Technical Evaluation Plan

Curriculum & Training Plan: USBG Volunteer Program

|  |
| --- |
| **Basis of evaluation (check one):**  **Trade Off**  **Lowest-Price Technically Acceptable (LPTA)** |
| **Non-Cost/Price Factors**  The Government anticipates awarding a Firm Fixed Price contract to the offeror whose quote conforms to the solicitation and represents the best value to the Government, as determined by the evaluation criteria described herein. A best value trade off approach will be used in evaluating the offeror’s quote and an award will be based on a detailed evaluation of all factors outlined below. The Government will evaluate submissions of an offeror’s quote using the evaluation factors outlined below, listed in descending order of importance and all evaluation factors, other than cost/price, when combined, are of equal significance.  Page limits for each non cost/price factor are outlined below. Further details on page counts and font sizes will be outlined in the Instructions to Offerors section of the solicitation. |
| **1. Factor 1 - Technical Approach** (Maximum of 10 pages). Rated on a scale of 0-4. Represents 40% of total non-cost/price factor rating. |
| Technical approach shall be evaluated to determine the extent to which the offeror’s technical approach reflects a demonstrated understanding of the requirements outlined in the PWS.  The Government will evaluate the extent to which the offeror demonstrates:   * Understanding of the needs of the USBG for this project and how those needs will be addressed; * A sound, practical, and feasible approach to accomplishing the requirements; * Ingenuity and forward thinking; and * Acceptable methods for ensuring the quality of deliverables.   The offeror shall describe the process by which the deliverables in the Performance Work Statement will be completed, including but not limited to development of training goals and content-specific learning objectives, creation of a structure or framework for the training program, development of instructional materials for the core training package, project evaluation and project implementation. |
| **2. Factor 2 - Management Approach** (Maximum of 5 pages). Rated on a scale of 0-4. Represents 20% of total non-cost/price factor rating. |
| The offeror shall describe how they will manage the project process, personnel, stakeholders, and communication.  The Government will evaluate the extent to which the offeror demonstrates:   * Understanding of the steps and amount of time needed to complete the deliverables outlined in the PWS * Ability to resolve issues as they pertain to efforts of similar size and scope; * Organizational structure, commitment of personnel, and cost/price control methodologies; and * Proposed communication procedures, including how work will be managed and distributed between the contractor and any proposed subcontractors and/or consultants. |
| **3. Factor 3 - Experience** (Maximum of 3 pages per contract). Rated on a scale of 0-4. Represents 20% of total non-cost/price factor rating |
| Experience shall be evaluated to determine the extent to which the offeror’s experience reflects services of similar size and scope to this requirement.  The offeror shall identify three (3) of their most relevant contracts and/or projects completed during the past three (3) years. The contracts identified may be either where the offeror performed as a prime contractor, subcontractor, or employee. The offeror shall provide the following information on each of the contracts or projects identified in this section:   * Contract Number or project name; * Name of the entity for whom the services were provided (agency, firm, organization, etc.); * Description of services provided; * Point of contact (POC) information, to include name, phone number, and email address of the Contracting Officer Representative (or analogous representative) on stated contract; * Total dollar value to include all option periods; * Period of Performance; * Percent complete (in terms of Period of Performance); and * If performed as a subcontractor, percent of work completed as a subcontractor.   The Government will evaluate the extent to which the contracts provided by the offeror reflect services of similar size, magnitude, complexity, and scope to this requirement. |
| **4. Factor 4 - Key Personnel and Staffing Plan** (Maximum of 2 pages per resume for each Key Personnel and maximum of 2 pages for the Staffing Plan). Rated on a scale of 0-4. Represents 20% of total non-cost/price factor rating. |
| Key personnel and staffing plan shall be evaluated to determine the extent to which the offeror demonstrates the expertise and experience of their proposed key personnel and their ability to provide qualified staffing in a timely manner.  The offeror shall provide resumes for each proposed key personnel. Resumes shall demonstrate that the individual possesses the education, expertise, abilities, and experience necessary to successfully manage requirements of similar size, magnitude, complexity, and scope.  The offeror shall provide a staffing plan that outlines their ability to staff this requirement. In the event the offeror proposes subcontractors, the offeror shall demonstrate its ability to manage and staff subcontractors.  The Government will evaluate the extent to which the offeror demonstrates:   * Key personnel possess the education, expertise, abilities, and experience necessary to successfully manage requirements of similar size, magnitude, complexity, and scope; and * Ability to provide experienced and qualified staff as outlined in the PWS. |
| **Cost/Price Factor**  Cost/Price shall be evaluated to determine the extent to which the offeror demonstrates an understanding of the requirement as it relates to the overall total expected cost/price of performing the work outlined in the PWS. |
| **1. Factor 1 - Price/Cost (No Page Limit)** |
| The offeror’s cost/price proposal will be evaluated for price reasonableness to prevent the Government from paying too much for the services outlined in the PWS. Additionally, a price realism analysis may be performed to determine whether an offeror’s cost/price is unrealistically low. An unrealistically low offer may question whether an offeror fully understands the size, magnitude, complexity, and scope of service outlined in the PWS. An unrealistic cost/price proposal may serve as a rejection for the proposal.  Cost/price will not be rated adjectivally but will be evaluated based on a comprehensive review. Cost/price proposals will be evaluated with respect to accuracy and completeness based on information submitted in the offeror’s written submission. This process will involve verification that figures are correctly calculated, prices are presented in the requested format, and that proposed rates and any applicable discounts are accurate. Additionally, the Government may utilize one or more of the following methods to evaluate price:   * Review of the proposed level-of-effort and associated pricing; * Analysis of proposed labor mix; * Comparison to other quotes received; * Comparison and/or analysis based on Independent Government Cost Estimate; or * Comparison/analysis to historical cost   As part of the cost/price evaluation, the Government will evaluate the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 52.217-8, Option to Extend Services by adding six (6) months of the offeror’s proposed cost/price during the final option period to the offeror's total proposed price. Thus, for the purpose of evaluation under this solicitation, the offeror's total price will include the base period and all other options periods. Please note, offerors shall not submit a price for the potential FAR 52.217-8 extension of services period. The Government will calculate this cost/price extension of services period in accordance with the instructions outlined above. |

