

Attachment L-6
Section M - Evaluation Factors for Award

M-1 BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD

1.1 Basis for Contract Award

This is a best value source selection conducted in accordance with (IAW) Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) subpart 15.3, *Source Selection*, and FAR 15.101-1, *Tradeoff Process*, as supplemented by the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) subpart 215.3, the DoD Source Selection Procedures (March 31, 2016), the Air Force FAR Supplement (AFFARS) subpart 5315.3, and the Air Force Mandatory Procedures 5315.3. These regulations are available electronically at www.acquisition.gov

The Government intends to make a single award by selecting the Offeror, who is determined to be responsible in accordance with FAR 9.1, *Responsible Prospective Contractors*, and its supplements, whose proposal conforms to the solicitation's requirements (to include all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and all other information required by Section L of this solicitation) and is evaluated, based on the evaluation Factors and Subfactors, to represent the best value to the Government. The Source Selection Authority (SSA) will base the source selection decision on a detailed assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria. This may result in an award to a higher rated, higher priced Offeror, where the decision is consistent with the evaluation Factors/Subfactors, and the SSA reasonably determines that the technical approach/technical risk and past performance of the higher price offer outweighs the cost/price difference.

While the Government source selection evaluation team and the SSA will strive for maximum objectivity, the source selection process, by its nature, is subjective; therefore, professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire process.

1.2 Discussions

If, during the evaluation period, it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government to hold discussions, Offeror responses to Evaluation Notices (ENs) and the Final Proposal Revision (FPR) will be considered in making the source selection decision.

If the Offeror's proposal has been evaluated as acceptable at the time discussions are closed, any changes or exceptions in the Final Proposal Revision are subject to evaluation and may introduce risk that the Offeror's proposal be determined unacceptable and ineligible for award.

1.3 Rejection of Unrealistic or Unreasonable Offers

The Government may reject any proposal that is evaluated to be unrealistic/unreasonable in terms of program commitments, including contract terms and conditions, or unreasonably high (beyond the Government's stated budget provided in Section M para 4.1.3.1) or unrealistically low in cost, such that the proposal is determined to reflect an inherent lack of competence or failure to comprehend the complexity and risks of the program.

1.4 Responsibility

No award shall be made unless the Contracting Officer makes an affirmative determination of responsibility. To be determined responsible, an Offeror shall meet the general standards described in FAR 9.104-1, and have an acceptable Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) Plan. The Contracting Officer may request Offerors to provide additional information to make a responsibility determination.

1.4.1 Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI)

The Government will review the Offeror's OCI Plan along with a completed OCI Mitigation Plan Checklist to ensure compliance with AFFARS 5352.209-9000 ALT I, II, III & VI (Oct 2019) for areas of potential conflicts. As discussed in Section L para 5.1.1, the resolution of OCI issues are treated as part of the Contracting Officer's contractor responsibility determination. An Offeror's actual or potential OCI concerns must be avoided, mitigated, or neutralized before that Offeror may receive an award.

1.4.2 Pre-Award Survey

The Government may conduct a pre-award survey as part of this source selection.

The Offeror shall be responsive to either DCMA or the Buying Office for any pre-award surveys (e.g. including financial capability) as required by FAR 9.104-1(a).

M-2 EVALUATION FACTORS: Volume I – Factor 1 – Combined Technical/Risk Capability

2.1 Evaluation Factors and Subfactors

Award will be made to the offeror proposing the combination most advantageous to the Government based upon an integrated assessment of the factor and subfactors described below. The following factors and subfactors will be used to evaluate each proposal:

Factor 1: Technical

Subfactor 1: Program Management Approach
Subfactor 2: South Vandenberg Power Plant (SVPP)
Subfactor 3: Pressure Vessels
Subfactor 4: Maintenance and Repair
Factor 2: Past Performance
Factor 3: Cost/Price

2.2 Relative Importance

The relative importance of each factor and subfactor is as follows: Technical, Past Performance, and Cost/Price are listed in descending order of importance with Factor 1 (Technical) being most important, Factor 2 (Past Performance) next in importance, and Factor 3 (Cost/Price) is last in importance. In accordance with FAR 15.304(e), all evaluation factors other than Cost or Price, when combined, are significantly more important than cost or price. Within Factor 1 Technical, all subfactors are equal in importance.

