

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1 LISTING OF PROVISIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

NOTICE: The following solicitation provisions pertinent to this section are hereby incorporated by reference:

I. FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION (48 CFR CHAPTER 1)

CLAUSE NUMBER	DATE	TITLE
------------------	------	-------

None included by reference.

II. NASA FAR SUPPLEMENT (48 CFR CHAPTER 18) PROVISIONS

CLAUSE NUMBER	DATE	TITLE
------------------	------	-------

None included by reference.

M.2 EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

1.0 GENERAL

The proposals will be evaluated by a Source Evaluation Board (SEB) in accordance with applicable regulations which include the FAR and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS). The SEB evaluation will be supported by appropriate personnel. The SEB will carry out the evaluation activities and report its findings to the Source Selection Authority (SSA), who is responsible for making the source selection decision.

2.0 MISSION SUITABILITY SUBFACTORS

The Mission Suitability subfactors identified below will be used by the SEB to indicate the quality of the work that is offered and the ability of the offeror to meet all of the requirements of the contemplated contract. Proposals will be evaluated and scored numerically based upon these subfactors.

2.1 SUBFACTOR: Management Approach

The efficiency and effectiveness of the offeror's proposed contract management approach will be evaluated. The evaluation will include the offeror's management systems, performance measure, Small Business Subcontracting Plan, proposed Key Personnel, Organization and Operating Plan (including phase-in-plan), Resources, Acceptance of Terms and Conditions, Conflict of Interests Avoidance Plan, Total Compensation Plan, and customer service.

Key Personnel - For any proposed key personnel and the Project Manager an evaluation will be made of their experience, past performance, education, overall capability, and commitment.

Organization and Operating Plans - An evaluation will be made of the offeror's plans and approach for the timely and effective management of the proposed effort.

Resources - An evaluation will be made of the offeror’s proposed resources for accomplishing the work in an efficient and effective manner. An evaluation will be made of the offeror’s proposed staffing, plans for recruitment and retention of required personnel, as well as plans for augmentation of capabilities, as required.

An evaluation will be made of the offeror’s proposal for meeting contract Terms and Conditions including advantages or disadvantages to the Government of any additional provisions or changes.

Small Business Subcontracting Plan - The overall quality and appropriateness of the small business subcontracting plan (other than the SDB participation) will be evaluated under this Management Approach subfactor. The offeror’s proposed ability to meet or exceed SDB business participation will be evaluated under the SDB Participation Subfactor

An evaluation will be made of the Contractor’s Conflict of Interests Avoidance Plan. In accordance with FAR 9.504(e), a contract may not be awarded “if a conflict of interest is determined to exist that cannot be avoided or mitigated”.

2.2 SUBFACTOR: Technical Approach

- I Under this subfactor, the Government will evaluate the excellence and soundness of the demonstrated understanding, effectiveness, and efficiency of the offeror’s overall technical approach to accomplishing statement of work requirements.

An evaluation of the responses provided to each of the scenarios defined in Section L, Attachment 3 will be performed.

- I Innovations proposed in the offeror’s technical approach will be evaluated for their reasonableness, and the overall impact on effectiveness and efficiency.

2.3 SUBFACTOR: Safety and Health

An evaluation will be made of the effectiveness of the offeror’s plan for Safety, Health, and Environmental Compliance.

2.4 SUBFACTOR: Small Disadvantaged Business Goals

The effectiveness of the offeror’s proposed plan to achieve or surpass the 16% goal for Small Disadvantaged Business will be evaluated. For evaluation purposes, the government will only evaluate information relevant to SDBs in the Small Business Subcontracting Plan for its effectiveness in achieving or surpassing the 16% goal for Small Disadvantaged Business. The small business subcontracting plan (other than the SDB participation) will be evaluated under the Management Approach subfactor and only the SDB Participation will be evaluated under this subfactor.

Relative Importance of Subfactors

SUBFACTOR	WEIGHT
Management Approach	300
Technical Approach	450
Safety And Health	150
Small Disadvantaged Business Subcontracting Goals	100
TOTAL	1000

The Mission Suitability subfactors and their corresponding weights reflecting relative importance are listed above. It is intended that these weights be used as a guideline in the source selection decision-making process.

3.0 PAST PERFORMANCE

Past Performance indicates how well an offeror performed on relevant earlier work and can be a significant indicator of how well it can be expected to perform the work required under this procurement.

Offerors' Past Performance, including relevant experience, will be evaluated separately by the SEB, but will not be numerically weighted and scored. The evaluation will be based on information provided by offerors in their proposals, as well as any other information obtained independently by the SEB. In accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv), an offeror without a record of relevant past performance, or for whom information on past performance is not available, may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably in past performance. In such an event, an offeror with no discernable relevant experience in past performance will receive a neutral rating. The results of the Board's evaluation will be presented to the SSA for their consideration in the source selection decision.

4.0 COST EVALUATION

Under the Cost factor, the Government will perform a cost realism analysis of each offeror's proposal. Cost realism is defined as, the process of independently reviewing and evaluating specific elements of each offeror's proposed cost estimate to determine whether the amounts proposed are realistic for the work to be performed; reflects a clear understanding of the requirements; and are consistent with each offeror's technical and management approach. Each offeror's cost proposal (including resources and efficiencies proposed in Volume II) will be evaluated for cost realism.

A cost realism analysis will also be performed, to determine the probable cost of performance for each offeror (what each offeror's proposal is likely to cost the Government if selected for award), given the requirements; the validity and adequacy of each offeror's proposed rates, prices and resources; and each offeror's unique technical and management approach. When elements of an offeror's proposal are judged by the Government to be unrealistic, probable cost adjustments will be made to the offeror's cost proposal.

The Government will evaluate proposed costs and establish the probable cost of doing business with each offeror; however, it will not use weighting and numerical scoring in this area. The probable cost is the product of cost realism analysis including all the probable cost adjustments. Proposed costs will be compared to the Government's estimated probable cost for the complete period of performance.

The cost of phase-in will be considered under the Cost/Price factor but will not be included in the probable cost for selection purposes. However, the proposed resources will be evaluated to ensure it is consistent with your phase-in plan. If it is not, weaknesses may be assessed against Mission Suitability.

Your initial proposed fee rate will be accepted and applied to the probable cost developed by the Government for the purposes of computing the initial probable fee amount. Your Final Proposal Revision (FPR) fee amount will be accepted as proposed and included in the Government's final probable cost.

The Government will also perform a price analysis of your entire proposal, including options.

The probable cost evaluation will presuppose a ten year period of performance as a result of the all award terms being earned. The delta between the total proposed cost and fee (Completion Form and LOE combined) and the total probable cost and fee will be calculated to determine the difference between proposed and probable cost. In accordance with the NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(B), a Mission Suitability point adjustment will be made using the Cost Realism Table below.

Difference Between Proposed and Probable Cost	Point Adjustment
+/- 5 percent	0
+/- 6 to 10 percent	-50
+/- 11 to 15 percent	-100
+/- 16 to 20 percent	-150
+/- 21 to 30 percent	-200
+/- more than 30 percent	-300

Any adjustments to Mission Suitability points resulting from the cost realism analysis of a proposal will reduce that proposal’s score under the Mission Suitability factor. The results of the Government’s cost evaluation will be presented to the Source Selection Authority (SSA) for consideration in making the source selection.

5.0 RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF EVALUATION FACTORS

Mission Suitability and Past Performance when combined are significantly more important than cost. Mission Suitability and Past Performance are approximately equal to one another.

[END OF SECTION]