
Evaluation

Proposal Evaluation (FAR Subpart 15.305)

The vision for the Federal Acquisition System is to deliver, on a timely basis, the best value product or service to the customer. This is accomplished by using contractors who have a track record of successful past performance or who demonstrate a current superior ability to perform a contract.

Proposal evaluation is an assessment of the proposal and the offeror's ability to perform the prospective contract successfully. DLA evaluates competitive proposals and then assesses their relative qualities solely on the factors and subfactors specified in the solicitation. Evaluations may be conducted using any rating method or combination of methods, and may include:

- *Cost or Price evaluation*
- *Past performance evaluation*
- *Technical/Quality evaluation*
- *Cost information*
- *Small business subcontracting evaluation*

The Government will evaluate all proposals and, if discussions are to be conducted, will establish what is called a "competitive range." The competitive range is comprised of all of the most highly rated proposals. These discussions are undertaken with the intent of allowing the offeror to revise its proposal.

Source Selection (FAR Subpart 15.3)

The term "source selection" means the determination of which offer to award in a competitive environment. The goal of source selection is to award the offer which represents the best value to the Government through the evaluation of the differences inherent in the offers or offerors. The specific differences that will be evaluated are called the evaluation factors, while the way that these differences will be evaluated is called the scoring system or evaluation method.

All significant evaluation factors, including price, will be listed in the solicitation. In addition, the solicitation will indicate the relative importance of the factors. This may be accomplished through a listing in descending order of importance, an adjectival description of importance (factor A is more important than factor B, factors B and C are equally important), or through a disclosure of the numerical weights assigned to the factors. These methods can be combined or factors can be grouped, e.g., "The following technical factors are listed in descending order of importance and in total are equal in importance to factor A."

Evaluation, Continued

Automated Best Value System

The Automated Best Value System (ABVS), formerly called the Automated Best Value Model, is a computerized system that collects a vendor's existing past performance data and translates it into a numeric score. The contracting officer then uses the score as an additional evaluation factor when making best value award decisions.

DLA assigns an ABVS score to each vendor based on the vendor's past performance. Vendors receive scores for performance in each Federal Supply Class (FSC scores). The FSC scores are based on DLA consolidated performance history. A vendor may have multiple FSC scores but will have only one DLA score, which is a compilation of the vendor's FSC scores for all business conducted with DLA.

The DLA system uses 24 months of past performance history as the standard rating period. Each monthly update includes data through the 5th of the month.

The delivery score is a combination of a vendor's delivery and quality scores and the scores range from zero to a perfect score of 100. If a vendor's score is less than 100, DLA provides the negative data that impacts that score. The delivery score reflects all lines shown as delinquent during the rating period. For administrative purposes, the delivery rating period excludes the most recent 60 days. For ABVS, delinquent lines represent shipments not shipped and/or received in their entirety by the contract delivery date.

The quality score reflects validated contractor caused product non-conformances/lab test failures and packaging non-conformances during the rating period. For administrative purposes, the rating period for quality excludes the most recent 30 days. The 30 and 60 day offset periods are not grace periods. Contractor caused discrepancies, regardless of corrective action, will be reflected in ABVS as an indicator of past performance. The repair, replacement or reimbursement of quality and packaging defects will not provide relief of negative ABVS data.

Buyers use ABVS as an additional evaluation factor in making best value award decisions. You should review your data carefully. Negative data affects your company's ABVS score.

Your negative performance data will be posted before it is reflected in the ABVS score (preview period), to give you an opportunity to review and verify data. Negative data must be challenged within the preview period to assure corrections are posted before it is included in the calculation of the score.

Check your data regularly! ABVS scoring is a continuous process, and while you may not have negative data this month, it could appear next month.

FSC scores are used when offers are evaluated. If a vendor does not have an FSC score in that particular federal supply class, a vendor's DLA score is used to evaluate its offer. The contracting officer may also consider the volume of business on which the FSC score is based as a measure of confidence in the score's indication of performance risk. He or she may choose to use the DLA score if he lacks confidence in the FSC score. The contracting officer also may use the DLA score if the FSC scores among offerors are relatively equal.

Evaluation, Continued

Past Performance

Past performance information is relevant information regarding a contractor's actions under previously awarded contracts. It includes, for example:

- The contractor's record of conforming to contract requirements and to standards of good workmanship;
- The contractor's record of forecasting and controlling costs;
- The contractor's adherence to contract schedules, including the administrative aspects of performance;
- The contractor's history of reasonable and cooperative behavior and commitment to customer satisfaction; and generally,
- The contractor's business-like concern for the interest of the customer.