

**Department of Homeland Security
Science and Technology Directorate
Washington, DC**



Technical Evaluation Plan

Broad Agency Announcement

BAA 13-012

November 20, 2013
Science and Technology Directorate
Department of Homeland Security

DISTRIBUTION NOTICE: Further dissemination only as directed by DHS Office of Policy

DESTRUCTION NOTICE: Destroy by any method that will prevent disclosure of contents or reconstruction of the document

TECHNICAL EVALUATION PLAN FOR FIRST RESPONDER GROUP BROAD AGENCY ANNOUNCEMENT (BAA) 13-012

1. Introduction

This Technical Evaluation Plan (TEP) describes the processes and procedures to be followed by the evaluation team to evaluate and rate offers received in response to Broad Agency Announcement (BAA) 13-012. Details of the evaluation process, including security, the application of evaluation criteria, reporting requirements, and assignment of ratings, are documented for the guidance of evaluation teams. TEP members will thoroughly familiarize themselves with the BAA, Department of Homeland Security issued Statements of Objectives (SOOs), Offeror's technical responses, and this TEP. The TEP will be used by all evaluators throughout the evaluation process.

2. Background

The DHS Science & Technology (S&T) First Responders Group (FRG) mission is to strengthen the first responder community's ability to protect the homeland and respond to disasters. Through the engagement of first responders at every stage, the FRG pursues a better understanding of needs and requirements, and develops innovative solutions to the most pressing challenges faced during day-to-day and large-scale emergencies.

The DHS Science and Technology Directorate (DHS S&T) is announcing to business and academia its intent to solicit proposals under this BAA. The over-arching strategy of the BAA involves the use of this 5-year open-ended BAA to quickly and efficiently execute research and development to deliver practical solutions to urgent first responder problems. This strategy will provide DHS an acquisition tool with the flexibility to solicit proposals and make awards to perform rapid prototyping of technical solutions to meet present and compelling first responder needs, as ever-changing urgent operational issues and capability gaps are identified.

The BAA will remain "open" for 5 years; however, proposals will only be solicited and accepted during official data calls issued via Statements of Objectives (SOOs).

3. Technical Evaluation Team (TET)

The Technical Evaluation Team is comprised of the individuals listed in Table 1, below:

Table 1: TET Organization

Approving Official	Robert Griffin
Technical Evaluation Chairperson	Greg Price
Contracting Officer	Sharon Flowers
Contract Specialist	Sophia Woodward
Lead Technical Evaluator	Bill Stout
Lead Technical Evaluator	Greg Price
Lead Technical Evaluator	Bill Deso
Lead Technical Evaluator	Christine Lee
Technical Evaluator	Gerald Bryan
Technical Evaluator	Raymond Silva
Technical Evaluator	Ralph Gonzales
Technical Evaluator	Bill Haskell
Technical Evaluator	Bill Troup
Technical Evaluator	Mike Fieldson
Technical Evaluator	Paul Hitchcock
Technical Evaluator	Jeffrey Powers
Technical Evaluator	Glenn Gaines
Technical Evaluator	Angela Ervin
Technical Evaluator	Stephen Davis

3.1 Approving Official

After an in-depth presentation, review, and consideration of all information available from the Technical Evaluation Chairperson, the Approving Official will make the final decision of which offerors to selection for award, subject to successful contract negotiations. This decision is subject to all applicable laws and regulations and in accordance with the evaluation criteria described in the BAA and this TEP.

3.2 Technical Evaluation Chairperson

The Technical Evaluation Chairperson is responsible for the acquisition and ensures that the evaluation is conducted properly and efficiently and conforms to Federal acquisition policies and requirements. The Technical Evaluation Chairperson for this BAA is Mr. Greg Price, the DHS S&T/FRG Program Manager. The Chairperson will also:

- Appoint the TET members;
- Work with the Contracting Officer (CO) to ensure that members are properly trained;
- Ensure conflicts of interest or appearances thereof do not exist;
- Provide the TET with guidance and instructions for conducting the evaluation and selection

process;

- Ensure all TET members are fully trained prior to the start of the evaluation, including any replacement TET members;
- Ensure that there is no premature or unauthorized disclosure of proprietary or source selection information; and
- Make the final award recommendation.

