

Technical Evaluation Criteria

**1. GENERAL**

The technical proposal will receive paramount consideration in the selection of the Contractor for this acquisition. All evaluation factors, other than cost or price, when combined are significantly more important than cost or price. However, cost/price may become a critical factor in source selection in the event that two or more offerors are determined to be essentially equal following the evaluation of all factors other than cost or price. In any event, the Government reserves the right to make an award to the offeror whose proposal provides the best overall value to the Government.

The evaluation will be based on the demonstrated capabilities of the prospective Contractors in relation to the needs of the project as set forth in the RFP. The merits of each proposal will be evaluated carefully. Each proposal must document the feasibility of successful implementation of the requirements of the RFP. Offerors must submit information sufficient to evaluate their proposals based on the detailed criteria listed below.

**1. TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA**

The evaluation criteria listed below are used by the technical evaluation committee when reviewing the technical proposals.

Facilities (40 points)

Suitability of facilities for re-derivation, breeding and maintenance of the mouse strains required in this project. This includes but is not limited to a helicobacter-free barrier facility, demonstrated effectiveness of environment controls, demonstrated effectiveness of back-up support system for barrier facility, and a demonstrated system of effective customer service and animal distribution system.

Experience: (40 points)

Documented evidence of experience in breeding, rearing and maintaining animal colonies of similar magnitude and having similar health, genetic, and environmental requirements; documented capability to re-derive the breeding mice by cesarean section or embryo transfer; documented ability in molecular biology to perform the genotyping assays; the demonstrated ability to maintain genetically pure colonies behind an effective barrier for an extended period (9 years or more); evidence of a corps of personnel trained in breeding, rearing, and maintaining animal colonies having similar health, genetic, and environmental requirements; and demonstrated capability of effective customer service and ability to distribute animals to investigators in a safe and timely manner. Where on-the-job training is indicated for new employees, give particulars on training program and instructors.

Awareness: (20 points)

A demonstrated awareness of problems and complications likely to be observed in the conduct of this project and methods to address them, particularly, the knowledge of the importance of maintenance of the high standard of health and genetic purity. Suitability of a plan to deal with accidental contamination or environmental emergencies.

**PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR**

An evaluation of offeror's past performance information will be conducted subsequent to the technical evaluation. However, this evaluation will not be conducted on any offeror whose proposal would not be selected for award based on the results of the evaluation of factors other than past performance.

The evaluation will be based on information obtained from references provided by the offeror, other relevant past performance information obtained from other sources known to the Government, and any information supplied by the offeror concerning problems encountered on the identified contracts and corrective action taken.

The Government will assess the relative risks associated with each offeror. Performance risks are those associated with an offeror's likelihood of success in performing the acquisition requirements as indicated by that offeror's record of past performance.

The assessment of performance risk is not intended to be the product of a mechanical or mathematical analysis of an offeror's performance on a list of contracts but rather the product of subjective judgment by the Government after it considers all available and relevant information.

When assessing performance risks, the Government will focus on the past performance of the offeror as it relates to all acquisition requirements, such as the offeror's record of performing according to specifications, including standards of good workmanship; the offeror's record of controlling and forecasting costs; the offeror's adherence to contract schedules, including the administrative aspects of performance; the offeror's reputation for reasonable and cooperative behavior and commitment to customer satisfaction; and generally, the offeror's business-like concern for the interest of the customer.

The Government will consider the currency and relevance of the information, source of the information, context of the data, and general trends in the offeror's performance.

The lack of a relevant performance record may result in an unknown performance risk assessment, which will neither be used to the advantage nor disadvantage of the offeror.

The following rating method shall be used in the evaluation of past performance information:

- +2 **Excellent** - Based on the offeror's performance record, no doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Sources of information are consistently firm in stating that the offeror's performance was superior and that they would unhesitatingly do business with the offeror again.
- +1 **Good** - Based on the offeror's performance record, little doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Sources of information state that the offeror's performance was good, better than average, etc., and that they would do business with the offeror again.
- 0 **None** - No past performance history identifiable.
- 1 **Marginal** - Based on the offeror's performance record, some doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Sources of information make unfavorable reports about the offeror's performance and express concern about doing business with the offeror again.
- 2 **Poor** - Based on the offeror's performance record, serious doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Sources of information consistently stated that the offeror's performance was entirely unsatisfactory and that they would not do business with the offeror again.

I. **EVALUATION OF SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS PARTICIPATION**

The extent of participation of small disadvantaged business (SDB) concerns in the performance of this acquisition will not be scored. However, the Government's conclusions about the overall commitment and realism of the offeror's targets for SDB participation will be used in determining the relative merits of the offeror's proposal and in selecting the offeror whose proposal is considered most advantageous to the Government.

Evaluation of SDB participation will be based on the following subfactors:

- a. The extent of commitment to use SDB concerns in performance of the contract (in terms of dollars and percentage of total contract value).
- b. The complexity and variety of work to be performed by SDB concerns (in terms of SIC Major Groups identified).