

SECTION M: EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1 52.252-1 SOLICITATION PROVISIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE (FEB 1998)

This solicitation incorporates one or more solicitation provisions by reference, with the same force and effect as if they were given in full text. Upon request, the Contracting Officer will make their full text available. The Offeror is cautioned that the listed provisions may include blocks that must be completed by the Offeror and submitted with its quotation or offer. In lieu of submitting the full text of those provisions, the Offeror may identify the provision by paragraph identifier and provide the appropriate information with its quotation or offer. Also, the full text of a solicitation provision may be accessed electronically at this/these address (es):

Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) clauses:

<https://acquisition.gov/far/>

NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) clauses:

<http://www.hq.nasa.gov/office/procurement/regs/nfstoc.htm>

(End of provision)

M.2 LISTING OF PROVISIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

Federal Acquisition Regulation (48 CFR Chapter I)

| <u>PROVISION NUMBER</u> | <u>TITLE</u> | <u>DATE</u> |
|-----------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| | NONE | |

(End of provision)

NASA FAR Supplement (48 CFR Chapter 18)

| <u>PROVISION NUMBER</u> | <u>TITLE</u> | <u>DATE</u> |
|-----------------------------|--------------|-------------|
| | NONE | |

(End of provision)

M.3 AWARD WITHOUT DISCUSSIONS

The proposals will be evaluated in accordance with procedures prescribed by the FAR and the NFS. As prescribed in the FAR 52.215-1, the Government intends to award based on initial proposals, without discussions. Therefore, the Offeror's initial proposal should contain the Offeror's best terms. The Government reserves the right to determine if discussions are required and if so, an establishment of a competitive range may be necessary. Consequently, the most highly rated proposals will be included in the competitive range.

(End of Provision)

M.4 EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

An initial review of proposals will be conducted to determine acceptability of the proposals in accordance with NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.305-70, Identification of Unacceptable Proposals. All unacceptable proposals will be eliminated from further evaluation.

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.

The Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible Offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government. This procurement shall be conducted utilizing a combination of mission suitability, past performance and cost/price evaluation factors. The lowest price proposals may not necessarily receive an award; likewise, the highest technically rated proposals may not necessarily receive an award. Mission Suitability and Past Performance when combined are more important than cost. Mission Suitability is more important than past performance.

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposal using the factors and subfactors below. Although proposals are organized by factors and subfactors, the Government will conduct an integrated evaluation to consider consistency among proposal information.

Therefore, all aspects of the Offeror's proposal will be considered during the evaluation process, including the Offeror's proposed Model Contract.

The Government reserves the right and may award the IDIQ Cost Plus Fixed Fee Task Orders (Attachments L-01 thru L-06) as proposed. All other work will be authorized on IDIQ Task Orders negotiated between the Contractor and the Government.

(End of provision)

M.5 PROPOSAL ARRANGEMENT, PAGE LIMITATIONS, COPIES, AND DUE DATE

(a) Late proposals will not be accepted in accordance with FAR 52.215-1, "Instructions to Offerors – Competitive Acquisition".

(b) Instructions for proposal arrangement, page limitations, copies, and due dates are specified in Section L.19. Offerors shall submit their proposals in accordance with those instructions. Pages and foldouts not conforming to the definition of a page, pages submitted in excess of the limitations specified, and pages submitted within a Volume which clearly do not belong in that Volume, will not be evaluated by the Government, will not be adjusted by the Government to conform to the RFP requirements, and will be returned to the Offeror.

(c) For example, a volume has a requirement for a page limit of 250 pages with non-compressed Arial font with single-spaced 12 point text printed on both sides of the sheet and one-inch margins. The following are examples of non-conformances: (1) If an Offeror submits this volume with 260 pages, two of which contain tables with 10 point font [if those two pages of tables in 10 point font were not removed as a result of excess pages] the 2 pages with 10 point font in addition to the 8 pages in excess of the page count will be returned to the Offeror and will not be adjusted or evaluated; (2) If an Offeror submits pages for this volume with less than one-inch margins, those pages with the smaller margins will be returned to the Offeror and will not be adjusted or evaluated; and (3) If an Offeror submits pages for this volume using a different font type than non-compressed Arial font with single-space 12 point text, then those pages containing the different font type will be returned to the Offeror and will not be adjusted or evaluated.

(d) As a further example, if an Offeror submits information in any Volume which clearly does not belong to that Volume, the pages containing that information will be returned to the Offeror and will not be considered for evaluation purposes.

(e) To the extent of any inconsistencies between data provided electronically and proposal hard copies, the hard copy data will be considered to be the intended data.

