

1  
2  
3  
4 **NATIONAL SECURITY SPACE LAUNCH (NSSL)**  
5 **PHASE 3 LANE 2 LAUNCH SERVICE PROCUREMENT**  
6 **FA8811-23-R-0002**

7  
8  
9  
10 **ATTACHMENT 13**  
11 **EVALUATION CRITERIA**

12  
13  
14  
15 **dRFP #2: 13 July 2023**

16  
17  
18  
19 **United States Space Force**  
20 **Space Systems Command (SSC)**  
21 **Assured Access to Space (AATS)**  
22 **Los Angeles Air Force Base, California**  
23  
24

25 **1 RESPONSIBILITY DETERMINATION**

26 The Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO) will make a responsibility determination in accordance  
27 with (IAW) Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 9.104-1 after the evaluation of proposals to  
28 determine whether an Offeror is eligible for contract award. The PCO will also consider the  
29 USSF Spaceflight Worthiness Certifying Official input on progress towards certification of the  
30 Offeror’s proposed launch system, among other standards listed in the FAR 9.104-1, to  
31 successfully launch National Security Space (NSS) missions.

32 In accordance with Section 1612 of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal  
33 Year (FY) 2018 (P.L. 115-91) and SSC Instruction (SSCI) 64-101, the PCO will not award a  
34 contract to a contractor included on the Air Force Space Contractor Responsibility Watch List  
35 (CRWL) without the approval of the SSC Commander.

36 **2 BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD**

37 This is a best value tradeoff source selection conducted IAW FAR subpart 15.3, Source  
38 Selection, as supplemented by the Defense FAR Supplement (DFARS), the Air Force FAR  
39 Supplement (AFFARS), and Department of Defense (DoD) Source Selection Procedures dated  
40 31 March 2016. The Government intends to award three requirements contracts as a result of  
41 this competition, using a best value basis. The Offeror determined to be the best value to the  
42 Government will be designated the “Requirement 1” provider. The Offeror determined to be the  
43 next best value to the Government will be designated as the “Requirement 2” provider.” The  
44 Offeror determined to be the third best value to the Government will be designated the  
45 “Requirement 3” provider.

46 The “Requirement 1” or “Requirement 2” launch service distributions for a portion of the NSSL  
47 manifest are described in Table 1 in 52.212-4 (z) Ordering, in the model contract. The  
48 “Requirement 3” launch service distribution portion of the NSSL manifest is described in Table  
49 2 in 52.212-4 (z) Ordering, in the model contract.

50 The Offerors will need to be deemed responsible IAW FAR subpart 9.1, as supplemented by  
51 DFARS and AFFARS, and proposals must conform to the solicitation's requirements to be  
52 eligible for award. While the Government will strive for maximum objectivity in its evaluations,  
53 the source selection process, by its nature, is subjective, and, therefore, professional judgment is  
54 implicit throughout the entire process. Each Offeror’s proposal will be evaluated independently,  
55 on its own merit, according to the evaluation criteria stated in the RFP.

56 **2.1 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY**

57 The following evaluation Factors and Subfactors will be used to evaluate each proposal.

58

Table 2.1-1: Evaluation Factors and Subfactors

Factors		Rating Methodology					
<b>Minimum Gate - Approved Certification Plan</b>		Acceptable			Unacceptable		
1	Technical	<i>Combined Technical and Technical Risk Color Rating</i>					
		Subfactors	Outstanding	Good	Acceptable	Marginal	Unacceptable
		1 System Capability	Blue	Purple	Green	Yellow	Red
		2 Category B	Blue	Purple	Green	Yellow	Red
		3 Category C	Blue	Purple	Green	Yellow	Red
4 System Risks and Mitigations	Blue	Purple	Green	Yellow	Red		
2	Past Performance	Substantial Confidence	Satisfactory Confidence	Neutral Confidence	Limited Confidence	No Confidence	
3	Small Business Participation	Acceptable		Unacceptable			
4	Price	Total Evaluated Price					
		Reasonable		Not Reasonable			
		Balanced		Unbalanced			

60

61 **2.2 RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF FACTORS AND SUBFACTORS**

62 In accordance with FAR 15.304(e), when combined, Factors 1 through 3 are significantly more  
63 important than Factor 4, Price. Additionally, Factor 1 Technical is by itself more important than  
64 Factor 2 Past Performance. Within Factor 1, Subfactor 1 is equal in importance to Subfactor 2,  
65 and Subfactor 2 is equal in importance to Subfactor 3. Subfactor 4 is more important than  
66 Subfactor 1, but when combined, any two of Subfactors 1, 2, or 3 are more important than  
67 Subfactor 4.

