# SECTION M
# EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

*M.1 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (52.217-5) (JUL 1990)*
*M.2 AWARD WITHOUT DISCUSSIONS*
*M.3 SOURCE SELECTION AND EVALUATIONS FACTORS – GENERAL*
*M.4 MISSION SUITABILITY FACTOR*
*M.5 COST FACTOR*
*M.6 PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FACTOR*

# EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

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

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. The evaluation of options will include Options One and Two and Award Term Options One, Two, and Three. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

(End of Provision)

## M.2 AWARD WITHOUT DISCUSSIONS

As provided for in FAR 52.215-1 "Instructions to Offerors--Competitive Acquisitions," the Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with Offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). Therefore, the Offeror's initial proposal should contain the Offeror's best terms from a price and technical standpoint. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer later determines them to be necessary. If the Contracting Officer 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 Contracting Officer 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 (see NFS 1815.306(c)(2)).

(End of Provision)

## M.3 SOURCE SELECTION AND EVALUATION FACTORS—GENERAL

### a) General

The proposed procurement will be evaluated in accordance with procedures prescribed by the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and the NASA FAR Supplement (NFS).

The attention of Offerors is particularly directed to NFS 1815.305, "Proposal evaluation" and to NFS 1815.305-70, "Identification of unacceptable proposals."

A best value trade-off process, as described at FAR 15.101-1, will be used in making the source selection decision.

### b) Source Selection

A Source Evaluation Board (SEB), appointed by the Agency Chief Information Officer at

NASA Headquarters, will evaluate the offers submitted in response to this Request for Proposal (RFP). Proposal documentation requirements set forth in this RFP are designed to provide guidance to the Offeror concerning the type of documentation that shall be submitted to the SEB.

**c) Source Selection Authority (SSA)**

The source selection decision will be made by the Agency Chief Information Officer at NASA Headquarters.

**d) Source Evaluation Board (SEB) Membership**

The voting members of the SEB are:

Gregory Black
Daniel Costello
Melissa Huzar
Vann Jones
Ronald Newby
Brian Powell
Patrick Whelan

**e) Evaluation Factors and Subfactors**

1) Acceptable offers will be evaluated using the following three factors as generally described in NFS 1815.304 and NFS 1815.305:
   - Mission Suitability (M.4)
   - Cost (M.5)
   - Past Performance (M.6)

2) The detailed descriptions of the factors and subfactors are set forth in M.4 through M.6.

**f) Relative Order of Importance of Evaluation Factors**

While only the Mission Suitability Factor is numerically scored, in order to provide Offerors with an indication of the relative importance of the three factors, the following information is furnished:

In accordance with FAR Part 15.101-1, selection will be made using a best value tradeoff analysis. All three evaluation factors are essentially equal in importance. When combined, Mission Suitability and Past Performance are significantly more important than Cost.

(End of Provision)

## M.4 MISSION SUITABILITY FACTOR

The Mission Suitability factor and associated subfactors will be used to evaluate the feasibility and soundness of the Offeror's proposed approach in satisfying the requirements of the Performance Work Statement (PWS). The Offeror's degree of understanding of the PWS requirements will be assessed in all Mission Suitability subfactors. Cost realism, or the lack thereof, will be used in evaluating the Mission Suitability subfactors as an indicator of the Offeror's ability to perform. Overall lack of cost realism may adversely impact the Offeror's Mission Suitability ratings and numerical score.

The Mission Suitability subfactors are listed below. Proposals will be evaluated and scored using the adjectival rating, definitions, and percentile ranges at NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(A). The subfactor scores will then be added together to arrive at a total (overall) Mission Suitability score.

The subfactors to be used in evaluating Mission Suitability and their corresponding weights reflecting relative importance are listed below:

| Mission Suitability Subfactor | Weighting |
|---|---|
| Management Approach | 400 points |
| Technical Approach | 500 points |
| Small Business Utilization | 100 points |
| Total | 1,000 points |

Note: The order of the elements delineated within each subfactor below should not be construed as representative of the relative importance of the subfactor elements for evaluation purposes. There are no discrete point values attached to any of the elements within each subfactor.

