

## Attachment 4 – Evaluation Definitions and Adjectival Ratings

### Definitions:

**Strength:** An element of a proposal which exceeds a requirement of the solicitation in a beneficial way to the Government.

**Weakness:** A flaw in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful performance.

**Omission:** An element of the government's requirement that has been overlooked and excluded from the proposal.

**Deficiencies:** Any part of an offer that does not conform to a material requirements of a RFP. A material requirements is one that affects price, quantity, quality, or delivery.

### **Technical Approach (Factor 1)**

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>Superior</b>	Proposal demonstrates an excellent understanding of the requirements and an approach that significantly exceeds performance or capability standards. Proposal strengths will significantly benefit the Government and risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
<b>Good</b>	Proposal demonstrates a thorough understanding of the requirements and an approach that exceeds performance or capability standards. Proposal has one or more strengths that will benefit the Government and risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Proposal demonstrates an understanding of the requirements and an approach that meets performance or capability standards. Proposal presents an acceptable solution with few, or no strengths and risk of unsuccessful performance is moderate.
<b>Marginal</b>	Proposal demonstrates a shallow understanding of the requirements and an approach that only marginally meets performance or capability standards necessary for minimal but acceptable contract performance. Significant weaknesses or deficiency exist that may be correctable without major proposal revisions. The risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	Proposal fails to meet requirements and deficiencies exist for which correction would require a major revision or redirection of the proposal. A contract cannot be awarded with this proposal.

### **Corporate Experience (Factor 2)**

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>Superior</b>	The Offeror's submitted projects demonstrate excellent experience and an understanding of the requirements that significantly exceed performance or capability standards. Proposal strengths will significantly benefit the Government and risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
<b>Good</b>	The Offeror's submitted projects demonstrate thorough experience and an understanding of the requirements that exceed performance or capability standards. Proposal strengths will benefit the Government and risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
<b>Satisfactory</b>	The Offeror's submitted projects demonstrate adequate experience and an understanding of the requirements that meet performance or capability standards. The proposal presents an acceptable solution with few or no strengths, and the risk of unsuccessful performance is moderate.
<b>Marginal</b>	The Offeror's submitted projects demonstrate shallow experience and an understanding of the requirements that only marginally meet performance or capability standards necessary for minimal but acceptable contract performance. Significant weaknesses or deficiencies exist that may be correctable without major proposal revisions, and the risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	The Offeror's submitted projects fail to demonstrate adequate experience and fail to meet minimum requirements. Deficiencies exist for which correction would require a major revision or redirection of the proposal. The risk of unsuccessful performance is unacceptable, and a contract cannot be awarded with this proposal.

## Attachment 4 – Evaluation Definitions and Adjectival Ratings

### Past Performance Factor 3

Rating	Definition
<b>Neutral</b>	No performance record is identifiable, for the recent (completed within the last 5 years) and relevant (similar in size, scope, and complexity) projects submitted, upon which to base a meaningful performance rating. The search was unable to identify any past performance information for the Offeror, or Subcontractors. This is neither a negative nor positive assessment.
<b>Superior</b>	Based on the Offeror's past performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. The Offeror has consistently demonstrated Exceptional delivery of quality products, strict adherence to schedules, proactive management, and full regulatory compliance, for its record of recent (completed within the last 5 years) and relevant (similar in size, scope, and complexity) projects, as verified via CPARS, PPQs, or other sources.
<b>Satisfactory</b>	Based on the Offeror's past performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. The Offeror has consistently demonstrated Satisfactory delivery of quality products, adherence to schedules, satisfactory management, and regulatory compliance, for its record of recent (completed within the last 5 years) and relevant (similar in size, scope, and complexity) projects, as verified via CPARS, PPQs, or other sources. Any adverse past performance information was minor in nature, and the Offeror demonstrated acceptable corrective actions.
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	Based on the Offeror's past performance record, the Government has no expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. The Offeror has consistently failed to demonstrate satisfactory or above performance, by failing to deliver quality products, missing schedule milestones, poor management, or failing to comply with regulations, for its record of recent (completed within the last 5 years) and relevant (similar in size, scope, and complexity) projects, as verified via CPARS, PPQs, or other sources. The Offeror has failed to demonstrate adequate or sustained corrective action after being afforded an opportunity to address it.