2.3 Factor 1: Technical Approach

An Offeror receiving a marginal or unacceptable rating in any one of the subfactors will not be eligible for award.

The Government will consider strengths Offerors note in their proposal and the Government will also consider aspects of the Offeror's technical proposal that may be advantageous to the Government as strengths. The Government intends to incorporate all evaluated strengths into the resulting contract, regardless of whether the Government has conducted discussions on any or all strengths.

2.3.1 Combined Technical/Risk Rating Evaluation

For Technical Factor: Subfactor 1 – Program Management Approach, Subfactor 2 – South Vandenberg Power Plant, Subfactor 3 – Pressure Vessels and Subfactor 4 – Maintenance and Repair will each be assigned a combined technical/risk color rating and adjectival as listed in Table 2. The Combined Technical/Risk Rating considers the risk associated with the technical approach in meeting the requirement and takes into consideration strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, uncertainties, and deficiencies as listed in Table 3.

Table 2. COMBINED TECHNICAL/RISK RATINGS:		
Color Rating	Adjectival Rating	Description
Blue	Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Purple	Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low to moderate.
Green	Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Yellow	Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Red	Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation and, thus, contains one or more deficiencies, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is unacceptable. Proposal is unawardable.

Table 3. RELEVANT DEFINITIONS	
Strength	<i>Strength</i> is an aspect of an Offeror's proposal that has merit or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Government during contract performance. See DoD Source Selection Procedures.
Weakness	<i>Weakness</i> means a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. See FAR 15.001.
Significant Weakness	<i>Significant Weakness</i> in the proposal is a flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. See FAR 15.001.
Deficiency	<i>Deficiency</i> is a material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level. See FAR 15.001.

2.3.2 Subfactor 1 – Program Management

This subfactor evaluates the proposed approach to Program Management. The standard of acceptability for this subfactor is met when the offeror's proposed approach demonstrates the following capabilities:

2.3.2.1 The proposed approach demonstrates a clear ability to administer the phase-in efforts to include how you will use the phase-in period to mobilize, train, observe, and otherwise prepare to assume complete responsibility on the first day of the base period.

2.3.2.2 The proposed approach demonstrates your rationale on why the proposed staffing is an optimal solution and its advantages to the Government to include any cross utilization of personnel if applicable

2.3.3 Subfactor 2 – South Vandenberg Power Plant (SVPP)

This subfactor evaluates the proposed approach to SVPP. The standard of acceptability for this subfactor is met when the offeror's proposed approach demonstrates the following capabilities:

2.3.3.1 The proposed approach demonstrates capability in operating and maintaining the South Vandenberg 15-megawatt power plant to include the interdependency of turbines, catalytic converters, fuel, oil and waste storage, water treatment, NOx and CO emissions control, granular activated carbon filters, zeolite softeners, and reverse osmosis.

2.3.3.2 The proposed approach demonstrates capability in maintaining the Allen-Bradley ControlLogix System, South Vandenberg power grid/substation configuration (including the multiple substation configuration scenarios used), the use of dual-fuel injection systems and fuel switching procedures, load bank operation, and permits necessary to operate SVPP.

2.3.3.3 The proposed approach demonstrates the capability in maintaining a consistent workforce in between launch operations. *Note* Operations in direct support of a launch will be funded via a Task Order in CLIN X005. Maintenance of SVPP is required under CLIN X004 and should be part of the TEP.

2.3.4 Subfactor 3 –Pressure Vessels

This subfactor evaluates the proposed approach to Pressure Vessels. The standard of acceptability for this subfactor is met when the offeror's proposed approach demonstrates the following capabilities:

2.3.4.1 The proposed approach demonstrates the capability in ensuring compliance with the Air Force, Federal, and national consensus pressure vessel requirements with respect to maintenance, testing and certification.

2.3.4.2 The proposed approach demonstrates the ability to obtain required certifications, documented training, and specific knowledge associated with aging pressure vessel infrastructure.

2.3.5 Subfactor 4 – Maintenance and Repair

This subfactor evaluates the proposed approach to Maintenance and Repair. The standard of acceptability for this subfactor is met when the offeror's proposed approach demonstrates the following capabilities:

2.3.5.1 The proposed approach demonstrates capability in maintenance and repair, test and inspection of installed Real Property (RP) and Real Property Installed Equipment (RPIE) and mitigating solutions as they may present themselves in day-to-day activities.