### Subfactor 1 – Management Approach

The evaluation of the Management Approach subfactor will consider how well the Offeror's proposal demonstrates an overall understanding of the requirements, as well as the extent to which the proposed approach reflects the capabilities necessary to achieve optimal performance of the PWS requirements. The adequacy, completeness, relevancy to requirements and excellence of the Offeror's approach will be evaluated to include:

**MA-1 Management Strategy and Organizational Structure Approach**

- Proposed organizational structure, management structure, teaming relationships, and organizational elements and rationale that address how the structure supports a logical, organized approach to the integrated planning, execution, controlling, and

reporting of contract activities that support EAST 2 Services;

- Approach for integrating teaming partners/subcontractors into the management and supervisory hierarchy;
- Approach for preventing the loss of corporate knowledge and critical skills throughout the life of the contract and avoiding single points of failure; and
- Approach for supporting NASA CIO governance processes to ensure an effective working relationship with the Government and other contractors, including but not limited to those responsible for performing the contracts listed in PWS Section 5.6. This shall include the approach for establishing and executing Associate Contractor Agreements (ACAs).

**MA-2 Key Positions / Key Personnel Approach**

- The extent to which the proposed Offeror's Key Positions will promote effective and efficient contract performance;
- Rationale for designating a particular position as key;
- The description of the function, responsibility, authority for each key position, and relationship to the organizational structure;
- Degree to which the Offeror's proposed key personnel's education, training, experience, availability (including percentage of time) and commitment to the contract will ensure contract success;
- Resumes for the key personnel, rationale for the selection of individuals designated as key personnel, including the appropriateness and reasonableness of these selections; and
- Approach and techniques for backup and replacement of key personnel throughout the life of the contract and for limiting impact to the Government in the event of key personnel absences or vacancies.

**MA-3 Staffing and Total Compensation Approach**

- 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;
- Degree to which the Offeror's approach for initial and continuous employee training ensures a qualified, multi-skilled workforce capable of cross-utilization and having the ability to respond to fluctuating work requirements;
- 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;
- Extent to which the Offeror's proposed salaries and fringe benefits for non-exempt employees complies with the SCA;
- 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;
- Degree to which the Offeror's proposed awards, career progression and recognition

programs incentivize recruitment, employee performance and retention;

- Skills that the Offeror identifies as essential to successful contract performance and the approach for retaining critical personnel and managing attrition;
- The approach for providing a flexible workforce necessary to accommodate workload fluctuations and adapt to rapid changes in technology throughout the life of the contract;
- The approach to maximize integration, synergies, resource sharing between PWS sections, accommodation of operational fluctuations and cross-utilization of personnel;
- The approach for balancing the need for experienced corporate knowledge with the need for new skills required to support emerging technologies;
- The Offeror's staffing plan for recruiting, utilizing and retaining a qualified workforce for the contract;
- The number of personnel per skill category and by organization element for the total workforce;
- The staffing plan as it relates to all major subcontractors;
- The Offeror's table delineating sources of staffing;
- Job Descriptions/Qualifications (JD/Q) forms;
- The Offeror's Total Compensation Plan (TCP);
- The Offeror's description of fringe benefit policies and practices for both full-time and part-time employees;
- The approach to handling the potential impact of different compensation structures, including salary levels combining these into a clear compensation structure based on labor classifications, and the approach to establishing a salary for each labor classification identified in Attachment **J-3A,** *Exempt/Non-Exempt Position Descriptions*, if applicable; and
- The Offeror's offsite staffing model, including the rationale for the approach; scope of work to be performed offsite; number of personnel and skill sets associated with the offsite facility; and security approach.

