MICC Guides

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS 2
FOREWARD.....3
1.0 INTRODUCTION 3
1.1 Guidebook Purpose 3
1.2 Disclaimer 4
1.3 Guidebook Flow and Structure 4
2.0 PRELIMINARY PLANNING PHASE 4
2.1 Purpose.....4
2.2 Process 4
2.3 MICC Supplemental Tools 6
2.4 ASSM Guidelines.....7
3.0 STRATEGY/SOLICITATION DEVELOPMENT PHASE.....7
3.1 Process 8
3.2 MICC Supplemental Tools. 13
3.3 ASSM Guidelines.....14
4.0 PROPOSAL PHASE 14
4.1 Process 14
4.2 MICC Supplemental Tools 20
4.3 ASSM Guidelines.....21
5.0 CONCLUSION.....22
LIST OF ENCLOSURES .....22 3 March 2009

FOREWARD

Conducting successful source selections is critical to optimally meeting the needs of the Army. Therefore, it is imperative that Mission and Installation Contracting Command (MICC) personnel be able to plan and execute the source selection process successfully.

"Today's preparation determines tomorrow's achievement."

- Author Unknown

There is no question that source selection can be an intimidating process for both contracting professionals and their customers. It is often viewed as a labor intensive, difficult, and time consuming process that is wrought with pitfalls and potential protests. However, experience has demonstrated that this is not the case when the acquisition and source selection strategies are properly planned and executed by Contracting Officers (KO). In other words, when KOs invest the time upfront to form an acquisition team, perform market research, perform program risk analysis, encourage industry feedback, and ***tailor the approach to the complexity of the requirement,*** the resultant evaluation and source selection process will not be as difficult and cumbersome as perceived. Rather, the process becomes simplified and reduces the opportunities for protest. The end result is a contract that is more successful and easier to administer!

This Guidebook has been developed specifically to assist MICC contracting professionals in planning and executing successful source selections, both formal and informal (it is not intended for Fair Opportunity awards made under Multiple Award Indefinite Delivery contracts). The consistent adherence to the principles found within this Guidebook will ultimately enhance MICC internal operations and improve the quality of our source selection products.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1. *Guidebook Purpose***.** There are many resources available to MICC contracting professionals on how to conduct proper source selections. The mandated resource currently available to MICC is the Army Federal Acquisition Regulations Supplement (AFARS), Appendix AA, Army Source Selection Manual, under Source Selection Information,

conduct market research, perform risk analysis, engage industry, and map out the acquisition and source selection strategy.

2.2.1. The membership of the acquisition team varies depending on the complexity of the requirement. Potential acquisition team members may include the customer, program manager, end user, legal advisor, small business office representative, contracting officer, contract specialist, and the assigned MICC installation analyst. For less complex requirements the acquisition team could simply consist of the KO (or contract specialist) and the customer. As the requirement becomes more complex, it becomes necessary to begin incorporating into the acquisition team additional members.

2.2.2. Once identified, the acquisition team determines the most efficient and effective acquisition (and source selection) strategy. The issues the Acquisition Team will need to address are identified in AFARS SubPart 5137.590, Army Management and Oversight of the Acquisition of Services. The key to addressing the issues and planning the strategy is collecting enough data to permit sound business decisions. This data collection process is accomplished by conducting thorough market research, identifying risk areas within the requirement (risk analysis), and engaging industry early in the planning process.

2.2.3. Market Research. In accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) Part 10, market research needs to be accomplished appropriate to the circumstances of the requirement. In other words, tailor it to the needs of the requirement. In many instances, market research is being conducted simply to determine potential small business set-asides. However, market research is more encompassing than looking at potential set-asides. Market research needs to include determining what sources (including mandatory sources) exist that can satisfy the requirement, assessing the commercial nature of the services, and assessing the practices of firms engaged in providing the commercial services. The commercial practices identified can be extremely critical in determining the strategy – this information can assist in: finalizing the PWS; determining pricing arrangements/contract types; identifying bundling issues; and identifying elevated risk areas and discriminators for source selection. If done appropriately, market research findings can be invaluable in development of the acquisition and source selection strategy.