2.3.5.2 The proposed approach demonstrates effective strategy to implement a Reliability Center Maintenance (RCM) program that ensures equipment achieves the desired levels of safety, reliability, environmental soundness, and operational readiness in the most cost-effective manner.

2.3.5.3 The proposed approach demonstrates effective strategy for a corrosion control (CC) program at Vandenberg AFB to include the relative importance to maintenance and repair operations CC plays, and how it is incorporated as an integral part of an RCM program.

2.3.5.4 The proposed approach demonstrates minimal environmental impacts or issues associated with corrosion control at Vandenberg AFB and its geographically separated locations (Oak Mountain, Pillar Point AFS, etc.).

2.3.5.5 The proposed approach demonstrates processes and procedures to comply with the environmental requirements for Federal, State of California, and the Santa Barbara Air Pollution Control District (SBAPCD).

2.3.5.6 The proposed approach demonstrates the processes and procedures for performing maintenance and operations of generators in accordance with an approved Permit to Operate (PTO).

M-3 EVALUATION FACTORS: Volume II – Factor 2 – Past Performance

3.1 Factor 2: Past Performance

The Past Performance evaluation results in an assessment of the Offeror's probability of meeting the solicitation requirements. The Past Performance evaluation considers each Offeror's demonstrated recent and relevant record of performance in supplying services that meet the contract's requirements. In accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(2), the currency and relevance of the information, source of the information, context of the data, and general trends in the Offeror's performance shall be considered. These are combined to establish one performance confidence assessment rating for each Offeror.

3.1.1 Rating

The Past Performance factor will receive one of the performance confidence assessments described in DoD Source Selection Procedures, Performance Confidence Assessments Rating Method, excerpted below in Table 4.

Table 4. PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENTS RATING METHOD	
Adjectival Rating	Description
SUBSTANTIAL CONFIDENCE	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will

	successfully perform the required effort.
SATISFACTORY CONFIDENCE	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
NEUTRAL CONFIDENCE	No recent/relevant performance record is available or the offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned. The offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on the factor of past performance.
LIMITED CONFIDENCE	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
NO CONFIDENCE	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

3.1.2 Evaluation Process

The past performance evaluation considers each offeror's demonstrated recent and relevant record of performance in supplying products and services that meet the contract's requirements. Performance confidence is assessed at the overall Past Performance factor level after evaluating aspects of the Offeror's recent past performance, focusing on performance that is relevant to the Technical Subfactors and magnitude. For Joint Venture offerors, recent past performance of both partners will be considered. The past performance of team members proposed to perform at least 5% of the total proposed contract value will be evaluated for recency and relevancy if the team member is proposed to perform work under the subfactor for which the citation is provided.

The Government may consider past performance in the aggregate in addition to on an individual contract basis. For example, the team could consider together different citations that might individually not be Relevant because one meets only half the Relevant criteria while another citation only meets the other Relevant criteria; but when taken together is tantamount to Relevant past performance, which could lead to an overall higher confidence rating. In conducting the past performance evaluation, the Government reserves the right to use both the information provided in the offeror's past performance proposal volume and information obtained from other sources available to the Government, to include, but not limited to, the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIS), Electronic Subcontract

Reporting System (eSRS), or other databases; the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA), and interviews with Program Managers, Contracting Officers, and Fee Determining Officials.

Offerors are cautioned to submit sufficient information and in the format specified in Section L. Offeror's may be asked to clarify certain aspects of their proposal (for example, the relevance of past performance information) or respond to adverse past performance information to which the offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond.

Adverse past performance is defined as past performance information that supports a less than satisfactory rating on any evaluation element or any unfavorable comments received from sources without a formal rating system. Communication conducted to resolve minor or clerical errors will not constitute discussions and the contracting officer reserves the right to award a contract without the opportunity for proposal revision.

3.1.2.1 Recency Assessment

An assessment of the past performance information will be made to determine if it is recent. To be recent, the effort must be ongoing or must have been performed during the past three (3) years from the date of issuance of this solicitation. Past performance information that fails this condition will not be evaluated further.