3.3 Contracting Officer (CO)

The CO will advise the TET to ensure fair and equitable treatment of offerors, and advise the Chairperson and Lead Evaluator on the proper and effective conduct of the proposal review process in accordance with this plan. (The CO for this acquisition is Ms. Sharon Flowers. Other specific CO duties include, but are not limited to:

- Review the evaluation reports/recommendation for award, and provides feedback to the Lead Technical Evaluator;
- Distribute notification letters to offerors;
- Review PR package;
- Conduct Cost/Price analysis;
- Negotiate with Contractor as necessary;
- Award contracts;
- Ensure source selection determination rationale is fully documented before source selection announcement;

3.4 TET Members

The primary responsibility of the TET is to ensure a comprehensive evaluation of each submission in response to the BAA in accordance with the evaluation factors contained in the solicitation. The TET members will be composed of personnel familiar with the operational requirements and environment BAA Technical Topic Areas (TTAs). At least three evaluators (including Lead evaluator) will be assigned for each proposal.

3.4.1 Lead Technical Evaluator

The Lead Technical Evaluator will head the TET members and will report to the Technical Evaluation Chairperson. The Lead Technical Evaluator will:

- Conveys consensus reports, and writes evaluation summary report;
- Provide CO/CS with draft Notification Letters to the offeror to include substantive feedback regarding the justification for the decision;
- Coordinate technical participation for discussions (if held) with offerors;
- Submits Complete Requisition Package for awards;

- Manage the overall activities of the TET and ensure compliance with source selection information security procedures;
- Ensures all **Source Selection Certificate, DHS Form 11000-6, and Gratuitous Services Agreements** are submitted to the CO prior to the commencement of evaluations;
- Ensure all TET members understand the evaluation objectives, procedures, schedules, and individual team member responsibilities;
- Provide the CO with a consolidated evaluation report immediately following the technical evaluation;
- Serve as the focal point for coordination and consultation with the Technical Evaluation Chairperson;
- Coordinate technical participation for discussions (if held) with offerors, as directed by the CO, and other activities as required.

3.4.2 Technical Evaluator

The TET Evaluators are voting members of the TET and will be responsible for determining how well proposals satisfy the evaluation criteria of the BAA. This will be accomplished by evaluating all proposals and rating each of them against the appropriate evaluation factors specified in Attachment 2 to this TEP. The evaluators will initially perform an individual evaluation of each submission and provide an individual rating for each submission. This rating should be the result of each evaluator's individual review of the submission rather than of discussions between the evaluators. After individual evaluations are concluded, the evaluators will prepare technical discussion questions and engage in group discussions to reach a consensus on a final rating.

Technical Evaluators are responsible for:

- Understanding the evaluation process, evaluation ratings, rating standards, and definitions before reviewing the proposals and supporting documentation;
- Reviewing the proposals received and properly documenting evaluation ratings;
- Rating each proposal against the established evaluation criteria identified in the BAA and this document;
- Identifying the strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies indicating how the rating for each criterion was determined. Where appropriate, specific section, page, and/or chart number references to the proposal should be included;
- Providing clear, concise, narrative comments to explain and justify all assigned ratings;
- Participating in the development of a consensus award recommendation;
- Ensure that the reasons for not selecting a proposal for award are properly documented;
- Participating in the development of comments for negotiations/discussions with selected offerors if necessary;

4. Duration and Location of the Evaluation

The TEP evaluations will depend on the number of proposals received; therefore, it is not possible to estimate the duration of this phase. The TET evaluators will remain available and committed until all evaluation and source selection actions have been completed. All evaluation

committee members will be required to be present at the evaluation location during normal duty hours. The evaluations will be performed at location(s) to be determined by the Technical Evaluation Chairperson. All facilities used for source selection shall be configured so that the evaluation can be performed in a secured, controlled area.

5. Proposal Evaluation Process

The purpose of the evaluation process is to provide critical input to the source selection determination by providing a rational basis for selection of the successful offeror. Evaluators will not compare one submission against another, but rather evaluate each submission against the **criteria established for the evaluation**. The evaluation process provides the necessary proposal analysis, which will allow the Technical Evaluation Chairperson to decide which proposal best satisfies the needs of the Government.

