



EVALUATION AND BASIS FOR AWARD

PNWH2 will evaluate proposals submitted in response to this Request for Proposal (RFP) and plans to award a subcontract to the supplier whose proposal represents the **Best Value offer(s)** to PNWH2 on the basis of adequacy of response and feasibility of approach to **the criteria outlined in the Statement of Work**, specifically:

- a) Technical & Management Approach
- b) Past Performance
- c) Capacity of Workforce

1. BASIS FOR AWARD

Award will be made to the qualified, responsive, and responsible supplier whose evaluated proposal provides the best value to PNWH2. Evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are significantly more important than cost or price. Best value will be determined by a tradeoff analysis of comparative differences in the value of technical merit with differences in cost / price. PNWH2 is more concerned with obtaining superior technical and management features than with making an award at the lowest overall cost / price.

2. SOURCE SELECTION DECISION

Suppliers' initial proposal should contain the supplier's best terms from a price, quality, and technical standpoint. Upon receipt of proposals, PNWH2 may contact suppliers with a request for clarifications, if required. Once clarifications are received, proposals shall be screened for responsiveness. Only proposals determined to be responsive shall be evaluated using the methodology described in this document.

3. EVALUATION FACTORS / SUBFACTORS / CRITERIA

In evaluating a Supplier's proposal, a numerical scoring system shall be utilized. Each Supplier shall receive a final technical score based on the evaluation criteria and scoring system for each of the evaluation factors. PNWH2 will then compare the Suppliers' criteria scores and evaluated prices as it conducts its Best Value Trade Off Analysis.

3.1 Supplier Responsiveness (Not Rated)

Immediately after receipt, the proposal packages will be screened for "Supplier Responsiveness," ensuring that the mandatory requirements are satisfied. A proposal will be considered "responsive" if the proposal is in compliance with all the requirements as outlined in the RFP.

PNWH2 reserves the right to consider any proposal "non-responsive" and reject it, in total or in part, with or without prior discussion with the Supplier, if the proposal:

- a) is not submitted in the format specified in the RFP or does not include all of the information requested by PNWH2;
- b) is not in accordance with the instructions contained in the RFP;
- c) contains irregularities of any kind; or,
- d) is submitted by a Supplier who does not meet the minimum qualifications.

Proposals found to be "non-responsive" will be eliminated from further consideration. Mandatory requirements are as follows:

Supplier Responsiveness	Evaluation
Supplier provided a complete proposal in the required format with all the required documentation (including all signatures), as defined in the Request for Proposal (RFP) Instructions for Proposal Preparation and as stated above.	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Supplier outlined a minimum of five (5) years' experience in providing legal support services similar to the complexity required PNWH2.	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
Supplier provided two (2) references with contact information applicable to the size and complexity of this procurement within the past five years. If applicable, Suppliers may provide the experience or past performance of a parent, affiliated or predecessor company (including Joint Venture prime partner companies and/or a parent or affiliated company) that is being otherwise proposed. The firm's proposal must demonstrate past performance criteria is met.	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO

3.2 Weighted Evaluation Criteria

Only proposals that are determined to be “responsive” and meet the mandatory requirements will be distributed for evaluation. The following criteria will be used for evaluation purposes:

Evaluation Factors	Description	Relative Importance
Factor 1: Organizational Ability	Subfactor 1 – Relevant Experience	30 points
	Subfactor 2 – Past Performance	
	Subfactor 3 – Capacity of Workforce	
Factor 2: Technical Capability	Subfactor 1 – Technical Understanding of Requirements	70 points
	Subfactor 2 – Work Order Implementation and Management	
	Subfactor 3 – Qualifications of Personnel	
	Total	100 points

3.3 Evaluation Criteria

3.3.1 FACTOR 1: Organizational Ability

In evaluating each Supplier’s overall capability to perform the work required by this RFP, the evaluation will consider both the total relevant domain experience, project management abilities, and staffing plan to supply the required capabilities and services. It will also consider the relevance of past performance of similar contracts. Evaluation will be based on the information conveyed in the Supplier’s proposal as well as from references and previous contracts. To determine if a Supplier possesses the professional ability to perform the work described in this RFP, the following will be considered:

Subfactor 1: - Relevant Experience (Maximum 10 points)

The Supplier shall demonstrate that a capable and technically diverse organization exists to meet the expectations of this subcontract, including the Program Leader, key technical leadership personnel, teaming and supporting personnel with experience in their respective fields, as applicable. Evidence provided in the Supplier’s proposal as well as input from references from former clients and previous contracts will be considered. The proposal shall be scored according to the following standards:

Documentation provided by the Supplier must include a summary of former clients of similar size, scale, and complexity.