68 **3 NUMBER OF CONTRACTS TO BE AWARDED**

69 The Government will award three contracts for the NSSL Phase 3 Lane 2 Launch Service  
70 Procurement for “Requirement 1”, “Requirement 2”, and “Requirement 3.” The “Requirement  
71 1” or “Requirement 2” launch service distributions will be as described in Table 1 in 52.212-4  
72 (z) Ordering, in the model contract. The “Requirement 3” launch service distribution portion of  
73 the NSSL manifest is described in Table 2 in 52.212-4 (z) Ordering, in the model contract.

74 **4 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS**

75 The Government will evaluate, IAW this attachment, information the Offeror provides IAW  
76 Attachment 12, Instructions to Offerors (ITO), with the exception of the executive summary.  
77 Proposals must conform to this Request for Proposal (RFP). Any submitted proposal that does  
78 not adhere to the requirements in this RFP may be eliminated from the competition and ineligible  
79 for award.

80 **4.1 DISCUSSIONS**

81 The Government anticipates entering into discussions after it makes a competitive range  
82 determination of the most highly rated proposals based on the ratings of each proposal against all  
83 evaluation criteria (see FAR 15.306(c)). Offeror responses to Evaluation Notices (ENs) and the  
84 Final Proposal Revision (FPR) shall be requested for evaluation from all Offerors who remain in  
85 the competitive range. The Government reserves the right to record audio telecommunications  
86 with the Offerors during the source selection. Any proposal updates shall be evaluated according  
87 to the evaluation criteria specified here.

88 **4.2 SOLICITATION REQUIREMENTS**

89 Offerors are required to meet or exceed all solicitation requirements, such as terms and  
90 conditions, small business subcontracting plan, organizational conflict of interest analysis results,  
91 representations and certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as  
92 Factors or Subfactors. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the solicitation may  
93 result in the Offeror being ineligible for award. The Government reserves the right to cross-  
94 reference between volumes and sections of volumes to support proposal evaluation.

95 **5 COMPETITIVE RANGE**

96 In accordance with FAR 15.306, an Offeror may be eliminated from the competitive range at any  
97 time during discussions if the Offeror is no longer considered to be among the most highly rated.  
98 This elimination can occur whether or not all material aspects of the proposal have been  
99 discussed, or whether or not the Offeror has been afforded an opportunity to submit a proposal  
100 revision.

101 **6 EVALUATION OF MINIMUM GATE: APPROVED CERTIFICATION**  
102 **PLAN**

103 6.1 Pursuant to FAR15.306(c)(2), the PCO may limit the number of proposals in the competitive  
104 range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly  
105 rated proposals. In the first phase of the evaluation, an Offeror’s proposal must meet the  
106 Minimum Gate, before moving to the second phase of the evaluation. Offerors not meeting the  
107 Minimum Gate would then be excluded from further evaluation in the second phase and will  
108 receive an unsuccessful offeror letter IAW FAR 15.503(a)(1).

109 6.2 In order for an Offeror to move to the second phase of the evaluation, there must be an  
110 “Acceptable” rating. This Minimum Gate will receive a rating of “Acceptable” or  
111 “Unacceptable” as depicted in Table 6.2-1 below.

112 **Table 6.2-1: Minimum Gate Rating**

<b>Rating</b>	<b>Description</b>
ACCEPTABLE	Proposal meets the requirements of the solicitation
UNACCEPTABLE	Proposal does not meet the requirements of the solicitation

113

114 6.3 If Offeror’s proposed launch system or family of systems is not already certified the  
115 Government will evaluate whether the Offeror has an approved Launch System Certification  
116 Plan(s).

117 6.4 Offerors who meet the Minimum Gate and advance to the second phase of the evaluation  
118 will be evaluated using the factors listed below.

