

The technical proposal shall include submittals for each technical factor as specified below:

FACTOR 1 - CORPORATE EXPERIENCE

The Offeror shall submit the following information:

Submit a minimum of one (1) and a maximum of three (3) projects that are similar in size, scope, and complexity to the work requirements specified in the RFP.

Projects submitted for the Offeror shall be current or completed within the past five (5) years of the date of issuance of this RFP.

The attached Corporate Experience Form (Attachment A) is MANDATORY and SHALL be used to submit project information. Except as specifically requested, the Government will not consider information submitted in addition to this form. Individual blocks on this form may be expanded; however, total length for each project data sheet shall not exceed one (1) double-sided page (or two (2) single-sided pages).

For all submitted projects, the description of the project shall clearly describe the scope of work performed and the relevancy to the project requirements of this RFP as described above.

If the Offeror is a Joint Venture (JV), relevant project experience should be submitted for projects completed by the Joint Venture entity. If the Joint Venture does not have shared experience, projects shall be submitted for each Joint Venture partner. Offerors are still limited to a total of three (3) projects combined.

If an Offeror is utilizing experience information of affiliates/subsidiaries/parent/LLC/LTD member companies (name is not exactly as stated on the SF33), the proposal shall clearly demonstrate that the affiliate/subsidiary/parent firm will have meaningful involvement in the performance of the contract.

The assessment of the Offeror's relevant experience will be used as a means of evaluating the capability of the Offeror to successfully meet the requirements of the RFP. The prime contractor will not be found acceptable on the basis of the subcontractor's experience only.

(ii) Basis of Evaluation:

The basis of evaluation will include the Offeror's demonstrated experience and depth of experience in performing relevant projects as defined in the solicitation submittal requirements. The assessment of the Offeror's relevant experience will be used as a means of evaluating the capability of the Offeror to successfully meet the requirements of the RFP. The Government will only review three projects. Any projects submitted in excess of the three (3) for Experience will not be considered.

FACTOR 2 - SAFETY

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

The Offeror shall submit the following information: (For a partnership or joint venture, the following submittal requirements are required for each Contractor who is part of the partnership or joint venture;

however, only one safety narrative is required. EMR and DART Rates shall not be submitted for subcontractors.)

(1) Experience Modification Rate (EMR):

For the three (3) previous complete calendar years (2013, 2014 and 2015), submit your EMR (which compares your company's annual losses in insurance claims against its policy premiums over a three (3) year period). If you have no EMR, affirmatively state so and explain why. Any extenuating circumstances that affected the EMR and upward or downward trends should be addressed as part of this element. Lower EMRs will be given greater weight in the evaluation.

(2) OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) Rate:

For the three (3) previous complete calendar years (2013, 2014 and 2015), submit your OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) Rate, as defined by the U.S. Department of Labor, Occupational Safety and Health Administration. If you cannot submit an OSHA DART Rate, affirmatively state so, and explain why. Any extenuating circumstances that affected the OSHA DART Rate data and upward or downward trends should be addressed as part of this element. Lower OSHA DART Rates will be given greater weight in the evaluation.

(3) Technical Approach for Safety:

Describe the plan that the Offeror will implement to evaluate safety performance of potential subcontractors, as a part of the selection process for all levels of subcontractors. Also, describe any innovative methods that the Offeror will employ to ensure and monitor safe work practices at all subcontractor levels. The Safety narrative shall be limited to two pages.

(ii) Basis of Evaluation:

The Government is seeking to determine that the Offeror has consistently demonstrated a commitment to safety and that the Offeror plans to properly manage and implement safety procedures for itself and its subcontractors. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's overall safety record, the Offeror's plan to select and monitor subcontractors, any and innovative safety methods that the Offeror plans to implement for this procurement. The Government's sources of information for evaluating safety may include, but are not limited to, OSHA, NAVFAC's Enterprise Safety Applications Management System (ESAMS), and other related databases. While the Government may elect to consider data from other sources, the burden of providing detailed, current, accurate and complete safety information regarding these submittal requirements rests with the Offeror. The evaluation will collectively consider the following:

- Experience Modification Rate (EMR)
- OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) Rate
- Offeror Technical Approach to Safety
- Other sources of information available to the Government

(1) Experience Modification Rate (EMR):

The Government will evaluate the EMR to determine if the Offeror has demonstrated a history of safe work practices taking into account any upward or downward trends and extenuating circumstances that impact the rating. Lower EMRs will be given greater weight in the evaluation.

(2) OSHA Days Away from Work, Restricted Duty, or Job Transfer (DART) Rate:

The Government will evaluate the OSHA DART Rate to determine if the Offeror has demonstrated a history of safe work practices taking into account any upward or downward trends and extenuating circumstances that impact the rates. Lower OSHA DART Rates will be given greater weight in the evaluation.

