***Disclaimer: The author of the Source Evaluation Plan (SEP) is to tailor all aspects of the entire template, including sample evaluator rating sheets, to the individual source selection and ensure that any template areas providing sample information or instructions (i.e., [bracketed red and italicized language]) are deleted prior to finalizing the SEP.***

***This template includes various sample evaluator rating sheets. These sample sheets are provided for use in each source selection; however, the sheets need to be tailored for each individual procurement action. The sample evaluator rating sheets included at the end of the SEP template are not to be provided when submitting your completed SEP for approval.***

**TRADEOFF**

**SOURCE EVALUATION PLAN**



**Date**

**Source Evaluation Plan**

**Approval and Concurrence**

***[Insert the required approvers for the Source Evaluation Plan. Please tailor the source evaluation plan approvers based on the size and complexity of the procurement.]***

**Example**: *The* following is a sample List of Approvers:

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| ***[NAME],*** Contracting Officer, **AAQ-XXX** | |
| Date: |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| ***[NAME],*** Source Selection Official ***[ROUTING SYMBOL]*** | |
| Date: |  |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| ***[NAME],*** Legal Advisor ***[ROUTING SYMBOL]*** | |
| Date: |  |

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1.INTRODUCTION 1

2.PURPOSE 1

3.NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE ACQUISITION 1

3.1.Description of the Effort 1

3.2.Acquisition Strategy 1

3.3.Source Evaluation Milestones 1

4.PROCUREMENT INTEGRITY 2

5.SOURCE SELECTION TEAM ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES 2

5.1.Source Selection Organization 2

5.2.Source Selection Team Responsibilities 3

5.2.1.Source Selection Official (SSO) 3

5.2.2.Contracting Officer (CO) 3

5.2.3.Legal Advisor 4

5.2.4.Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) Members 4

5.2.5.SSEB Lead 4

5.2.6.Source Selection Evaluation Team 5

5.2.6.1.Technical Evaluation Team (TET) 5

5.2.6.2.Price Evaluation Team (PET) 5

5.2.7.Past Performance Evaluation Team 6

5.2.8.Advisors 6

6.NON-GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL 6

6.1.Prohibitions 6

6.2.Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) 7

7.RULES OF CONDUCT 7

8.SECURITY OF PROPOSALS AND SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION 7

8.1.Definition of Terms: 7

8.2.Control of CSI and SSI 7

8.3.Disclosure of CSI and SSI 8

8.4.Transmittal of CSI and SSI 8

8.5.Code of Conduct and Safeguarding Proposal Evaluation Information 8

9.SOURCE SELECTION/EVALUATION PROCESS 8

9.1. Evaluation of Factors 8

9.2. Strengths/Weaknesses/Deficiencies 9

9.3. Ratings for Non-Cost/Price Factors 10

9.4. Mandatory Requirements 12

9.5. Past Performance Evaluation 12

9.6. Sources of Past Performance Information 12

9.7. Relevance of Past Performance Information 12

9.8. Quality of Past Performance 13

9.9. Summary Report of Past Performance 14

9.10. Cost/Price Analysis 14

9.11. Completeness Factor 14

9.12. Reasonableness Factor 14

9.13. Realism Factor 14

9.14. Relative Order of Importance 14

9.15. Small Business Subcontracting Plan Evaluation (Large Businesses Only) 15

10.ATTACHMENT 1: EVALUATION FORMS 16

10.1.ATTACHMENT 1-1: SET (TET and MET) INDIVIDUAL FACTOR/SUBFACTOR EVALUATION 16

11.ATTACHMENT 2: EVALUATION FORMS 17

11.1.ATTACHMENT 2-1: SET INDIVIDUAL EVALUATOR RATING SHEET 17

12.ATTACHMENT 3: EVALUATION FORMS 18

12.1.ATTACHMENT 2-2: SEB SUMMARY EVALUATION RATING SHEETS 18

13.ATTACHMENT 4: EVALUATION FORMS 19

13.1.ATTACHMENT 2-3: SEB COMPOSITE OFFERORS NON-COST/PRICE FACTORS (TECHNICAL) RATING REPORT 19

14.ATTACHMENT 5: SAMPLE PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE 20

15.ATTACHMENT 4: PPET EVALUTION REPORT TEMPLATE 25

1. INTRODUCTION

***[Include a brief introduction about the Project and the overall use of the Source Evaluation Plan]***

This Source Evaluation Plan (SEP) has been prepared in accordance with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Acquisition Management System (AMS) and sets forth the processes that will be used for PROJECT NAME source evaluation and selection. Specifically, this plan describes the source selection organization, source selection processes, and ground rules for conduct of the evaluation.

1. PURPOSE

***[Include a brief description of the requirement, a summary of the objectives of the acquisition, and reference(s) to applicable AMS Guidance. Your description should also provide information on the type of acquisition (e.g., competition, small business set aside, etc.)]***

**Example:** The SEP provides the evaluation guidelines for the selection of the Offeror whose proposal for PROJECT NAME represents the “Best Value” to the FAA considering the evaluation criteria specified in Section M of the Solicitation. This SEP describes the information and processes that will be used to conduct the evaluation of Offeror proposals and how they factor into an award decision. The SEP identifies the Source Selection Organization which is comprised of the Source Selection Official (SSO), Source Evaluation Board (SEB), the Contracting Officer (CO), a Legal Advisor, and the Source Evaluation Team (SET) consisting of four individual evaluation teams and their individual responsibilities.

1. NATURE AND SCOPE OF THE ACQUISITION
   1. Description of the Effort

***[Provide a description of the requirement.]***

**Example:** The FAA’s Program Office has a requirement for professional services covering such areas as engineering support, logistics, software integration and maintenance, training, operations research and analysis, requirements development and analysis, and business and material management. Examples include technical support services to assist in the planning, research, development, engineering, implementation, sustainment, and decommissioning of various navigation, landing and lighting systems. Additional requirements tie in to the transition to integrated ground-based and space-based navigation system architecture.

* 1. Acquisition Strategy

***[Briefly describe the acquisition strategy for this requirement.]***

**Example:** 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 single Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract for a base period of five (5) years with two one (1) year options. The contract will award Task Orders on a Time and Materials (T&M) or Firm Fixed Price (FFP) basis.

