**EVALUATION PLAN**

**Task Order Title:{taskOrderTitle}**

**Basis of evaluation:** *{sourceSelection} – {method}*

{IF sourceSelection === `NO\_TECH\_PROPOSAL`}

{IF method === `LPTA`}

* Government user does not require a technical proposal; award will be made on a Lowest Price Technically Acceptable (LPTA) basis

The KO will request Contractors provide a price proposal that includes the total price and a complete list of cloud service offerings with catalog item numbers/SKUs, the unit price, unit of issue, and quantities calculated on a monthly basis for each catalog item number/SKU required to meet the criteria in the DoW; Contractor shall map each proposed catalog item number/SKU to the specific requirement element(s). Award will be made to the lowest priced offeror meeting the compliance standards.

Compliance Standards:

* + - Each requirement element has one or more specific catalog item number/SKU specified
    - The Contractor mapped the catalog item numbers/SKUs to the requirement element(s)
    - MO writes detailed compliance standard applicable to specific need:
    - { FOR object in customSpecifications}
    - { INS $object}
    - {END-FOR object}

{END-IF}

{END-IF}

{IF sourceSelection === `TECH\_PROPOSAL`}

{IF method === `LPTA`}

* Government User require a technical proposal

The KO will request the Contractor propose a technical solution and provide a price proposal that includes the total price and a complete list of cloud service offerings with catalog item numbers/SKUs, the unit price, unit of issue, and quantities calculated on a monthly basis for each catalog item number/SKU.

* + LPTA

Award will be made to the lowest priced offeror meeting the compliance standards.

Compliance standards:

* The proposed solution fully addresses each requirement element
  + - The proposed solution identifies all catalog items (and quantity) necessary to meet the requirements
    - Each catalog item is mapped to a specific requirement and an explanation of how the item will contribute to the solution is provided
    - *(Optional)* MO writes detailed compliance standard applicable to specific need:
    - { FOR object in customSpecifications}
    - { INS $object}
    - {END-FOR object}

{END-IF}

{IF method === `BVTO`}

* Government User require a technical proposal

The KO will request the Contractor propose a technical solution and provide a price proposal that includes the total price and a complete list of cloud service offerings with catalog item numbers/SKUs, the unit price, unit of issue, and quantities calculated on a monthly basis for each catalog item number/SKU.

* + - Best Value Trade-Off (BVTO)

Award will be made to the Contractor providing the best value.

Compliance standard:

* + - The proposed solution fully addresses each requirement element
    - The proposed solution identifies all catalog items (and quantity) that are required
    - Each catalog item is mapped to a specific requirement and an explanation of how the item will contribute to the solution is provided
    - *(Optional)* MO writes detailed compliance standard applicable to specific need:
    - { FOR object in customSpecifications}
    - { INS $object}
    - {END-FOR object}

Differentiators: The solutions offer benefits beyond the solution itself

* *(Optional)* Level of complexity reduced due to proposed solution
* *(Optional)* Any capability gained by implementing the solution (beyond the Government’s requirement)
* *(Optional)* Any schedule savings achieved due to proposed solution
* *(Optional)* Any lifecycle cost savings achieved due to proposed solution
* *(Optional)* Any enduring persistence (longevity) due to proposed solution
* *(Optional)* Any automation capability proposed to improve reliability and reduce human-error
* *(Optional)* MO writes detailed differentiator applicable to specific need:
* { FOR object in customDifferentiators}
* { INS $object}
* {END-FOR object}

{END-IF}

{END-IF}

{IF sourceSelection === `SET\_LUMP\_SUM`}

{IF method === `BEST\_USE`}

* Government would like to purchase a set lump sum dollar amount of offerings from any one Contractor; award will be made to the Contractor offering the “best use” or “lowest risk”
  + Best Use

The KO will request Contractors submit a white paper identifying a strategy and approach that will meet or exceed the requirements within the proposed costs; must provide a price proposal which includes a complete list of cloud service offerings with catalog item numbers/SKUs and quantities to meet the requirements. Award will be made to the Contractor whose white paper offers the “best use” or “lowest risk” solution as identified.