119 **7 EVALUATION OF FACTOR 1: TECHNICAL**

120 **7.1 EVALUATION OF TECHNICAL SUBFACTORS**

121 Each Technical Subfactor will receive a combined Technical/Risk rating. The combined  
122 technical/risk ratings include consideration of the significant strengths, strengths, weaknesses,  
123 significant weaknesses, and deficiencies. The combined Technical/Risk evaluation utilizes the  
124 combined Technical/Risk ratings listed in Table 7.2-1 and the risk descriptions set forth in Table  
125 7.2-2.

126 The Government will assign a combined Technical/Risk rating, as described in Table 7.2-1  
127 below, for all Factor 1 Subfactors, as identified in Table 2.1-1. The Government may assign  
128 significant strengths, strengths, and/or deficiencies to the Offeror’s proposal. Significant  
129 strengths, strengths, deficiencies, weakness, and significant weakness are defined as follows:

130 A "significant strength" is an aspect of an Offeror's proposal that has merit or exceeds specified  
131 performance or capability requirements in a way that will be very advantageous to the  
132 Government during contract performance.

133 A "strength" is an aspect of an Offeror's proposal that has merit or exceeds specified  
134 performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Government  
135 during contract performance.

136 A "weakness" is a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract  
137 performance.

138 A "significant weakness" is a flaw in the proposal that appreciably increases the risk of  
139 unsuccessful contract performance.

140 A "deficiency" is a material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a  
141 combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful  
142 contract performance to an unacceptable level.

143 The Government reserves the right to incorporate significant strengths and strengths into the  
144 contract. When evaluating proposals for award, the Government may find advantageous the use  
145 of demonstrated flight data of the proposed system, flight heritage for major subsystems,  
146 operationally ready launch facilities and associated infrastructure, and other evidence of  
147 readiness to meet NSSL requirements. The ordering of these items does not imply relative  
148 importance or weighting.

149 To be eligible for award, Offerors must receive combined Technical/Risk ratings of Marginal,  
150 Acceptable, Good, or Outstanding for all Subfactors.

## 151 **7.2 RATINGS**

152 Each Technical Subfactor, as identified in Table 2.1-1, will receive one of the combined  
153 Technical/Risk ratings described in Table 7.2-1 below:

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

**Table 7.2-1: Combined Technical/Risk Ratings**

<b>Color Rating</b>	<b>Adjectival Rating</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>BLUE</b>	OUTSTANDING	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements, and</li> <li>2. Proposal contains a significant strength or multiple strengths/significant strengths, and</li> <li>3. Risk of unsuccessful performance is low.</li> </ol>
<b>PURPLE</b>	GOOD	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements, and either               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Proposal contains at least one significant strength, or multiple strengths, and risk of unsuccessful performance is moderate, or</li> <li>b. Proposal contains at least one strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low</li> </ol> </li> </ol>
<b>GREEN</b>	ACCEPTABLE	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and</li> <li>2. Risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.</li> </ol>
<b>YELLOW</b>	MARGINAL	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and/or</li> <li>2. Risk of unsuccessful performance is high.</li> </ol>
<b>RED</b>	UNACCEPTABLE	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation and, thus, contains one or more deficiencies, and/or</li> <li>2. Risk of unsuccessful performance is unacceptable.</li> <li>3. Proposal is unawardable.</li> </ol>

163

164 The combined Technical/Risk Rating for Technical Subfactors, as identified in Table 2.1-1, will  
 165 use the risk descriptions described in Table 7.2-2 below.

166

167

168

169

**Table 7.2-2: Technical Risk Descriptions**

<b>Adjectival Risk Rating</b>	<b>Description</b>
LOW	Proposal may contain weakness(es) which have little potential to cause disruption of schedule or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and normal Government monitoring or similar activities will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.
MODERATE	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which may potentially cause disruption of schedule or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring or similar activities will likely be able to overcome difficulties.
HIGH	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses/significant weaknesses which is likely to cause significant disruption of schedule or degradation of performance. Is unlikely to overcome any difficulties, even with special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring or similar activities.
UNACCEPTABLE	Proposal contains a material failure or a combination of significant weaknesses that increases the risk of unsuccessful performance to an unacceptable level.

