

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (52.217-5) (JUL 1990)

- (a) Except when it is determined in accordance with FAR 17.206(b) not to be in the Government's best interests, the Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

(End of Provision)

M.2 PRECEDENCE OF MISSION SUITABILITY, PAST PERFORMANCE AND PRICE PROPOSAL DOCUMENTATION

- (a) In cases where discrepancies occur in proposal content, and unless the Offeror specifically states otherwise, the most recent information submitted will take precedence over all previously submitted information (hard copies govern).

(End of Provision)

M.3 SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES - GENERAL

- (a) The proposals will be evaluated using procedures prescribed by the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and the NASA FAR Supplement (NFS).
- (b) The proposals will be evaluated by a Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed by the Source Selection Authority (SSA). The SEB will be supported by subject matter experts during the evaluation. The SEB is tasked with conducting a thorough and impartial evaluation of each proposal received and reporting those evaluation findings to the SSA. It is the SSA's responsibility to make the final source selection decision.
- (c) The SSA for this procurement is the Associate Administrator (AA), Mission Support Directorate, or his designee.
- (d) The SEB voting members are: Mark Chadwick, Sherri McGee, Saurabh Baveja, Charles McIntosh and Charles Bridges.
- (e) The SEB will interpret the Offeror's failure to provide sufficient detail and rationale, or use of ambiguous terms as a lack of understanding on the part of the Offeror. Pages submitted in excess of the limitations specified in Provision L. 19, *Proposal Preparation Instructions (General)*, will not be evaluated by the Government and will be returned to the Offeror.

- (f) NASA intends to evaluate this competitively negotiated acquisition in accordance with FAR Subpart 15.3, *Source selection*, and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) Subpart 1815.3, *Source selection*. The SEB procedures at NFS 1815.370, *NASA source evaluation boards*, will apply. Offerors' attention is particularly directed to NFS 1815.305, *Proposal evaluation*, and to NFS 1815.305-70, *Identification of unacceptable proposals*. NASA will make source selection using the trade-off source selection process, as described at FAR 15.101-1.
- (g) As provided for in FAR 52.215-1, *Instructions to Offerors--Competitive Acquisitions, Alternate I*, the Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract after conducting discussions with Offerors whose proposals have been determined to be within the competitive range. If the Contracting Officer (CO) determines that the number of proposals that would otherwise be in the competitive range exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted, the CO may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly rated proposals. Therefore, the Offeror's initial proposal should contain the Offeror's best terms from a price and technical standpoint.

(End of Provision)

M.4 EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

- (A) The Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible Offeror whose offer conforming to the solicitation will be most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered. The following factors shall be used to evaluate offers:

- 1) Mission Suitability Factor
- 2) Past Performance Factor
- 3) Price Factor

All three evaluation factors are essentially equal in importance. When combined, Mission Suitability and Past Performance are significantly more important than price. (see FAR 15.304(e)(1)), *Evaluation factors and significant subfactors*.) However, as Offerors' proposals approach equivalent ratings under the non-price factors, the importance of price will increase.

The Government will evaluate proposals by classifying findings as strengths, weaknesses, significant strengths, significant weaknesses, or deficiencies using the classifications set forth in Table M-1 below:

TABLE M-1 CLASSIFICATION OF FINDINGS	
Type of Finding	Definition
Significant Strength (not in FAR/NFS)	A proposal area that greatly enhances the potential for successful performance or contributes significantly toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner

	that provides additional value to the government.
Strength (not in FAR/NFS)	A proposal area that enhances the potential for successful performance or contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the government (this could be associated with a process, technical approach, materials, facilities, etc.).
Weakness	A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
Significant Weakness	A proposal flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
Deficiency	A material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.

