

TIDEWATER GOVERNMENT INDUSTRY COUNCIL



Tidewater Government Industry Council 8/16/2011



DoD Source Selection Procedures

- USD AT&L directed DPAP to lead a JAT to examine the source selection process within DoD
- Task: Analyze the SS process, GAO protest data, collect lessons learned and best practices to inform a DoD Source Selection Procedure for competitive acquisitions under FAR Part 15
- Feb 09 – Established JAT Executive Steering Group and Sub-Committees to complete task
- Apr 10 – Draft SS Procedures sent out for comment
- Mar 11 – SS Procedures signed out by DPAP (effective 1 Jul)





DoD Source Selection Procedures

Highlights:

- 5 Standard Non-Cost/Price Ratings and Definitions
 - Technical – 2 evaluation options
 - Technical assessment inclusive of risk
 - Evaluate risk independently
 - Three standard risk ratings/definitions for independent risk evaluation
- Standard Past Performance Evaluation
- Standardized Small Business rating/evaluation process
- Increased emphasis on exchanges with industry through industry day(s), draft RFPs and discussions
- Mandatory appointment of SSA & SSAC at \$100M
- Strengthen documentation requirements for SSA decisions





DoD Source Selection Procedures

- Five Standard Technical Ratings, with options to include or evaluate risk independently
 - Combined Technical/Risk Rating

TABLE 1 – COMBINED TECHNICAL/RISK RATINGS

| 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. |





DoD Source Selection Procedures

- Five Standard Technical Ratings, with options to include or evaluate risk independently
 - Separate Technical and Risk Ratings

TABLE 2.1 –TECHNICAL RATINGS

| Color | Rating | Description |
|--------|--------------|--|
| Blue | Outstanding | Proposal meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements. The proposal contains multiple strengths and no deficiencies. |
| Purple | Good | Proposal meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal contains at least one strength and no deficiencies. |
| Green | Acceptable | Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal has no strengths or deficiencies. |
| Yellow | Marginal | Proposal does not clearly meet requirements and has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. |
| Red | Unacceptable | Proposal does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies and is not awardable. |





DoD Source Selection Procedures

– Standard Technical Risk Ratings/Descriptions

TABLE 2.2.- RISK RATINGS

| Rating | Description |
|----------|---|
| Low | 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. |
| Moderate | 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. |
| High | 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. |





DoD Source Selection Procedures

- Standard Past Performance rating/definitions for PP relevancy and simplified rating process

•TABLE 3 – PAST PERFORMANCE RELEVANCY RATINGS

| •Rating | •Definition |
|--------------------|--|
| •Very Relevant | •Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires. |
| •Relevant | •Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires. |
| •Somewhat Relevant | •Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires. |
| •Not Relevant | •Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires. |





DoD Source Selection Procedures

- Standard PP confidence ratings/descriptions

TABLE 4 – PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENTS

| Rating | Description |
|-------------------------|---|
| Substantial Confidence | Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. |
| Satisfactory Confidence | Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. |
| Limited Confidence | Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. |
| No Confidence | Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort. |
| Unknown Confidence | No recent/relevant performance record is available or the offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned. |