5.1 Preparation and Training

Several functions must be performed prior to initiation of the actual evaluation process, including:

- Personnel participating in the TET must be identified and appointed by the Technical Evaluation Chairperson;
- Personnel participating in the source selection will be required to attend technical evaluation briefing.
- Participants in the source selection must sign the following required Certification/Form that become part of the official supporting documentation:
 - Source Selection Participant Certification (Fed employee)
 - Non-disclosure Agreement DHS 11000-6 (All Non-Fed Advisors/SMEs, Support Contractors)
 - Gratuitous Services Agreements (Non-contractor, non-Federal Advisors/SMEs)
- Participants in the source selection shall read the BAA and appropriate SOOs to become thoroughly familiar with project requirements. Any questions concerning the requirements, evaluation process, and evaluation criteria will be directed to the CO for resolution;
- Evaluation panel members must acquire a thorough knowledge and understanding of the evaluation factors and criteria and how they are applied;

5.2 Proposal Evaluation

Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with FAR 35.016. The formal source selection procedures outlined in FAR Part 15 do not apply to this Research & Development (R&D) effort. In addition, DHS intends on awarding contracts without discussions but reserves the right to conduct communications as needed. If needed, communications may be written or oral, with specific offerors only, and as circumstances warrant. The rules concerning discussions outlined in FAR 15.306 do not apply to the proposals submitted in response to the BAA.

TET Evaluators will assess and rate proposals based on how well the offerors meet the factors and requirements outlined in the BAA using the evaluation criteria and instructions in the TEP. Evaluators will assess each written technical submission, and then prepare a narrative description of the strengths, weaknesses, and areas requiring clarification to support the rating.

At least three TET Evaluators will be designated to evaluate each proposal (one Lead and minimum of 2 Evaluators). All Government personnel participating in the evaluation of proposals will be required to sign Source Selection Certificate acknowledge they understand their role and responsibilities and received the procurement integrity act training.

An initial cursory proposal review will be made and the TET evaluators may recommend elimination of any proposal from further consideration if the offer is so deficient as to be totally unacceptable. As an example, failure of an offeror to abide by the Government's proposal preparation directions and limitations will likely result in immediate elimination from further consideration.

Each evaluator shall initially evaluate and rate each proposal independently. Discussion among TET members and the TET Chairperson for purposes of understanding and clarification is expected and encouraged. Ratings at this point are tentative and rationale for assigned ratings will be discussed with significant deviations reconciled for development of composite ratings. As a result, the TET members shall reach evaluation *consensus* on the overall technical rating of each proposal and again on any revised proposal as a result of discussions.

Federal First Responders Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) will serve as voting TET evaluators and non-Federal FRRG members may be asked to provide specialized technical expertise as non-voting advisors to evaluators.

5.3 Discussions

The Government intends to evaluate proposals and extend an offer/award a contract without discussions with offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the CO later determines them to be necessary. If the CO determines that the number of proposals that would otherwise be in the competitive range exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted, the CO may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly rated proposals. The Government may reject any or all quotes if such action is in the public interest; accept other than the lowest quote; and waive informalities and minor irregularities in quotes received.

5.4 Limits on Exchanges

Governments personnel involved in the acquisition shall not engage in conduct that:

- Favors one offeror over another;

- Reveals an offeror's technical solution, including unique technology, innovative and unique uses of commercial items, or any information that could compromise an offeror's intellectual property to another offeror; and
- Knowingly furnishes source selection information in violation of FAR Part 3.104 and 41 U.S.C. 423(h)(1)(2).

5.5 Source Selection Documentation

(1) Files shall be adequate to support reconstruction or review of all decisions to support any feedback inquiries. The findings of the TET evaluation team will be properly documented in an evaluation worksheet or summary report that shall contain the ratings assigned for each factor by the evaluation (supported by narratives), and contain any relevant specifics with regard to any strengths, weaknesses, or deficiencies of each proposal.

(2) The evaluation rating sheets (Attachment 2) for each proposal will be completed during the evaluation process, and retained and secured in lockable storage by the TET Chairperson. All individual working papers and rating sheets will be retained and secured in lockable storage during the evaluation and after the evaluation is complete. The final consensus decisions of the technical team reflected in the evaluation rating sheets will be properly documented and shall contain the ratings assigned for each factor by the evaluation and any relevant specifics with regard to any strengths, weaknesses, or deficiencies of the proposal.