(End of provision)

M.6 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. The Mission Suitability subfactors and their corresponding weights reflecting relative importance are listed below. These weights are intended to be used as a guideline in the source selection decision-making process.

| Mission Suitability | Weight (pts) |
|---|---------------------|
| Subfactor 1 Management Approach and Plans | 300 |
| Subfactor 2 Technical Approach | 500 |
| Subfactor 3 Small Business Utilization | 100* |
| Subfactor 4 Safety and Health Plan | 100 |
| TOTAL | 1000 |

*Small Business Offerors receive full 100 points.

Proposals will be evaluated and scored numerically based upon the subfactors set forth below. The Government will interpret failure to provide sufficient detail and rationale, use of ambiguous terms, or inconsistencies noted during the evaluation of proposal information, as a lack of understanding on the part of the Offeror and the Offeror is notified that this may affect their Mission Suitability score. The Offeror is also notified that a lack of resource realism may adversely affect their Mission Suitability score and result in cost realism adjustments under the Price/Cost factor.

M.6.1 Management Approach and Plans (MA) - Mission Suitability Subfactor 1

The Offeror's management approach (with supporting rationale) for fulfilling the contract requirements will be evaluated using the Management Approach subfactor elements as described below. Failure to capture proposed efficiencies and innovations in the model contract may result in loss of mission suitability points.

MA1. Overall Management Approach – The Offeror's Overall Management Approach (MA1) will be evaluated for overall demonstrated comprehensive understanding, completeness, effectiveness, feasibility, efficiency, innovation, and consistency.

MA2. Staffing/Retention Approach and Total Compensation Plan – The Offeror's Staffing Approach and Total Compensation Plan (MA2) will be evaluated for overall demonstrated comprehensive understanding, completeness, effectiveness, feasibility, efficiency, innovation, and consistency.

MA3. Key Personnel – The Offeror's Key Personnel Approach (MA3) and Key Personnel Resumes (Attachment L-07) will be evaluated for overall demonstrated comprehensive understanding, completeness, effectiveness, feasibility, efficiency, innovation, and consistency.

MA4. Quality Management System – The Offeror's Quality Management System (MA4) will be evaluated for overall demonstrated comprehensive understanding, completeness, effectiveness, feasibility, efficiency, innovation, and consistency with JSC QMS and SAE AS9100, if applicable .

MA5. Phase-in Plan – The Offeror's Contract Phase-in Plan (MA5) will be evaluated for overall demonstrated comprehensive understanding, completeness, effectiveness, feasibility, efficiency, innovation, and consistency.

SB1 Small Business Utilization Subfactor 3(Small Business Offerors will not be evaluated in this section, but will receive full 100 points under subfactor of Small Business Utilization.)

– The evaluation of Small Business Subcontracting and Commitment to the Small Business Program applies to all Offerors, except that Small Businesses are not required to submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan.

The evaluation of SDB participation applies to all Offerors.

SBU 1 Small Business Subcontracting –

The Small Business Subcontracting Plan will be evaluated in terms of reasonableness and soundness of the Offeror's independent assessment to achieve the proposed overall subcontracting goals, in comparison to the Contracting Officer's assessment of the appropriate subcontracting goals for this procurement. The Offeror's Small Business Subcontracting Plan will also be evaluated in terms of meeting the requirements of FAR 19.704, Subcontracting Plan Requirements. The evaluation of the Small Business Subcontracting Plan will be on the basis of total contract value. Additionally, the Offeror's rationale for proposing higher and/or lower goals than those determined appropriate by the Contracting Officer will also be evaluated.

SBU 2 Commitment to the Small Business Program -

The Government will evaluate the extent to which any work performed by a small business subcontractor(s) is identified as "high technology". NASA also will evaluate the extent of commitment to use the subcontractor(s) (enforceable vs. non-enforceable commitments). The Government will evaluate the potential risks or impacts to performance throughout the site when subcontracting out such efforts and the associated mitigations of those risks.

The Government will evaluate the extent to which the identity of the small business subcontractor is specified in the proposal as well as the extent of the commitment to use small businesses and to support their development.

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's established or planned procedures and organizational structure for small business outreach, assistance, participation in the Mentor Protégé program, counseling, market research and small business identification, and relevant purchasing procedures. (For large businesses Offerors,

this information should conform to its submitted Small Business Subcontracting Plan. For small business Offerors, NASA will evaluate this only if subcontracting opportunities exist.)

SA1 Safety and Health Plan Subfactor 4 – The Offeror’s Safety and Health Plan will be evaluated for overall demonstrated understanding, effectiveness, feasibility, efficiency, and completeness.

(End of provision)

M.6.2 Overall Technical Approach (TA) - Mission Suitability Subfactor 2

The offeror’s demonstrated in-depth understanding of the requirements (with supporting rationale) will be evaluated in Technical Approach subfactor element as described below.

