MACHINED PARTS
MARKET BASKET
SOLICITATION SP0412-04-R-4229
100% SMALL BUSINESS SET-ASIDE

PART 2 OF 2
CONSISTING OF:
1. SOLICITATION PACKAGE, PAGES 22-24

shipments destined for stock locations (DSCR Form P41 reference for freight shipments).
Section 4: Procurement Automated Contract Evaluation (PACE) Instructions
Section 5: Full text of Contract Data Requirements List (CDRLs)
Section 6: Special Packaging Instruction (SPIs) Drawings
Section 7: Full text of Individual Repair Parts Ordering Data (IRPODs)

DLA site with links to all of the above — http://www.procregs.hq.dla.mil/icps.htm

DSCR NOTE: Where only a portion of text is included in the solicitation document in order to provide or collect fill-in data or to append a DSCR note to a FAR/DFARS provision, the text as included in the solicitation is not intended to be represented as the full text of the provision.

L83 52.252-5 AUTHORIZED DEVIATIONS IN PROVISIONS (APR 1984)

(a) The use in this solicitation of any Federal Acquisition Regulation (48 CFR Chapter 1) provision with an Authorized deviation is indicated by the addition of '(Deviation)' after the date of the provision.

(b) The use in this solicitation of any Defense FAR Supplement (48 CFR chapter 2) provision with an authorized deviation is indicated by the addition of '(Deviation)' after the name of the regulation.

SECTION M

M2 252.208-7000 INTENT TO FURNISH PRECIOUS METALS AS GOVERNMENT-FURNISHED MATERIAL DFARS (DEC 1991)

(b) The Offeror shall cite the type (silver, gold, platinum, palladium, iridium, rhodium and ruthenium) and quantity in whole troy ounces of precious metals required in the performance of this contract (including precious metals required for any first article or production sample), and shall specify the national stock number (NSN) and nomenclature, if known, of the deliverable item requiring precious metals.

Precious Metal*	Quantity	Deliverable Item (NSN and Nomenclature)

* If platinum or palladium, specify whether sponge or granules are required.

(c) Offerors shall submit two prices for each deliverable item which contains precious metals--one based on the Government furnishing precious metals, and one based on the Contractor furnishing precious metals.

M5 52.213-9001 EVALUATION FACTOR FOR SOURCE INSPECTION DLAD (MAY 1999)

M8 52.214-9002 TRADE DISCOUNTS DLAD (JUN 1983)

M10F 52.215-9G05 AUTOMATED BEST VALUE SYSTEM DSCR (JUL 2002)

(a) The Automated Best Value System (ABVS) Score as an Element of Past Performance Evaluation.

(1) ABVS scores do not determine eligibility for award or technical acceptability. The Government shall use ABVS scores to compare past performance among offerors, not to make determinations of responsibility.

(2) To evaluate each offeror's past performance, DLA will assign an ABVS score to each offeror based on the offeror's past performance. ABVS scores for performance in each Federal Supply Class (FSC score) will be based on DLA consolidated performance history. An offeror may have multiple FSC scores but will have only one DLA score, which is a compilation of the offeror's FSC scores for all business conducted with DLA. These scores will be calculated monthly and remain in effect for a month. The ABVS score is a combination of an offeror's delivery and quality scores. The quality score reflects validated contractor caused product and packaging nonconformances during the rating period. For administrative purposes, the rating period excludes the most recent 30 days. The delivery score reflects all lines shown as delinquent during the rating period. For administrative purposes, the rating period excludes the most recent 60 days. For ABVS purposes, delinquent lines represent shipments not shipped and/or received in their entirety by the contract delivery date. The 30 and 60 day offset periods are NOT grace periods.

(3) Business Systems Modernization.

(i) The Defense Logistics Agency is developing and installing a new suite of commercial business software we call Business Systems Modernization (BSM). BSM will replace the old material management systems with the best of today's business applications. The first phase of BSM that will affect both DLA and our business partners is called the Concept Demonstration. This Concept Demonstration will use actual BSM software, real time data and actual transactions such as solicitations and awards. But because of the new software being tested, certain processes will change during the test and one of the most important is the change in ABVS. The collection of past performance information for certain NSNs in ABVS has been changed by the new software and will be affected by this Concept Demonstration beginning in August 2002.

