SECTION M

CONTENTS

PART 1 – INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES TO OFFERORS

M.1.1 LISTING OF PROVISIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE (FAR 52.252-1) (FEB 1998)

M.1.1.1 Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) (48 CFR Chapter 1) Clauses

M.1.1.2 NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) (48 CFR Chapter 18) Clauses

PART 2 – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.2.1 GENERAL

M.2.2 SOURCE EVALUATION

M.2.2.1 Factor 1 - Mission Suitability

M.2.2.1.1 Mission Suitability Subfactors

M.2.2.1.2 Relative Importance of Subfactors

M.2.2.2 Factor 2 - Past Performance

M.2.2.3 Factor 3 - Cost

M.2.3 RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF EVALUATION FACTORS

SECTION M TABLES

Table	Section	Title
M-1	M.2.2.1.2	Mission Suitability Subfactors
M-2	M.2.2.3	Cost Realism Table

SECTION M – PART 1
INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES TO OFFERORS

M.1.1 LISTING OF PROVISIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE (FAR 52.252-1) (FEB 1998)

Solicitation Provisions Incorporated by Reference

This solicitation incorporates one or more solicitation provisions by reference, with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request, the Contracting Officer will make their full text available. The offeror is cautioned that the listed provisions may include blocks that must be completed by the offeror and submitted with its quotation or offer. In lieu of submitting the full text of those provisions, the offeror may identify the provision by paragraph identifier and provide the appropriate information with its quotation or offer. Also, the full text of a solicitation provision may be accessed electronically at this/these address(es):

FAR: http://www.arnet.gov/far

NASA FAR: http://www.hq.nasa.gov/office/procurement/regs/nfstoc.htm

JSC PI: http://officeofprocurement.jsc.nasa.gov/jpiprod/jpi_doc.htm

(End of provision)

M.1.1.1 Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) (48 CFR Chapter 1) Clauses

CLAUSE NUMBER	DATE	TITLE
52.217-5	JUL 1990	EVALUATION OF OPTIONS

M.1.1.2 NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) (48 CFR Chapter 18) Clauses

CLAUSE NUMBER	DATE	TITLE
1852.215-81	FEB 1998	PROPOSAL PAGE LIMITATIONS

SECTION M – PART 2
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.2.1 GENERAL

The proposals will be evaluated in accordance with procedures prescribed by the FAR and the NFS. As prescribed in the FAR 52.215-1, the Government may award based on initial proposals, without discussions. Should it be determined that discussions are required and the consequential establishment of a competitive range is necessary, the most highly rated proposals will be included in the competitive range.

M.2.2 SOURCE EVALUATION

A Source Evaluation Board (SEB) will evaluate the offers submitted in response to this Request for Proposals (RFP). 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. Acceptable offers will be evaluated to identify deficiencies, strengths, and weaknesses in accordance with the following factors and subfactors set forth below:

Factor 1 Mission Suitability

Subfactor 1 Management Approach and Plans

Subfactor 2 Technical Approach

Subfactor 3 Safety and Health Plan

Subfactor 4 Small Disadvantaged Business Goals

Factor 2 Past Performance

Factor 3 Cost

A brief description of each of these factors is set forth below. Only the Mission Suitability factor will be weighted and numerically scored.

Pages submitted in excess of the limitations specified in Section L will not be evaluated by the Government and will be returned to the Offeror.

M.2.2.1 Factor 1 - Mission Suitability

The Mission Suitability factor and associated subfactors will be used to evaluate the feasibility and soundness and the ability of the offeror to actually provide what is proposed. Proposals will be evaluated and scored numerically based on the subfactors set forth in the paragraphs below.

M.2.2.1.1 Mission Suitability Subfactors

Subfactor 1 – Management Approach and Plans

The effectiveness, clarity, soundness, comprehensiveness, feasibility, and suitability of the Offeror's proposed management approach and plans will be evaluated.

SubFactor 2 – Technical Approach

Overall Technical Approach – The effectiveness, clarity, soundness, comprehensiveness, feasibility, suitability, efficiency, and innovation of the Offeror's overall technical approach to accomplishing Statement of Work requirements will be evaluated.

Specific Technical Understanding and Associated Resources Format - The Offeror's technical understanding of Statement of Work requirements for the S&MA Support Services Contract (S&MA SSC) will be evaluated. Proposed resources in the resources tables will be evaluated to determine that proposed resources are capable of executing the work as described in the technical narrative.

Technical Exercises - The response to the Technical Exercises for the Offeror's demonstrated understanding of the SOW requirements will be evaluated.

Subfactor 3 - Safety and Health Plan

Safety and Health Plan (DRD 09) – The effectiveness, clarity, soundness, comprehensiveness, feasibility, and suitability of the Offeror's proposed Safety and Health Plan will be evaluated.

