), or other databases; communication with points of contact in the offeror's customer's organization, which could include private sector requirements and contracts personnel, Administrative Contracting Officers, Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) personnel, Procuring Contracting Officers, Contracting Officer's Representatives, and other Government activity requirements personnel. The Government may verify past performance information. The Government may contact some or all of the references provided, as appropriate, and may collect information through questionnaires, telephone interviews, and existing data sources. The Government reserves the right to obtain information for use in the evaluation of past performance from any and all sources, including sources outside of the Government. This information will be used for the evaluation of past performance.

This evaluation and rating is separate and distinct from the Contracting Officer's responsibility determination. The assessment of the offeror's past performance will be used as a means of evaluating the relative capability of the offeror and other competitors to successfully meet the requirements of the RFP. In determining the rating for the past performance evaluation sub-factor, the Government will give greater consideration to the contracts which the Government assess as most relevant to the RFP.

NOTE: A rating of "Limited Confidence" for the past performance factor means that the offeror's proposal is not

awardable without a change or changes to the offeror's proposal. A proposal that includes a "Limited Confidence"

rating is considered to be susceptible to correction if the contracting officer determines that discussions (pursuant to FAR 15.306) is appropriate and said exchange is conducted. A rating of "No Confidence" for the past performance factor means that the offeror's proposal is not awardable, is not susceptible to correction, and will not be further evaluated.

Volume IV, Factor IV - Price

Price Proposals will be evaluated based on price reasonableness in accordance with FAR 15.404-1(b), Price Analysis. The Government may evaluate any and all information submitted by the offeror to support the reasonableness of the prices proposed. The method of evaluation used by the contracting officer is solely within the discretion of the contracting officer.

Although price is not the most important evaluation factor, it has the potential to become more significant during the evaluation process. The degree of importance of price will increase with the degree of equality of the proposals in relation to the other factors on which selection is to be based. The importance of price will also increase when a proposals price is so significantly high as to diminish the value to the Government that might be gained under the other aspects of the proposal. If, at any stage of the evaluation, all offerors are determined to have submitted equal, or virtually equal, non-price proposals, price could become the factor in determining which offeror will receive the award.

Evaluation of Options

The options at FAR clauses 52.217-8 and 52.217-9 will be evaluated pursuant to solicitation provision FAR 52.217-5, Evaluation of Options. The Government will evaluate proposals for award purposes by adding the total price for the option to the total price for the basic requirement. The Government may determine that a proposal is unacceptable if the option price is significantly unbalanced. Evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

Written Notice

A written notice of award or acceptance of an offer e-mailed or otherwise furnished to the successful offeror within

the time for acceptance specified in the offer, shall result in a binding task order 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.

5. Ratings Tables

TABLE 1: FACILITIES SECURITY CLEARANCE RATING TABLE

Rating	**Description**
Acceptable	Proposal meets the minimum requirements of the solicitation.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet the minimum requirements of the solicitation.

-

TABLE 2: TECHNICAL APPROACH - COMBINED TECHNICAL/RISK RATING TABLE

-

Rating	**Description**
Outstanding	Proposal demonstrates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths and/or at least one significant strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength or significant strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low to moderate.
Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation and, thus, contains one or more deficiencies and is unawardable, and/or risk of performance is unacceptably high.

-

TABLE 3: TECHNICAL RISK DEFINITIONS TABLE

Type of	**Description**

Risk	
Low	Proposal may contain weakness/weaknesses which have low potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation of performance. Normal contractor emphasis and normal Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.
Moderate	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which may have a moderate potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.
High	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which is likely to have high potential to cause significant disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will unlikely be able to overcome any difficulties.
Unacceptable	Proposal contains a deficiency or a combination of significant weaknesses that causes an unacceptable level of risk of unsuccessful performance.

DEFINITIONS:

Strength - an aspect of an offeror's proposal with merit or will exceed specified performance or capability requirements to the advantage of the Government during contract performance.

Significant Strength - an aspect of an Offeror's proposal with appreciable merit or will exceed specified performance or capability requirements to the considerable advantage of the Government during contract performance.

Weakness - a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Significant Weakness - a flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Deficiency - 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.

Risk - (as it pertains to source selection) The potential for unsuccessful contract performance. The consideration of risk assesses the degree to which an offeror's proposed approach to achieving the technical factor or sub-factor may involve risk of disruption of schedule, degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight, and the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance.

Uncertainty - aspect of a non-cost/price factor proposal for which the intent of the offer is unclear (e.g., more than one way to interpret the offer or inconsistencies in the proposal indicating that there may have been an error, omission, or mistake)

TABLE 4: PAST PERFORMANCE RELEVANCY RATING METHOD

Rating	**Description**
Very Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort this solicitation requires.
Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort this solicitation requires.
Somewhat Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort this solicitation requires.
Not Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort this solicitation requires.

TABLE 5: PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENTS RATING METHOD

Rating	Description
Substantial Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Satisfactory Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Neutral Confidence	No recent/relevant performance record is available or the offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned. The offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on the factor of past performance.
Limited Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
No Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

(b) *Options (if applicable)*. 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. The evaluation of options does not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

(c) *Notice of award*. A written notice of award or acceptance of an offer 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.

(End of provision)