Subfactor 1: Relevant Experience (Maximum 10 points)	
Points	Description
10 points	Exceeds Expectations – Supplier’s core abilities exceed the amount of required capabilities and has demonstrated success in complex projects whereby multiple disciplinary skills are used simultaneously to meet customer requirements. Proposal provides a substantial understanding and knowledge of the scope and complexity of the technical requirements
7 points	Meets Expectations – Supplier’s core abilities satisfy most of the required capabilities and has demonstrated success projects whereby there are small teams required to interact to meet customer requirements. Proposal provides some understanding and knowledge of the scope, and complexity of the technical requirements. Any weaknesses or deficiencies are potentially correctable.

3 points	Partially Meets Expectations – Supplier is capable of satisfying a nominal amount of the required capabilities and has demonstrated success projects whereby employees individually contribute to meet customer requirements. Proposal minimally meets expectations in the understanding and comprehensive knowledge of the scope, and complexity of the technical requirements. Any weaknesses or deficiencies are not easily correctable.
0 points	Below Expectations – Supplier is not capable of satisfying stated requirements.

Subfactor 2: Past Performance (Maximum 10 points)

Past performance is a measure of the degree to which a Supplier has satisfied its customers (including PNWH2, if applicable) in the past. The evaluation team will contact select Supplier’s references to ask if: (1) the Supplier delivered a quality work product compliant with the customer’s requirements; (2) the Supplier’s performance conformed with the terms and conditions of its contract, including the delivery schedule and budgeted time/cost; (3) the Supplier was reasonable and cooperative during performance and committed to customer satisfaction; and (4) the Supplier’s team has consistently provided staff with relevant knowledge, skills and abilities.

Documentation provided by the Supplier must include a minimum of two (2) Supplier’s references (with contact information), description of past performance and summary of communications services provided. Documentation provided by the Supplier must be included the proposal.

Subfactor 2: Past Performance (Maximum 10 points)	
Points	Description
10 points	Exceeds Expectations – Supplier received excellent reviews on past performance as described above from clients similar to PNWH2. The Supplier has demonstrated the ability to successfully estimate, staff (no gaps in coverage), manage, and oversee the work to completion and ensure the highest quality end-product is delivered on-time, budget, and within the established scope statements.
7 points	Meets Expectations – Offeror received good reviews as described above. The Offeror has demonstrated the ability to estimate, staff with small gaps in coverage (less than 80%), manage, and oversee the work to completion and ensure a quality end-product is delivered on-time, budget, and within the established scope statements with no rework of technical deliverables required other than to address comments from reviewers.
3 points	Partially Meets Expectations - Offeror received satisfactory reviews as described above. The Offeror has demonstrated some cost, schedule, and performance leading to gaps in coverage of staff (less than 50%). The need to rework technical deliverables due to quality concerns.

0 points	Below Expectations - Supplier did not receive good reviews from references.
----------	---

Subfactor 3: Capacity of Workforce (Maximum 10 points)

Supplier’s proposal shall provide evidence that the suppliers and its subcontractors workforce is sufficient to deliver the required services given the significant demand that this and other similar scopes of work are expected to have. Supplier shall document the capability to meet project deliverable due dates.

Documentation provided by the Supplier must include a summary of technical qualifications via resumes or CVs that include at a minimum education level and years of experience.

Subfactor 3: Capacity of Workforce (Maximum 10 points)	
Points	Description
10 points	Exceeds Expectations - Supplier’s capabilities exceed all requirements in the SOW. No significant weaknesses or deficiencies are identified. The proposal clearly conveys a thorough breadth and depth of technical understanding in implementing multiple task orders simultaneously.
7 points	Meets Expectations – Supplier’s capabilities meet most requirements in the SOW at a minimum addressing abilities to meet task requirements. Any weaknesses or deficiencies are potentially correctable. The proposal conveys a technical understanding in implementing multiple task orders simultaneously.
3 points	Partially Meets Expectations - Supplier’s capabilities satisfies some of the requirements in the SOW. Any weaknesses or deficiencies are not easily correctable. The proposal demonstrates a technical understanding in implementing multiple task orders simultaneously.
0 points	Below Expectations - Supplier did not receive good reviews from references.

3.3.2 FACTOR 2: Technical Capability

The technical evaluation will consider the breadth and depth of the Supplier’s overall capability to perform the scope of work required by this RFP. The evaluation will consider professional expertise, qualifications, project management, staffing, and project planning. Evaluation will be based on the information conveyed in the Supplier’s proposal. To determine if a Supplier possesses the technical ability to perform the work described in this RFP, the following criteria will be evaluated:

Subfactor 1: Technical Understanding of Requirements (Maximum 25 points)

(Reference Statement of Work)

The Supplier’s proposal must clearly convey an overall understanding of the scope and complexity of the technical requirements for this effort. The Supplier’s proposal must clearly demonstrate agility to implement multiple Task Orders simultaneously and show a comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the various processes, procedures, and professional standards required to perform the work as specified.

