|  |
| --- |
| Informational Guidance |

**IG5315.305   
Proposal Evaluation**

Proposal Analysis Report (PAR)

# January 2008

### Table of Contents

### 1. [Why Use this Guide?](#p1)

a. [What this Guide will answer?](#p1a)

b. [What’s in this Guide/Template?](#p1b)

c. [Keeping current with policy changes.](#p1c)

2. [Proposal Analysis Report (PAR)](#p2)

a. [What is a PAR?](#p2a)

b. [What is the purpose of a PAR?](#p2b)

c. [When is it required?](#p2c)

d. [Who writes the PAR?](#p2d)

e. [Who reviews it?](#p2e)

f. [Who approves it?](#p2f)

g. [Can the PAR be combined with the PCM and/or the PMN?](#p2g)

h. [How does the PAR differ from the Decision Briefing?](#p2h)

i. [How does the PAR relate to the Source Selection Decision document (SSDD)?](#p2i)

j. [What is the PAR general format and content?](#p2j)

Appendix A: [PAR Template](#p31)

Appendix B: [PAR and PCM Template](#p32)

Appendix C: [PAR Outline](#p41)

**1. Why Use this Guide?**

This guide and template are designed to assist Source Selection Evaluation Teams (SSET) and Source Selection Advisory Councils (SSAC) in preparing a Proposal Analysis Report (PAR) for the Source Selection Authority (SSA). There is no requirement to follow this format. It is one approach that you can use. You can, and should, tailor the content of your PAR to meet the requirements of your program and the needs of your SSA. How much detail to include in each section depends on several things, most notably the complexity of the proposals and the SSA’s preferences. The key point is to provide the SSA with sufficient information to compare offerors and make an award decision and create an administrative record of the source selection. Discussing the SSA’s expectations ahead of time can avoid frustration and rework later.

Current guidance for preparing a PAR is in [AFFARS 5315.305](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/af_afmc/affars/5315.htm) and [MP5315.3](https://cs.eis.af.mil/airforcecontracting/knowledge_center/Pages/5315-main.aspx#MP). This PAR guide supplements the AFFARS and MP5315.3, providing additional information on what to document in the PAR to effectively convey the results of the SSET evaluation to the SSA. The PAR includes the results of final discussions, Final Proposal Revisions (FPR), other considerations from the SSET, as well as a source selection recommendation from the SSET or SSAC (if used) and inputs from your legal counsel. The SSET should have the PAR substantially completed at, or prior to, the decision briefing. The finalized PAR will be presented to the SSA prior to the SSA signing the Source Selection Decision Document.

**a. What this Guide will Answer?** This guide will answer such questions as:

What’s the purpose of a PAR?  
When is it required?   
Who writes it?   
Who reviews it?   
Who approves it?

Can the PAR be combined with the Price Competition Memorandum (PCM) and/or Price Negotiation Memorandum (PNM)?  
How does the PAR relate to source selection decision briefings?   
How does the PAR relate to the Source Selection Decision Document (SSDD)?   
What is the PAR’s general format and content?

**b. What's in this Guide/Template?**

This is a practical guide to help you prepare a PAR. [MP5315.3](https://cs.eis.af.mil/airforcecontracting/knowledge_center/Pages/5315-main.aspx#MP), paragraph 6.3.1, requires a PAR for all source selections > $100 million or as required by the SSA. Each source selection is unique and many techniques are used for evaluation. However, for all source selections where a PAR is required, you must complete a narrative assessment of the evaluation at the factor or subfactor level, whichever applies. The assessment must be precise and identify the Mission Capability (Technical and Risk), Cost/Price Risk (if used), Performance Confidence Assessment, and Cost/Price evaluation for all offerors in the competitive range. This guide will walk you through the process to ensure you properly document your evaluation results and provide a comparative analysis of offerors.

**c. Keeping Current with Policy Changes**

As you prepare to write your PAR, ongoing policy changes may affect the document content and approval requirements described in this guide. Make sure you check for any updates to FAR, DFARS, AFFARS, or MP5315.3 that might affect your acquisition. Also, see your Acquisition Center of Excellence (ACE) representative, legal counsel, or Contracting Policy/Clearance office for information on current updates, additional information, or assistance.

**2. Proposal Analysis Report (PAR)**

**a. What is a PAR?**

The PAR is the official record of the source selection evaluation. It includes a summary of each proposal, the SSET’s integrated assessment of Mission Capability (Technical and Risk), Cost/Price Risk (if used), Past Performance, Cost or Price, a comparative analysis, and a source selection recommendation for the SSA’s consideration (if applicable, any minority opinion).

**b. What is the Purpose of a PAR?**

The PAR documents the results of the SSET evaluation and provides a comparative analysis of all competitive offers. The PAR includes the integrated assessment of all evaluation factors (Mission Capability (Technical and Risk Ratings), Cost/Price Risk (if required) Past Performance, and Cost or Price).

**c. When is it Required?**

The PAR is required for acquisitions:

> $100M, or

As required by the SSA:

> $10M to $100M SSET can recommend using a PAR or a Simplified Source Selection Report (SSSR). The SSA will select the method appropriate for the acquisition.

**d. Who Writes the PAR?**

Normally, the chairperson of the SSET writes the PAR in conjunction with the Contracting Officer. However, if your source selection organization includes a SSAC, the SSA may assign the responsibility to write the comparative analysis portion of the PAR to the SSAC. A good practice is to have the SSAC chairperson and the SSET chairperson determine who should write each portion of the PAR and make a recommendation to the SSA.

**e. Who Reviews it?**

At a minimum, the Contracting Officer, your ACE source selection representative, and legal counsel should review the PAR before it goes to the SSA.

**f. Who Approves it?**

The SSET chairperson signs the PAR. If your source selection organization includes a SSAC, the SSAC chairperson will also approve the PAR.

**g. Can the PAR be combined with the Price Competition Memorandum (PCM) and/or Price Negotiation Memorandum (PNM)?**

(1) The PCM is an AFMC term of art used to distinguish between competitive and sole source situation documentation. It is a form of PNM documentation. The term PCM is not codified or defined in any of the FAR supplements. Its prescribed use is limited to AFMC organizations. There is no restriction on using the PAR to also satisfy the PCM or PNM for other commands requirements. Regardless of the type of memorandum used, if you combine the pricing memorandum with the PAR, the PAR must include sufficient detail so as to reflect essential summary information, market research results, the actual price or cost analysis, and negotiated positions that constitute price fair and reasonableness. The PAR/PCM should be a clear, complete and accurate documentation of the source selection and cover all parts of the AFMC PCM checklist, if applicable. The final PAR/PCM will be a permanent part of the source selection file, while the contract file will contain a memorandum referencing the location of the PAR/PCM.

(2) The PAR template below shows, in blue text, the additional information required if the PAR is combined with the PCM/PNM. The price/cost analyst then becomes a key player in writing and reviewing the PAR. The Contracting Officer must sign the document since it will include the determinations of price reasonableness and adequate price competition.

**h. How does the PAR differ from the Decision Briefing?**

(1) [FAR 15.308](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/15.htm) requires a source selection decision based on a comparative assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria in the solicitation. The SSET, and SSAC if applicable, provide this comparative assessment. One method of providing this comparative assessment is through the source selection decision briefings. [MP5315.3](https://cs.eis.af.mil/airforcecontracting/knowledge_center/Pages/5315-main.aspx#MP), paragraph 6.1, requires a decision briefing when the SSA is other than the Contracting Officer. There are two opportunities for decision briefings. The first chance for a decision briefing is after initial evaluations are complete. At that time the SSET present the results of their evaluation to the SSA and recommends either establishment of a competitive range and entry into discussions or award without discussions. If the SSA chooses to authorize discussions instead of awarding without discussions, the second decision brief will take place after completion of discussions, FPRs, and final evaluation of proposals.

