

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD TO OFFERORS

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1 LISTING OF PROVISIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

NOTICE: The following contract clauses pertinent to this section are hereby incorporated by reference:

I. FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION (48 CFR CHAPTER 1)

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

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

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

None

(End of provision)

PART IV – REPRESENTATIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS

SECTION M

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.2 GENERAL

Proposals will be evaluated by the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) in accordance with applicable regulations which include the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and the NASA FAR Supplement. 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.

M.3 SOURCE EVALUATION

Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the following factors: Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost. A brief description of each of these factors is set forth below. Only the Mission Suitability factor will be weighted and numerically scored. The Government's intent regarding discussion with offerors in the competitive range is set forth in provision L.6 Instructions to Offerors-Competitive Acquisition.

M.4 MISSION SUITABILITY FACTOR

The Mission Suitability Factor and associated subfactors are used to assess the ability of the Offeror to provide and administer the requirements of the SOW. Proposals will be evaluated and scored numerically based upon the subfactors set forth below.

- A. Management Approach
- B. Technical Approach
- C. Safety and Health Plan

The evaluation of the Mission Suitability factor will consider the quality and soundness of the proposed approach, the degree to which the offeror demonstrates their understanding of the total requirements of the RFP, and the Offeror's ability to perform the contract. Adequacy and realism of resources will be considered in evaluating Mission Suitability, as an indicator of the Offeror's understanding of the requirement.

The supporting subfactors are set forth below:

4.1. VOLUME I

- A. **Management Approach** - The Offeror's management approach, including supporting rationale, for fulfilling the requirements of the contract will be assessed.

- MA1** An evaluation will be made of the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the Offeror's management approach, including: customer relations; business and information systems; cost and price tracking; allocation of labor skills into the proposed organization; local organizational structure; corporate organizational structure, including lines of communication, local autonomy, span of control, and corporate support; benefits and rationale for any teaming partners, subcontractors, or other arrangements, and the impact, if any, on the Offeror's status as a small business; identification and mitigation of management risks; and acceptance of contract terms and conditions.
- MA2** An evaluation will be made of the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the Offeror's approach to recruiting, staffing, training, and retaining a qualified workforce, including: identification of critical skills and approach to recruit, staff, train, and retain these critical skills; support of fluctuating workloads; initial staffing from various sources; ID/IQ work; Total Compensation Plan; and Labor Relations Plan.
- MA3** An evaluation will be made of the overall effectiveness of the proposed approach for establishing an Associate Contractor Agreement (ACA) with the other JSC Contractors; identification of plans for mitigation of risk involved with the multiple contracts; understanding of the related critical functions in the other contracts; understanding of the benefits of the ACA's; and proposed schedule on achieving successful negotiation of the ACA's
- MA4** An evaluation will be made of the experience, past performance, education, commitment, and overall capability of the proposed key personnel and the soundness of the Offeror's rationale for why the proposed key positions are critical to the success of the contract. The absence of key personnel from oral discussions, if conducted, may adversely impact an Offeror's key personnel evaluation.
- MA5** An evaluation will be made of the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the proposed Logistics Operations Phase-In Plan, including assurance of a smooth transition without disruption to ongoing work; appropriateness and realism of the proposed milestone schedule, appropriate identification of activities necessary to meet the schedule and identification of the risks and problems associated with work transition; and provision of accessible office space.

B. SAFETY AND HEALTH APPROACH

SA1 Safety and Health Approach - The Offeror's approach for satisfying the Safety and Health requirements of DRD SA-1-1, Safety and Health Plan, will be assessed. The Offeror's Safety and Health Plan will be evaluated for effectively describing a process for ensuring safety and health of personnel, and thoroughly identifying and managing safety and health risks.

4.2 TECHNICAL APPROACH

The effectiveness of the Offeror's approach for meeting the technical requirements of the SOW, and the Offeror's demonstrated in-depth understanding of the requirements will be evaluated. Adequacy and realism of resources will be considered as an indicator of the Offeror's understanding of the requirements.

