

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1 LISTING OF PROVISIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

NOTICE: The provisions in this Section are incorporated by reference, with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Provisions incorporated by reference which require a fill-in by the Government include the text of the affected paragraph(s) only. This does not limit the provision to the affected paragraph(s). The Contractor is responsible for understanding and complying with the entire provision. The full text of the provision is available at the addresses contained in clause 52.252-1, Provisions Incorporated by Reference, of this contract. The following contract provisions pertinent to this section are hereby incorporated by reference:

I. FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION (48 CFR CHAPTER 1)

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

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

PROVISION NUMBER	DATE	TITLE
------------------	------	-------

None included by reference.

M.2 METHOD OF EVALUATION

- A. Proposals received in response to this solicitation will be evaluated by a source selection team in accordance with NFS 1815.3 and Section M.5, below. The team will rate Technical Acceptability as Meets Requirement or Does Not Meet Requirement in accordance with M.5.A, below, and will rate Past Performance in accordance with Section M.5.C, below. The team will consider cost/price in accordance with this Section M.
- B. The Source Selection Authority (SSA), after consultation with the source selection team and other advisors, will select the offeror that can perform the contract in a manner most advantageous to the Government, all factors considered. The SSA will make an integrated assessment of each offer and comparatively evaluate competing offers, considering input from the source selection team. The SSA will consider adjectival ratings assigned by the source selection team; however, the SSA will base selection on substantive proposal differences that are reflected by the adjectival ratings as opposed to basing selection on mere differences in ratings or scores.
- C. Evaluation will be on the basis of material presented and substantiated in the offeror's proposal and not on the basis of what may be implied. Vague statements will be interpreted as a lack of understanding on the part of the offeror and/or inability to demonstrate adequate qualifications. The offeror's attention is directed to Section L, which provides important instructions concerning proposal preparation.

M.3 SAFETY AND HEALTH PLAN

NASA will review the offeror's proposed approach to Safety and Health as required by NFS 1852.223-70, Safety and Health and the offeror's Safety and Health Plan in accordance with NFS 1852.223-73 and Attachment L-1, Additional Safety and Health Plan Instructions. **NOTE:** The Safety and Health Plan will not be rated. The Plan will be reviewed by the NASA LaRC Safety Officer to ensure it addresses the requirements of NFS 1852.223-70, NFS 1852.223-73, and Attachment L-1 to this RFP. Corrections to the Plan, if any, will be addressed after an offeror is selected for award and will not necessitate otherwise unneeded discussions.

M.4 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. Selection of the contractor will be made on the basis of a determination of the best value presented by those offerors who meet the technical acceptability factor. The best value determination will be made on the basis of a tradeoff of the past performance and cost/price factors.

The following factors shall be used to evaluate offers:

- A. Factor 1: Technical Acceptability
- B. Factor 2: Cost/Price
- C. Factor 3: Past Performance

M.5 EVALUATION FACTORS

A. FACTOR 1: VOLUME I - TECHNICAL ACCEPTABILITY

The effectiveness of the Offeror's approach to meeting the baseline technical requirements of the SOW, and the Offeror's demonstrated in-depth understanding of the requirements shall be evaluated. Completeness of response and adequacy and realism of resources will be considered as an indicator of the Offeror's understanding of the requirements.

1. Subfactor 1: Technical Requirements

- 1.1 NASA will evaluate the offeror's plan for accomplishing the work in the Statement of Work from both a technical and schedule standpoint. NASA will evaluate the adequacy of the proposed resources, which includes the amounts and kinds of materials and equipment. NASA will evaluate the type of equipment to be provided by the offeror for work and any other items required for the proposed method of implementation.
- 1.2 NASA will evaluate the planned organizational structure for efficiently managing the work. NASA will evaluate the overall approach to contract management, the authority and responsibilities vested in the contract manager, as well as the manager's access to company resources. NASA will evaluate the proposed interfaces with NASA personnel and any subcontractors.
- 1.3 NASA will evaluate the approach for recognizing, reporting, solving and following-up on technical and schedule problems. Your discussion on the identification of and the proposed

resolution of any potential problems likely to be encountered during contract performance will also be evaluated.

2. Subfactor 2: Staffing Plan

- 2.1 NASA will evaluate the resume for the Project Manager covering, at a minimum, the experience, education, training and commitment to this contract of the individual proposed.
- 2.2 NASA will evaluate the proposed approach to transition work from the incumbent contractor.
- 2.3 NASA will evaluate the proposed plans for staffing, training, maintaining and retaining a qualified workforce throughout the course of the contract.
- 2.4 NASA will evaluate the proposed plans for maintaining staffing flexibility to accommodate changes in requirements and fluctuation in seasonal workloads.