* 1. Source Evaluation Milestones

***[Include a milestone schedule of significant events related to the source selection activities. The below milestone schedule is typical of actions taken and should be tailored as necessary to address particular requirements and process steps associated with the source selection.]***

| **Milestone** | **Date** |
| --- | --- |
| Source Evaluation Plan Approved |  |
| Draft SIR Issued |  |
| Final SIR Issued |  |
| Proposals Received from Offerors |  |
| Source Evaluation Kick Off Meeting |  |
| Source Evaluation Team (Technical, Management, etc.) Report of Non-Cost/Price Evaluation |  |
| Price Evaluation Team Report |  |
| Past Performance/Small Business Evaluation Team Report |  |
| Source Evaluation Board Report of Non-Cost/Price Evaluation |  |
| SEB Briefing to SSO |  |
| SSO Source Selection Decision |  |
| Contract Award |  |

1. PROCUREMENT INTEGRITY

***[This language can be boilerplate for this section].***

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.

1. SOURCE SELECTION TEAM ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

***[Provide a description of the source selection team roles and responsibilities to ensure a successful source evaluation and selection. A list of source selection team roles and responsibilities can be found in AMS T3.2.2.4.A.2. The source selection team may be comprised of the Source Selection Official, Source Evaluation Team, Contracting Officer, Product or Service Team Lead or Director of the Requiring Service Organization, nongovernmental evaluators and advisors, and support personnel. The composition of the source selection team will vary based on the size and complexity of the procurement.]***

* 1. Source Selection Organization

**Example:** As depicted below in Figure 1, the Source Selection Organization is comprised of the Source Selection Official (SSO), Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB), the Contracting Officer (CO), a Legal Advisor, and the Source Evaluation Team (SET) consisting of four individual evaluation teams that are responsible for the evaluation of the associated proposal volumes. The individual evaluation teams are as follows:

* Technical Evaluation Team (TET);
* Management Evaluation Team (MET);
* Past Performance and Small Business Subcontracting Plan Evaluation Team (PP/SBET); and
* Price Evaluation Team (PET).

Figure 1: Source Selection Organization

| **Name** | **Title** | **Organization** |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Source Selection Official (SSO)** |  |
| Jane Doe | Program Manager | AAP-1 |
| **Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB)** | | |
|  |  |  |
| **Source Evaluation Team** | | |
|  |  |  |
|  | **Legal Advisor** |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | **Contracting Officer** |  |
|  |  |  |

* 1. Source Selection Team Responsibilities

***[The below is an example of the roles that would be included in a source selection. Please tailor the roles and responsibilities section based on the size and complexity of the procurement.]***

* + 1. Source Selection Official (SSO)

The Product or Service team lead or Director (or equivalent position) of the requiring organization is the source selection official (SSO) for a procurement under an investment program subject to the Joint Resources Council (JRC) process (unless the JRC otherwise designates an SSO). For procurements not subject to the JRC investment- decision process, the CO is the SSO. The SSO's responsibilities include the following:

* + - Assure team competence, cohesiveness, and effectiveness;
    - Approve evaluation plans and assure the evaluation conforms to the plan and to the stated evaluation criteria; and
    - Make down-select decisions and assume full authority to select the source for award.
    - Ensure the selection process is conducted properly and according to applicable policies and laws;
    - Establish the Source Evaluation Team (SET) and ensures the team has the skills, expertise, and experience to perform the evaluation;
    - Ensure actual or apparent conflicts of interest are avoided; Ensures premature or unauthorized disclosure of source selection information is avoided;
    - Concur with the CO’s decision to release the SIR (if the SSO is other than the CO); and
    - Make the final source selection decision for an award, and ensures the rationale is documented before contract award.
    1. Contracting Officer (CO)

The CO ensures compliance with the FAA AMS and other relevant regulations and advises the SSO and SET. The CO is also responsible for the following:

* + - Serve as the SSO for procurements not subject to the JRC investment- decision process;
    - 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 following:
      * 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.
    1. Legal Advisor

The Legal Advisor acts as a non-voting advisor to the entire Source Selection Organization and provides consultation as necessary. The Legal Advisor is also responsible for the following:

* + - Providing background and opinions on the legal aspects of the source selection process to the SSO, Contracting Officer, and SET
    - Reviewing the SEP and evaluation reports
    - Reviewing clarification requests (CRs) and other communications with Offerors prior to their release
    - Assisting the CO in briefing the evaluation teams on rules and regulations applicable to the conduct of the evaluation process (e.g. Procurement Integrity Act, Conflict of Interest)
    - Reviewing the proposed contract for form and legality prior to award
    - Reviewing redacted evaluation reports prior to their release to Offerors
    - Assisting the CO and participating in the conduct of Offeror debriefings
    1. Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) Members

SSEB members are responsible for ensuring a comprehensive evaluation is conducted for each submission in response to the SIR in accordance with the SEP. SSEB members are also responsible for the following:

* + - Reviewing and concurring with the SEP
    - Abiding by all provisions of this plan
    - Completing and adhering to Conflict of Interest, Non-Disclosure requirements and rules of conduct
    - Completing evaluation training
    - Ensuring the SET conducts a fair, impartial, in-depth review of each proposal
    - Reviewing the individual volume-level evaluation reports and coordinating any questions or required clarifications through the CO
    - Participating in SSEB meetings and decisions
    - Performing a comparative analysis of the Offeror proposals and evaluation results as part of the best value trade-off
    - Reaching consensus on the best value recommendation to the SSO
    - Preparing and signing the SSEB Report that documents the best value trade-off and provides an award recommendation for the SSO
    - Preparing briefing materials for the SSO to summarize the evaluation results
    - Submitting a minority report for SSO consideration if consensus cannot be reached
    - Participating in Offeror debriefings if requested by the CO
    1. SSEB Lead

In addition to having the same role as other SSEB members, the SSEB Lead is responsible for the conduct of all SEB activities. The SEB Lead is also responsible for the following:

* + - Managing the overall activities of the SSEB
    - Ensuring that all SSEB members adhere to Conflict of Interest, Non-Disclosure requirements and rules of conduct
    - Ensuring all SSEB members are trained prior to start of SEB evaluation activities
    - Ensuring all SSEB members have read and understand the provisions of this plan
    - If consensus cannot be reached, documenting the best value recommendation for the SSO based upon the majority view while ensuring the existence of minority views is noted in the report summary and any minority reports are included as attachments to the report
    - Serving as the focal points for coordination and consultation with the SSO
    - Briefing the SSO on the findings of the SSEB
    1. Source Selection Evaluation Team
       1. Technical Evaluation Team (TET)

The TET Team will evaluate the non-cost/price (technical) portion of each offeror’s proposal in accordance with the SEP and Sections L and M of the RFP. Specific duties are as follows:

* + - Conduct a comprehensive review and evaluation of proposals based solely on the evaluation criteria outlined in the RFP.
    - Assist the TET Lead in documenting the TET evaluation results.
    - Support any post-source-selection activities, such as debriefings and postaward reviews/meetings, as required. TET members shall perform comparative analysis of proposals or make source selection recommendations unless requested by the SSO.

