

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1 LISTING OF PROVISIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

NOTICE: The following provisions clauses pertinent to this section are hereby incorporated by reference:

I. FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION (48 CFR CHAPTER 1)

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

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

CLAUSE NUMBER	DATE	TITLE
1852.214-72	DEC 1988	FULL QUANTITIES

(End of Provision)

M.2 GENERAL

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, and the requirements of this RFP. The Source Evaluation Board (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.

M.3 SOURCE EVALUATION

Source Selection: This competitive negotiated acquisition will be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.3, "Source Selection", and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.3, same subject. The Source Evaluation Board procedures at NFS 1815.370, "NASA formal source selection" will apply.

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

The Government intends to award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible Offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government. A brief description of each of the evaluation factors is set forth below. Only the Mission Suitability factor will be weighted and numerically scored.

Discussions: The Government's intent regarding discussions with Offerors is set forth in provision FAR Clause 52.215-1, Instructions to Offerors-Competitive Acquisition, Clause L.3.

Proposed Enhancements: The Government will evaluate the benefits of any proposed enhancements to the contract requirements under the appropriate Mission Suitability sub-factor. The Government will only evaluate proposed enhancements that the Offeror agrees to include in the final contract.

Best Value Process: The Best Value Process described at FAR 15.101, will be used in making source selection.

M.4 MISSION SUITABILITY FACTOR

The Mission Suitability Factor and associated subfactors are used to assess the ability of the Offeror to successfully perform and administer the requirements of the PWS and Task Orders. Proposals will be evaluated and scored numerically based upon the sub-factor weights set forth below. These weights are intended to be used as a guideline in the source selection decision-making process.

A.	Technical Approach	425
B.	Management Approach	375
C.	Small Business Participation Approach	100
D.	Safety and Health Approach	100
TOTAL		1000

Table M.1 Mission Suitability Sub-Factors and Weights

The evaluation of the Mission Suitability factor will consider, under the four subfactors set forth below, the overall quality and soundness of the proposed approach, the degree to, which the Offeror understands the total requirements of the RFP, PWS, and Task Orders, and the Offeror's ability to perform the contract. Adequacy and realism of resources will be considered in evaluating Mission Suitability, as an indicator of the Offeror's understanding of the requirements.

A. TECHNICAL APPROACH (425 POINTS)

The Offeror's approach for meeting the technical requirements of the PWS and Task Orders, the effectiveness of the approach and a demonstration of in-depth understanding of the requirements will be evaluated per the criteria in this section. Adequacy and realism of resources will be considered as one indicator of the Offeror's understanding of the requirements.

TA1 Understanding the Requirements

1. Technical Scenarios

The Offeror's approach to accomplishing the work, demonstrated understanding of the requirements in the PWS and Task Orders, and proposed labor and non-labor resources will be evaluated. The Offeror's approach to handling the seven Technical Scenarios delineated in Section L, including any technical and management issues or complexities will be evaluated.

- (1) Technical Scenario 1
- (2) Technical Scenario 2
- (3) Technical Scenario 3
- (4) Technical Scenario 4
- (5) Technical Scenario 5
- (6) Technical Scenario 6
- (7) Technical Scenario 7

2. General

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's understanding of the requirements through their proposed overall technical approach, including their proposed approach as outlined in a separate discussion for each task order, as well as the following:

(1) The Offeror's identified critical work functions to be accomplished within this contract, PWS, and task orders and approach for ensuring these critical functions are accomplished;

(2) The Offeror's demonstrated understanding of the key contract performance characteristics along with their proposed key performance metrics, including proposed benefits to management insight;

(3) The Offeror's approach to Quality Management (Quality Control and Quality Assurance), including how the Offeror will use quality organization processes, procedures, inspection techniques, training, certification, non-conformance and corrective action to ensure supplies and services conform to contract requirements;

(4) The Offeror's technical approach to performing the requirements of the PWS and Task Orders in relation to their proposed labor resource requirements;

(5) The Offeror's approach to work management and controls, including mechanisms to be used to match the correctly trained and skilled manpower to the work requirement and how receiving, scheduling, tracking completing and closing our work will be accomplished.