2.2.4. Risk Analysis. Identifying risks within a requirement and managing these risks are key drivers in developing the acquisition (and source selection) strategy. The basic philosophy behind risk management is to identify those risks that pose the most serious threat to program success and develop a plan to mitigate them. Mitigation can be accomplished by identifying these risk areas as discriminators for source selections; selecting a certain contract type; using,

contract incentives; and/or changing the PWS requirements. By using elevated risk areas as discriminators in source selections we focus effort on the critical performance areas and it permits you to distinguish the differences among the proposals. The importance of performing risk analysis upfront in the preliminary planning phase is highlighted in FAR Part 7.105(a)(7), AFARS 5137.590-7, and the ASSM.

2.2.4.1. Risk analysis tools. Tools for accomplishing risk assessment/analysis vary from informal brainstorming sessions to sophisticated automated methods. Risk management analysis does not have to take several days to accomplish - an analysis can be effectively performed by the acquisition team in as little as a few hours, provided requirements are adequately defined. First and foremost, the team must understand the requirements and the relative importance of those requirements (key program objectives). The remaining steps include identifying the risks (e.g. technical, cost, and schedule), ranking these risks, mitigating the risks (through evaluation factors, contract type, changing PWS requirements, etc), and documenting the results.

2.2.4.2. Rating Risk Impact and Probability. The acquisition team works together to identify the risk areas by focusing on things that can go wrong or that may present obstacles to success. In other words, when reviewing the PWS what is the probability of an event occurring (what are the chances it will occur) and what is the impact if it occurs (the seriousness of an event occurring). Once identified and ranked, the more serious (elevated) risk drivers need to be mitigated (i.e. selected as discriminators, through contract type, changing the PWS requirements, etc).

2.2.5. Industry involvement. Engaging industry (i.e. market research questionnaires, one-on-one meetings, industry days, requests for information, etc.) during the preliminary planning process is another key driver in developing the acquisition and source selection strategy. Industry feedback is valuable in assisting with the development of the evaluation methodology, determining the evaluation criteria, and deciding what type of proposal information to request. Additionally, industry could be included in the risk identification and analysis process, since they will frequently point out risks that might not be evident to the Government. Engaging industry early in the process will lead to a smoother evaluation and award process because industry will have a keen understanding of the requirement, will know what proposal information the government desires, and they will understand the evaluation criteria – all of these will lead to better proposals.

2.3. MICC Supplemental Tools. The following templates and training related to preliminary planning phase have been developed and can be found at the, under Source Selection Information.

3.1. *Process.* For purposes of this guide, the strategy/solicitation development phase begins with the SSA's agreement of the concept of the acquisition strategy and ends with the solicitation closing. In the strategy/solicitation development phase, the acquisition team ensures the source selection organization is established, determines the evaluation methodology, and develops the source selection criteria. The KO also obtains approval of the Acquisition Strategy and Source Selection Plan (SSP) and issues the solicitation.

3.1.1. *Developing the Source Selection Organization (SSO).* To accomplish the source selection process efficiently and effectively, it is not only important to identify the right people, but also the right number of people. One of the key mistakes to avoid when planning a source selection is overcomplicating the process by creating a SSO that is too complex or large for the acquisition. The source selection organization needs to be tailored to the complexity of the requirement. Please keep in mind the following:

3.1.1.1. The SSO depicted in Figure 2-3 of the ASSM is typical for a complex, formal source selection conducted in MICC. However, it is important to remember that a Source Selection Advisory Council (SSAC) is normally only used for the ***most*** complex, high visible acquisitions which involve multiple functional areas – so the acquisition team must weigh the merits of using a SSAC before simply including it in the SSO. For less complex, informal source selections the acquisition team should consider streamlining the SSO by not using a compartmentalized approach. The SSO may consist of simply the KO, advisors, and technical personnel.

