

Ratings and Definitions

A. Technical Ratings.

1. Technical ratings shall focus on strengths, uncertainties, and deficiencies in the proposal. Technical shall be rated at the subfactor level, and an overall technical factor rating is not assigned. Technical subfactors shall be rated as follows:

Rating	Definition
Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low to moderate.
Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation, and thus, contains one or more deficiencies, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is unacceptable. Proposal is unawardable.

2. If a proposal demonstrates a material failure to meet a Government requirement, this is a deficiency in the proposal resulting in an Unacceptable rating; the proposal is unawardable. Also note that proposal evaluations include an integrated proposal risk rating.

- B. Past Performance Ratings. Based upon relevance and performance, the Government will assign a performance confidence assessment rating as follows:

Substantial Confidence	Based on the offeror's relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Satisfactory Confidence	Based on the offeror's relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Limited Confidence	Based on the offeror's relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
No Confidence	Based on the offeror's relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

- C. Pricing Evaluation. A best value determination will consider the sum of the total price for the basic requirement and all optional requirements. The Government may determine that an offer is unacceptable if optional prices are significantly unbalanced. Evaluation of optional prices shall not obligate the Government to fund and award optional requirements. Award will be made in the best interests of the Government on the basic requirement and any combination of optional requirements for which funds are determined to be available at the time of the award or within 90 days of award.

Basis for Award

- A. The Government intends to make one award based on evaluation of proposals submitted in response to this solicitation. Award will be made to the responsible contractor whose proposal conforms to all solicitation requirements and provides the best value to the Government based on the results of the evaluation. This may result in award to a higher rated, higher priced proposal where the decision is consistent with evaluation factors and the Contracting Officer reasonably determines that the technical superiority and/or overall approach and/or superior past performance of the higher priced proposal outweighs the price difference.
- B. Relative Importance of Evaluation Factors.
Proposals will be evaluated on the following factors: technical approach, past performance and price. All five subfactors within the technical approach factor are of equal importance. Technical approach is more important than past performance. When combined, technical approach and past performance are approximately equal in importance to price in reaching the award decision.