TA2 Staffing Plan

1. The Government will evaluate the appropriateness, completeness, effectiveness and efficiency of the Offeror's overall approach to provide and maintain an appropriate balance of skills and resources required to meet the contract, PWS, and task order requirements through achieving a high level of excellence and ensuring the appropriate certifications are obtained

and maintained and how the Offeror plans to maintain an environment in which highly skilled and talented people will make long-term commitments to achieving this mission;

2. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's identification of critical skills and ability to accomplish critical work requirements identified in their overall technical approach, as well as the Offeror's approach for recruiting and maintaining critical skill personnel identified in your proposal; and

3. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's approach to managing resources, while accommodating workload fluctuations.

TA3 Innovation and Efficiency

The Offeror's proposed innovative techniques to maximize operational efficiencies will be evaluated for effectiveness and practicality. The Offeror's proposed plans, strategies, and practices for enhancing standardization and uniformity across NASA will be assessed for viability, efficacy, applicability, and impact.

B. MANAGEMENT APPROACH (375 POINTS)

The Offeror's management approach, including supporting rationale, for fulfilling the requirements of the contract, PWS and Task Orders will be evaluated.

MA1 Management Plan

An evaluation will be made of the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the Offeror's management approach and Management Plan as follows:

(a) The Offeror's overall approach to Program and Contract management including organizational structure, program reporting, records management, communications, teaming and risk.

(b) The Offeror's overall proposed organizational structure, including the rationale for its application to the contract requirements and rationale that demonstrates the proposed organizational approach will ensure success in each of the critical areas identified within your proposal.

(c) The Offeror's proposed structure for contract management and reporting with any teaming partners and subcontractors, as well as the proposed benefits and rationale of the teaming/subcontractor arrangements and the associations, division of tasks and responsibilities relative to the contract PWS. This assessment will include evaluation of the proposed lines of communication, local autonomy, span of control, and corporate support provided, including lines of succession and authority, and the proposed subcontractors, team members, or joint venture partners proposed to illustrate their relationships within the proposed structure or between the organizational elements. Also to be evaluated will be the proposed reporting responsibilities of the Program Manager to corporate management and the relationship between the Program Manager and the prime contractor's corporate management, as well as, the management of any proposed subcontractors, team members, or joint venture partners. Proposed benefits included in the structure will also be evaluated.

- (d) The Offeror's proposed Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) and its mapping to the PWS along with the Offeror's rationale for the proposed WBS.
- (e) The Offeror's overall approach to identification, tracking, and resolution of customer concerns along with the approach to measure and maintain customer satisfaction.
- (f) The Offeror's proposed business and information systems that will be used to collect, track, analyze, distribute, and report costs and task information and the Offeror's proposed approach for these systems to share and disseminate digital data for the Government's use.
- (g) The Offeror's proposed standard labor categories in accordance with the labor categories described in the PWS.
- (h) The Offeror's plan to comply with and implement export control regulations, as required by the contract, PWS, and task orders.
- (i) The Offeror's approach and schedule for establishing Associate Contractor Agreements (ACA's) (interface arrangement) to establish and maintain effective working relationships with the contractors performing major functions at all NASA Centers. This includes services or functions other contractors provide to this contract, as well as, services or functions this contract provides to other NASA Contractors, including the scope of the agreements, interfaces and expected benefits of these cooperative efforts.
- (j) The Offeror's overall approach to records management in accordance with the Records Management Clause and the Management Plan DRD.
- (k) The Offeror's proposed **Total Compensation Plan (for prime and all major subcontractors)** will be evaluated by the Government to include the following:
- (i) How wages, salaries, and fringe benefits were established for professional employees, and non-exempt service employees and the commitment for compliance with the Service Contract Act and all wage determinations.
 - (ii) The Offeror's approach to initial staffing and the application to the following:
 - a. Incumbent workforce broken down by exempt and non-exempt employees,
 - b. Outside recruitment, other than incumbent workforce,
 - c. Internal labor resource (corporate or company wide).
 - (iii) The Offeror's proposed wage/salary information for each labor classification proposed and planned escalations for exempt employees.
 - (iv) The Offeror's fringe benefit policies and practices regarding health insurance coverage, the types of health insurance benefits offered, the company share of premium costs, what co-pays are required, the effective date of coverage, and anticipated escalation of insurance costs, as well as policies on assuming health insurance coverage for incumbent employees and differences in coverage between working groups.

(v) Proposed retirement/savings plans, including types of plans offered, how much the company provides toward a plan and vesting of company contributions along with differences in coverage between working groups.