The TET will provide a written narrative identifying proposal areas which are deficient or in need of clarification or substantiation; and rate each proposal in accordance with the guidelines set forth herein. Proposals requirements are documented in Section L – Instructions to Offerors (Attachment 1). Evaluation criteria are documented in Section M – Evaluation Factors for Award (Attachment 2).

The TET will provide suggested topics for communication with the Offeror, if communications are held, and such briefings and consultations concerning the evaluation as required by the SSO. The TET will not have access to cost information during their evaluation. The Contracting Officer, however, in consultation with the TET Lead may decide to make limited cost information available to corroborate certain information in either an Offeror’s technical or cost proposal. The TET’s evaluations and ratings are documented using the individual and composite evaluation forms shown in Attachment 3.

TET Report: The TET’s evaluation of each offeror’s technical proposal shall be documented in a written report submitted for SSO review and approval. The TET report shall address each offer received as well as the methods and results of the TET’s technical evaluation.

* + - 1. Price Evaluation Team (PET)

The PET Lead shall ensure that the PET performs its duties in accordance with the SEP and applicable regulations addressing the analysis of cost/pricing proposals; preside over PET meetings; coordinate documentation and retention of PET findings; brief PET members and ensure the proper safeguarding of source selection information; reconcile disagreements between PET members and document the rationale for differences, if unresolved; and act as the liaison between the PET and the SSA.

The PET will review and evaluate each cost/price proposal against the requirements of the Government’s RFP; verify that the labor hours/labor mix offered in each offeror’s technical proposal is the same as that offered in it’s the cost/price proposal, and analyze any inconsistencies; verify that proposed costs/prices are realistic and reasonable utilizing Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) and Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) services as necessary; determine whether the amounts proposed for all cost elements (e.g., direct labor, other direct costs, indirect costs) are reasonable and realistic for the work to be performed; develop recommended questions, statements, or topics for discussion based on the results of the cost/price evaluation; and provide any necessary briefings, and consultations, concerning the results of the PET’s review.

PET Report: The PET’s evaluation of each offeror’s cost/pricing proposal shall be documented in a written report submitted for SSO review and approval. The PET report shall address each offer received as well as the methods and results of the PET’s cost/price evaluation and shall include a recommended total evaluated cost/price for each offeror.

* + 1. Past Performance Evaluation Team

The PPET Lead is responsible for ensuring that the PPET performs its duties in accordance with the SEP. The Lead will brief PPET members concerning the need to safeguard source selection information and will convene the PPET and preside over PPET meetings. The Lead will act as the liaison between the PPET and the SSO; reconcile disagreements between PPET members and document the rationale for those differences, if unresolved; and coordinate the documentation and preservation of the findings of the PPET, and provide a written report to the SSO that summarizes the methods and results of the PPET’s past performance evaluation.

The PPET will perform past performance evaluations for all offerors, in accordance with AMS T3.2.2.3.B.2. Each past performance evaluation shall address recent and relevant performance based on Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) assessment data, and may include other information obtained using Past Performance Questionnaires. Attachment 4 provides a sample Past Performance Questionnaire Template.

PPET Evaluation Report: The PPET will prepare an Evaluation Report addressing the results of its evaluations of each offeror’s past performance and submit to SSO for review and approval.]. (A sample PPET Evaluation Report Template is provided as Attachment 5).

* + 1. Advisors

Advisors are non-voting team members that have expertise that is not otherwise available to the evaluation team but considered essential to the selection process. Advisors are either Government or Non-Government personnel who actively participate in the evaluation. Advisors will also:

* + - Review and abide by all provisions of this plan
    - Complete and adhere to Conflict of Interest and Non-Disclosure requirements and rules of conduct
    - Complete evaluation training
    - Ensure that the proposals and related information are safeguarded against unauthorized disclosure
    - Read all proposal information related to the assigned evaluation team
    - Participate in debriefings to Offerors if requested by the CO

As requested by the respective Evaluation Team Lead, Advisors will also:

* + - Participate in team discussions
    - Identify potential clarification requests
    - Analyze and provide assessments of proposals being evaluated by the particular team
    - Assist with the preparation of the team’s evaluation report

As requested by the SEB, SEB Advisors will also:

* + - Assist with the preparation of evaluation documentation, including the SEB Report to the SSO and the SSO Decision Memorandum.

1. NON-GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL

***[This language can be boilerplate for this section].***

* 1. Prohibitions

Non-government personnel may support the source evaluation; however, the development of the best value recommendation and the award decision are the responsibility of Government personnel exclusively. The SSO may add advisors to the SET at any time during the evaluation. Any support Contractor approved to participate in the Evaluation process is required to complete a Non-Disclosure Agreement and conflict of interest form prior to participation.

* 1. Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI)

OCI clauses are included in contracts when non-Governmental technical advisors have been approved in accordance with the above paragraph to provide support to this source selection. The OCI clauses require the companies and individual non-Government advisors to protect Offeror proprietary data and Government source selection information and prohibit the companies from otherwise participating as an Offeror, a subcontractor, or as a consultant to an Offeror/subcontractor in relation to this acquisition.

1. RULES OF CONDUCT

***[This language can be boilerplate for this section].***

No source selection participant shall:

1. Discuss proposals, findings, recommendations, etc., outside working places or within hearing range of individuals not participating in the source selection
2. Discuss source selection sensitive information among individuals not involved in the source selection process.
3. Accept an invitation from an offeror or offeror’s personnel to participate in any event/function, regardless of how remote it may be from the source selection process, without first consulting and obtaining the approval of General Counsel. Refer to General Counsel all questions relating to standards of conduct/conflicts of interest as soon as they arise.
4. Discuss the procurement with any person who is not part of the Source Selection Team, even after announcement of a winning offeror.
5. Confirm individual participation in the evaluation/source selection process, the number or identities of evaluators, the number or identities of offerors, or any other information related to the procurement, no matter how innocuous or trivial it may seem. Any contact from persons not involved in the source selection process must be reported immediately to the SSA and the Contracting Officer.
6. Engage in prohibited conduct (e.g., knowingly furnishing source selection information, revealing an offeror’s price without that offeror’s permission, revealing an offeror’s technical solution, or revealing the source(s) of past performance information).
7. SECURITY OF PROPOSALS AND SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION

***[This language can be boilerplate for this section].***

To maintain the effectiveness and integrity of the source selection process, information related to the source selection and Offeror proposal information must be handled with the utmost discretion. Source Selection Information (SSI) and Competition Sensitive Information (CSI) will be marked accordingly.

