



Attachment C: Technical Evaluation Criteria

ED-NAG-13-R-0005

World Wide Web Services

SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

The Government will make award to the responsible offeror whose offer conforms to the requirements stated in the Request for Quotes (RFQ), has no deficiencies, and is most advantageous to the Government, cost or price and other factors considered. For this RFQ, soundness of the technical approach will be a substantial factor in source selection, however, cost/price factors shall be evaluated and the Contracting Officer will determine whether the difference in quality is worth the difference in cost or price. Evaluation criteria are summarized and detailed below.

Summary Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Points
1. Technical Approach	30
2. Management Plan	20
3. Project Staffing	15
4. Organizational Experience	15
Total Technical Points	80
5. Past Performance	20
Grand Total	100

1. Technical Approach (30 points)

Reviewers will look for information that demonstrates the following:

- (a) A clear understanding of the scope of work required for the project, with a work plan that will ensure achievement of task objectives;
- (b) A clear understanding of federal laws and regulations in operating a website and a viable plan for implementing these requirements;
- (c) A viable website transition plan with contingency planning and established milestones;
- (d) An integrated plan that expands outreach to targeted audiences;
- (e) An overall effective web strategy that accomplishes all project goals as outlined in the Statement of Work

2. Management Plan (20 points)

Responses will be reviewed for information that shows proposed staff have the education, training, knowledge, and experience to successfully carry out the project. Reviewers will look for

information that demonstrates the following:

- (a) Requisite qualifications, experience, and time commitment of the project director and proposed staff;
- (b) Demonstrated ability of proposed staff to perform work assignments accurately and in a timely manner;
- (c) Staff flexibility and commitment to perform work assignments on short notice based on changing task priorities.
- (d) An effective quality control and cost monitoring plan that adheres to requirements specified in the Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan

3. Project Staffing (15 points)

Each proposal will be reviewed for information that shows the potential capability and experience of the offeror to successfully undertake website design, operation, and maintenance. Reviewers will look for information that demonstrates the following:

- (a) Requisite knowledge, skills and abilities of key staff assigned to the project
- (b) Demonstrated staff experience in managing websites, with examples of sites developed for clients, especially government and education related web sites;
- (c) An effective management plan that ensures allocation of staff and resources to accomplish project goals.

4. Organizational Experience (15 points)

Offerors shall demonstrate the following:

- (a) Organizational capability, resources, and experience in website design, maintenance, and operation;
- (b) Implementation of quality and cost controls, with effective project and financial tracking and reporting

(5) Past Performance (20 points)

Each offeror's past performance will be evaluated based on the subfactors below. The past performance rating (worth 20 points) will be combined with the technical rating (worth 80 points) to produce a combined rating of a maximum 100 points. Past performance subfactors are detailed below:

- (a) *Quality of Product or Service* – compliance with contract requirements – technical excellence and know-how – successful web site designs and layouts from previous clients – responsiveness and accuracy of communication – assignment of qualified and appropriate personnel – proactive in suggesting designs, tools, or layout to improve look and accessibility of a site – creative strategies and plans for web site development and maintenance.

- (b) *Timeliness of Performance* – meets milestones and deadlines – quick turnaround time on requests – promptly communicates issues– reliable – stays on schedule – responsive to technical direction – completes tasks on time.
- (c) *Problem Resolution* – anticipates, avoids, or mitigates problems – proactive in monitoring web site for content freshness – satisfactorily overcomes or resolves problems – prompt notification of problems – recommends viable solutions
- (d) *Cost Control* – consistently within task budgets – current, accurate, and complete billings – costs properly allocated – unallowable costs not billed – relationship of negotiated costs to actual costs – cost efficiencies.
- (e) *Business Relations* – effective management – accountability for employee performance – business-like concern for customer’s interests – effective use of web technology – effective supervision of staff – reasonable/cooperative behavior –flexible – maintains high employee morale.
- (f) *Customer Service* – prompt responses and communication – understands and embraces service and program goals – team approach with the customer – satisfaction with the contractor’s services – positive customer feedback — courteous interactions – initiative.

Evaluation Process for Past Performance

Past performance evaluation will be based on information obtained from the awards and references provided in the offeror’s responses to the RFQ, information from www.cpars.gov, information from other customers known to the Government, and other sources who may have useful and relevant information. Evaluation of past performance may be quite subjective, based on consideration of all relevant facts and circumstances. It will include consideration of the offeror’s commitment to customer satisfaction, compliance with federal laws and regulations for IT services, and conclusions of informed judgment.

Offerors shall be given an opportunity to discuss adverse past performance information, if the offeror has not had a previous opportunity to comment on the information. The contracting officer may review recent contracts to ensure that corrective measures raised in discussions have been implemented. If no relevant information on past performance is available for an offeror, the offeror will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance, meaning half-credit will be given.