**SAMPLE LOWEST PRICE TECHNICALLY ACCEPTABLE (LPTA)**

**SOURCE EVALUATION PLAN**



**Date:**

**Source Evaluation Plan**

**Approval and Concurrence**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| ***[NAME],*** Technical Evaluation Team Lead, ***[ROUTING SYMBOL]*** | |
| Date: |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| ***[NAME],*** Source Selection Official/Contracting Officer, **AAQ-XXX** | |
| Date: |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| ***[NAME],*** Technical Evaluation Team Member ***[ROUTING SYMBOL]*** | |
| Date: |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| ***[NAME],*** Technical Evaluation Team ***Member [ROUTING SYMBOL]*** | |
| Date: |  |

**Table of Contents**

[**Source Evaluation Plan** 2](#_Toc77151111)

[**Approval and Concurrence** 2](#_Toc77151112)

[**I.** **INTRODUCTION** 4](#_Toc77151113)

[**II.** **PURPOSE** 4](#_Toc77151114)

[**III.** **NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE ACQUISITION** 4](#_Toc77151115)

[1. Description of the Effort 4](#_Toc77151116)

[2. Acquisition Strategy 4](#_Toc77151117)

[3. Source Evaluation Milestones 4](#_Toc77151118)

[**IV.** **PROCUREMENT INTEGRITY** 4](#_Toc77151119)

[**V.** **SOURCE SELECTION ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES** 4](#_Toc77151120)

[**VI.** **SECURITY OF PROPOSALS AND SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION** 6](#_Toc77151121)

[1. Security of Proposals 6](#_Toc77151122)

[2. Control of Source Selection Sensitive Information 6](#_Toc77151123)

[3. Code of Conduct and Safeguarding Proposal Evaluation Information 7](#_Toc77151124)

[**VII.** **SOURCE SELECTION/EVALUATION PROCESS** 7](#_Toc77151125)

[1. Source Selection Overview 7](#_Toc77151126)

[2. Source Selection Evaluation Process 7](#_Toc77151127)

[i. Evaluation Methodology 8](#_Toc77151128)

[ii. Evaluation of Non-Cost/Price Factors 8](#_Toc77151129)

[iii. Evaluation Scoring 9](#_Toc77151130)

[3. Price 10](#_Toc77151131)

[4. Risk Assessment 10](#_Toc77151132)

[**ATTACHMENT 1** 11](#_Toc77151133)

[**ATTACHMENT 2** 12](#_Toc77151134)

# **INTRODUCTION**

This Source Evaluation Plan (SEP) has been prepared in accordance with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Acquisition Management System (AMS) and describes the procedures to be followed in the evaluation and scoring of technical submissions received under **69XXX-XX-R-000XX** . Complete details on all aspects of the evaluation are contained herein and encompass organization; safeguarding information; the process to be followed (includes definition of factors and cost), scoring, and risk assessment.

# **PURPOSE**

**Section L** of the SIR as issued provides instructions to prospective offerors regarding how proposals should be prepared and submitted to include instructions to offerors on content and format. **Section M** of the SIR as issued specifies how the submitted proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the evaluation criteria and used in conjunction with this Source Evaluation Plan. Evaluators will rate each offeror in accordance with the Evaluation Form for each Factor in coordination with the requirements set forth in the SIR. Each evaluator should become familiar with the requirements set forth in the SIR, Sections L and M and utilize them directly for reference to information submitted for evaluation.

# **NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE ACQUISITION**

## Description of the Effort

The purpose of this project is ***[DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT]***. This procurement will be awarded to the contractor whose proposal meets all technical criteria as specified in this plan and whose proposal complies with all terms and conditions of the SIR at the lowest offered price (lowest price technically acceptable).

## Acquisition Strategy

The ***[PROJECT NAME]*** acquisition and source selection are being conducted in accordance with AMS Clause 3.2.2.3 Source Selection. The Government contemplates awarding a Firm-Fixed-Price Contract.

