

# Sample Evaluation Process

---

Here is the documentation for a sample process used to evaluate proposals you receive in response to a Request for Proposals (RFP).

1. A Request for Quotation (RFQ999999) was posted on GSA eBuy on <DATE> (Reference # NBQ999999). Respondents were given until noon <DATE> to submit their proposals. The Statement of Work included four technical evaluation criteria against which the proposals would be rated.

2. 9 proposals were received by the due date and made available via the <BLM District Office's SharePoint site folder> to the Technical Proposal Evaluation Committee (TPEC) on <DATE>. The TPEC consists of *(3 – 7 members are recommended)*:

- <NAME>, Chair, <TITLE>, <Office>
- <NAME>, <TITLE>, <Office>
- <NAME>, <TITLE>, <Office>
- <NAME>, <TITLE>, <Office>
- <NAME>, <TITLE>, <Office>

Cost estimates for each proposal were not sent to the panel.

3. Panelists were given <11> working days to review each proposal, evaluate them against the criteria, provide numerical ratings, and include written justification to explain the ratings and highlight strengths and weaknesses. The evaluations were documented using the Technical Evaluation Rating Form (see Appendix A).

Points for each criterion were guided by the definitions on the Technical Evaluation Criteria Ratings paper (see Appendix B). For example, if the maximum points available were 30, then the respondent could get 25-30 points for excellent qualifications, but only 13-18 if their qualifications were merely acceptable.

4. The TPEC chair (also the contracting officer's representative) put TPEC members' rating points for each criterion for each proposal, plus the total points, on one sheet (see Appendix C), making note of each person's top 5 and bottom 4 total scores.

5. On <DATE>, the TPEC and contracting officer participated in a conference call to discuss their evaluations (see Appendix D). The 5 proposals with the lowest ratings (<LIST COMPANIES>) were quickly discussed and eliminated.

- <COMPANY Z> was rated #9 out of 9 (last) by all 5 TPEC members, so they were not discussed further.
- <COMPANY Y> was rated low by 3 members and high/moderate by 2 members, <COMPANY X> was rated low by 4 members and high by 1 member, so those who rated them low discussed their weaknesses and the ones who rated them higher agreed with the lower rankings.
- <COMPANY V> and <COMPANY W> were rated low/moderate by all. Their weaknesses were discussed, since all panel members know the proposed instructor(s), and chairperson wanted to ensure all were discussed and documented fully.

6. The top 4 proposals (<LIST COMPANIES>) were discussed in detail (see Appendix D). For each proposal, the panel discussed strengths and weaknesses for each criterion, and then a consensus rating was agreed on.

7. The points for the top 4 proposals were totaled; since the score <COMPANY D> was in the 70s (out of 100), it wasn't discussed further. Scores for the other 3 proposals were in the 80s, within 5 points of each other, so they were considered equal.

Only then were the cost estimates revealed. <COMPANY A's> estimate was less than half of <COMPANY B's> and just over half of <COMPANY C's> estimate. Because there was such a significant difference, we sent them three questions via email on <DATE>:

- a. Did your price include travel/per diem for all classes?
- b. Did your price include printing & shipping EISs to mailing list?
- c. Did your price include # meetings in # locations?

All companies responded the same day, and they all answered "yes" to all questions.

8. Therefore, the TPEC's recommended selecting <COMPANY A>, with the following reservations / caveats / assumptions:
  - a. Only one <SPECIALIST> is identified, and the workload is large, so they must ensure the deadlines are met even for this specialty.
  - b. The bid is lower than the other bids and lower than the independent government cost estimate (see Appendix E); however, they appear to understand the project, they have done similar work, and they have assured us they can fulfill the contract for the cost submitted.
  - c. Two panel members expressed concern with previous personal experience with one or two of the employees when s/he (they) worked for <Company XYZ> in regards to <Quality, Consistency, Responsiveness, Deadlines>. The COR will discuss at the post-award meeting and require <weekly / monthly> conference calls to monitor the deliverables to minimize this from occurring.

