

Part IV – Representations and Instructions

SECTION M: Evaluation Factors for Award

M.1 Clauses Incorporated by Full Text

52.217-5 Evaluation of Options (JULY 1990)

M. 2 Evaluation Criteria

The Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible Offeror whose offer, in conforming to the solicitation, provides an overall best value to the Government, price and other factors considered. The following factors shall be used to evaluate offers:

1. Technical Approach
2. Past Performance
3. Project Management
4. Staffing
5. Price

The Government will use the following terminology when assessing the value of factors:

1. More important: The criterion is greater in value than another criterion.
2. Approximately equal: The criterion is nearly the same in value as another criterion; any difference is very slight.

The Technical Approach factor is more important than the Past Performance factor, which is more important than the Project Management factor, which is more important than the Staffing factor. When combined, all four non-price factors are significantly more important than Price. Within the Technical Approach, Project Management, and Staffing factors, the sub-factors are listed in their order of importance and the evaluation elements within the sub-factors are of approximately equal importance. Within the Past Performance factor, all evaluation elements are of equal importance.

M.3 Non-Price Evaluation Factors and Sub-factors

M.3.1 Technical Approach

M.3.1.1 Understanding of the scope and complexity of the work, including creativity and thoroughness shown in understanding the objectives of the SOO and specific tasks, and planned execution of the project.

M.3.1.2 Evidence of a viable System Development Life-cycle Methodology (SDLC) that uses repeatable processes; follows industry standards; and demonstrates specific methods and techniques for completing each task on time with high-quality results.

M.3.1.3 Degree to which the offerors project plan presents a set of appropriate tasks in a logical order and with a realistic schedule to accomplish the objectives.

M.3.1.4 Thoroughness of the Performance Work Statement (PWS). Ability of the project plan, tasks, schedule, and deliverables described in the PWS to accomplish the tasks described in the SOO. Completeness of the project plan, milestones, deliverable descriptions, acceptability standards, and Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP).

M.3.2 Past Performance

The Government will use available information in the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS). If an Offeror does not have any record in the PPIRS website, the Offeror will receive a white (neutral) rating for past performance. Information from the PPIRS website will also be used to review relevant past performance ratings for subcontractors that will be performing major or critical aspects of the requirement. Past Performance from sources other than PPIRS and the Past Performance Questionnaires may be considered.

M.3.2.1 The Offeror's specific past performance demonstrates relevant and recent experience using Microsoft .NET and is similar to FAIS in size, scope, cost, and complexity.

M.3.2.2 Past Performance shows history of producing high-quality deliverables and history of staying on schedule and within budget.

M.3.2.3 Offeror has successfully acted as prime contractor; leading the work efforts of sub-contractors for prior projects similar in size, scope, cost and complexity. This element applies only to Offerors teaming with other vendors.

M.3.2.4 Past Performance Questionnaire Response includes high customer satisfaction, demonstrates ability of the Offeror to manage the project and keep the customer informed of status, and demonstrates the ability to deliver high quality products on time and within budget.

M.3.3 Project Management

M.3.3.1 Evidence of specific methods and techniques for completing each task on time with high-quality results, to include such items as project management, quality assurance, risk management, communication plan, configuration management, training and customer-service.

M.3.3.2 A viable System Development Life-cycle Methodology (SDLC) that uses repeatable processes; follows industry standards; is appropriate for the project; and facilitates the Offeror's ability to develop and implement high-quality, reliable software that meets customer requirements.

M.3.4 Staffing

M.3.4.1 The relevancy proposed staff positions; relevancy, quality, and depth of experience of individual personnel in working on similar projects. Projects must convey similarity in topic, dollar value, workload, duration, and complexity.

M.3.4.2 Availability: The plan to procure, train, and maintain appropriate staffing levels, and schedule the required technical and management personnel throughout all project phases to complete all tasks on schedule. Availability of key personnel at contract start date (notwithstanding circumstances that arise from causes beyond the control and without the fault or negligence of the Contractor and/or subcontractor).

M.3.4.3 Subcontractor management: The processes and procedures the Offeror proposes to manage its subcontractors and integrate them with its employees to form a unified team.

M.4 Price Evaluation Factor

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed Firm Fixed Price (FFP) for each major deliverable listed in the Performance Work Statement (PWS) and the total overall FFP of completing Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of the Statement of Objectives (SOO). The intent of this evaluation is to determine whether the proposed price is realistic for the work proposed, reflects a clear understanding of the requirements, and is consistent with the approach described in the Offeror's Technical proposals. The Government will not assign color ratings or risk ratings to the Price factor. The Government will rank each Offeror's proposal from the lowest price to the highest price when determining the competitive range.

M.5 Evaluation Methodology

The Government will use the color/adjectival methodology below to document each non-price factor rating.

Rating	Definition
Excellent (E)/ Blue	The proposal contains a significant number of strengths with no deficiencies or weaknesses. Based on information provided, there is no doubt that the contractor demonstrates an exceptional understanding of the services required to meet or exceed most contract requirements. The highest quality of contract performance is anticipated. Very low risk (Based on the information provided, there is no doubt that the contractor will successfully perform the required effort.)
Very Good (VG)/ Purple	The proposal contains some strengths, and only a few minor weaknesses that do not require discussions, and no deficiencies. Based on the information provided, there is little doubt that the contractor demonstrates a high quality of understanding of the services required to meet or exceed some contract requirements. Low Risk (Based on the information provided, there is little doubt that the contractor will successfully perform the required effort.)

Satisfactory (S)/ Green	The proposal contains no or very few strengths, some minor weaknesses that will not prevent successful completion of the contract, and no deficiencies. Based on the information provided, the contractor demonstrates the minimum level of understanding of the services required to meet contract requirements. Contractor adheres to SOW/SOO requirements. Moderate risk (Based on the information provided, there is some doubt that the contractor will successfully perform the required effort.)
Poor (P)/ Yellow	The proposal contains deficiencies and/or a significant number of weaknesses that may prevent successful completion of the contract but could contain some strengths. Based on information provided, there is doubt that the contractor understands the services required to meet the contract requirements. Requirement/services can be met only with major changes to the proposal. High risk (Based on the information provided, there is considerable doubt that the contractor will successfully perform the required effort.)
Unacceptable (U)/ Red	Technical proposal has many deficiencies and/or gross omissions with no or very few strengths. The proposal demonstrates the contractor's failure to understand much of the scope of work necessary to perform the required tasks, failure to provide a reasonable, logical approach to fulfilling much of the government's requirements or failure to meet many personnel requirements in the solicitation. When applying this adjective to a proposal as a whole, the technical proposal would have to be so unacceptable in one or more areas that it would have to be completely revised in order to attempt to make it other than unacceptable. Very high risk (Based on the information provided, there is significant doubt that the contractor will successfully perform the required effort.)
Neutral (N)/ White	The absence of relevant present and past performance information will result in the assignment of a white (neutral) rating. Unknown risk (The contractor has little or no recent/relevant past performance upon which to base a meaningful performance risk prediction.)