171

172 **7.3 SUBFACTOR 1: SYSTEM CAPABILITY**

173 **7.3.1 MASS-TO-ORBIT**

174 The Government will evaluate whether, and the extent to which, the Offeror’s proposed mass-to-  
 175 orbit capability meets or exceeds Government requirements and whether the methodology and  
 176 justification supporting the proposed mass-to-orbit capability is technically sound (note: TOR-  
 177 2023-01395 "Disposal Options for Selected Orbits" provides a methodology for evaluating long-  
 178 term propagation and collision probability for orbits near GEO and MEO and may be used to  
 179 evaluate compliance of disposal requirements).

180 **7.3.2 ORBITAL PARAMETER ACCURACY**

181 The Government will evaluate whether, and the extent to which, the Offeror’s proposed orbital  
 182 parameter accuracy for the primary launch vehicle configuration for each reference orbit meets  
 183 or exceeds Government requirements and whether the methodology and justification supporting  
 184 proposed orbital parameter accuracy is technically sound.

185 **7.3.3 MISSION ASSURANCE**

186 The Government will evaluate whether, and the extent to which, the Offeror’s proposed mission  
187 assurance approach, integration of mission assurance products, and subcontractor mission  
188 assurance approach are technically sound.

#### 189 **7.4 SUBFACTOR 2: CATEGORY B**

##### 190 **7.4.1 CATEGORY B SAMPLE MISSIONS**

###### 191 **7.4.1.1 Category B LEO**

###### 192 **7.4.1.1.1 LEO Launch Operations Concept of Operations (CONOPS)**

193 The Government will evaluate whether, and the extent to which, the Offeror’s proposed Launch  
194 Operations CONOPS is technically sound.

###### 195 **7.4.1.2 Category B Molniya**

###### 196 **7.4.1.2.1 Molniya Mission Profile**

197 The Government will evaluate whether, and the extent to which, the Offeror’s analyses  
198 appropriately identify, assess, and mitigate risks for undemonstrated mission profile  
199 portions/unproven capabilities.

###### 200 **7.4.1.3 Category B GEO 1.5 Co-Manifested Mission**

###### 201 **7.4.1.3.1 GEO 1.5 Mission Profile and Sequence of Events**

202 The Government will evaluate whether, and the extent to which, the Offeror’s proposed  
203 approach for the Category B GEO 1.5 mission profile is technically sound. This includes data  
204 and supporting evidence for flight demonstrated mission profile portions as specified in  
205 Attachment 12, paragraph 7.4.1.3.1. The Government will evaluate whether, and the extent to  
206 which, the Offeror’s analyses appropriately identify, assess, and mitigate risks for  
207 undemonstrated mission profile portions/unproven capabilities. (Reference Attachment 12,  
208 Paragraph 7.4.1.3.1)

###### 209 **7.4.1.3.2 GEO 1.5 Mission Unique Integration (Co-Manifested Payloads):**

210 The Government will evaluate whether, and the extent to which, the Offeror’s approach for co-  
211 manifesting, to include: 1) the integration of an augmented ESPA aft payload and a testbed SV  
212 forward payload, 2) the encapsulation process, 3) forward and aft payload access during  
213 integration and prior to final closeouts, 4) meeting unique environmental control system  
214 requirements for both payloads while encapsulated on the launch pad, and 5) launch  
215 environments for the two payloads, separation attitude and re-contact analyses, and multiple  
216 separation signal/circuit capabilities is technically sound. The Government will also evaluate  
217 whether, and the extent to which, the Offeror’s approach for launch and deployment of the  
218 augmented ESPA into the same initial orbit as the testbed SV is technically sound. The  
219 Government may consider it a strength (or strengths) if the Offeror’s solution exceeds the  
220 Government requirements in a beneficial or advantageous way. (Reference Attachment 12,  
221 Paragraph 7.4.1.3.2)

222 **7.4.1.3.3 GEO 1.5 Classified Payload Management:**

223 The Government will evaluate whether, and the extent to which, the Offeror’s proposed  
224 approach to manage and process classified payloads (Special Access Program/Special Access  
225 Required) and to handle and protect classified mission data (requirements, analysis inputs and  
226 results) is technically sound. The Government may consider it a strength if the Offeror’s  
227 solution exceeds the Government requirements in a beneficial or advantageous way. (Reference  
228 Attachment 12, Paragraph 7.4.1.3.3)