(ii) Beginning in August 2002, ABVS will not collect performance information on NSNs that are included in this BSM test. The performance data for quality and delivery performance from new contract awards for these NSNs will not be used in the calculation of FSC scores. The contract line items will also not be included in the total number of contract line items on which the FSC score is based. Subsequently, the DLA score, which is a compilation of the FSC scores, will not include performance data from new awards on these NSNs. For NSNs, which are not in the BSM test, ABVS will continue to work as it does today.

(iii) In order to determine if a NSN or FSC is included in this BSM test, go to the BSM Supplier Information Resource Center, http://www.dla.mil/j-6/bsm/SIRC/SIRC.htm. **Awards not included in the ABVS performance data will be identified by contract numbers beginning with SPMXXX or SPEXXX in lieu of SP0XXX (this does not apply to orders issued against non-DLA Basic Ordering Agreements or contracts).**

(iv) This change also means that your ABVS score in BSM will be your DLA score only; the FSC score will not be visible. This initial release will provide an opportunity for DLA, our customers, and our suppliers to use the new technology and processes to improve our supply chain effectiveness. Further information is found at the BSM Vendor Information Center at http://131.70.202.70/j%2D6/bsm/test/vic.htm.

(4) DSCR will make negative quality and delivery data reflected in the ABVS score available to offerors by the 15th day of the month via the ABVS Website. The offeror's negative performance data will be posted before it is reflected in the ABVS score (Preview Period), to give offerors an opportunity to review and verify data. An offeror must challenge any negative data within the Preview Period to assure corrections are posted before calculation of the score. Offerors must submit challenges and substantiating evidence (e.g. invoices, DD Form 250s, modifications) to the ABVS Administrator. The 'Center' field will identify the appropriate focal point. For those identified as 'DSCR,' send challenges to:

Defense Supply Center Richmond
Attn: DSCR-OZP (ABVS)
8000 Jefferson-Davis Highway
Richmond, VA 23297-5516

Telephone (804) 279-6881

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

FAX (804) 279-5042

(5) Though offerors may challenge negative data at any time, it is to the offeror's advantage to challenge negative data during the Preview Period before it has an opportunity to be reflected in the ABVS score. Accordingly, an offeror should review performance data on a monthly basis at a minimum. When a challenge is received, the ABVS score will be flagged. The flag will remain until the challenge is resolved. If an offer under evaluation involves a challenged score, then the Contracting Officer will consider the nature of the challenged data and its relevance to the acquisition as part of the award decision. The ABVS Administrator will adjust the ABVS score if the Administrator upholds an offeror's challenge. Scores created in the update cycle immediately following the determination will reflect the adjustment.

(6) When there is a discrepancy between the offeror's challenged data and the Government's data, it becomes disputed data. The Government will make every effort to resolve the discrepancy expeditiously. However, the Government is the final authority for resolution of disputed data and its use in the source selection process, and may make an award decision despite the existence of an unresolved challenge.

(b) Using the ABVS score for evaluation.

(1) The contracting officer will first evaluate offers using the FSC score for the solicited FSC in effect at the time offers are evaluated. The contracting officer will use an offeror's DLA score to evaluate an offeror without an FSC score for that particular FSC. The contracting officer may consider the volume of business on which the FSC score is based as a measure of confidence in the score's indication of performance risk. The contracting officer may choose to use the DLA score if he or she lacks confidence in the FSC score. The contracting officer also may use the DLA score if the FSC scores among offerors are relatively equal. An offeror with no performance history will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably and will be assigned a '999.9' in the ABVS. A '999.9' is used to designate those instances wherein the offeror has no past performance history, has no history for the particular FSC or has no history for the timeframe being rated.

(2) Contractor caused discrepancies or delinquencies will be reflected in the ABVS as an indicator of past performance. Repair, replacement or reimbursement of quality and packaging defects will not provide relief of negative ABVS data. Contractor caused delivery extensions, regardless of consideration paid, will be reflected in the delivery score.