**MA-4 Phase-In Plan**

- The extent to which the Offeror's proposed Phase-In Plan ensures a seamless continuation of the support for Enterprise and Center applications;
- Strategy and approach for assuming all responsibilities described in the PWS;
- Approach for implementation of all proposed processes and strategies;
- Approach for the continuation of all work in progress and for assimilating all tasks into the EAST 2 contract structure;
- Approach for assuming responsibility for NEACC software license agreements per Attachment **J-1**, *PWS 2.3.2*;
- Proposed approach for integrating Contractor systems with NASA systems per Attachment **J-1**, *PWS 3.0.10*;
- Proposed key milestones and schedule for Contract Phase-In;
- Approach for identifying, addressing, and dispositioning problems and issues

associated with the Contract Phase-In; and
- Identification of the Phase-In staffing approach and management team.

**MA-5 Organizational Conflict of Interest**

- The Offeror's Organizational Conflict of Interest Mitigation Plan will be evaluated to determine the degree to which it 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 to be contained in the resulting contract's *Limitation of Future Contacting* in Clause **H.4**.

**MA-6 Cost Control/Savings**

- The value of the Offeror's proposed cost control/saving measures provided to the Government;
- The Offeror's strategy and approach for controlling costs throughout the life of the contract; and
- The Offeror's strategy for cost savings measures while maintaining productivity and customer satisfaction.

**MA-7 Management Approach Risk Assessment**

- The Offeror's risk assessment and proposed mitigations for the complete Management Approach subfactor will be evaluated to determine whether the Offeror understands program and cost risks for supporting Enterprise and Center applications.

## Subfactor 2 – Technical Approach

This 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**, *PWS*. The adequacy, completeness and technical soundness of the Offeror's technical approach will be evaluated including:

**TA-1 Sustaining Operations Approach**

- Extent to which the Offeror demonstrates the knowledge of and capability to use the various systems and applications required to sustain operations;
- Effectiveness of the Offeror's proposed approach to provide sustaining operations support across all Lines of Business (LOBs);

- Offeror's NEACC Operational Model including the approach for performing the requirements within Attachment **J-1**, *PWS;*
- Approach for identification, tracking and visibility of costs for implementing strategic initiatives (planned vs. actual), timely delivery date projections, and actual performance against delivery date projections;
- The Offeror's proposed capacity management strategies;
- Approach for unification of Enterprise and Center processes and techniques while respecting Agency and Center IT Governance requirements; and
- Infrastructure Optimization Approach for continuously assessing, planning, proposing, and implementing upgrades/improvements to software and services in order to ensure that service levels are met, prevent technological obsolescence, enable new technologies, and improve performance, all while gaining price efficiencies for all PWS requirements.

**TA-2 Improving Service Levels & Efficiencies Approach**

- Extent to which the Offeror demonstrates the knowledge of and capability to improve service levels and efficiencies;
- Effectiveness of the Offeror's proposed approach to improve service levels and efficiencies across all LOBs;
- Method for leveraging Service Level Management capabilities and for measuring Service Level performance; and
- Approach for measuring and improving the quality and efficiency of NEACC Operations and how the projected efficiencies are reflected in the pricing of Delivery Functions, Attachment **J-1,** *PWS Section 5.0.*

**TA-3 Release Management Approach**

- Extent to which the Offeror demonstrates the knowledge of and capability to perform Release Management as described in Attachment **J-1**, *PWS Section 5.1.2*;
- Effectiveness of the Offeror's proposed approach to Release Management across all LOBs;
- Proposed method to establish a unified and agile NEACC Release Management and Deployment process for Center and Enterprise Applications;
- Method for maintaining and executing test scripts as described in Attachment **J-1**, *PWS Section 5.1.3*, as well as any proposed innovations to improve the overall quality and efficiency of application testing; and
- Method for managing documents and configuration information as described in Attachment **J-1,** *PWS Section 5.1.5*.

**TA-4 Application Functional Support Approach**

- Extent to which the Offeror demonstrates the knowledge of and capability to provide functional support for Enterprise and Center applications;

- Effectiveness of the Offeror's proposed approach for providing application functional support across all LOBs; and
- Implementing Application Functional Support requirements as defined in Attachment **J-1**, *PWS Section 5.2* analyzing the approach for working with the Government, and identifying the differences, if any, in the Offeror's support for Enterprise and Center Applications.

