

GSA IPM PROGRAM RFP EVALUATION FACTORS

I. Sample Statement of Technical Evaluation Factors and Their Relative Importance

The Government will make award to the responsible offeror whose offer conforms to the solicitation and is most advantageous to the Government. For this solicitation, technical quality is significantly more important than price. Proposals will be evaluated based on the following technical evaluation factors, in accordance with the weight assigned to each. As proposals become more equal in their technical merit, their price will become more important.

Evaluation Criteria Element	Weight
• Experience/Past Performance	3.0
• Operating Plan and Staffing	3.0
• Control Procedures (Pesticides)	1.0
• Control Procedures (Non-pesticide)	1.0
• Monitoring and Recordkeeping	1.0
• In-House Training	1.0
TOTAL	10.0

Weight is multiplied by a raw score (ranging between 1 and 10) that is assigned by the evaluator.

II. Sample Scoring Guidelines for Technical Evaluation Factors

Score each factor in accordance with the following guidelines:

Adjectival Rating	Numerical Rating (Raw Score)	Description
Excellent	10	The proposal significantly exceeds, in all aspects, the standard for evaluation.
Very Good	8 - 9	The proposal exceeds, to varying degrees, one or more of the requirements identified in the standard for evaluation.
Good	5 - 7	The proposal meets all aspects of the standard for evaluation.
Fair	3 - 4	The proposal is slightly below the standard for evaluation but for the most part, complies with that standard.
Poor	1 - 2	The proposal has major shortcomings when measured against the standard for evaluation.
Unacceptable	0	One or more elements of the offeror's proposal does not meet the minimum requirements of the solicitation.

Note: The numerical rating (raw score) is multiplied by the factor's weight to arrive at the weighted score.

III. Sample Descriptions of Technical Factors, with Comments on Evaluation Standards

Factor 1: Experience/Past Performance

This factor considers the offeror's experience within the past five years. The execution of similar work as well as the quality of the work with consideration to timeliness and technical success should be noted. This factor also considers size and complexity of past projects and degree of conformance to Integrated Pest Management (IPM) principles and procedures.

Evaluation Standards: A reasonable standard would be satisfactory performance on two contracts, each of which pertained to property of roughly the same size as the current solicitation. If the solicitation involves substantially more property than most local offerors would have experience with, it would be fair to scale back the minimum square footage somewhat. A contract might be considered "similar" to the current solicitation if it included such components as:

- Pesticide application by need only
- Insecticides limited to bait formulations except for special circumstances
- Routine use of sticky traps
- All on-site service delivered by certified technicians only
- Service delivered weekly for major buildings

In addition, performance on the contracts would have to be considered at least "satisfactory", i.e., the contractor must have carried out work effectively and in accordance with all contract requirements. Unlike the other factors, evaluating past performance entails contacting references provided by offerors. The same basic questions should be asked of each reference contacted.

Factor 2: Operating Plan and Staffing

This factor considers the offeror's plans for carrying out all phases of the contract work as it pertains to scheduling work assignments, allocating work resources, and delivering emergency and special services. This factor also considers the education, experience, knowledge, and the necessary skills of the offeror's staff entomologist and each service technician or other technical personnel assigned to the contract.

Evaluation Standards: A reasonable standard might include the following items:

- Realistic service frequencies for the various facilities under contract
- A realistic plan for responding to emergency and special service calls in a timely manner
- The staff entomologist's resume reflects experience on two similar contracts meeting the same size and technical criteria as in Factor 1.
- The resumes of the proposed technicians reflect experience with "IPM" service delivery.

Factor 3: Pesticide Control Procedures

This factor considers the offeror's proposed methods for controlling pests with pesticides including specific chemical products and application equipment to be used.

Evaluation Standards: A reasonable standard might include the following items:

- Two different bait products (including at least one gel) for cockroach control
- Two different bait products for ant control
- Two different types of bait for rodent control
- Tracking powder for application to rodent burrows outside buildings
- *Not* proposing the routine use of liquid, aerosol, and dust formulations

Factor 4: Non-Pesticide Control Procedures

This factor considers the offeror's proposed methods for controlling pests without pesticides, including specific products and equipment to be used.

Evaluation Standards: A reasonable standard might include the following items:

- Two different types of flying insect trapping devices
- Two different types of rodent trapping devices
- *Not* proposing the routine use of glue boards for rodent control

Factor 5: Monitoring and Recordkeeping

This factor considers the offeror's proposed methods for monitoring and reporting pest populations and structural or sanitary conditions conducive to pest infestation. This factor also considers the method and format for recording data pertaining to monitoring, control, and pesticide application.

Evaluation Standards: A reasonable standard might include the following items:

- An emphasis on the use of sticky traps in problem areas
- A standard procedure for expert identification of trapped or collected specimens that cannot be identified by technicians in the field
- A clear and concise service report form

Factor 6: In-House Training

This factor considers the offeror's in-house program for continually developing its employees' professional skills and for keeping employees up-to-date on rapidly changing IPM procedures and technology.

- **Evaluation Standards:** A reasonable standard would be documentation of an ongoing and mandatory training program that involves service technicians on a monthly basis.

IV. Sample Rating Sheet (example is for a single Factor)

Evaluation Factor 4: Non-Pesticide Control Procedures

Proposer: _____ Date: _____

Evaluator: _____

Raw Score: _____

Adjective Rating: _____

Major Strengths: _____

Major Weaknesses: _____

Major Deficiencies: _____

V. Sample Summary Rating Sheet

Proposer: _____

Evaluator: _____

Date: _____

Evaluation Factor	Raw Score	X	Weight	=	Weighted Score
1. Experience/Past Performance		x	3.0	=	
2. Operating Plan and Staffing		x	3.0	=	
3. Pesticide Control Procedures		x	1.0	=	
4. Non-Pesticide Control Procedures		x	1.0	=	
5. Monitoring and Recordkeeping		x	1.0	=	
6. In-House Training		x	1.0	=	

TOTAL (Maximum 100 Points) = _____