## Source Evaluation Milestones

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Milestone | Date |
| Source Evaluation Plan Approved |  |
| Draft SIR Issued |  |
| Final SIR Issued |  |
| Proposals Received from Offerors |  |
| SSO Source Selection Decision |  |
| Contract Award |  |

# 

# **PROCUREMENT INTEGRITY**

All source evaluation team members involved in the selection process will be familiar and comply with AMS Guidance T3.1.8 Procurement Integrity Act. The source evaluation team members are required to submit Conflict of Interest and Non-Disclosure documentation to the Contracting Officer (CO). Individuals will not be permitted to review proposals until all required forms are signed and they receive Procurement Integrity training. The CO will review all Conflict of Interest documentation for possible conflicts of interest. If an actual or potential conflict of interest is found to exist, the CO, after consulting with Counsel, will recuse the person from participation in the selection process.

# **SOURCE SELECTION ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

The Source Selection Evaluation team shall consist of the following individuals.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Role** | **Name** | **Division** | **Phone Number** |
| Source Selection Official /Contracting Officer | Name | AAQ-### | Phone # |
| **Technical Evaluation Team Lead/Chairman** |  |  |  |
| **Technical Evaluation Team Member** |  |  |  |
| **Technical Evaluation Team Member** |  |  |  |

The Source Selection Evaluation team shall consist of respective sub-teams to complete the technical evaluation and pricing analysis. Additionally, the team shall have a source selection official assigned.

The duties and responsibilities of the Technical Evaluation Team (TET) shall consist of the following:

Technical Evaluation Team Lead shall:

* Provide written notice to evaluation members of their selection.
* Schedule and conduct team meetings.
* Review, discuss, and reconcile, as necessary; comments, findings, and ratings of evaluation team members. If no reconciliation is achieved, the chairperson will ensure each member affected in the difference has prepared supporting rationale for the record.
* Coordinate and prepare a summary report of each proposal, which summarizes the team findings.
* Ensure that a record of all notes, contracts, meetings, discussions, and data pertinent to the evaluation are maintained and safeguarded.
* Ensure that a record of all notes, contacts, meetings, discussions, and data pertinent to the evaluation are maintained and safeguarded.
* Provide all information, reports, briefings, or other assistance regarding the evaluation proceedings as may be needed by the requiring organizations.
* Prepare a Technical Evaluation Team report to the CO. The Technical Evaluation Team Report will be reviewed and signed by the TET Lead and all team members. This report will state the findings on the results of the evaluation. This report shall include a narrative statement covering the significant strengths and weaknesses which significantly affected the evaluator’s decisions as to pass/fail ratings.
* Participate in all phases of the technical evaluation process including evaluating and scoring technical proposals.

Source Selection Evaluation Team Member(s) shall:

* Evaluate each proposal in accordance with the evaluation procedures described in this evaluation plan. For documentation purposes, each evaluator shall use the score sheets attached to this plan. The evaluator shall cite specific references from the proposals that support their judgment; e.g., page number, paragraph number, briefing.
* Be knowledgeable of the contents of the Statement of Work, each offeror’s proposal and substantiating documents.
* When opposing determinations are reached, the evaluators will discuss rationale to support their respective determinations in an attempt to reconcile the determinations. If no reconciliation is achieved, the evaluator(s) having the divergence will document the rationale for the record.
* Participate in the preparation of the summary reports for each proposal.
* Maintain a record of all notes taken to facilitate their evaluation.
* Provide post-evaluation assistance as might be needed concerning explanations or debriefings related to the technical evaluation.
* Assist the Chairperson in preparing the technical report to the Source Selection Official.

The Contracting Officer (CO) shall:

* Serve as the SSO for procurements not subject to the JRC investment decision process;
* Review and evaluate each cost/price proposal against the requirements of the Government’s RFP and verify the proposed costs are realistic and reasonable for the work to be performed.
* Ensure, when applicable, conflict of interest documentation is obtained from all source selection team members; with legal counsel, determine if any conflicts or apparent conflicts of interests exist; and if so, resolve them;
* Ensure source selection team members are briefed on sensitivities of the source selection process to include but not limited to the prohibition against unauthorized disclosure of information (including their responsibility to safeguard proposals and any documentation related to the source selection team proceedings); requirements concerning conflicts of interest; and ensure source selection team members provide nondisclosure of information statements.
* Coordinate communications with industry and conduct all debriefings;
* Control all written documentation issued to industry;
* Lead screening, selection, and debriefing phases of source selection;
* Issue letters, public announcements, SIRs, SIR amendments, and other procurement documents; and
* Ensure the contract is signed by a contractor's representative with the authority to bind the contractor; with legal counsel, ensure all contractual documents comply with applicable laws, regulations, and policies.