3. Subfactor 3: Phase-In Plan

- 3.1 NASA will evaluate the proposed Phase-In Plan, which demonstrates the Offeror's ability to meet full performance beginning with the first day of the contract.
 - 3.1.1 NASA will evaluate the proposed plans for effecting a smooth phase-in in order to maintain efficient operations at NASA LaRC for the 30 day period prior to contract start. NASA will evaluate the schedule for all phase-in steps and how the schedule will be met.
 - 3.1.2 NASA will evaluate the proposed plans for recruiting and training your personnel during the phase-in period.
 - 3.1.3 NASA will evaluate the proposed initial staffing plan, including incumbent personnel retention and the rationale utilized to develop the initial staffing plan.
 - 3.1.4 NASA will evaluate the proposed relationships during phase-in with the incumbent contractor and NASA, including support, resources and interfaces expected from each.

Technical Acceptability Ratings: The ratings set forth below will be used to evaluate the Technical Acceptability factor for each offeror.

Meets Requirements: A proposal that demonstrates an understanding and feasible approach to all technical requirements. The proposal may be accepted on its present terms.

Does Not Meet Requirements: A proposal that either does not address all technical requirements or contains deficiencies in both understanding of and technical approach to a least one essential requirement. This includes approaches that are not technically feasible, or could not be acceptable without rewriting or resubmission of a new technical approach.

NOTE: An offeror must receive a Meets Requirements rating in all three of the above subfactors in order to receive a Meets Requirements rating for the Technical Acceptability Factor. If an offeror receives one or more Does Not Meet Requirements rating in any of the three subfactors above, the offeror will receive a rating of Does Not Meet Requirements for the Technical Acceptability Factor.

B. FACTOR 2: VOLUME 2 - COST/PRICE

NASA will conduct an analysis of the proposed price to determine price reasonableness and cost realism. The specific elements of each offeror's proposed cost estimate will be reviewed and evaluated by NASA to determine whether the proposed cost elements are realistic for the work to be performed; reflect a clear understanding of the requirements; and are consistent with the unique methods of performance and materials described in the offeror's technical proposal. Results of this analysis may be used in performance risk assessments and responsibility determinations.

C. FACTOR 3: VOLUME III - PAST PERFORMANCE

Under the Past Performance factor, NASA will evaluate each offeror's record (including the record of any significant subcontractors and/or teaming partners) of performing services or delivering products that are similar in size, scope, and complexity to the requirements of this solicitation. The rating assigned to Past Performance (see below) will reflect consideration of information contained in the proposal, past performance evaluation input provided through customer questionnaires, and other references, if any, that the Government may contact for additional past performance information. Offerors without a record of relevant past performance, or for whom information on past performance is not available, shall receive a neutral rating. Offerors are cautioned that omissions or an inaccurate or inadequate response to this evaluation factor will have a negative effect on the overall evaluation.

Past Performance Ratings - The ratings set forth below will be used to evaluate the Past Performance factor for each offeror.

Each of the adjective ratings below has a "performance" component and a "relevance" component. The offeror must meet the requirements of both components to achieve a particular rating. In assessing relevance, the Government will consider the degree of similarity in size, scope, and complexity to the requirements in this solicitation, as well as how current the past performance is.

In assessing performance, the Government will make an assessment of the offeror's overall performance record. The Government will evaluate the offeror's past performance record for meeting technical, schedule, cost, management, occupational health, safety, security, mission success, subcontracting goals and other contract requirements. Isolated or infrequent problems that were not severe or persistent, and for which the offeror took immediate and appropriate corrective action, may not reduce the offeror's rating. On the other hand, ratings will be reduced when problems were within the contractor's control and were significant, persistent, or frequent, or when there is a pattern of problems or a negative trend of performance.

Excellent - Of exceptional merit; exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner; very minor (if any) deficiencies with no adverse effect on overall performance; and experience that is highly relevant to this procurement.

Very good - Very effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part; only minor deficiencies with minimal effect on overall performance; and experience is very relevant to this procurement.

Good - Effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable deficiencies, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance; and experience is relevant to this procurement.

Satisfactory - Meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable deficiencies with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance; and experience is at least somewhat relevant to this procurement.

Poor/Unsatisfactory - Does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; deficiencies in one or more areas which adversely affect overall performance.

Neutral - no record of relevant past performance or past performance information is not available

M.6 RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF EVALUATION FACTORS

Overall, in the selection of a Contractor for contract award, Technical Acceptability, Cost/Price, and Past Performance will be of essentially equal importance. All evaluation factors other than Cost/Price, when combined, are significantly more important than Price/Cost.

[End of Section]