**TA-5 Information Assurance Approach**

- Extent to which the Offeror demonstrates the knowledge of and capability to perform Information Assurance support;
- Effectiveness of the Offeror's proposed approach to provide Information Assurance support across all LOBs;
- Approach for optimizing these Information Assurance services over time;
- Approach for establishing prioritization of multiple security activities;
- Method for addressing Business Continuity and Availability requirements;
- Method for ensuring the Offeror's approach is applied consistently across all LOBs; and
- Offeror's draft version of the Information Security Plan in accordance with DRD CF-001, as set forth in Attachment **J-2**, *Data Procurement Document.*

**TA-6 Application Portfolio Management Approach**

- Extent to which the Offeror demonstrates the knowledge of and capability to perform Application Portfolio Management;
- Effectiveness of the Offeror's proposed approach to provide Application Portfolio Management across all LOBs and transform the application portfolio, where appropriate.
- Approach for assessing the health of existing applications;
- Approach for rationalizing the application portfolio;
- Approach for establishing and leveraging common platforms across Enterprise and Center applications to reduce duplication and gain synergies among them; and
- Approach for maintaining, integrating and extending the Cross Functional Infrastructure Services as defined in Attachment **J-1**, *PWS Section 1.4* across all LOBs.

**TA-7 Software Lifecycle Management Approach**

- Extent to which the Offeror demonstrates the knowledge of and capability to perform Software Lifecycle Management;
- Effectiveness of the Offeror's proposed approach to provide Software Lifecycle Management across all LOBs;

- Approaches for managing the software lifecycle with continuously evolving requirements;
- Ensuring that delivered products meet stakeholder and end-user needs and expectations;
- Reducing defects in delivered products;
- Ensuring effective team dynamics for both co-located and geographically dispersed teams;
- Effectively communicating change impacts to stakeholders and end-users;
- Managing requirements changes after initial implementation; and
- Decommissioning applications to include data preservation, migration, and/or archiving.

**TA-8 Center Applications Transition Approach**

The Offeror's Center Applications Transition Plan as defined in Attachment J-1, PWS Section 1.4, will be evaluated to include:

- Extent to which the Offeror demonstrates the knowledge and capability of transitioning support for Center applications;
- Effectiveness of the Offeror's proposed approach for unifying operational processes to support Enterprise and Center applications;
- Strategy and approach for transitioning support for Center applications, including MSFC applications, to the NEACC; and
- Approach for unifying operational processes to support Enterprise and Center applications.

**TA-9 Technical Approach Risk Assessment**

The Offeror's risk assessment and proposed mitigations for the complete Technical Approach subfactor will be evaluated to determine whether the Offeror understands technical risks for supporting Enterprise and Center applications.

## Subfactor 3 – Small Business Utilization (SB)

The evaluation of Small Business Subcontracting and Commitment to the Small Business Program applies to all Offerors with the exception of small businesses, because they are not required to submit subcontracting plans.

**SB-1 Small Business Subcontracting**

- The 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.

- Small businesses are not required to submit subcontracting plans. NASA 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 performed 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.

**SB-2 Commitment to the Small Business Program**

- NASA 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.)

- NASA 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 Offeror's commitment to use small businesses. (For small business Offerors, NASA will evaluate this only if subcontracting opportunities exist.)

- NASA 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.)

**SB-3 Small Business Utilization Risk Assessment**

- The Offeror's risk assessment and proposed mitigations for the complete Small Business Utilization subfactor will be evaluated.

## M.5 <u>COST FACTOR</u>

(a) The adequacy, reasonableness, and realism of the cost proposal will be evaluated to determine the probable cost of doing business. The Government will perform a cost realism analysis by independently reviewing and evaluating each Offeror's proposed costs to determine if the estimated cost elements are realistic for the work to be performed; reflect a clear understanding of the PWS and all other RFP requirements; and are consistent with the unique methods of performance as described in the Offeror's Mission Suitability proposal. The Government will also evaluate any cost reductions proposed over the life of the contract through continuous improvement initiatives resulting in reductions in labor costs, and/or other cost efficiencies/savings without degradation to

service or customer satisfaction.