The Source Selection Officer (SSO) shall:

* Select the source(s) for contract award.
* Approve the Technical Evaluation criteria and plan and ensures the SIR is consistent with both.
* Ensure the disciplines needed to prepare contract documents, solicit and select sources, award contract, and administer contracts are properly represented on the team.
* Make the final source selection decision for an award, and ensures the rationale is documented before contract award.

# **SECURITY OF PROPOSALS AND SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION**

## Security of Proposals

1. **Administrative Restriction.** All proposals, supporting materials, evaluation procedures, guidelines, score sheets, and comments are administratively restricted and shall be safeguarded to avoid any compromise of findings or ratings.
2. **Prohibitions.** All evaluation team members are expressly prohibited from revealing to anyone outside the team any information on the proceedings, methods, or scores of the evaluation. No rules or regulations can cover all possible situations, and there is no final substitute for good judgment and personal integrity.
3. **Avoid contacts.** All evaluation team members are expressly prohibited from discussing the evaluation proceedings with any other person not involved in the evaluation, except as may be authorized by the CO. Avoid contact, if at all possible, with the vendors involved in the acquisition and their representatives. Members shall also exercise due care in any discussion of technical evaluation proceedings with other evaluators outside the evaluation area.
4. **Conflict of Interest.** Each member of the team shall execute all required conflict of interest and non-disclosure statements.
5. **Storage.** All proposals, and copies thereof, containing proprietary data will be stored in a secure area when not being evaluated. No official security classification is required for the proposals.

## Control of Source Selection Sensitive Information

An electronic evaluation file will be maintained by the CO/Contract Specialist (CS). This file will contain all correspondence and working papers applicable to a specific evaluation.

As a minimum, the file should contain the following documentation:

* Memoranda and correspondence related to the selection of the evaluation board.
* Originals of all individual evaluation work sheets.
* Copies of the composite evaluation work sheets and the narrative report.
* All technical proposals and evaluation work sheets will be treated "SOURCE SELECTION SENSITIVE." These documents will be handled and stored so proprietary information is not released to unauthorized personnel.

## Code of Conduct and Safeguarding Proposal Evaluation Information

All proposals, supporting materials, evaluation procedures, guidelines, evaluation results, and comments are administratively restricted and must be safeguarded to avoid any compromise of findings or ratings. All evaluation team members are expressly prohibited from revealing to anyone outside their individual team any information on the proceedings, methods, or ratings determined during the evaluation process. It should be assumed that all information contained in proposals is proprietary. Information provided must not be used for any purpose other than to evaluate the proposal. The CO must authorize access to the proposal information. No rules or regulations can cover all possible situations, and there is no final substitute for good judgment and personal integrity. Further, all evaluation team members are expressly prohibited from discussing the evaluation proceedings with any other persons not involved in the evaluation, except as may be authorized by the CO. Avoid contact, if at all possible, with the firms involved in the acquisition and their representatives. Members will also exercise due care in any discussion of technical evaluation proceedings with other evaluators outside the evaluation area. All proposals, and copies thereof, containing proprietary data will be stored in a secure area when not being evaluated.

# **SOURCE SELECTION/EVALUATION PROCESS**

## Source Selection Overview

Award will be made on the basis of the lowest priced, technically acceptable proposal from a responsible Offeror.

1. **Technical Evaluation.** All technical evaluation team members shall review the specific criteria within the technical proposals using an “ACCEPTABLE” or “UNACCEPTABLE” rating. All offerors will be evaluated for all factors without exception. All ratings, whether “ACCEPTABLE” or “UNACCEPTABLE” will be documented fully to include the rationale for the rating and a reference to the specific portion of the offeror’s proposal that the evaluator(s) used to determine their rating.
2. **Price Evaluation.** The price proposal will be analyzed for fairness and reasonableness and balanced pricing among the contract line items (CLINs). It may also be analyzed to determine whether it is realistic for the work to be performed and reflects a clear understanding of the Government’s requirements.
3. **Source Selection Decision.** The award will be made to the lowest priced, technically acceptable offeror. Offerors must be rated "ACCEPTABLE" in all Factors in order to be considered technically acceptable.

