



# Technical Evaluation Committee Process Instruction Guide and Template

A Mandatory Reference for ADS Chapter 300

New Edition Date: 04/02/2013  
Responsible Office: M  
File Name: 300mag\_040213



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

# TECHNICAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEMBER GUIDE AND TEMPLATE

**BUREAU FOR MANAGEMENT (M)**  
OFFICE OF ACQUISITIONS AND ASSISTANCE  
TEMPLATES SERIES

**MAY 2012**

## Introduction

The purpose of the guidance is to convey to you responsibilities of individuals serving as members of a technical evaluation committee. The technical evaluation process is an analysis of each offeror's proposal with respect to the standards and criteria established in the source selection plan and as set forth in the solicitation. The Technical Evaluation Committee's (TEC) objective is to evaluate each offeror's technical proposal against the evaluation factors established in the solicitation to determine if the offeror is able to perform the tasks that are outlined in the Statement of Work (SOW). It is imperative that each member of the TEC become familiar with the solicitation and all supporting documents referenced in the solicitation before looking at the offeror's technical proposal. Each evaluator independently scores/rates each technical proposal and documents in narrative the offeror's strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses and deficiencies as it relates to the evaluation factors and sub-factors outlined in the solicitation.

In order to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the evaluation process you should also review the following guidance: *Source Selection Plan Guidance and Template, Technical Evaluation Committee Chairperson Guide and Template, Technical Evaluation Committee Process Instruction Guide and Template, Cost Realism Key Components Guidance and Checklist and the Harmonization Guidance Section C (SOW) – to - Section L and M.*

## Audience

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agreement Officer                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Agreement Officer's Technical Representative              |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Contracting Officer            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Contracting Officer's Technical Representative |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Contract Specialist            | <input type="checkbox"/> Program Analyst/Activity Manager                          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agreement Specialist                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Budget Officer  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Technical Evaluation Committee |  |

## Acronyms

CO	Contracting Officer
COR	Contracting Officer Representative
CRB	Contract Review Board
CR	Competitive Range
CTO	Cognizant Technical Office
FAR	Federal Acquisition Regulation
GC	Office of the General Counsel

IQC	Indefinite Quantity Contract
OAA	Office of Acquisition and Assistance
OSDBU	Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization
RFP	Request for Proposal
SSA	Source Selection Authority
SSP	Source Selection Plan
TEC	Technical Evaluation Committee

## **Key Roles and Responsibilities**

**Source Selection Authority (SSA)** is the individual designated to make the best-value decision. The SSA is the CO unless another individual has been designated in writing by the appropriate authority. The CO decision shall be based on a comparative assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria in the solicitation. While the CO may use reports and analyses prepared by others, the source selection decision shall represent the CO's independent judgment.

**Contracting Officer (CO)** is responsible for coordinating with the Activity Manager to define the acquisition requirements, entering into, administering, and terminating USAID-direct contracts in accordance with the limitations of their delegated authority, policy directives, and required procedures.

**Technical Evaluation Committee (TEC)** Chairperson is responsible for the overall management of the TEC, can also be an evaluator, and act as the TEC's interface to the CO. The TEC chairperson is responsible for ensuring the adequacy of documentation and the team's evaluation of the proposals received.

**Contracting Officer's Representative (COR)** is designated by the Contracting Officer, and is responsible for the technical oversight and administration of the activity during contract performance.

**Contract Review Board (CRB)** is often comprised of Contracting Officers, members from Evaluation and Policy offices and when required, a representative of General Counsel. The CRB is responsible for reviewing documentation for acquisition actions (pre-solicitation, competitive range determination, and pre-award) that are expected to exceed \$25M. This includes basic Indefinite Quantity Contracts (IQCs) with the total estimated ceiling expected to exceed \$25M for single or multiple awards.

**General Counsel (GC)** is responsible for advising the CO and TEC on legal issues relating to the source selection process.

## **Definitions**

Below are definitions of terms used to describe different elements in the offerors proposals. These definitions are drawn from the FAR Part 15. Pay careful attention to the distinctions, e.g., a *weakness* is *not required* to be shared during discussions with offerors, however, significant weaknesses are *required* to be shared.