(3) Technical Approach to Safety:

The Government will evaluate the narrative to determine the degree to which subcontractor safety performance will be considered in the selection of all levels of subcontractors on the upcoming project. The Government will also evaluate the narrative to determine the degree to which innovations are being proposed that may enhance safety on this procurement. Those Offerors whose plan demonstrates a commitment to hire subcontractors with a culture of safety and who propose innovative methods to enhance a safe working environment may be given greater weight in the evaluation.

FACTOR 3 – TECHNICAL APPROACH

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

The Offeror shall submit a narrative response that clearly demonstrates its understanding of and approach to accomplishing the complexity and magnitude of service requirements set forth in the performance objectives and standards of the Performance Work Statement. Each of the four topics below must be included in the narrative and tabbed in the technical proposal and discussed separately.

- (a) Provide evidence of training / training programs in place that ensure mechanics servicing our equipment are fully capable of working on a wide range of boiler makes and models. Discuss your plan to ensure personnel have the necessary training and certification to accomplish the specialty work requirements specified in this Sub-Annex. Explain how you will ensure this training and certification is maintained current.
- (b) Some of our boilers have limited part availability on local supplier shelves. Please demonstrate your ability to acquire repair parts through local vendors, stocking high-rate failure parts, overnight shipping, etc. to minimize equipment downtime.
- (c) Provide a brief work flow process for requesting service work for boilers on the Integrated Maintenance Program (IMP) that have malfunctioned and an example of how you will track the service requests; ie, how will we contact you, what will you require from us to initiate service work, etc.
- (d) Explain how your (IMP) incorporates an optimized approach to maximize useful life of equipment while still being economical (i.e., not gold-plated).

(ii) Basis of Evaluation:

The Technical Approach/Management factor shall be evaluated based upon the following criteria:

- (a) The proposal demonstrates an acceptable understanding of the performance objectives and standards.
- (b) The proposal provides a feasible technical approach with the capability to, at least, meet solicitation performance objectives and standards.
- (c) The proposal offers a low to moderate performance risk to the Government.

FACTOR 4 – PAST PERFORMANCE

(i) Solicitation Submittal Requirements:

IF A COMPLETED CPARS EVALUATION IS AVAILABLE, IT SHALL BE SUBMITTED WITH THE PROPOSAL. IF THERE IS NOT A COMPLETED CPARS EVALUATION, the Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) included in the solicitation is provided for the offeror or its team members to submit to the client for each project the offeror includes in its proposal for Factor 1, Experience. AN OFFEROR SHALL NOT SUBMIT A PPQ WHEN A COMPLETED CPARS IS AVAILABLE.

IF A CPARS EVALUATION IS NOT AVAILABLE, ensure correct phone numbers and email addresses are provided for the client point of contact. Completed PPQs should be submitted with your proposal. If the offeror is unable to obtain a completed PPQ from a client for a project(s) before proposal closing date, the offeror should complete and submit with the proposal the first page of the PPQ (Attachment B), which will provide contract and client information for the respective project(s). Offerors should follow-up with clients/references to ensure timely submittal of questionnaires. If the client requests, questionnaires may be submitted directly to the Government's point of contact, Kaitlyn Cumber at Kaitlyn.cumber@navy.mil prior to proposal closing date. Offerors shall not incorporate by reference into their proposal PPQs or CPARS previously submitted for other RFPs. However, this does not preclude the Government from utilizing previously submitted PPQ information in the past performance evaluation.

Also include performance recognition documents received within the last (*insert the number of years*) such as awards, award fee determinations, customer letters of commendation, and any other forms of performance recognition.

In addition to the above, the Government may review any other sources of information for evaluating past performance. Other sources may include, but are not limited to, past performance information retrieved through the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) using all CAGE/DUNS numbers of team members (partnership, joint venture, teaming arrangement, or parent company/subsidiary/affiliate) identified in the offeror's proposal, inquiries of owner representative(s), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), and any other known sources not provided by the offeror.

While the Government may elect to consider data from other sources, the burden of providing detailed, current, accurate and complete past performance information rests with the Offeror."

(ii) Basis of Evaluation:

The degree to which past performance evaluations and all other past performance information reviewed by the Government (e.g., PPIRS, Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information

System (FAPIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), performance recognition documents, and information obtained from any other source) reflect a trend of satisfactory performance considering:

- A pattern of successful completion of tasks;
- A pattern of deliverables that are timely and of good quality;
- A pattern of cooperativeness and teamwork with the Government at all levels (task managers, contracting officers, auditors, etc.);
- Recency of tasks performed that are identical to, similar to, or related to the task at hand; and
- A respect for stewardship of Government funds

***** End of Combined Synopsis/Solicitation *****