M10G 52.215-9G06 EVALUATION AND AWARD DSCR (FEB 2000)

(a) AWARD. The Government intends to evaluate proposals and, if necessary, conduct discussions with all responsible offerors within the competitive range. The award will be made to the offeror whose proposal conforms to the terms and conditions of the solicitation and represents the best value to the Government. Therefore, award may be made to other than the lowest priced or the highest technically rated offer.

(b) RELATIVE IMPORTANCE AND TRADE-OFFS. The Government will base the determination of best value on a comparative assessment of the offerors' prices, past performance, and the other evaluation factors identified elsewhere in this solicitation. The determination of best value also considers the relative importance of the evaluation factors. All evaluation factors, when combined, are:

[ ] significantly more important than cost or price. As other evaluation factors become more equal, the evaluated cost or price becomes more important.

[X] approximately equal to cost or price; or

[ ] significantly less important than cost or price. As the evaluated cost/price becomes more equal, relative importance of all other evaluation factors becomes more significant.

The final award decision may involve a trade-off among cost or price and the non-price factors. Factors that may be considered in the trade-off process include, but are not limited to:

Item criticality and weapons system application
Delivery schedule and current inventory status
Historical delivery or quality problems
Concerns over limited supply sources and industrial base
Benefits from obtaining new sources

(c) COST OR PRICE. The Government will evaluate the offered cost or price for cost realism, as defined in FAR 15.401, and reasonableness. The Government will add any other cost or price evaluation factors identified elsewhere in this solicitation (e.g. Buy American Act or FOB Origin transportation costs) to arrive at the offeror's evaluated cost or price. The evaluated cost or price will be used in conjunction with the other non-price factors to determine the best value to the Government.

(d) PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FACTORS. The Government will use the past performance evaluation factors marked below in addition to cost or price and other evaluation factors specified in the solicitation. Unless indicated otherwise, past performance is significantly more important than other non-price factors. Within the past performance subfactors, ABVS scores will be weighed most heavily because of their relevance to DSCR awards. Quality history and delivery schedule compliance will be weighed more heavily than the remaining past performance subfactors. All other non-price evaluation factors specified in this solicitation weigh equally, unless otherwise indicated.

[X] ABVS Score (52.215-9G05)

[X] Quality History

[X] Delivery Schedule Compliance

[ ] Javits-Wagner-O'Day (JWOD) (52.215-9005)

[ ] Mentoring Business Agreements (MBA) (52.219-9003)

[ ] Socioeconomic Support (52.215-9003)

[ ] Other (specify):

(e) PAST PERFORMANCE. Past performance includes, but is not limited to, the offeror's record of conforming to contract requirements and standards of good workmanship; adherence to contract schedules, including the administrative aspects of performance; the offeror's reputation for reasonable and cooperative behavior and commitment to customer satisfaction; and generally, the offeror's business-like concern for the customer's interest.

(i) Offerors may submit with their offer information on past and current Federal (non-DSCR), State and local government and private sector contracts performed by the offeror at the proposed performance location within the last three years that are similar in nature to this acquisition. Offerors electing to submit this data must furnish at least the following information: name and address of the contracting entity; the contract number; award and completion dates; the dollar value; the contract type; the items or services provided; two references, with title and phone number; and any problems encountered and the corrective action taken by the offeror.

(ii) By submitting past performance information, the offeror agrees to permit the Government's representatives to contact the listed references and inquire of the offeror's performance. If more than three contracts are identified, the Government reserves the right to randomly select and limit its review to three contracts. In addition to the information provided, the Government may consider information obtained from other sources when evaluating the offeror's past performance. Offerors will be given the opportunity to discuss negative past performance information obtained from references if the offeror has not had a previous opportunity to comment on that information.

(iii) In addition to the information above, DSCR will use the Automated Best Value System (ABVS) to evaluate quality and past performance on DLA awards (see 52.215-9G05).

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

(iv) Offerors with no past performance history (whether internal or external to the Federal government) will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably.

M12 52.216-9G09 EVALUATION - INDEFINITE QUANTITY CONTRACT DSCR (NOV 1996)

Offers will be evaluated on the basis of the estimated annual quantity. If quantity breaks are offered with various prices, the highest price offered will be used for evaluation.

