

# Technical Evaluation Plan

## RFQ BG210042

**Basis of evaluation (check one):** **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 represent 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.**

The offeror shall describe the process by which the deliverables in the Statement of Work will be completed including but not limited: describing the target audience and stakeholders and methods for engaging them in this work, methods for selecting and analyzing potential competitors and collaborators, process for conducting a needs assessment, and process for developing an outreach strategy.

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 SOW.

The Government will evaluate:

- The extent to which the offeror demonstrates an understanding of the needs of the USBG for this project and how those needs will be addressed;
- The extent to which the offeror understands the target audience for this project and how to engage them;
- The ingenuity and forward thinking presented in the proposal; and
- The extent to which the offeror demonstrates a sound, practical, and feasible approach to accomplishing the requirements.

#### **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 will describe how they will manage the project process, personnel, stakeholders, communication.

Management approach shall be evaluated to determine the extent to which the offeror's management approach reflects a demonstrated understanding of the requirements outlined in the SOW.

The Government will evaluate:

- The extent to which the offeror demonstrates understanding of the steps and amount of time needed to complete the deliverables in a timely manner;
- The extent to which the offeror demonstrates their organizational structure and commitment of personnel.
- The extent to which the offeror demonstrates their 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.**

The offeror shall identify three (3) of their most relevant contracts or projects completed during the past three (3) years. The contracts or projects 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 and location of the entity for whom the services were provided (agency, firm, etc.);
- Description of services provided;
- Point of contact (POC) information, to include name, phone number, and email address of the Contracting Officer Representative (COR) on stated contract;
- Total dollar value to include all option periods;
- Period of Performance and percent complete (in terms of Period of Performance);
- If performed as a subcontractor, percent of work completed as a subcontractor.

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 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.**

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 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.

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 Government will evaluate:

- The extent which the offeror demonstrates the key personnel possess the education, expertise, abilities, and experience necessary to successfully manage requirements of similar size, magnitude, complexity, and scope; and
- The extent to which the offeror demonstrates their ability to provide experienced and qualified staff as outlined in the SOW.

#### **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 SOW.

#### **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 SOW. 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 SOW. 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 offerors based on the following ratings and definitions:

### **RATING DEFINITIONS**

**The rating definitions below shall be used on all non-Price/Cost Factors with the exception of Past Performance.**

4 points Outstanding	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.
3 points Good	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.
2 points Acceptable	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.

1 Marginal	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.
0 Unacceptable	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.

**The rating definitions below shall be used for Past Performance.**

Substantial Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent (3 years) and relevant (similar in magnitude and scope of this effort) performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform.
Satisfactory Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent (3 years) and relevant (similar in magnitude and scope of this effort) performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform.
Limited Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent (3 years) and relevant (similar in magnitude and scope of this effort) performance record, the Government has a limited expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform.
No Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent (3 years) and relevant (similar in magnitude and scope of this effort) performance record, the Government has no expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform.
Unknown Confidence (Neutral)	The Offeror does not have recent (3 years) and relevant (similar in magnitude and scope of this effort) performance; or the Offeror's performance record is so sparse; a meaningful confidence rating cannot be reasonably assigned.

**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.