

Offeror: _____

Reviewer: _____

Attachment 2

Acceptability of the Offer

Scoring Sheets

The Government will determine the acceptability of each offer, on a pass or fail basis, by evaluating the consistency of each offeror's promises with the terms and conditions of the RFP. An offer will be considered acceptable when it manifests the offeror's assent, without exception or imposition of condition, to the terms and conditions of this RFP, including attachments and documents incorporated by reference. An offer which takes exception to any of the terms and conditions of this RFP, imposes additional conditions, or omits material information required by this RFP may be considered to be unacceptable (see RFP provision L-317 paragraph 1.0 regarding discussions and correction of deficiencies).

Scoring Procedure: Each offer will be judged against the criteria listed in the source selection plan and the solicitation.

Scoring Criteria: Use the following checklist to determine acceptability. Failure to answer "Yes" to all checklist requirements may render an offer unacceptable.

- | | |
|--------|---|
| Yes/No | Offer includes fully completed Standard Form 33, without any material omissions. |
| Yes/No | Offer includes fully completed RFP Section B, without any material omissions. |
| Yes/No | Offer includes fully completed RFP Section K, without any material omissions. |
| Yes/No | Offer includes fully completed Signature Block of the four (4) Parts List Certifications, without any material omissions. |
| Yes/No | Offer does not take exception to any RFP terms and conditions. |
| Yes/No | Offer does not impose any additional conditions to RFP. |

If answers to any of the above requirements are "No", identify and document deficiency:

Score: Acceptable / Unacceptable

Attachment 3
Oral Presentation Guidelines
(See Section L-317 and M-307)

1. Schedule for presentations. On 14 MAY 03 you will be notified of your scheduled presentation date and time. Your oral presentation will be scheduled in June 2003 at the location specified in the solicitation. The order in which offerors will make their presentations will be determined by a drawing of lots by the Contracting Officer. Once notified of their scheduled presentation date and time, offerors shall complete their presentations on the scheduled date and time. Requests from offerors to reschedule their presentations will not be entertained.

2. Form of presentation. Offerors will make their oral presentations in person at SPAWARSYSCEN SAN DIEGO to the Technical Evaluation Board, Contracting Officer, Contracts Negotiator and other representatives of the Government. Submission of videotapes or other forms of media containing the presentation for evaluation is not authorized. An advanced copy of the presentation material shall be provided in Microsoft PowerPoint 2000 format no later than the RFP closing date.

The on-line web site for information concerning the location is accessible at the following location:
<http://www.spawar.navy.mil/contract/> (conference room link)

3. Time allowed for presentations. Each offeror will have a maximum of sixty (60) minutes in which to present to include a maximum of 10 minutes in which to introduce the members of the presenting team and provide a brief description and history of the firm.

The Government will then caucus for fifteen (15) minutes, and reconvene for a question and answer (clarification and comment) period of forty-five (45) minutes.

During the Government caucus period and the question and answer session, the offeror's presentation team (participants and attendees) shall have no contact with anyone other than Government personnel.

4. Media. The government will provide a computer (with 250 MB ZIP drive and CD ROM) to support the offerors presentation. The Government will also provide blank flipchart paper and blank overhead slide transparencies for the offeror to use during the presentation. An overhead slide projector will be provided for offeror use during the presentation.

5. Offeror's presentation team. The individuals provided for the Oral Presentations, shall be directly involved in the effort of the resultant contract. Number of offeror participants shall be limited to five (5) contractor personnel. No person shall appear and actively participate for more than 1 contractor team.

6. Purpose of oral presentations. The sole purpose of the oral presentation is to test an offeror's knowledge of the requirements of the prospective contract. The session may include questions about the difficulties and risks expected to be encountered during performance of the contract described in the RFP, and how those difficulties and risks would be managed. Questions and responses shall not encompass price or any other element of the offer. Responses will provide offerors the opportunity to demonstrate an understanding of the scope of the technical issues, problems, and possible solutions associated with the envisioned work. The session will not constitute discussions, as defined in FAR 15.306(d), nor will it obligate the Government to conduct discussions or to solicit or entertain any revisions to an offer. If the Government does decide to conduct discussions, the oral presentation can be discussed.

7. Content of presentations. The presentations shall not encompass price or cost and fee. Generally, offerors should provide information that demonstrates a clear understanding of the technical requirements of the solicitation's Statement of Work, and the Fabrication Specifications Document.

