

## 24. TEPMEMB

SUBJECT: Evaluation of Proposals Received in Response to ARS  
Solicitation \_\_\_\_\_  
For (Brief Description Title) \_\_\_\_\_

TO: \_\_\_\_\_  
Member, Technical Evaluation Panel

FROM: \_\_\_\_\_  
Contracting Officer

In every procurement it is necessary that a period of time be allotted by contracts personnel to brief the Technical Evaluation Panel (TEP) on their responsibilities when evaluating the relative strengths and weaknesses of an offerors proposal. The purpose of the briefing is to familiarize panel members with the acceptable method of reviewing proposals in order to insure that each proposal is evaluated fairly against the criteria set forth in the solicitation.

Panel members are cautioned that they are prohibited from discussing any Source Selection Sensitive information with anyone except other panel members, the assigned Contract Specialist, or the Contracting Officer.

Source Selection Sensitive information includes:

- A. Number of proposals received;
- B. Names of Offerors;
- C. Technical content of any proposals;
- D. Relative standing of any offer; and
- E. Cost information.

Members are also reminded of their responsibilities under the Procurement Integrity Provisions. Anyone interfering with the evaluation procedures either by (1) attempting to influence the decision of a panel member; or (2) by requesting information about an offeror's technical approach, strengths or weaknesses, score or relative standing must be immediately reported to the Contracting Officer. It is imperative that panel members avoid even the appearance of impropriety. Divulging information during the evaluation the selection or negotiation phase of the procurement to persons other than those described above could jeopardize any resultant award.

In no event during the course of the evaluation, shall the panel members have any discussions with offerors concerning any of the proposals received, prices, cost ranges or the Government Cost Estimate. Discussions with offerors relative to any aspect of the procurement shall be held only by or with the Contracting Officer or his/her representative.

The following procedures must be followed by each panel member when evaluating an offerors proposal:

### **TECHNICAL REVIEW**

1. Be objective. Your review must be based strictly on the contents of the solicitation and the offerors proposal in response to that solicitation.
2. Read the solicitation and each criteria and its relative weight before reviewing any proposal. This will help to focus on the significant matters which offerors should address in their technical proposal. Review each proposal against the evaluation criteria set forth in the solicitation to determine the offerors strengths and weaknesses.
3. When writing strengths and weaknesses do not use qualifying statements (e.g. "it appears that the offeror understands the scope of work"), be definitive! Stress in narrative form each strength and weakness and reference the page and paragraph number that supports your comments. **NOTE: THE NARRATIVES FORM THE BASIS FOR LATER DEBRIEFINGS AND THE CONTENTS ARE SUBJECT TO PROTESTS AND DISCLOSURE UNDER COURT DISCOVERY PROCEEDINGS.**
4. Proposals must be reviewed independently. Do not compare proposals. Each must be evaluated independently against the solicitation evaluation criteria, **NOT** against each other. **DO NOT** collaborate with other panel members during your individual review. Your comments and assigned scores must reflect your independent analysis of the proposal.
5. After independently reviewing each proposal against the evaluation criteria and clearly identifying the strengths and weaknesses, panel members shall assign a point score they feel appropriately reflects the proposed submission. The scores must reflect a relationship to the number of evaluation points assigned to each of the specific criteria and correlates to your written comments.
6. Sign the cover sheet of each offeror's score sheets set. Your signature on the score sheet is a certification that you have:
  - A. Personally reviewed the technical proposal, including all attachments, exhibits, samples, etc.
  - B. Compared the proposals to the specific evaluation criteria and **NOT** to each other.

- C. Independently determined the strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies of the offerors proposal and assigned an appropriate point score.
  - D. **NOT** discussed the proposals with anyone other than other panel members, the TEP chairperson, the Contract Specialist, or the Contracting Officer.
7. After individual proposals have been initially reviewed and the score sheets completed, the entire panel will meet to discuss all individual narratives. If, during the full panel discussions, information is presented which a panel member missed, the panel member shall make a note of the situation on their individual score sheet. The original score shall be crossed out once so it is still legible and the element rescored by the individual. The situation, original TEP member element score and revised score shall also be noted on the TEP report. **REMEMBER, THE SCORE SHEET IS A PART OF THE OFFICIAL CONTRACT FILE AND ERASURES OR OBLITERATED ENTRIES ARE NOT ACCEPTABLE. ANY CHANGES MUST BE EXPLAINED.**
  8. Determine whether or not individual offerors are technically acceptable. Do not use "cut-off" scores. The determination of the appropriate category, technically acceptable or unacceptable, must be made solely on the basis of the documented strengths and weaknesses of the proposal versus the evaluation criteria in the solicitation.
  9. If you find areas which are unclear you should immediately draft the necessary questions for the offeror. These questions should be provided in writing to the Chairperson for forwarding to the Contracting Officer. The Contracting Officer will review the questions to insure that they are proper and then transmit them to the offerors who are determined technically acceptable.
  10. Inherent in any panels purpose is the resolution of differences of opinion and the reaching of a mutually agreeable position. However, there are instances where all panel members cannot agree. In such cases, panel members should submit a minority report to the Chairperson specifying his/her reasoning for disagreement. Minority reports must be included in the Chairperson's summary report to the Contracting Officer.

### **BUSINESS REVIEW**

1. After the technical evaluation and final technical scoring have been accomplished and accepted by the Contracting Officer, the panel may be asked to assist the TEP Chairperson to review the business proposals of those offerors determined to be technically acceptable.

The review of the business proposal should include an overall comparison of the technical and business proposal for comparability, i.e. is the business proposal an appropriate extension of the technical proposal? If applicable, do the categories of labor, materials, supplies,

equipment, travel, etc., correlate?

The business evaluation report to be completed by the panel (if required) must also include specific comments on the following factors:

- A. The reasonableness of the number of direct, subcontract, and consultant labor hours proposed.
- B. The appropriateness of the direct, subcontract, and consultant categories proposed.
- C. The need for the types and quantities of materials, supplies, and equipment. If appropriate, comment on whether rent or purchase is more beneficial to the Government.
- D. Whether the proposed travel and per diem is reasonable for the effort required and successful performance of the contract.

### **SUBSEQUENT REQUIREMENTS**

1. You may be called upon to participate in additional meetings, reviewing offerors responses, negotiations, etc.
2. You will review offeror's final proposals, rescore as necessary and provide input for the TEP Chairperson's final summary and recommendation. Procedures for rescoring and documenting are consistent with requirements for the initial review.

Please remember, the Contract staff will make themselves available for any advice or guidance. If you have any questions, please call \_\_\_\_\_ at \_\_\_\_\_ who is the Contract Specialist for this procurement.

### **ACKNOWLEDGMENT:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
TEP Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

No.):\_\_/\_\_/2000

revised: 11/03/2000  
(w:\share\ppdsop.dir\tepmemb.wpd)