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
52.217-5	JUL 1990	EVALUATION OF OPTIONS

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 Mid-Range Procurement Team (MPT) in accordance with applicable regulations which include the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and the NASA FAR Supplement. The MPT 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 fourth in provision L.4 Instructions to Offerors-Competitive Acquisition.

M.4 MISSION SUITABILITY FACTOR

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 Mission Suitability subfactors identified below 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. Technical Approach
B. Safety and Health Plan
C. Management Approach
D. Key Personnel

The supporting subfactors are set forth below:

M.5 VOLUME 1: TECHNICAL APPROACH

The Government will evaluate the effectiveness of the Offeror's approach to meeting the technical requirements of the SOW. The Government will also evaluate the Offeror's demonstrated in-depth understanding of the requirements. Adequacy and realism of resources will be considered as an indicator of the Offeror's understanding of the requirements. The proposal will be evaluated based on the Offeror's ability to transform understanding into accomplishment.

TA1. Specific Technical Understanding and Resources

A. Technical Narrative

Completion Form
The Offeror's proposal will be evaluated on the technical approach and the level of detail provided to demonstrate comprehension of the requirements in each section of Table L.2. Your proposal will be evaluated on the completeness, thoroughness, and soundness with which the SOW is addressed, along with taking into account the unique nature of the work.

The Offeror's proposal will be evaluated on the approach to provide and manage accurate documents and your knowledge and application of environmental laws. The description of how you will communicate with and educate Government personnel and the other contractors will also be assessed.

Sample Task Orders (IDIQ)
The Offeror's proposal will be evaluated on the technical resources and technical approach to complete the IDIQ portion of the work. The validity and reasonableness of your assumptions and rationale will be evaluated.

Risk
The Offeror's technical proposal will be evaluated on the approach for identifying, monitoring, and mitigating risks.

B. Basis of Estimate

The Offeror's Basis of Estimate (BOE) will be evaluated for the reasonableness of the proposed approach.

C. Resources Table

The Offeror's Resources Table will be evaluated for validity and reasonableness, appropriate level of detail, and agreement with the technical, BOE and cost proposal.

TA2. Technical Scenarios

The Offeror's technical scenarios will be evaluated on your understanding of the SOW and the relevant laws and agency requirements, and your ability to transform the understanding into accomplishment.

The Offeror's description and understanding of the interfaces with the Facilities Contractor in Technical Scenarios 1 and 2 will be evaluated.

M.6 VOLUME 2: SAFETY AND HEALTH PLAN

SH1. Safety and Health Plan

The Offeror's Plan will be evaluated to determine its compliance with the requirements of DRD SA-1-1, Safety and Health Plan.

M.7 VOLUME 3: MANAGEMENT APPROACH AND KEY PERSONNEL

Section 1: Management Approach

The Offeror's management approach, including supporting rationale, for fulfilling the requirements of the contract will be evaluated.

MA1. Management Approach

An evaluation will be made of the overall effectiveness and efficiency of your management approach, including: local organizational structure and corporate organizational structure; lines of communication, local autonomy, and corporate support; communication between your staff and JSC Environmental Office and problem resolution; allocation of labor skills into the proposed organization; subcontracting, joint venture or teaming approach; and acceptance of contract terms and conditions.

MA2. Workforce Management

An evaluation will be made of the overall effectiveness and efficiency of your approach to recruiting, initial staffing, and retaining a qualified workforce, and corporate support for employees. The Offeror's approach to effectively support fluctuating workloads, including IDIQ, will be evaluated.

MA3. Total Compensation Plan

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's total compensation plan for the ability to recruit and retain a high quality and stable workforce. The professional compensation proposed will be considered in terms of its impact upon recruiting and retention of employees.

MA4. Associated Contractor Agreement

An evaluation will be made of the overall effectiveness of the proposed approach and schedule for establishing an Associate Contractor Agreement (ACA) with the other JSC Contractors.

MA5. Management Scenario

An evaluation will be made of the Offeror's management scenario based on the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the approach to support the EFR, inventory, and generator approval, and accomplish the on-going activities while recruiting a replacement key personnel.

MA6. Phase-In Plan

The Offeror's Plan will be evaluated on the effectiveness and soundness of the approach in successfully implementing the transition during phase-in.

Section 2: Key Personnel

KP1. Key Personnel

An evaluation will be made of the quality and relevance of the experience, education, commitment, and overall capability of the proposed key personnel.

KP2. Key Personnel Management

An evaluation will be made on your approach to recruit, retain and manage the performance of highly qualified personnel.

M.8 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.

Technical Approach	400
Safety and Health Plan	100
Management Approach	300
Key Personnel	200
TOTAL MISSION SUITABILITY POINTS	**1000**

M.9 VOLUME 4: PAST PERFORMANCE

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 required under the contract.

The Offeror's past performance and relevant experience (including joint-venture partners and proposed major subcontractors), will be evaluated separately by the MPT. Past Performance Factor is not numerically weighted or scored, but will be assigned an adjective rating of Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair or Poor as defined in the NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(A).

The evaluation will be based on information provided in your proposals, information obtained by the MPT from Attachment L-2, *Service Provided on Similar Contracts Questionnaire*, and Attachment L-3, *Past Performance Questionnaire,* communications with listed references as well as any other information obtained independently by the MPT. 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. In such a situation, an Offeror will receive a neutral rating. The results of the MPT's evaluation will be presented to the SSA for consideration in making the source selection decision.

You and your major subcontractors' past performance will be evaluated for your ability and commitment to conduct work in a safe and environmentally compliant

manner. You will be evaluated on your past performance in successfully implementing sustainable programs, air quality programs and ISW management programs. The benefits and accomplishments resulting from your relationships with regulatory agencies, and past experience and participation in working groups and guidance development will be evaluated.

M.10 VOLUME 5: COST PROPOSAL

The MPT will not utilize weighting and scoring in the cost area. The Government will perform a price analysis and cost realism analysis of the Offeror's proposed rates, prices and resources. Each cost proposal (including resources proposed in Volume 1, Technical Approach) 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 MPT to be unrealistic, probable cost adjustments will be made. If the overall proposed cost is determined to be unrealistic, the mission suitability score will be adjusted in accordance with Table M.1.

Probable cost is the MPT'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.

Table M.1 – 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 MPT 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 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 completion form work for Contract Years 1-5 will be evaluated.

Cost and Fee Evaluation of IDIQ

The MPT 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 proposed probable IDIQ cost for contract years 1-5 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 Contract Years 1-5 for both Completion Form and IDIQ effort. This includes the entire completion form effort plus the probable cost developed from using the matrix. 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.11 RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS

Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost. As related to each other, Mission Suitability and Past Performance are approximately equal.

[END OF SECTION]