* 1. Definition of Terms:

1. ***Source Selection Information.*** SSI is any information prepared by the FAA for the purpose of evaluating a bid or proposal to enter into a contract if that information is sensitive and should be protected. This information may include the Source Evaluation Plan, technical evaluations of proposals, price evaluations of proposals, rankings of proposals, reports to the SSO, etc.
2. ***Competition Sensitive Contractor Bid and Proposal Information.*** Competition Sensitive Information (CSI) is defined as the written information, visual aids and oral information of one contractor (or its subcontractors) that is engaged in a competitive procurement that, if disclosed, would jeopardize or compromise one or more of their competitive positions. In accordance with the FAA’s implementation of the Procurement Integrity Act, Contractor Bid and Proposal information (CBPI) is comprised of cost or pricing data, labor rates, and proprietary information about manufacturing processes, operations, or techniques.
   1. Control of CSI and SSI

Originators of CSI and SSI are responsible for identifying and marking such data at the bottom of each page of material. Hardcopy documents marked as CSI and SSI. Information marked as CSI and SSI will be destroyed following the evaluation or maintained by the CO in a secure contracts file.

* 1. Disclosure of CSI and SSI

Disclosure of CSI and SSI shall be limited to the SSO, and SSEB, SET members who are involved in the evaluation and have signed and have on file with the Contracting Officer a Non-Disclosure and Conflict of Interest Agreement for the Source Selection. Please note that there will be no cross-evaluation-team disclosure except that which is discussed in this evaluation plan/orchestrated by the CO.

* 1. Transmittal of CSI and SSI

The appropriate method of transmittal of CSI and SSI will be determined by the CO. Information marked as CSI and SSI may not be transmitted by facsimile or hand-carried away from the evaluation site. Exceptions may occur only with the permission of the CO. No CSI or SSI documents may be reproduced without the permission of the CO.

* 1. 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.

1. SOURCE SELECTION/EVALUATION PROCESS

***[For Section 9, the CO may reference and/or attach SIR Sections L and M to the Source Evaluation Plan to address the Source Selection/Evaluation Process portion of the SEP. The information provided below is an example of the information required in Section M or the Source Evaluation Plan.]***

The SET will evaluate proposals in strict accordance with the instructions to offerors in Section L (Attachment 1) and evaluation factors for award stated in Section M (Attachment 2) of the SIR. Award will be made to the responsible and responsive offeror(s) whose proposal represents the best value to the Government.

***[Indicate here whether the basis for award will be the “Best Value to the Government based on consideration of price and non-price factors.]***

This process is appropriate because\_\_\_\_\_

***[Insert here the rationale for this method of evaluation. For example, Best Value (Tradeoff Process) is most often used when the requirement is not clearly defined or if there is a higher degree of performance risk, or when it is in the Government’s best interest to consider award to other than the lowest priced offeror or other than the highest technically rated offeror.]***

***[For Tradeoff Process state whether all evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are significantly more important than, approximately equal to, or significantly less important than cost or price.]***

* 1. Evaluation of Factors

In evaluating the Non-Cost/Price (Technical) portion of offeror proposals, the SET will evaluate the following factors and sub-factors, as described in Section M of the SIR:

***[For Best Value (i.e. Tradeoff Process) state whether all evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are significantly more important than, approximately equal to, or significantly less important than cost or price. See AMS T3.2.2.3.A.5 (1) for additional information.]***

***[List here all Non-Cost/Price factors and sub-factors to be evaluated, other than Past Performance. In doing so, address the relative importance of each factor/subfactor, i.e., whether it is of equal importance or of weighted importance relative to another factor/subfactor.]***

***Example:*** The Government’s source selection decision will be based on the following six evaluation factors, listed in order of descending importance:

(1) Technical Qualifications (Volume I);

(2) Management Approach (Volume II);

(3) Past Performance (Volume IV);

(4) Small Business (SB) and Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB)

Participation (Volume V);

(5) Price (Volume III); (Not Rated); and

(6) Miscellaneous (Volume VI); (Not Rated)

* 1. Strengths/Weaknesses/Deficiencies

**Example:**Source Evaluation Definitions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strength** | An aspect of a proposal that would positively impact performance of the resulting contract, exceed the minimum requirements, or otherwise benefit the Government. The area that exceeds the requirements stated in the statement of work. Also may contain enhancing features that provide supply or service above and beyond what is called for that benefit the Government. |
| **Weakness** | An aspect of a proposal that would negatively impact performance of the resulting contract, fail to meet the minimum requirements, or otherwise harm the Government. A flaw that increases the risk of unsuccessful performance. A weakness is also an omission from the Offeror’s proposal that contributed to a deficiency in meeting the evaluation criteria or is otherwise a shortcoming of the proposal that has the potential to degrade contract performance. A weakness may be correctable through discussions and revisions. |
| **Deficiency** | A material failure to meet the requirement or a combination of weaknesses that increases the risk of unsuccessful performance to an unacceptable level. Deficiencies are fatal errors that can’t be corrected, without major revisions. |
| **Risk** | An aspect an Offeror's proposal that presents an uncertainty as to the ability of the Offeror successfully to perform the required effort or the proposed approach. An aspect (e.g. cost, price, technical, performance or schedule) that would be possible if the Offeror is selected. |
| **Clarification** | Communication with an Offeror for the sole purpose of eliminating minor irregularities, informalities, ambiguities, or apparent clerical mistakes in its offer. It is achieved by explanation or substantiation, either in response to Government inquiry or as initiated by the Offeror. Note: An ambiguity is a situation in which something can be understood in more than one way and it is not clear which meaning is intended. |
| **Omission** | Information requested in the SIR that was not provided in the proposal. An omission is not necessarily a deficiency if is not material in nature and the intent of the Offeror can be readily determined. |

The evaluation of non-Cost/Price factors and subfactors described above, shall fully address and document strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies, and potential discussion questions for each offeror’s proposal.

* 1. Ratings for Non-Cost/Price Factors

***[In any evaluation process, the source evaluation board should first identify the strengths and weaknesses involved with a proposal, and then assign the adjectival or numerical rating to the criteria. For the below section, please provide the ratings for the Non-Cost/Price Factors.]***

**Example 1:** The output of the Technical evaluation will be a single adjectival rating for each Offeror’s Volume I proposal. There are five (5) adjectival ratings: Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, and Unsatisfactory. The definitions for the adjectival ratings are provided in Table M-3 of the SIR and shown below.