Assessment areas:

* + - Solution adequately addresses each requirement element or identifies any requirement elements which are not explicitly identified in the strategy or approach
    - The proposed solution identifies all cloud service offerings with catalog item numbers/SKUs (and quantities) that are required
    - Each catalog item is mapped to a specific requirement and an explanation of how the item will contribute to the solution is provided
    - The proposed solution addresses how the Contractor will facilitate the described need
    - (Optional) Risk to the Government
    - (Optional) Any automation capability proposed to improve reliability and reduce human-error
    - (Optional) MO writes detailed compliance standard applicable to specific need:
    - { FOR object in customSpecifications}
    - { INS $object}
    - {END-FOR object}

{END-IF}

{IF method === `LOWEST\_RISK`}

* Government would like to purchase a set lump sum dollar amount of offerings from any one Contractor; award will be made to the Contractor offering the “best use” or “lowest risk”
  + Lowest Risk

The KO will request Contractors submit a white paper identifying a strategy and approach that will meet or exceed the requirements within the proposed costs; must provide a price proposal which includes a complete list of cloud service offerings with catalog item numbers/SKUs and quantities to meet the requirements. Award will be made to the Contractor whose white paper offers the “best use” or “lowest risk” solution as identified.

Assessment areas:

* + - Solution adequately addresses each requirement element or identifies any requirement elements which are not explicitly identified in the strategy or approach
    - The proposed solution identifies all cloud service offerings with catalog item numbers/SKUs (and quantities) that are required
    - Each catalog item is mapped to a specific requirement and an explanation of how the item will contribute to the solution is provided
    - The proposed solution addresses how the Contractor will facilitate the described need
    - Risk to the Government
    - (Optional) Any automation capability proposed to improve reliability and reduce human-error
    - (Optional) MO writes detailed compliance standard applicable to specific need:
    - { FOR object in customSpecifications}
    - { INS $object}
    - {END-FOR object}

{END-IF}

{END-IF}

{IF sourceSelection === `EQUAL\_SET\_LUMP\_SUM`}

* Government would like to purchase an equal set lump sum dollar amount of offerings from each Contractor; the Government will issue equal awards to each Contractor

The KO will request Contractors respond if “interested” or “not interested”. Task Orders will be issued to all interested CSPs; award will be made in equal parts to each Contractor that responded to the RFQ as “interested”

{END-IF}

**Evaluation Tables:**

{IF sourceSelection === `NO\_TECH\_PROPOSAL`}

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table 1: Technical/Management Ratings - LPTA** | |
| **Rating** | **Description** |
| Acceptable | Quote meets the minimum requirements of the solicitation. |
| Unacceptable | Quote does not meet the minimum requirements of the solicitation. |

{END-IF}

{IF sourceSelection === `TECH\_PROPOSAL`}

{IF method === `LPTA`}

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table 1: Technical/Management Ratings - LPTA** | |
| **Rating** | **Description** |
| Acceptable | Proposal meets the minimum requirements of the solicitation. |
| Unacceptable | Proposal does not meet the minimum requirements of the solicitation. |

{END-IF}

{IF method === `BVTO`}

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 2: Color Scheme for the Combined Technical/Management and Risk Ratings - BVTO** | | |
| **Color** | **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. |

{END-IF}

{END-IF}

{IF sourceSelection === `SET\_LUMP\_SUM`}

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table 3: Best Use/Lowest Risk Ratings** | |
| **“Best Use” Rating** | **Description** |
| Outstanding | White paper meets the assessment criteria, indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements, and provides technical merit. |
| Good | White paper meets the assessment criteria, indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements, and provides technical merit. |
| Acceptable | White paper meets the assessment criteria and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. |
| Unacceptable | White paper does not meet the requirements. |
| **“Risk” Rating** | **Description** |
| Low | White paper demonstrates low risk of unsuccessful performance. |
| Low to Moderate | White paper demonstrates low to moderate risk of unsuccessful performance. |
| No worse than Moderate | White paper demonstrates no worse than moderate risk of unsuccessful performance. |
| High | White paper demonstrates a high risk of unsuccessful performance. |

{END-IF}