Offeror: _____

Reviewer: _____

Attachment 2

Acceptability of the Offer

Scoring Sheets

The Government will determine the acceptability of each offer, on a pass or fail basis, by evaluating the consistency of each offeror’s promises with the terms and conditions of the RFP. An offer will be considered acceptable when it manifests the offeror’s assent, without exception or imposition of condition, to the terms and conditions of this RFP, including attachments and documents incorporated by reference. An offer which takes exception to any of the terms and conditions of this RFP, imposes additional conditions, or omits material information required by this RFP may be considered to be unacceptable (see RFP provision L-317 paragraph 1.0 regarding discussions and correction of deficiencies).

Scoring Procedure: Each offer will be judged against the criteria listed in the source selection plan and the solicitation.

Scoring Criteria: Use the following checklist to determine acceptability. Failure to answer “Yes” to all checklist requirements may render an offer unacceptable.

- Yes/No Offer includes fully completed Standard Form 33, without any material omissions.
- Yes/No Offer includes fully completed RFP Section B, without any material omissions.
- Yes/No Offer includes fully completed RFP Section K, without any material omissions.
- Yes/No Offer includes fully completed Signature Block of the four (4) Parts List Certifications, without any material omissions.
- Yes/No Offer does not take exception to any RFP terms and conditions.
- Yes/No Offer does not impose any additional conditions to RFP.

If answers to any of the above requirements are “No”, identify and document deficiency:

Score: Acceptable / Unacceptable

Attachment 3
Oral Presentation Guidelines
(See Section L-317 and M-307)

1. Schedule for presentations. On 14 MAY 03 you will be notified of your scheduled presentation date and time. Your oral presentation will be scheduled in June 2003 at the location specified in the solicitation. The order in which offerors will make their presentations will be determined by a drawing of lots by the Contracting Officer. Once notified of their scheduled presentation date and time, offerors shall complete their presentations on the scheduled date and time. Requests from offerors to reschedule their presentations will not be entertained.

2. Form of presentation. Offerors will make their oral presentations in person at SPAWARSYSCEN SAN DIEGO to the Technical Evaluation Board, Contracting Officer, Contracts Negotiator and other representatives of the Government. Submission of videotapes or other forms of media containing the presentation for evaluation is not authorized. An advanced copy of the presentation material shall be provided in Microsoft PowerPoint 2000 format no later than the RFP closing date.

The on-line web site for information concerning the location is accessible at the following location:
<http://www.spawar.navy.mil/contract/> (conference room link)

3. Time allowed for presentations. Each offeror will have a maximum of sixty (60) minutes in which to present to include a maximum of 10 minutes in which to introduce the members of the presenting team and provide a brief description and history of the firm.

The Government will then caucus for fifteen (15) minutes, and reconvene for a question and answer (clarification and comment) period of forty-five (45) minutes.

During the Government caucus period and the question and answer session, the offeror's presentation team (participants and attendees) shall have no contact with anyone other than Government personnel.

4. Media. The government will provide a computer (with 250 MB ZIP drive and CD ROM) to support the offerors presentation. The Government will also provide blank flipchart paper and blank overhead slide transparencies for the offeror to use during the presentation. An overhead slide projector will be provided for offeror use during the presentation.

5. Offeror's presentation team. The individuals provided for the Oral Presentations, shall be directly involved in the effort of the resultant contract. Number of offeror participants shall be limited to five (5) contractor personnel. No person shall appear and actively participate for more than 1 contractor team.

6. Purpose of oral presentations. The sole purpose of the oral presentation is to test an offeror's knowledge of the requirements of the prospective contract. The session may include questions about the difficulties and risks expected to be encountered during performance of the contract described in the RFP, and how those difficulties and risks would be managed. Questions and responses shall not encompass price or any other element of the offer. Responses will provide offerors the opportunity to demonstrate an understanding of the scope of the technical issues, problems, and possible solutions associated with the envisioned work. The session will not constitute discussions, as defined in FAR 15.306(d), nor will it obligate the Government to conduct discussions or to solicit or entertain any revisions to an offer. If the Government does decide to conduct discussions, the oral presentation can be discussed.

7. Content of presentations. The presentations shall not encompass price or cost and fee. Generally, offerors should provide information that demonstrates a clear understanding of the technical requirements of the solicitation's Statement of Work, and the Fabrication Specifications Document.