Based on the strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies noted above, the SET shall assign to each technical factor/subfactor a rating using the following adjectival rating scale:

Table 1: Adjectival Rating Definitions for Technical Approach

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **Description** |
| Excellent | The Offeror’s proposal contains no deficiencies and fully addresses all aspects of the criteria and demonstrates an excellent approach/solution and understanding of the requirements.  Many strengths exist, far outweighing any weaknesses. The highest quality of contract performance is anticipated with very low risk. |
| Good | The Offeror’s proposal contains no deficiencies; fully addresses all aspects of the criteria and demonstrates a very effective approach/solution and understanding of the requirements.  Some weaknesses may exist; however, the weaknesses, if any, are outweighed by strengths. A high quality of contract performance is anticipated with low risk. |
| Satisfactory | The Offeror’s proposal contains no deficiencies; addresses all aspects of the criteria and demonstrates an adequate approach/solution and understanding of the requirements.  Strengths and weaknesses are offsetting or will have little or no impact on contract performance. A quality contract performance is anticipated with an acceptable amount of risk. |
| Marginal | The Offeror’s proposal may contain deficiencies; fails to address all of the criteria and does not demonstrate an adequate approach/solution or understanding of the requirements.  One or more weaknesses exist which are not offset by strengths. Contract performance is anticipated with high risk. |
| Unsatisfactory | The Offeror’s proposal contains many deficiencies and does not address all aspects of the criteria and/or does not present evidence demonstrating an adequate approach/solution and understanding of the requirements.  Many weaknesses and/or omissions exist creating an unacceptable risk. |

The overall volume-level adjectival ratings will be based upon the assimilation of the subfactor-level ratings and the order of importance of the individual factors as defined in Section M of the SIR.

**Example 2:** Adjectival Ratings for Technical Factors

Based on the strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies noted above, the SET shall assign to each technical factor/subfactor a combined technical/risk rating using the following adjectival rating scale:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Technical | |
| OUTSTANDING | Proposal meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths far outweigh weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is very low. |
| GOOD | Proposal meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal contains strengths which outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is low. |
| ACCEPTABLE | Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths and weaknesses are offsetting or will have little or no impact on contract performance. Risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate. |
| MARGINAL | Proposal does not clearly meet requirements and has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. The proposal has one or more weaknesses which are not offset by strengths. Risk of unsuccessful performance is high. |
| UNACCEPTABLE | Proposal does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies. Proposal is unawardable. |

**Example 3:** Numerical Ratings for Technical Factors

***[It is strongly suggested that if a numerical system is used, the point system used should be a staggered numeric rating system (e.g., 1, 3, 5, 8 and 10) representing the various ratings and not use a full sequential scale (i.e., 0, 1, 2, 3 . . . 10) to represent the various ratings. If the sequential system is used, it forces the evaluation team to differentiate the rating of each evaluation factor within a range of points (e.g., a satisfactory element of a proposal must receive either 4, 5 or 6 rating points) as opposed to the assignment of a standard 5 point rating for a satisfactory rating. The sequential system also can result in generating overall proposal ratings which are numerically close in the total rating which may disguise the proposal differences.]***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| NUMERICAL | DEFINITION/STANDARDS |
| 10 | Proposal demonstrates excellent understanding of requirements and approach that significantly exceeds performance or capability standards. Has exceptional strengths that will significantly benefit the Government. |
| 8 | Proposal demonstrates good understanding of requirements and approach that exceeds performance or capability standards. Has one or more strengths that will benefit the Government. |
| 5 | Proposal demonstrates acceptable understanding of requirements and approach that meets performance or capability standards. Acceptable solution. Few or no strengths. |
| 3 | Proposal demonstrates shallow understanding of requirements and approach that only marginally meets performance or capability standards necessary for minimal but acceptable contract performance. |
| 0 | Fails to meet performance or capability standards. Requirements can only be met with major changes to the proposal. |

* 1. Mandatory Requirements

***[Omit this section if there are no minimum standards that must be met.] [List here any Mandatory Requirements rated as Acceptable/Unacceptable (Pass/Fail).]***

**Example:** The following are Mandatory Proposal Requirements as stated in Section M of the SIR.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Mandatory Requirements** | **Pass/Fail Ratings** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

* 1. Past Performance Evaluation

***[The following applies to a Tradeoff source selection process.]***

The PPET will conduct a structured past performance evaluation that examines each offeror’s demonstrated record of recent past performance on similar contracts to determine its relevance to the Government’s current needs, the quality of that performance, and the degree of confidence the Government places in each offeror’s ability to meet its requirements.

* 1. Sources of Past Performance Information

***[In accordance with AMS Guidance T3.2.2.3.B.2, past performance factors chosen for evaluation should be reasonable, logical, coherent, and directly related to requirements in the statement of work (SOW). The key to successful use of past performance in the screening process is a clear relationship between the SOW, instructions to offerors, and evaluation criteria. Past performance information that is not important to the current acquisition should not be included.]***

1. CPARS may serve as a source of information when evaluating each offeror’s relevant past performance.
2. Additional past performance information may be obtained from the following sources:

***[Indicate here any additional sources, and the process by which past performance data will be collected. Sources of data may include past performance information provided by the offeror (e.g. references submitted in accordance with Sections L and M of the Request for Proposal RFP)), and other Government and non-Government sources.]***

1. A Past Performance Questionnaire may be used to collect information on an offeror’s recent and relevant past performance.

***[Tailor the elements and sub-elements to be used in evaluating past performance to the circumstances of the acquisition.***

* 1. Relevance of Past Performance Information

***After receipt of each offeror’s past performance information, the PPET shall consider the relevance of each offeror’s past performance in relation to the Government’s current requirements.***

**Example:** Past Performance Relevancy Ratings

| **PAST PERFORMANCE RELEVANCY RATINGS**  Aspects of relevance include similarity of service/support provided, complexity of effort, dollar value, contract type, and, where applicable, the degree of subcontracting/teaming. To be relevant performance data needs to be recent as described in Section L of the RFP. | |
| --- | --- |
| **Very Relevant** | Present/past performance involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities as this solicitation requires. |
| **Relevant** | Present/past performance involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities as this solicitation requires. |
| **Somewhat Relevant** | Present/past performance involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities as this solicitation requires. |
| **Not Relevant** | Present/past performance involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities as this solicitation requires. |

* 1. Quality of Past Performance

For past performance found to be relevant to the Government’s current requirements, the following elements and sub-elements will be evaluated for each offeror:

***[List here, and include in the Past Performance Questionnaire, all applicable elements and sub elements relating to past performance (e.g., Quality of Product or Service, Schedule Performance, Management Performance, Cost Control, etc.), and explain what these elements and sub-elements encompass.]***

**Example 1:** Adjectival Ratings for Past Performance

The following evaluation levels and rating definitions shall be used in assessing the quality of each offeror’s past performance with respect to the above listed elements and sub-elements.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PAST PERFORMANCE QUALITY RATINGS**  Aspects of quality include how well an offeror meets or exceeds contractual requirements, how problems encountered in the course of contract performance were addressed, and the effectiveness of corrective actions taken. | |
| **Exceptional** | Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the Government’s benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were highly effective. |
| **Very Good** | Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the Government’s benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective. |
| **Satisfactory** | Performance meets contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor appear or were satisfactory. |
| **Marginal** | Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions. The contractor’s proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented. |
| **Unsatisfactory** | Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains a serious problem(s) for which the contractor’s corrective actions appear or were ineffective. |

