

RFP5-12345-JLB
SECTION M 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 applicable 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 PROPOSAL DOCUMENTATION

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.

(End of text)

M. 3 SOURCE SELECTION AND EVALUATION FACTORS--GENERAL

1. Source Selection

This competitive negotiated acquisition shall 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".

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

2. Evaluation Factors and Subfactors

The evaluation factors are Mission Suitability, Price, and Past Performance. These factors, as described at NFS 1815.304-70, will be used to evaluate each proposal. This Section M provides a further description for each evaluation factor, inclusive of subfactors. Only the Mission Suitability factor is numerically scored.

Proposals will be evaluated against the requirement specified in this solicitation. Although the Government does not encourage/discourage technical performance or capability enhancements, Offerors may choose to propose enhancements that are above those specified in this document. If these enhancements are valued by the Government (based on the mission suitability instructions and

RFP5-12345-JLB
SECTION M Evaluation Factors For Award

subfactors in this section), and the Offeror wants them to potentially be evaluated as strengths/significant strengths in the Mission Suitability evaluation, then the Offeror shall complete Contract Attachment H, Contractor Proposed Enhancements. The offeror may receive credit for the proposed enhancement only to the extent of its description on Attachment H, as explained in its proposal. Inconsistent statements about any enhancement in the proposal may result in a neutral or negative evaluation by the Government. Any enhancement may result in a positive, neutral, or negative evaluation in spite of the Governments right to waive an enhancement during contract performance under clause H.15 of the contract..

3. Relative Order of Importance of Evaluation Factors

The Price Factor is significantly less important than the combined importance of the Mission Suitability Factor and Past Performance Factor. As individual factors, the Price Factor is less important than the Mission Suitability Factor but more important than the Past Performance Factor.

(End of text)

M. 4 MISSION SUITABILITY FACTOR

1. Mission Suitability Subfactors and Description of Each Subfactor

Subfactor A: Technical Approach

The Government will evaluate the system design, including all PDR material submitted, for maturity, completeness, and risk. The Government will also evaluate the ability of the proposed system to deliver LDCM Data Packages and VDPs meeting the LDCM specifications.

The Government will evaluate the robustness and reliability of all system elements to meet data delivery requirements.

The Government will evaluate the instrument design for maturity, completeness, and risk, including the ability of the proposed instrument to acquire LDCM Sensor Data meeting the LDCM specifications.

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's approach to data acquisition, processing and delivery in terms of throughput, performance, reliability, security, risk and ability to generate required LDCM Data Packages and VDPs.

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's approach to interface with Government systems and services for items such as scheduling, LDCM Data Packages, VDPs delivery and data anomaly resolution.

The Government will evaluate the Offerors Cal/Val Plan and its ability to meet the Cal/Val Requirements (contract Attachment I). The Government will evaluate the Offeror's ability to carry

RFP5-12345-JLB
SECTION M Evaluation Factors For Award

out and maintain data quality throughout the term of the LDCM contract, including accurate radiometric, spectral, and spatial calibrations for all bands across the LDCM field of view.

The Government will evaluate the comprehensiveness and effectiveness of the data processing algorithms to create LDCM Sensor and Ancillary Data and the required deliverable Data Packages and Validation Products. The Government will evaluate the Contractor's on-board and ground processing algorithms and their effect on the quality of LDCM Validation Data Products and Data Packages.

The Government will evaluate the technical risk and feasibility of the proposed approach for delivering the optional Level 1G-ortho data products in accordance with Attachment J.

The Government will evaluate any requirements for Government furnished equipment, tasks, services, or data required in its proposed approach for technical feasibility and risk.

The Government will evaluate the value, risk, feasibility, and impact to the Government of any enhancements proposed under this subfactor.

1.2 Subfactor B: Business Approach

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's business approach and ability to ensure Landsat data continuity.

The Government will evaluate the Government's share of the system cost and risk in proportion to the system data and products provided to the Government.

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's ability to provide LDCM data at the proposed price including an analysis of the viability of the financing plan, viability of post-launch revenue sources, and overall business viability. The Government will use the results from the financing model to assess business approach viability and financial risk.

The Government will evaluate the viability of the Offeror's financing strategy to fund the system development and operation costs for the system used to produce the LDCM data.

The Government will evaluate the ability of the Offeror's investment group to finance the Offeror's proposed venture. This evaluation will include an analysis of the financial health of the Offeror's investment group, organizational structure, business relationships between partners, financial liability of the investors and corporate financial commitment.

The Government will evaluate the viability of the Offeror's business and marketing strategy to deliver revenues required to support business operations for the life of the LDCM contract. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's ability to mitigate the financial risks including the Offeror's approach to mitigating any loss in revenues due to a reduction in system performance (partial or total). Any other financial risk mitigation strategies will also be addressed such as financial recovery plan, insurance approach and access to additional sources of capital.

RFP5-12345-JLB
SECTION M Evaluation Factors For Award

The Government will evaluate the contractor's commercial product distribution, tool development activities, and customer support approach for reasonableness and consistency.

The government will evaluate the Offeror's approach, if revenues do not materialize, to ensuring the continuous stream of LDCM data for the life of the contract without the successful development of a commercial market.

The Government will evaluate the value, risk, feasibility, and impact to the Government of any enhancements proposed under this subfactor.

1.3 Subfactor C: Management Approach

The Government will evaluate the reasonableness and the programmatic risk of all contract terms and conditions that may affect the continuity of the Landsat Program, including, but not limited to, the proposed launch and IOC dates, rights in data, and timing of any Government payments.

The Government will evaluate any requirements for Government furnished equipment tasks, services, or data required in its proposed approach for cost, availability, and programmatic impact.