3.1.1.2. Regardless of the complexity of the SSO, the most important thing to remember is that the SSO should include the minimum number of mission capability (technical) evaluators necessary to perform the evaluations. Typically, in MICC for formal source selections, this is between three to five voting members. It may be less for informal source selections**.** Remember, advisors can always be utilized to supplement the SSEB in order to maintain an efficient number of voting members on the SSEB. SSOs with too many evaluators can complicate and delay the process.

3.1.2. *Determining the evaluation methodology.* The Government can obtain "best value" in acquisitions by choosing from a continuum of source selection approaches – based upon the relative importance of cost or price and non-cost/price factors. The continuum runs from Low Price Technically Acceptable (LPTA) through Full Tradeoffs (FTO).

3.1.2.1. LPTA. If the requirement is clearly definable, the outcomes predictable, and the risk of unsuccessful contract performance is minimal, then cost/price should play a more dominant role in source selection. In this scenario,

a LPTA is the more appropriate methodology to use. The use of LPTA should be considered in all low complex, low dollar value requirements. When using a LPTA approach, please ensure the solicitation under "Basis for Award" specifically states that "Tradeoffs are not permitted."

3.1.2.1.1. Note that the KO must document the file pursuant to FAR 15.304(c)(3)(iii) if past performance is NOT an evaluation factor in LPTA source selections. If the KO elects to consider past performance as an evaluation factor, past performance should be evaluated in accordance with FAR 15.304.

3.1.2.1.2. LPTA is exempt from the evaluation of Small Business participation required in DFARS 215.304(c)(i)

3.1.2.2. Performance Price Tradeoffs (PPT). PPT is a hybrid approach in which the final selection decision is based on a tradeoff between past performance and price. There are two methods for conducting a PPT. One method is simply evaluating past performance and then trading it off with price; there is no need for the submittal of technical proposals. The other method involves evaluating technical proposals for acceptability first, then among the technically acceptable offers trading off past performance and price. PPT may be used when it is necessary to distinguish levels of past performance among the proposals to make an award decision.

3.1.2.3. FTOs. If the requirement is more complex, less definable, and more developmental work is required, then technical/performance risk should play a more dominant role in source selection. In this instance the non-cost factors (Mission Capability, Past Performance, and Small Business Participation) are more important than the cost/price factor and the government would be willing to pay more for exceeding the minimum PWS requirements if justified. The use of FTO should be considered in all complex, multi-function requirements. When using FTO, please ensure the solicitation under the "Basis for Award" specifically states that "Tradeoffs are permitted" and "the Government reserves the right to award to other than the lowest priced offeror."

3.1.3. *Developing Evaluation Criteria*. Another complicating mistake is selecting too many (or non-discriminators) evaluation factors/subfactors/elements to evaluate. The ASSM in Chapter five specifically states, "*not everything that an offeror will have to provide or perform under the contract is a discriminator in selecting the best value proposal. It is of utmost importance to limit the evaluation factors and subfactors to those that warrant a comparative evaluation in a particular area. Adding non-discriminators will dilute the importance of the true discriminators, make proposal preparation more burdensome, require more evaluators, and increase the evaluation time*". Consequently, Evaluation Criteria shall be:

-Limited in number - Too many dilute the relative importance of the significant Factors.
-Independent – Select factors/subfactors/elements that are not overlapping.
-Applicable – Ask “Does this really belong in the evaluation?”

3.1.3.1. Evaluation criteria consist of factors with related subfactors or elements. In the past, in MICC we delineate the aspects to be evaluated under a particular factor as subfactors. Each subfactor is assigned an adjectival rating and then the ratings of the subfactors are used to derive an overall rating for the factor (see Figure 3.1 below). However, if aspects to be evaluated under a factor are of equal importance you should strongly consider using elements in lieu of subfactors for evaluation purposes. It is not necessary to assign an adjectival rating to elements nor is it required to stipulate an order of importance. The use of elements (in lieu of subfactors) can streamline the evaluation process and provide more flexibility when evaluating the factor (see Figure 3.2 below).

