

Individual Technical Evaluation Document - Ratings Summary Page

Vendor: POORCORP

Evaluator:

Category	Evaluation Sub Factor	Rating
Management Approach and Technical Capabilities	1. Understanding of the work, including creativity and thoroughness shown in understanding the objectives of the SOW and specific tasks, and planned execution of the project.	P
	2. Evidence of specific methods and techniques for completing each discrete task, to include such items as quality assurance, and customer-service.	P
	3. Ability to address anticipated potential problem areas, and creativity and feasibility of solutions to problems and future integration of new processes and technology enhancements.	P
	4. Degree to which the offerors proposal demonstrates an understanding of logistics, schedule, and any other issues the Government should be aware of.	S
	5. Quality and effectiveness of the allocation of personnel and resources.	S
	Overall Management Approach and Technical Capabilities	P
Personnel Qualifications	1. The currency, quality and depth of experience of individual personnel in working on similar projects. Similar projects must convey similarity in topic, dollar value, workload, duration, and complexity.	P
	2. Quality and depth of education and experience on other projects which may not be similar enough to include in response to #1. (Immediately above) but may be relevant.	S
	3. The currency, quality and depth of how the Project Director will supervise and coordinate the workforce.	S
	Overall Personnel Qualifications	S
Organizational Experience	1. Evidence that the organization has current capabilities; and for assuring performance of this requirement. Evidence of supporting subcontractors, consultants and business partners will be considered.	P
	2. Appropriate mix and balance of education and training of team members.	S
	Overall Organizational Experience	P
Past Performance	1. The organizations history of successful completion of projects; history of producing high-quality reports and other deliverables; history of staying on schedule and within budget.	S
	2. The quality of cooperation (with each other) of key individuals within your organization, and quality of cooperation and performance between your organization and its clients.	P
	3. The organization's specific past performance on prior similar efforts specified within this SOW.	P
	Overall Past Performance	P
Summary	Overall Technical Rating	P

Vendor Name:

Evaluator Name:

Management Approach and Technical Capabilities		
Evaluation Sub Factors		
1. Understanding of the work, including creativity and thoroughness shown in understanding the objectives of the SOW and specific tasks, and planned execution of the project.	Strengths	Does exhibit some technical capability in systems development
	Weaknesses	
	Deficiencies	It does not appear that POORCORP understands the objectives of the SOW and the scope of the work. They did not address the requirements in sections 4.2 and 4.3 and proposed tasks that did not match the SOW requirements.
2. Evidence of specific methods and techniques for completing each discrete task, to include such items as quality assurance, and customer-service.	Strengths	
	Weaknesses	Frankly, it appears that POORCORP put together a standard boilerplate proposal – regurgitating much of what we said in the SOW and without addressing how they would meet specific needs, goals or objectives completely. There are parts of the proposal that simply don't fit the SOW and there are words left out – in general, you sense that their interest in our effort is not enough to put together a well thought out proposal. This would seem to indicate that customer service or attention to details are not priorities for POORCORP.
	Deficiencies	The quality assurance information provided by POORCORP does not match up with tasks they will be performing so there is no way of determining how they plan to address quality assurance based on the tasks they have defined in the SOW or previously in their proposal.
3. Ability to address anticipated potential problem areas; and creativity and feasibility of solutions to problems and future integration of new processes and technology enhancements.	Strengths	
	Weaknesses	
	Deficiencies	POORCORP does not address any anticipated problems or ways of addressing them. The evaluation criteria are no more than a statement that they "fully exceed" the evaluation criteria set forth in the SOW. They indicate that their evaluation will be based on their "complete understanding of the project requirements". However, as stated above, based on their proposal they are unclear about the objectives of SOW. This seems to be an obvious deficiency.

4. Degree to which the offerors proposal demonstrates an understanding of logistics, schedule, and any other issues the Government should be aware of.	Strengths	Adequately covered.
	Weaknesses	However, the idea that they would expect us to pay for overnight accommodations for POORCORP staff to travel from Rockville, MD – 23 miles away – to Reston to attend an 8:00 a.m. meeting is totally unacceptable.
	Deficiencies	
5. Quality and effectiveness of the allocation of personnel and resources.	Strengths	Seems an adequate number of staff and the number of hours sound reasonable.
	Weaknesses	Effectiveness of staff would be questionable since they do not have apparent experience with enterprise systems.
	Deficiencies	
Overall summary of Management Approach and Technical Capabilities	The information provided by POORCORP does not match up with tasks they will be performing -- so it is unclear if they thoroughly understand the scope of the SOW or our objectives. They seem to have put the proposal together regurgitating much of the SOW without following it up with their specifics on how things would be accomplished – no real approach, philosophy or definitive actions. There really is no way of assessing the work they would do for us.	