If line items for both stock and DVD are included in the schedule offers will be evaluated based on the total extended price for the stock and DVD line items.

M15 52.217-5 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (JUL 1990)

M18 52.217-9G11 EVALUATION OF OPTION TO EXTEND THE TERM OF THE CONTRACT - SUPPLIES DSCR (JAN 1996)

The evaluation of options to extend the term of the contract as required by either FAR Clause 52.217-5 (Section M) or 52.212-2 will be based on the highest possible option price offered for each option as specified in DSCR Clause 52.217-9G08 (Section I).

M19CA 52.217-9G27 SURGE & SUSTAINMENT EVALUATION - MINIMUM REQUIREMENT DSCR (JUNE 2001)

(a) Evaluation. The surge & sustainment (S&S) requirement identified in the schedule represents a minimum requirement for award; therefore, offerors that fail to offer for the S&S requirement or submit proposals that are deficient may be rejected. The S&S capability assessment specified in 52.217-9G26 will be evaluated to determine the offeror's ability to meet the increased quantity/accelerated delivery requirements identified in the schedule for S&S.

(b) Acceptable Standard. Acceptable proposals must:

(1) describe a methodology which enables visibility of supplier base resources on a continuing basis;

(2) identify supplier base inventories, production capability, on-demand manufacturing and advanced technology capabilities, or any other means of support available to meet S&S requirements and, based on this identification, provide a description of S&S strategies for all items;

(3) identify problem items for which S&S cannot be easily met, propose solutions for these items, and identify any significant investments (dollars or otherwise) needed to implement these solutions;

(4) describe access to, and plans for, coordinating distribution and transportation services for meeting S&S requirements; and

(5) provide information regarding agreements with subcontractors, suppliers and service provides, if applicable, that reflect access to S&S resources;

(6) identify any significant investment (dollars or otherwise) under (3) or other subparagraphs above, needed to develop S&S capability, with the following information:

(i) An explanation of why the investment is needed.

(ii) A description of what items or materials will need to be purchased with the investment.

(iii) Provide a justification/basis for the investment cost.

(iv) Identify the S&S capability to be gained from the investment.

(v) For investments to effect S&S strategies, an analysis of what strategies were considered and why the proposed strategies are the most cost effective.

(c) Acceptable Standard Commercial. The following standard shall apply in lieu of paragraph (b) for commercial items that are readily available and accessible in sufficient quantities to meet the S&S requirements. Adequate proposals shall:

(1) provide information to support the rationale for concluding that the S&S items are readily available;

(2) describe how access to these resources will provide the ability to meet S&S requirements; and

(3) identify a plan for coordinating distribution and transportation services for meeting S&S requirements

(d) Deficient Proposals. Proposal revisions to correct deficiencies in S&S capability may be addressed during negotiations with offerors determined within the competitive range.

(e) Price. Price(s) associated with S&S items will be evaluated for reasonableness and realism in accordance with proposal analysis techniques specified in FAR 15.404. The total evaluated price associated with a proposal will include S&S prices/costs only to the extent such prices/costs represent:

(1) the dollar amount that must be obligated or reserved at time of award to implement and or maintain the S&S capability and

(2) the dollar amount associated with a confirmed requirement to support an actual contingency.

(f) Materially Unbalanced Offers. The Government may determine that a proposal is unacceptable if the prices proposed are materially unbalanced between line items or subline items. Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable total evaluated price, the price of one or more contract lines is significantly overstated or understated as indicated by application of cost or price analysis techniques. A proposal may be rejected if the Contracting Officer determines that lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.

M33 52.247-9G21 BASIS FOR SUBMISSION AND EVALUATION OF OFFERS DSCR (JAN 1996)

(a) Offers are invited on an f.o.b. destination basis for items ALL , , . Bids submitted on any other basis will be rejected as non-responsive.

(b) Offers are invited on the basis of both f.o.b. origin and destination for items N/A , , .

(c) Offers are invited on an f.o.b. origin basis for items N/A , , . When supplies are regionally priced the applicable regions shall be specified below. If regional price(s) are offered and the region is not specified, the bid will not be considered.

_____

_____

_____