Subfactor
(Rating is at this Level)
Subfactor
(Rating is at this Level)
Subfactor
(Rating is at this Level)

Factor
(Roll-up Rating)
Figure 3.1 – Using Subfactors
Element
Element
Element
Factor
(Rating is at this Level)
Figure 3.2 – Using Elements
3.1.3.2. LPTA: the evaluation criteria should focus on critical requirements where specific standards or minimum levels of service are identified. When using an LPTA approach there is not a need to identify an order of importance within the evaluation factors, therefore, it is recommended that the

factors use elements instead of subfactors (see paragraph 3.1.3.1. above). Technical factors will be assigned a rating of “Acceptable” or “Unacceptable” based on whether the proposal meets the basic PWS requirements and standards. An option the KO may consider when using a LPTA approach is to stipulate in the solicitation that the government *reserves the right* to evaluate the lowest priced proposal first and if it is acceptable then make award to that offeror. In the event that the lowest price proposal is not acceptable, then the second lowest proposed price proposal is evaluated and if acceptable then award to it, and so on. However the success of this approach is dependant upon the quantity and quality of proposals received. This approach can provide the KO tremendous flexibility in streamlining the evaluation process.

3.1.3.3. For acquisitions conducted in MICC using FTOs, the following evaluation factors will be used unless a deviation is identified within the approved Acquisition Services Strategy Panel (ASSP):

-**Mission Capability**

-**Past Performance**

-**Small Business Participation** (use only three factors if Small Business Participation is not required)

-**Cost/Price**

These factors adhere to FAR Part 15.304, Evaluation Factors. The relative importance of the factors and subfactors when using FTO shall be stated in the solicitation. The solicitation shall also state, at a minimum, whether all evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are:

Significantly more important than cost or price;

Approximately equal to cost or price; or

Significantly less important than cost or price.

3.1.3.3.1. The Mission Capability Factor is where the quality of services as delineated in FAR Part 15.304 (c)(2) is evaluated. Mission Capability is evaluated using subfactors or evaluation elements. Subfactors or elements shall:

-Be true discriminators – These discriminators represent areas considered to be the main risks to the program success and are critical areas where, should the successful offeror not succeed in this area, the program fails

-Be definable and measurable – Can be understood in qualitative terms (i.e., adjectival and risk indicators)

-Be of value – Represent the key areas of importance that the customer is willing to pay more for the additional performance

3.1.3.3.2. Mission Capability Subfactors or Elements should be derived from key program objectives and risks. The Acquisition Team reviews the PWS requirements to identify the key program objectives and risk areas (see paragraph 2.2.4 above for risk analysis). Once identified these areas are then used to create the discriminators and ultimately the subfactors/elements for the requirement. It is vital that the evaluation subfactors/elements be consistent with the program objectives and risk assessment and kept to the absolute minimum required to assess the proposals effectively**. If subfactors are used, the maximum number should not exceed five (5).**

3.1.3.4. Past Performance is evaluated as a risk assessment of an offeror's likelihood of success in performing the requirements based upon current or past performance. The recency and relevancy of past performance be clearly defined in the solicitation. Where possible, use past performance information available from Government-wide and agency-wide databases. If information is not readily available from existing databases, seek it from other Government entities and private sector sources (e.g., by means of questionnaires, published commercial evaluations, and interviews).

3.1.3.5. Small Business Participation should only be an evaluation factor for unrestricted (not set-asides) solicitations using full tradeoffs (FTO). This factor is applicable to both large and small businesses and is evaluated by your small business specialist. This factor should not be confused with the subcontracting plan requirements of FAR Part 19.702, whereas, each large business offeror provides a Small Business Subcontracting Plan that contains all the elements required by FAR Clause 52.219-9. The Subcontracting Plan is submitted separately from the Small Business Participation information. The Subcontracting Plan is not a requirement for evaluation in source selection, but rather, a requirement for award to a Large Business and it will be incorporated into any resultant contract.