**Example 2:** Adjectival Ratings for Past Performance

| **Rating** | **Definition** |
| --- | --- |
| **Acceptable** | The Offeror’s record of past performance indicates there is very little risk associated with receiving quality products, timely services and full contract performance. Past performance surveys and the Offeror’s experience indicate the Offeror will meet or exceed the requirements of the contract. The Contractor has demonstrated recent experience with projects of similar size, scope and complexity. |
| **Unacceptable** | The Offer’s record of past performance indicates that there is some potential risk associated with receiving quality products, timely services, and contract performance. Past performance surveys and the Offeror’s experience indicate the Offeror may have some problems during performance of the delivery order. The Contractor has demonstrated limited recent experience with projects of similar size, scope and complexity. |

* 1. Summary Report of Past Performance

After the PPET has completed the above described evaluation process for each offeror, it shall prepare for the SET a PPET Evaluation Report. The PPET Evaluation Report shall summarize its findings and conclusions with respect to the relevance and quality of each offeror’s past performance, and how that evaluation supports the PPET’s confidence assessment of each offeror’s ability to meet the Government’s needs.

* 1. Cost/Price Analysis

In evaluating the cost/price portion of each offeror’s proposal, the PET will evaluate proposed prices/costs for completeness, reasonableness, and realism.

* 1. Completeness Factor

The Government will evaluate each cost/pricing proposal for completeness by determining the adequacy and traceability of cost/pricing data provided for all proposal requirements.

* 1. Reasonableness Factor

The Government will evaluate how well each offeror’s proposal supports elements of cost, work hours, loading factors and rates over the life of the proposed contract. Proposed rates and factors also will be verified with the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) via rate checks or formal audits, as appropriate.

* 1. Realism Factor

***[Include discussion of how the Price Evaluation Team will address realism if applicable in SIR.]***

Example: In accordance with AMS T3.2.3, the Government will perform a cost realism analysis by identifying the specific elements of a cost estimate or a proposed price and comparing those elements against reliable and independent means of cost measurement. This analysis judges whether or not the estimates under analysis are verifiable, complete, and accurate, and whether or not the offeror's estimating methodology is logical, appropriate, and adequately explained. This verifies that the costs or prices proposed fairly represent the costs likely to be incurred for the proposed services under the offeror's technical and management approach. The offeror’s Most Probable Cost (MPC) is determined by adjusting each offeror’s proposed cost, and fee when appropriate, to reflect any cost additions or reductions in cost elements to realistic levels based on the results of the cost realism analysis.

* 1. Relative Order of Importance

In evaluating offers the relative order of importance of non-cost/price (technical) and past performance evaluation factors and subfactors is as follows:

***[List here the various factors and subfactors being evaluated and address their relative importance. For the non-cost/price (technical) factors listed indicate whether each factor will be of equal importance or whether some factors are of greater importance than others, and if so their relative weights. With respect to the various subfactors within each non-cost/price (technical) evaluation factor, indicate their relative importance or whether they are of equal importance. Similarly, provide a rank ordering for past performance evaluation factors and subfactors. Then indicate the relative importance of non-cost/price (technical) factors versus past performance factors. ]***

Each offeror will receive a summary rating for the combined non-cost/price (technical) and past performance elements of its proposal. When combined, all of these non-cost evaluation factors are

***[State here whether all evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are significantly more important than, approximately equal to, or significantly less important than cost or price.]***

* 1. Small Business Subcontracting Plan Evaluation (Large Businesses Only)

***[If applicable, state how the Small Business Subcontracting Plan will be evaluated.]***

Example: Small Business Subcontracting Plan Evaluation

The evaluation of Small Business Subcontracting Plans will be based upon the degree to which Large Business Offerors meet the subcontracting goals identified in Section L and AMS clause 3.6.1-4. The Government also will evaluate whether the Offeror’s Small Business Subcontracting Plan demonstrates that the subcontracting goals apply over the full life of the contract, including the base period and each exercised option period. Offeror submissions will be assessed on an individual basis; there will be no comparison of Offerors to reach the volume-level ratings.

The Small Business Subcontracting Plans will be evaluated as Acceptable or Unacceptable as defined in Table below. The submission of a Small Business Subcontracting Plan is not applicable to small businesses and therefore small or small disadvantaged businesses will not receive a rating for this factor. Since the Government’s subcontracting goals are stated in terms of the percentage of the total planned subcontracting dollars, an Offeror with no subcontractors will receive an Acceptable Rating by default.

**Sample Small Business Subcontracting Plan Evaluation Rating Definitions**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Rating | Definition |
| Acceptable | The Offeror’s response demonstrates a viable small business subcontracting plan that meets the specified subcontracting goals and the AMS content requirements. |
| Unacceptable | The Offeror’s response does not demonstrate a viable small business subcontracting plan and does not meet the specified subcontracting goals or the AMS content requirements. |

At the conclusion of the Small Business Subcontracting Plan evaluation, the SBET will prepare a report that summarizes the evaluation methodology, each Offeror’s proposed subcontracting approach and percentages, the evaluation findings for each Offeror, and the associated rationale.

APPENDIX 1: SECTION L – INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS

***[Insert Section L of the Request for Proposals]***

APPENDIX 2: SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

***[Insert Section M of the Request for Proposals]***

1. ATTACHMENT 1: EVALUATION FORMS
   1. ATTACHMENT 1-1: SET (TET and MET) INDIVIDUAL FACTOR/SUBFACTOR EVALUATION

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluator: |  |
| Offeror: |  |
| Factor/Sub-factor: |  |
| Rating: |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **STRENTHS:** |
|  |
| **WEAKNESSES:** |
|  |
| **DEFICIENCIES:** |
|  |
| **PROPOSED COMMUNICATIONS QUESTIONS:** |
|  |

***[Each evaluator must complete the above form for each technical evaluation subfactor identified in the Source Evaluation Plan for each offeror being evaluated. Once completed, this form provides documentary support and serves as the basis for completion of the SET Individual Factor Summation Report; and any further clarifications or discussions with this offeror.]***