229 **7.4.2 CATEGORY B SYSTEM READINESS**

230 The Government will evaluate Offeror’s Payload Envelope Category B system development,  
231 certification, and Non-Recurring Design Validation (NRDV) activities by 1 October 2026. If the  
232 Offeror is proposing one system that will meet both Category B and Category C requirements,  
233 the Government will still evaluate its readiness in each Category separately. The System  
234 Readiness will be based on the proposed launch system(s). Secondary launch systems will not  
235 be considered a viable risk mitigation strategy for the proposed launch system readiness. When  
236 the Government requests updated Launch System Maturity Assessment Process (LSMAP)  
237 reports after proposal submission, the additional reports will be evaluated based on the Offeror’s  
238 Payload Envelope Category B system development, NRDV completion and certification  
239 activities as well as Offeror’s progress against planned NRDV activities.

240 **7.4.2.1 Category B System Technical Assessment**

241 The Government will consider the LSMAP Technical assessment and evaluate whether, and the  
242 extent to which, the Offeror’s plans to complete NRDV for its Category B system are technically  
243 sound.

244 **7.4.2.2 Category B System Eastern Range Schedule Assessment**

245 The Government will consider the LSMAP schedule assessments (per section LE OI 17-001  
246 dated 2 April 2018) and evaluate whether, and the extent to which, the Offeror’s plans to  
247 complete all development, certification, and NRDV activities to meet all NSSL Category B  
248 requirements by 1 October 2026 in support of a mission from Cape Canaveral Space Force  
249 Station (CCSFS) or Kennedy Space Center (KSC) are technically sound. The Government may  
250 assign a significant strength or a strength for a Launch System that has demonstrated it is ready  
251 earlier than the required readiness date.

252 **7.4.2.3 Category B System Western Range Schedule Assessment**

253 The Government will consider the LSMAP schedule assessment (per section LE OI 17-001 dated  
254 2 April 2018) and evaluate whether, and the extent to which, the Offeror’s plan to complete all  
255 development, certification, and NRDV activities to meet all NSSL Category B requirements by 1  
256 October 2026 in support of a mission from Vandenberg Space Force Base (VSFB) is technically  
257 sound. The Government may assign a significant strength or a strength for a Launch System that  
258 has demonstrated it is ready earlier than the required readiness date.

259 **7.5 SUBFACTOR 3: CATEGORY C**

260 **7.5.1 CATEGORY C SAMPLE MISSIONS**

261 **7.5.1.1 Category C GEO 2**

262 **7.5.1.1.1 GEO 2 Mission Profile**

263 The Government will evaluate whether, and the extent to which, the Offeror's analyses  
264 appropriately identify, assess, and mitigate risks for undemonstrated mission profile  
265 portions/unproven capabilities.

266 **7.5.1.1.2 GEO 2 Mission Support Equipment (MSE) Accommodations**

267 The Government will evaluate whether, and the extent to which, the Offeror's proposed  
268 approach to providing GEO 2 MSE Accommodations is technically sound.

269 **7.5.2 CATEGORY C SYSTEM READINESS**

270 The Government will evaluate the Offeror's Payload Envelope Category C system development,  
271 NRDV completion, and certification activities by 1 October 2026. If the Offeror is proposing  
272 one system that will meet or exceed both Category B and Category C reference orbit  
273 requirements, the Government will still evaluate its readiness in each Category separately. When  
274 the Government requests updated LSMAP reports after proposal submission, the additional  
275 reports will be evaluated based on the Offeror's Payload Envelope Category C system  
276 development, NRDV completion, and certification activities as well as Offeror's progress against  
277 planned NRDV activities.

278 **7.5.2.1 Category C System Technical Assessment**

279 The Government will consider the LSMAP Technical assessment and evaluate whether, and the  
280 extent to which, the Offeror's plan to complete NRDV for its Category C system are technically  
281 sound.

282 **7.5.2.2 Category C System Eastern Range Schedule Assessment**

283 The Government will consider the LSMAP schedule assessment and evaluate whether, and the  
284 extent to which, the Offeror's plan to complete all development, certification, and NRDV  
285 activities to meet all NSSL Category C requirements by 1 October 2026 in support of a mission  
286 requiring vertical integration from CCSFS or KSC is technically sound. The Government may  
287 assign a significant strength or a strength for a Launch System that has demonstrated it is ready  
288 earlier than the required readiness date.

