

## SECTION M – EVALUATION CRITERIA

### **M 1** BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD

**M 1.1** A single award will be made to the responsible offeror submitting the proposal that is determined to offer the best value (trade off) to the Government (i.e., which provides the greatest overall benefit to the Government in response to the requirement, price and non-price evaluation factors considered). As such, the Government may award to other than the lowest priced or technically outstanding proposal.

**M 1.2** The Government does not intend to hold discussions, but reserves the right to do so, at the sole discretion of the Contracting Officer. The Government will conduct the competition in accordance with FAR Subpart 16.505 and the STOC II IDIQ, and award a delivery order without exchanges, other than clarifications. "Exchanges" and "clarifications" are defined in FAR Subpart 15.306, but these terms are used without otherwise importing the policies and procedures identified in FAR Part 15, except where applicable, and at the sole discretion of the Contracting Officer. The Government will evaluate all proposals in accordance with the evaluation criteria included in the solicitation, and if discussions are to be conducted, establish a competitive range comprised of the most highly rated proposals, based upon the ratings of evaluation of each proposal against all evaluation factors. The decision to establish a competitive range will be made at the sole discretion of the Source Selection Authority. After evaluating the proposals, the Contracting Officer may also determine that the number of most highly rated proposals that might otherwise be included in the competitive range exceeds the number at which efficient competition can be conducted. Offerors are therefore advised that the Contracting Officer, for purposes of efficiency, may also limit the number of competitive range offerors, at their sole discretion.

**M 1.3** Offerors are cautioned that while the Government will not evaluate every Statement of Work (SOW) and specification (SPEC) requirement (other than those identified in the evaluation criteria below) the awardee will be required to comply with all the SOW and SPEC requirements during delivery order performance. Furthermore, should an offeror indicate in its proposal that: it cannot or will not meet any SOW or SPEC requirement; it provides an approach that clearly does not meet any SOW or SPEC requirement; or, includes data which prompts the Government to question the offeror's compliance with any SOW or SPEC requirement, the Government may determine, at its discretion, that the offeror's proposal is non-compliant, and therefore, ineligible for award.

### **M 2** EVALUATION CRITERIA/RELATIVE ORDER OF IMPORTANCE

**M 2.1** The evaluation criteria consist of factors, sub-factors, and elements. The proposals will be evaluated under two evaluation factors: Technical Approach and Management, and Cost/Price.

Factor 1: Technical Approach and Management

## SECTION M – EVALUATION CRITERIA

### Sub-Factor A: Trainer Design

Element A1: Training Effectiveness

Element A2: Software Modeling

Element A3: Training System Design

Element A4: STRYKER MGS DTT System Description/Specification

### Sub-Factor B: Management

Element B1: Program Management Strategy

Element B2: System-Software Engineering

Element B3: Integrated Test and Evaluation (T&E)

### Factor 2: Cost/Price

#### **M 2.2** Relative order of importance of each factor, sub-factor, and elements.

1. Technical Approach and Management is significantly more important than Cost/Price.
2. For Factor 1, Sub-Factor A is more important than Sub-Factor B.
  - a) For Sub-Factor A, all elements (A1-A4) are equal.
  - b) For Sub-Factor B, all elements (B1-B3) are equal.
3. To be eligible for Delivery Order Award, an Offeror's proposals must receive a rating of no less than acceptable in all sub-factors and elements. Offerors are on notice that receiving a rating less than acceptable in a sub-factor or element rating constitutes disqualification of the entire proposal and Delivery Order Award, at the sole discretion of the Government.
4. Proposals will be evaluated for the presence or absence of descriptive material which demonstrates an offeror's understanding of all system requirements, the adequacy of the proposed approach, and compliance with the requirements of the solicitation. Narrative information that simply "parrots" the solicitation, thus providing no value, will be considered unacceptable.
5. A technical merit assessment will be made for each element within the Technical and Management approach sub-factors. Assessment criteria consisting of understanding requirements and adequacy of approach will be applied. These assessment criteria will be based on a standard for each element that defines an acceptable level of performance. After the technical merit has been assessed for each element, the element assessments will be compiled into an assessment of technical merit for the sub-factor. Similarly, technical merit assessments for the various sub-factors will be compiled into a factor assessment. Then the factor assessments will be compiled to arrive at an overall assessment of technical merit for the proposal. Technical merit is slightly more important than proposal risk.