# Sample Technical Evaluation Rating Form

---

Contractor Rated: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator: \_\_\_\_\_

Date Evaluated: \_\_\_\_\_

Total Points: \_\_\_\_\_

Criteria	Rating
<p><b>1. Clear understanding of government needs.</b> Include details of what you're specifically looking for <i>(for example, ask them to provide a timeline and outline of document or process or product)</i>. (Max: <b>30 points</b>)</p>	
<p><b>Comments:</b></p>	
<p><b>2. Technical approach to performing work.</b> Include details of what you're specifically looking for <i>(for example, address your unique approach to completing this work and how it sets you apart from other companies)</i>. (Max: <b>25 points</b>)</p>	
<p><b>Comments:</b></p>	
<p><b>3. Qualifications &amp; experience of organization and personnel.</b> Include details of what you're specifically looking for <i>(for example, 2 social scientists, a PhD in botany, etc.)</i> (Max: <b>25 points</b>)</p>	
<p><b>Comments:</b></p>	
<p><b>4. Past performance with work that is similar in scale and scope.</b> Include details of what you're specifically looking for <i>(for example, include a list of clients &amp; contact information for current and recently completed projects that are similar in scale/scope; include quality of service, timeliness/responsiveness, resolving customer satisfaction problems.)</i> (Max: <b>20 points</b>)</p>	
<p><b>Comments:</b></p>	

## Sample Technical Evaluation Criteria Ratings

---

We developed a chart indicating how the panel should score the technical evaluation criteria for each proposal. Here's an example for one of the criterion (this one is rather generic, the other ones were more specific):

4. **Past performance with work that is similar in scale and scope.** Provide past performance information. Include a list of clients & contact information for current and recently completed projects that are similar in scale/scope; include quality of service, timeliness/responsiveness, resolving customer satisfaction problems, and cost control. **(Max = 20 points)**

17-20	Proposal demonstrates <b>excellent</b> understanding of requirements and capability standards. Has exceptional strengths that will significantly benefit the government. Other clients indicate excellent relevant past performance; especially regarding quality, timeliness/responsiveness, and customer satisfaction.
13 - 16	Proposal demonstrates <b>good</b> understanding of requirements and capability standards. Has several strengths that will benefit the government. Other clients indicate good relevant past performance; especially regarding quality, timeliness/responsiveness, customer satisfaction.
9 - 12	Proposal demonstrates <b>acceptable</b> understanding of requirements and capability standards. Acceptable solution. Few or no strengths that will benefit the government. Other clients indicate acceptable relevant past performance; especially regarding quality, timeliness/responsiveness, and customer satisfaction.
5 - 8	Proposal demonstrates <b>shallow</b> understanding of requirements and capability standards necessary for minimal contract performance. Some weaknesses and/or inadequacies that may be correctable. Other clients indicate fair relevant past performance; especially regarding quality, timeliness/responsiveness, and customer satisfaction.
0 - 4	<b>Fails</b> to meet performance or capability standards. Significant weaknesses and/or deficiencies requiring major proposal rewrite. Other clients indicate unacceptable relevant past performance; especially regarding quality, timeliness/responsiveness, and customer satisfaction.

# Sample TPEC Consolidated Ratings

\*TPEC = Technical Proposal Evaluation Committee

Company	TPEC-1	TPEC-2	TPEC-3	TPEC-4	TPEC-5
<b>1. Clear understanding of government needs. (MAX 30 pts)</b>					
COMPANY A	23	16	19	18	15
COMPANY B	25	26	26	21	20
COMPANY C	5	10	7	5	5
COMPANY D	19	28	23	18	28
COMPANY E	15	20	25	17	25
COMPANY F	10	20	24	15	25
COMPANY G	23	28	25	21	20
COMPANY H	20	26	19	25	30
COMPANY J	19	19	13	21	25
<b>2. Technical approach to performing work. (MAX 25 pts)</b>					
COMPANY A	23	15	11	16	20
COMPANY B	20	21	21	18	20
COMPANY C	10	5	6	5	10
COMPANY D	23	24	21	23	25
COMPANY E	18	24	5	15	15
COMPANY F	15	24	21	15	10
COMPANY G	20	23	25	19	23
COMPANY H	25	24	18	22	24
COMPANY J	12	17	11	18	20
<b>3. Qualifications &amp; experience. (MAX 25 pts)</b>					
COMPANY A	20	18	16	15	15
COMPANY B	25	25	25	19	23
COMPANY C	14	10	6	5	10
COMPANY D	21	24	23	19	25
COMPANY E	18	23	15	19	15
COMPANY F	20	23	24	15	10
COMPANY G	21	24	24	21	23
COMPANY H	23	20	17	22	20
COMPANY J	10	14	9	17	23
<b>4. Past performance with work that is similar in scale and scope. (MAX 20 pts)</b>					
COMPANY A	17	16	13	10	15
COMPANY B	10	17	18	16	10
COMPANY C	0	10	5	5	10
COMPANY D	16	19	20	18	20
COMPANY E	15	18	9	15	10
COMPANY F	12	18	17	13	10
COMPANY G	18	19	20	18	18
COMPANY H	15	20	13	18	18
COMPANY J	12	15	6	18	20