(2) The initial briefing to the SSA provides the complete results of the SSET’s initial evaluation of all proposals including a comparative assessment of ratings for all offerors against all evaluation criteria. Based on this assessment, the SSET can recommend that the SSA establish a competitive range to eliminate some offerors from the competition, approve the release of Evaluation Notices (EN), and authorize discussions with offerors remaining in the competitive range. If possible, based on the initial assessment, the SSET has the alternative of recommending an award without discussions.

(3) If the SSA authorizes discussions, the final briefing presents the SSET’s final evaluation results based on discussions and evaluation of FPRs submitted by offerors in the competitive range. The final briefing documents the evaluation through a comparative assessment of the ratings of all offerors in the competitive range against the evaluation criteria. At this time, the SSAC (if used) or the SSET presents a source selection recommendation for the SSA’s consideration. The SSA makes an award decision based on this comparative assessment.

(4) The PAR includes a comparative assessment, as mentioned above, of all proposals against the solicitation evaluation criteria. The main difference between the PAR and the decision briefings is that the PAR is in narrative format with the opportunity for a more detailed, comprehensive analysis of each proposal. The decision briefings provide the assessment in an abbreviated, bullet format on briefing charts. Notes on the briefing charts supplement the bullets, but usually not in great detail. As a result, the PAR is very important because of the detailed evaluation narrative it provides to the SSA.

**i. How does the PAR relate to the Source Selection Decision Document (SSDD)?**

The PAR documents the results of the SSET evaluation and provides the comparative analysis of competitive offers and includes the integrated assessment of the evaluation factors, as well as the SSAC’s or SSET’s source selection recommendation. The SSDD is a summary supporting the SSA’s best value decision based on the evaluation factors in the RFP. The SSDD reflects the SSA’s integrated assessment and decision. The SSDD clearly explains the decision and documents the reasoning used by the SSA to reach a decision.

**j. What is the PAR general format and content?**

(1) The following template shows the recommended format and content of the PAR along with a Table of Contents. In Part 3 “Evaluation Results”, this format addresses the evaluation of each offeror’s complete proposal before going on to the next offeror.

(2) Another option is to address the evaluation results by Factor [i.e., Mission Capability (Technical Rating and Risk Rating) for all offerors, Cost/Price Risk (if used) for all offerors, Performance Confidence Assessment for all offerors, and Cost/Price for all offerors]. Appendix A to this guide is an outline of a PAR in that format, by Factor.

(3) Use the format that your SSA prefers. To help determine which format better suits your needs, compare the Table of Contents of the Template to Appendix A.

(4) The **blue** text provides the additional information required for a combined PAR/PCM (or PAR/PNM).

APPENDIX A: TEMPLATES

PROPOSAL ANALYSIS REPORT
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**1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1 Discussion of Requirement   
1.2 Source Selection Procedures   
1.3 Evaluation Criteria   
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1.5 Past Performance   
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**2. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSALS**

2.1 *(Insert Name of Offeror A)*   
2.1.1 Key Mission Capability Features   
2.1.2 Key Contract Features
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2.2.1 Key Mission Capability Features   
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*Repeat as necessary for each offeror*

**3. EVALUATION RESULTS**

3.1 *(Insert Name of Offeror A)*

**3.1.1 MISSION CAPABILITY (TECHNICAL AND RISK RATINGS) FACTOR** *(Offeror A)*

3.1.1.1 Subfactor 1 – *(Insert subfactor title)*   
Strengths:   
Uncertainties:   
Deficiencies:   
Weaknesses:   
Risk:   
3.1.1.2 Subfactor 2 – *(Insert subfactor title)*   
Strengths:

Uncertainties:   
Deficiencies:   
Weaknesses:   
Risk:   
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Risk:
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3.1.2.1 Summary of Estimates/Tools/Models Used

3.1.2.2 Government MPCC

3.1.2.3 Offeror MPCC

3.1.2.4 Summary

**3.1.3 PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR *(Offeror A)***3.1.3.1 Data Gathered   
3.1.3.2 Programs/Contracts Evaluated   
3.1.3.3 Performance Confidence Assessment (Offeror A)   
Strong Points, Positive Performance   
Weak Points, Negative Performance   
3.1.3.4 Summary

**3.1.4 COST/PRICE *(Offeror A)***

3.1.4.1 Summary of Proposed and Evaluated Cost/Price   
3.1.4.2 Other Government Costs (OGC)   
3.1.4.3 Identified Risk   
3.1.4.4 Summary

3.2 *(Insert Name of Offeror B)*

**3.2.1 MISSION CAPABILITY (TECHNICAL AND RISK RATINGS) FACTOR** *(Offeror B)*

3.2.1.1 Subfactor 1 – *(Insert subfactor title)*   
Strengths:   
Uncertainties:   
Deficiencies:   
Weaknesses:   
Risk:   
3.2.1.2 Subfactor 2 – *(Insert subfactor title)*   
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Uncertainties:   
Deficiencies:   
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3.2.4.4 Summary
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4.2.3 Summary of Contractor MPCC for each Offeror

4.2.3 Summary of Identified Risks (Cost and Schedule) for each Offeror

4.2.4 Summary

**4.3 PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR**

**4.4 COST OR PRICE FACTOR**4.4.1 Summary of Proposed and Evaluated Cost/Price for Each Offeror   
4.4.2 Summary of Other Government Costs (OGC) for Each Offeror(Not Applicable when Cost/Price Risk is used)   
4.4.3 Summary of Identified Schedule Risk for Each Offeror (Not Applicable when Cost/Price Risk is used)   
   
4.4.4 Summary   
4.4.5 Adequate Price Competition Determination

**4.5 SOURCE SELECTION RECOMMENDATION**
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## APPENDIX B: TEMPLATE

(Program Title)

PROPOSAL ANALYSIS REPORT (PAR)   
AND PRICE COMPETITION MEMORANDUM

Pricing Case No. xxx

**1. INTRODUCTION**.

**1.1 Discussion of Requirement**

*Describe your requirement, and include references to the Program Management Directive (PMD), Capability Development Document (CDD), Capability Production Document (CPD), specification, drawing number, part number, description of services or other requirements documentation as applicable.*

*Describe any outside influences or time pressures that may have affected the source selection such as, procurement priority, funding limitations, and so forth. Discuss and quantify, if possible, the impact of direction given by Congress, other agencies or higher level officials. Briefly summarize the results of any required market research.*

**1.2 Source Selection Procedures**

The SSET conducted this source selection in accordance with (IAW) Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Part (*insert 12 or 15*); Air Force FAR Supplement (AFFARS) Subpart 5315.3, “Source Selection”; Subpart 5315.5, “Pre-Award, Award, and Post-Award Notifications, Protest, and Mistakes”; Air Force Mandatory Procedures (MP) 5315.3 “Source Selection”; and the *(insert Program Title)* Source Selection Plan (SSP) *(insert date)*, and the Request for Proposal (RFP), dated *(insert date).*

*(Provide an overview of your evaluation process. Discuss significant events such as proposal receipt, Evaluation Briefings, Evaluation Notices (ENs), discussions, Requests for Final Proposal Revisions, Final Proposal Receipt, etc.)*

**1.3 Evaluation Criteria**

The SSA approved the basis for contract award, evaluation factors, and scope of evaluation by approving the SSP. We provided the same basis for contract award, evaluation factors and scope of evaluation to offerors in the RFP. The factors and subfactors used to perform the evaluation were: *(Must be tailored for your source selection. List factors and subfactors in order of relative importance)*

Factor: Mission Capability (Technical and Risk Ratings) *(Maximum of six subfactors)*   
Subfactor 1: *(Insert Subfactor title)*  
Subfactor 2: *(Insert Subfactor title)*  
Subfactor 3: *(Insert Subfactor title)*  
Subfactor 4: *(Insert Subfactor title)*  
Subfactor 5: *(Insert Subfactor title)*  
Subfactor 6: *(Insert Subfactor title)*  
Factor: Cost/Price Risk (If required)   
Factor: Past Performance   
Factor: Cost or Price

*(Describe relative importance of factors and subfactors. IAW FAR 15.304(e), include a statement about the relative importance of cost/price in comparison to all other evaluation factors and be sure to discuss in the evaluation narrative the rating distinctions caused by the relative order of importance of the evaluation criteria)*

**1.4 Cost/Price Risk (If Used)**

For programs requiring a most probable cost/price evaluation (mandatory for ACAT SDD acquisitions utilizing an MPC), the Source Selection Evaluation team must describe the components that make up the aggregate government most probable cost. The cost/price risk evaluation assesses the degree to which an offerors’ cost proposal for the contract line items to be included in the intended contract and associated options, if evaluated, compares with the government MPC for the same items. Cost/Price Risk shall be rated Low, Moderate, or High using the risk descriptions found in Table 4 of [MP5315.3](https://cs.eis.af.mil/airforcecontracting/knowledge_center/Pages/5315-main.aspx#MP).

