**CONTRACTING OFFICER’S AWARD DETERMINATION**

Issuing Office: Commander Navy Installations Command

NAF Acquisitions Branch N945

5720 Integrity Drive, Bldg 457

Millington, TN 38055

Contract#: **HDQMWR-20-X-XXXX**

Solicitation#:

Program/Project Name:

Description of Item/Services:

Contractor:

Price: Award amount: $\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Base + all option yrs amount: $\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Contract Type: FFP? Single award? Multiple award? IDIQ?

Period of Performance:

I. **Introduction Summary:**

Provide brief background information about the customers’ need, and provide background information about the services/supplies the NAFI will be receiving. Give a brief summary about what this KOAD is for. i.e: This is a sole source? Single award? Multiple award? Resulting from RFP# HDWMWR-20-R-XXXX. Proposing award HDQMWR-20-D-XXXX to

\_\_\_\_\_\_(Name of Awardee)\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ ­­­­in the amount of $\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ for the base year.

II. **PARTICULARS**:

1. Purchase Request received:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Amount: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.
2. Market Research conducted: Date, and brief explanation of findings from market research.
3. Acquisition Strategy/Acquisition Plan: Date, and result. i.e Sole Source? Compete? Multiple award? Options included? IDIQ?
4. Solicitation issued:
5. Solicitation closed:
6. Initial Proposal received: How many proposals were received?
7. Technical Evaluation started:
8. Clarifications: Name of offeror(s) and brief explanation of what item(s) needed clarification.
9. Competitive Range Determination: Brief explanation of how competitive range was determined, how many Offerors made it?
10. Preaward Notices of exclusion from competitive range sent: Date and name of offeror(s) who was notified of exclusion.
11. Negotiations/Discussions: Brief explanation of what was negotiated/discussed and the results.
12. Final Proposal Revision received: Date and name of Offerors who sent in final proposals.
13. Final Technical Evaluation: Date and brief explanation of TEB result (name of offeror(s) to award with overall rating).

III. **PRICE PROPOSAL**:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **BASE YEAR – POP XX MONTH YEAR – XX MONTH YEAR** | | | | | |
| CLIN | Description | Qty | Unit | Proposed Unit Price | Proposed Total Price |
| 0001 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0002 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0003 |  |  |  |  |  |

Base Year & All Option Years Total Estimated Price $ \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**IV. PRICE ANALYSIS**

A price analysis was completed to determine the contractor’s price as fair and reasonable by \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_(i.e comparing historical data, competition, etc).

The chart below is the cost comparison between the Independent Government Cost Estimate (IGCE) and the Proposal. The overall cost over/under the independent government cost estimate is $\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. The total cost is \_\_\_\_% over/under the estimate. The Contracting Officer determines the difference to be acceptable.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **YEARS** | **IGCE** | **PROPOSAL** | **DIFFERENCE** | **% DIFF** |
| Base |  |  |  |  |
| Option Year 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Option Year 2 |  |  |  |  |
| Option Year 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Option Year 4 |  |  |  |  |
| Total Estimate |  |  |  |  |

**V. TECHNICAL AND PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION:**

**TECHNICAL EVALUATION SUMMARY**

The source selected may not be the lowest price, but will be the most advantageous to the NAFI, price and other factors considered, presenting the best overall value to the NAFI. This was determined by comparing differences in the value of the non-price features with differences in price to the NAFI.

The contract resulting from this solicitation will be awarded to the responsible offeror whose offer, conforming to the solicitation, is the most advantageous to the NAFI, price and non-price factors considered presenting the best overall value to the NAFI. The following non-price factors along with price was used to evaluate offers. Factors were listed in descending order of importance. Any offer that resulted in a rating of unacceptable for Factor 1 did not receive further consideration for award.

Order of Importance: The order of relative importance for the evaluation factors was established as follows:

1. Factors 1 and 2 are of equal importance and when combined, are significantly more important than Factor 3.

The non-price factors, when combined, are significantly more important than price.

Evaluation Criteria:

FACTOR 1: TECHNICAL

FACTOR 2: KEY PERSONNEL

FACTOR 3: PAST PERFORMANCE

**PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION SUMMARY:**

Provide a brief summary of the KO’s evaluation and how the Rating was determined.

**SUMMARY OF RATINGS:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **OFFEROR** | **Overall Technical Rating**  **(Factor 1)** | **Overall Technical Rating**  **(Factor 2)** | **Past Performance**  **(Factor 3)** |
|  | **Acceptable** | **Excellent** | **Excellent** |
|  | **Acceptable** | **Good** | **Unknown/Neutral** |
|  | **Marginal** | **Excellent** | **Excellent** |
|  | **Good** | **Good** | **Good** |
|  | **Acceptable** | **Good** | **Good** |

**VI. MISC:**

1. SAM was conducted on:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ results: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**VII. BASIS OF AWARD/RECOMMENDATION:**

Explain the basis of award: trade-off? Lowest price? What was the recommendation of the TEB and why?

**VIII: CONCLUSION:**

Based on the information cited above, the Contracting Officer has determined that \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ is responsible and its offers conforms to the solicitation and is the most advantageous to the NAFI, price is considered fair and reasonable and non-price factors were considered presenting the best overall value to the NAFI. It is the best interest of the NAFI to award contract number HDQMWR-20-X-XXXX in the amount of $\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.

Contracting Officer