(vi) Proposed paid time off policies including vacation, sick leave, holidays, payment policies regarding severance pay, overtime pay, holiday pay and any other premium pay anticipated along with differences in coverage between working groups.

(vii) Proposed special provisions that your company has regarding the hiring of incumbents; including recognition of seniority, protection of current wages/salaries and fringe benefit coverage.

(viii) Any proposed uncompensated overtime for exempt employees, and the effects of uncompensated overtime on the Total Compensation Plan, including possible effects that uncompensated overtime will have on employee morale and retention.

(ix) Proposed policies and procedures to be used to attract and recruit, staff, train, certify, and retain a highly qualified workforce, as well as incentives to be used to motivate and reward performance and to encourage the retention of personnel.;

(x) Offeror's discussion of prior experience with this proposed Total Compensation Plan, including such information as the length of time you (or other elements of the company) have used the plan and the turnover experienced with this compensation plan compared to the National Average.

(l) The Offeror's **Labor Relations Plan** will be evaluated by the Government to include the following areas:

(i) Your company's plan for recognizing the organized labor associations that are currently represented on the contract.

(ii) How your company will comply with the economic terms of the existing collective bargaining agreements that are referenced in the wage determination, whether your company plans to bridge the existing collective bargaining agreements, negotiate new agreements, or comply with the economic terms only, and your proposed compliance with the economic terms.

(iii) Your company history during the past 3 years in working with organized labor. Provide the names of the unions that your company has negotiated with, the location of the worksite, how many employees are represented, and the average number of grievances per year that your company receives. **Note: an Offeror that does not have any relevant experience with organized labor will not be evaluated negatively or positively in this area.**

(iv) Methods your company plans to use to promote and maintain harmonious labor relations during the transition phase and during Contract performance.

MA2 Phase-in Plan

An evaluation will be made of the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the proposed Phase-In Plan, including the following:

- (a) Offeror's plan for implementing a smooth phase-in without compromising effective and efficient operations across NASA. Your overall approach to ensure requirements are successfully accomplished, including the transition of property and systems compliance to ensure prompt and correct reporting as required by the TO(s) and contract. The management milestones (including all key critical milestones), and all associated schedules that you believe are required from start of phase-in to the full assumption of contract responsibilities, as well as, risks associated with your plan and ways you propose to mitigate them, along with the proposed objective criteria that can be used to determine if each milestone has been achieved.
- (b) Your discussion of the processes and procedures to be used to ensure adequate staffing levels to cover the contract requirements, even with workload fluctuations, including your plan for certifying and training your personnel (including key and critical personnel) to assume operational responsibilities and critical functions at contract start.
- (c) Your method for ensuring that all documentation necessary to perform the requirements of this contract is in place at the end of the phase-in period.
- (d) Proposed office space requirements for phase-in, if any.
- (e) Your plan to ensure that all company certifications and systems are in place to fulfill all of the requirements of this contract.

MA3 Key Personnel

An evaluation will be made of the Offeror's rationale for why the proposed key positions are critical to the success of the contract. The records of performance (resumes and references), education, commitment (letters of commitment), and overall capability of the proposed key personnel will be evaluated. The Offeror's rationale for assigning each key person to the proposed position, as well as the offer's process for replacing key personnel, will be evaluated.

MA4 Risk Management

The Offeror's overall approach to risk management will be evaluated, including the following:

- (a) Identification of those areas of management risk you believe should be addressed relative to performance of work under this contract, including the processes you will use to monitor and control these risks and your plans to mitigate or accept each risk.
- (b) Your discussion of potential risks and planned risk mitigation to multiple contractor systems at all NASA Centers.
- (c) Identification of functions that are provided by the other contracts, which are critical to the success of this contract, and why they are critical.

(d) Identification of those areas of technical risk you believe should be addressed relative to performance of work under this contract, including the process you will use to monitor, accurately identify, and control these risks and your plans to mitigate or accept each risk.

C. SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION APPROACH (100 POINTS)

The Offeror's proposed approach to ensure maximum Small Business participation in this Contract will be evaluated as proposed in accordance with Section L requirements and within the Offeror's proposed Small Business Plan. The evaluation of Small Business Subcontracting applies to all offerors except small businesses. Offerors that are small businesses will be evaluated positively with regard to small business subcontracting; however, NASA will also look at small business participation to the extent subcontracting opportunities exist.