(3) The Award Recommendation provided in Attachment 6 will be forwarded to the CO along with the consensus rating sheets. Both the final consensus rating sheets and the Award Recommendation sheet will be filed with the proposals to document evaluation results.

(4) All individual working paper rating sheets and proposals not selected for funding will also be retained and secured in lockable storage.

5.6 Best Value Determination

The offeror who provides the "best" overall value to the Government will be selected. Therefore, the successful proposal may not necessarily be the lowest reasonably priced cost proposal. Government cost/price analysis will determine whether each cost proposal is either "reasonable" or "unreasonable." Technical competency is more important than price. However, price may become relatively more important as the difference in technical scores decreases.

5.7 Security, Special Handling Provisions, and Facilities

All submissions will be submitted to the DHS S&T BAA portal and maintained in an appropriately secured manner.

Evaluators and advisors are expected and required to ensure proper destruction of all notes and any materials. Evaluators and advisors must turn over to the Technical Evaluation Lead or destroy all notes and all material promptly following the Technical Evaluation Chairperson's

decision regarding awards. Evaluators and advisors may not maintain personal files of source selection materials.

Evaluators and/or advisors shall not contact any of the Offerors after completion of proposal evaluations. If contact with a Offeror becomes necessary, the Lead Evaluator will consult with the Chairperson and Contracting Officer to determine whether and how contact shall be made.

If, at any time during the proceedings of the evaluation, it is determined that there has been an unauthorized disclosure, the matter will be brought to the immediate attention of the Chairperson, Contracting Officer, and/or Legal Advisor who will conduct an investigation and take appropriate action.

No Classified proposals (or portions of proposals) will be accepted.

6. Definitions

Technical evaluators will utilize the following standard terms and definitions during the course of its proposal evaluations:

- A *strength* is defined as an aspect of the submission that increases the likelihood of successful contract performance.
- A *weakness* is defined as a flaw in the submission that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
- A *deficiency* is defined as an aspect of the submission that fails to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.
- A *clarification* is defined as limited exchanges between the Government and offerors, for the purpose of enhancing the Government's understanding of proposals, without entering into discussions, or requesting a revision to the submission.
- *Discussions* are defined as exchanges between the Government and offerors for the purpose of identifying to the offeror significant weaknesses, deficiencies, and other aspects of its submission that could, in the opinion of the CO, be altered or explained to enhance materially the submission's potential for award and where revised proposals are requested.

7. Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation of proposals will be accomplished through an independent technical review using the following criteria, which are listed in descending order of relative importance:

7.1 Technical Evaluation Criteria

Criterion I: Sound technical and managerial approach to the proposed work, including a demonstrated understanding of the critical technology or engineering challenges required for achieving the goals of the TTA.

Criterion II: Potential of the technology/solution for meeting the TTA goals provided in BAA 13-012 resulting in the best ideas and concepts.

Criterion III: Qualitative assessment of the commercialization experience and strategy to determine the likelihood that the offeror will be able to deploy a technology and/or solution(s) that can be transitioned effectively to the user community either through commercialization of the technology or through other means.

7.2 Past Performance Criteria

Criterion IV: Capability to perform proposed work and history of performance of the Team in developing related technologies.

7.3 Cost/Price Criteria

Criterion V: Each offeror's cost/price proposal will be evaluated for reasonableness and completeness of the proposed contract cost.

8. Basis for Award

(1) Technical Evaluation Criteria (Criterion I, II, and III) is more important than Past Performance Evaluation Criteria (Criterion IV). Technical Evaluation Criteria and Past Performance Criteria, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost/Price Criteria (Criterion V).

(2) Adjectival Ratings. The technical evaluation team will use the adjectival ratings identified in Attachment 1 to rate each evaluation criterion for each proposal.

(3) DHS S&T reserves the right to select for award and to fund all, some, or none of the proposals received in response to BAA 13-012.

9. Adjectival Ratings

The TEP evaluators will use the adjectival ratings identified in Attachment 1 to rate each evaluation criterion for each proposal.

