EVALUATION CRITERIA

The Government will award a single PO resulting from this request to the responsible Offeror whose offer conforming to this request will be most advantageous to the Government. The following factors shall be used to evaluate offers: Technical, Past Performance and Price.

Technical and past performance, when combined, are significantly more important than price. As individual factors, Price is less important than both Technical and Past Performance. Offerors are advised that a proposal meeting the objectives and requirements with the lowest price may not be selected if award to a higher priced Offeror is determined to be most advantageous to the Government.

Offerors proposal will be evaluated as follows:

(A) PROPOSAL (TECHNICAL MERIT)

The Government will evaluate proposals by classifying findings as strengths, weaknesses, significant strengths, significant weaknesses, or deficiencies using the following:

Weakness – a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance

Significant Weakness – a proposal flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance

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

Strength – a proposal area that enhances the potential for successful performance or contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the government (this could be associated with a process, technical approach, materials, facilities, etc.).

Significant Strength – a proposal area that greatly enhances the potential for successful performance or contributes significantly toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the government.

The Offeror's overall technical proposal will be evaluated using adjectival ratings to determine how well the Offeror understands the technical requirements as expressed in the Offeror's approach to performing the specific requirements listed in the SOW and Representative Task Orders. One of the following adjectival ratings will be assigned:

ADJECTIVAL RATING	DEFINITIONS
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 and 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 significantly 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 Offerors proposals will evaluated as follows:

- The Government will evaluate the offeror's technical approach for its effectiveness and offeror's overall ability to meet the requirements of the statement of work. The Government will evaluate how thoroughly the offeror understands the requirements and the inherent problems associated with the objectives of this procurement. The Government will evaluate the potential non-conformances identified by the offeror and the proposed techniques to manage these non-conformances.

- The Government will evaluate for merit the offeror's basis for subcontracting/teaming or advisory arrangements and the management procedures for monitoring and controlling those arrangements. The Offeror will be evaluated on the reasonableness and extent of the functional split of responsibilities between the prime and subcontractors. The offeror will be evaluated on thoroughness and completeness of its plan for integrating the efforts of the prime contract with any proposed subcontracts/teaming arrangements and/or advisory agreements. The offeror will be evaluated on the effectiveness and efficiency of its plan for identifying and addressing any problems that arise as a result of the proposed organizational structure or poor and/or non-performance of subcontracted portions of the contract. The Government will also evaluate the benefits to the Government of these arrangements.

(B) PAST PERFORMANCE

Experience and past performance shall be assessed for the offeror and any proposed significant subcontractor(s) (defined as any subcontract that is likely to exceed 25% of a proposed RTO estimate) to determine the extent to which the offeror has performed on similar contracts with this type of technical work in terms of size, scope and/or complexity as well as the quality of the performance.

In conducting the evaluation for this factor, the Government reserves the right to use all information available at the time of the evaluation, whether provided by the offeror or obtained from other sources. The Government may rely on information contained in its own records, obtained through reference checks, Government audit agencies, and commercial sources. The Government will give one overall Past Performance rating to the offeror based on the evaluated past performance information, where "offeror" includes both the prime and any significant subcontractors.

Past Performance Ratings – The ratings set forth below will be used to evaluate the Past Performance factor for each offeror:

ADJECTIVAL RATING	DEFINITIONS
Very High Level of Confidence (VH)	The 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.
High Level of Confidence (H)	The 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.
Moderate Level of Confidence (M)	The 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.
Low Level of Confidence (L)	The 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.
Very Low Level of Confidence	The Offeror's relevant past performance does not meet

(VL)	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.
N/R	Not Rated

(C) PRICE

A price analysis will be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(1). Price analysis is described at FAR 15.404-1(b). This analysis is done to ensure that a "fair and reasonable" price is paid by the Government. However, the analysis is not intended to be protective of the offeror.

The total of the proposed fixed price will be presented to the Selecting Official. This factor is used to determine the reasonableness of the proposed price for the Government, should it be selected for award.