### Evaluation Process

The evaluation of offers is critically important as this process assesses the offeror’s proposed solution and ability to perform. This process includes examining each offer in detail against the evaluation factors and sub-factors set forth in the solicitation and assigning a rating with a supporting narrative. The technical evaluation process consists of two phases, individual technical evaluations and the technical consensus. Following each panel member’s individual evaluation, the Chairperson of the TEP will lead the panel in developing an overall consensus rating for each offeror based on the following ratings and definitions:

RATING DEFINITIONS

**The rating definitions below shall be used on all non-Price/Cost Factors**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Outstanding (4) | The proposal provides a very clear, comprehensive and detailed response which meets all requirements and includes significant strengths with no deficiencies or significant weaknesses. The risk of unsuccessful performance is very low as the proposal demonstrates a clear understanding of the requirements and can be expected to result in outstanding performance. |
| Good (3) | The proposal provides a sound response which meets all requirements and includes strengths with no deficiencies and few weaknesses. The risk of unsuccessful performance is low as the proposal demonstrates an understanding of the requirements and can be expected to result in satisfactory performance. |
| Acceptable (2) | The proposal provides a response which is capable of meeting all requirements but includes both strengths and weaknesses with no deficiencies. Strengths are not outweighed by the weaknesses. The risk of unsuccessful performance is moderate as the proposal demonstrates a general understanding of the requirements and can be expected to result in satisfactory performance. |
| Marginal (1) | The proposal provides a response which does not meet all requirements and includes strengths, weaknesses, and/or deficiencies. Strengths are outweighed by the weaknesses and/or deficiencies. The risk of unsuccessful performance is high as the proposal does not demonstrate an understanding of the requirements and can be expected to result in unsatisfactory performance. |
| Unacceptable (0) | The proposal provides a response that does not meet all requirements and includes significant weaknesses and/or deficiencies which far outweigh any strengths. The risk of unsuccessful performance is very high as the proposal does not demonstrate an understanding of the requirements and will result in unsatisfactory performance. |

**PRICE:**

The offeror’s price quote will be evaluated for price reasonableness to prevent the Government from paying too much for the services outlined in the PWS. Additionally, a price realism analysis may be performed to determine whether an offeror’s price is unrealistically low. An unrealistically low offer may question whether an offeror fully understands the scope of service outlined in the PWS. An unrealistic price quote may serve as a rejection for the proposal. Price will not be rated adjectivally but will be evaluated based on a comprehensive review. Price quotes will be evaluated with respect to accuracy and completeness based on information submitted in the offeror’s written submission.