

## Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Coastal Plain Oil and Gas Leasing Program

**BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD:** Awards will be made to offerors whose proposals, responsive and conforming to the RFQ, are determined to be most advantageous to the Government in terms of Technical, Price and other factors considered.

This is a **competitive best value source selection** in which competing offerors' past performance history will be evaluated on a basis *significantly more important than* cost or price considerations. By submission of its offer, the offeror accedes to all solicitation requirements, including terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as evaluation factors or subfactors. All technically acceptable offers shall be treated equally except for their prices and performance records. Failure to meet a requirement may result in an offer being determined technically unacceptable. Offerors must clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and provide complete accompanying rationale. The evaluation process shall proceed as follows:

- A. **Technical Acceptability.** Initially, the government technical evaluation team shall evaluate the technical proposals on a pass/fail basis, assigning ratings of Acceptable, Reasonably Susceptible of Being Made Acceptable, or Unacceptable. The proposals shall be evaluated against the following subfactors:
  - a. **System Block Diagram and System Description:** System block diagram will be evaluated for completeness in conveying system configuration, including as a minimum MCR equipment, CCU, CCC, operators console, MCR console, FIDs, MUXs, and DTCs.
  - b. **Equipment Description:** Manufacturer's data sheets will be evaluated for each of the items shown on the block diagram and identified in the system description.
- B. **Price Evaluation.** Next, the government shall rank all technically Acceptable and Reasonably Susceptible of Being Made Acceptable offers by price, including option prices.
- C. **Performance Confidence Assessment.** Using CPARS and past performance submitted by the vendor, the contracting officer shall seek relevant performance information on based on (1) the past and present efforts provided by the offeror and (2) data independently obtained from other Government and commercial sources.
  - a. The following weighting apply to relevancy considering all the elements listed above;
    - i. VERY RELEVANT - Past/present performance efforts involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires;
    - ii. RELEVANT - Past/present performance efforts involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires;
    - iii. SOMEWHAT RELEVANT - Past/present performance efforts involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities, this solicitation requires;
    - iv. NOT RELEVANT - Past/present performance efforts involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities, this solicitation requires.
- D. In accordance with FAR 15.306(a)(2), if award will be made without conducting discussions, offerors may be given the opportunity to clarify certain aspects of their proposals, e.g., the relevance of an offeror's

**Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Coastal Plain Oil and Gas Leasing Program**

Past Performance information and adverse Past Performance information to which the offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond, or to resolve minor clerical errors.

- E. Performance Confidence Assessment: In conducting a performance confidence assessment, each offeror shall be assigned one of the ratings as it applies to performance confidence assessment.
  - a. 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.
  - b. 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.
  - c. 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.
  - d. 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.
  - e. UNKNOWN CONFIDENCE (NEUTRAL) - 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.
- F. In evaluating past performance, the Government reserves the right to give greater consideration to information on those contracts deemed most relevant to the effort described in this RFP.
- G. If the lowest priced evaluated technically acceptable offer is judged to have a High Confidence performance confidence assessment, that offer represents the best value for the government and the evaluation process stops at this point. Award shall be made to that offeror without further consideration of any other offers.
- H. If the lowest priced offeror is not judged to have a High Confidence performance confidence assessment, the next lowest priced offeror will be evaluated and the process will continue (in order by price) until an offeror is judged to have a High Confidence performance assessment or until all offerors are evaluated. The Source Selection Authority shall then make an integrated assessment best value award decision.
- I. Offerors are cautioned to submit sufficient information and in the format specified in Section L. Offeror's may be asked to clarify certain aspects of their proposal (*for example*, the relevance of past performance information) or respond to adverse past performance information to which the offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond. Adverse past performance is defined as past performance information that supports a less than satisfactory rating on any evaluation element or any unfavorable comments received from sources without a formal rating system. Communication conducted to resolve minor or clerical errors would not constitute discussions and the contracting officer reserves the right to award a contract without the opportunity for proposal revision.
- J. The government intends to award a contract without discussions with respective offerors. The government, however, reserves the right to conduct discussions if deemed in its best interest.