3.1.2.2 Relevancy Assessment

The Government will conduct an evaluation of all recent performance information obtained to determine how closely the services performed under those contracts/citations relate to the Technical Subfactors. For each recent past performance citation reviewed, the relevance of the work performed will be assessed for the Technical Subfactors (however, all aspects of performance that relate to this acquisition may be considered). Consideration will be given to relevant efforts performed for other agencies of the federal, state or local governments and commercial customers. A relevancy determination of the Offeror's past performance will be made based upon the aforementioned considerations. In determining relevancy for each citation, consideration will be given to the effort, or portion of the effort, proposed to be performed by the company whose contract is being reviewed and evaluated. Only the **prime** offeror's past performance will be determined relevant for the Program Management subfactor. An effort will be deemed relevant if it demonstrates experience with providing support services similar to those specified in Table 5.1. The past performance narratives, questionnaires, and information obtained from other sources will be used to establish relevancy of past performance. Table 5 outlines the relevancy ratings that will be assigned based on the criteria in Table 5.1. These areas relate to each subfactor within the Technical factor.

The Government will use the following relevancy definitions when assessing recent, relevant contracts (DoD Source Selection Procedures, Past Performance Relevancy Rating Method), Table 5:

Table 5. PAST PERFORMANCE RELEVANCY RATINGS:	
Rating	Definition
RELEVANT	Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
SOMEWHAT RELEVANT	Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
NOT RELEVANT	Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

Table 5.1 Past Performance Relevancy Areas and Relevancy Elements. Rating is based on present/past performance citation that is similar to the scope, magnitude and complexities when the citation meets the criteria listed below for each subfactor (Program Management, Power Plant Operations, Pressure Vessel Support, and Maintenance and Repair).

Table 5.1 PAST PERFORMANCE RELEVANCY RATINGS:			
Program Management	Power Plant Operations	Pressure Vessel Support	Maintenance and Repair
Relevant			
Present/past performance citation is similar in scope, magnitude and complexity and the first two relevancy elements below are met.	Present/past performance citation is similar in scope, magnitude and complexity and all four relevancy elements below.	Present/past performance citation is similar in scope, magnitude and complexity and the first two relevancy elements below are met.	Present/past performance citation is similar in scope, magnitude and complexity and all four relevancy elements below.
Somewhat Relevant			
Present/past performance citation is similar in scope, magnitude and complexity and the first relevancy element below is met.	Present/past performance citation is similar in scope, magnitude and complexity and the first three relevancy elements below are met.	Present/past performance citation is similar in scope, magnitude and complexity and the first relevancy element below is met.	Present/past performance citation is similar in scope, magnitude and complexity and the first three relevancy elements below are met.
Not Relevant			
Present/past performance citation is not similar in scope, magnitude and complexity and none of the first two relevancy elements below are not met.	Present/past performance citation is not similar in scope, magnitude and complexity and the first three relevancy elements below and one other relevancy element are not met.	Present/past performance citation is not similar in scope, magnitude and complexity and first two relevancy elements below are not met.	Present/past performance citation is not similar in scope, magnitude and complexity and the first three relevancy elements below and one other relevancy element are not met.
Magnitude			
To be considered relevant, the citation must \$4M annually or greater	\$500K annually or greater	\$350K annually or greater	\$3M annually or greater

Relevancy Elements	
Program Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) An organizational structure that defines responsibilities of all organizational elements with adequate staffing levels and skills to accomplish program requirements 2) A evolution of management approach and management controls (organization and approach) while maintaining the ability to execute the fluctuating workloads and distribution of available resources 3) Effective executions of phase-in procedures such as transitioning of inventory and Government furnished property
Power Plant Operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Ability to operate and maintain a 15-megawatt or greater power plant and associated systems 2) Ability to operate and ensure uninterrupted operational support in meeting applicable requirements 3) Defined Processes and Procedures in meeting all Permit to Operate requirements to include Federal, State, and Local regulations 4) Development and submission of mandatory data in accordance with state, local, and contract requirements
Pressure Vessel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Administer, facilitate and implement a comprehensive pressure system certification/re-certification program, process safety information and an inspection schedule 2) Implement and manage a comprehensive In-Service Inspection (ISI) program ensuring compliance with all required regulations 3) Establish the required certifications, documented training, and specific knowledge associated with pressure vessel infrastructure
Maintenance & Repair	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Implement and manage a comprehensive Reliability Center Maintenance (RCM) and Corrosion Control program 2) Administer and facilitate a robust maintenance and repair schedule 3) Ability to manage environmental requirements across geographically separated locations meeting state and local regulations 4) Processes in developing and maintaining all required permits and certification

3.1.2.3 Quality of Services:

The Government will consider information from customers on how well the offeror performed on past contract citations. For each recent, relevant past performance citation reviewed, the

quality of the work performed will be assessed for the Technical subfactors and magnitude (however, all aspects of performance that relate to this acquisition may be considered). The quality of services assessment consists of an in-depth evaluation of all past performance information that the Government found to be relevant, regardless of its source.