289

290 **7.5.2.3 Category C System Western Range Schedule Assessment**

291 The Government will consider the LSMAP schedule assessment and evaluate whether, and the  
292 extent to which, the Offeror's plan to complete all development, certification, and NRDV  
293 activities to meet all NSSL Category C requirements by 1 October 2026 in support of a mission  
294 from Vandenberg SFB is technically sound. The Government may assign a significant strength

295 or a strength for a Launch System that has demonstrated it is ready earlier than the required  
296 readiness date.

297

## 298 **7.6 SUBFACTOR 4: SYSTEM RISKS AND MITIGATIONS**

299 The Government will evaluate how the technical risks may affect the ability of the launch system  
300 to meet requirements. The Government will evaluate the effectiveness of identified mitigation  
301 plans and associated uncertainties. Secondary launch systems will not be considered a viable risk  
302 mitigation strategy for the proposed launch system.

303 The Government will evaluate how the Offeror mitigates their top technical risk(s). Each  
304 presented risk may apply to multiple of the following areas:

- 305 a. Booster Stages (e.g., rocket propulsion system, structures, avionics, software)
- 306 b. Upper Stages (e.g., rocket propulsion system, structures, avionics, software)
- 307 c. Long Coast Capability (e.g., GEO 1, GEO 1.5, and GEO 2)
- 308 d. Infrastructure (e.g., production, launch, and recovery/refurbishment, as applicable)
- 309 e. Design (e.g., new and modifications to existing design)
- 310 f. RF Attenuation Approach (e.g., Molniya and GEO 2)
- 311 g. Development and qualification risks (e.g., anomalies, design changes)
- 312 h. Operational (e.g., production, system integration, launch, recovery or refurbishment)
- 313 i. Vertical integration (e.g., SV processing and encapsulation, post encapsulation access,  
314 and launch operations)
- 315 j. LV/SV interface risks (e.g., loads, vibration, shock (especially Molniya and GEO 2),  
316 thermal, acoustic, Electromagnetic Interference (EMI), and contamination)
- 317 k. Requirements flow down to subcontractors
- 318 l. One additional top risk if not covered above

319 The Government reserves the right to identify additional technical risks, for which the Offeror  
320 shall provide corresponding risk mitigation plans.

## 321 **8 EVALUATION OF FACTOR 2: PAST PERFORMANCE**

### 322 **8.1 PAST PERFORMANCE**

323 The Offeror's past performance efforts will be evaluated for recency, relevancy, and quality.  
324 The combined past performance evaluation results in one Past Performance Rating IAW Table  
325 8.6-1. Offerors must receive a past performance confidence rating of Substantial, Satisfactory,  
326 Neutral, or Limited to be eligible for award.

### 327 **8.2 EVALUATION PROCESS**

328 The past performance evaluation considers the Offeror's demonstrated recent and relevant record  
329 of performance. In conducting the past performance evaluation, the Government will obtain Past  
330 Performance information from the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) and  
331 the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS). Additionally, the

332 Government reserves the right to obtain past performance information from the following:  
 333 Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), or other databases; the Defense Contract  
 334 Management Agency; and interviews with Program Managers, Contracting Officers, Fee  
 335 Determining Officials, and commercial sources.

336 **8.3 REGENCY EVALUATION**

337 Recent efforts must be ongoing or must have been performed during the past 5 years from the  
 338 date of proposal submission. Past performance information that does not meet this definition  
 339 will not be evaluated. In the overall past performance evaluation, more recent past performance  
 340 information will be more impactful than less recent past performance information.

341 **8.4 RELEVANCY EVALUATION**

342 The Government will conduct an evaluation of all recent performance information obtained to  
 343 determine whether the past performance efforts relate to missions launched to NSS reference  
 344 orbits. For each recent past performance effort reviewed, consideration will be given to the  
 345 extent to which the scope, magnitude, and complexity is similar to missions to NSS reference  
 346 orbits. This evaluation will result in relevancy assessment ratings for each mission. A relevancy  
 347 determination of the Offeror’s past performance will be made based upon the aforementioned  
 348 considerations, including joint venture partner(s) and major and critical subcontractor(s). In  
 349 determining the relevancy of effort performed under individual contracts, the Government will  
 350 only consider the specific effort or portion consistent with that proposed to be completed by the  
 351 prime, subcontractor, or teaming partner. Past performance information obtained from  
 352 applicable sources will be used to establish the relevancy of past performance. The Government  
 353 will use the following relevancy definitions in Table 8.4-1 when assessing recent, relevant  
 354 efforts.