## SECTION M – EVALUATION CRITERIA

6. A proposal risk (technical and schedule) assessment also will be made for each element within the Technical and Management Approach. After the proposal risk has been assessed for each element, the assessments will be compiled upwards through the sub-factors and factors, in similar fashion as that done with technical merit, to arrive at an overall assessment of proposal risk. Proposal Risk is slightly less important than Technical Merit.

### **M 3** VOLUME I – TECHNICAL APPROACH AND MANAGEMENT

The Technical Approach and Management factor will be evaluated on the basis of the offeror's understanding of the 91S MOS training tasks as defined in the System Requirement Document (SRD) (PRF-PT-00606) and the subsequent translation of these tasks into a technical design approach. The Technical Approach and Management factor will be evaluated on the following two sub-factors and their elements.

- Sub-Factor A - Trainer Design
- Sub-Factor B - Management

**M 3.1** Sub-factor A: Trainer Design. Trainer design will be evaluated on the basis of the following four elements.

- Element A1 - Training Effectiveness
- Element A2 - Software Modeling
- Element A3 - Training System Design
- Element A4 - STRYKER MGS DTT System Description/Specification

**M.3.1.1** Element A1: Training Effectiveness. Training Effectiveness will be evaluated on how the offeror details their understanding of the following: adequacy and fidelity of troubleshooting and maintenance training; the adequacy of the trainer to support closed-loop, interactive subsystems, and stand-alone operational training modes; and adequacy of the trainer instructor/operator station to initiate, modify, and create training missions (exercises) while minimizing instructor load during class execution.

**M 3.1.2** Element A2: Software Modeling. Software modeling will be evaluated on the adequacy of proposed software development methodologies presented in the Software Development Plan. The ability of these methodologies to produce quality software with flexibility will be evaluated. Proposed programming language and software engineering environment will be evaluated on their ability to provide for life-cycle support and hardware platform transportability. The adequacy of software design to satisfy the performance requirements of the SRD will be evaluated with special emphasis on the approach to achieve

## SECTION M – EVALUATION CRITERIA

Information Assurance (IA) compliance, methodology for incorporating two Interactive Electronic Technical Manuals (ITEM) versions into the trainer design and the methodology for rendering realistic 3-D representations of MGS components and their spatial realism.

**M 3.1.3 Element A3: Training System Design.** The Government will evaluate proposals on: the adequacy of the engineering and analysis process to integrate system design, development, and life-cycle support into the STRYKER Maintenance Training System (MTS); the integrated system analysis process to define major subsystem and overall trainer design and development requirements; and the systems approach to satisfy training requirements and seamless compatibility with the existing system architecture while addressing IA compliance. The proposal will be evaluated on the methodologies utilized to obtain STRYKER Mobile Gun System (MGS) data required during the design, development, test and evaluation of the trainer.

**M 3.1.4 Element A4: STRYKER MGS DTT System Description/Specification.** The STRYKER MTS Diagnostic Troubleshooting Trainer (DTT) System Description/Specification will be evaluated on the basis of completeness and the applicability towards future MGS Hands-on trainer (HOT). Methodology and approach for updating all existing documentation will be evaluated.

**M 3.2 Sub-factor B – Management.** The offeror's Integrated Management concept shall demonstrate that the organizational structure, policies, and culture effectively support the systems engineering process using a concurrent engineering approach. Management consists of three elements.

