**Evaluation Team Worksheet**

The purpose of this document is to help Technical Evaluation Team (TET) members clearly and accurately document their assessments of challenges, scenarios and written quotations. Evaluators will perform their evaluation using the **TET Evaluator Response Form.**

Each individual evaluator should save their own copy of this document to help guide them through the evaluation process.

The Government intends to utilize a phased approach for this procurement as described below. To be considered for award, contractors must successfully pass through each phase.

The technical evaluation will take place using the following phased approach:

1. First Phase: Challenge submission
2. Second Phase: Scenario submission
3. Third Phase: Technical Approach, Management Approach, and Similar Experience submission

Challenge Question:

To be considered acceptable Contractor responses must address the following in each core functional area: (1) Determining where things stand now; (2) Outlining the path forward for Phase Two; and, (3) Ensuring modernization efforts continue beyond Phase Two.

Scenario Response:

To be considered acceptable Contractor responses must address the following: How would you obtain agency-wide buy-in for the modernization efforts promoted by the CoE while also linking efforts and fostering collaboration with other vendors and government staff across all of the Centers at the Agency Partner?

**Technical Approach**

The following ratings will be used:

* **Exceptional:** Quotations receiving an “Exceptional” rating will explain how specific methods or techniques will be used by the contractor to successfully achieve each performance objective associated with the functional area. Further, “Exceptional” quotations will specify methods or techniques that will allow the contractor to exceed all performance objectives in a specific way that benefits the Government. Finally, “Exceptional” quotations will explain how the methods or techniques to be used by the contractor are free from issues requiring Government intervention to address.
* **Good:** Quotations receiving a “Good” rating will explain how specific methods or techniques will be used by the contractor to successfully achieve each performance objective associated with the functional area. Further, “Good” quotations will specify methods or techniques that will allow the contractor to *at least meet* all performance objectives. Finally, “Good” quotations will explain how the methods or techniques to be used by the contractor either free from issues identified during evaluation, or are associated with issues determined during evaluation to be correctable. A quotation identifying methods or techniques that exceed all performance objectives will receive no better rating than a “Good” rating if that quotation contains correctable issues.
* **Poor:** Quotations receiving a “Poor” rating fail to meet the basic requirements of this solicitation. A quotation that fails to explain how specific methods or techniques will be used by the contractor to successfully achieve *any* performance objective associated with the functional area will receive a “Poor” rating. A quotation that specifies methods or techniques that *fail to meet* all performance objectives will receive a “Poor” rating.

**Management Approach and Similar Experience**

The following ratings will be used:

* **Very Likely**: Management approach and prior experience indicate that the contractor is very likely to perform the technical approach as proposed. Contractor’s approach mitigates all identified risks; demonstrates exceptional control over the proposed personnel and / or team; and, displays substantial experience in the performance of similar requirements.
* **Likely**: Management approach and prior experience indicate that the contractor is likely to perform the technical approach as proposed. Contractor’s approach mitigates most identified risks; demonstrates satisfactory control over the proposed personnel and / or team; and, displays some experience in the performance of similar requirements.
* **Unlikely**: Management approach and prior experience indicate that the contractor is unlikely to perform the technical approach as proposed. Contractor’s approach mitigates few to none of the identified risks; and / or demonstrates unsatisfactory control over the proposed personnel and / or team; and / or displays little to no experience in the performance of similar requirements.

**Evaluator Section - Phase 1**

Please ensure you mention what innovative technologies (e.g., artificial intelligence, robotic process automation, machine learning, etc.) and  skills (e.g., human-centered design, journey mapping, project management techniques, etc.) you would use in achieving your objectives. Additionally, where applicable, outline how you would engage stakeholders to create buy-in for your solution.

**Rating: RATING**

**Narrative**

The team put forward by VENDOR is outlined in section X of the quotation. They are NAMES AND ROLES.

**(Example of Strength)** VENDOR has the requisite experience to perform this task. This experience includes Y, which maps with Z from the RFQ. Additionally, because of REASON, this experience exceeds what the Government requires.

**(Example of Weakness)** VENDOR claims to have the requisite experience to perform this task, but fails to provide details to verify their claims. Specifically, Z, which is required by the RFQ.

(Example of Risk) NAME does not have the requisite experience to perform this task. Specifically, Z, which is required by the RFQ. This would result in a LEVEL-level of risk to the Government because of A, B, and C.

NAME does not have the requisite experience to perform this task. Specifically, Z, which is required by the RFQ. This would result in not meeting the performance objectives because of A, B, and C.

**Evaluator Section - Phase 2**

**Rating: RATING**

**Narrative**

The vendor’s five examples of relevant experience are outlined in section X of the quotation. They include PROJECTS.

(Example of Strength) PROJECT has a similar scope, size, and complexity. PROJECT involved Y, which maps with Z from the RFQ. Additionally, because of REASON, this experience exceeds what the Government requires.

(Example of Weakness) VENDOR claims PROJECT is similar in scope, size, and complexity, but fails to provide details to verify their claims. Specifically, Z, which is required by the RFQ.

(Example of Risk) PROJECT does not represent the type of scope, size, and complexity the Government seeks. Specifically, Z, which is required by the RFQ. This would result in a LEVEL-level of risk to the Government because of A, B, and C.