3.1.3.6. Cost or price will be evaluated in all source selections. It is imperative that the Cost/Price Factor clearly define what is included in the total evaluated price/cost and how cost/price will be evaluated. The Independent Government Cost Estimate (IGCE) plays a role in both cost and price analysis. It may be used as benchmark for price analysis and/or it may be used as benchmark for individual cost elements. Typically, Cost/Price is evaluated two ways depending on contract type.

3.1.3.6.1. For fixed price efforts (where cost or pricing information is not required by FAR Part 15), proposed prices are evaluated for fair and

reasonableness only using price analysis techniques identified in FAR 15.404-1. As price analysis techniques do not entail evaluating separate cost elements and proposed profit, there is no need to request this information in proposals.

3.1.3.6.2. For cost type contracts (and in some exceptional cases fixed price type contracts--see FAR 15.404-1(d)), proposal costs/prices are evaluated for their realism, reasonableness, and completeness using both cost and price analysis techniques. Cost Analysis entails the examination and evaluation of the separate cost elements and fee in an offeror's proposal. In cost type contracts, the proposed cost is usually an offeror's best estimate of what the costs are anticipated to be. What the Government will actually pay by the end of such a contract will be based on actual costs during performance, and these have the potential to vary from the original estimated proposed cost. Therefore, in source selection, you need to make your best estimate of what you expect an offer to actually cost - you do this by computing the Government's estimate of Most Probable Cost (MPC). The MPC must determine if the proposed cost is realistic for the proposal approach, does it reflect a clear understanding of the requirements; and is it consistent with the elements of technical approach. Adjustments for the most probable cost estimate should not be based solely on differences from the IGCE; the MPC must consider each offeror's technical approach. This is accomplished primarily by cross walking the technical evaluation findings of the SSEB with the cost proposal (i.e. the technical deficiencies and weaknesses and their impact on cost to assure proper adjustments can be made to the proposed costs)

3.2. *MICC Supplemental Tools*. The following templates and training related to the strategy/solicitation development phase have been developed and can be found at the MICC Homepage (https://www.us.army.mil/suite/page/547519), under Source Selection Information.

3.2.1. *Sample Request for Source Selection Organization Candidates*. This memo is used by the KO to formally request SSAC and SSEB personnel from the requiring activity.

3.2.2. *SSP and Sections L&M templates*. These templates can be used as a starting point in developing the SSP and Sections L&M. They were developed as a "fill-in the blanks" document, the KOs need to insert tailored information applicable to their requirements to complete the documents.

3.2.3. *Sample SSA Source Selection Plan Briefing*. This sample briefing provides the KO with a tailor-able briefing for obtaining SSA approval of the SSP prior to solicitation release.

3.3. *ASSM Guidelines*. The chapters and samples within the ASSM that are available to the KO to manage the strategy/solicitation development phase are:
3.3.1. Selecting the evaluation methodology (p. 4);
3.3.2. Establishing the source selection organization (p. 5). This section also provides a list of the roles and responsibilities of the SSA, KO, Source Selection Advisory Council (SSAC), Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) Chair, and SSEB members. Appendix B of the ASSM provides further personnel considerations when selecting source selection personnel.
3.3.3. Chapter 3, Source Selection Plan (SSP) (p. 12). This section outlines the information that is required in the SSP.
3.3.4. Chapter 4, Solicitation (p. 14). This section provides information on structuring the solicitation.
3.3.5. Chapter 5, Evaluation Factors, Subfactors, Weights, and Adjectival ratings (P. 17). This section provides guidance on developing Factors/Subfactors and using adjectival ratings.

4.0 PROPOSAL PHASE

4.1. *Process*. For purpose of this guide, the proposal phase begins with the initial screening of the proposals and ends with the debriefing of offerors. In the proposal phase, the KO:
- receives and screens the proposals for evaluation,
- trains the SSEB, monitors and assists the SSEB during the evaluation process,
- ensures SSEB properly documents their evaluation findings,
- recommends the competitive range to the SSA,
- conducts discussions,
- assists in preparation of the Source Selection Decision Document (SSDD) for the SSA, and
- debriefs offerors.

