

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD TO OFFERORS

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 provision 52.252-1, Solicitation Provisions Incorporated by Reference, of this solicitation.

I. FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION (48 CFR CHAPTER 1) CLAUSES

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

None by reference.

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

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

None by reference.

M.2 METHOD OF EVALUATION

(A) Proposals received in response to this solicitation will be evaluated by a NASA Source Evaluation Team (SET) in accordance with NFS 1815.3. The team will rate Mission Suitability in accordance with M.3 below, and Past Performance in accordance with M.5 below. The team will evaluate 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(s) 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 and point scores assigned by the source selection team; however, the SSA will base selection on substantive proposal differences that are reflected by the adjectival ratings and point scores 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 to M.5 EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.3 FACTOR 1 - MISSION SUITABILITY

The content of this section of the offeror's proposal will provide the basis for the evaluation of the response to the technical requirements of the solicitation. Note: Proposal risks and the approach for managing those risks will be evaluated for each subfactor. The evaluation of risk will consider the probability of success, the impact of failure, and the alternatives available to meet the requirements. The Mission Suitability subfactors to be considered and scored in the evaluation of the Technical Proposal are set forth below:

(A) Subfactor 1 – Understanding the Requirement and Technical Approach

(1) Representative Delivery Orders

NASA will evaluate the offeror's proposed technical approach for performing the representative Delivery Orders identified in Section J, Attachment 2, including the proposed time schedule for completion of work that indicates task start times, task completion times, and schedule interrelationships. NASA will evaluate key milestones, in addition to choices that would represent large differences in risk, time, or equipment use. NASA will also evaluate the offeror's proposed staffing plan and cost estimate submitted for each representative Delivery Order.

(2) Performance Work Statement

NASA will evaluate the offeror's understanding of and approach for achieving the requirements of the performance work statement that are not included in discussion of the representative Delivery Orders.

(3) Problems and Problem Resolution

NASA will evaluate the offeror's discussion of typical problems associated with the work and proposed resolutions, as well as any innovative ideas that may be applied in performing the work.

(B) Subfactor 2 - Facilities and Equipment

NASA will evaluate the proposed facilities in terms of the number of square feet devoted to engineering, manufacturing, inspection, computer systems, classified work areas and any other necessary functions, including the detailed floor plan which depicts the overall facility layout. NASA will evaluate the inventory of proposed manufacturing, inspection, and engineering equipment and computer systems to be provided, including the type, accuracy, capability, capacity, and other parameters such as age and condition. Any facility capability to perform classified work shall also be evaluated.

(C) Subfactor 3 - Management Approach

(1) NASA will evaluate the offeror's response to this subfactor in the

following areas:

(a) Any work functions which the offeror expects to obtain through joint ventures, teaming, subcontracting and/or consulting agreements.

(b) Procedures for ensuring effective and efficient coordination with the Government in areas such as design reviews, in-process inspection, and transfer of classified material. Operational efficiency, including the approach for integrating the various work areas into an efficient manageable operation.

(c) Approach to problem solution, including the approach to recognize, report, solve, and follow-up on problems.

(2) NASA will evaluate the offeror's proposed approach to safety and health as required by NFS 1852.223-72, Safety and Health (Short Form).

(3) Quality System—NASA will evaluate the effectiveness of the offeror's proposed quality system:

(a) All Offerors - The Quality Plan of each offeror will be evaluated on the approach to develop quality system documentation or modify existing quality system documentation needed to ensure effective planning, operation and control of processes/work activities specific to this contract. The offeror will also be evaluated on how the integrity of the Quality Management System (QMS) is maintained when changes to the QMS are planned and implemented.

(b) ISO 9001 Compliance:

Offerors which **ARE** ISO 9001 compliant (as defined in H.15) at Proposal Due Date: The Quality System Manual of compliant offerors will be evaluated, in addition to quality system procedures for: (a) contract and subcontract management, (b) customer requirement review and execution, (c) task management, including work order generation and processing, (d) document control, (e) handling of customer supplied product, (f) corrective, preventive and continuing improvement action systems, (g) training of employees, (h) customer satisfaction/performance measurement and (i) design control.

Offerors which **ARE NOT** ISO 9001 compliant: The letter from an appropriate company official expressing commitment to becoming compliant within nine months of the contract effective date will be evaluated. The plan for becoming ISO 9001 compliant will also be evaluated.