<b>Significant Strengths</b>	An outstanding, or exceptional aspect of an Offeror’s proposal that has merit and exceeds the specified performance or capability requirements in a way beneficial to the USAID, and either will be included in the contract or is inherent in the Offeror’s process and greatly increases the likelihood of successful performance.
<b>Strengths:</b>	An aspect of the proposal that increases the likelihood of successful contract performance.
<b>Clarification:</b>	Limited exchanges between the Government and Offerors that may occur when award without discussions is contemplated. Offeror may be given the opportunity to clarify certain aspects of the proposal (e.g., the relevance of an Offeror’s past performance information and adverse past performance information to which the Offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond) or to resolve minor or clerical errors. Clarification does not give the Offeror an opportunity to revise or modify its proposal, except to the extent that corrections of apparent clerical mistakes result in a revision. Clarifications do not require “discussions” or submission of another proposal. The Contracting Officer controls all clarifications and discussions with the Offerors.
<b>Deficiency:</b>	A material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.
<b>Deviation:</b>	An Offeror’s proposal implies or specifically offers a deviation below specified criteria. The Offeror may or may not have called the deviation to the Government's attention. The technical reviewers will identify deviations. The contract normally can't be awarded with deviations. A deviation is also known as a material deficiency.
<b>Discussions:</b>	Exchanges between the Government and offerors for the purpose of identifying to the offeror’s significant weaknesses, deficiencies, and other aspects of the proposal that could, in the opinion of the contracting officer, be altered or explained to enhance materially the proposal's potential for award.

<b>Weakness:</b>	A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. A SIGNIFICANT WEAKNESS is a flaw in the proposal that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. All significant weaknesses discovered will be identified to the Offeror during discussions, if conducted, and in any debriefing after award has been made. The Contracting Officer may not award a contract to any Offeror who fails to correct significant weaknesses that are deemed essential.

## Guidance

The TEC Members may be called upon, as required by the Chairman, to support any or all of the following source selection phases: (1) Evaluation; (3) Consensus; (4) Report; and (5) Debriefing. All TEC members are required to be fully engaged and available through the entire process.

The CO convenes a Technical Evaluation “Kickoff” meeting with the TEC. The purpose of this meeting is to provide an overview at the beginning of the principles that when followed maintain the integrity of the evaluation process. The Contracting Officer will ensure that the TEC Chairperson and his team have signed and dated procurement integrity document (Table 6). These documents must be executed prior to any member of the TEC receiving access to the proposal materials.

Below is a description of the TEC responsibilities during the evaluation and consensus scoring phase of the process.

### A. **Evaluation Phase** – the Member:

- a. Review solicitation documentation. In this step make sure you have thoroughly read the SOW, RFP, SSP, and all pertinent supporting documents. Become familiar with referenced specifications contained within the SOW.
- b. Review all proposals. In the initial evaluation, read the material completely for content. Take notes, make comments, or prepare comments for discussion with other members of the TEC. Do not score/rate at this point. Do not write on any proposal (i.e. take notes on the margins of proposal pages.)
- c. Score/Rate proposals. Score/rate proposals based on the evaluation factors established in the solicitation, noting the strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses and deficiencies of each offeror.
  - For this initial evaluation proposals must be evaluated solely on the evaluation factors and not against other offeror’s proposals. Only material

presented within the written proposals or oral presentations (when required) can be considered in the evaluation. A TEC member's prior experience with the product and/or offeror cannot be considered in the rating of proposals. TEC members should use the Evaluator Technical Evaluation Findings form (Table 2). For each rating, write on the evaluation from your rationale for giving the rating. First impressions or ideas that have not been carefully thought through should not be part of the evaluation record.

If the TEC member is unsure of certain items or issues included in the offeror's proposal, it may be possible to request clarification from the offeror. The request must be reviewed by the TEC Chairperson and approved by the CO. The CO is the only one permitted to have contact with an offeror. Requests for clarification will be in writing from the CO to the offeror with a written response requested. TEC members are reminded that they may NOT have contact with any of the offerors.

- TEC members should use the Clarification Request and Deficiency Report form (Table 1)..

d.

- e. : (Optional) Oral Presentation. In the event the solicitation requires the offerors to present part of their proposal in a presentation to the TEC, each TEC member will be responsible for taking notes and evaluating performance in accordance with the evaluation factors stated in the solicitation.

When the team members have completed their individual reviews the Chairperson must convene a meeting to obtain agreement on a consensus rating for each evaluation factor in each offeror's proposal when there is a large disparity in individual scores. TEC member consensus meetings may occur as often as the TEC Chairman believes is necessary, but usually they occur twice at a minimum.

## **B. Consensus Phase –**

- f. : The TEC should discuss all aspects of proposals so there is a unified understanding of the criteria and corresponding responses. Individual scores/ratings may be adjusted at this point, based on discussions – in doing so; the TEC members must discuss each of the proposals. If extremely divergent opinions exist, and it is clear that none of the evaluators have misinterpreted any aspects of the proposals, the SSA/CO must be provided a report containing both a written majority and a written minority opinion. The TEC member who has the minority opinion is required to prepare the narrative in support of the opinion.

g.

