

**SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

**M.1 AWARD WITHOUT DISCUSSIONS**

As provided for in FAR 52.215-1 *Instructions to Offerors--Competitive Acquisitions*, the Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with Offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). Therefore, the Offeror’s initial proposal should contain the Offeror’s best terms from a price and technical standpoint. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the CO later determines them to be necessary. If the CO determines that the number of proposals that would otherwise be in the competitive range exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted, the CO may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly-rated proposals (see NFS 1815.306(c) (2)).

(End of Provision)

**M.2 EVALUATION FACTORS—GENERAL**

The Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible offeror whose offer conforming to the solicitation will be most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered. The following factors shall be used, in order of importance, to evaluate offers:

- a. Mission Suitability
- b. Price
- c. Past Performance

These factors will be weighted as follows:

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Weight (%)</u>
Mission Suitability	50
Price	30
Past Performance	<u>20</u>
Total	100

**A. Mission Suitability**

The government will evaluate the Offeror's overall technical approach to accomplishing the statement of work. The evaluation sub-factors for Mission Suitability include:

- a) The specific scope of work, objectives, approaches, deliverables, and plans for developing and verifying the products demonstrate a clear understanding of the problem and current state-of-the-art to meet the needs of this SOW.
- b) The technical capabilities and experiences of the principal investigator or project manager, key personnel, staff, consultants and subcontractors, if any, will be evaluated for consistency with the research effort and their degree of commitment and availability. The team conducting the work will be evaluated for relevant experience producing similar evaluations and valuations studies; relevant journal/peer-reviewed publications and/or numerous technical reports; and relevant experience conducting work in international settings with knowledge and understanding of culture norms and human subject rights for participation in research activities.
- c) The schedule and reasonableness of identified Project Milestones will be evaluated.

Under Mission Suitability, sub-factor a) is more important than sub-factor b), which is more important than sub-factor c).

## SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD CONT.

### M.2 EVALUATION FACTORS—GENERAL CONT.

#### A. Mission Suitability Cont.

The following rating system will be assessed to assist in determination of Mission Suitability:

Rating	Criteria
Excellent	The technical approach is innovative, appropriate and robust for the stated need in this SOW. The team conducting the work will have extensive experience producing similar evaluations and valuations studies. Team members will have journal/peer-reviewed publications and/or numerous technical reports in relevant areas to this SOW. The team will have experience conducting work in international settings with knowledge and understanding of culture norms and human subject rights for participation in research activities.
Very Good	The technical approach is appropriate and robust for the stated need in this SOW. The team conducting the work will have extensive experience producing similar evaluations and valuations studies. Team members will have either previous journal/peer-reviewed publications or produced technical reports in relevant areas to this SOW. The team will have experience conducting work in international settings with knowledge and understanding of culture norms and human subject rights for participation in research activities.
Good	The technical approach is appropriate and robust for the stated need in this SOW. The team conducting the work will have some experience producing similar evaluations and valuations studies. The team will have experience conducting work in international settings with knowledge and understanding of culture norms and human subject rights for participation in research activities.
Fair	The technical approach is appropriate and robust for the stated need in this SOW. The team conducting the work will have some experience producing similar types of analysis and reports. The team will have experience conducting work with an understanding of human subject rights for participation in research activities.
Poor	The technical approach is appropriate for the stated need in this SOW. The team conducting the work will have limited experience producing similar types of analysis and reports. The team will have limited experience conducting work with an understanding of human subject rights for participation in research activities.

**SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD CONT.**

**M.2 EVALUATION FACTORS—GENERAL CONT.**

**B. PRICE SECTION**

a. The Government will evaluate the total price for each proposal. The price reasonableness, or lack thereof, will be used as an indicator of the Offeror’s understanding of the requirement. Each Offeror’s proposed cost will be evaluated under the Price Section. Overall lack of price reasonableness will adversely impact the Offeror’s Price confidence. The Government will evaluate price components in accordance with the price data submitted for the proposal. The overall price reasonableness, completeness, and the extent to which the Offeror complied with the anticipated funding allocation in the proposal will be evaluated.

b. Based on the price evaluation, the Government will identify any price or elements of price that appear to be reasonable and complete for the efforts priced. After identification of omissions, inconsistencies, or conditions/qualifications associated with the proposed prices or elements, the Government will determine if these aspects of the proposal represent a decreased level of confidence to providing the effort in accordance with the terms of the contract.

c. The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.404 and NFS 1815.404. The following risk levels will be assessed to assist in determination of price reasonableness:

Low Risk	The evaluators have identified no price risks, or only minor price risks, that impact providing the requirements proposed and in accordance with the terms of the contract.
Medium Risk	The evaluators have has identified price risks that may impact, but not substantially impact, providing the requirements proposed and in accordance with the terms of the contract.
High Risk	The evaluators has identified price risks that may substantially impact providing the requirements proposed and in accordance with the terms of the contract.

(End of Provision)

**SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD CONT.****C. Past Performance:**

In accordance with the FAR 15.305(a)(2) and NFS 1815.304-70, the Offeror's overall corporate past performance will be evaluated. The government will evaluate the quality and relevance of offeror's past performance.

1. Relevancy of past performance will be determined by similarity of value, scope and complexity.
2. Quality of past performance will be based on previous project experience in related evaluations and studies, existing publications or technical reports, and team expertise to conduct evaluations/valuation studies.
3. Confidence Level for overall past performance will be assessed as described below.

Low Level of Confidence	The offeror has no experience in this area pertinent to this acquisition but has experience in other capacities demonstrating the potential for excellence in the requested performance type.
Moderate Level of Confidence	The offeror has at least two past experiences/projects pertinent to this acquisition.
High Level of Confidence	The offeror least worked on more than 5 previous projects/evaluations with similar and relevant content highly pertinent to this acquisition.

(End of Provision)

**SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD CONT.**

**M.3 Selection Process:**

a. Once the evaluations are finalized, the Procurement Advisor will present the findings of the evaluation board to the Selection Official for decision. The Selection Official is the Supervisory Contract Specialist.

b. When a proposal is not selected for award, the Offeror will be notified in writing. An Offeror desiring additional information may contact the Contracting Officer who will arrange a debriefing. Debriefings will be conducted in accordance with FAR/NFS Subpart 15.5, entitled Pre-award, Award, and Post Award Notifications, Protest and Mistakes.

[END OF SECTION]