Addendum to 52.212-2 Evaluation – Commercial Products and Commercial Services (MAR 2026)

1 Basis for Award

The Government intends to award a single contract to the responsible offeror whose quote represents the most advantageous offer to the Government, considering technical approach, experience, and price. The Government may award to other than the lowest-priced offeror or the highest technically rated offeror if doing so represents the best value. Technical factors are equally important, individually are more important than price and when combined, are significantly more important than price.

Quotes that are determined to be non-responsive or that fail to address all required elements of the Performance Work Statement (PWS) may be eliminated from consideration without further evaluation.

2 Evaluation Factors

Quotes will be evaluated on the following factors:

1. **Factor I – Technical Approach (technical factor)**
2. **Factor II – Experience (technical factor)**
3. **Factor III – Price**

3 Factor I – Technical Approach

The Government will evaluate the offeror's methodology for designing and delivering a validated executive assessment program for up to two SESCDP cohorts of approximately 24 participants each. Specifically, the Government will evaluate:

3.1 Instrument Validation *(Pass/Fail)*

The Government will first evaluate whether the offeror's proposed assessment instruments have undergone documented validation studies. This sub-factor will be rated on a Pass/Fail basis as follows:

- **Pass:** The offeror demonstrates that proposed assessment instruments have undergone formal validation studies in federal or comparable senior executive environments.
- **Fail:** The offeror does not demonstrate that proposed assessment instruments have undergone formal validation studies in federal or comparable senior executive environments. Quotes receiving a fail rating

under this sub-factor will be deemed non-responsive and will not receive further evaluation.

All other sub-factors under 3.2 through 4 will be evaluated using confidence ratings as described in 6.

3.2 Simulation Design

The quality and extent to which activities replicate the complexity of an SES environment to reliably elicit and measure directly observable, ECQ-aligned leadership behaviors.

3.4 Individual Assessment Reporting

Completeness of the proposed individual assessment report format, including the degree to which reports summarize each candidate's strengths and developmental needs against each ECQ.

4 Factor II – Experience

The Government will evaluate up to three (3) recent or ongoing examples of projects of similar size, scope, and complexity (within the last five years). Experience examples will be assessed on the following sub-factors:

4.1 Executive Assessment Program Experience

The extent to which the offeror demonstrates experience designing and delivering executive-level assessment programs, including the number of participants assessed, the seniority level of participants (SES or SES-equivalent), and the type of organization served.

4.2 Assessor Management Practices

The extent to which the offeror demonstrates experience with assessor management practices, including assessor-to-participant ratios, assessor training and calibration processes, and methods used to achieve consensus reliability across assessor teams.

4.3 Validation Approach

The extent to which the offeror demonstrates experience with validation methodology and any supporting evidence and documentation, including whether instruments have been validated for senior executive environments. Offerors without prior federal-specific validation experience will be evaluated on the quality

of their explanation of how their methodology will be adapted to the federal environment.

Note: Experience with SES-level federal government assessment programs is strongly preferred. Experience examples that do not include all required administrative information (reference contact, contract number, agency, period of performance, and contract value) will not be evaluated.

5 Factor III – Price

Price will be evaluated for reasonableness and completeness. The Government will not assign confidence ratings to price but will consider price alongside the technical and experience ratings. Unrealistically low prices may be considered indicative of a lack of understanding of requirements.

6 Confidence Ratings

Technical Approach and Experience factors will be assigned the following confidence ratings, reflecting the Government's level of confidence that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort based on the information provided:

Confidence Rating	Definition
High Confidence	The Government has high confidence that the offeror understands the requirements and will successfully perform the effort. The quote demonstrates a thorough, well-supported approach with no significant weaknesses, gaps, or no government intervention.
Some Confidence	The Government has reasonable confidence that the offeror understands the requirements and will successfully perform the effort. The quote demonstrates an adequate approach but contains minor weaknesses or gaps that introduce some uncertainty and will require some government intervention.
Low Confidence	The Government has low confidence that the offeror understands the requirements or will successfully perform the effort. The quote contains significant weaknesses, gaps, or inconsistencies that introduce substantial uncertainty and will require substantial government intervention.

7 Past Performance

The Government may also consider information obtained through other sources such as the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) to determine the offerors' responsibility. This assessment shall allow the Government to determine whether the offeror is capable, ethical, and financially stable to successfully execute the requirement

8 Most Advantageous Offer

Award may be made to other than the lowest-priced offeror when the Government determines that a higher confidence-rated quote offers value that justifies any price premium. The Government also reserves the right to award to a lower-priced offeror with a lower confidence rating if the price premium of a higher-rated quote is not determined to be worth the additional cost.