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's ability to perform the Implementation phase, the realism of the Offeror's schedule and critical path, and the effectiveness of the Offeror's proposed approach to evaluating and resolving any deficiencies or concerns identified by the Government. The Government will evaluate the risk and schedule feasibility of the proposed approach for providing an additional five years of LDCM data.

The Government will evaluate the visibility and significance the program will have with upper management during all phases of the LDCM contract.

The Government will evaluate the nature and extent of the work to be performed by teaming Contractors and Subcontractors, as well as the quality and efficiency of the interface and relationships of the Offeror and its Contractors and Subcontractors.

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed process for providing Government insight and meeting the requirements of contract clause H.12, including how the Government will gain insight into contractors who are subject to ITAR restrictions.

The Government will evaluate the management effectiveness of the Offeror's proposed lines of responsibility and authority for performing Systems Engineering for the total program and at each major interface. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's ability to manage the data anomaly process in the pre and post-IOC timeframes.

The Government will evaluate the reasonableness and acceptability of the proposed Small Business Subcontracting Plan and the overall proposed Small Business Subcontracting goal.

RFP5-12345-JLB
SECTION M Evaluation Factors For Award

The Government will evaluate the reasonableness of the proposed labor categories and rates for the IDIQ task orders included in the contract schedule under this subfactor.

The Government will evaluate the efficacy of the Risk Management Plan, and the program wide risk list for realism and effective mitigation planning.

The Government will evaluate the value, risk, feasibility, and impact to the Government of any enhancements proposed under this subfactor.

1.4 Subfactor D: Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB) Participation (FAR 19.12)

Offerors should refer to FAR provision 52.219-24, "Small Disadvantaged Business Participation Program--Targets" in section L of this solicitation. This subfactor includes the percent of proposed SDB participation against total contract value with emphasis on complex or high technology work that will enhance the development of SDBs. Specific identification of SDB contractors and associated work and past performance of the Offeror in meeting SDB goals and earning and associated incentives will be considered. The Offeror's proposed plans, procedures, and organizational structure associated with ensuring attainment of proposed SDB targets will also be considered.

2. Weights and Scoring

In accordance with NFS 1815.304-70(b)(1), the Mission Suitability factor will be weighted and scored on a 1000-point scale.

The weights (points) associated with each Mission Suitability subfactor are as follows:

	Points
Subfactor A - Technical Approach	350
Subfactor B - Business Approach	350
Subfactor C - Management Approach	250
Subfactor D - Small Disadvantaged Business Participation	50
Total	1000

The Mission Suitability subfactors and the total Mission Suitability factor will be evaluated using the adjectival rating, definitions and percentile ranges at NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(A). The maximum points available for each subfactor will be multiplied by the assessed percent for each subfactor to derive the score for the particular subfactor. For example, if a subfactor has possible 200 points and receives a percent rating 80, then the score for that subfactor would be 160 points.

(End of text)

RFP5-12345-JLB
SECTION M Evaluation Factors For Award

M. 5 PRICE EVALUATION FACTOR

This is a firm fixed-price acquisition.

A price analysis will be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(1). Price analysis is described at FAR 15.404-1(b). This analysis is done to ensure that the Government pays a “fair and reasonable” price. However, the analysis is not intended to be protective of the Offeror.

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.” The adjustment will not be made if there are no Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB) Offeror(s) or if all SDB Offerors have waived the price adjustment.

(End of text)

M. 6 PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION FACTOR

This factor will apply to the proposing entity and any significant subcontractors.

The evaluation will be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(2) and NFS 1815.305(a)(2), "Past performance evaluation". The approach to evaluating past performance is provided below in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(2).

This factor will not be point scored. One of the following adjectival ratings will be assigned:

Excellent - Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the Government’s benefit. The contractual performance of the element being assessed was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were highly effective.

Very Good - Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the Government’s benefit. The contractual performance of the element being assessed was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective.

Good - Performance meets contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element contains some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor appear or were satisfactory.

Fair - Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element being assessed reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions. The Contractor's proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.

RFP5-12345-JLB
SECTION M Evaluation Factors For Award

Poor - Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element contains serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective.

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 on past performance. Refer to FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv).

Past performance will include the following specific areas established for this procurement in accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(2)(B).

--Technical Performance

- The Offeror's compliance with technical requirements and performance standards for previous and present work. For software, hardware, and systems, this includes compliance with process requirements (such as product assurance) and control systems (such as configuration management) as well as the performance requirements for the delivered hardware or system and whether design life was achieved. The Offeror's performance on interim work and deliverables such as system designs, prototype hardware, and technical reports will also be considered, as well as the initiative of the Offeror in identifying and resolving unforeseen technical problems.

--Schedule Performance

- The Offeror's performance in meeting completion dates. This includes any interim deliverables or milestones such as periodic technical and business reports, system designs, and prototype hardware.

--Cost Performance

- The Offeror's cost performance relative to cost increases and cost savings (such as overruns and underruns) experienced on previous and current contracts. Only those increases or savings within the responsibility of the Offeror under the terms of the particular contracts are considered. However, customer directed efforts and "de-scopings" to mitigate cost increases will be considered in assessing cost performance.

(End of Text)

RFP5-12345-JLB
SECTION M Evaluation Factors For Award

M. 7 OFFER/NO OFFER RESPONSE SHEET

Compliance is requested, but not required.

This page may be used to indicate whether your company intends to submit an offer in response to this solicitation. You may also indicate your intent by E-Mail or FAX. The E-Mail address is jbecker@pop200.gsfc.nasa.gov. The FAX number is 301-286-7434. If mailed, return the completed page to the individual and address on the face page of this solicitation.

The _____(name of firm)

(/ / intends) (/ / does not intend) to submit an offer in response to DRFP-12345.

(End of text)