## Source Selection Evaluation Process

1. **Evaluation Procedures**

* A preliminary review of all submissions will be accomplished to ascertain if any of the proposals contain ambiguities and to determine if the proposals are grossly deficient.
* The individual evaluators will read, evaluate, and become thoroughly familiar with the proposals in accordance with this plan. The evaluator will independently evaluate one proposal at a time. After the evaluation for that proposal is complete, evaluation can begin on the next proposal until all proposals are evaluated.
* The evaluation will be based on an acceptable/unacceptable basis with no allowance for “gray” area decisions. If any aspect of the offeror’s proposal is insufficient, the inadequacies should be listed.
* The written description forms part of the final report to the CO.

1. **Communications with Offerors**

Communications with the offeror are not required. However, if a particular submission needs clarification/supplemental information, the CO will be notified, in writing by the evaluation team members, and communication may be conducted with the offeror. The offeror will submit and the board will evaluate all revisions/clarifications to the elements that were discussed.

### **Evaluation Methodology**

* The vendor shall submit an offer acceptable for award in accordance with Section L, Instructions to Offerors, and; the evaluation criteria outlined in Section M of 69XXX-XX-R-000XX. The vendor shall assent to the terms and conditions of the model contract (Sections A through K of 69XXX-XX-R-000XX), that includes the provisions, contract clauses, Statement of Work (SOW), and documents, exhibits, and attachments.
* Each proposal will be evaluated on the proposed technical approach of satisfying the requirements of the SOW and the realism and reasonableness of the proposed cost.
* The evaluation is a team effort. The technical team will individually review and score each proposal in accordance with the rating criteria specified in Section M of 69XXX-XX-R-000XX. Upon completion of the technical evaluation, the TET will convene and review all evaluation findings and ratings, conduct all necessary analyses of the evaluation process, and prepare a report to the SSO. The report will outline the results of their review and analysis based on the evaluation criteria.
* All briefings to the SSO of vendor proposals will be conducted in a manner that would preclude the true identity of the vendors from being revealed to the persons being briefed until a selection decision has been made.

### **Evaluation of Non-Cost/Price Factors**

The source selection evaluation shall be conducted based on two (2) technical evaluation factors:

**Factor 1- Relevant Experience**

**Factor 2 – Administrative Requirements**

Sub factor 2.1: SIR Section A/Contract Form

Sub factor 2.2: Financial Condition and Capability

Sub factor 2.3: Section K Representations and Certifications

Sub factor 2.4: Organizational Conflict of Interest Plan

These factors are of equal weight and importance. Ratings of "ACCEPTABLE" or "UNACCEPTABLE" are considered to be objective ratings and are to serve as merely guides for decision making. The SSO is responsible for independently determining if the lowest-priced, technically acceptable vendor has proposed a fair and reasonable price and is otherwise eligible for award. Trade-offs are not permitted. **Offerors must be rated "ACCEPTABLE" on all factors to be considered technically acceptable.**

**Factor 1 – Relevant Experience**

**Factor**: Demonstrate the experience of offeror and/or proposed team, including sub-contractors, on projects same/similar to that described in the SOW for the ***[PROJECT NAME].***

The Offeror shall complete a minimum of three (3), but no more than five (5), "Past Performance Experience Information" forms, attached to the SIR (Section J, Attachment 9 in response to this factor. All blocks must be filled in and all data should be accurate, current, and complete. All projects submitted must have been underway or completed within the last **X** years through the closing date identified on the SIR. Each project provided must be valued at or over **$XXXXX.** If the Offeror does not have prior prime contracts to cite, then the Offeror may cite instances on which it has served as a primary subcontractor.

**If any of the information required is not included in the form then the Offeror will be considered non-responsive and evaluated as unacceptable.**

**Evaluation Criteria:** The Government's Technical Evaluation Team will review the project experience of the offeror, including subcontractors, on projects provided in response to Factor 1. Offerors must meet all of the following minimum acceptability standards to receive an "ACCEPTABLE" on this factor:

* Offeror must have three (3) projects that are same/similar to that of the work required in the project specifications and this solicitation; **AND**
* Each project submitted must be valued at or over **$XXXXX; AND**
* Projects submitted must have been completed, or underway, within the last **X years** through the closing date of the SIR.

Failure to demonstrate the minimally acceptability standards under this factor will result in an "UNACCEPTABLE" rating and possible elimination from further consideration for contract award.