***Note:***MPC referred to in the mandatory procedures is the same thing as the probable costs referred to in the FAR. A draft program office estimate (POE) with the cost estimating data and methodology should be established before the intense and extensive up-front communications with prospective offerors. The POE may be altered due to methodologies and data acquired during these discussions. The MPC developed for each offeror may use some of the estimating techniques from the POE depending on the proposed solution when compared to the assumptions for the POE. Many times the estimating techniques will be adjusted for the offeror’s unique characteristics. The proposals are then compared and contrasted with the MPC. However, the Cost/Price risk evaluation is the result of comparing the MPC (and its associated uncertainty analysis) with each individual proposal (and its associated uncertainty analysis). The contractor will provide both their proposed cost and their analysis of uncertainty as part of their proposal. The uncertainty analysis is required for ACAT I programs and the [AF Cost and Risk Uncertainty Handbook](https://acc.dau.mil/adl/en-US/316093/file/46243/AF_Cost_Risk_and_Uncertainty_Handbook_Jul07.pdf) can be used as a guide. Uncertainty analysis is highly recommended but not required for programs smaller than ACAT I.

The offeror’s final proposed costs or prices were evaluated against the criteria of (realism as applicable). Describe the cost/price analysis techniques and or models used and appropriateness in determining cost/price realism. Describe realism analysis techniques as well as the assessment of balanced pricing and any associated risks. The contract type is (insert contract type) for (insert type of acquisition).

**1.5 Past Performance**

The Performance Confidence Assessment Group (PCAG) assessed the Government’s confidence in the offeror’s ability to fulfill solicitation requirements while meeting schedule, budget, and performance quality constraints. The assessment focused on the offeror’s demonstrated performance in specific areas, their knowledge of the program, relevancy and significance of the data, and recency of the data. The PCAG based their assessment on a subjective evaluation of available past performance information. The PCAG determined their level of confidence in each offeror’s ability to perform as proposed. The performance confidence assessment is at the factor level. (Include words describing the criteria used to determine relevancy and recency.)

The PCAG used (identify the number) sources of past performance data for the risk assessment: 1) Past and Present Performance as provided by the offerors; 2) Contractor Performance Assessment Reports (CPARS); 3) Questionnaires sent to cognizant Government Program Managers, AdministrativeContracting Officers, Procurement Contracting Officers, and contractors; and 4) *List additional sources.*

**1.6. Cost/Price**

The offeror’s final proposed costs or prices were evaluated against the criteria of (include reasonableness, realism, affordability, etc. as applicable). Describe the cost/price analysis techniques used and appropriateness in determining price reasonableness and completeness. Describe realism analysis techniques as well as the assessment of balanced pricing and any associated risks. The contract type is (insert contract type) for (insert type of acquisition).

(Address techniques used to evaluate cost or price such as Total Evaluated Price or Probable Cost and cost/risk assessment, if required). (Explain what was included in the Cost or Price Factor, such as “Production and installation at target quantities, warranty, etc. Note if Risk has been dollarized and if Other Government Costs (OGC) are included.)

The following methods were used to evaluate the proposed costs/prices: *(briefly state what method or methods were used).* The criteria that the offerors’ proposals were required to meet are: *(Incorporate evaluation criteria from RFP)*

*For programs requiring a most probable cost/price evaluation (mandatory for ACAT SDD acquisitions utilizing an MPC), many of these discussions will be included in paragraph 1.4 above.*

**1.7 Offerors**

*(Insert number of offerors)* contractors submitted proposals in response to the *(insert Program Title)* RFP. *(Insert number)* were considered in the competitive range for purposes of discussions.

The offerors and their subcontractors or teaming partners are: *(Insert name and location of each offeror and their subcontractors or teaming partners)*

**2. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSALS**

The purpose of this portion of the PAR is to provide a general description of each offeror’s proposal. It does not contain evaluation results. It documents that the SSET has read and understood the proposals.

**2.1 *(Insert Name of Offeror A)***

**2.1.1 Key Mission Capability Features**

*(Describe the key technical, performance, management, etc. features of Offeror A’s mission capability proposal)*

**2.1.2 Key Contract Features.**

*(Insert name of Offeror A)* proposes a *(insert FAR Part 12 or FAR Part 15) (insert type of contract).* The basic contract includes the following:

*(Use bullet statements to describe unique features of proposal from Offeror A, such as subcontractors or teaming arrangements, show the delivery schedule or period of performance including schedules for the basic and all options)*

**2.2 *(Insert Name of Offeror B)***

**2.2.1 Key Mission Capability Features**

*(Describe the key technical, performance, management, etc. features of Offeror B’s mission capability proposal)*

**2.2.2 Key Contract Features**

*(Insert name of Offeror B)* proposes a *(insert FAR Part 12 or FAR Part 15) (insert type of contract).* The basic contract includes the following:

*(Use bullet statements to describe unique features of proposal from Offeror B, such as subcontractors or teaming arrangements, show the delivery schedule or period of performance including schedules for the basic and all options)*

***Repeat as necessary for each offeror.***

**3. EVALUATION RESULTS**

**3.1 *(Insert Name of Offeror A)***

**3.1.1 MISSION CAPABILITY (TECHNICAL AND RISK RATINGS) FACTOR**

**3.1.1.1 Subfactor 1 – *(Insert subfactor title****)*

*(Insert a description of what Offeror A proposes and summarize the SSET evaluation of that proposal. Identify the color rating. Identify any strengths or deficiencies that support the color rating. Identify weaknesses and relate them to risk.)*

**Strengths:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify strengths, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 8.15)*

**Uncertainties:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify uncertainties, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 8.16)*

**Deficiencies:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify deficiencies, as defined in FAR 15.001 “Definitions”)*

**Weaknesses:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify weaknesses, as defined in FAR 15.001)*

**Risk:**

*(Insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCEPTABLE *and explain why in a summary sentence, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 5.5.1.2 and Table 2)*

**3.1.1.2 Subfactor 2 – *(Insert subfactor title****)*

*(Insert a description of what Offeror A proposes and summarize the SSET evaluation of that proposal. Identify the color rating. Identify any strengths or deficiencies that support the color rating. Identify significant weaknesses and relate them to risk.)*

**Strengths:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify strengths, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 8.15)*

**Uncertainties:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify uncertainties, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 8.16)*

**Deficiencies:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify deficiencies, as defined in FAR 15.001)*

**Weaknesses:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify weaknesses, as defined in FAR 15.001)*

**Risk:**

*(Insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCEPTABLE *and explain why in a summary sentence, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 5.5.1.2 and Table 2)*

**3.1.1.3 Subfactor 3 – *(Insert subfactor title****)*

*(Insert a description of what Offeror A proposes and summarize the SSET evaluation of that proposal. Identify the color rating. Identify any strengths or deficiencies that support the color rating. Identify significant weaknesses and relate them to risk.)*

**Strengths:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify strengths, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 8.15)*

**Uncertainties:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify uncertainties, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 8.16)*

**Deficiencies:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify deficiencies, as defined in FAR 15.001)*

**Weaknesses:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify weaknesses, as defined in FAR 15.001)*

**Risk:**

*(Insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCEPTABLE *and explain why in a summary sentence, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 5.5.1.2 and Table 2)*

**3.1.1.4 Subfactor 4 – *(Insert subfactor title****)*

*(Insert a description of what Offeror A proposes and summarize the SSET evaluation of that proposal. Identify the color rating. Identify any strengths or deficiencies that support the color rating. Identify significant weaknesses and relate them to risk.)*

**Strengths:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify strengths, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 8.15)*

**Uncertainties:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify uncertainties, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 8.16)*

**Deficiencies:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify deficiencies, as defined in FAR15.001)*

**Weaknesses:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify weaknesses, as defined in FAR 15.001)*

**Risk:**

*(Insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCEPTABLE *and explain why in a summary sentence, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 5.5.1.2 and Table 2)*

**3.1.1.5 Subfactor 5 – *(Insert subfactor title****)*

*(Insert a description of what Offeror A proposes and summarize the SSET evaluation of that proposal. Identify the color rating. Identify any strengths or deficiencies that support the color rating. Identify significant weaknesses and relate them to risk.)*

**Strengths:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify strengths, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 8.15)*

**Uncertainties:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify uncertainties, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 8.16)*

**Deficiencies:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify deficiencies, as defined in FAR 15.001)*

**Weaknesses:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify weaknesses, as defined in FAR 15.001)*

**Risk:**

*(Insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCEPTABLE *and explain why in a summary sentence, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 5.5.1.2 and Table 2)*

**3.1.1.6 Subfactor 6 – *(Insert subfactor title****)*

*(Insert a description of what Offeror A proposes and summarize the SSET evaluation of that proposal. Identify the color rating. Identify any strengths or deficiencies that support the color rating. Identify significant weaknesses and relate them to risk.)*

**Strengths:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify strengths, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 8.15)*

**Uncertainties:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify uncertainties, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 8.16)*

**Deficiencies:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify deficiencies, as defined in FAR 15.001)*

**Weaknesses:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify weaknesses, as defined in FAR 15.001)*

**Risk:**

*(Insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCEPTABLE *and explain why in a summary sentence, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 5.5.1.2 and Table 2)*

**3.1.2 COST/PRICE RISK FACTOR (IF USED) (Offeror A)**

*For programs requiring a most probable cost/price evaluation (mandatory for ACAT SDD acquisitions utilizing an MPC), the Source Selection Evaluation team must describe the components that make up the aggregate government most probable cost. The cost/price risk evaluation assesses the degree to which an offerors’ cost proposal for the contract line items to be included in the intended contract and associated options, if evaluated, compares with the government MPC for the same items. Cost/Price Risk shall be rated Low, Moderate, or High using the risk descriptions found in Table 4 of MP5315.3, paragraph 5.5.4..*

The offeror’s final proposed costs or prices were evaluated against the criteria of (realism as applicable). *Describe the cost/price analysis techniques and or models used and appropriateness in determining cost/price realism. Describe realism analysis techniques as well as the assessment of balanced pricing and any associated risks.* The contract type is (insert contract type) for (insert type of acquisition).

**3.1.3 PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR (Offeror A)**

**3.1.3.1 Data Gathered.**

*(Insert Offeror A’s Name)* proposed *(insert quantity)* relevant contracts. The PCAG team located *(insert quantity)* additional contracts of which *(insert quantity)* were relevant contracts. A total of *(insert quantity)* contracts were deemed relevant and evaluated for *(Insert Offeror A’s Name).*

The prime offeror, major subcontractors, and their respective involvement, are listed in the tables below:

Prime: *(Insert Name of Offeror A) (List that portion of the effort the prime performs)*

Subcontractors:   
*(Insert Name of Subcontractor) (List that portion of the effort this sub performs)*   
*(Insert Name of Subcontractor) (List that portion of the effort this sub performs)*

*Repeat for each major subcontractor*

**3.1.3.2 Programs/Contracts Evaluated**

The PCAG evaluated the following programs/contracts performed by *(Insert Name of Offeror A)*: *(List by title major programs/contracts performed and evaluated by the PCAG.)*

The PCAG relied upon the sources of data, described in paragraph 3.1.3.1 “Data Gathered” above, to assign performance confidence ratings for each offeror. (*Describe the evaluation process consistent with the section M evaluation criteria).* In the event adverse data was reflected in a questionnaire, the SSET through the contracting officer provided the contractor an opportunity to respond if the contractor had not previously been offered the opportunity.

The PCAG used the following considerations in assigning the performance confidence ratings to each offeror (Note: tailor these considerations for your source selection). The offeror’s overall work record; the number and severity of problems; the effectiveness of any corrective actions; and programmatics such as product similarity, complexity, contract type and phase of the program. The offerors’ consolidated confidence rating with their strong points, weak points, and supporting rationale follow:

**3.1.3.3 Performance Confidence Assessment**

*(Insert Name of Offeror A)* was assigned a performance confidence assessment of *(insert* Substantial Confidence, Satisfactory Confidence, Unknown Confidence, Limited Confidence, or No Confidence, *as appropriate). Discussions should include sources of past performance information whether from CPARS or questionnaires. For example,* the team analyzed a total of *(insert quantity for each category of)* veryrelevant, relevant or somewhat relevant contracts. Of the *(insert quantity by relevancy)* contracts evaluated, CPARs existed on *(insert quantity by relevancy)* contracts. The CPARs reflected ratings ranging from *(insert color or narrative performance rating)* to *(insert color or narrative performance rating).* Furthermore, approximately *(insert percentage)* of the CPARs reflected color ratings ranging from *(insert color or narrative performance rating)* to *(insert color or narrative performance rating)*. The remaining *(insert percentage)* of the CPARs reflected CPAR ratings of *(insert color or narrative performance rating). (Include a similar summary of the review and assessment of the questionnaires that were sent out and responses received for each category of very relevant, relevant or somewhat relevant contracts).*

**Strong Points, Positive Performance**

The PCAG identified the following positive aspects of performance:   
*(Use bullet statements to list strong points.)*

**Weak Points, Negative Performance**

The PCAG identified the following negative aspects of performance:   
*(Use bullet statements to list weak points.)*

**3.1.3.4 Summary**

Based on the information identified above, the PCAG assigned the performance confidence assessment of *(insert* Substantial Confidence, Satisfactory Confidence, Unknown Confidence, Limited Confidence, or No Confidence, *as appropriate)*. *(Explain and discuss in one or two paragraphs the significant strong and weak points, causes, and corrective action taken by the contractor)*

**3.1.4 COST/PRICE FACTOR (Offeror A)**

**3.1.4.1 Summary of Proposed and Evaluated Cost/Price**

Below is a summary of proposed and evaluated prices:   
*(Summarize proposed and evaluated costs/prices)*

A more detailed breakout of the evaluated cost/price follows:   
*(Provide detailed breakout of the type of evaluation (e.g., probable cost; probable life cycle cost) and an explanation of the quantification of cost, schedule or performance risk)*

*For programs requiring a most probable cost/price evaluation (mandatory for ACAT SDD acquisitions utilizing an MPC), many of these discussions will be included in paragraph 3.1.2 above.*

**3.1.4.2 Other Government Costs (OGC).**

*(Use only if applicable)*   
OGC was a major element of the decision criteria. The following summarizes the items covered within the OGC portions. The prices for the items were derived from current Government contracts, Government estimates, and/or stock list.