Vendor Name:		Evaluator Name:	
Personnel Qualifications			
Evaluation Sub Factor			
1. The currency, quality and depth of experience of individual personnel in working on similar projects. Similar projects must convey similarity in topic, dollar value, workload, duration, and complexity.	Strengths	Background in systems development, but mostly for small scale operations.	
	Weaknesses	Concerned about relevance of some experiences listed such as Defense Mapping Agency. That agency hasn't been called DMA for a long time—they've had 2 name changes since they were last called DMA.	
	Deficiencies	Their examples of projects deal mainly with small, customized systems.	
2. Quality and depth of education and experience on other projects which may not be similar enough to include in response to #1. (Immediately above) but may be relevant.	Strengths	POORCORP's staff have a good mix of education and experience. The technical lead has acceptable experience with a wide range of programming methods and operating systems.	
	Weaknesses		
	Deficiencies		
3. The currency, quality and depth of how the Project Director will supervise and coordinate the workforce.	Strengths	Project director has had previous experience in large projects, although not while at POORCORP.	
	Weaknesses		
	Deficiencies		
Overall summary for Personnel Qualifications	Qualifications are acceptable, nothing out of the ordinary.		

Vendor Name:		Evaluator Name:	
Organizational Experience			
Evaluation Sub Factor			
1. Evidence that the organization has current capabilities; and for assuring performance of this requirement. Evidence of supporting subcontractors, consultants and business partners will be considered.	Strengths	POORCORP has current capabilities for all aspects of survey design, administration, data capture and data transfer.	
	Weaknesses	No experience with call centers or help desk-type support. POORCORP is more of a "custom software" development company.	
	Deficiencies	Did not address the requirements in section 4.4	
2. Appropriate mix and balance of education and training of team members.	Strengths	Acceptable	
	Weaknesses	Very narrow focus in education/training that leans toward pure development/programming rather than the big picture of "IT Support"	
	Deficiencies		
Overall summary for Organizational Experience	Good experience for what POORCORP's focus is (development), which is only a subset of the skills we are looking for. Significant risk that they could perform well on our project.		

Vendor Name:		Evaluator Name:
Past Performance		
Evaluation Sub Factor		
1. The organizations history of successful completion of projects; history of producing high-quality reports and other deliverables; history of staying on schedule and within budget.	Strengths	
	Weaknesses	Does not have the best track record within our department. Went over budget on one project.
	Deficiencies	
2. The quality of cooperation (with each other) of key individuals within your organization, and quality of cooperation and performance between your organization and its clients.	Strengths	
	Weaknesses	According to another agency in our department, POORCORP was very difficult to work with. The eventual products were acceptable but it was a struggle getting there.
	Deficiencies	
3. The organization's specific past performance on prior similar efforts specified within this SOW.	Strengths	
	Weaknesses	
	Deficiencies	Did not demonstrate the ability to perform on a large scale project; all references were for projects much smaller in scope.
Overall summary for Past Performance	Past performance not impressive. They have produced adequate results, but not consistently, and never on a project with a scope as large as our project's. Using them would be very high risk.	

Evaluation Summary

Vendor Name:

**Overall
Summary of
contractor's
technical
proposal**

Overall Rating: Poor

They do not have expressed strategies for dealing with complex, large-scale IT projects. They also did not provide the specific tasks for addressing the stated objectives of the SOW. They do not have a stated organizational development approach. They also appear to not understand the tasks or the scope of the work – they included in their proposals tasks that do not match this SOW. Their proposal seemed to provide a boilerplate approach to our more complex needs. And finally, the past/current performance of POORCORP – although they may be good at what they do – did not provide examples or references that showed they had the capability to provide us with the entire range of services we are looking for under this SOW.

Evaluator Name and Signature:

Date:

Technical Evaluation Rating Definitions

Ensure the Ratings Match the Strength & Weakness Narrative

Rating	Abbreviation	Risk Level	Definition
Excellent	E	Very Low Risk	The proposal contains no deficiencies or weaknesses. Based on information provided, there is no doubt that the offeror demonstrates an exceptional understanding of the services required to meet or exceed most contract requirements. The highest quality of contract performance is anticipated.
Very Good	VG	Low Risk	The proposal contains no deficiencies and only a few minor weaknesses that do not require discussions. Based on the information provided, there is little doubt that the offeror demonstrates a high quality of understanding of the services required to meet or exceed some contract requirements.
Satisfactory	S	Moderate Risk	The proposal contains no deficiencies and some weaknesses. Based on the information provided, the Offeror demonstrates an understanding of the services required to meet contract requirements.
Poor	P	High Risk	The proposal contains deficiencies and significant weaknesses. Based on information provided, there is doubt that the contractor understands the services required to meet the contract requirements. Requirement/services can be met only with major changes to the proposal.
Unacceptable	U	Unacceptable Risk	Technical proposal has many deficiencies and/or gross omissions; failure to understand much of the scope of work necessary to perform the required tasks; failure to provide a reasonable, logical approach to fulfilling much of the government's requirements; failure to meet many personnel requirements in the solicitation. (When applying this adjective to a proposal as a whole, the technical proposal would have to be so unacceptable in one or more areas that it would have to be completely revised in order to attempt to make it other than unacceptable.)