EVALUATION CRITERIA AND PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

01 EVALUATION CRITERIA

A. Information submitted in proposals will be evaluated using only the criteria listed below. As used herein, the term "proposal" is synonymous with the term "Offer." The criteria are listed in descending order of importance with the first having the most weight and with each of the following criteria having lesser weight than the one preceding it. Each criterion consists of all elements listed in the paragraph under each criterion. Please note that the elements listed in each of these paragraphs are not considered sub criteria and will be evaluated collectively, not individually. In other words, when evaluating how well a Technical Proposal (which is the portion of the Offer described in 05 – Technical Proposal Submission Instructions) meets a particular criterion, the Authority will consider all the elements of that criterion together as a single criterion, not as separate sub-criteria. The Authority will base its evaluation on information provided by the Offeror in its proposal.

B. The Authority reserves the right to establish a competitive range of Offerors based upon its initial evaluation of the Technical Proposals (the technical evaluation) and at subsequent points during the evaluation process. The Authority also reserves the right to conduct oral interviews with only the Offerors in the competitive range and to include the results of the interviews in its evaluation and to consider only these firms for a contract award. The Authority further reserves the right to request Best and Final Offers (BAFO) if in the best interest of the Authority. If BAFOs are desired, the Contracting Officer will issue a Solicitation amendment containing the BAFO request. This amendment will be issued to all Offerors still within the competitive range and will state a deadline for receipt of the BAFOs. Offerors are not required to change their Technical Proposal or Financial Offer (defined below) in response to the BAFO request but must acknowledge the BAFO amendment even if they do not change their proposals. Contract award will be made to the Offeror whose Offer is judged by an integrated assessment of the Technical Proposal (based on the technical evaluation criteria) and Financial Offer to be most advantageous to the Airports Authority based on technical merit and price (best value) and that the Airports Authority deems responsible in accordance with the Airports Authority Contracting Manual.

C. Capitalized terms used in this document are defined herein or in Section V of the Solicitation.

Definitions For Technical Evaluation

Technical Proposals will be evaluated by their strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies against the evaluation criteria and these attributes will be communicated to the Offerors for follow-up action as appropriate.

Definitions:

Clarifications: Communications with an Offeror for the sole purpose of eliminating minor irregularities, informalities, or apparent clerical mistakes in the proposal. Unlike discussions, clarifications do not give the Offeror an opportunity to revise or modify its proposal, except to the extent that correction of apparent clerical mistake results in revisions.

Discussions: Oral or written communications, including negotiations, between the Authority and an Offeror (other than Clarifications) that involve information essential for determining the acceptability of the proposal or to cure identified deficiencies in the proposal.

Deficiencies: Defects in the proposal which preclude acceptance and involve any part of the Offeror's proposal which would not satisfy the Authority's minimum requirements established in the Solicitation, including failures to meet specifications, submit information, or questionable technical or management approaches. Deficiencies disclosed during Discussions are evaluated in two categories: (1) Material - basis for rejection of the proposal because further Discussions would be meaningless; or (2) Curable – the Offeror may correct the deficiencies by Clarifications or Discussions and the proposal may be brought into the competitive range.

Weakness: Flaws in the proposal, including ambiguities, lack of complete descriptions, errors in interpretation, and omissions of essential information, inadequate information, all of which are considered curable in Discussions. An excessive number of Clarifications may constitute a weakness.

Strengths: Elements of the proposal that meet or exceed the minimum requirements established in the Solicitation and provide an identified benefit to the Authority.

02 EVALUATION

A. Technical Proposal Evaluation Ratings

Technical Proposal Evaluation Ratings An adjectival rating will be given depicting how well the Offeror's Technical Proposal meets or exceeds the stated evaluation criteria, as follows:

Unacceptable The proposal fails to meet the evaluation standard and the Deficiency is uncorrectable. The proposal would have to undergo a major revision to become Acceptable. The proposal has a demonstrated lack of understanding of the Authority's requirements or omissions of major areas.

Marginal The proposal lacks essential information to support a rating of Unacceptable, Acceptable, Good, or Excellent. Deficiencies found are not Material and are Curable with Clarification or Discussion. These communications are not intended as a re-write of the proposal. Marginal is not intended as a final rating but used as a placeholder.

Acceptable The proposal meets the evaluation standard. The proposal has no Deficiencies.

Good The proposal meets the Acceptable evaluation standard and has some Strengths and no significant Weaknesses.

Excellent The proposal exceeds the Good evaluation standard by having significant Strengths.

