**TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA (TEMPLATE)**

**Adjectival Rating**

GENERAL

The major evaluation factors for this solicitation include technical (which encompasses experience, technical approach, corporate and human resources, quality control and past performance factors) and cost/price factors. Although technical factors are of paramount consideration in the award of the contract, cost/price is also important to the overall contract award decision. All evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are significantly more important than cost or price. In any case, the Government reserves the right to make award(s) to that offeror whose proposal provides the best overall value to the Government.

Offerors are advised that award will be made to that offeror whose proposal provides the combination of features that offers the best or greatest overall value to the Government. The Government is more concerned with obtaining performance capability superiority rather than lowest overall cost. **However**, the Government will not make an award at a significantly higher overall cost to the Government to achieve only slightly superior performance. Overall cost to the Government may become the ultimate factor for award of a contract as proposals become more equal based on other factors.

The evaluation will be based on the demonstrated capabilities of the prospective Contractors in relation to the needs of the project as set forth in the RFP. The merits of each proposal will be evaluated carefully. Each proposal must document the feasibility of successful implementation of requirements of the RFP. Offerors must submit information sufficient to evaluate their proposals based on the detailed criteria below.

MANDATORY CRITERIA

The below are mandatory criteria and will have to be met prior to award of the contract:

*(Insert mandatory criteria)*

TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

The criteria below are listed in the relative order of importance.

| **Relative Order of Importance**  | **Factor**  |
| --- | --- |
| 1  | Factor 1: Key Personnel and Personnel Management  |
| 2  | Factor 2: Transition Plan  |
| 3  | Factor 3: Corporate Experience and Capabilities  |
| 4  | Factor 4: General Technical Approach  |
| 5  | Factor 5: Quality Assurance  |

1. ***Key Personnel and Personnel Management***

*(Insert Key Personnel and Personnel Management Evaluation Criteria in detail)*

 ***Transition Plan***

*(Insert Transition Plan Evaluation Criteria in detail)*

1. ***Corporate Experience and Capabilities***

*(Insert Corporate Experience and Capabilities Evaluation Criteria in detail)*

1. ***General Technical Approach***

*(Insert General Technical Approach Evaluation Criteria in detail)*

1. ***Quality Assurance***

*(Insert Quality Assurance Evaluation Criteria in detail)*

ADJECTIVAL RATING

The Government will evaluate the Technical Proposal using the following adjectival rating.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **Adjectival**  | **Description** |
| **Blue** | **Exceptional** | Greatly exceeds all minimum requirements of the criteria; has a high probability of success; contains no weaknesses or deficiencies. |
| **Green** | **Good** | Exceeds all the minimum requirements of the criteria; has an above average probability of success; contains no significant weaknesses and only minor, correctable weaknesses exist. |
| **Yellow** | **Acceptable** | Meets all the minimum requirements of the criteria; has an average probability of success; no significant weaknesses and any deficiencies can be readily corrected. |
| **Orange** | **Marginal** | Fails to meet one or more of the minimum requirements of the criteria; low probability of success; major weaknesses and/or significant number of deficiencies exist. |
| **Red** | **Unacceptable** | Fails to meet any of the minimum requirements of the criteria; proposal needs major revisions; very low probability of success. |

PAST PERFORMANCE

The Past Performance Factor evaluation will assess the relevance and breadth of the Offeror’s experience and the quality of the Offeror’s past performance. The Government is seeking to determine whether the Offeror has experience that will enhance its technical capability to perform and whether the Offeror consistently delivers quality services in a timely and cost effective manner. In evaluating past performance, HHS/NIH will only take into consideration the relevant experience and past performance assessments from the Offeror's customers. However, the HHS/NIH reserves the right to use other relevant past performance information it obtains through other sources including other agency databases and information contained in trade literature.

Relevance of Experience: The Offeror’s experience will be evaluated on the degree of relevance to the requirement on the basis of similarity in size, scope, complexity, technical difficulty, contract type, and period of performance. Only recent experience will be evaluated. Evaluations may include interviews with previous clients of the prime contractor and subcontractors and may include interviews with previous clients of proposed personnel. The Offeror’s experience with and knowledge of issues and problems of large organizations will be evaluated.

Past Performance Assessments: The Offeror’s past performance will be evaluated on the basis of information contained in the Offeror's proposal and the information that the Government obtains through other means. The past performance evaluation will assess the Offeror’s record of providing high quality services of a similar nature in a manner that ensures maximum accuracy, throughput, cost effectiveness and overall client satisfaction.

If some of the Offeror’s experience is relevant and the rest is not, only the relevant experience will be evaluated for purposes of past performance. If no experience is relevant or the experience that is relevant cannot be evaluated due to a reference’s failure to respond, a rating of neutral will be assigned for past performance as defined below.

The Government will evaluate the Past Performance Factor using the following adjectival ratings.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Rating*** | ***Symbol*** | ***Definition*** |
| **Neutral** | **N** | No past performance available for evaluation. Offeror has asserted that it has no directly related or similar relevant past performance experience. Proposal receives no merit or demerit for this factor. |
| **Outstanding** | **O** | Based on the Offeror’s record of past performance, no issues, concerns, or risks are associated with receiving timely services and contract performance. Past performance surveys and the Offeror’s experiences indicate that the Offeror is capable of exceeding the requirements of the delivery order. The Contractor has demonstrated significant experience with and knowledge of the issues and problems of large organizations. |
| **Good** | **G** | 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 delivery order. The Contractor has demonstrated experience with and knowledge of the issues and problems of large organizations. |
| **Acceptable** | **A** | 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 experience with and knowledge of the issues and problems of large organizations. |
| **Unsatisfactory** | **U** | The Offeror’s record of past performance indicates it will be unable to perform successfully on the delivery order. |

COST/PRICE FACTORS

Offeror(s) cost/price proposal will be evaluated for reasonableness. For a price to be reasonable, it must represent a price to the government that a prudent person would pay when consideration is given to prices in the market. Normally, price reasonableness is established through adequate price competition, but may also be determined through cost and price analysis techniques as described in FAR 15.404. The Offeror shall submit firm fixed prices for all items listed in Section B (including options).

EVALUATION OF OPTIONS

It is anticipated that any contract awarded from this solicitation will contain option provision(s) and periods(s)

In accordance with FAR clause 52.217-5 Evaluation of Options, (July 1990) the Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by addition the total price for all options to the total price of the basic requirement, except when it is determined in accordance with FAR 17.206(b) not to be in the Government’s best interests. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s)

SELECTION FOR AWARD

Offeror should be aware that the Government shall perform a “best value analysis” and the selection for award shall be made to the Offeror whose proposal is most advantageous to the Government, taking into consideration the technical factors listed above and the total proposed price across all contract periods.