(B) **MISSION SUITABILITY FACTOR**: This factor is used to evaluate an Offeror’s ability to successfully perform the requirements of the Performance Work Statement (PWS) in a manner that satisfies established quality standards; meets established timelines and schedules; maximizes value for each dollar spent; and minimizes overall program risk. The Mission Suitability Factor is the only one of the three evaluation factors which will use both a numerical score (maximum of 1,000 points) and an adjectival rating (see Table M-2 for adjective ratings). While numerical scores will be used at both the subfactor and overall factor level, adjectival ratings will be used only at the subfactor level. Under the Mission Suitability Factor, there are three subfactors which the SEB will use to evaluate an Offeror’s overall Mission Suitability. These subfactors and their corresponding weights are listed below:

<u>Subfactor</u>	<u>Points</u>
Technical Approach	500
Management Approach	400
Small Business Subcontracting and Commitment to the Small Business Program	<u>100</u>
Total	1,000

The adjectival rating definitions and percentile ranges delineated in Table M-2 are found in the NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) at 1815.305(a)(3)(A). The maximum points available for a subfactor are multiplied by the SEB’s evaluated percentage for that subfactor to derive a numerical score. For example, if a subfactor worth 100 points receives a percentage rating of 80%, the numerical score for that subfactor would be 80 points.

TABLE M-2		
ADJECTIVAL RATINGS FOR MISSION SUITABILITY FACTOR & SUBFACTORS		
Adjective Rating	Percentage	Definition
Excellent	91% – 100%	A comprehensive and thorough proposal of exceptional merit with one or more significant strengths. No deficiency or significant weakness exists.

Very Good	71% – 90%	A proposal having no deficiency and which demonstrates overall competence. One or more significant strengths have been found, and strengths outbalance any weaknesses that exist.
Good	51% – 70%	A proposal having no deficiency and which shows a reasonably sound response. There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both. As a whole, weaknesses not off-set by strengths do not significantly detract from the Offeror’s response.
Fair	31% – 50%	A proposal having no deficiency and which has one or more weaknesses. Weaknesses outbalance any strengths.
Poor	0% – 30%	A proposal that has one or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses that demonstrate a lack of overall competence or would require a major proposal revision to correct.

(1) **Subfactor 1: Technical Approach:** This evaluation subfactor will be used to evaluate the Offeror’s overall technical approach and capability as it relates to all requirements defined in Attachment J-1, *Performance Work Statement (PWS)*. The adequacy, completeness and technical soundness of the Offeror’s technical approach will be evaluated. This subfactor will receive a numerical score and an adjectival rating. The Government will evaluate the Offeror’s technical approach and understanding of the requirements based on the following:

(a) TA-1: Shared Services Administration

(1) Degree to which the Offeror’s proposal demonstrates an effective approach to providing the various shared services administration functions necessary for the effective support of NSSC services (PWS Section 2.0 - risk management, environment, records management, emergency preparedness, etc.)

(2) Extent to which the Offeror’s approach demonstrates a thorough understanding of performance management as it relates to defined service level indicators and performance measures contained in Attachment J-3, *Performance Requirements Summary*.

(3) Extent to which the Offeror’s approach to implementing a Quality Management System and *Quality Control Plan* (DRD 2.10-1) demonstrate a thorough understanding of quality management as it applies to the delivery of services.

(4) Degree to which the Offeror’s proposal demonstrates a thorough understanding of the importance of the customer experience and over-all customer satisfaction; knowledge and incorporation of industry best practices; and analysis and statistical modeling of customer satisfaction data.

(5) Extent to which the Offeror demonstrates an effective, comprehensive and innovative approach to continuous improvement.

(6) Extent to which the Offeror's proposed Property Management Plan demonstrates effective and efficient Government property management and its understanding of applicable Government property regulations and policies.

(7) Degree to which the Offeror's proposal demonstrates an effective approach for working with the Government to bring additional services, clients and revenue to the NSSC.

(b) TA-2: Financial Management Support Services

(1) Extent to which the Offeror demonstrates the knowledge of and capability to use the various major systems used by NASA to provide NSSC Financial Management services.

(2) Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates an effective understanding of the NSSC processes currently used to provide Financial Management services and the technical capability to implement those processes.

(3) Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates a depth of knowledge and understanding of applicable Government Financial Management regulations and policies.

(c) TA-3: Human Resource Support Services

(1) Extent to which the Offeror demonstrates the knowledge of and capability to use the various major systems used by NASA to provide NSSC Human Resource support services.

(2) Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates an effective understanding of the processes currently used to provide Human Resource support services and the technical capability to implement those processes.

(3) Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates a depth of knowledge and understanding of applicable Government Human Resource regulations and policies.

