Below is a **sample evaluation criteria framework** for an **IT services acquisition**, structured under FAR Part 15 (best value, tradeoff process). It includes **Past Experience** as a key technical factor, and uses a typical three-factor structure with associated subfactors. It's adaptable for agile development, cloud services, system integration, or platform modernization efforts.

Evaluation Criteria – IT Services Acquisition

Evaluation Approach:
This procurement will use a **Best Value Tradeoff** source selection methodology in accordance with FAR 15.101-1. The Government intends to evaluate proposals based on **technical merit, past performance, and price**, with technical factors being **more important than price**. However, as differences in technical proposals narrow, price will become a more significant factor in the tradeoff decision.

Factor 1 – Technical Approach

Subfactors:

1. **Solution Design and Methodology**

   o Clarity and feasibility of the proposed technical solution to meet the objectives in the PWS or SOO.

   o Use of modern development practices (e.g., Agile, DevSecOps, cloud-native design).

   o Alignment with government-provided product vision or desired outcomes.

2. **Understanding of Requirements**

   o Demonstrated understanding of the problem space, constraints, user needs, and success metrics.

   o Degree to which the offeror proposes an approach that enables rapid delivery and adaptability.

3. **Innovation and Risk Mitigation**

o Thoughtful incorporation of automation, open-source tools, or commercial best practices.

o Identification of risks and proposed strategies to mitigate them without compromising delivery.

Evaluation Method:
Narrative assessment with **Confidence Rating** (e.g., High Confidence, Some Confidence, Low Confidence).

Factor 2 – Past Experience

Subfactors:

1. **Relevant Experience**

   o Evidence of recent (within the past 5 years) experience with contracts of similar scope, size, and complexity.

   o Demonstrated delivery of IT solutions in a federal or similarly regulated environment.

2. **Technical Breadth**

   o Experience delivering key technical components (e.g., user-centered design, secure APIs, cloud migration, iterative delivery).

3. **Team Experience and Continuity**

   o Experience of proposed team members or key personnel in similar engagements.

   o Evidence of team stability and ability to collaborate with Government Product Owners.

Evaluation Method:
Qualitative assessment based on case studies, project summaries, and resumes. May include validation through past performance references.

Confidence Rating Example:

- **High Confidence:** Offeror has demonstrated highly relevant, successful experience delivering comparable solutions.

- **Some Confidence:** Offeror has relevant experience, but not fully aligned with scope or success is not clearly demonstrated.

- **Low Confidence:** Offeror has limited or poorly articulated relevant experience.

Factor 3 – Price

Price proposals will be evaluated for **reasonableness, realism, and balance**, in accordance with FAR 15.404. Evaluation will include:

- Consistency with proposed team size and level of effort

- Alignment of labor categories with technical approach

- Realism of pricing for agile delivery (e.g., per sprint, fixed iteration models)

Note: Price will be less important than the combined technical factors but will be considered in the final tradeoff analysis.

Optional: Factor 4 – Small Business Participation Plan

(Include if required or incentivized)

Let me know if you want this formatted for an **SSP**, **Evaluation Panel Briefing**, or **Section M language for an RFP**. I can also tailor this for **Agile, COTS, or Cloud-specific acquisitions.**