(c) AS9100 Compliance:

Offerors which **ARE** AS9100 compliant (as defined in Section H.17) at Proposal Due Date: The Quality System Manual of compliant offerors will be evaluated, in addition to quality system procedures for: (a) contract and subcontract management, (b) customer requirement review and execution, (c) task management, including work order generation and processing, (d) document control, (e) handling of customer supplied product, (f) corrective,

preventive, and continuing improvement action systems, (g) training of employees, (h) customer satisfaction/performance measurement and (i) design control

Offerors which **ARE NOT** AS9100 compliant: The letter from an appropriate company official expressing commitment to becoming compliant within nine months of the contract effective date will be evaluated. The compliance plan for becoming AS9100 compliant will also be evaluated.

(4) Subcontracting Plan—NASA will evaluate the offeror's Small Business Subcontracting Plan based on the requirements of FAR 52.219-8-Utilization of Small Business Concerns and FAR 52.219-9-Small Business Subcontracting Plan, as well as the approach for achieving the goals set forth in Section L, L.16(C)(4). The proposed Small Disadvantaged Businesses (SDB's) will be evaluated based upon the SDB's status as a small business only. (Subcontracting with SDB's based upon their status as SDB's will be evaluated only under Mission Suitability Subfactor 4 - Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB) Participation Program.) The requirement for submission of a Subcontracting Plan does not apply to Small Businesses.

(5) Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI) Avoidance Plan—NASA will evaluate the Offeror's plan for complying with Section H.7, "Organizational Conflicts of Interest" and Section H.6, "Limitation of Future Contracting". NASA will evaluate the Offeror's analysis of possible organizational conflicts of interest that might result from the award of the contract and the effectiveness of the Offerors' strategies to mitigate or eliminate the impacts of those OCIs.

(D) Subfactor 4 - Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB) Participation Program

NASA will evaluate the proposed extent of SDB participation in contract performance, as well as the proposed targets required in Section L, L.16(D). Small Disadvantaged Business offerors that do not waive the 10% price evaluation adjustment under FAR 52.219-23 shall not receive any evaluation credit under this Mission Suitability subfactor (meaning they will receive a score of zero for this subfactor). Small Disadvantaged Business offerors that do waive the price evaluation adjustment will be evaluated in the same manner as all other offerors.

M.4 FACTOR 2 - COST/PRICE ANALYSIS

An analysis of the proposed price will be conducted to determine price reasonableness and cost realism. The specific elements of each offeror's proposed cost estimate will be reviewed and evaluated by the Government 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.

M.5 FACTOR 3 – PAST PERFORMANCE

(A) 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 paragraph B 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.

(B) 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, content, 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, overall 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

(A) The weights to be used in the scoring of the Mission Suitability subfactors are presented below:

	<u>Subfactors</u>	<u>Weight</u>
1.	Understanding the Requirement & Technical Approach	400
2.	Facilities and Equipment	300
3.	Management Approach	200
4.	Small Disadvantaged Business Participation Program	<u>100</u>
	TOTAL	1,000

(B) The numerical weights assigned to the above subfactors are indicative of the relative importance of those evaluation areas. Overall, in the selection of a Contractor(s) for contract award, Mission Suitability and Past Performance will be of essentially equal importance, and more important than Cost/Price. All evaluation factors other than Cost, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost/Price.

M.7 COST REALISM ADJUSTMENT

(A) A pool of 300 points will be used to adjust the Mission Suitability score to account for any weaknesses associated with the lack of cost realism present in the offeror's proposal. This adjustment will be made if the proposed resources are unrealistically high or low according to the following guidelines.

(B) Depending on the severity of the lack of realism, some or all of the points in the cost realism pool will be deducted from the offeror's Mission Suitability score. The total number of points to be subtracted from the Mission Suitability score will be calculated as follows:

Difference Between Proposed and Probable Cost	Point Adjustment
+/- 0 to 30 percent	0
+/- 31 to 40 percent	-50
+/- 41 to 50 percent	-100
+/- 51 to 60 percent	-150

+/- 61 to 70 percent	-200
+/- more than 70 percent	-300

(C) The magnitude of the realism adjustments will be rounded up to the next integer value of percentage (e.g., a value of +/- 15.3% will be rounded up to +/- 16%).

[END OF SECTION]