(d) TA-4: Procurement Support Services

(1) Extent to which the Offeror demonstrates the knowledge of and capability to use the various major systems used by NASA to provide NSSC Procurement support services.

(2) Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates an effective understanding of the processes currently used to provide Procurement support services and the technical capability to implement those processes.

(3) Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates a depth of knowledge and understanding of applicable Government Procurement regulations and policies.

(e) TA-5: Information Technology (IT) Support Services

(1) Extent to which the Offeror demonstrates a comprehensive approach to providing and managing the Information Technology (IT) systems and applications required for performing NSSC services.

(2) Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates a robust knowledge of IT Security and the effectiveness of the Offeror's approach to implementing an IT Security program.

(3) Extent to which the Offeror demonstrates the ability to develop new systems or applications; enhance existing systems or applications; and plan for end of life retirement and replacement of systems and applications.

(4) Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates a depth of knowledge and understanding of applicable Government IT governance, regulations and policies as well as the Offeror's approach to implementing ITIL and CMMI-DEV goals and practices.

(f) TA-6: Cross-cutting Services

(1) Extent to which the Offeror demonstrates the knowledge and capability to operate and manage a Customer Contact Center that supports multiple lines of business and services.

(2) Effectiveness of the Offeror's proposed approach to providing document imaging and electronic data management support across multiple lines of business and services.

(3) Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates a depth of knowledge of and ability to use the various major systems and applications used

by NASA to provide Customer Contact Center and Document Imaging/Electronic Data Management support across multiple lines of business and services.

(g) TA-7: IT Support Services (Enterprise Service Desk (ESD))

(1) Degree to which the Offeror's approach displays knowledge of and the ability to provide incident, service, configuration, knowledge, change and problem management support to an IT helpdesk that serves a large and diverse customer base.

(2) Effectiveness of the Offeror's approach for coordinating with multiple NASA IT service providers supported by the NSSC's tier 0/1 helpdesk services.

(3) Degree to which the Offeror's approach displays knowledge of and the ability to effectively utilize Information Technology Service Management (ITSM) tools in providing helpdesk services that serve a large and diverse customer base.

- (2) **Subfactor 2: Management Approach:** This evaluation subfactor will be used to evaluate the Offeror's ability to manage all requirements of the contract in an effective and efficient manner while minimizing program risk. Specifically, the Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's management approach provides the methods and processes required to effectively manage the provision of multiple lines of business and services to a large, geographically dispersed customer base; staffing; personnel compensation approach; subcontractor management/structure; customer relations; organizational conflicts of interest (OCI); and the transition of services at the start of performance. This subfactor will receive a numerical score and an adjectival rating. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposal based on the following:

(h) MA-1: Management Structure

(1) Degree to which the Offeror's organizational structure (corporate and local) and the lines of communication within this structure will promote effective and efficient contract performance.

(2) Extent of autonomy the Offeror grants to the onsite Program Manager to make key business decisions affecting the contract.

(3) Extent to which the Offeror's approach to customer relations promotes open communication between the Contractor and Government and a methodology to address feedback on contract performance.

(i) MA-2: Staffing

(1) Degree to which the Offeror's proposed approach for retaining incumbent personnel (personnel working under the current NSSC contract) including target capture rate (if any) as a percentage of the total workforce; the basis for this rate; and the strategy proposed to recruit and hire incumbents for this contract, will contribute to successful contract performance.

(2) Extent to which the Offeror's proposed staffing/skill sets for each service are realistic and reasonable for the services for which they are proposed (Attachment J-18, *Staffing Profile*).

(3) Degree to which the Offeror's proposed key personnel's education, training, experience, availability and commitment to the contract will ensure contract success (contract clause H.3, *Key Personnel* and Attachment J-30, *Key Personnel Resume*).

(4) Degree to which the Offeror's approach for initial and continuous employee training ensures a qualified, multi-skilled workforce capable of cross-utilization and the ability to respond to fluctuating work requirements.

(j) MA-3: Employee Compensation Plan

(1) Extent to which the Offeror's proposed compensation plan provides for salaries and fringe benefits for both professional and Service Contract Act (SCA) employees and reflects a sound management approach and understanding of the contract requirements by taking into account differences in skills; the complexity of various disciplines; and job difficulty.

(2) Extent to which the Offeror's proposed salaries and fringe benefits for non-exempt employees complies with the SCA.

(3) Degree to which the attributes of the Offeror's proposed compensation plan contribute to the Offeror's ability to attract, employ and retain quality employees.

(4) Degree to which the Offeror's proposed awards, career progression and recognition programs incentivize recruitment, employee performance and retention.

(k) MA-4: Subcontractor Management/Structure

(1) Degree to which the Offeror's proposed subcontracting or teaming arrangement provides for an organizational structure that ensures a seamless, effective and efficient approach to the provision of NSSC services.

(2) Extent to which the Offeror's proposed subcontracting or teaming structure mitigates the potential loss of productivity or employee morale that could result from multiple compensation and personnel policies within a single line of business or service area.

(l) MA-5: Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI)

(1) Degree to which the Offeror's OCI Plan presents an acceptable approach to removing or mitigating potential or actual conflicts of interest, as defined in FAR Part 9.5, that may arise through the performance of the requirements of this contract and an understanding of the restrictions contained in the solicitation's Limitation of Future Contacting clause.

(m) MA-6: Phase-in Plan

(1) Extent to which the Offeror's proposed Phase-in Plan ensures a seamless continuation of the services being provided by the NSSC.

(2) Adequacy of the Offeror's proposed Phase-in Plan in ensuring hiring, pre-employment screenings, background checks, badging procedures, and that the transfer of Government Furnished Property and Equipment are completed prior to the start of contact performance.

(3) **Subfactor 3: Small Business Subcontracting and Commitment to the Small Business Program:** 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.

(a) SB-1: Small Business Subcontracting

(1) Small Business Subcontracting Plan will be evaluated in terms of the Offeror's proposed subcontracting goals (overall subcontracting goals and individual subcontracting goals by small business category) in comparison to the Contracting Officers 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.

(2) Small businesses are not required to submit subcontracting plans. The SEB will only evaluate the amount of work proposed to be performed by the small business prime and any small business at the first tier subcontract level. The proposed amount of work to be done by the prime small business and first tier small business subcontractors will be evaluated against the Contracting Officer's assessment of the overall subcontracting goal for this procurement. Individual subcontracting goals by small business categories will not be evaluated for small business primes and their first tier subcontractors.

(b) SB-2: Commitment to Small Businesses

(1) Extent to which any work performed by a small business subcontractor(s) is identified as "high technology." The SEB also will evaluate the extent of commitment to use the subcontractor(s) (enforceable vs. non-enforceable commitments.)

(2) 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. (For small business Offerors, The SEB will evaluate this only if subcontracting opportunities exist.)

(3) 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, the SEB will evaluate this only if subcontracting opportunities exist.)

- (C) **PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR:** Past Performance indicates how an Offeror performed on earlier work, and can be a significant indicator of how that Offeror can be expected to perform the resultant contract work. This evaluation factor will be used to evaluate the Offeror's Past Performance, including its relevant experience.

Relevant experience is defined as the accomplishment of work that is comparable to the resultant contract work in:

- Scope: Providing and managing services similar in breadth, dollar value, type, and complexity to those covered in Attachment J-1, *Performance Work Statement* to Government or commercial customers.
- Size: Providing and managing services that involve large numbers of employees, comparable in quantity to the current NSSC Support Services contract, and a very large number of customers that are geographically dispersed, similar to the NASA environment.
- Subcontract Management: Managing contracts with two or more subcontractors that are responsible for a significant portion of the work performed.
- Contract Type: Managing IDIQ contracts structured with firm-fixed-price transactional rates, level of effort labor categories and fully burdened rates ordering mechanisms.
- Customer Relations: Managing contracts requiring extensive and effective communications with a very large number of customers that are geographically dispersed (similar to the NASA environment) and a willingness to work with customers to resolve performance concerns.

The Offeror's past safety record will also be evaluated to include:

- Occupational Health and Safety Administration (OSHA) recordable injuries and illnesses for the past three (3) years including the number of employees and total labor hours at the worksite, the calculated OSHA recordable frequency rate and the North American Industrial Classification Code (NAICS) utilized.
- OSHA citations of the firm's operations during the last three (3) years.
- Federal, State, and local environmental citations of the firm's operations in the past three (3) years.

