Evaluation Criteria and Evaluation

Technical Capability

Information shall be precise, factual, detailed, and complete. Offerors should not assume that the evaluation team is aware of company abilities, capabilities, plans, facilities, organization, or any other pertinent fact that is important to accomplishment of work.

Technical acceptability will be determined by review of information submitted acceptable offeror which must provide a description in sufficient detail to show that product offered meets the Government's requirement in accordance with the Statement of Work.

Discuss your proposed approach to satisfy the requirements of the PWS. Discussion shall be in the order listed in the PWS.

Past Performance

The Offeror shall submit the information set forth below for the prime Offeror and any subcontractor or teaming partner.

1. Provide a list of all Government or commercial contracts and subcontracts relevant in scope and size to this anticipated effort over the prior three years.

   For each, identify:
   a. Contract number
   b. Government agency or company that awarded the contract
   c. The type of contract (e.g., FFP, T&M, etc.)
   d. Brief description of the work
   e. Contract value
   f. Contract performance dates
   g. Name, title, telephone number, and email address of at least <u>two</u> people knowledgeable with contract performance
   h. Name, telephone number and email address of the Contracting Officer and Contracting Officer's Representative for any Government contract

Offerors are authorize to provide information on problems encountered on the identified contracts and the offeror corrective actions. The Government will consider this information, as well as information obtained from any other sources, when evaluating the offeror past performance.

Price

(a) Submission of "certified cost or pricing data" is not required and the successful offeror will not be required to submit a Certificate of Current Cost or Pricing Data. Offerors are required to submit "data other than certified cost or pricing data" as

described herein. The terms “certified cost or pricing data” and “data other than certified cost or pricing data” are defined at FAR 2.101.

The price proposal shall be written in a manner that is consistent with the Offeror’s normal, disclosed, and/or approved estimating and accounting practices.

Monetary amounts, other than direct labor rates, shall be expressed to the closest whole dollar amount.

The data provided in the Price information shall match the unit prices and extended prices included in Section B (cover letter). Offerors are also instructed to identify:

Evaluation

TECHNICAL CAPABILITY FACTOR

(a) The Technical Capability Factor indicates, for each Offeror, the quality of the work to be performed and the ability of the Offeror to accomplish what is proposed. The Government will evaluate the overall understanding and approach to accomplish the requirements of the Statement of Performance Work Statement. The Technical Capability Factor will be adjectivally scored. Adjectival rating used to score the Technical Capability factors are as follows:

ADJECTIVAL RATING	DEFINITION
EXCELLENT	A comprehensive and thorough proposal of exceptional merit with one or more significant strengths. No deficiency or significant weakness exists.
VERY GOOD	A proposal having no deficiency and which demonstrates over-all competence. One or more significant strengths have been found, and strengths outbalance any weaknesses that exist.
GOOD	A proposal having no deficiency which shows a reasonably sound response. There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both. As a whole, weaknesses not off-set by strengths do not detract from the Offeror's response.
FAIR	A proposal having no deficiency and which has one or more weaknesses. Weaknesses outbalance any strengths.
POOR	A proposal that has one or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses that demonstrate a lack of overall competence or would require a major proposal revision to correct.

The following definitions will be used by the evaluation committee to classify the findings of the evaluation of the Offerors.

	DEFINITION
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.
Weakness	A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
Significant Weakness	A flaw in the proposal that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
Strength	An aspect of the proposal that will have some positive impact on the successful performance of the contract.
Significant Strength	Some aspect of the proposal that greatly enhances the potential for successful contract performance.

PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's past performance to determine whether it is relevant to the PWS of this procurement. Consideration will be given to: overall contract performance, contract type, contract size, and type of services provided.

The Government will evaluate the information provided, questionnaire submitted, and Government's past performance databases, and other sources available to the Government.

Offerors without a record of relevant past performance, or for whom information on past performance is not available, shall receive a neutral rating in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv).

Past Performance will not be numerically scored but will be evaluated using the following levels of confidence ratings:

ADJECTIVAL RATING	DEFINITION
VERY HIGH LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE	Offeror's relevant past performance is of exceptional merit and is very highly pertinent to this acquisition; indicating exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner; very minor (if any) problems with no adverse effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. ** (One or more significant strengths exist. No significant weaknesses exist.)
HIGH LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE	Offeror's relevant past performance is highly pertinent to this acquisition; demonstrating very effective performance that would be fully responsive to contract requirements with contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part with only minor problems with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. ** (One or more significant strengths exist. Strengths outbalance any weakness.)

MODERATE LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE	Offeror's relevant past performance is pertinent to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. ** (There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both.)

LOW LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE	Offeror's relevant past performance is at least somewhat pertinent to this acquisition, and it meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements. ** (One or more weaknesses exist. Weaknesses outbalance strengths.)
VERY LOW LEVEL OF CONFIDENCE	Offeror's relevant past performance does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas which, adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. ** (One or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses exist.)
NEUTRAL	ıe case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance [see FAR 15.305(a) (2) (ii) and (iv)].

PRICE FACTOR

Although the price information is not numerically scored and receives no adjectival rating, it is important in determining that the Offeror understands the requirement and the resources required to satisfy it. Price analysis techniques will be applied to the Evaluated Price to ensure that a fair and reasonable price is paid by the Government.

The "Evaluated Prices" will be compared with the lower "Evaluated Prices" being more favorable than higher "Evaluated Prices."