

SECTION M
EVALUATION
FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1 LISTING OF CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

NOTICE: The following solicitation provisions and/or contract clauses pertinent to this section are hereby incorporated by reference.

- I. FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION (48 CFR CHAPTER 1) -
52.217-5 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (JUL 1990)
- II. NASA FAR SUPPLEMENT (48 CFR CHAPTER 18) –

NO NASA By Reference clauses in Section M.

(End of provision)

M.2 EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

2.1 General

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.

A Midrange Procurement Team (MRT) or Buying Team (BT) in accordance with applicable regulations that include the FAR and NASA FAR Supplement will evaluate the proposals. Appropriate personnel in conducting the evaluation will support the MRT. The MRT will carry out the evaluation activities and report its findings to the Source Selection Authority (SSA), who is responsible for making the source selection decision.

The Government's intent regarding discussions with offerors in competitive range is set forth in provision 52.215-1 in Section L.

2.2 Evaluation Factors and Subfactors

Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the following factors described in the below subparagraphs: Technical, Past Performance, and Price.

NOTE TO OFFERORS

The FAA certifications and submission of proof of the certifications are a "Go/No Go" requirement. No further evaluation shall be made of the offeror's proposal if the required certifications are not submitted with the proposal.

Technical

- Technical Approach
- Quality Management Program
- Response and Delivery Time
- Facilities and Equipment
- Security
- Warranty
- Contractor Engineering Approved Technical Instructions
- Small Business Utilization

SECTION M
EVALUATION
FACTORS FOR AWARD

Past Performance
Price

M.3 LOWEST PRICE TECHNICALLY ACCEPTABLE WITH PAST PERFORMANCE

This procurement shall be conducted utilizing a combination of technically acceptable baseline requirements and an evaluation of past performance.

The following factors shall be used to evaluate offers:

1. Technical Acceptability
2. Past Performance
3. Price

The Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the offeror whose proposal after evaluation represents lowest price, technically acceptable offer with past performance.

3.1 Technical Acceptability

The Technical factor and associated subfactors are used to assess the merit of the work or product proposed and the ability of the offeror to actually provide what is offered. The MRT will evaluate the offeror's demonstrated ability to effectively identify, mitigate, and control risks for each of the Technical Acceptability subfactors.

A. Technical Approach Subfactor

The MRT will evaluate the offeror's ability to demonstrate its understanding of the requirements in the SOW. The MRT will also evaluate the offeror's risk assessment and plans to mitigate these risks. If applicable, an evaluation of the offeror's use of subcontractors in supporting this effort will be made.

B. Quality Management Program Subfactor

The MRT will evaluate the offeror's commitment to quality processes and procedures, and workforce qualifications.

C. Response and Delivery Time Subfactor

The MRT will evaluate the offeror's proposed approaches for timely delivery of aircraft parts in order to minimize aircraft downtime.

D. Warranty Subfactor

The MRT will evaluate the degree of responsibility and cost assumed by the offeror's warranty in order to guarantee maximum aircraft hours and calendar life time provided by the warranty following aircraft schedule and unscheduled maintenance activities.

SECTION M
EVALUATION
FACTORS FOR AWARD

E. Contractor Engineering Approved Technical Instructions

The MRT will evaluate the comprehensiveness of the contractor-developed internal engineering technical instructions to ensure reliability and safety of the work.

F. Facilities and Equipment

The contractor and subcontractor facilities and equipment will be evaluated to determine if they meet the requirements set forth in the SOW.

Note: The Government reserves the right to conduct site visits of the contractor's facility and any proposed subcontractors' facility where the work will be performed.

G. Security

The MRT will evaluate contractor and subcontractor security protection plans for NASA aircraft while at their facility. They will look at aircraft accessibility to the public, security guard controlled access, closed circuit surveillance, night parking area lighting capabilities, and availability of armed security, if required.

H. Small Business Utilization

SMALL BUSINESS UTILIZATION

The evaluation of Small Business Subcontracting applies to all Offerors. Although small business concerns are not required to submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan as required by FAR clause 52.219-9, *Small Business Subcontracting Plan* and its *Alternate II*, NASA will evaluate small business subcontractor participation to the extent that 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 described in Section M.

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 category) in comparison to the Contracting Officers assessment of the appropriate subcontracting goals for this procurement. The Small Business Subcontracting Plan will also be evaluated in terms of the reasonableness and soundness of the Offeror's independent assessment to achieve the proposed

SECTION M
EVALUATION
FACTORS FOR AWARD

overall subcontracting goals and the individual subcontracting goals by category. The evaluation will include the reasonableness of rationale for any goal that is less than the Contracting Officer's recommended goal for any category, the reasonableness of efforts made to establish a goal for that category, as well as on-going efforts, if any, the Offeror plans during performance to increase participation in that category. This evaluation of the Small Business Subcontracting Plan will be on the basis of total Time and Materials Maximum value. The Small Business Subcontracting Plan will also be evaluated in terms of meeting the requirements of FAR 19.704 Subcontracting Plan Requirements.

Additionally, NASA will evaluate:

- (1) For small businesses not required to submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan, the extent, reasonableness, and quality of small business subcontracting participation to the extent that subcontracting opportunities exist.
- (2) The reasonableness and quality of the rationale specific to work that will be performed by the small business subcontractor(s). NASA will also evaluate the extent to which SB concerns are specifically identified and the extent of commitment to use SB firms (for example, enforceable commitments vs. non-enforceable commitments.)
- (3) The quality of Offeror's past performance in small business utilization as an indicator of commitment to utilize small business concerns.
- (6) The reasonableness and quality of information demonstrating the extent of commitment to utilize small business concerns

SDB Participation

Separately from Small Business Subcontracting, NASA will evaluate SDB Participation.

NASA will evaluate the reasonableness of proposed target SDB participation in the approved NAICS Industry Subsectors against total contract value.

Additionally, NASA will evaluate other information as follows only to the extent that it pertains to SDBs in the authorized NAICS Industry Subsectors:

- (1) The reasonableness and quality of the rationale provided to substantiate the proposed targets for SDB participation.
- (2) The reasonableness and quality of the rationale specific to work that will be performed by the SDB(s). NASA will also evaluate the extent to which SDB concerns are specifically identified.
- (3) The quality of the Offeror's past performance in SDB utilization as an indicator of commitment to utilize SDBs.

SECTION M
EVALUATION
FACTORS FOR AWARD

Technical acceptability will be rated either as meets requirements or does not meet requirements.

3.2 Past Performance

Past Performance indicates how well an offeror performed on earlier work and can be a significant indicator of how well it can be expected to perform the work at hand. The offeror's past performance including recent experience will be evaluated by the buying team. The evaluation will be based on information provided by offerors in their proposals, information obtained by the buying team based on communications with listed references as well as any other information obtained independently by the buying team. Past Performance for the offeror and major subcontractors will be evaluated and rated as Excellent, Very Good, Good, Fair, or Poor*. If an offeror has no past performance experience, it will be given a neutral rating.

*As defined as NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement 1815.305(a)(3)(A).

3.3 Price

The MRT will evaluate price by adding: the total price for the basic requirement to the total price of all the options and the additional amount for aircraft flight distance cost to the offeror's facility for each contract year.

The MRT will evaluate the Cost and Benefit Templates (Attachment 4) to ensure that the Offeror is paying its employees in accordance with the respective Department of Labor wage determination for the local area.

3.4 Tradeoff Process

The Government will select the technically acceptable proposal with the lowest price unless past performance merit selection of a higher price proposal.

(End of provision)

(END OF SECTION)