1. ATTACHMENT 2: EVALUATION FORMS
   1. ATTACHMENT 2-1: SET INDIVIDUAL EVALUATOR RATING SHEET

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluator: |  |
| Offeror: |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluator: | |
| Offeror: | |
|  | |
| **Non-Cost/Price Factors** | **Factor/Subfactor Ratings** |
| **Factor 1:**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |  |
| **Subfactor:** |  |
| **Subfactor:** |  |
| **Overall Factor 1 Rating** |  |
|  |  |
| **Factor 2:** |  |
| **Subfactor:** |  |
| **Subfactor:** |  |
| **Overall Factor 1 Rating** |  |
|  |  |
| **Overall Rating** |  |

***[Add or delete rows as necessary to identify and individually rate all non-cost/price factors and subfactors specified in the Source Evaluation Plan. Provide an overall technical rating taking into consideration all technical evaluation factors and subfactors listed, and their relative weights, as specified in the Source Selection Plan. Include in the space provided a narrative summary supporting this overall rating. Each evaluator should complete the above evaluation form for each offeror being evaluated. Once completed, the information contained on these forms will provide the supporting detail necessary for completion of the SET Summary Evaluation Rating Sheet for all offerors receiving a technical evaluation.]***

1. ATTACHMENT 3: EVALUATION FORMS
   1. ATTACHMENT 2-2: SEB SUMMARY EVALUATION RATING SHEETS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluator: |  |
| Offeror: |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Factor/Subfactor Ratings** | | | | **Summary** |
| **Evaluator Name** | **Evaluator Name #1** | **Evaluator Name #2** | **Evaluator Name #3** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Factor 1:** |  |  |  |  |
| **Subfactor:** |  |  |  |  |
| **Subfactor:** |  |  |  |  |
| **Overall Factor 1 Rating** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Factor 2:** |  |  |  |  |
| **Subfactor:** |  |  |  |  |
| **Subfactor:** |  |  |  |  |
| **Overall Factor 2 Rating** |  |  |  |  |
|  | | | | |
| **Overall Rating** |  |  |  |  |

***[For the individual offeror indicated, above, add or delete rows and columns to this form as necessary to identify and rate all technical evaluation factors and subfactors specified in the Source Evaluation Plan; and to identify each person providing an l evaluation of the offeror’s proposal. Indicate in the Summary column the composite rating of all identified evaluators for each factor and subfactor listed.] [This form, which will serve as the basis for the SEB Composite Offerors Non-Cost/Price Factors Rating Report, must be completed for each offeror receiving a technical evaluation.]***

1. ATTACHMENT 4: EVALUATION FORMS
   1. ATTACHMENT 2-3: SEB COMPOSITE OFFERORS NON-COST/PRICE FACTORS (TECHNICAL) RATING REPORT

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Factor/Subfactor Ratings** | | | | **Summary** |
| **Offeror Name** | **Offeror Name #1** | **Offeror Name #2** | **Offeror Name #3** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Factor 1:** |  |  |  |  |
| **Subfactor:** |  |  |  |  |
| **Subfactor:** |  |  |  |  |
| **Overall Factor 1 Rating** |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Factor 2:** |  |  |  |  |
| **Subfactor:** |  |  |  |  |
| **Subfactor:** |  |  |  |  |
| **Overall Factor 2 Rating** |  |  |  |  |
|  | | | | |
| **Overall Rating** |  |  |  |  |

**Submitted By:**

***[Add or delete rows and columns as necessary to list and rate all technical factors and subfactors specified in the Source Evaluation Plan for all offerors who submitted technical proposals.]***

1. ATTACHMENT 5: SAMPLE PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

**PART I (TO BE COMPLETED BY OFFEROR REQUESTING THE REFERENCE)**

1. **OFFEROR INFORMATION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Offeror Name: |  |
| Offeror Address: |  |

1. **CONTRACT IDENTIFICATION**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: |  | | | | |
| Contract Number: |  | | | | |
| Agency/Customer: |  | | | | |
| Agency/Customer POC Name: |  | | | | |
| Agency/Customer POC Email Address |  | | | | |
| Contract/Order/Subcontract/Other: |  | | | | |
| Contract Type: |  | | | | |
| Contract Purpose (e.g., Service, Supply, Deveopment/First Article, R&D)? |  | | | | |
| Contract Award Date: |  | | | | |
| Period of Performance |  | | | | |
| Total Contract Value: |  | | | | |
| Value of Offeror’s Share |  | | | | |
| Was the Offeror a Prime Contractor? |  | **Yes** |  |  | **No** |
| Was the Offeror a Sub Contractor? |  | **Yes** |  |  | **No** |
| Competitive Award? |  | **Yes** |  |  | **No** |

Program Title and nature of the effort (i.e., describe the scope of the effort, the type of tasks involved, labor skills used, and products/support delivered).

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**PART II (TO BE COMPLETED BY RESPONDENT)**

Please answer each of the following questions with a rating that is based on objective measurable performance indicators to the maximum extent possible. Commentary to support very high or very low rating should be noted on page 5.

Assign each area a rating of, 4 (Outstanding), 3 (Good), 2 (Satisfactory), and 1 (Unsatisfactory). Use the attached Rating Guidelines which is provided as Exhibit 1 as guidance in making these evaluations. Circle the appropriate rating.

1. **IDENTIFICATION OF RESPONDENT**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name: |  |
| Title: |  |
| Telephone Number: |  |
| Address: |  |
| Email: |  |

1. **EVALUATION**

**QUALITY OF SERVICE**:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Category | Rating | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | N/A |
| 1 | Compliance with contract requirements |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Accuracy of reports |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Level of knowledge, experience, and training of personnel |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Capability of personnel to perform required services |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Effectiveness of personnel in performing required services |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Overall quality of service |  |  |  |  |  |

**TIMELINESS OF PERFORMANCE**:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Category | Rating | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | N/A |
| 1 | Reliability |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Responsive to technical direction |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Meets contract delivery schedules and/or task deadlines |  |  |  |  |  |

**COST CONTROL**:

| # | Category | Rating | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | N/A |
| 1 | Current, accurate and complete billings |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Relationship of negotiated costs to actuals |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Cost effectiveness |  |  |  |  |  |

**PROGRAM MANAGEMENT:**

| # | Category | Rating | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | N/A |
| 1 | Adequate and complete management plan |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Specific management team dedicated to this project |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Indications that the provided team had experience in subcontractor management and surveillance |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Process, or metrics, for the evaluation of their own overall management performance |  |  |  |  |  |

**CUSTOMER RELATIONSHIP:**

| # | Category | Rating | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | N/A |
| 1 | Effective management, including subcontracts |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Reasonable/cooperative behavior |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Responsive to contract requirements |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Notification of problems |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | Flexibility |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6 | Proactive vs. reactive |  |  |  |  |  |

**OVERALL CUSTOMER SATISFACTION:**

| # | Category | Response | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Yes | No |
| 1 | The contractor is committed to customer satisfaction: |  |  |
|  | 1. Contractor Manageent Personnel |  |  |
|  | 1. Contractor Onsite Facility Personnel |  |  |

