

- M1 SECTION M – PART 1**
 - INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES TO OFFERORS**
- M1.1 LISTING OF PROVISIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE**
 - NONE**

**M2 SECTION M – PART 2
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

M2.1 GENERAL

The proposals will be evaluated by a Source Evaluation Committee (SEC) in accordance with applicable regulations which include the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and the NASA FAR Supplement. The SEC will be supported by appropriate personnel in conducting the evaluation. The SEC 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.

M2.2 SOURCE EVALUATION

The SEC will evaluate proposals on the following:

1. Mission Suitability, Volume I
2. Past Performance, Volume II
3. Cost, Volume III

Paragraphs M2.3 – M2.5 below contain brief descriptions of how the SEC will evaluate each of these items.

Only Mission Suitability will be weighted and scored.

Pages submitted in excess of the limitations specified in section L will not be evaluated by the Government and will be returned to the Offeror.

M2.3 MISSION SUITABILITY FACTOR

The Mission Suitability sub-factors and their corresponding weights reflecting relative importance are listed below. These weights are intended to be used as a guideline in the source selection decision-making process.

Factor	Weight (pts)
1. Technical Understanding and Resources	500
a. Statement of Work Fulfillment	
b. Technical Exercises	
2. Management Approach	400
a. Management Plan	
b. Quality Plan	
c. Phase-in Plan	
3. Safety and Health Plan	100
Total	1000

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

The Mission Suitability factor and associated sub-factors are used to assess the ability of the Offeror to provide and administer the requirements of the SOW. Proposals will be evaluated and scored numerically based upon the sub-factors set forth below.

M2.3.1 Technical Understanding and Resources Sub-Factor (See L2.4.1)

Under this sub-factor, the SEC will:

M.2.3.1.1 Evaluate Statement of Work (SOW) Fulfillment

The offeror's proposed approach to meeting the SOW requirements will be evaluated on the completeness and appropriateness of the following:

- (a) Plan to accomplish all SOW tasks and sub-tasks
- (b) Innovations, efficiencies, and cost savings
- (c) Policies, procedures, and operational techniques
- (d) Identification of risks involved with meeting requirements and plans to mitigate them
- (e) Non-Labor Resources (NLRs)
- (f) Skill mix to meet the technical requirements

M.2.3.1.2 Evaluate Technical Exercise Answers

The accuracy, efficiency, and competency of the offeror's proposed solutions to the provided Technical Exercises will be evaluated.

M2.3.2 Management Organization and Approach Sub-Factor (See L2.4.2)

Under this sub-factor, the SEC will:

M.2.3.2.1 Evaluate the Management Plan

The offeror's proposed plan for meeting the management requirements of this contract will be evaluated on the effectiveness, clarity, and suitability of the following:

- (a) Organizational structure, implementation approach, work methods, operating procedures, and management systems
- (b) Rationale for designating positions as "key"
- (c) Key personnel's education, experience, certifications, past performance, personal commitment, and overall capability

NOTE: Failure to have key personnel personally committed to this proposed effort, including attendance at pre-award contract oral discussions (should they occur), may adversely impact the Management Organization and Approach scores.

- (d) Recruiting and training processes, staffing, certification processes, and the ability to hire, compensate, and retain qualified personnel
- (e) Actions proposed to mitigate performance risks

M.2.3.2.2 Evaluate the Quality Plan

The offeror's proposed plan for meeting the quality requirements of this contract will be evaluated on the completeness and adequacy of the following:

- (a) Standards, policies, techniques, procedures, metrics
- (b) Mechanisms for implementing ISO 9001-2000 compliance

M.2.3.2.3 Evaluate the Phase-In Plan

The offeror's proposed plan for phase-in from the existing support contract to the proposed contract will be evaluated on its capability to successfully continue critical services without interruption.

M2.3.3 Safety and Health Plan Sub-Factor (See L2.4.3)

The offeror's proposed Safety and Health Plan will be evaluated on the adequacy, responsiveness, and completeness of policies, procedures, and techniques used to ensure the safety and health of its employees and all working conditions.

M2.4 PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR

Past Performance indicates how well an offeror performed on earlier work and can be a significant indicator of how well they can be expected to perform the work at hand. Relevant Experience is defined as the accomplishment of work that is comparable or related to the work required under this procurement. 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.

The offeror's Past Performance will be evaluated by the SEC but will not be numerically weighted and scored. The evaluation will be based upon information provided by offerors in their proposals and by their references, as well as any other information obtained independently by the SEC.

The SEC's evaluation of the offeror's Past Performance will include assessment of the relevance and excellence of overall general performance, as well as safety and environmental performance, insurance history, quality systems experience, and export control experience.

M2.5 COST FACTOR

Under the Cost factor the Cost Proposal will be evaluated for the validity, realism, and adequacy for the performance of this effort in accordance with the offeror's organization and technical approach. The evaluation of the Cost factor will include an assessment of the cost of doing business with each offeror, predicted growth in proposed cost during the performance of the work, and the features of each offeror's position that would cause its actual cost to be more or less than the proposed cost.

The Government will perform a cost realism analysis of your cost proposal. Cost realism analysis is defined as, the process of independently reviewing and evaluating specific elements of each offeror's proposed cost estimate to determine whether the estimated proposed cost elements are realistic for the work to be performed; reflect a clear

understanding of the requirements; and are consistent with the unique methods of performance and materials described in the offeror's technical proposal.

The cost of the base period and all options will be included in the probable cost. The cost of the phase-in period will be considered under the Cost factor but will not be included in the probable cost.

The sum of the cost deltas between the proposed cost and the probable cost for the areas above will be compared to the cost realism chart below to determine whether mission suitability points will be affected.

Mission Suitability points will be adjusted based on the percentage difference between proposed and probable costs defined below:

Difference Between Proposed and Probable Cost	Point Adjustment
+ or – 0 to 5%	0
+ or – 6 to 10%	-50
+ or – 11 to 15%	-100
+ or – 16 to 20%	-150
+ or – 21 to 30%	-200
+ or – more an 30%	-300

The results of the Government's cost evaluation will be presented to the Source Selection Authority for consideration in making the source selection.

M2.6 RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS

Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost. As related to each other, Mission Suitability and Past Performance are approximately equal.