Past Performance is not numerically weighted or scored, but will receive an adjectival rating per Table M-3 below. The Government's evaluation will be based on:

- Information provided by Offerors in their proposals.
- Responses received on RFP Attachment J-29, *Past Performance Questionnaire*.
- Interviews with contracting and technical personnel responsible for oversight of contracts previously performed by the Offeror.
- Data available from Government-wide Past Performance Databases.
- GAO and/or IG report findings.
- Other information obtained independently by the Government.

As described in 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 will receive a neutral rating on past performance.

**TABLE M-3
ADJECTIVAL RATINGS FOR PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR**

Adjective Rating	Definitions
Very High Level of Confidence	The Offeror's relevant past performance is of exceptional merit and is very highly pertinent to this acquisition; indicating exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner; 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. One or more significant strengths exist. No significant weaknesses exist.
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 with contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part with only minor problems with 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. One or more significant strengths exist. Strengths outbalance any weakness.
Moderate Level of Confidence	The Offeror's relevant past performance is pertinent to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; 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. There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both.
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; adequate results; 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. One or more weaknesses exist. Weaknesses outbalance strengths
Very Low Level of Confidence	The Offeror's relevant past performance does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas which adversely affect 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. One or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses exist.
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)].

- (D) **PRICE FACTOR:** The Government will perform a price analysis of each Offeror's proposal in accordance with FAR 15.305, *Proposal evaluation*, and 15.404-1, *Proposal Analysis Techniques*. The Government may use any of the various price analysis techniques and procedures identified in FAR 15.404-1(b)(2), *Price analysis for commercial and non-commercial items*, to determine price reasonableness. An Offeror's price will be evaluated for completeness, reasonableness, and performance risk as defined below. An Offeror's estimating

assumptions, techniques, and/or pricing models must be reasonable, and based on current and anticipated labor market conditions.

- **Completeness.** Proposals will be evaluated to determine if the proposal includes all pricing information required by the solicitation, and the pricing forms are accurately completed per the instructions in the solicitation. The degree to which the proposal includes supporting rationale; estimating assumptions, techniques, and or models; information on business systems; and hourly rates and fringe benefits proposed for employees covered by the SCA in sufficient detail that allows for an adequate evaluation and can be directly traced back to the proposed transactional service rates or fully burdened labor rates will also be considered.
- **Reasonableness.** Proposals will be evaluated to determine that the Phase-in price, transactional service rates and fully burdened labor rates proposed for level-of-effort services are fair and reasonable. The Phase-in price, transactional service rates and fully burdened labor rates may be determined to be fair and reasonable based on adequate price competition; comparison with other transactional service rates or fully burdened labor rates received in response to the solicitation; comparison to historical prices paid for the same or similar service; and/or comparison to Independent Government Cost Estimates.
- **Performance Risk.** Based on the price analysis conducted, the Government will assess a level of confidence (performance risk) in the Offeror’s ability to successfully perform the Phase-in, transactional and level-of-effort services set forth in the solicitation, given the transactional service rates and fully burdened labor rates proposed.

(1) The SEB will report its assessment of performance risk to the Source Selection Authority (SSA) utilizing the definitions in Table M-4 below.

Table M-4 Confidence Level (Performance Risk) Definitions	
High	The Government has a very high level of confidence in the Offeror’s ability to successfully perform both the transactional and level-of-effort services set forth in the solicitation, given the transactional service rates and fully burdened labor rates proposed.
Medium	The Government has a reasonable level of confidence in the Offeror’s ability to successfully perform both the transactional and level-of-effort services set forth in the solicitation, given the transactional service rates and fully burdened labor rates proposed.
Low	The Government has at best a marginal level of confidence in the Offeror’s ability to successfully perform both the transactional and level-of-effort services

	set forth in the solicitation, given the transactional service rates and fully burdened labor rates proposed.
--	---