(b) Definitions: An Offeror should refer to FAR 2.101(b) for a definition of “cost realism” and to FAR 15.404-1(d) for a discussion of "cost realism analysis” and “probable cost.”

(c) Assessment of Probable Cost:

(1) This solicitation will result in a Cost-Plus-Performance Fee contract.

(2) The proposed cost will be evaluated to determine reasonableness and cost realism (including the impact of proposed uncompensated overtime). The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.305(a) (1) and NFS 1815.305(a)(1). The Cost Factor, although not scored numerically, is relevant in determining the Offeror’s understanding of the contract and its resource requirements and will be evaluated. Unrealistic costs or elements of cost may adversely impact the proposal’s Mission Suitability ratings and numerical scores.

(3) The Government assessment of the “probable cost adjustment” with each Offeror, possible cost growth during the course of the contract, and features that could cause a given proposal to cost more or less than proposed, will be included in this evaluation. Upward or downward adjustments may be made to the proposed cost as a result of the assessment of cost realism to determine a “probable cost.” This can include adjustments to all Offeror-proposed direct and indirect costs.

(4) The proposed fee value will not be adjusted, but will be included in the probable cost in the amount proposed.

(5) Each Offeror’s proposed Phase-In cost for the separate Phase-In Purchase Order will be identified separately and reported to the SSA. The Government will not make adjustments to the proposed Offeror’s Phase-In costs.

(6) Government-Calculated IDIQ Value (for evaluation purposes only):

(i) The Government will calculate, for evaluation purposes only, a total IDIQ cost for each Offeror utilizing the labor categories and labor hours specified in Table M.5-1, *IDIQ Fully Burdened Labor Rates Model*. This model will be populated with the Offeror’s proposed fully burdened labor rates, inclusive of fee, from Attachment J-5A, *IDIQ Labor Rate Schedule.* The IDIQ rates proposed for the MSFC location will be used to calculate this cost for evaluation purposes. The Government will review the Offeror’s cost volume for explanations of any significant differences between the MSFC location Fully Burdened Labor rates and the rates for other locations. Note that the hours and labor mix in Table M.5-1, *IDIQ Fully Burdened Labor Rates Model,* are based on NASA’s best estimate of future Center requirements. The labor hours below in Table M.5-1 will be used for the purposes of creating a realistic evaluation of each Offeror’s proposed IDIQ rates. The actual labor mix and hours ordered by NASA will vary from the estimate below; therefore, Offerors should not assume that the hours and labor mix will reflect what the Government may actually order via the

*Supplemental Task Order Procedures for EAST 2* in Clause **H.20**.

(ii) A Government-calculated IDIQ value will be determined for each contract year (for a total of eight (8) years) using the Offeror's proposed fully burdened labor rates for that year.

