

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD TO OFFERORS

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 included by reference.

(End of provision)

M.2 COMBINATION OF THE TWO ENDS OF THE NEGOTIATED SOURCE SELECTION CONTINUUM EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD.

The Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the Offeror whose proposal represents the best value after evaluation. This procurement shall be conducted utilizing a combination of technical acceptability and tradeoff of predefined qualitative value characteristics; past performance; Safety and Health Requirements; and cost/price.

The following factors shall be used to evaluate offers:

- Technical Acceptability
- Past Performance
- Safety and Health Requirements

- Predefined Qualitative Value Characteristics
- Cost/Price

1) Technical Acceptability

The proposals will be evaluated for the complete and adequate response to the SOW (technical requirements) and the requirements of the Initial Annual Grounds Maintenance Work Plan, Key Personnel and Staffing Plan, SBA Ostensible Subcontractor Rule Evaluation, and the Phase-in Plan. The effectiveness of the Offeror's approach to meeting the technical requirements of the SOW, and the Offeror's demonstrated in-depth understanding of the requirements will be evaluated. Completeness of response and adequacy and realism of resources (including the basis of estimate to support the price proposal) will be considered as an indicator of the Offeror's understanding of the requirements.

A) Technical Requirements

The proposal will be evaluated to ensure that it demonstrates an understanding of the magnitude and scope of the work to be performed and provides a sound approach to the accomplishment of the SOW requirements.

The proposed organizational structure, subcontract management approach, and management systems will be evaluated to ensure technical, schedule, and cost performance.

Innovations will only be considered as qualitative value characteristics if specifically proposed as such (see M.3 (4)).

B) Initial Annual Grounds Maintenance Work Plan (DRD 01)

The plan will be evaluated to ensure that it addresses all requirements. Consideration will be given to the approach to IPM, composting and mulching, staffing and training, and work methods. The organization and

presentation of the sample months of the Master Schedule will also be considered.

C) Key Personnel and Staffing Plan (DRD 01, Subpart 1.0)

The proposal will be evaluated to ensure the Project Manager meets the Standard Labor Category Job Guidelines for the position.

The approach to maintaining staffing flexibility to accommodate changes in requirements and fluctuation in workloads will be evaluated to ensure the Offeror's understanding of the scope of the work to be performed and to ensure a sound approach to accomplishment of the SOW requirements.

Special experience and/or certification of key personnel will be considered as a qualitative value characteristic only if specifically proposed as such (see M.3 (4)).

D) SBA Ostensible Subcontractor Rule Evaluation

Provided details will be evaluated to determine that the prime contractor making the offer will be performing the primary and vital requirements for the contract.

E) Phase-In Plan

The schedule and work methods for all phase-in steps will be evaluated for both thoroughness and effectiveness of approach to maintaining continuity of services throughout transition.

Technical acceptability will be rated as either meets requirements or does not meet requirements.

2) 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 at hand. The

Offeror's past performance including recent experience will be evaluated by the Government. The evaluation will be based on information provided by Offerors in their proposals, information obtained by the Government based on communications with listed references as well as any other information obtained independently by the Government. Past Performance for the Offeror will be rated as Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, or Poor (as defined in NASA FAR Supplement 1815.305(a)(3)(A)). If an Offeror has no past performance experience, they will be given a neutral rating.

Consideration will be given to past performance on work of similar size and scope. Past performance on work of a similar size and scope is necessary to achieve a rating of Excellent, and it will increase all other adjective ratings by one level.

3) Safety and Health Requirements

The Offeror's approach to safety and health as required by NFS 1852.223-70 will be evaluated and rated as Acceptable or Unacceptable. The suitability and adequacy of the Offeror's Safety and Health Plan (DRD 02) in accordance with NFS 1852.223-73 will be included in this evaluation.

4) Predefined Qualitative Value Characteristics (VC)

Only proposals that meet the technical acceptability and safety and health requirements outlined above will be judged against the qualitative characteristics. Only items specifically proposed as Qualitative Value Characteristics will be evaluated as such. The following Predefined Qualitative Value Characteristics are applicable to this procurement and will be evaluated and rated as Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair or Poor:

- 1) Innovative technical approach (e.g. operational efficiencies, equipment reliability strategies, environmentally friendly alternatives)
- 2) Key personnel: Demonstrate how proposed key personnel have special training or experience specifically tailored to the requirements.

5) Tradeoff Process

- 1) If all Offerors are of approximately equal merit, award will be made to the Offeror with the lowest price.
- 2) The Government will consider awarding to an Offeror with higher merit if the difference in price is commensurate with added value.
- 3) The Government will consider making award to an Offeror whose offer has lower merit if the price differential between it and other offers warrant doing so.

Technical acceptability, past performance, safety and health requirements, and the qualitative value characteristics, when combined, are approximately equal to price.

(End of provision)

M.3 COST/PRICE FACTOR

The Government will consider each offeror's proposed price elements in evaluating the offeror's understanding of the effort required, and to establish what additional value, if any, is associated with a higher price, or what factors contribute to a lower price. The Offeror's price proposal shall provide adequate detail to permit such evaluation.

Each cost/price proposal will be evaluated to determine if the price is fair and reasonable.

Price Evaluation of Completion Form - The Government will perform an analysis of proposed rates and resources. All proposed resources will be assessed for validity, realism, and adequacy.

Price Evaluation of IDIQ - The Government will perform an analysis of proposed IDIQ rates included in Section B.

The evaluation specifically excludes the cost associated with Phase-in.

The proposed price of the Phase-In will be analyzed to determine if the price or proposed resources are consistent with the proposed Phase-in Plan.

(End of provision)

[END OF SECTION]