Subfactor 4 - Small Disadvantaged Business Goals

The soundness and effectiveness of the Offeror's proposed plan to achieve or surpass the 10% 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 10% 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 SDB Participation will be evaluated under this Subfactor.

M.2.2.1.2 Relative Importance of Mission Suitability Subfactors

The Mission Suitability subfactors and their corresponding weights reflecting relative importance are listed below. NOTE: These weights are intended to be used as a guideline in the source selection decision-making process.

Table M-1: Mission Suitability Subfactors

Factor 1 Mission Suitability	Weight (pts)
Subfactor 1 Management Approach and Plans	300
Subfactor 2 Technical Approach	500
Subfactor 3 Safety and Health Plan (DRD 09)	100
Subfactor 4 Small Disadvantage Business Goals	100
TOTAL	**1000**

M.2.2.2 Factor 2 - Past Performance

Past Performance indicates how well an offeror performed an earlier work and can be a significant indicator of how well it can be expected to perform future work

Offeror's 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, responses received on the Present/Past Performance Questionnaire (Attachment L-2), 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.

M.2.2.3 Factor 3 - Cost

The SEB will not utilize weighting and scoring in the cost area. The Government will perform a cost realism analysis of the Offeror's proposed rates, prices and resources. Each cost proposal (including resources proposed in Volume II) will be evaluated for cost realism.

Cost realism analysis is the process of independently reviewing and evaluating specific elements of each Offeror's proposed cost estimate to determine whether the estimated proposed cost elements are realistic for the work to be performed. Realistic cost elements indicate a clear understanding of the requirements and are consistent with the unique technical and management approach described in each Offeror's proposal. When elements of an Offeror's proposal are judged by the SEB to be unrealistic, probable cost adjustments will be made to the Offeror's cost proposal.

Probable cost is the SEB's estimate of the anticipated cost to NASA of contract performance in accordance with each Offeror's specific technical and management approach described in the Offeror's proposal.

The delta between the total proposed cost and fee (Completion Form & LOE) and the total probable cost and fee will be calculated to determine the difference between proposed and probable cost. However, if and to the extent that an offeror realistically proposes to hire some or all of the incumbent workforce, and if an offeror clearly states in the total compensation template (e) their intent to maintain current incumbent direct labor rates and seniority rights, the results of any differences arising from probable cost adjustments related to incumbent direct labor rates (including direct labor cost and associated expenses such as overhead, G&A and fee) will be subtracted from the delta between proposed and probable cost. This cost delta, excluding any labor rate adjustments for incumbency assumptions, will be used in accordance with the NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(B), and a Mission Suitability point adjustment will be made using the Cost Realism Table below:

Table M-2: Cost Realism Table

Proposed and Probable Cost Difference	Point Adjustment
+/-0 to 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

The results of the Government's cost evaluation will be presented to the SSA for consideration in making the source selection.

Cost and Fee Evaluation of Completion Form will be evaluated for cost realism. All proposed resources will be assessed for validity, realism, and adequacy. Proposed cost will also be compared to the Government's estimated probable cost based on the offeror's management and technical approach. The resources listed in both the cost and Technical Volumes will be evaluated. The evaluation of the cost factor will result in a probable cost which will include an evaluation of the cost of doing business with each offeror, including the anticipated growth in cost during the contract period of performance, and the features of each offeror's proposal that would cause its actual cost to be more or less than the proposed cost. The proposed and probable cost for the complete period of performance (Contract Years 1-5) will be evaluated.

Cost and Fee Evaluation of LOE - The SEB will perform a cost realism analysis of proposed LOE cost and fee. All proposed skill mix will be evaluated for validity, realism, and adequacy. The proposed and probable cost for the complete period of performance (Contract Years 1-5) will be evaluated. The fully burdened rate (FBR) in Section B of the model contract should not differ from the FBRs used in contract rates of the Summary Cost Template (SCT) in the cost proposal. However, if they do differ the FBRs in Section B will used as a basis for developing the proposed cost. The Cost realism delta for mission suitability off-set of points will then be the difference between the proposed cost based on section B and the Government probable cost, excluding for incumbency assumptions as mentioned above.

Probable cost for selection purposes – The probable cost (including any probable cost adjustments resulting from your proposal to pay current incumbent labor rates)

will be used for selection purposes and will include the cost of the basic and option periods of performance for both Completion Form and LOE effort. It specifically excludes the cost/price associated with Phase-In.

Phase-In - The price of the Phase-In will be considered under the Cost/Price factor but will not be included in the probable cost for selection purposes.

The Government will also perform a price analysis of your entire proposal. The phase-in cost will be evaluated but will not be included in the Cost Factor for selection purposes.

M.2.3 RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF EVALUATION FACTORS

Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost/Price. Mission Suitability and Past Performance are approximately equal in importance.

[END OF SECTION]