ATTACHMENT 1

ADJECTIVAL RATINGS FOR PROPOSALS

1. TECHNICAL CRITERIA I, II, III, AND IV

EXCELLENT: The proposed technology fully and completely meets or exceeds the expectations of BAA 13-012 and sets forth plans, approaches and analyses that show an extremely high probability of meeting all of the Department of Homeland Security's desired attributes and performance parameters given in BAA 13-012. The risks and technical challenges associated with simultaneously achieving all the desired attributes and performance parameters are fully and completely understood, and the strategy to address those issues is exceptionally well developed. Numerical Rating Value = 5.0

VERY GOOD: The proposed technology meets the requirements of BAA 13-012 and sets forth plans, approaches and analyses that show a likely probability of meeting all of the Department of Homeland Security's desired attributes and performance parameters given in BAA 13-012. The risks and technical challenges associated with simultaneously achieving all the desired attributes and performance parameters are largely understood and the strategy to address those issues is sufficiently well developed. Numerical Rating Value = 4.0

GOOD: The proposed technology meets most, but not all, requirements of BAA 13-012 and sets forth plans, approaches, and analyses that show a fair probability of meeting all of the Department of Homeland Security's desired attributes and performance parameters given in BAA 13-012. The risks and technical challenges associated with simultaneously achieving all the desired attributes and performance parameters are somewhat understood and the strategy to address those issues will likely need further development to be fully acceptable. Numerical Rating Value = 3.0

FAIR: The proposed technology meets few requirements of BAA 13-012 and sets forth plans, approaches, and analysis that show a low probability of meeting the Department of Homeland Security's desired attributes and performance parameters given in BAA 13-012. The risks and technical challenges associated with simultaneously achieving all the desired attributes and performance parameters are poorly understood and the strategy to address those issues will need substantial further development to be fully acceptable. Numerical rating value = 2.0

UNACCEPTABLE: The proposal was not provided in the required format and/or is technically non-responsive to the requirements of BAA 13-012. Numerical value = 0.0

2. Adjectival Ratings for the Cost Proposal

ACCEPTABLE: The cost proposed is determined reasonable. The proposed labor hours, labor rates, material costs, burden rates and other costs in light of current information available is considered reasonable. The cost meets the expectations of the BAA, and sets forth plans, approaches and analyses that show a reasonable possibility of meeting the Department of Homeland Security's desired cost for completing the proposed effort.

UNACCEPTABLE: The cost proposal is determined to be unreasonable. The proposed labor hours, labor rates, material costs, burden rates and other costs in light of information available is considered unreasonable. The cost does not meets the expectations of the BAA, or set forth plans, approaches and analyses that show a reasonable possibility of meeting the Department of Homeland Security's desired cost for completing the proposed effort.

ATTACHMENT 2

Technical Evaluation Form – Criterion I

Evaluator Signature: _____ Date: _____

OFFEROR: _____ ORD TITLE/NUMBER: _____

Rating for this Criterion: _____ (E,VG,G,F,U)

Criterion I

Sound technical and managerial approach to the proposed work, including a demonstrated understanding of the critical technology or engineering challenges required for achieving the goals of the TTA.

Rating

Definition

Excellent

The proposed technology fully and completely meets or exceeds the expectations of BAA 13-012 and sets forth plans, approaches and analyses that show an extremely high probability of meeting all of the Department of Homeland Security's desired attributes and performance parameters given in BAA 13-012. The risks and technical challenges associated with simultaneously achieving all the desired attributes and performance parameters are fully and completely understood, and the strategy to address those issues is exceptionally well developed.

Very Good

The proposed technology meets the requirements of BAA 13-012 and sets forth plans, approaches and analyses that show a likely probability of meeting all of the Department of Homeland Security's desired attributes and performance parameters given in BAA 13-012. The risks and technical challenges associated with simultaneously achieving all the desired attributes and performance parameters are largely understood and the strategy to address those issues is sufficiently well developed.

Good

The proposed technology meets most, but not all, requirements of BAA 13-012 and sets forth plans, approaches, and analyses that show a fair probability of meeting all of the Department of Homeland Security's desired attributes and performance parameters given in BAA 13-012. The risks and technical challenges associated with simultaneously achieving all the desired attributes and performance parameters are somewhat

understood and the strategy to address those issues will likely need further development to be fully acceptable.

Fair

The proposed technology meets few requirements of BAA 13-012 and sets forth plans, approaches, and analysis that show a low probability of meeting the Department of Homeland Security's desired attributes and performance parameters given in BAA 13-012. The risks and technical challenges associated with simultaneously achieving all the desired attributes and performance parameters are poorly understood and the strategy to address those issues will need substantial further development to be fully acceptable.