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

**Rating Guidelines**

Use the following definitions in your assessment of contractor performance.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RATING** | **QUALITY OF PRODUCT OR SERVICE** | **COST CONTROL** | **TIMELINESS OF PERFORMANCE** | **BUSINESS RELATIONS** |
| 4-Outstanding | Contractor is in compliance with contract requirements and/or delivers quality products/services | Contractor is effective in managing costs and submits current, accurate, and complete billings | Contractor is effective in meeting milestones and delivery schedules | Response to inquiries, technical/service/  administrative issues is effective |
| 3-Good | Minor inefficiencies/errors have been identified | Contractor is usually effective in managing costs | Contractor is usually effective in meeting milestones and delivery schedules | Response to inquiries, technical/service/administrative issues is usually effective |
| 2-Satisfactory | Some problems have been encountered | Contractor is having some problems in managing costs effectively | Contractor is having some problems meeting milestones and delivery schedules | Response to inquiries, technical/service/administrative issues is somewhat effective |
| 1-Unsatisfactory | Contractor is not in compliance and is jeopardizing achievement of contract objectives | Contractor is unable to manage costs effectively | Contractor delays are jeopardizing performance of contract objectives | Response to inquiries, technical/service/administrative issues is not effective |

1. ATTACHMENT 4: PPET EVALUTION REPORT TEMPLATE

**Overview**

The Past Performance Evaluation Team (PPET) assessed the confidence associated with each offeror’s relevant past performance on prior contracts. Emphasis of the assessment was on the relevance of each offeror’s recent past performance in specific areas, knowledge of the program[s] for which the offeror has supplied past performance information, and the quality of that performance. The PPET’s evaluation was subjective. From its evaluation of the relevance and quality of each offeror’s past performance the PPET was able to determine its level of confidence in each offeror’s ability to perform as proposed. Sub-elements not typically used for Past Performance were not used in this evaluation.

1. **Data Gathered**

The PPET used [*number*] sources of past performance data to assess the degree of confidence the Government places in each offeror’s ability to meet its requirements.

1. Past and present performance information provided by offerors;
2. Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) data (required per AMS T3.10.1.B.9;
3. Completed Past Performance Questionnaires received from *[Indicate sources, e.g., cognizant Project Officer, Contracting Officer’s Representative, Administrative Contracting Officer, Procuring Contracting Officer, and Contract Specialist]*;
4. Information gathered as a result of phone interviews with offeror-provided points of contact; and
5. *[Continue list to include all additional sources].*

***[Offeror A’s Name]*** provided ***[number]*** relevant contracts to be assessed. The PPET located ***[number]*** additional contracts performed by ***[Offeror A’s Name]***, of which ***[number]*** were relevant contracts. ***[Number]*** contracts were deemed relevant and were evaluated for ***[Offeror A’s Name]****.*

***[Offeror B’s Name]*** provided ***[number]*** relevant contracts to be assessed. The PPET located ***[number]*** additional contracts performed by ***[Offeror B’s Name]***, of which ***[number]*** were relevant contracts. ***[Number]*** contracts were deemed relevant and were evaluated for ***[Offeror B’s Name]****.*

***[Repeat for all offerors.]***

The offerors, their major subcontractors, and the respective involvement of all parties, are listed in the tables below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Offeror A** | |
| ***[Name of Offeror A]*** | ***[List that portion of the effort the Offeror performs / performed]*** |
| **Subcontractors** | |
| ***[Name of Subcontractor]*** | ***[List that portion of the effort this sub performs / performed]*** |
| ***[Name of Subcontractor]*** | ***[List that portion of the effort this sub performs / performed]*** |

1. **Evaluation**

The PPET evaluated the following projects performed by ***[Name of Offeror A]:***

* ***[List, by title, major projects performed by the Offeror and evaluated by the PPET.]***

The PPET evaluated the following projects performed by ***[Name of Offeror B]:***

* ***[List, by title, major projects performed by the Offeror and evaluated by the PPET.]***

***[Repeat for all Offerors]***

1. **Ratings**

The PPET relied upon all sources of data to assign a confidence assessment rating for each Offeror***. [Explain what data, if any, carried the most importance.]***

The PPET used the following considerations in assigning a confidence assessment rating to each Offeror:

*[Specify the considerations used, e.g., overall work record; number and severity of problems; effectiveness of any corrective actions; and programmatic such as product similarity, complexity, contract type and phase of the project.]*

Each offeror’s consolidated confidence rating with strengths, weaknesses, and supporting rationale follow: ***[Name of Offeror A]***

***[Name of Offeror A]*** was assigned a confidence rating of ***[insert rating]***. The team analyzed a total of ***[number]*** relevant contracts. Of the [*number*] contracts evaluated, PPIRS Reports existed on ***[number]*** contracts. The PPIRS Reports reflected ratings ranging from ***[adjectival rating]*** to ***[adjectival rating]****.* The PPET also reviewed ***[number]*** questionnaires with resultant ratings ranging from ***[adjectival rating]*** to ***[adjectival rating]*** and conducted phone interviews that resulted in ratings ranging from ***[adjectival rating]*** to ***[adjectival rating]****.*

* Strengths

The PPET identified the following strengths:

***[Use bullet statements to list strengths.]***

* Weaknesses

The PPET identified the following weaknesses:

***[Use bullet statements to list weaknesses.]***

* Deficiencies

The PPET identified the following deficiencies:

***[Use bullet statements to list deficiencies.]***

Given the strengths and weaknesses identified above, the PPET believes a confidence rating of ***[insert rating]*** was justified***. [Explain and discuss in one or two paragraphs the significant weaknesses and deficiencies, causes, and corrective action taken by the offeror.]***

**[REPEAT THE ABOVE ANALYSIS FOR EACH OFFEROR.]**

1. **Summary**

***[Provide a brief summary that includes a table identifying for each offeror its Past Performance Relevancy Rating, Past Performance Quality Rating, and resulting Past Performance Confidence Assessment similar to the following.]***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Offeror** | **Past Performance Relevance** | **Past Performance Quality** | **PPET Confidence Assessment** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

***[In determining these ratings, consider the number and severity of problems, the demonstrated effectiveness of corrective actions taken (not just those planned or promised), the offeror’s overall work record, and the degree of relevancy of all considered efforts. Ratings should reflect overall results and how they were achieved, rather than just problem-free management.]***

***[The final assessment should include the rationale for the conclusions reached, including instances of good or poor performance related to solicitation requirements. As long as the rationale is reasonable, i.e., based on analysis, verification, or corroboration of past performance information and is evaluated against the elements SIR, it will withstand any challenges.]***