- Element B1 - Program Management Strategy
- Element B2 - System-Software Engineering
- Element B3 - Integrated Test and Evaluation

**M 3.2.1 Element B1: Program Management Strategy.** The Government will evaluate the adequacy and completeness of the proposed management organization to control and coordinate all of the work to be performed. Specifically, evaluation will be made of the offeror's program management organization including dedicated program resources, teaming arrangements and subcontract management approach; the realism of the offeror's proposed schedule and relationship of key milestones within the schedule, manloading by CWBS, labor category, and ability to meet milestones and control schedule, the offeror's configuration/data management approach, as well as the offeror's approach to quality assurance. The evaluation will include the offeror's understanding of the need to bring technical balance and user input to the management process in addition to cost, schedule and risk. The evaluation will include the implementation of a management control system for internal Cost/Schedule Status Reporting. The effective capture, transfer, and availability of software and hardware design, logistics, testing and quality data to all integrated product team (IPT) members will be evaluated. The evaluation will also

## SECTION M – EVALUATION CRITERIA

include the availability of this information in a timely manner to allow the government to collaborate within the IPT and recommend best courses of action.

**M 3.2.2 Element B2: System-Software Engineering.** The Government will evaluate the adequacy of the system-software engineering management process to insure compatibility with the legacy software, manage the successful accomplishment of IA certification, and identify and control risk in the execution of the contract. The process will be evaluated in regards to the development and design of MGS DTT lesson's software and its ability to integrate with the current system architecture and baseline without degrading performance. Proposed metrics for software management will be evaluated.

**M 3.2.3 Element B3: Integrated Test and Evaluation (T&E).** The Government will evaluate the adequacy of the T&E program management processes to define and document the capabilities of the trainer with a continuous evaluation in order to integrate and minimize testing and deficiencies, utilization of independent testers, and methods for capture and maintaining management visibility of identified problems and their resolution. The T&E will also evaluate for the methodology for achieving Information Assurance (IA) certification.

### **M 4 Rating Scheme**

**M 4.1** Ratings for the factors, sub-factors and elements will be expressed as two separate ratings. These ratings include Technical Ratings (Table M.4.2.1) and Technical Risk Ratings (Table M.4.3.1) for the quality of the Offeror's technical solution for meeting the Government's requirements and an assessment of risk.

#### **M 4.2 Technical Ratings**

The technical rating evaluates the quality of the Offeror's technical solution for meeting the Government's requirement. Technical evaluations shall utilize the ratings listed in Table M.4.2.1 below.

SECTION M – EVALUATION CRITERIA

<b>M.4.2.1 Technical Ratings</b>		
Color	Rating	Description
Blue	Outstanding	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths far outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is very low.
Purple	Good	Proposal meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal contains strengths which outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Green	Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths and weaknesses are offsetting or will have little or no impact on contract performance. Risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Yellow	Marginal	Proposal does not clearly meet requirements and has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. The proposal has one or more weaknesses which are not offset by strengths. Risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Red	Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies. Proposal is unawardable.

SECTION M – EVALUATION CRITERIA

**M 4.3 Technical Risk Rating**

Assessment of technical risk, which is manifested by the identification of weakness(es), considers potential for disruption of schedule, increased costs, degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight, or the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance. Technical risk shall be rated using the ratings listed in Table M 4.3.1 below. For FFP CLINs, the reference to increased cost is the sunk cost associated with schedule delays.

<b>Table M-4.3.1 Technical Risk Ratings</b>	
<b>RATING</b>	<b>DEFINITION</b>
<b>Low</b>	Has little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and normal Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.
<b>Moderate</b>	Can potentially cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome difficulties.
<b>High</b>	Is likely to cause significant disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Is unlikely to overcome any difficulties, even with special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring.

**M 5 DEFINITIONS**

<b>Significant Strength</b> - An aspect of the offeror’s proposal that appreciably enhances the merit of the proposal or appreciably increases the probability of successful contract performance.
<b>Strength</b> - An aspect of the offeror’s proposal that has merit or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Government during contract performance.
<b>Weakness</b> - A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
<b>Significant Weakness</b> - A flaw in the offeror’s proposal that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

SECTION M – EVALUATION CRITERIA

**Deficiency** - A material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.

**M 6 VOLUME II – COST/PRICE**

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed Price in accordance with FAR Subpart 15.404-1. The Government will use Section B to calculate the Total Evaluated Price (TEP). The TEP will be calculated by adding the total for all FFP CLINs. The TEP will be used in the Government's "best value" cost/price-technical tradeoff to select the awardee for this DO.

**NOTE: No cost/price information shall be included in the technical volume.**