TA1. Specific Technical Understanding and Resources - The Government will evaluate the offeror’s Specific Technical Understanding and Resources response for overall demonstrated comprehensive understanding, effectiveness, feasibility, efficiency, innovation and consistency. For any proposed improvements, innovations, and efficiencies, the Government will evaluate the appropriateness and its potential for effective and efficient implementation in the contract. Failure to capture proposed efficiencies and innovations in the model contract may result in loss of mission suitability points.

M.6.3 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 Offeror’s past performance will be evaluated by the SEB.

The Government will use past performance information from proposal data required by provisions of Section L, information obtained by the SEB team based on communications with listed references, as well as data independently obtained from other government and commercial sources, such as the Past Performance Information Retrieval System and similar systems of

other governmental departments and agencies, Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) channels, interviews with client program managers and contracting officers, and other sources known to the Government, including commercial sources. Offerors are to note that, in conducting this assessment, the Government reserves the right to use both data provided by the Offeror and data obtained from other sources. The Government will consider the number and severity of problems, the effectiveness of corrective actions taken and the overall record of past performance. It shall also consider the Offeror's record for adherence to contract schedules, safety, and cost control.

The past performance evaluation will assess the degree of confidence the government has in the Offeror's ability to fulfill the solicitation requirements for the contract while meeting schedule, budget, and performance quality constraints. The past performance evaluation considers each Offeror's demonstrated record of performance in supplying the requirements of this solicitation that meet the user's needs. The Offeror's past performance record will be examined for recent and relevant past performance to determine its ability to perform the required work.

Recency: Contracts with more recent performance will receive greater consideration in the performance confidence assessment than those with more distant performance, assuming all other considerations to be equal. If the contract is still ongoing, it must have a documented performance history. The Government will not consider performance on a newly awarded contract that has no documented performance history (in other words, projects that are less than six months under contract).

Relevancy: For purposes of this procurement, relevancy will be assessed using the following definitions:

| | |
|---------------|--|
| Very Relevant | Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires. |
| Relevant | Present/past performance effort involved much of the magnitude of |

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| | effort and complexities this solicitation requires. |
| Somewhat Relevant | Present/past performance contractual effort involved some of the magnitude of effort and complexities than this solicitation requires. |
| Not Relevant | Present/past performance effort did not involve any of the magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires. |

Additionally, for Offerors submitting corporate parent, affiliate, or other organization past performance information with their proposal, the Government will consider the degree of contribution (Workforce, Management, Facilities, and Other), the parent, affiliate, or other organization is proposed to provide to the SST II contract effort in determining the applicability of parent, affiliate, or other organization past performance to the SST II contract effort.

Past Performance Confidence Rating. A performance confidence rating will be assessed at the overall factor level for Past Performance after evaluating aspects of the Offeror's recent and relevant past performance.

Offeror Performance Confidence Assessment Ratings will be assigned as follows:

Very High Level of Confidence: The Offeror's relevant past performance is of exceptional merit and is very highly pertinent to this acquisition, indicates exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner and very minor (if any) problems with no adverse effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

High Level of Confidence: The Offeror's relevant past performance is highly pertinent to this acquisition; demonstrating very effective performance that would be fully responsive to contract requirements. Offeror's past performance indicates that contract

requirements were accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part, with only minor problems that had little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Moderate Level of Confidence: The Offeror's relevant past performance is pertinent to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance. Performance was fully responsive to contract requirements; there may have been reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Low Level of Confidence: The Offeror's relevant past performance is at least somewhat pertinent to this acquisition, and it meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards. Offeror achieved adequate results; there may have been reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements.

Very Low Level of Confidence: The Offeror's relevant past performance does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action was required in one or more areas. Performance problems occurred in one or more areas which adversely affected overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Neutral: In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance [see FAR 15.305(a) (2) (ii) and (iv)].

More recent and more relevant past performance will receive greater consideration in the performance confidence assessment than less recent or less relevant past performance. The performance confidence assessment will be based on the recency, magnitude, complexity and content of the projects being evaluated for past performance, as compared to the effort in the RFP.

Contracts that exhibit all specific trades/type of work required under the solicitation statement of work will be considered more

relevant than contracts limited to specific trades only. The proposed past performance effort of program manager will receive less consideration in the performance confidence assessment than the proposed past performance effort of the same recency, magnitude, complexity and content of that offered by a prime or subcontractor.

The proposed past performance effort of a prime or subcontractor as an entity will be considered more relevant than the proposed past performance effort of the same currency/recency, size, content, and complexity of that offered by a parent or affiliate company.

Additionally, for Offerors submitting corporate parent, affiliate, or other organization past performance information with their proposal, the Government will consider the degree of contribution (Workforce, Management, Facilities and Other), the parent, affiliate, or other organization is proposed to provide to the SST II effort in determining the applicability of parent, affiliate, or other organization past performance to the SST II contract effort.