8. Before commencement of the oral presentations, the offeror shall provide the Technical Evaluation Board with a typed letter listing the names, firms, and position titles of all presenters and their proposed participation in the program. At the close of oral presentations, the offeror shall provide the TEB with all flipcharts and/or overhead slides used during the presentation and all soft copies (CD ROM) of the presentation if modified from the one provided to the TEB prior to the oral presentation. The Government will only accept documentation for evaluation that was presented or referenced during the presentation. No additional information will be accepted.

Offeror: _____

Reviewer: _____

Attachment 5

Past Performance Guidance and Scoring Sheets

Past performance is a measure of the degree to which an offeror has satisfied customers in the past, and complied with Federal, state, and local laws and regulations. The Government's assessment of past performance will be subjective, and based mainly on offeror reputations with customers and others. Reviewers will evaluate the Reference Information Sheets submitted by offerors, Past Performance Questionnaires submitted by offeror references, their own experience with offerors, and information from other third-party references and databases against the following subfactors:

(a) Quality of Product or Service - Conformance to contract requirements, specifications and standards of good workmanship, accuracy of reports, appropriateness of personnel, and technical excellence.

(b) Cost Control - Within budget, current accurate and complete billings, actual cost/rates reflect closely to negotiated cost/rates, cost efficiency measures, adequate budgetary internal controls.

(c) Schedule - Timeliness of performance, met interim milestones, reliable, responsive to technical and contractual direction, completed on time, including wrap-up and contract administration, no liquidated damages assessed.

(d) Business Relationships - Effective management, businesslike correspondence, responsive to contract requirements, prompt notification of problems, reasonable/cooperative behavior, flexible, proactive, effective Contractor recommended solutions, customer satisfaction.

(e) Assigned Personnel - How long assigned personnel stayed on the contract, how well they managed their portion of the contract, the quality and relevancy of the products/services generated by assigned personnel.

Offeror: _____

Reviewer: _____

Scoring Procedure:

Step 1. For each offeror, reviewers will generate a score and complete an attached scoring sheet for each of the five criteria of this section. Reviewers will consider their own experience with each offeror, along with the Reference Information Sheets submitted by offerors, Past Performance Questionnaires submitted by offeror references, and other available performance databases and sources at SSC-SD. The following definitions/scores should be used for each of the five criteria:

- 0 Record of performance is NOT SATISFACTORY. Offeror has consistently not satisfied previous customers and/or violated laws, regulations, and contract requirements.
- .5 Record of performance is MARGINAL. Offeror has occasionally satisfied, and occasionally not satisfied, previous customers, laws, regulations, and contract requirements.
- 1.0 Record of performance is SATISFACTORY. Offeror has consistently satisfied previous customers and consistently satisfied laws, regulations, and contract requirements by meeting – but not exceeding – mandatory or minimum requirements.
- 1.5 Record of performance is VERY GOOD. Offeror has consistently satisfied previous customers and consistently satisfied laws, regulations, and contract requirements by meeting – and occasionally exceeding – mandatory or minimum requirements.
- 2.0 Record of performance is EXCEPTIONAL. Offeror has consistently satisfied previous customers and consistently satisfied laws, regulations, and contract requirements by meeting – and consistently exceeding – mandatory or minimum requirements.

Step 2. For each offeror, reviewers will sum the scores from each of the five criteria. There is a maximum possible score of 10 points.

Note: Pursuant to FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv), an offeror without a record of relevant past performance, or for whom information on past performance is not available, may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance. Therefore, offerors who assert the absence of relevant past performance through the failure to submit any Reference Information Sheets will receive a neutral score of 5 points, ½ of the maximum possible score of 10 points.

Offeror: _____

Reviewer: _____

(a) Quality of Product or Service - Conformance to contract requirements, specifications and standards of good workmanship, accuracy of reports, appropriateness of personnel, and technical excellence.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Comments:

Overall Rating:

RISK ASSESSMENT:

High _____

Moderate _____

Low _____

Offeror: _____

Reviewer: _____

(b) Cost Control - Within budget, current accurate and complete billings, actual cost/rates reflect closely to negotiated cost/rates, cost efficiency measures, adequate budgetary internal controls.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Comments:

Overall Rating:

RISK ASSESSMENT:
High _____
Moderate _____
Low _____

Offeror: _____

Reviewer: _____

(c) Schedule - Timeliness of performance, met interim milestones, reliable, responsive to technical and contractual direction, completed on time, including wrap-up and contract administration, no liquidated damages assessed.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Comments:

Overall Rating:

RISK ASSESSMENT:

Low _____

Medium _____

High _____

Offeror: _____

Reviewer: _____

(d) Business Relationships - Effective management, businesslike correspondence, responsive to contract requirements, prompt notification of problems, reasonable/cooperative behavior, flexible, proactive, effective Contractor recommended solutions, customer satisfaction.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Comments:

RISK ASSESSMENT:

High _____

Moderate _____

Low _____

Offeror: _____

Reviewer: _____

(e) Assigned Personnel - How long assigned personnel stayed on the contract, how well they managed their portion of the contract, the quality and relevancy of the products/services generated by assigned personnel.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Comments:

Overall Rating:

RISK ASSESSMENT:

High _____

Moderate _____

Low _____

Offeror: _____

Reviewer: _____

Step 3. For each offeror, sum the scores from each of the five criteria: _____. There is a maximum possible score of 10 points.

Offeror: _____

Reviewer: _____

Attachment 7

Oral Presentation -Scoring Sheets

Scoring Procedure:

Each offeror's oral presentation will be evaluated by the TEB immediately after the conclusion of each oral presentation. The TEB chair will be responsible for distributing and collecting score sheets from the TEB members. Each presentation will be scored (0-90) by each voting member of the TEB. Reviewers will generate a score for each of the 3 Key Areas, which includes 3 SOW Parts. The individual criteria scores will be totaled to obtain a final reviewer score for the section. (90 POINTS)

Key Areas:

- A. Manufacturing capabilities pertaining to SOW Parts 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3. The offeror will provide a description of facilities, capital equipment and human resources. For example, the offeror will demonstrate the use of capital and human resources and the likelihood of the proposed approach and resulting First Article and Production units meeting or exceeding the technical requirements as referenced in the Statement of Work (SOW) and Fabrication Specifications.
(30 POINTS)
- B. Technical knowledge of specific processes pertaining to SOW Parts 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3. For example, what pro-active manufacturing methods produce a quality end-item using rotational molding and resin transfer process and how the offeror's proposed test program will demonstrate full compliance to the Government's proposed Fabrication Specifications.
(30 POINTS)
- C. Scheduling and delivery of Contract Line Items. For example, how well the offeror's Program Schedule depicts a realistic, time phased basis for successful completion of efforts described in the SOW, and the extent to which the proposed processes, personnel, and tasks support meeting the objectives as contained in the Fabrication Specifications and the SOW, and mitigate programmatic and technical risks identified by the offeror.
(30 POINTS)

Offeror: _____

Reviewer: _____

Point Assignment Criteria:

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| Poor
(0-2) | The offeror fails to meet the requirements listed in the key area. There are significant weaknesses. The significant weaknesses will be very difficult to correct or are not correctable. |
| Fair
(3-5) | The offeror does not meet some of the requirements listed in the key area. Weaknesses outweigh any strength that may exist. The weaknesses are difficult to correct. |
| Good
(6-8) | The offeror meets the requirements listed in the key area. Strengths and weaknesses may exist. The weaknesses are correctable. |
| Excellent
(9-10) | The offeror meets and exceeds the requirements listed in the key area. One or more significant strengths exist. Weaknesses may exist, but none are considered significant and are easily correctable. |

Offeror: _____

Reviewer: _____

1. Each voting member shall rate each Key Area and the appropriate SOW Part herein.

INDIVIDUAL OFFEROR SCORING MATRIX

Key Area	Rating For SOW Part 4.1	Rating For SOW Part 4.2	Rating For SOW Part 4.3	Key Area Total / Grand Total
A. Manufacturing Capabilities	(0- 10)	(0- 10)	(0- 10)	(0- 30)
B. Technical Knowledge	(0- 10)	(0- 10)	(0- 10)	(0- 30)
C. Scheduling and delivery	(0- 10)	(0- 10)	(0- 10)	(0- 30)
SOW Part Total / Grand Total	(0- 30)	(0- 30)	(0- 30)	(0- 90)
	(SOW Part Total Block)	(SOW Part Total Block)	(SOW Part Total Block)	(Grand Total Block)

Offeror: _____

Reviewer: _____

2. Each TEB voting member shall provide a narrative explanation of the strengths and weaknesses as well as a risk assessment for each offeror. Considering the scores recorded above for each key area, reviewers will generate a summary score for each reference. Considering the summary scores for each reference, reviewers will generate a final organizational experience rating for the particular offeror.

Strengths:

Weaknesses:

Risk Assessment:

Summary Rating:

3. The TEB Chair shall compute and record the individual average score of all reviewers for each offeror in the CAR Summary Score Matrix (Attachment 8)