Section 5: Evaluation Criteria

Attachment 3
RFP HM157526R0039
Endor

The RFP stated that proposals submitted in response to the RFP will be evaluated against the following factors and sub-factors:

Factor 1: Technical
Sub-factor 1.1 Film Digitization
Sub-factor 1.2 Information Technology
Sub-factor 1.3 Maintenance

Factor 2: Price

Relative Importance of Evaluation Factors:

Factor 1 Technical is significantly more important than Factor 2 Price.

Factor 1 – Technical

Technical Capability will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the Offeror demonstrates its approach and solutions to perform all the SOW requirements based on the following:

Sub-Factor 1.1: Film Digitization

Evaluation Criteria: This sub-factor will evaluate the extent to which the contractor can adequately conduct scanning operations at the film-canister level for a federal government film collection that continues to exceed 170M images. Scanning technicians, at a minimum, are expected to scan approximately 10 cans per day, per individual (50 cans per week, per individual). This sub-factor will ensure all tasks in the SOW section 4.1 are addressed. Proposals must include detailed approaches demonstrating adequate understanding for each task described under section 4.1 of the SOW.

Sub-Factor 1.2: Information Technology

Evaluation Criteria: This sub-factor will evaluate the extent to which the contractor digitization specialists have the capability to possess intermediate computer skills to support front end and back end requirements necessary for the digitization, conversion, retrieval, and long-term storage of imagery files. This sub-factor will ensure all tasks in the SOW section 4.2 are addressed. Proposals must include detailed approaches demonstrating adequate understanding of each information technology task needed to fulfill NGA's requirements listed in section 4.2.

Sub-Factor 1.3: Maintenance

Evaluation Criteria: This sub-factor will evaluate the extent to which the contractor provides an adequate approach to the tasks listed under SOW section 4.3 for on-site maintenance support and the tasks listed under SOW sections 4.4-4.7. Proposals failing to adequately address

digitization equipment training, operations center attire, physical requirements, and safety requirements in the SOW sections 4.4-4.7 will not be eligible for award.

Methodology—Combined Technical/Risk Rating

The combined technical/risk rating includes consideration of risk in conjunction with the strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, uncertainties, and deficiencies in determining technical ratings. The combined technical/risk evaluation will utilize the combined technical/risk ratings listed in Table 1, below and the risk descriptions set forth in Table 2 for firm-fixed price contract types, below.

Table 1: Combined Technical/Risk Rating Method

COLOR	RATING	Adjectival Rating Description
BLUE	OUTSTANDING	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
PURPLE	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.
GREEN	ACCEPTABLE	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
YELLOW	MARGINAL	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
RED	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.

Table 2: Combined Technical Risk Rating Method (FFP)

ADJECTIVAL	RATING DESCRIPTION
LOW	Proposal may contain weaknesses which have little potential to cause disruption of schedule or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and normal Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.
MODERATE	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which may potentially cause disruption of schedule or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome difficulties.
HIGH	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which is likely to cause significant disruption of schedule or degradation of performance. Is unlikely to overcome any difficulties, even with special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring.
UNACCEPTABLE	Proposal contains a material failure or a combination of significant weaknesses that increases the risk of unsuccessful performance to an unacceptable level.

The Technical Team will document their individual evaluations.

Members will evaluate the Offeror's proposal against the content requirements contained in Section 4 and the evaluation criteria contained in Section 5 of the solicitation. In arriving at the rating for each factor and subfactor, the evaluator will consider the quality of the Offeror's technical solution for meeting the RFP's stated requirement.

Each evaluator will develop narratives on the strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies of each proposal by citing the relevant page number in the proposal. The exception to this requirement is the case where a "Meets The Standard" (MTS) assessment is given. In this instance, identifying strengths and weaknesses is not applicable and therefore does not need to be written. However, an explanatory comment will be included. When a proposed approach is above the Government's expectations, as reflected in the evaluation criteria and standards, it forms the basis for a "strength," which is then assigned a degree of strength or intensity indicated by the number of pluses as shown in Table 3 – Strengths and Weaknesses. Likewise, when a proposed approach is below the Government's expectations, as reflected in the evaluation criteria and standards, it forms the basis for a "weakness," which is assigned a degree of weakness or intensity according to the number of minuses as shown in Table 3 – Strengths and Weaknesses. Using succinct and clearly stated narratives (in "bullet" form), the evaluator will indicate the impact to the Government by the strengths and weaknesses, providing supporting facts and rationale. Narrative comments are also required for proposals that simply (MTS) without any noted strengths and/or weaknesses.

Table 3: Degrees of Strengths and Weaknesses

CLASSIFICATION	DEFINITION
Significant Strength (+ + +)	An aspect of an Offeror's proposal that has merit or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be significantly advantageous to the Government during contract performance (or may significantly decrease the risk of unsuccessful contract performance).
Moderate Strength (+ +)	An aspect of an Offeror's proposal that has merit or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be moderately advantageous to the Government during contract performance (and/or may moderately decrease the risk of unsuccessful contract performance).
Slight Strength (+)	An aspect of an Offeror's proposal that has merit or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be slightly advantageous to the Government during contract performance (and/or may slightly decrease the risk of unsuccessful contract performance).
Meets the Standard (MTS)	Offeror's approach meets the standard. No strengths or weaknesses can be identified.
Slight Weakness (-)	A flaw in the proposal that slightly increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
Moderate Weakness (- -)	A flaw in the proposal that moderately increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
Significant Weakness (- - -)	A flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
Deficiency	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.

Factor 2 – Price

The Offeror's shall fill-in and complete pricing in section 1. The Offeror's proposed price in the Pricing Sheet will be utilized by the Government to calculate the Offeror's Total Evaluate Price (TEP).

The offered price will be evaluated for completeness and reasonableness. Offerors whose price is determined to be incomplete and/or unreasonable will not be considered for award. The Offeror that proposes the Lowest TEP will be considered to have offered the lowest price to the Government.

Completeness: All information required by the solicitation has been submitted and is accurate.

Fair and Reasonable: The Government will conduct a price analysis to determine whether the TEP is fair and reasonable using one or more techniques set forth in FAR 15.404-1(b). The Government reserves the right but is not obligated to perform a price realism analysis to ensure that an offeror understands the contract requirements.