

## Innovation Technique 3 — Confidence Ratings

Purple	Exceptional	Greatly exceeds all minimum requirements of the criteria; has a high probability of success; contains <b>no weaknesses or deficiencies</b> .
Blue	Good	Exceeds all the minimum requirements of the criteria, has an average probability of success; contains <b>no significant weaknesses, only minor, correctable weaknesses</b> exist.
Green	Acceptable	Meets all the minimum requirements of the criteria; has a probability of success; contains <b>no significant weaknesses</b> ; any weaknesses can be readily corrected.
Yellow	Marginal	Fails to meet <b>one or more of the minimum requirements</b> of the criteria; has a probability of success; major weaknesses and or significant deficiencies exist.
Red	Unacceptable	Fails to meet <b>any of the minimum requirements</b> of the criteria; proposal needs major revisions; very low probability of success.

<b>High Confidence</b>	The Government has <b>high confidence</b> that the Offeror understands the requirement, proposes a sound approach, and will be successful in performing the contract with <b>little or no</b> Government intervention.
<b>Some Confidence</b>	The Government has <b>some confidence</b> that the Offeror understands the requirement, proposes a sound approach, and will be successful in performing the contract with <b>some</b> Government intervention.
<b>Low Confidence</b>	The Government has <b>low confidence</b> that the Offeror understands the requirement, proposes a sound approach, or will be successful in performing the contract <b>even with</b> Government intervention.

### WHY CONFIDENCE RATINGS?

- Confidence ratings may be used in acquisitions under FAR Subpart 8.4 (orders/BPAs under schedules), Part 13 (Simplified Acquisitions), Subpart 15.3 (source selections), and § 16.505 (orders under multiple-award IDIQ contracts). Only source selections under Subpart 15.3 require documentation of relative strengths, deficiencies, significant weaknesses, and risks; other acquisitions may use different approaches.
- Adjectival ratings that limit evaluators to a certain rating based on having a certain number of strengths or weaknesses are not flexible, and overly restrict the evaluators' ability to assign appropriate ratings. They also cause far too much controversy and re-work in our internal review processes.
- Confidence ratings provide evaluators the ability to look more holistically at the strong points and weak points of an offer. Confidence ratings, supported by rationale, are often more helpful to a selecting official.

Easier!  
Faster!  
Smarter!

Sample from **FOSS** Source Selection Plan—

Excerpt from **FOSS** Solicitation—

<p><i>“The Government will assess its level of confidence that the offering contractor will successfully perform all requirements in regards to the technical approach, management approach, and key personnel qualifications.”</i></p> <p><i>“The evaluation factors will measure the Government’s confidence that the offeror understands the requirement, proposes a sound approach, and will be successful in performing the contract.”</i></p>	<p>Section: L.4.2.1.3: <i>“Offerors shall provide sufficient information for the Government to determine its level of confidence in the ability of the Offeror to perform the requirements of the RFP based on an assessment of relevant experience from the contractor.”</i></p> <p>Section M.2.2.1: <i>“The Government will assess its level of confidence that the contractor will successfully perform the requirements based on their experience...”</i></p>
---	---