The evaluation of SDB participation applies to all offerors except SDB offerors unless the SDB Offeror has waived the price evaluation adjustment factor by completing paragraph (c) of FAR clause 52.219-23. The waiver, if elected, makes the particular SDB Offeror INELIGIBLE for the price evaluation factor adjustment but ELIGIBLE for the "evaluation credit" (points) associated with the SDB participation.

SB1 Small Business Subcontracting

The Small Business Subcontracting Plan will be evaluated in terms of the reasonableness and soundness of the Offeror's ability to achieve the proposed overall subcontracting goals and the individual subcontracting goals by category. This evaluation of the Small Business Subcontracting Plan will be based on total proposed contract value. The Government will evaluate the extent of commitment to use small businesses, i.e., proposed plans, procedures, and organizational structure associated with ensuring attainment of the subcontracting goals; the types, amount, and complexity of work to be performed by small businesses; and the approach for flow down of small business goals to large business subcontractors and the probability the approach will meet or exceed proposed goals, and the level of commitment to use small businesses to perform the contract. The Offeror's Small Business Subcontracting Plan will also be evaluated in terms of meeting the requirements of FAR 19.704 Subcontracting Plan Requirements, including the Offeror's rationale for proposing not to meet the Contracting Officer's recommended goals.

SB2 Small Disadvantaged Business Participation

The Government will evaluate proposed SDB participation along with supporting rationale against total proposed contract value with emphasis on complexity of work that will enhance the development of SDBs. The extent to, which SDB concerns are specifically identified, the extent of commitment to use SDB concerns (for example, enforceable commitments vs. non-enforceable ones), variety of the work SDB concerns are to perform, and the ability to cross-check actual performance with actual cost will be evaluated. The Offeror's proposed plans, procedures, and organizational structure associated with ensuring attainment of the proposed SDB target will also be evaluated for effectiveness.

Although 15 U.S.C. 637(d) requires subcontracting plans to contain information about small disadvantaged business concerns, case law prevents the Government from giving evaluation credit to business types based on race or ethnicity unless those businesses are in under

represented industries. Section M on SDB participation ensures that the Government only evaluates participation of SDB's in industries that are designated by the Department of Commerce as under represented. For purposes of the Small Business Subcontracting Plan, the proposed subcontracting target for SDB's will be evaluated based upon the SDB's status as a small business.

D. SAFETY AND HEALTH APPROACH (100 POINTS)

The Offeror's proposed Safety and Health Plan will be evaluated for compliance with requirements set forth in the Safety and Health Plan DRD and the requirements in Section L Paragraph L.10 and the PWS. The approach for reducing or eliminating injuries and improving health will be evaluated.

The Offeror's historical Days Away Case Rate (DACR), Total Recordable Injury Rate (TRIR), Days Away plus Restricted Duty (DART), OSHA logs, loss run and experience modification rate from workers' compensation underwriters, and records of OSHA EPA citations will be evaluated against industry standards.

The Offeror's safety and health policies, procedures, and processes, including the draft Safety and Health Plan DRD, shall be evaluated to assess focus on workplace safety.

M.5 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, along with joint-venture partners or teammates and major subcontracts, past performance, including relevant experience will be evaluated separately by the SEB, but will not be numerically weighted and scored. The evaluation will be based on the assessment of information provided by the Offeror in their proposal, in accordance with the Section L instructions and requirements, information obtained by the SEB from the Past Performance Questionnaires and communications with listed references, as well as any other information obtained independently by the SEB.

As part of the past performance evaluation the Offeror's record of past participation of SB concerns in subcontracts, along with the type of work subcontracted will be evaluated.

The past performance evaluation will also consider the Offeror's past performance on safety and health. Consideration will be given to OSHA citations, OSHA incident rates, OSHA 300 reports, Experience Modifier Rating, and EPA citations. The Offeror's safety and health performance and Lost Time Case (LTC) rate will be evaluated. Each referenced contract/project LTC will be averaged (3 years) and compared to the latest available Department of Labor (DOL) LTC national average for the given NAICS.

For a newly formed organization, the evaluation will consider the past performance record of its component organizations, if any. In accordance with 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, past performance may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably.

