

Proposal Evaluation Plan

1. Best Value Approach:

___ Lowest Price Technically Acceptable (LPTA): The LPTA process is appropriate when best value is expected to result from selection of a technically acceptable proposal with the lowest evaluated price.

X Tradeoff: This process allows for a tradeoff between non-cost factors (Mission Capability only) and cost/price and allows the Government to accept other than the lowest priced proposal or other than the highest technically rated proposal to achieve an overall best-value contract award.

2. Evaluation factors will include Factor 1 - Mission Capability (with Sub factors/Sub factor Criteria if applicable) and Factor 2 - Cost/Price. The Contracting Officer will address evaluation of Factor 2 - Cost/Price while the RA must address the technical evaluation of Factor 1 - Mission Capability (and all Sub factors/Sub factor Criteria if applicable).

If Tradeoff is selected, the Mission Capability combined technical/risk rating provides an assessment of the offeror's capability to satisfy the Government's requirements without performance risk. Each Sub factor under Mission Capability (Factor 1) will receive a combined technical/risk rating that includes assessment of performance risk in conjunction with the strengths, benefits, weaknesses and deficiencies reflected in the offeror's proposal. Individual Sub factor ratings will not be rolled up into an overall technical/risk rating for Factor 1 - Mission Capability. Mission Capability Sub factor combined technical/risk ratings for the Tradeoff Best Value Process are illustrated below:

MISSION CAPABILITY COMBINED TECHNICAL/RISK RATINGS - TRADEOFF	
<i>Rating</i>	<i>Description</i>
Outstanding	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.

If Lowest Price Technically Acceptable is selected, all Sub factors are of equal importance and the Mission Capability Sub factor evaluation will be on a pass/fail (Acceptable/Unacceptable) basis. If any Mission Capability Sub factor fails, the Mission Capability Factor (Factor 1) will fail as well. Mission Capability Sub factor combined technical/risk ratings for the LPTA Best Value Process are illustrated below:

MISSION CAPABILITY COMBINED TECHNICAL/RISK RATINGS - LPTA	
<i>Rating</i>	<i>Description</i>
Acceptable	Meets the minimum performance or capability requirements of the solicitation. Risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.

Proposal Evaluation Plan

MISSION CAPABILITY COMBINED TECHNICAL/RISK RATINGS - LPTA	
<i>Rating</i>	<i>Description</i>
Unacceptable	Fails to meet performance or capability requirements of the solicitation. Risk of unsuccessful performance is high.

3. Identify Sub factors under the Mission Capability Factor (e.g., Technical Approach, Organizational Effectiveness, Readiness, Security, Risk Mitigation, Innovation, etc.). The RA has reasonably broad discretion in establishing Sub factors under the Mission Capability Factor, provided that such Sub factors: (1) Are consistent with PWS requirements; (2) Represent critical areas of importance to the mission; (3) Support meaningful comparison of the technical proposals; (4) Can be exceeded; and (5) Allow substantiation of benefits for the Government.
- *Note: The Multiple-Award Contract (MAC) contractors have already been determined capable, responsible and responsive so Past Performance should be considered acceptable for the subject task order best value evaluation.*

4. The Mission Capability Sub factor Evaluation Criteria applicable to the Task Order are:

- 1) Management Approach
- 2) Technical Approach
- 3) Basis of Estimate

5. If Tradeoff is marked under Paragraph 1 above, Mission Capability Sub factors are:

- ☒ Equal in importance
- ☐ Not equal in importance

6. If Tradeoff is marked under Paragraph 1 above and Mission Capability Sub factors are not equal in importance (Per Paragraph 5 above), identify the relative order of importance using the scale 1 to 3, where “1” is the most important Sub factor, where “2” is the next important Sub factor, where “3” is the next important Sub factor, etc.:

- 1 (rank) Management Approach
- 1 (rank) Technical Approach
- 1 (rank) Basis of Estimate

If Tradeoff is marked under Paragraph 1 above, the Mission Capability factor (Factor 1) is:

- ☒ Significantly more important than Cost/Price (Factor 2)
- ☐ Slightly more important than Cost/Price (Factor 2)
- ☐ Approximately equal in importance to Cost/Price (Factor 2)
- ☐ Significantly less important than Cost/Price (Factor 2)

**Note: If selected, reconsider the use of LPTA versus Tradeoff*

Proposal Evaluation Plan

7. For each Mission Capability Sub factor listed under Paragraph 4 above, identify all Sub factor Criteria and all Sub factor Elements:

Mission Capability Factor 1	
Sub factor 1	Management Approach
3 pages	The offeror presents an effective project management plan that will optimize the accomplishment of the requirements.
Sub factor 2	Technical Approach
10 pages	Sub factor 2 critical elements
2.A	The offeror presents a realistic approach, to include experience, designing simulation interfaces.
2.B	The offeror presents a realistic approach, to include experience, integrating simulation interfaces.
2.C	The offeror presents a realistic approach, to include experience, developing simulation interfaces.
2.D	The offeror presents a realistic approach, to include experience, fielding interfaces.
Sub factor 3	Basis of Estimate
Not included in page count	Offeror presents a sound project baseline expressed in terms of skill sets and scheduled labor hours (e.g., burn rate) aligned with project tasks, resources, interdependencies, milestones, and deliverables.

8. Identify up to three (3) Government personnel who will be responsible for the technical evaluations on this requirement; one individual will serve as the lead for the technical evaluation team.

Name (Last, First, MI)	Title	Organization & Address	Email	Phone Number (Commercial & DSN)
* Designates lead				