TOTAL POINTS					
	TPEC-1	TPEC-2	TPEC-3	TPEC-4	TPEC-5
COMPANY A	83	65	59	59	65
COMPANY B	80	89	89	74	73
COMPANY C	29	35	24	20	35
COMPANY D	79	95	87	78	98
COMPANY E	66	85	54	66	65
COMPANY F	57	85	86	58	55
COMPANY G	82	94	94	79	84
COMPANY H	83	90	67	87	92
COMPANY J	53	65	39	74	88

Top 5	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5
TPEC-1	COMPANY A (tie)	COMPANY H (tie)	COMPANY G	COMPANY B	COMPANY D
TPEC-2	COMPANY D	COMPANY G	COMPANY H	COMPANY B	COMPANY E (tie)
TPEC-3	COMPANY G	COMPANY B	COMPANY D	COMPANY F	COMPANY H
TPEC-4	COMPANY H	COMPANY G	COMPANY D	COMPANY B (tie)	COMPANY J (tie)
TPEC-5	COMPANY D	COMPANY H	COMPANY J	COMPANY G	COMPANY B

Bottom 4	#9	#8	#7	#6
TPEC-1	COMPANY C	COMPANY J	COMPANY F	COMPANY E
TPEC-2	COMPANY C	COMPANY J	COMPANY A	COMPANY F (tie)
TPEC-3	COMPANY C	COMPANY J	COMPANY E	COMPANY A
TPEC-4	COMPANY C	COMPANY F	COMPANY A	COMPANY E
TPEC-5	COMPANY C	COMPANY F	COMPANY E (tie)	COMPANY A (tie)

# Sample Consensus Ratings

This form is filled out for each Company evaluated. It's a brief summary documentation of the TPEC comments.

## COMPANY D- Ranked in Top 3 of 9 Proposals

TPEC-1	TPEC-2	TPEC-3	TPEC-4	TPEC-5	Consensus
<b>1. Clear understanding of government needs. (Include details, or not)</b>					(MAX 30 pts)
19	28	23	18	28	<b>24</b>
<p><b>Strengths:</b> They recognize that many of our projects aren't complicated or technical. Outline had good material. Schedule format was good.</p> <p><b>Weaknesses:</b> More specialist reports, less interdisciplinary work. Too much introductory/background material. Too little time for the analysis process. Talked a lot about preparing solar EISs, not much on preparing geothermal EISs and EAs.</p>					
<b>2. Technical approach to performing work. (Include details, or not)</b>					(MAX 25 pts)
23	24	21	23	25	<b>21</b>
<p><b>Strengths:</b> good description of their approach to EIS development and following our planning process. Nice variety of interactions among specialists.</p> <p><b>Weaknesses:</b> Not crazy about the how they would incorporate review comments and cooperator feedback. Same outline as for solar EIS proposal submitted 2 years ago, doesn't appear to have tailored it to this RFP.</p>					
<b>3. Qualifications &amp; experience. (Include details, or not)</b>					(MAX 25 pts)
21	24	23	19	25	<b>23</b>
<p><b>Strengths:</b> Experience with multiple types of EISs. Explicitly showed experience with BLM NEPA processes in four other states. Experience with other agency processes. They've worked a lot with other energy states and EISs, so they appear to have the right kind of experience and specialists.</p> <p><b>Weaknesses:</b> How are they going to use all their staff that they included? Who's going to be the primary authors? What will their role be? Most of their experience appears to be with EISS, not RMPs.</p>					
<b>4. Past performance with work that is similar in scale &amp; scope. (Incl. details or not)</b>					(MAX 20 pts)
16	19	20	18	20	<b>18</b>
<p><b>Strengths:</b> Documentation they provided on past performance was excellent and more abundant than other proposals. They have ePlanning experience. They are easy to work with, based on TPEC personal experience on 3 other projects.</p> <p><b>Weaknesses:</b> All their past performance ratings were for EAs and Forest Service EISs, not RMPs. Little evidence of past performance of similar scale and scope on geothermal projects for the BLM.</p>					
<b>Total Points</b>					(MAX 100 pts)
79	95	87	78	98	<b>86 (#1/9)</b>