3.1.2.4 Assigning Performance Confidence Assessment Rating

The past performance confidence assessment rating is based on the offeror's overall record of recency, relevance and quality of services assessments. Offerors will receive an integrated performance confidence assessment rating at the factor level (see Table 4 above). Although the past performance evaluation focuses on performance that is relevant to the Technical subfactors, the resulting performance confidence assessment rating is made at the factor level and represents an overall evaluation of offeror's performance. Offerors without a record of recent/relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance and, as a result, will receive a "Neutral Confidence" rating for the Past Performance factor.

A record of relevant past performance may be considered more advantageous to the Government than a "Neutral Confidence" rating. Likewise, a more relevant past performance record may receive a higher confidence rating and be considered more favorably than a less relevant record of favorable performance.

M-4 EVALUATION FACTORS: Volume III – Factor 3 – Cost/Price

4.1 Factor 3: Cost/Price

4.1.1 Price Evaluation

The Offeror's Total Evaluated Price (TEP) will be calculated as described below in paragraph 4.1.2. The price evaluation will document the reasonableness, and if unbalanced pricing exists within each Offeror's TEP. The Offeror's proposed burden rates for CPFF CLINs will be evaluated for reasonableness and cost realism. The performance period of the contract includes a 1-month phase-in period, 12-month base period, five (5) one (1)-year options, and a 6-month extension. Offeror's TEP determined not to be reasonable, realistic or balanced will result in the Offeror being deemed not eligible for award. In the evaluation, the Government may use data external to the Offeror's proposal in accordance with FAR 15.404-1. For all Contract Line Item Number (CLIN) types, the evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise such options. The Government-calculated TEP will be presented to the Source Selection Authority for the best value tradeoff decision.

4.1.2 Total Evaluated Price will be calculated using Table 6, specifically:

4.1.2.1 The sums of the Firm Fixed Price (FFP) CLINs, excluding Phase-in FFP CLIN 0009, shall constitute the total evaluated price.

4.1.2.2 Offerors shall use the Government provided amounts for Cost Reimbursement (CR) CLINs, which contain no fee. These CR CLINs will not be included in the Total Evaluated Price.

4.1.2.3 Offerors shall acknowledge the maximum fee for all Cost Plus Fixed Fee (CPFF) CLINs for Task Orders is 5% during the entire period of performance within their proposal and model contract. Table 6 reflects the 5% maximum Fixed Fee for CPFF CLINs and references a Government plug number based on projected costs associated with future Task Orders. These CPFF CLINs will not be included in the total evaluated price. The Government's workload estimates for future Task Orders against the CPFF CLINs are projected at \$5,137,355.00 per fiscal year (FY22-FY28), with past yearly averages of \$5-6M per fiscal year (FY16 – FY20).

4.1.3 Evaluation Area Details

The proposal must contain sufficient details for the Government evaluation of the following areas:

4.1.3.1 Reasonableness

The Offeror's proposal will be assessed for reasonableness, where reasonableness will be an assessment of whether the price is too high. In conducting the reasonableness analysis, the Government will use one or more analysis techniques described in FAR 15.404-1. A determination of unreasonableness will render the proposal unawardable. In addition, proposals that have been assessed to be technically unacceptable are ineligible for award, and as a result, a reasonableness determination will not be made for technically unacceptable, unawardable proposals. The Government will identify estimated cost for the cost associated with the reimbursable Cost CLIN and the CPFF CLINs. The Government estimated costs are not evaluated as part of the TEP. Note: CLIN 0009 is not evaluated as part of the TEP, however price reasonableness still applies.

The Government's total budget for the Firm Fixed Price CLINs (0001, 0002, 0003 and 0004) during the initial base period of twelve months is \$7,831,680.00, and \$55,334,231.00 for the entire period of performance, excludes budgets for reimbursable costs CLIN and the CPFF CLINs. The Government's budget for the one (1) month Phase-in Firm Fixed Priced CLIN 0009 is \$274,499.00.