OGC consists of Government furnished products including equipment requested by each competitor as follows: *(Insert top-level bullet list of OGC, such as “GBL shipping for GFP”, “Government flight test support”, “GFE”, etc.)*

The evaluated price of the OGC is summarized as follows: *(List OGC and evaluated price)*

The major cost drivers for OGC are: *(Identify as appropriate)*

**3.1.4.3 Identified Risk**.

*(Use only if a schedule risk assessment is performed.)*

**3.1.4.4 Summary**

The cost/price is fair and reasonable, realistic, etc. based on (provide rationale) or the cost/price is not fair and reasonable, realistic, etc. based on (provide rationale).

**3.2 *(Insert Name of Offeror B)***

**3.2.1 MISSION CAPABILITY (TECHNICAL AND RISK RATINGS) FACTOR**

**3.2.1.1 Subfactor 1 – *(Insert subfactor title****)*

*(Insert a description of what Offeror B proposes and summarize the SSET evaluation of that proposal. Identify the color rating. Identify any strengths or deficiencies that support the color rating. Identify significant weaknesses and relate them to risk.)*

**Strengths:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify strengths, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 8.15)*

**Uncertainties:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify uncertainties, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph8.16)*

**Deficiencies:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify deficiencies, as defined in FAR15.001)*

**Weaknesses:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify weaknesses, as defined in FAR 15.001)*

**Risk:**

*(Insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCEPTABLE *and explain why in a summary sentence, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 5.5.1.2 and Table 2)*

**3.2.1.2 Subfactor 2 – *(Insert subfactor title****)*

*(Insert a description of what Offeror B proposes and summarize the SSET evaluation of that proposal. Identify the color rating. Identify any strengths or deficiencies that support the color rating. Identify significant weaknesses and relate them to risk.)*

**Strengths:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify strengths, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 8.15)*

**Uncertainties:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify uncertainties, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 8.16)*

**Deficiencies:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify deficiencies, as defined in FAR 15.001)*

**Weaknesses:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify weaknesses, as defined in FAR 15.001)*

**Risk:**

*(Insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCEPTABLE *and explain why in a summary sentence, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 5.5.1.2 and Table 2)*

**3.2.1.3 Subfactor 3 – *(Insert subfactor title****)*

*(Insert a description of what Offeror B proposes and summarize the SSET evaluation of that proposal. Identify the color rating. Identify any strengths or deficiencies that support the color rating. Identify significant weaknesses and relate them to risk.)*

**Strengths:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify strengths, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 8.15)*

**Uncertainties:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify uncertainties, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 8.16)*

**Deficiencies:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify deficiencies, as defined in FAR 15.001)*

**Weaknesses:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify weaknesses, as defined in FAR 15.001)*

**Risk:**

*(Insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCEPTABLE *and explain why in a summary sentence, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 5.5.1.2 and Table 2)*

**3.2.1.4 Subfactor 4 – *(Insert subfactor title****)*

*(Insert a description of what Offeror B proposes and summarize the SSET evaluation of that proposal. Identify the color rating. Identify any strengths or deficiencies that support the color rating. Identify significant weaknesses and relate them to risk.)*

**Strengths:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify strengths, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 8.15)*

**Uncertainties:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify uncertainties, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 8.16)*

**Deficiencies:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify deficiencies, as defined in FAR 15.001)*

**Weaknesses:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify weaknesses, as defined in FAR 15.001)*

**Risk:**

*(Insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCEPTABLE *and explain why in a summary sentence, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 5.5.1.2 and Table 2)*

**3.2.1.5 Subfactor 5 – *(Insert subfactor title****)*

*(Insert a description of what Offeror B proposes and summarize the SSET evaluation of that proposal. Identify the color rating. Identify any strengths or deficiencies that support the color rating. Identify significant weaknesses and relate them to risk.)*

**Strengths:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify strengths, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 8.15)*

**Uncertainties:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify uncertainties, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 8.16)*

**Deficiencies:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify deficiencies, as defined in FAR 15.001)*

**Weaknesses:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify weaknesses, as defined in FAR 15.001)*

**Risk:**

*(Insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCEPTABLE *and explain why in a summary sentence, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 5.5.1.2 and Table 2)*

**3.2.1.6 Subfactor 6 – *(Insert subfactor title****)*

*(Insert a description of what Offeror B proposes and summarize the SSET evaluation of that proposal. Identify the color rating. Identify any strengths or deficiencies that support the color rating. Identify significant weaknesses and relate them to risk.)*

**Strengths:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify strengths, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 8.15)*

**Uncertainties:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify uncertainties, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 8.16)*

**Deficiencies:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify deficiencies, as defined in FAR 15.001)*

**Weaknesses:**

*(Use separate paragraphs to identify weaknesses, as defined in FAR 15.001)*

**Risk:**

*(Insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCEPTABLE *and explain why in a summary sentence, as defined in MP5315.3, paragraph 5.5.1.2 and Table 2)*

**3.2.2 COST/PRICE RISK FACTOR (IF USED) (Offeror B)**

*For programs requiring a most probable cost/price evaluation (mandatory for ACAT SDD acquisitions utilizing an MPC), the Source Selection Evaluation team must describe the components that make up the aggregate government most probable cost. The cost/price risk evaluation assesses the degree to which an offerors’ cost proposal for the contract line items to be included in the intended contract and associated options, if evaluated, compares with the government MPC for the same items. Cost/Price Risk shall be rated Low, Moderate, or High using the risk descriptions found in Table 4 of MP5315.3, paragraph 5.5.4.*

The offeror’s final proposed costs or prices were evaluated against the criteria of (realism as applicable). *Describe the cost/price analysis techniques and or models used and appropriateness in determining cost/price realism. Describe realism analysis techniques as well as the assessment of balanced pricing and any associated risks.* The contract type is (insert contract type) for (insert type of acquisition).

**3.2.3 PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR (Offeror B)**

**3.2.3.1 Data Gathered.**

*(Insert Offeror B’s Name)* proposed *(insert quantity)* relevant contracts. The PCAG team located *(insert quantity)* additional contracts of which *(insert quantity)* were relevant contracts. A total of *(insert quantity)* contracts were deemed relevant and evaluated for *(Insert Offeror B’s Name).*

The prime offeror, major subcontractors, and their respective involvement, are listed in the tables below:

Prime: *(Insert Name of Offeror B) (List that portion of the effort the prime performs)*

Subcontractors:   
*(Insert Name of Subcontractor) (List that portion of the effort this sub performs)*   
*(Insert Name of Subcontractor) (List that portion of the effort this sub performs)*

*Repeat for each major subcontractor*

**3.2.3.2 Programs/Contracts Evaluated**

The PCAG evaluated the following programs/contracts performed by *(Insert Name of Offeror B)*: *(List by title major programs/contracts performed and evaluated by the PCAG.)*

The PCAG relied upon the sources of data, described in paragraph 3.1.3.1 “Data Gathered” above, to assign performance confidence ratings for each offeror. (*Describe the evaluation process consistent with the section M evaluation criteria).* In the event adverse data was reflected in a questionnaire, the SSET through the contracting officer provided the contractor an opportunity to respond if the contractor had not previously been offered the opportunity. The PCAG used the following considerations in assigning the performance confidence ratings to each offeror (Note: tailor these considerations for your source selection). The offeror’s overall work record; the number and severity of problems; the effectiveness of any corrective actions; and programmatics such as product similarity, complexity, contract type and phase of the program. The offerors’ consolidated confidence rating with their strong points, weak points, and supporting rationale follow:

**3.2.3.3 Performance Confidence Assessment**

*(Insert Name of Offeror B)* was assigned a performance confidence assessment of *(insert* Substantial Confidence, Satisfactory Confidence, Unknown Confidence, Limited Confidence or No Confidence, *as appropriate). Discussions should include sources of past performance information whether from CPARS or questionnaires. For example, t*he team analyzed a total of *(insert quantity for each category of)* veryrelevant, relevant or somewhat relevant contracts. Of the *(insert quantity by relevancy)* contracts evaluated, CPARs existed on *(insert quantity by relevancy)* contracts. The CPARs reflected ratings ranging from *(insert color or narrative performance rating)* to *(insert color or narrative performance rating).* Furthermore, approximately *(insert percentage)* of the CPARs reflected color ratings ranging from *(insert color or narrative performance rating)* to *(insert color or narrative performance rating)*. The remaining *(insert percentage)* of the CPARs reflected CPAR ratings of *(insert color or narrative performance rating*). *(Include a similar summary of the review and assessment of the questionnaires that were sent out and responses received for each category of very relevant, relevant or somewhat relevant contracts.)*

**Strong Points, Positive Performance**

The PCAG identified the following positive aspects of performance:   
*(Use bullet statements to list strong points.)*

**Weak Points, Negative Performance**

The PCAG identified the following negative aspects of performance:   
*(Use bullet statements to list weak points.)*

**3.2.3.4 Summary**

Based on the information identified above, the PCAG assigned the performance confidence assessment of *(insert* Substantial Confidence, Satisfactory Confidence, Unknown Confidence, Limited Confidence or No Confidence, *as appropriate)*. *(Explain and discuss in one or two paragraphs the significant strong and weak points, causes, and corrective action taken by the contractor)*

**3.2.4 COST/PRICE FACTOR(Offeror B)**

**3.2.4.1 Summary of Proposed and Evaluated Cost/Price**

Below is a summary of proposed and evaluated prices:   
*(Summarize proposed and evaluated costs/prices)*

A more detailed breakout of the evaluated cost/price follows:   
*(Provide detailed breakout of the type of evaluation (e.g., probable cost; probable life cycle cost) and an explanation of the quantification of cost, schedule or performance risk)*

*For programs requiring a most probable cost/price evaluation (mandatory for ACAT SDD acquisitions utilizing an MPC), many of these discussions will be included in paragraph 3.2.2 above.*

**3.2.4.2 Other Government Costs (OGC).**

*(Use only if applicable)*   
OGC was a major element of the decision criteria. The following summarizes the items covered within the OGC portions. The prices for the items were derived from current Government contracts, Government estimates, and/or stock list.

OGC consists of Government furnished products including equipment requested by each competitor as follows: *(Insert top-level bullet list of OGC, such as “GBL shipping for GFP”, “Government flight test support”, “GFE”, etc.)*

The evaluated price of the OGC is summarized as follows: *(List OGC and evaluated price)*

The major cost drivers for OGC are: *(Identify as appropriate)*

**3.2.4.3 Identified Risk**.

*(Use only if a schedule risk assessment is performed.)*

**3.2.4.4 Summary**

The cost/price is fair and reasonable, realistic, etc. based on (*provide rationale*) **or** the cost/price is not fair and reasonable, realistic, etc. based on (*provide rationale*).

***Repeat Evaluation Results for each offeror***   
  
**4. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF OFFERS AND AWARD RECOMENDATION**

*(This section should include a comparative analysis of all offers received that were included in the competitive range. If a competitive range determination was not made, the PAR must address all offerors. If any offerors were excluded from the competitive range, the rationale should be included. The analysis shall identify strengths, uncertainties, deficiencies, and weaknesses, as well as the resulting evaluation ratings. Include a discussion of the results of the past performance evaluation, cost/price risk evaluation (if used), and the cost/price evaluation. When completed, this section should contain an overall, integrated assessment of mission capability (technical and associated risk rating), cost/price (if used), , past performance, and cost or price. This section shall also provide the source selection recommendation and rationale from the SSET or SSAC, if used, and any minority opinion. Discuss the relative order of importance of the evaluation criteria. If the PAR does not address this in sufficient detail, it may result in a protest allegation asserting that the evaluation record did not establish that the evaluation team and the SSA actually applied the relative order of importance of the evaluation criteria when the actual comparative analysis was accomplished)*

**4.1 MISSION CAPABILITY (TECHNICAL AND RISK RATINGS) FACTOR**

The following is a comparative analysis of the technical aspects of all offerors’ proposals.

**4.1.1 Subfactor 1 – *(Insert subfactor title)***

*(Name of offeror A)* was rated *(insert* BLUE, GREEN, YELLOW, or RED*)* for subfactor *(insert subfactor title) (Name of offeror A)* was assigned *(insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCETABLE*)* risk.

*(Name of offeror B)* was rated *(insert* BLUE, GREEN, YELLOW, or RED*)* for subfactor *(insert subfactor title) (Name of offeror B)* was assigned *(insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCETABLE*)* risk.

***(Repeat as necessary for each offeror)***

The primary differences among offerors were:

*(Use separate paragraphs to contrast and compare offerors. Discuss how they met or exceeded requirements and how it will benefit the Air Force).*

Due to the differences identified above, *(insert name of offeror)* had the strongest proposal for subfactor *(Insert subfactor title).*

*(Insert offeror name)* was assessed as *(insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCETABLE*)* as *(summarize in a few sentences why they received the rating)*

**4.1.2 Subfactor 2 – *(Insert subfactor title)***

*(Name of offeror A)* was rated *(insert* BLUE, GREEN, YELLOW, or RED*)* for subfactor *(insert subfactor title) (Name of offeror A)* was assigned *(insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCETABLE*)* risk.

*(Name of offeror B)* was rated *(insert* BLUE, GREEN, YELLOW, or RED*)* for subfactor *(insert subfactor title) (Name of offeror B)* was assigned *(insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCETABLE*)* risk.

***(Repeat as necessary for each offeror)***

The primary differences among offerors were:

*(Use separate paragraphs to contrast and compare offerors. Discuss how they met or exceeded requirements and how it will benefit the Air Force).*

Due to the differences identified above, *(insert name of offeror)* had the strongest proposal for subfactor *(Insert subfactor title).*

*(Insert offeror name)* was assessed as *(insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCETABLE*)* as *(summarize in a few sentences why they received the rating)*

**4.1.3 Subfactor 3 – *(Insert subfactor title)***

*(Name of offeror A)* was rated *(insert* BLUE, GREEN, YELLOW, or RED*)* for subfactor *(insert subfactor title) (Name of offeror A)* was assigned *(insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCETABLE*)* risk.

*(Name of offeror B)* was rated *(insert* BLUE, GREEN, YELLOW, or RED*)* for subfactor *(insert subfactor title) (Name of offeror B)* was assigned *(insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCETABLE*)* risk.

***(Repeat as necessary for each offeror)***

The primary differences among offerors were:

*(Use separate paragraphs to contrast and compare offerors. Discuss how they met or exceeded requirements and how it will benefit the Air Force).*

Due to the differences identified above, *(insert name of offeror)* had the strongest proposal for subfactor *(Insert subfactor title).*

*(Insert offeror name)* was assessed as *(insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCETABLE*)* as *(summarize in a few sentences why they received the rating)*

**4.1.4 Subfactor 4 – *(Insert subfactor title)***

*(Name of offeror A)* was rated *(insert* BLUE, GREEN, YELLOW, or RED*)* for subfactor *(insert subfactor title) (Name of offeror A)* was assigned *(insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCETABLE*)* risk.

*(Name of offeror B)* was rated *(insert* BLUE, GREEN, YELLOW, or RED*)* for subfactor *(insert subfactor title) ) (Name of offeror B)* was assigned *(insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCETABLE*)* risk.