The Supplier must clearly convey in their proposal, the capabilities to provide support.

Documentation shall include, in detail, how the Supplier’s technical response to the SOW addresses all the required technical areas for the implementation of managing multiple Task Orders.

Subfactor 1: Technical Understanding of Requirements (Maximum 25 points)	
Points	Description
25 points	Exceeds Expectations - Supplier’s capabilities exceed all requirements in the SOW. No significant weaknesses or deficiencies are identified. The proposal clearly conveys a thorough breadth and depth of technical understanding in implementing multiple task orders simultaneously.
18 points	Meets Expectations – Supplier’s capabilities meet most requirements in the SOW at a minimum addressing abilities to meet task requirements. Any weaknesses or deficiencies are potentially correctable. The proposal conveys a technical understanding in implementing multiple task orders simultaneously.
8 points	Partially Meets Expectations - Supplier’s capabilities satisfies some of the requirements in the SOW. Any weaknesses or deficiencies are not easily correctable. The proposal demonstrates a technical understanding in implementing multiple task orders simultaneously.
0 points	Below Expectations - Supplier is not capable of satisfying stated requirements.

Subfactor 2: Implementation and Management (Maximum 20 points)

The Supplier must convey they have a sound plan and experience to conduct and complete the work scope including a comprehensive, detailed, and realistic schedule and that they possess the ability to successfully manage and oversee the work to completion and ensure a quality end product is delivered on time and within the established scope statement.

Documentation provided by the Supplier must include detailed scheduling, labor categories, and estimated hours.

Subfactor 2: Implementation and Management (Maximum 20 points)	
Points	Description
20 points	Exceeds Expectations – Supplier’s capabilities exceed all requirements to the work scope. No significant weaknesses or deficiencies are identified. The proposal clearly conveys a sound and thorough plan and schedule that demonstrates achievability of the work scope; the Supplier demonstrates the ability to successfully manage and oversee the work to completion and ensure the highest quality end product is delivered on time and within the established scope statement.
13 points	Meets Expectations – Supplier is capable of meeting all stated requirements to the work scope. Any weaknesses or deficiencies are potentially correctable. The proposal demonstrates achievability of the work scope; the Supplier demonstrates the ability to manage the work to completion and ensure a quality end product is delivered and within the established scope statement.
7 points	Partially Meets Expectations – Supplier is capable of satisfying some stated requirements of the work scope. Any weaknesses or deficiencies are not easily correctable. The proposal satisfies the work scope; the Supplier is capable of managing the work.
0 points	Below Expectations - Supplier is not capable of satisfying stated requirements.

Subfactor 3: Qualifications of Personnel (Maximum 25 points)

Supplier’s proposal shall provide evidence that available in-house and subcontractor staff are exceptionally qualified to deliver the required services, based on education, professional credentials, and experience. Supplier shall document capabilities of key in-house technical staff or subcontractors, as appropriate, in each technical area.

Documentation provided by the Supplier must include a summary of technical qualifications via resumes or CVs that include at a minimum education level and years of experience.

Subfactor 3: Qualifications of Personnel (Maximum 25 points)	
Points	Description
25 points	Exceeds Expectations – Supplier’s capabilities exceed all requirements in personnel qualifications. No significant weaknesses or deficiencies are identified. Supplier demonstrates a high level of staff qualification, as evidenced by education and professional credentials.
18 points	Meets Expectations - Supplier is capable of meeting most of the stated requirements in personnel qualifications. Any weaknesses or deficiencies are potentially correctable. Supplier demonstrates staff qualification, as evidenced by education and professional credentials.
8 points	Partially Meets Expectations – Supplier is capable of satisfying some stated requirements in personnel qualifications. Any weaknesses or deficiencies are not easily correctable.
0 points	Below Expectations – Supplier is not capable of satisfying stated requirements.

5.0 Estimated Price (Not Rated)

Suppliers are required to complete and submit

- Contracting Methodology
- Labor and/or Other rates
- Attachment F – Cost Estimate Worksheet

Proposals shall include 1. Fully burdened rates for each labor category identified; and 2. Estimated proposal costs for the Sample Work Order, reference Attachment F – Work Order 1 and pricing shall include all detailed cost information based on the proposed contracting methodology. Pricing shall be complete and comprehensive, including all costs for the proposed Work Order. Pricing will be considered after the technical evaluation is completed and will be reviewed for fair and reasonableness.

Best value will be determined by a tradeoff analysis of comparative differences in the value of technical merit with differences in cost / price. PNWH2 is more concerned with obtaining superior technical and management features than with making an award at the lowest overall cost / price.