Unacceptable

The proposal was not provided in the required format and/or is technically non-responsive to the requirements of BAA 13-012.

Strengths: _____

Weaknesses: _____

Deficiencies: _____

Technical Questions/Clarifications: _____

(Note: Cite the paragraph and page number(s) from the proposal

ATTACHMENT 2

Technical Evaluation Form – Criterion II

Evaluator Signature: _____ Date: _____

OFFEROR: _____ ORD TITLE/NUMBER: _____

Rating for this Criterion: _____ (E,VG,G,F,U)

Criterion II

Potential of the Technology/solution for meeting TTA goals provided in BAA 13-012 resulting in the best ideas and concepts.

Rating

Definition

Excellent

The proposed technology fully and completely meets or exceeds the expectations of BAA 13-012 and sets forth plans, approaches and analyses that show an extremely high probability of meeting all of the Department of Homeland Security's desired attributes and performance parameters given in BAA 13-012. The risks and technical challenges associated with simultaneously achieving all the desired attributes and performance parameters are fully and completely understood, and the strategy to address those issues is exceptionally well developed.

Very Good

The proposed technology meets the requirements of BAA 13-012 and sets forth plans, approaches and analyses that show a likely probability of meeting all of the Department of Homeland Security's desired attributes and performance parameters given in BAA 13-012. The risks and technical challenges associated with simultaneously achieving all the desired attributes and performance parameters are largely understood and the strategy to address those issues is sufficiently well developed.

Good

The proposed technology meets most, but not all, requirements of BAA 13-012 and sets forth plans, approaches, and analyses that show a fair probability of meeting all of the Department of Homeland Security's desired attributes and performance parameters given in BAA 13-012. The risks and technical challenges associated with simultaneously achieving all the desired attributes and performance parameters are somewhat understood and the strategy to address those issues will likely need further development to be fully acceptable.

ATTACHMENT 2

Technical Evaluation Form – Criterion III

Evaluator Signature: _____ Date: _____

OFFEROR: _____ ORD TITLE/NUMBER: _____

Rating for this Criterion: _____ (E,VG,G,F,U)

Criterion III

Qualitative assessment of the commercialization experience and strategy to determine the likelihood that the offeror will be able to deploy a technology and/or solution(s) that can be transitioned effectively to the user community either through commercialization of the technology or through other means.

Rating

Definition

Excellent	The proposed technology fully and completely meets or exceeds the expectations of BAA 13-012 and sets forth plans, approaches and analyses that show an extremely high probability of meeting all of the Department of Homeland Security's desired attributes and performance parameters given in BAA 13-012. The risks and technical challenges associated with simultaneously achieving all the desired attributes and performance parameters are fully and completely understood, and the strategy to address those issues is exceptionally well developed.
Very Good	The proposed technology meets the requirements of BAA 13-012 and sets forth plans, approaches and analyses that show a likely probability of meeting all of the Department of Homeland Security's desired attributes and performance parameters given in BAA 13-012. The risks and technical challenges associated with simultaneously achieving all the desired attributes and performance parameters are largely understood and the strategy to address those issues is sufficiently well developed.
Good	The proposed technology meets most, but not all, requirements of BAA 13-012 and sets forth plans, approaches, and analyses that show a fair probability of meeting all of the Department of Homeland Security's desired attributes and performance parameters given in BAA 13-012. The risks and technical challenges associated with simultaneously achieving all the desired attributes and performance parameters are somewhat

understood and the strategy to address those issues will likely need further development to be fully acceptable.

Fair The proposed technology meets few requirements of BAA 13-012 and sets forth plans, approaches, and analysis that show a low probability of meeting the Department of Homeland Security's desired attributes and performance parameters given in BAA 13-012. The risks and technical challenges associated with simultaneously achieving all the desired attributes and performance parameters are poorly understood and the strategy to address those issues will need substantial further development to be fully acceptable.

Unacceptable The proposal was not provided in the required format and/or is technically non-responsive to the requirements of BAA 13-012.