B. PRICE PROPOSAL EVALUATION

The Authority will evaluate price proposals for completeness, reasonableness, and realism, as applicable. Each Offeror's price proposal will be evaluated based on the following factors, which are of equal importance:

Submission of Fully Loaded Fixed Rates
The Offeror shall submit proposed fully loaded fixed rates for the entire period of performance. Failure to submit the required rates may render the proposal non-responsive and subject to rejection.

Balanced Pricing
The Authority may reject any proposal determined to be materially unbalanced. A materially unbalanced proposal is one in which prices are significantly overstated for certain items and significantly understated for others, creating an unacceptable risk to the Authority.

Price Reasonableness Analysis
The Authority will compare proposed prices to the Independent Government Estimate (IGE) and other relevant pricing information to assess price reasonableness. If adequate price competition exists, the Authority will conduct a price analysis. If adequate price competition does not exist, the Authority may conduct a cost analysis to determine whether the proposed price is fair and reasonable.

Certified Cost or Pricing Data
In accordance with applicable procurement requirements, and when required by the Contracting Officer, the Offeror shall submit certified cost or pricing data to support the proposed pricing.

C. TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

Criterion 1: Experience and Qualifications

The Authority will evaluate the depth, quality, and relevance of each Offeror's past performance and experience in performing Baggage Handling System (BHS) refurbishment, rehabilitation, modernization, and related services comparable in size, complexity, and scope to the requirements of this solicitation.

The Offeror shall demonstrate relevant experience and qualifications necessary to successfully perform the BHS refurbishment, rehabilitation, modernization, and related services. Evaluation will consider, experience performing projects of similar scope, size, and complexity. Qualifications, certifications, licenses, and education of proposed key personnel. Demonstrated technical expertise in the required service areas. Past performance and successful completion of comparable projects. Availability and capability of personnel and resources to meet project requirements.

Proposals that demonstrate extensive relevant experience, highly qualified personnel, and a strong record of successful performance will receive a higher rating.

Criterion 2: Technical Approach

The Offeror shall describe their understanding of the operational, technical, and logistical challenges associated with performing Baggage Handling System (BHS) refurbishment and rehabilitation activities within an active airport environment. The response shall demonstrate the Offeror's understanding of maintaining continuous airport operations while minimizing impacts to passengers, airlines, TSA operations, and other airport stakeholders.

The Offeror shall demonstrate a clear, comprehensive, and effective approach for performing all requirements of the Statement of Work (SOW). The proposal should describe: Understanding of the project objectives, scope, and requirements. Methodology and processes that will be used to accomplish the work. Work plan, schedule, milestones, and deliverables. Quality control and risk management procedures. Staffing approach, including key personnel roles and responsibilities. Tools, technologies, and resources that will be utilized. Strategies for communication, reporting, and coordination with the MWAA. Procedures for ensuring compliance with all applicable regulations, standards, and contract requirements. Approach to integrating new equipment, controls, and technologies into existing BHS infrastructure. The response shall address compatibility with legacy systems, phased implementation, testing and commissioning procedures, system cutovers, operational continuity, and measures to maintain system performance, reliability, and availability throughout the project.

02 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

A. Submission Instructions

All Offers must be submitted electronically as PDF files via the upload link available in the Airports Authority's Contract Lifecycle Management System as accessed through https://www.mwaa.com/business/current-contracting-opportunities. The offer shall contain the following:

1. Solicitation Offer and Award Page
2. Price Schedule, Section III
3. Representations and Certifications
4. Supplier Diversity Documents (as applicable) (single PDF)
   a. Small Local Business Enterprise Program Certification Letter
   b. Subcontractor Utilization Plan and/or Commitment Letter
   c. Letter of Intent
   d. Waiver Request
5. Insurance Affidavit
6. Technical Proposal
   a. Do not include any reference to price.
   b. Submit on typewritten 8 ½ x 11".
   c. Do not exceed thirty-fives (35), double-spaced. Exhibits and samples of previous work are not included in the 35-page limit.
   d. Address the evaluation criteria in the order they are presented.

B. Format and Instructions for Technical Proposal Preparation

Each Offeror's technical proposal must demonstrate the Offeror's ability to meet all requirements in this RFP. The following information is to be provided in the technical proposals and will be used in evaluating the proposals.

The technical proposal will be limited to a total of thirty-fives (35) pages, not including exhibits, attachments, etc. and will include the following sections in the order listed below.

Cover/Title Sheet

Table of Contents Offerors will include a table of contents that lists section numbers and page numbers. This is not part of the overall page limit.

Section 1. Experience and Qualifications (Section is limited to 20 pages) (Criterion 1)

Section 2. Technical Approach (Section is limited to 15 pages) (Criterion 2)

Do not include any Price Proposal information in any of the technical proposal sections.