**Table M.5-1 <u>IDIQ Fully Burdened Labor Rates Model</u>**

| Labor Category | | Labor Hours | X | Fully Burdened Labor | = | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Professional/Management** | | | | | | |
| Program Manager | | **1,000** | | | | |
| Senior Manager | | **1,000** | | | | |
| Technical Area Mgr | | **1,400** | | | | |
| Human Resources/Labor Relations | | **1,000** | | | | |
| Planner/Scheduler | | **1,000** | | | | |
| **Business/Administrative** | | | | | | |
| Contracts/Subcontracts/Purchasing | | **1,000** | | | | |
| Contracts/Subcontracts/Purchasing Specialist | | **1,900** | | | | |
| Business Specialist | | **3,200** | | | | |
| Secretary II | | **1,000** | | | | |
| General Clerk II | | **1,000** | | | | |
| General Clerk III | | **1,000** | | | | |
| **Engineering** | | | | | | |
| Systems Engineer I | | **1,200** | | | | |
| Systems Engineer II | | **3,000** | | | | |
| Systems Engineer III | | **2,400** | | | | |
| Software Engineer I | | **4,000** | | | | |
| Software Engineer II | | **7,000** | | | | |
| Software Engineer III | | **5,000** | | | | |
| IT Security Engineer I | | **1,600** | | | | |
| IT Security Engineer II | | **2,400** | | | | |
| IT Security Engineer III | | **2,000** | | | | |
| **IT Specialist** | | | | | | |
| Computer Programmer I | | **3,800** | | | | |
| Computer Programmer II | | **5,900** | | | | |
| Computer Programmer III | | **7,900** | | | | |
| Computer Programmer IV | | **5,300** | | | | |
| Computer Systems Analyst I | | **5,700** | | | | |
| Computer Systems Analyst II | | **15,400** | | | | |
| Computer Systems Analyst III | | **12,900** | | | | |
| | **Subtotal** | | | | | |
| | **GOVERNMENT Worksheet-IDIQ Cost Model Total Amount** | | | | | **$** |

(iii) Offerors shall not input any data into Table M.5-1.

(d) Assessment of Cost Confidence

A level of confidence determination (high, medium, or low) will be made for the probable cost assessment for each proposal and reported to the SSA. The confidence levels for probable cost are defined as:

(1) High: The Government has a very high level of confidence that the probable cost, which is the Government's best estimate for the cost of a contract resulting from the Offeror's proposal, correlates very closely to the actual costs that the Offeror would incur to successfully implement its proposal.

(2) Medium: The Government has a reasonable level of confidence that the probable cost, which is the Government's best estimate for the cost of a contract resulting from the Offeror's proposal, correlates very closely to the actual costs that the Offeror would incur to successfully implement its proposal.

(3) Low: The Government has at best a marginal level of confidence that the probable cost, which is the Government's best estimate for the cost of a contract resulting from the Offeror's proposal, correlates very closely to the actual costs that the Offeror would incur to successfully implement its proposal.

(e) The following will be reported to the SSA:

(1) Proposed total cost for the Enterprise and MSFC applications, including Program Management and any proposed cost efficiencies/savings for all eight (8) years;

(2) Evaluated probable cost for the Enterprise and MSFC applications, including Program Management and any evaluated cost efficiencies/savings for all eight (8) years;

(3) Proposed Phase-In cost;

(4) Government calculated IDIQ value from Table M.5-1, *IDIQ Fully Burdened Labor Rates Model* for all eight (8) years;

(5) Evaluated probable cost for the Government calculated IDIQ value using the Government's adjusted prime and subcontractor rates for all eight (8) years;

(6) Cost confidence rating; and

(7) Proposed Performance Fee.

## M.6 PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FACTOR

The Past Performance evaluation will be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(2) and NFS 1815.305(a)(2), "Past performance evaluation."

The Offeror's overall corporate Past Performance, to include the corporate Past

Performance of any proposed subcontractors/teammates, will be evaluated. Relevancy of Past Performance will also be assessed by considering: (1) types of services performed, (2) size and complexity of the contract, (3) subcontract management, and (4) customer relationship management. This factor is not numerically scored, but is assigned an adjectival rating and is reported to the SSA for consideration in making a selection decision. The adjective rating system/definitions set forth in NFS 1815.305(a)(2)(A) will be utilized in the Past Performance evaluation.

The evaluation will consider Past Performance information provided by:

- Offerors;
- Interviews with contracting and technical personnel responsible for oversight of contracts that the Offeror has previously performed;
- Data available from Government-wide Past Performance Databases;
- GAO and/or IG report findings;
- Other information obtained independently by the Government; and
- The Past Performance Questionnaire form will also be used to solicit assessments of the Offeror's performance from the Offeror's previous customers. All pertinent information, including customer assessments and any Offeror rebuttals, if appropriate, will be made part of the evaluation records and included in the evaluation.

Offerors without a record of relevant Past Performance or for whom information on Past Performance is not available, will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably under this factor. Refer to FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv).

(End of Provision)

[END OF SECTION]