The proposed past performance effort of key personnel will receive less consideration in the performance confidence assessment than the proposed past performance effort of the same recency, magnitude, and complexity, and content of that offered by a prime or subcontractor.

NOTE: The key person's experience will be considered more relevant if it includes experience in managing integrated activities associated with all of the Sections of the SOW.

M.6.4 Cost/Price Evaluation Factor

To ensure that the final agreed-to prices are sound, fair, and reasonable the Government will perform price analysis and will also perform cost analysis to include a cost realism analysis, in accordance with FAR 15.305 Proposal Evaluation, FAR 15.404 Proposal Analysis, and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.305 Proposal Evaluation.

Cost-Reimbursable IDIQ – The Government will perform a cost realism analysis of the proposed IDIQ direct labor rates and resources, and develop a probable cost estimate for the Sample

Task Orders. This evaluation of the cost factors will result in a probable cost which may differ from the proposed cost and reflects the Government's best estimate of the cost of any contract that is most likely to result from the Offeror's proposal. The proposed Fully-Burdened Rates (FBRs) for the entire potential five year period of performance will be evaluated. The Government will also evaluate the reasonableness of the non-labor resources. The FBRs used in developing the cost proposal shall match the FBRs in Section B of the model contract. However, if they do not match, the government will use the FBR in Section B as the basis for re-developing the proposed cost.

For evaluation and selection purposes, the Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed contract year one task order labor and non-labor resources. The price for each task order for the first year shall consist of the following.

- Proposed year one labor resources multiplied by the proposed year one FBRs per SLC,
- Proposed cost of non-labor resources,
- Applied indirect costs to non-labor resources,
- Proposed fee.

For years 2 through 5, the contractor shall straight-line the labor and non-labor resources.

FFP Phase-in - To promote fair competition, the price of phase-in is not a discriminator for selection purposes, as long as the proposed price of phase-in is reasonable.

The Fixed Price proposed for phase-in will only be subject to price analysis. The price of phase-in will be compared to the proposed prices of other Offerors to establish that the price is reasonable. An unreasonable phase-in price may be addressed in discussions.

Price and Probable Costs for Selection Purposes – The results of the Government's cost and price evaluation will be presented to the Source Selection Authority (SSA) for consideration in making the source selection. The proposed and probable costs for all five years will be considered for selection purposes.

M.6.5 Model Contract

The model contract will not be evaluated for selection purposes. It will, however, be reviewed to ensure that it was signed by a person authorized to commit the Offeror, that there is completion of all fill-ins, and that it accurately captures the content as set forth in the Offeror's proposal. Errors or inconsistencies in the Model Contract may result in an Offeror being removed from consideration for award.

M.6.6 Eligibility Considerations

An Offeror must be eligible for award in accordance with FAR 9.104. Business System Adequacy, Organizational Conflict of Interest Information, Taxpayer Identification Number, Waiver of Rights to Inventions, Cost Accounting Standards, Subcontractor Listing, and IT Security Management Program information are used to determine eligibility. The items listed below are important Eligibility Considerations; however, these items may not constitute all Eligibility Considerations that will be addressed by the SEB pursuant to FAR 9.104.

The Government may choose to evaluate this information for the offerors in the Competitive Range or the apparent Successful Offeror only.

(a) Business System Adequacy

In accordance with FAR 16.301-3, Cost-Reimbursement Contracts – Limitations, the Offeror's accounting system status will be reviewed to determine if the Offeror has an adequate accounting system. A contract may only be awarded to an Offeror with an accounting system determined to be adequate by the Government. Other business systems will be reviewed for responsibility in accordance with FAR 9.104-1, General Standards.

(b) Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) Information

The Government will perform an analysis to ensure an Organizational Conflict of Interest issue that cannot be mitigated does not exist. The OCI information will be assessed to verify the offeror is eligible for award. If it appears an OCI issue does exist that the offeror's plan failed to mitigate, the government must notify

the contractor, provide the reasons therefore, and allow the contractor a reasonable opportunity to respond. The contracting officer will make the final determination if the OCI issue exists and can be mitigated.

(c) Waiver of Rights to Inventions

Information submitted will be reviewed to determine compliance with NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Clause 1852.227-70, "New Technology" and NFS provision 1852.227-71, "Request for Waiver to Rights to Inventions".

(d) Cost Accounting Standards

If an offeror is required to submit a Disclosure Statement by the provisions at K.6, Cost Accounting Standards Notices and Certification (52.230-1), the adequacy of that disclosure statement will be determined in accordance with FAR 30.202-6.

(e) IT Security Management Program

The offeror's IT Security Management Plan will be reviewed for demonstrated ability to comply with IT security requirements, and laws. If it appears that the proposed plan does not comply with IT security requirements and laws, the government must notify the offeror, provide the reasons therefore, and allow the offeror a reasonable opportunity to respond.

(End of provision)

[End of Section]