

Attachment 11 Proposal Ratings Guide

The Government will evaluate and rate non-cost factors and gate requirements based on the submission requirements in Section L and in accordance with the evaluation factors set forth in Section M. The Government will evaluate the offeror's proposed costs in accordance with Section M. The Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) will assign adjectival ratings for each evaluation factor. A proposal need not have all of the characteristics of a rating category in order to receive that rating; evaluators should use judgment to rate the proposal using these characteristics. Ratings will be accompanied by a consistent narrative assessment (strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, and deficiencies), which forms the basis for the ratings, as follows:

FACTOR 1 – TECHNICAL & MANAGEMENT CAPABILITY

Outstanding: Proposal meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths far outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is very low.

Good: Proposal meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal contains strengths which outweigh any weaknesses. The risk of unsuccessful contract performance is low.

Acceptable: The offeror demonstrates an adequate understanding of the scope of the technical issues, problems, and possible solutions associated with the surface ship, submarine, and shore installations services being procured under this solicitation. 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.

Risk Definitions

Low: Has little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and normal Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.

Moderate: Can potentially cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome difficulties.

N00039-14-R-0400

Attachment 11

Ratings Guide - This form is for informational purposes only and does not need to be returned with the proposal.

High: Is likely to cause significant disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Is unlikely to overcome any difficulties, even with special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring.

FACTOR 2 – EXTENT OF PARTICIPATION OF SMALL BUSINESS

Exceptional: Offeror proposes at least 20% of total proposed acquisition value for small business. Of the proposed twenty (20) percent at least fifteen (15) percent of the total proposed acquisition value shall be attributable to direct labor hours. Additionally, the extent of participation of small business shall meet, at a minimum, three (3) of the five (5) minimum proposed goals listed in the table below.

<i>Socioeconomic Categories</i>	<i>Minimum Proposed Goals*</i>
SDB	6.35%
SDVOSB	3.00%
WOSB	3.10%
HUBZone	1.30%
VOSB	3.00%

* As a percent of the total proposed acquisition value.

Satisfactory: Offeror proposes at least 15% of total proposed acquisition value for small business. Of the proposed fifteen (15) percent at least ten (10) percent of the total proposed acquisition value is attributable to direct labor hours.

FACTOR 3 – ORGANIZATIONAL PAST PERFORMANCE

PAST PERFORMANCE RELEVANCY RATINGS	
RATING	CRITERIA
Very Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Somewhat Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Not Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

Past Performance Quality Ratings - Quality measures how well the contractor performed on the contracts. The past performance evaluation performed in support of a current source selection does not establish, create, or change the existing record and history of the Offeror’s past performance on past contracts; rather, the past performance evaluation process gathers information from customers on how well the Offeror performed those past contracts.

PAST PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENTS	
RATING	CRITERIA
Substantial Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/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 recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Limited Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
No Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.
Unknown Confidence (Neutral)	No recent/relevant performance record is available or the offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned.

Past Performance Confidence Assessment Crosswalk - The SSEB will be guided in its assignment of Confidence Ratings by the table provided below:

	Exceptional	Very Good	Satisfactory	Marginal	Unsatisfactory	Unknown/No Rating
Very Relevant	Substantial Confidence	Substantial Confidence	Satisfactory Confidence	Limited Confidence	No Confidence	Unknown Confidence
Relevant	Substantial Confidence	Satisfactory Confidence	Limited Confidence	Limited Confidence	No Confidence	Unknown Confidence
Somewhat Relevant	Satisfactory Confidence	Limited Confidence	Limited Confidence	No Confidence	No Confidence	Unknown Confidence
Not Relevant	Unknown Confidence	Unknown Confidence	Unknown Confidence	Unknown Confidence	Unknown Confidence	Unknown Confidence

FINDINGS DEFINITIONS

Strengths: That part of a proposal that ultimately represents a benefit to the Government requirements and is expected to increase the quality of the contractor's performance. Strengths are typically high quality personnel, organizational experience, management, past performance, and/or technical capabilities that may allow the contractor to perform the work more cost effectively or provide superior performance benefits.

Weaknesses: A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. That part of a proposal which detracts from the contractor's ability to meet the

Government's requirements or results in inefficient or ineffective performance. Weaknesses are typically less-than-average quality personnel, organizational experience, management, past performance, and/or technical capabilities that may cause the contractor to perform the work less cost effectively or not meet requirements.

Significant Weakness: A flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. That part of a proposal which fully detracts from the contractor's ability to meet the Government's requirements or results in inefficient or ineffective performance. Significant weaknesses are typically very low quality personnel, organizational experience, management, past performance, and/or technical capabilities that may cause the contractor to perform the work less cost effectively or not meet requirements.

Deficiencies: Any part of a proposal that is a material failure of the proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level. The proposal has insufficient data making it impossible to assess compliance with the evaluation factors or contains ambiguities, which must be resolved before an assessment of compliance can be made, or takes exception to any of the terms and conditions.