DATE

MEMORANDUM FOR CONTRACTOR’S NAME

FROM:

SUBJECT: Notice of Unsuccessful Offer for Solicitation CONTRACT#, NAME OF THE REQUIREMENT

1. The Government received five proposals in response to the subject requirement. The Government evaluated proposals in accordance with the Solicitation Task Order Request for Proposals and Evaluation Criteria. As a result of this evaluation, contract CONTRACT#, has been awarded to AWARDEE #, in the amount of

**TOEP AWARD,** for a transition period, base year + # option years, and a six- month extension period.

1. AWARDEE’s NAME proposal represented the best value to the Government. In accordance with the evaluation criteria stated in the solicitation, an integrated assessment of technical and price resulted in the Government’s award decision and a trade-off for technical over price, consistent with the evaluation criteria.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **OFFEROR** | **Sub-Factor 1** | **Sub-Factor 2** | **Sub-Factor 3** | **Price** |
| **AWARDEE NAME** | Good (4.5) | Acceptable (3.7) | Acceptable (3.3) |  |
| **OFFEROR’S NAME** | Unacceptable (0) | Acceptable (3.0) | Acceptable (3.0) | Not Evaluated |

1. Your final evaluation results are provided below.

## Factor 1: Technical

Sub-Factor 1 – Mission Scenario- Unacceptable (0.0)

Criteria 1 (Score: 3.0): OFFEROR’S NAME proposal provided an adequate approach and understanding of the PWS requirements for this criteria. The proposal includes a high-level approach for integrating representative platform and characteristics into the existing AF architecture. OFFEROR’S NAME plan identifies a Department of Defense Architecture Framework (DoDAF) based enterprise engineering process (Exhibit 5). Exhibit 6 captures top-level stakeholders and integration planning research factor. The proposal captures a top-level ISR data flows and addressed exploitation at multiple operational sites. These factors meet the government’s requirements.

* Strengths: A strength captured is OFFEROR’S NAME plan to modernize interfaces while remaining backward compatible with other ISR storage capabilities. The proposed solution states that it will ensure access to data before, during and after planned system upgrades. This is a benefit to government as it is not a requirement of the PWS.
* Weaknesses: Exhibit 4 in the proposal provides a top-level ISR data flow architecture; however, it lacks the in-depth technical details of a representative ISR architecture or associated components. Another

weakness noted is the lack of technical details of encrypting data streams between networks. This is a function that occurs daily and a limited understanding of ISR platform architecture and associated components increases new sensor integration timeframes and ability to meet security policy requirements; directly affecting the ability to meet operational timelines. This increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

* Deficiencies: None

Criteria 2 (Score: ):

* Strengths:
* Weaknesses:
* Deficiencies:

Sub-Factor 2 – (Subfactor Title) – Acceptable/Unacceptable (Score)

Criteria 1 (Score: ):

* Strengths:
* Weaknesses:
* Deficiencies:

Criteria 2 (Score: ):

* Strengths:
* Weaknesses:
* Deficiencies:

Criteria 3 (Score: ):

* Strengths:
* Weaknesses:
* Deficiencies:

## Factor 2 – Cost/Price:

1. The information provided in this letter is all of the information the Government can provide in a post- award debriefing as it encompasses the entire evaluation of your proposal. If you would like an oral post-award debriefing, please confirm the request in writing or through emailto this office IAW FAR15.506 (a) (1). As an unsuccessful offeror, we will cover all areas allowed in FAR 15.505 and 15.506. Please note that in accordance with FAR 15.506(e), “The debriefing shall not include point-by-point comparisons of the debriefed offeror’s proposal with those of other offerors. Moreover, the debriefing shall not reveal any information prohibited for disclosure by 24.202 or exempt from release under the Freedom of Information Act.”
2. The time and effort expended in preparing this proposal are greatly appreciated. While your proposal was not selected for award under this requirement, future proposals will be requested for new requirements as they arise. If you have any questions or desire additional information, please contact me at CO’S TELEPHONE#.

CO’S SIGNATURE