Strengths: _____

Weaknesses: _____

Deficiencies: _____

Technical Questions/Clarifications: _____

(Note: Cite the paragraph and page number(s) from the proposal

ATTACHMENT 2

Technical Evaluation Form – Criterion IV

Evaluator Signature: _____ Date: _____

OFFEROR: _____ ORD TITLE/NUMBER: _____

Rating for this Criterion: _____ (E,VG,G,F,U)

Criterion IV

Capability to perform proposed work and history of performance of the team in developing related technologies.

Rating

Definition

Excellent

The proposed technology fully and completely meets or exceeds the expectations of BAA 13-012 and sets forth plans, approaches and analyses that show an extremely high probability of meeting all of the Department of Homeland Security's desired attributes and performance parameters given in BAA 13-012. The risks and technical challenges associated with simultaneously achieving all the desired attributes and performance parameters are fully and completely understood, and the strategy to address those issues is exceptionally well developed.

Very Good

The proposed technology meets the requirements of BAA 13-012 and sets forth plans, approaches and analyses that show a likely probability of meeting all of the Department of Homeland Security's desired attributes and performance parameters given in BAA 13-012. The risks and technical challenges associated with simultaneously achieving all the desired attributes and performance parameters are largely understood and the strategy to address those issues is sufficiently well developed.

Good

The proposed technology meets most, but not all, requirements of BAA 13-012 and sets forth plans, approaches, and analyses that show a fair probability of meeting all of the Department of Homeland Security's desired attributes and performance parameters given in BAA 13-012. The risks and technical challenges associated with simultaneously achieving all the desired attributes and performance parameters are somewhat understood and the strategy to address those issues will likely need further development to be fully acceptable.

ATTACHMENT 3

Technical Evaluation Team Individual Ratings Summary

Evaluator _____ Offeror _____ ORD Title/Number _____

INITIAL RATING*	AFTER DISCUSSIONS	AFTER RECEIPT OF AMENDED OFFER
--------------------	----------------------	--------------------------------------

Criterion I Sound Technical/Managerial
Approach

Criterion II Potential of Technology/Solution

Criterion III Assessment of Commercialization
Experience/Strategy

Criterion IV Capability to Perform and
Performance History

*Ratings are: E=Excellent
VG = Very Good
G = Good
F = Fair
U = Unsatisfactory

ATTACHMENT 4

Overall Summary Score Sheet

For Use By Lead Technical Evaluator Only

Date: _____ Offeror: _____ ORD Title/Number _____

	Evaluator 1	Evaluator 2	Evaluator 3	Evaluator 4	Consensus Score
Criterion I	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Criterion II	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Criterion III	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Criterion IV	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Ratings are: E=Excellent
VG = Very Good
G = Good
F = Fair
U = Unsatisfactory

ATTACHMENT 5

Overall Weighted Score Sheet

For Use By Lead Technical Evaluator Only

Date:_____ Offeror:_____ ORD Title/Number:_____

Chairperson Signature:_____

	Rating consensus* (from Attachment 4)	Assigned weight	Factor score (Rating consensus x Assigned weight)
Criterion I		.4	
Criterion II		.3	
Criterion III		.2	
Criterion IV		.1	
Total score..... _____			

***Rating Consensus Key**

Excellent: 5.0
Very good: 4.0
Good: 3.0
Fair: 2.0
Unsatisfactory: 0.0

ATTACHMENT 6

***Award Recommendations for
BAA 13-012 First Responders Group***

ORD/BAA Call Number: _____

Number of proposals evaluated: _____

Number of proposals not selected: _____

Number of proposals that are not reviewed due to direct noncompliance with BAA requirements:

Based upon the Evaluation Criteria provided in BAA13-012, the available funding and other programmatic considerations, recommend awards in the following order:

OFFEROR	WORK DESCRIPTION	RECOMMENDED VALUE /VEHICLE

Technical Evaluation Chairperson:

Greg Price
Program Manager, FRG
Science & Technology Directorate
Department of Homeland Security

Date

ATTACHMENT 7 Acronym List

BAA: Broad Agency Announcement

CO: Contracting Officer

DHS: Department of Homeland Security

FAR: Federal Acquisition Regulations

FRG: First Responders Group

ORD: Operational Requirements Document

R&D: Research & Development

S&T: Science & Technology Directorate

SME: Subject Matter Expert

SOO: Statement of Objectives

SSA: Source Selection Authority

TEP: Technical Evaluation Plan

TET: Technical Evaluation Team

TTA: Technical Topic Area

USC: United States Code