**Factor 2: Administrative Requirements**

**Factor:** In order to receive an Acceptable rating for Factor 2, Offeror must be determined responsible in accordance with FAA Acquisition Management System (AMS) T.3.2.2.7 and receive an Acceptable rating in the applicable sub factors.

**Evaluation Criteria:**

**Subfactor 2.1 SIR Section A, Solicitation/Contract Form:** The FAA will review SIR Section A, Solicitation/Contract Form for compliance to Section L. This review is for informational purposes only and may not be factored into the award decisions.

**Subfactor 2.2 Financial Condition and Capability:** Prior to award of any contract, the Offeror must also be determined to be a responsible contractor. The FAA intends to review the financial statements requested in Section L as part of the responsibility determination by performing various financial ratios to ensure the financial capability of the Offeror.

**Subfactor 2.3 Section K Representations and Certifications:** The FAA will review SIR Section K, Representation and Certifications for compliance to Section L.

**Subfactor 2.4 Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI):** The OCI information provided will be reviewed to determine if the Offeror (including subcontractors) has any OCI and, if so, whether the Offeror has presented an acceptable plan for mitigating the OCIs. Offerors determined to have an OCI that is not adequately addressed in the proposal mitigation plan may not be eligible for award.

### **Evaluation Scoring**

* All vendors will receive an Acceptable or Unacceptable rating for each factor according to quality of their submission. All vendors will be rated according to the rating scheme outlined in this section.
* Each evaluator will use the following criteria to measure and score each proposal. Scoring will reflect the extent to which the vendor has met the overall factor requirements. Upon completion of the evaluation of each factor by a member of the evaluation team, the lead technical evaluator will summarize the proposals in a manner that determines which proposals are acceptable and which are unacceptable to support. Evaluation factors will be scored as outlined below to which the Offeror has met the overall factor requirements.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **Definition** |
| **Acceptable** | The proposal meets the stated requirements. The response is considered complete in terms of the basic content and level of information the Government seeks for review. |
| **Unacceptable** | The proposal fails to meet the stated requirements. The response is considered deficient in terms of basic content and support the Government seeks for review. |

There is no weighing of factors under this acquisition since the evaluation method/process is Lowest Priced, Technically Acceptable (LPTA).

## Price

LPTA is applied to known, firm requirements, usually readily available in the commercial marketplace where a fair and reasonable price determination is based on adequate price competition. Therefore, price analysis will normally be used to determine the reasonableness of total evaluated price to support the selection of the lowest priced, technically acceptable offeror.

## Risk Assessment

There is no separate risk assessment for the factors under this acquisition since the evaluation method/process is Low- Priced, Technically Acceptable (LPTA).

# **ATTACHMENT 1**

**LPTA EVALUATION INDIVIDUAL / CONSENSUS WORKSHEET**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SIR NUMBER:** | 69XXX-XX-R-000XX |
| **PROJECT:** |  |
| **EVALUATOR:** |  |
| **OFFEROR:** |  |

**This is an objective evaluation. The rating will be either “ACCEPTABLE” or “UNACCEPTABLE” against the criteria/measurement in the SIR. At the time a contractor receives an “UNACCEPTABLE” rating for any factor, the rationale for the rating will be documented below and the proposal will not be evaluated further.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Factors | Rating and Rationale |
| Factor 1, Relevant Experience | Rating (circle one): ACCEPTABLE NONACCEPTABLE  Rationale: |
| Factor 2, Administrative Requirements | Rating (circle one): ACCEPTABLE NONACCEPTABLE  Rationale: |

Is this proposal considered otherwise ACCEPTABLE for award? YES NO

# **ATTACHMENT 2**

**LPTA EVALUATION SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

**SIR NUMBER:** 69XXX-XX-R-000XX

**PROJECT: XXXXXXX**

The rating has been determined to be either “ACCEPTABLE” or UNACCEPTABLE” against the criteria/measurement in the SIR. At the time a contractor receives an “UNACCEPTABLE” rating for any factor, the rationale for the rating will be documented below and the proposal will not be evaluated further. Following is the summary findings:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Contractor**  **Name** | **Factor 1** | **Factor 2** | **Acceptable for Award? (Y/N)** |
| Contractor A |  |  |  |
| Contractor B |  |  |  |
| Contractor C |  |  |  |
| Contractor D |  |  |  |
| Contractor E |  |  |  |
| Contractor F |  |  |  |