The results of the SEB's evaluation of the Offeror's past performance will be presented to the SSA for consideration in making the source selection decision.

Past Performance Adjectival Definitions

Excellent: Of exceptional merit; exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner; very minor (if any) problems with no adverse effect on overall performance; and experience that is highly relevant to this procurement. Based on the offeror's performance record, there is a very high level of confidence that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Very Good: Very effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part; only minor problems with little identifiable effect on overall performance; and experience is very relevant to this procurement. Based on the offeror's performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Good: Effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance; and experience is relevant to this procurement. Based on the offeror's performance record, there is confidence that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Fair: Meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance; and experience is at least somewhat relevant to this procurement. Based on the offeror's performance record, there is low 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.

Poor: 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 very low 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)].

M.6 PRICE FACTOR

The Government will conduct Price Proposal evaluations in accordance with Section 15.4 of the FAR. Particular attention shall be given to FAR 15.404-1(b) entitled Price Analysis. Elements of FAR 15.404-1(b) that shall be considered include: comparison of proposed prices received in response to the solicitation; comparison of proposed prices with independent Government cost estimates; and analysis of pricing information provided by the Offeror.

Price Proposal evaluations shall also include an analysis for unbalanced pricing as referenced in FAR 15.404-1(g). A determination of unbalanced pricing may lead to the rejection of the Offeror as permitted in FAR 15.404-1(g)(3).

Relatively low prices will also be evaluated to determine whether there is a risk of default in the event of award to that Offeror. If the Government determines that there is an unreasonably high risk of default, such a determination may serve as the basis for non-selection.

An evaluation of the profit shall also be conducted. The proposed profit will be evaluated for reasonableness and for the extent that it will serve as a motivator of efficient and effective contract performance as referenced in FAR 15.404-4(a).

For purposes of source selection, the total proposed price will be utilized. The total proposed price consists of: the Phase-In price, the 5-year Initial Base Period price, and the total price of the five Option Years for all Task Orders. This means that the total proposed price is the sum of the proposed prices for all Task Orders identified in this RFP. As stated in the provision Evaluation of Options FAR 52.217-5, July 1990, 'evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s)'.

This is a full and open competition within one of the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Industry Subsectors determined by the Department of Commerce for the application of small disadvantaged procurement mechanisms and applicable factors. Refer to FAR 19.201(b), FAR 19.11 and to FAR Clause 52.219-23, "Notice of Price Evaluation Adjustment for Small Disadvantaged Business Concerns". This adjustment shall be applied to the total proposed price. The adjustments will not be made if there are no Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB) Offeror(s) or if all SDB Offerors have waived the price adjustment.

The Price Proposal evaluation is not numerically scored nor will receive an adjectival rating. However, Price Proposal evaluation findings will be presented to the Source Selection Authority for consideration in making the Source Selection Decision.

M.7 MODEL CONTRACT AND TASK ORDERS

Acceptance of Terms and Conditions - The proposed Contract terms and conditions incorporated in this RFP are intended for incorporation into any resulting Contract. The Offeror's proposal shall contain a statement of acceptance of these provisions. The Offeror's compliance with instructions and acceptance of terms and conditions will be considered in the evaluation.

The Model Contract: The model contract shall be in complete agreement with the proposal. However, if the data included in the model contract disagrees with the data in the proposal volumes then the model contract will be considered as having precedence over the data included in the proposal volumes.

NASA Center/Location Task Orders: The Offeror shall submit a proposal for each NASA Center/Location Task Order and place all of them here in Volume IV of the proposal. All NASA Center/Location Task Orders will be evaluated as part of the Mission Suitability evaluation, but will not be counted against the Mission Suitability volume page limitations.

M.8 PLANS, FORMS, AND OTHER DATA

Offeror shall submit all Plans, Forms, and Other Data called for in the RFP here in Volume V. All separate items such as Plans (Management Plan, Quality Assurance Plan, Safety and

Health Plan, Subcontracting Plan, etc.), Key personnel resumes and forms, etc, requested in the RFP, will be evaluated as part of the corresponding sections of Mission Suitability, but will not be counted in the page limitations for Mission Suitability.

M.9 RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS

The Mission Suitability Factor is more important than the Past Performance Factor. The Mission Suitability Factor and the Past Performance Factor, when combined, are significantly more important than the Price Factor.

[End of Section]