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. Any evaluation criteria are of a pass/fail nature.

\_\_ *Tradeoff*: The non-cost factor is significantly more important than cost/price. 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.

1. **Evaluation factors**: Evaluation factors are Factor 1 – Mission Capability (with Sub factors/Sub factor elements 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 elements if applicable).
2. **Factor 1 Mission Capability Ratings**: 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** |
| --- |
| ***Rating*** | ***Description*** |
| 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. |

# **Definitions Applicable to the Available Ratings for each Subfactor**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Strength | Is an aspect of an Offeror’s proposal that has merit or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the government during contract performance. |
| Weakness | Means a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. |
| Deficiency | Is a material failure of a 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. |
| Low Risk | Proposal may contain weakness(es) which have 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 Risk | Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which may 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. |
| High Risk | Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which 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. |
| Unacceptable Risk | Proposal contains a material failure or a combination of significant weaknesses that increases the risk of unsuccessful performance to an unacceptable level.  |

# 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 ratings for the LPTA Best Value Process are illustrated below:

| **MISSION CAPABILITY RATINGS - LPTA** |
| --- |
| ***Rating*** | ***Description*** |
| Acceptable | Meets the minimum performance or capability requirements of the solicitation. Risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate. |
| Unacceptable | Fails to meet performance or capability requirements of the solicitation. Risk of unsuccessful performance is high. |

1. The Mission Capability Sub factors applicable to the Task Order are:
2. Technical Approach
3. Management Approach
4. Labor Basis of Estimate and Task Narrative

The RA has reasonably broad discretion in establishing sub factors and elements under the Mission Capability Factor, provided that the sub factors and elements: (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 XX IAC MAC TO Multiple-Award Contract (MAC) full and open contractors have already been determined capable, responsible and responsive so Past Performance should be considered acceptable for the subject task order best value evaluation.

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

\_\_\_ Equal in importance
\_ \_\_ Not equal in importance. If the Mission Capability Sub factors are *not* equal in importance, identify the relative order of importance using “1” for the most important and “2” as the next important.

\_\_ (rank) Technical Approach
\_\_ (rank) Management Approach

\_\_ (rank) Labor Basis of Estimate and Task Narrative

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |   |
| Sub factor 1 | Technical Approach |
| XX pages | Sub factor 1 Elements |
| 1.A  | Offeror presents a realistic approach in conducting analyses, assessments, and modeling and simulation for the missions of strategic deterrence; surveillance, and reconnaissance; combating weapons of mass destruction; and analysis and targeting. PWS Task 3.4, 3.6  |
| 1.B | Offeror presents a realistic approach to providing wargaming and experimentation analysis and demonstration that includes planning, executing, and conducting post-event analysis and reporting. PWS Task 3.5, 3.7. |
| 1.C | The offeror presents a realistic approach to the attached Scenarios. The offeror must, within the allowable page limits, comprehensively address the seven elements specified within scenario 1A and the 5 elements specified within scenario 1B. |
| Sub factor 2 | Management Approach |
| XX pages | Sub factor 2 Element |
| 2.A | Program Management. The Offeror presents an effective program/project management approach and an organizational chart to accomplish the requirements of the PWS and delivery of contract deliverables. |
| 2.B | Transition. Offeror describes a sufficient ability to gradually assume responsibility of PWS requirements leading to full performance within the XX day Transition-In period with no degradation of services |
| Sub factor 3 | Labor Basis of Estimate and Task Narrative |
|  | Sub factor 3 Element |
| 3.AUse Excel Template3000 character limit for Task Narrative | Labor Basis of Estimate and Task Narrative. Offeror presents a sound project baseline and methodology expressed in terms of appropriate qualifications, skill sets, certifications, clearances, and scheduled labor hours required to successfully complete the technical and management requirements of the PWS.  |

6. Identify up to 3 Government personnel who will be responsible for the technical evaluations on this IAC MAC TO 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* |

**Scenario Example**

a. Background - The Wascally Wabbit Management is the focal point for addressing frequency management of all Air Force systems. This effort will be in direct support of the AF representative of the Wile E. Coyote Working Group (WECWG) and the Daffy Duck Space Systems Subcommittee (DDS). In this role, Wascally Wabbit is responsible for protecting the telemetry, tracking, and control (TT&C) frequencies used by the Wile Coyote Control Network (WCSCN) that supports command and control of all Marvin the Martian systems from harmful radio-frequency interference (RFI) from other systems. If RFI is caused to the TT&C frequencies, then the system could be inoperable for an indefinite period. Therefore, it is essential that the Wile Coyote can operate without unacceptable RFI.

b. The offeror shall provide technical, engineering analyses and subject matter expertise to determine the potential for RFI between the WCSCN and newly published systems in the MMTU database (Note: The DD publishes newly registered other systems once every two weeks) and develop coordination strategies for bilateral meetings with other operators. This tasks needs to be completed for systems published on the Daffy Duck Frequency Information Circulars (DDFICs) to be addressed at each WECWG / DDS meeting.

c. The offeror should develop an approach and plan that outlines how the offeror will identify the other networks to be considered, the proposed methodology for the RFI analyses, and the recommended course of action based on the results of the analyses.

The offeror's approach and plan should specifically address the following elements:

1. List of milestone-like events needed to identify systems of concern, perform the RFI analyses, and provide the recommended course of action.

2. Describe the proposed methodology for performing the RFI analyses including key criteria, sources of data, any known limitations, and planned tool sets.

3. Describe the types of actions that may be recommended based on the results of the RFI analyses.

4. Describe the process of developing coordination strategies for bilateral meetings with Marvin the Martian.

5. Describe the skill sets and experience of the personnel required to complete the RFI analyses.

6. Describe the skill sets and experience of the personnel required to develop coordination strategies for bilateral meetings with Marvin the Martian operators.