TA1 (1) The Offeror's proposed Logistics Technical Integration Plan will be evaluated for their approach to meeting the requirements set forth in the SOW.

(2) The Offeror's plan for monitoring, identifying, and controlling risks will be evaluated.

TA2 The Offeror's Logistics Operations Comparative Table, identifying new work instructions, modification to, or continued use of identified existing work instructions will be evaluated.

TA3 Soundness of the Offeror's approach to implementing their Quality Control Plan and ISO 9001 compliance will be evaluated.

TA4 The Offeror's approach to accomplishing the requirements of the sample task orders and the SOW will be evaluated, including demonstration of understanding and comprehension of the SOW. The Offeror's approach to dealing with the technical and management complexities will also be considered. The Offeror's approach for controlling costs and efficiencies with regard to the acquisition of store stock, furniture and critical spares will be evaluated.

4.3 PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR

Past Performance indicates how well an Offeror performed on earlier work and can be a significant indicator of how well it can be expected to perform the work at hand.

The offerors' past performance including relevant experience (including joint-venture and subcontracts) 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, information obtained by the SEB from the Past Performance Questionnaire and communications with listed references as well as any other information obtained independently by the SEB. For a newly formed organization, the evaluation will consider the past performance record of its component organizations. 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 on past performance. The results of the Board's evaluation will be presented to the SSA for consideration in making the source selection decision.

The Offeror's substantiating past performance of previous phase-ins of similar complexity will be evaluated.

SA2 Safety and Environmental Past Performance – The Offeror's safety and environmental past performance for prime and subcontractors will be evaluated using data provided in accordance with section L of the RFP. Records and associated data of the Offeror's OSHA citations during the past three years, including recordable injuries and illnesses, and listing of all safety and health insurance carriers that have underwritten the Offeror's workers' compensation program or equivalent for the last three years for the prime and subcontractors will be evaluated.

MISSION SUITABILITY SUBFACTOR WEIGHTS

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

Management Approach	400
Safety and Health Plan	100
Technical Approach	500
TOTAL MISSION SUITABILITY POINTS	1000

4.4 COST/PRICE FACTOR

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, Part 2) 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 Offerors cost proposal, as shown on page M-7.

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 (i.e., Completion Form and IDIQ combined) and the total probable cost and fee will be calculated to determine the difference between proposed and probable cost. Note that the probable IDIQ cost and fee shall be determined from the matrix provided sample hours and not from the sample task orders. However, if and to the extent that an offeror proposes to hire some or all of the incumbent workforce, and states on the total compensation template (e) their intent to maintain current incumbent direct labor rates, then the probable cost adjustments related to incumbent direct labor rates will be subtracted from the delta between proposed and probable cost prior to making a Mission Suitability point adjustment to the Offeror's overall score in accordance with the NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(B) using the Cost Realism Table below.

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 Source Selection Authority (SSA) for consideration in making the source selection.

Cost and Fee Evaluation of Completion Form – The SEB will perform a cost realism analysis for Completion Form. 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 contracts 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 1-10) will be evaluated.

Cost and Fee Evaluation of IDIQ - The SEB will perform a cost realism analysis of proposed IDIQ rates and develop probable rates. All proposed resources will be assessed for validity, realism, and adequacy. These probable rates will be multiplied against the matrix of hours provided in the RFP to develop a probable cost. The Government's probable rates multiplied against the Government's matrix hours will be considered the Offeror's probable cost and will be used for selection purposes.

Probable cost for selection purposes – The probable cost will be used for selection purposes and will include the cost of the basic and Award Term periods of performance for both Completion Form and IDIQ effort. This includes the entire completion form effort plus the probable cost developed from using the matrix for contract years 1-10. 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. This consideration involves performing an analysis of the proposed price which may lead to mission suitability weaknesses if the price or proposed resources are not consistent with the proposed Phase-in Plan.

M.5 RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS

Considered separately, each of the three factors, Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost are approximately equal to one another. Mission Suitability and Past performance, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost.