Tactical BAA Topic Area Groups (TAGs) Executive Summary Review

BACKGROUND

The following Executive Summary (ES) was received under the FA9451-24-S-0001 TACTICAL BAA and reviewed to determine selection inclusion as a group member under the identified Topic Area:

Topic Area	
Title of Executive Summary	
Offeror	
CAGE/UEI	
Offeror Technical POC and Contacts	
Offeror Contracting POC and Contacts	
Date Received	
Date Review Completed	

REVIEW

The Executive Summary was reviewed for the following technical factors in accordance with FAR 35.007(a) by a minimum two (2) technical personnel with concurrence from a Division Chief, Deputy Division Chief, or Chief Engineer. A Contracting Officer also approved the final assessment.

The ES was reviewed for the following eight (8) Factors, with one (1) selection per factor. Each factor has four (4) options with points attributed to them: "Well Qualified" (3 points), "Qualified" (2 points), "Minimally Qualified" (1 points), and "Not Qualified" (0 points). To gain access to the Topic Area Group (TAG), the ES must score a minimum of eighteen (18) out of a maximum of twenty-four (24) points. Any 'Not Qualified' rating results in an automatic disqualification of the ES as not technically qualified. **Note: offerors can meet these criteria either on their own or through established partnerships as long as they are clearly identified within the Executive Summary.**

	Review Factors			Points
1.	**The Executive Summary is aligned with topic area**			
	☐	Well Qualified	Executive Summary demonstrates technical qualifications in three (3) or more sub-topic categories within the topic area.	0
	☐	Qualified	Executive Summary demonstrates technical qualifications in two (2) sub-topic categories within the topic area.	0
	☐	Minimally Qualified	Executive Summary demonstrates technical qualifications in one sub-topic category within the topic area.	0
	☐	Not selectable	Does not align with topic area or within any of the sub-topic categories	0
2.	**Demonstrates that the offeror possesses experience in performing work of this nature within the topic area**			
	☐	Well Qualified	Clearly demonstrates highly relevant present and/or past similar work in three (3) or more sub-topic categories and provides specific contract numbers/project titles, Independent Research and Development (IRAD) investments, etc. to substantiate experience.	0

	☐	Qualified	Demonstrates present and/or past relevant work in two (2) sub-topic areas, provides specific contract numbers/project titles, IRAD investments, etc. to substantiate experience.	0
	☐	Minimally Qualified	Demonstrates present and/or past relevant work in at least one (1) topic area. Provides specific contract numbers/project titles, IRAD investments to substantiate experience.	0
	☐	Not selectable	Does not demonstrate present and/or past relevant or similar work. Not clear examples provided.	0
3	**Demonstrates competent and experienced engineering, scientific, or other technical personnel are available to perform work in the identified topic area. (**Access through established partnerships is acceptable).			
	☐	Well Qualified	Team with excellent composition. No near-term gaps in essential expertise in topic area. Offeror has key personnel on staff OR has means to access expertise (teaming agreements, etc.). Key personnel will be made available for any potential work. Executive Summary clearly identifies key personnel by name, details personnel makeup, their qualifications/credentials, areas of expertise, and ability to acquire and retain professional and technical capabilities	0
	☐	Qualified	If expertise gaps exist, team recognizes these gaps and presents a specific plan to address needs. Key personnel will be made available for any potential work. Executive Summary clearly identifies key personnel by name, details personnel makeup, their qualifications/credentials, areas of expertise, and ability to acquire and retain professional and technical capabilities.	0
	☐	Minimally Qualified	Team recognizes gaps in expertise but presents no plan to address needs. Executive Summary clearly details personnel makeup, their qualifications/credentials, areas of expertise, and ability to acquire and retain professional capabilities and expertise.	0
	☐	Not Qualified	Team missing essential areas of expertise and details (personnel makeup, qualifications, or credentials) to demonstrate/justify areas of expertise).	0
4.	**Demonstrates the availability of, from any source, necessary research, test, laboratory, or shop facilities to perform work within this topic area. (**Access through established partnerships is acceptable).			
	☐	Well Qualified	Clearly demonstrates access (with no near-term gaps) to all necessary research, test, laboratory, or shop facilities necessary to perform work within the topic area, providing details, including sources/partnerships, etc.	0
	☐	Qualified	Demonstrates access to some necessary research, test, laboratory, or shop facilities, providing a specific plan for addressing gaps (acquiring technical capabilities).	0
	☐	Minimally Qualified	Demonstrates access to some necessary research, test, laboratory, or shop facilities. Recognizes gaps with no plan to address.	0
	☐	Not Qualified	Does not demonstrate access to necessary research, test, laboratory, or shop facilities.	0
5	**Demonstrates ability to research, design, model, develop, and test innovative solutions within this topic area (**through established partnerships is acceptable)			
	☐	Well Qualified	Clearly demonstrates ability to perform all the following taskings within the topic area: research, design, model, develop, and test innovative solutions.	0

	☐	Qualified	Demonstrates ability to perform three (3) or more of the following taskings in the topic area: research, design, model, develop, and test innovative solutions.	0
	☐	Minimally Qualified	Demonstrates ability to perform one (1) or more of the following taskings in the topic area: research, design, model, develop, and test innovative solutions.	0
	☐	Not Qualified	Does not demonstrate ability to perform the following taskings in the topic area: research, design, model, develop, and test innovative solutions.	0
6.	**Demonstrates ability to establish and maintain effective partnerships**			
	☐	Well Qualified	Demonstrates ability to establish and maintain effective partnerships, including subcontractors, vendor relationships, university partnerships, etc. Clearly identifies current and past examples of effective partnerships.	0
	☐	Qualified	Identifies ability to establish and maintain effective partnerships, including subcontractors, vendor relationships, university partnerships. Does not provide current or past examples but provides a plan for obtaining effective partnerships.	0
	☐	Minimally Qualified	States ability to establish and maintain effective partnerships, but does not provide specific current or past examples nor a plan to establish effective partnerships in future.	0
	☐	Not Qualified	Does not address ability to establish and maintain effective partnerships.	0
7.	**Quality of the Executive Summary**			
	☐	Well Qualified	Clearly and persuasively written. No spelling or grammar errors, supported by compelling relevant detail, substantive evidence, and meaningful data.	0
	☐	Qualified	Effectively written and easy to follow. No spelling or grammar errors. Supported my detail and substantive evidence of how offeror may be technically qualified.	0
	☐	Minimally Qualified	Moderately written, difficult to follow. Lacks detail and substantive evidence of how offeror may be technically qualified. A few spelling/grammar errors.	0
	☐	Not Qualified	Poorly written. Lacks details, examples, and substantive detail. Several spelling or grammar errors. Did not follow instructions for request for Executive Summary.	0
8.	**Demonstrates ability to submit a proposal within thirty (30) calendar days, and commitment to an expedited negotiation and award schedule**			
	☐	Well Qualified	Clearly states commitment to meet thirty calendar day proposal submission schedule, as well as to a highly responsive and expedited negotiation and award process. Provides examples of past urgent DoD projects requiring a swift award.	0
	☐	Qualified	States commitment to meet thirty calendar day proposal submission schedule, as well as a highly responsive and expedited negotiation and award timeline. Does not provide specific examples	0
	☐	Minimally Qualified	States will try to meet but does not commit to thirty calendar day proposal submission schedule, does not fully commit to a swift negotiation and award.	0
	☐	Not Qualified	Does not address or will not give any level of commitment to a thirty calendar day proposal submission schedule.	0

TOTAL POINTS	0

ASSESSMENT

After careful review, and consideration overall of the above evaluation factors and an evaluation score of _0_____points, this Executive Summary is ☐ selected ☐ not selected for the Topic Area Group.

Lead Reviewer
REVIEWER NAME, GRADE, DAF
AFRL/RDXX

Reviewer #2
REVIEWER NAME, GRADE, DAF
AFRL/RDXX

Reviewer #3 (optional)
REVIEWER NAME, GRADE, DAF
AFRL/RDXX

Reviewer #4 (optional)
REVIEWER NAME, GRADE, DAF
AFRL/RDXX

Division Chief/Deputy/Chief Engineer
REVIEWER NAME, GRADE, DAF
AFRL/RDXX

Contracting Officer
REVIEWER NAME, GRADE, DAF
AFRL/RDXX