***(Repeat as necessary for each offeror)***

The primary differences among offerors were:

*(Use separate paragraphs to contrast and compare offerors. Discuss how they met or exceeded requirements and how it will benefit the Air Force).*

Due to the differences identified above, *(insert name of offeror)* had the strongest proposal for subfactor *(Insert subfactor title).*

*(Insert offeror name)* was assessed as *(insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCETABLE*)* as *(summarize in a few sentences why they received the rating)*

**4.1.5 Subfactor 5 – *(Insert subfactor title)***

*(Name of offeror A)* was rated *(insert* BLUE, GREEN, YELLOW, or RED*)* for subfactor *(insert subfactor title) (Name of offeror A)* was assigned *(insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCETABLE*)* risk.

*(Name of offeror B)* was rated *(insert* BLUE, GREEN, YELLOW, or RED*)* for subfactor *(insert subfactor title) ) (Name of offeror B)* was assigned *(insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCETABLE*)* risk.

***(Repeat as necessary for each offeror)***

The primary differences among offerors were:

*(Use separate paragraphs to contrast and compare offerors. Discuss how they met or exceeded requirements and how it will benefit the Air Force).*

Due to the differences identified above, *(insert name of offeror)* had the strongest proposal for subfactor *(Insert subfactor title).*

*(Insert offeror name)* was assessed as *(insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCETABLE*)* as *(summarize in a few sentences why they received the rating)*

**4.1.6 Subfactor 6 – *(Insert subfactor title)***

*(Name of offeror A)* was rated *(insert* BLUE, GREEN, YELLOW, or RED*)* for subfactor *(insert subfactor title) (Name of offeror A)* was assigned *(insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCETABLE*)* risk.

*(Name of offeror B)* was rated *(insert* BLUE, GREEN, YELLOW, or RED*)* for subfactor *(insert subfactor title) (Name of offeror B)* was assigned *(insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCETABLE*)* risk.

***(Repeat as necessary for each offeror)***

The primary differences among offerors were:

*(Use separate paragraphs to contrast and compare offerors. Discuss how they met or exceeded requirements and how it will benefit the Air Force).*

Due to the differences identified above, *(insert name of offeror)* had the strongest proposal for subfactor *(Insert subfactor title).*

*(Insert offeror name)* was assessed as *(insert* LOW, MODERATE, HIGH, or UNACCETABLE*)* as *(summarize in a few sentences why they received the rating)*

**4.1.7 Overall Comparison of Mission Capability Factor**   
(*This section must discuss the relative order of importance at both the factor and subfactor level (if such a distinction is drawn at the subfactor level.)*

A summary of the proposal color ratings and proposal risk ratings for Mission Capability subfactors 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 are shown below.

**OFFERORS**   
**SUBFACTORS A B C etc.**

1 *(Insert Subfactor Title) (Insert Color) (Insert Color) (Insert Color)*   
*(Insert Risk) (Insert Risk) (Insert Risk)*

2 *(Insert Subfactor Title) (Insert Color) (Insert Color) (Insert Color)*   
*(Insert Risk) (Insert Risk) (Insert Risk)*

3 *(Insert Subfactor Title) (Insert Color) (Insert Color) (Insert Color)*   
*(Insert Risk) (Insert Risk) (Insert Risk)*

4 *(Insert Subfactor Title) (Insert Color) (Insert Color) (Insert Color)*   
*(Insert Risk) (Insert Risk) (Insert Risk)*

5 *(Insert Subfactor Title) (Insert Color) (Insert Color) (Insert Color)*   
*(Insert Risk) (Insert Risk) (Insert Risk)*

6 *(Insert Subfactor Title) (Insert Color) (Insert Color) (Insert Color)*   
*(Insert Risk) (Insert Risk) (Insert Risk)*

**4.2 COST/PRICE RISK FACTOR (If Used)**

Summarize the Cost/Risk for each offeror:

(Provide detailed breakout of the type of evaluation (e.g., probable cost; probable life cycle cost) and an explanation of the quantification of cost, schedule or performance risk and risk assessment).

*(Insert offeror name)* was assessed as *(insert* LOW, MODERATE, or HIGH)as *(summarize in a few sentences why they received the rating)*

***(Repeat as necessary for each offeror)***

**4.3 PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR**

Summarize the Performance Confidence Assessment for each offeror:

The following is a summary and comparative analysis of the Performance Confidence Assessment for each offeror.

*(Insert offeror A name)* was assessed as *(insert* Substantial Confidence, Satisfactory Confidence, Unknown Confidence, Limited Confidence or No Confidence *as appropriate)* as *(summarize in a few sentences why they received the rating).*

*(Insert offeror B name)* was assessed as *(insert* Substantial Confidence, Satisfactory Confidence, Unknown Confidence, Limited Confidence or No Confidence *as appropriate)* as *(summarize in a few sentences why they received the rating).*

**4.4 COST OR PRICE FACTOR**

**4.4.1 Summary of Proposed and Evaluated Cost/Price for Each Offeror**

Below is a summary of proposed and evaluated costs/prices:

*(Summarize proposed and evaluated costs/prices for each offeror)*

For programs requiring a most probable cost/price evaluation (mandatory for ACAT SDD acquisitions utilizing an MPC), many of these discussions will be included in paragraph 4.2 above.

**4.4.2 Summary of Other Government Costs (OGC) for Each Offeror** *(Use only if applicable)*

OGC was a major element of the decision criteria. The following summarizes the items covered within the OGC portions. The prices for the items were derived from current Government contracts, Government estimates, and/or stock list.

OGC consists of Government furnished products including equipment requested by each competitor as follows: *(Insert top-level bullet list of OGC, such as “GBL shipping for GFP”, “Government flight test support”, “GFE”, etc.)*

The evaluated price of the OGC is summarized as follows: *(List OGC and evaluated price by offeror)*

The major cost drivers for OGC are: *(Identify as appropriate)*

**4.4.3 Summary of Identified Schedule Risk for Each Offeror**

*(Use only if a schedule risk assessment is performed.)*

**4.4.4 Summary**

Offeror (*insert name of Offeror*) has the strongest cost or price because (*state rationale*). Summarize the statement of fair and reasonableness.

**4.4.5 Adequate Price Competition Determination**

(The conclusion of the comparative analysis must be followed-up with the final determination of adequate price competition (several interim determinations may be warranted throughout the source selection process). This conclusion will be based on all of the information received during the source selection. The determination must satisfy adequate price competition requirements of [FAR 15.403-1(c)(1)](http://farsite.hill.af.mil/reghtml/regs/far2afmcfars/fardfars/far/15.htm) and as supplemented. Basically, it must definitively state that adequate price competition occurred and provide a discussion supporting this claim.)

(Insert number of offerors – must be two or more) offerors, competing independently, submitted priced offers that satisfy the Government’s expressed requirement, and award will be made to the offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government. Cost/Price is a substantial factor in the selection for award.

**4.5 SOURCE SELECTION RECOMMENDATION**

(*Provide a source selection recommendation for the SSA to consider. The recommendation is from the SSAC, if used, or the SSET. Rationale for the recommendation shall be based upon the evaluation criteria of the solicitation. In the event that there is significant disagreement among the SSET or SSAC members regarding the recommendation, a minority opinion shall be provided with sufficient information for the SSA to fully consider the minority view. The source selection recommendation must also address the relative order of importance of the evaluation criteria in order to prove that the evaluation team understood and applied the relative order of importance of the evaluation criteria. Otherwise, the recommendation might be suspect and result in a challenge by an unsuccessful offeror alleging failure to follow the stated evaluation structure )*

**5. CONTRACTUAL CONSIDERATIONS**

**5.1 Results of Questions and Answers (Q&As)**

*(Use this paragraph if draft proposals were submitted in a phased approach or informal questions and answers were used prior to the use of official Exchange Notices (ENs). Briefly summarize the number of Q&As per offeror and the procedures used.)*

**5.2 Results of EN Clarifications and Communications**

*(Briefly summarize the number of Clarification and Communication ENs per offeror and the procedures used.)*

**5.3 Results of the EN Discussions**

*(Briefly summarize the number of Discussion ENs per offeror and the procedures used. Describe the discussion process used, the charts presented, and confirm that updated decision briefing charts showing the results of the discussions were provided to each respective offeror.)*

**5.4 Differences in Contract Features**

*(Briefly describe key contract features that were discussed and whether or not all critical contractual issues have been resolved. Unique clauses or features should be addressed and any exceptions to terms and conditions must be discussed. Suggest a final closing paragraph such as:)*

The final proposals received from each offeror have no significant differences in the contract provisions. No waivers or deviations to standard FAR/DFARS/AFFARS clauses were requested by any offeror. All contracts are awardable, affordable, and executable.