- (2) The Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement (see Provision M.1, *Evaluation of Options*) using the total price computation methodology specified in Paragraph (3) below. The Government may determine that an offer is unacceptable if the option prices are significantly unbalanced. Evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).
- (3) The price stated in Cell K:9 on the Excel worksheet entitled “Contract Summary” of the Excel Price Model (see Provision L.22, Volume III: Price Proposal Instructions) will be considered the Offeror’s total price for evaluation and award purposes and will be reported to the SSA as such. The Excel Price Model calculates this price by adding together the Offeror’s proposed prices for:
- Shared Services Administration for all eight (8) contract years (Cells C:9 through J:9 on the Excel worksheet entitled “2.0 Shared Svcs. Admin.”).
 - Level-of-effort services for all eight (8) contract years utilizing the Government specified labor categories, productive labor hours, and other direct costs and the offeror’s proposed fully burden labor rates (Cells C:9 through J:9 on each of the Excel worksheets entitled “3.1.11, 3.1.13, 3.2.1.6, 3.2.1.7, 3.2.2, 3.2.3.7, 3.2.4, 3.2.12, 3.3.1, 3.3.7.1, 3.3.7.2, 3.3.7.3, 3.3.7.4, 3.4.2, 3.4.3.1, 3.4.3.2, 3.4.4, 3.4.10.1, 3.4.10.2, 3.4.10.3, 3.4.10.5, 3.4.10.6, 3.4.10.8, 3.4.10.9, 3.4.11 and 3.9.1”).
 - Transactional services for all eight (8) contract years utilizing the Government-provided number of transactions in Band 2 and the Offeror’s proposed transactional service rates for Band 2 (Cells B:20 through I:20 on each of the Excel worksheets entitled “3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.4, 3.1.5.1, 3.1.5.2-3.1.5.4, 3.1.8, 3.1.12, 3.2.1.1, 3.2.1.2, 3.2.1.3, 3.2.1.4, 3.2.1.5, 3.2.3.1, 3.2.3.2, 3.2.3.3, 3.2.3.4, 3.2.3.5, 3.2.3.6, 3.2.5.1, 3.2.5.2, 3.2.7, 3.2.11, 3.2.13.1, 3.2.13.2, 3.3.2.1, 3.3.2.2, 3.3.3.1, 3.3.3.2, 3.5.1, 3.5.2, and 3.8.3”). Band 2 Totals (B:18 through I:18) on each transactional service are included in the total contract price.
 - Transactional services for all eight (8) contract years utilizing the Government provided number of transactions in Band 1 and Band 3 and the offeror’s proposed transactional service rates for Band 1 and Band 3 will be evaluated for reasonableness as compared to the proposed Band 2 rates but will not be evaluated as part of total price (Cells B:10 through

I:10 and B:30 through I:30 on each of the Excel worksheets entitled “3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.4, 3.1.5.1, 3.1.5.2-3.1.5.4, 3.1.8, 3.1.12, 3.2.1.1, 3.2.1.2, 3.2.1.3, 3.2.1.4, 3.2.1.5, 3.2.3.1, 3.2.3.2, 3.2.3.3, 3.2.3.4, 3.2.3.5, 3.2.3.6, 3.2.5.1, 3.2.5.2, 3.2.7, 3.2.11, 3.2.13.1, 3.2.13.2, 3.3.2.1, 3.3.2.2, 3.3.3.1, 3.3.3.2, 3.5.1, 3.5.2, and 3.8.3”). Band 1 and Band 3 totals are not included in total contract price.

- Phase-in (Cell C:9 on the Excel worksheet entitled “Phase-in Price”). The Phase-in price Tab is not linked to the total contract value in the price template because Phase-in will be awarded as a separate purchase order; however, for evaluation purposes, the Phase-in price will be included in the total proposed contract.

- (4) The productive labor hours, labor categories, other direct costs, and quantities of transactional services identified in the Excel Price Model are for evaluation and award purposes only. They represent the Government’s best estimate of the Transactional and Level-of-Effort Services that the Government anticipates ordering during the term of the contract. There is no commitment or guarantee that the Government will order Transactional and Level-of-Effort Services in these exact quantities. The successful Offeror’s fully burdened labor rates and transaction rates for each Band will be incorporated into the contract for ordering purposes. Once again, the productive labor hours, labor categories, other direct costs, and quantities of transactional services identified in the Excel Price Model are for evaluation and award purposes only.

The Government will place orders for Transactional and Level-of-Effort Services approximately 45 days before the start of each contract year in accordance with the ordering procedures stipulated in Clause B.5, *Ordering Procedures for Transactional and Level-of-Effort Services*.

(End of Provision)

[End of Section]