- h. Consensus scores/ratings must be supported by narratives supporting the overall rating. Narratives cannot include generalities; they must explicitly set forth strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, and deficiencies of each proposal, with specific page number and paragraph references connecting them between the solicitation and individual offeror proposal. The TEC Chairperson will consolidate the consensus findings, with support from the TEC members if requested, to include in the TEC Report.

## Report Phase

The Chairperson collects and consolidates the the ratings and narratives in TEC evaluation forms and prepares a TEC report for each of the two stages of the evaluation process. The two stages are

Stage one: TEC Report, resulting from the team's initial review, to the Contracting Officer that identifies those offerors most qualified to receive an award and those that should no longer be considered for an award this is called the competitive determination.

Stage two: TEC Report that documents final consensus scores and narratives and recommends to the SSA/CO the organization to which they want to give the award.

Each Member's narrative influence the Chairperson and the Contracting Officer (CO) in determining competitive range, i.e., those offerors with the best likelihood of receiving a contract award, and the recommended award decision. As such, clarity and precision are the keys to successfully prepared narratives. Evaluators should indicate in their narratives, as a minimum:

1. What is offered?
2. Strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, deficiencies, risks, rational for score/rating (i.e. narratives that support score/rating given).
3. References to where in the offeror's proposal the evaluator is getting the information.

**B. Debriefing Phase** – During the debriefing phase members may be called upon by the TEC Chairperson to support such activities as the development of debriefing documents, but for the most part TEC members usually have a limited role to play during this phase.



## **Tools**

Tables 1 and 2 in this document are provided as tools for the TEC to use during the evaluation process. The Chairperson can use these tools to capture the information for the technical evaluation report.

## TECHNICAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEMBER TEMPLATES

**Table 1: Clarification Request and Deficiency Report** by Offeror  
(*Sample Table 1 - Modify, add or delete items as necessary.*)

Table 1: Evaluator Clarification Request and Deficiency Report			
Project Name:		Offeror Name:	
RFP No.:	Issue Date: <a href="#">Click here to enter a date.</a>	Proposal: <a href="#">Choose an item.</a>	Rec. Date: <a href="#">Click here to enter a date.</a>
TYPE: <a href="#">Choose an item.</a>		Date: <a href="#">Click here to enter a date.</a>	
RFP Reference		Proposal Reference	
Section: <a href="#">Choose an item.</a>		Volume: <a href="#">Click here to enter text.</a>	
Page No.: <a href="#">Click here to enter text.</a>		Page No.: <a href="#">Click here to enter text.</a>	
Paragraph No.: <a href="#">Click here to enter text.</a>		Paragraph No.: <a href="#">Click here to enter text.</a>	
Subject: <a href="#">Click here to enter text.</a>			
Description: <a href="#">Click here to enter text.</a>			
TYPE: <a href="#">Choose an item.</a>		Date: <a href="#">Click here to enter a date.</a>	
RFP Reference		Proposal Reference	
Section: <a href="#">Choose an item.</a>		Volume: <a href="#">Click here to enter text.</a>	
Page No.: <a href="#">Click here to enter text.</a>		Page No.: <a href="#">Click here to enter text.</a>	
Paragraph No.: <a href="#">Click here to enter text.</a>		Paragraph No.: <a href="#">Click here to enter text.</a>	
Subject: <a href="#">Click here to enter text.</a>			
Description: <a href="#">Click here to enter text.</a>			
Evaluator Initial: <a href="#">Click here to enter text.</a>	Date: <a href="#">Click here to enter a date.</a>	TEC Chair Initial: <a href="#">Click here to enter text.</a>	Date: <a href="#">Click here to enter a date.</a>

**Table 2: Evaluator Technical Evaluation Findings** by Offeror by Factor  
*(Sample Table 2 - Modify, add or delete items as necessary.)*

<b>Table 2: Evaluator Technical Evaluation Findings</b>	
<b>Offeror "n":</b> Click here to enter text.	
<b>Rating Information</b>	
<b>FACTOR "n":</b> Choose an item.	<b>OVERALL RATING:</b> Choose an item.
SubFactor "n": Click here to enter text.	Rating: Choose an item.
SubFactor "n": Click here to enter text.	Rating: Choose an item.
SubFactor "n": Click here to enter text.	Rating: Choose an item.
<b><u>RATIONAL for OVERALL RATING:</u></b> Click here to enter text.	
<b><u>STRENGTHS:</u></b> Click here to enter text.	
<b><u>SIGNIFICANT WEAKNESSES:</u></b> Click here to enter text.	
<b><u>DEFICIENCIES:</u></b> Click here to enter text.	
<b><u>RISK:</u></b> Click here to enter text.	