**6. SIGNATURE PAGE**

This report represents an integrated “best value” assessment of proposals for the *(insert Program title).* The evaluation was conducted at the *(insert office symbol)* Source Selection Facility at *(insert AFB or other facility)* between *(insert date)* and *(insert date).* This document, the PCAG documentation, and the decision briefing presented on *(insert date)* are offered in support of the SSA’s source selection decision.

*Name, Rank, Service*   
*Title*   
SSET CHAIR

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

*Name, Rank, Service*   
CONTRACTING OFFICER *(if* *combining PCM/PNM with PAR)*

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**APPROVED (*if applicable*):**

*Name, Rank, Service*   
*Title*   
SSAC Chairperson

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Attachment A – List of Government Advisory Reports**

Advisory reports received including audit, field pricing, technical, or any other report. *(Include the respective report number and date if applicable. If informal assistance was used briefly state the scope and the recommendations given.)*

**Attachment B – List of Participants in Cost/Price Evaluation**

All who participated in the cost/price analysis and realism analysis. *(Include the names, titles, and organizations of each person)*

APPENDIX C

PROPOSAL ANALYSIS REPORT (PAR) OUTLINE

*By Evaluation Factor*

**1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1 Discussion of Requirement   
1.2 Source Selection Procedures   
1.3 Evaluation Criteria

1.4 Cost/Price Risk (if applicable)   
1.4 Past Performance  
1.5 Cost/Price  
1.6 Offerors

**2. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSALS**

2.1 *(Insert Name of Offeror A)*   
2.1.1 Key Mission Capability Features   
2.1.2 Key Contract Features

2.2 *(Insert Name of Offeror B)*   
2.2.1 Key Mission Capability Features   
2.2.2 Key Contract Features

*Repeat as necessary for each offeror*

**3. EVALUATION RESULTS**

**3.1 Mission Capability (Technical and Risk Ratings) Factor**

3.1.1 *(Insert Name of Offeror A)*   
3.1.1.1 Subfactor 1 – *(Insert subfactor title)*   
Strengths:

Uncertainties:   
Deficiencies:   
Weaknesses:   
Risk:   
3.1.1.2 Subfactor 2 – *(Insert subfactor title)*   
Strengths:

Uncertainties:   
Deficiencies:   
Weaknesses:   
Risk:   
3.1.1.3 Subfactor 3 – *(Insert subfactor title)*   
Strengths:

Uncertainties:   
Deficiencies:   
Weaknesses:   
Risk:   
3.1.1.4 Subfactor 4 – *(Insert subfactor title)*   
Strengths:

Uncertainties:   
Deficiencies:   
Weaknesses:   
Risk:   
3.1.1.5 Subfactor 5 – *(Insert subfactor title)*   
Strengths:

Uncertainties:   
Deficiencies:   
Weaknesses:   
Risk:   
3.1.1.6 Subfactor 6 – *(Insert subfactor title)*   
Strengths:

Uncertainties:   
Deficiencies:   
Weaknesses:   
Risk:

3.1.2 *(Insert Name of Offeror B)*   
3.1.2.1 Subfactor 1 – *(Insert subfactor title)*   
Strengths:

Uncertainties:   
Deficiencies:   
Weaknesses:   
Risk:   
3.1.2.2 Subfactor 2 – *(Insert subfactor title)*   
Strengths:

Uncertainties:   
Deficiencies:   
Weaknesses:   
Risk:   
3.1.2.3 Subfactor 3 – *(Insert subfactor title)*   
Strengths:

Uncertainties:   
Deficiencies:   
Weaknesses:   
Risk:   
3.1.2.4 Subfactor 4 – *(Insert subfactor title)*   
Strengths:

Uncertainties:   
Deficiencies:   
Weaknesses:   
Risk:   
3.1.2.5 Subfactor 5 – *(Insert subfactor title)*   
Strengths:

Uncertainties:   
Deficiencies:   
Weaknesses:   
Risk:   
3.1.2.6 Subfactor 6 – *(Insert subfactor title)*   
Strengths:

Uncertainties:   
Deficiencies:   
Weaknesses:   
Risk:

*Repeat Evaluation Results for each additional offeror as necessary*

**3.2 Cost/Price Risk (If used) Factor**

**3.3 Past Performance Factor**

3.3.1 Data Gathered   
3.3.1.1 Offeror A   
3.3.1.2 Offeror B   
*Repeat as necessary for each offeror*   
3.3.2 Programs/Contracts Evaluated   
3.3.2.1 Offeror A   
3.32.2 Offeror B   
*Repeat as necessary for each offeror*   
3.3.3 Performance Confidence Assessment Rating   
3.3.3.1 Offeror A   
Strong Points, Positive Performance   
Weak Points, Negative Performance   
3.3.3.2 Offeror B   
Strong Points, Positive Performance   
Weak Points, Negative Performance   
*Repeat as necessary for each offeror*   
3.3.4 Summary

**3.4 Cost/Price Factor**

3.4.1 Offeror A   
3.4.1.2 Summary of Proposed and Evaluated Cost/Price   
3.4.1.3 Other Government Costs (OGC)   
3.4.1.4 Identified Risk   
3.4.1.5 Summary

3.4.3 Offeror B   
3.4.3.1 Summary of Proposed and Evaluated Cost/Price   
3.4.3.2 Other Government Costs (OGC)   
3.4.3.3 Identified Risk   
3.4.3.4 Summary

*Repeat Evaluation Results for each additional offeror as necessary*

**4. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF OFFERS**

**4.1 Mission Capability (Technical and Risk Ratings) Factor**The following is a comparative analysis of the technical aspects of all offerors’ proposals.   
4.1.1 Subfactor 1 – *(Insert subfactor title)*   
4.1.2 Subfactor 2 – *(Insert subfactor title)*   
4.1.3 Subfactor 3 – *(Insert subfactor title)*   
4.1.4 Subfactor 4 – *(Insert subfactor title)*   
4.1.5 Subfactor 5 – *(Insert subfactor title)*   
4.1.6 Subfactor 6 – *(Insert subfactor title)*   
4.1.7 Overall Comparison of Mission Capability Factor

**4.2 Cost/Price Risk (If used) Rating**

**4.3 Past Performance Factor**

**4.4 Cost or Price Factor**4.4.1 Summary of Proposed and Evaluated Cost/Price for Each Offeror   
4.4.2 Summary of Other Government Costs (OGC) for Each Offeror   
4.4.3 Summary of Identified Schedule Risk for Each Offeror   
4.4.4 Summary   
4.4.5 Adequate Price Competition Determination

**4.5 Source Selection Recommendation**

**5. CONTRACTUAL CONSIDERATIONS**

5.1 Results of Questions and Answers   
5.2 Results of EN Clarifications and Communications   
5.3 Results of the EN Discussions   
5.4 Differences in Contract Features

**6. SIGNATURE PAGE**

*SSET Chair*   
*Contracting Officer* *(if* *combining PCM/PNM with PAR)*  
*SSAC Chair (if applicable)*

**Attachment A** – List of Government Advisory Reports

**Attachment B** – List of Participants in Cost/Price Evaluation