The Government will not provide a further breakout of budgets for Firm Fixed Priced CLINs

beyond what is stated above. The Government's objective is to not influence Offeror's staffing approaches/strategies, cross utilization efforts, nor applied escalation rates in prices where assumptions, factors or basis is to be stated within their proposals.

DRAFT

Table 6. Total Evaluated Price						
CLIN	CLIN Noun/Title	Contract Type	Cost	5% (maximum) Fixed Fee for CPFF CLINs	Total CLIN Price	Period
0001	Range Support M&R (FY22)	FFP	N/A	N/A	Proposed Price	12 mos Base Yr
0002	MDA M&R (FY22)	FFP	N/A	N/A	Proposed Price	12 mos Base Yr
0003	CSPOC M&R (FY22)	FFP	N/A	N/A	Proposed Price	12 mos Base Yr
0004	Assured Access to Space M&R (FY22)	FFP	N/A	N/A	Proposed Price	12 mos Base Yr
0005	Launch Support (FY22)	CPFF	\$800,000	5%	\$800,000	12 mos Base Yr
0006	Reimbursables (FY22)	CR Only	\$1,626,000	N/A	\$1,626,000	12 mos Base Yr
0007	Repairs, Additions (FY22)	CPFF	\$4,337,355	5%	\$4,337,355	12 mos Base Yr
0009	Phase-In (FY22)	FFP	\$274,499	N/A	\$274,499	1 month
1001	Range Support M&R (FY23)	FFP	N/A	N/A	Proposed Price	12 mos Opt Yr 1
1002	MDA M&R (FY23)	FFP	N/A	N/A	Proposed Price	12 mos Opt Yr 1
1003	CSPOC M&R (FY23)	FFP	N/A	N/A	Proposed Price	12 mos Opt Yr 1
1004	Assured Access to Space M&R (FY23)	FFP	N/A	N/A	Proposed Price	12 mos Opt Yr 1
1005	Launch Support (FY23)	CPFF	\$800,000	5%	\$800,000	12 mos Opt Yr 1
1006	Reimbursables (FY23)	CR Only	\$1,626,000	N/A	\$1,626,000	12 mos Opt Yr 1
1007	Repairs, Additions (FY23)	CPFF	\$4,337,355	5%	\$4,337,355	12 mos Opt Yr 1
2001	Range Support M&R (FY24)	FFP	N/A	N/A	Proposed Price	12 mos Opt Yr 2
2002	MDA M&R (FY24)	FFP	N/A	N/A	Proposed Price	12 mos Opt Yr 2
2003	CSPOC M&R (FY24)	FFP	N/A	N/A	Proposed Price	12 mos Opt Yr 2
2004	Assured Access to Space M&R (FY24)	FFP	N/A	N/A	Proposed Price	12 mos Opt Yr 2
2005	Launch Support (FY24)	CPFF	\$800,000	5%	\$800,000	12 mos Opt Yr 2
2006	Reimbursables (FY24)	CR Only	\$1,626,000	N/A	\$1,626,000	12 mos Opt Yr 2
2007	Repairs, Additions (FY24)	CPFF	\$4,337,355	5%	\$4,337,355	12 mos Opt Yr 2
3001	Range Support M&R (FY25)	FFP	N/A	N/A	Proposed Price	12 mos Opt Yr 3
3002	MDA M&R (FY25)	FFP	N/A	N/A	Proposed Price	12 mos Opt Yr 3
3003	CSPOC M&R (FY25)	FFP	N/A	N/A	Proposed Price	12 mos Opt Yr 3
3004	Assured Access to Space M&R (FY25)	FFP	N/A	N/A	Proposed Price	12 mos Opt Yr 3
3005	Launch Support (FY25)	CPFF	\$800,000	5%	\$800,000	12 mos Opt Yr 3
3006	Reimbursables (FY25)	CR Only	\$1,626,000	N/A	\$1,626,000	12 mos Opt Yr 3
3007	Repairs, Additions (FY25)	CPFF	\$4,337,355	5%	\$4,337,355	12 mos Opt Yr 3
4001	Range Support M&R (FY26)	FFP	N/A	N/A	Proposed Price	12 mos Opt Yr 4
4002	MDA M&R (FY26)	FFP	N/A	N/A	Proposed Price	12 mos Opt Yr 4
4003	CSPOC M&R (FY26)	FFP	N/A	N/A	Proposed Price	12 mos Opt Yr 4
4004	Assured Access to Space M&R (FY26)	FFP	N/A	N/A	Proposed Price	12 mos Opt Yr 4
4005	Launch Support (FY26)	CPFF	\$800,000	5%	\$800,000	12 mos Opt Yr 4
4006	Reimbursables (FY26)	CR Only	\$1,626,000	N/A	\$1,626,000	12 mos Opt Yr 4
4007	Repairs, Additions (FY26)	CPFF	\$4,337,355	5%	\$4,337,355	12 mos Opt Yr 4
5001	Range Support M&R (FY27)	FFP	N/A	N/A	Proposed Price	12 mos Opt Yr 5
5002	MDA M&R (FY27)	FFP	N/A	N/A	Proposed Price	12 mos Opt Yr 5
5003	CSPOC M&R (FY27)	FFP	N/A	N/A	Proposed Price	12 mos Opt Yr 5
5004	Assured Access to Space M&R (FY27)	FFP	N/A	N/A	Proposed Price	12 mos Opt Yr 5
5005	Launch Support (FY27)	CPFF	\$800,000	5%	\$800,000	12 mos Opt Yr 5
5006	Reimbursables (FY27)	CR Only	\$1,626,000	N/A	\$1,626,000	12 mos Opt Yr 5
5007	Repairs, Additions (FY27)	CPFF	\$4,337,355	5%	\$4,337,355	12 mos Opt Yr 5
6001	Range Support M&R (FY28)	FFP	N/A	N/A	Proposed Price	6 mos Ext
6002	MDA M&R (FY28)	FFP	N/A	N/A	Proposed Price	6 mos Ext
6003	CSPOC M&R (FY28)	FFP	N/A	N/A	Proposed Price	6 mos Ext
6004	Assured Access to Space M&R (FY28)	FFP	N/A	N/A	Proposed Price	6 mos Ext
6005	Launch Support (FY28)	CPFF	\$400,000	5%	\$800,000	6 mos Ext
6006	Reimbursables (FY28)	CR Only	\$813,000	N/A	\$1,626,000	6 mos Ext
6007	Repairs, Additions (FY28)	CPFF	\$2,168,678	5%	\$4,337,355	6 mos Ext