4.1.1. One of the keys to a successful proposal evaluation phase is the involvement of the KO, or a seasoned contract specialist, in the process ***(if possible, to facilitate KO involvement have the SSEB co-located with the KO.)*** The KO or Specialist must ensure the evaluation process is consistent, managed, and carried out in a professional, comprehensive manner. It is imperative that the KO or Specialist stay engaged with the SSEB throughout the evaluation process. This includes daily interaction with the SSEB to answer.

inquiries and ensure they are properly performing the evaluation (i.e. going in the right direction before they get too far down the road); facilitating the SSEB consensus boards; engaging Legal and obtaining their commitment early in the process; and garnering a clear understanding of the proposed Items for Negotiations (IFNs).

4.1.1.1. The KO or Specialist needs to be prepared for the SSEB. He/She should have evaluation binders prepared for each SSEB member. The evaluation binders should contain a copy of the solicitation (as amended), the source selection plan, and the non-disclosure statements to be signed by the evaluator. Additionally, the KO or Specialist should have computers available for each SSEB member with the summary evaluation forms (see paragraph 4.2.2. below) already loaded onto them. If possible have a multi-media projector available for the consensus boards. These preparations will go a long way in ensuring a consistent and efficient evaluation is conducted. Note: This is not necessary for low dollar, informal source selections where the SSO consists of the KO and one to two evaluators.

4.1.1.2. The KO must provide SSEB participants with a clear understanding of their responsibilities and an overview of the evaluation process. This is accomplished by providing tailored training to the SSEB on how to conduct their evaluations. This should be completed prior to commencement of evaluations.

4.1.1.2.1. The electronic summary evaluation form (see paragraph 4.2.2) should be used in all source selections. The SSEB will use the summary evaluation form to document its assessment of each proposal against the solicitation evaluation criteria (the summary evaluation form shall not be used for the Cost/Price Factor). This assessment is initially done by each evaluator, then the ratings and narratives are finalized through a consensus rating. The SSEB shall document on the summary evaluation form how the proposal exceeds, meets, or fails to meet the criteria through narratives documenting the significant strengths, strengths, significant weaknesses, weaknesses, deficiencies, and risks. When documenting the evaluation findings ensure the applicable proposal and PWS reference is identified for each strength, weakness, deficiency, and uncertainty. If the SSEB identifies a point as a strength, it is not enough to merely identify it - they must articulate what specific benefit the Army will receive. Similarly, for weaknesses, the SSEB must articulate what adverse impact it could have on the program. Once identified, the SSEB should prioritize each strength, weakness and deficiency and determine the appropriate adjectival rating. The SSEB must articulate which narratives drove the adjectival rating (because not all strengths and weaknesses have the same merit or impact). The key point is to provide the Source Selection Authority (SSA) with meaningful findings so he/she can make a sound decision.

4.1.1.2.2. Figure 4.1 depicts the documentation flow for the source selection process. The SSEB report is the culmination of the evaluation findings that are presented to the SSA for a competitive range determination (if discussions are held) and the selection decision. In formal source selections the SSEB findings may also have to be briefed to the SSA. Please note that if discussions are held then you will have a minimum of two sets of documentation: one after the initial evaluation and one after final evaluations.

It is important to remember that the SSEB is a fact finding body and does not compare proposals or make recommendations to the SSA.

Figure 4.1

4.1.1.2.3. Discussions. After the initial evaluation of proposals the KO determines the need for discussions. If the KO determines discussions are necessary then the KO, subject to SSA approval, establishes a competitive range. The key point to remember when conducting discussions is to convey the information in such a manner that the offerors fully understand all the discussion issues. Without clear communication revised proposals will not adequately address the IFNs, many times resulting in the need for another round of discussions. One proven methodology that KOs should consider to ensure the offerors fully understand all of the issues, is to use oral clarifications supplementing the written IFNs. The KO sends out the IFNs to the offerors in.

writing with a cover letter opening discussions, then the KO (and SSEB members) contacts the offerors by telephone within a day or two to ensure they have a complete understanding of the IFNs. This small step goes a long way in ensuring that meaningful discussions occur. Also, it is strongly recommended that when the IFNs are issued that the initial adjectival rating be disclosed to the offerors so they can fully grasp the importance of adequately addressing the IFNs. One last key point to remember when conducting discussions, an IFN ***must*** be generated for all significant weaknesses, weaknesses, deficiencies, and unclear aspects identified by the SSEB.

