**ATTACHMENT E**

**TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA**

**for**

**ORD’s Graphics & Media (G&M) Support**

The Government will make award to the responsible Offeror(s) whose offer conforms to the solicitation and is most advantageous to the Government cost or other factors considered. For this solicitation, a Best Value with Tradeoffs will be performed where all non-price evaluation factors, when combined, are significantly more important than price. The Offeror must meet or exceed all criteria to be considered for award.

The non-price evaluation factors are as follows and are listed in descending order of importance:

1. **Technical Approach (Factor 1):** The Offeror will be evaluated on the degree to which the proposed technical approach demonstrates an understanding, knowledge, experience and ability to perform and accomplish all the requirements of the Performance Work Statement (PWS).
2. **Staffing Approach (Factor 2):** The Offeror’s staffing approach will be evaluated on the demonstrated technical skills, experience, qualifications, and availability of their proposed key personnel and their intended role in fulfilling the PWS requirements. The Offeror will also be evaluated on its ability to recruit, retain, train, and manage qualified staff.
3. **Past Performance (Factor 3)**: The Offeror will be evaluated on performance under existing and prior contracts/subcontracts for projects of similar size, scope, complexity, and dollar value, completed within the last three years. Additionally, past performance will be evaluated based on the completed past performance questionnaires submitted by the Offeror’s current and former clients. Areas that may be evaluated include quality of product or service, schedule, cost control, and management.
4. **Performance Management (Factor 4):** The Offeror will be evaluated on its demonstrated program management capability and process for keeping EPA informed about critical issues, and the Offeror’s ability to manage and track progress and performance. The Offeror will be evaluated on its subcontractor management and its ability to ensure efficiency and quality performance of its proposed subcontractors (if applicable).

**II. Evaluation Rating Method**

The EPA will use the following adjectival ratings in its evaluation for Factors 1, 2, and 4.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Combined Technical/Risk Rating** | |
| **Rating** | **Description** |
| Outstanding | Proposal meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths far outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is very low. |
| Good | Proposal meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal contains strengths which outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is low. |
| Acceptable | Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths and weaknesses do not outweigh one another or will have little or no impact on contract performance. Risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate. |
| Marginal | Proposal does not clearly meet requirements and has not clearly demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. The proposal has one or more weaknesses which are not outweighed by strengths. Risk of unsuccessful performance is high. |
| Unacceptable | Proposal does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies. Proposal is unacceptable for purposes of an award |

EPA will use the following adjectival ratings in its evaluation of the past performance (Factor 3) criterion:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Past** **Performance Confidence Assessment** | |
| **Rating** | **Description** |
| Substantial Confidence | Based on the offeror’s recent/relevant past performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. |
| Satisfactory Confidence | Based on the offeror’s recent/relevant past performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. |
| Limited Confidence | Based on the offeror’s recent/relevant past performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. |
| No Confidence | Based on the offeror’s recent/relevant past performance record, the Government has no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort. |
| Unknown Confidence (Neutral) | No recent/relevant past performance record is available or the offeror’s performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned. |