4.1.3.2 Realism

The Government will evaluate the cost realism of each offeror's proposed burden rates for the total period of performance, table 4.4.1.2, for Cost Plus Fixed Fee CLINs only. This will include an evaluation of the extent to which proposed rates are sufficient for the work to be performed, reflective of a clear understanding of the requirements (derived from the PWS and historical and workload data) and consistent with the unique methods of performance described in the Offeror's technical proposal.

The Offeror's proposed rates for the Cost Plus Fixed Fee CLINs, are documented as table 4.4.1.2, and shall become the Forward Pricing Rates in the awarded contract for the entire period of performance for the purposes of negotiating CPFF CLIN requirements.

4.1.3.3 Unbalanced Pricing

The Offeror's proposal will be assessed for the presence of unbalanced pricing IAW FAR 15.404-1(g). Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable total evaluated price, the price of one or more contract line items is significantly over or understated as indicated by the application of cost or price analysis techniques. An offer may be rejected if the Contracting Officer determines that the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government. The assessment of unbalanced pricing will be applicable to all Firm Fixed Priced CLINs, excluding the Firm Fixed Price Phase-in CLIN 0009.

Volume IV – Contract Documentation

5.1 Administrative Documents

5.1.1 Solicitation Requirements, Terms and Conditions

Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as factors or subfactors. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the solicitation may result in the offeror being ineligible for award. Should an Offeror take any exception to the terms and conditions of the solicitation, the Offerors must clearly identify any such exception(s) to the solicitation terms and conditions and must provide complete supporting rationale to explain why it is taking said exception(s).

5.1.2 Pre-Award Survey

The Government may conduct a pre-award survey (PAS) as part of this source selection. Results of the PAS (if conducted) will be evaluated to determine each offeror's capability to meet the requirements of the solicitation.

5.1.3 Mission Essential Contractor Services

The Mission-Essential Contractor Services Plan IAW DFARS 252.237-7023 and DFARS 252.237-7024 will be evaluated to determine each offeror's capability to meet the requirements of the solicitation and the PWS.

DRAFT