4.1.1.3. Debriefings will be provided formally at the request of any offeror who requests one. Most unsuccessful offerors desire a debriefing because they want assurances that they were treated fairly during the source selection process. That is why it is extremely important that KOs not take debriefs lightly. A KO providing a professional, frank and open debrief can go a long way to assuring offerors they were treated fairly and can possibly prevent protests. The debriefing team should consist of the KO, SSEB Chairperson, and any additional SSEB members and advisors deemed necessary. The KO needs to ensure they control all discussions during the debrief. Debriefings need to include an overview of the SSEB process as well as identifying to the offeror, the strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies found in their proposal. Additionally, the top level ratings of the successful offeror should be provided. A debriefing is not intended to be a page by page analysis of the proposal, a point by point comparison of proposals, or a debate or defense of the SSA's decision, so KO's should not fall into this trap with offerors. It is extremely important that each debriefing be fully documented to include responses to any questions asked by the offeror. A best practice is to use the SSA decision briefing charts and redact the charts for each offeror, then create a Memorandum for Record to document responses to offeror questions. All debriefing materials need to be reviewed by the Legal office prior to giving the debriefing. Written debriefs shall not be used when employing a FTO or PPT methodology.

4.1.2. Non-price/cost factors and related subfactors have to be rated utilizing an adjectival scheme (the use of numerics and percentages are prohibited). As we require the SSEB to document their evaluations using significant strengths, strengths, significant weaknesses, weaknesses, deficiencies, and risks then it makes sense to tie the adjectival rating definitions to the manner in which we require the SSEB to document their evaluation findings. Therefore, for acquisitions conducted in MICC the following adjectival definitions will be used unless a deviation is identified within the approved Acquisition Services Strategy Panel (ASSP):

4.1.2.1. For **LPTAs.**

Technical Areas: ADJECTIVAL

RATING	DEFINITION
Acceptable	Acceptable quality and meets minimum PWS requirements necessary for satisfactory contract performance. Proposal contains no deficiencies or significant weaknesses, and any identified weaknesses do not impact the probability of meeting minimum requirements. Fair probability of success with low to

	moderate degree of risk.
Susceptible to being made acceptable	A proposal that satisfies most but not all of the minimum PWS requirements and/or in some instances fails to provide sufficient detail to demonstrate the feasibility of a proposed approach. The proposal contains weaknesses (to include possible significant weaknesses) and/or some deficiencies, but the overall approach is sufficiently sound that the weaknesses and/or deficiencies may be corrected without a major rewrite of the proposal. The degree of proposal risk is moderate to high. Note: A Susceptible rating cannot be a final rating. The final rating will either increase to acceptable or decrease to unacceptable.
Unacceptable	A proposal that fails to meet minimum PWS requirements necessary for acceptable performance. Where discussions are contemplated, the proposal contains weaknesses, significant weaknesses, and deficiencies that cannot be corrected without a major rewrite of the proposal. The degree of proposal risk is high to very high.

Past Performance: Rating	Description
Excellent	Essentially no doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort based on their performance record. Performance Risk Level: Very Low
Good	Little doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort based on their performance record. Performance Risk Level: Low
Adequate	Some doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort based on their performance record. Performance Risk Level: Moderate
Marginal	Significant doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort based on their performance record.

	Performance Risk Level: High
Poor	It is extremely doubtful that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort based on their performance record. Performance Risk Level: Very High
Neutral	The offeror has little/no relevant past performance upon which to base a meaningful performance risk prediction. Performance Risk Level: Unknown