355 **Table 8.4-1: Past Performance Relevancy Rating**

Adjectival Rating	Description
VERY RELEVANT	Past or ongoing efforts that involved a single or multi-mission launch service for the launch service provider, involving essentially the same scope, magnitude, and complexity as the NSS reference orbits using the proposed launch system(s).
RELEVANT	Past or ongoing efforts that involved a single or multi-mission launch service for other Government or commercial missions as the launch service provider, involving either similar scope, magnitude, and complexity as that required to meet the NSS reference orbits using the proposed launch system or essentially the same scope, magnitude, and complexity as the NSS reference orbits using an other than proposed launch system.
SOMEWHAT RELEVANT	Past or ongoing efforts that involved a single or multi-mission launch service for other Government or commercial missions as the launch service provider or its subcontractor, involving some of the scope,

	magnitude, and complexity as that required to meet the NSS reference orbits.
NOT RELEVANT	Past or ongoing efforts that involved a single or multi-mission launch service for other Government or commercial missions as the launch service provider or its subcontractor, involving little or none of the scope, magnitude, and complexity as that required to meet the NSS reference orbits.

356

357 **8.5 QUALITY ASSESSMENT**

358 The Government will assess the performance quality of recent and relevant efforts. The quality  
359 of the work performed will be assessed for performance and schedule. Pursuant to DFARS  
360 215.305(a)(2), the evaluation will also consider the extent to which, the Offeror’s evaluated past  
361 performance demonstrates compliance with FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business  
362 Concerns. The quality assessment may result in positive or adverse findings. Adverse is defined  
363 as past performance information that results in an unsatisfactory rating on any evaluation  
364 element or any unfavorable comment received from sources without a formal rating system (e.g.,  
365 PPIRS). For identified adverse information, the evaluation will consider the number and severity  
366 of the adverse information, mitigating circumstances, and the effectiveness of corrective actions  
367 that have resulted in any sustained improvements.

368 **8.6 PAST PERFORMANCE RATING**

369 The past performance rating is based on the Offeror’s overall record of recency, relevancy, and  
370 quality of performance. The evaluation will result in confidence rating IAW Table 8.6-1.

371

**Table 8.6-1: Past Performance Rating**

<b>Adjectival Rating</b>	<b>Description</b>
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.
---------------	---

372

373 **9 EVALUATION OF FACTOR 3: SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION**

374 **9.1 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY OF SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION**

375 The Small Business Participation Factor evaluation will result in Offerors receiving a rating of  
 376 “Acceptable” or “Unacceptable” as depicted in Table 9.1-1. The Small Business Participation  
 377 Commitment Document (SBPCD) focuses on the Offeror’s performance in the utilization of  
 378 small business concerns and its evaluation will be included within the rating of the Small  
 379 Business Participation Factor. The Small Business Subcontracting Plan shall address the  
 380 SBPCD. Offerors must receive a Small Business Participation Factor rating of Acceptable to be  
 381 eligible for award.

382 **Table 9.1-1: Small Business Factor Rating**

Rating	Description
ACCEPTABLE	Proposal meets the requirements of the solicitation
UNACCEPTABLE	Proposal does not meet the requirements of the solicitation

383

384 **9.2 SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION**

385 The Small Business Subcontracting Plan will be assessed IAW FAR 19.704 and must reflect the  
 386 level of small business participation commitment specified in the SBPCD.

387 The SBPCD is a separate document from the Small Business Subcontracting Plan required by  
 388 FAR subpart 19.7. The Government will evaluate the SBPCD as measured against Total Launch  
 389 Service (Basic Launch Service plus Mission Unique Services). Offerors must meet the  
 390 Minimum Quantitative Requirement (MQR) level of small business participation, which is an  
 391 annual average of 4% for launch services.

392 **10 EVALUATION OF FACTOR 4: PRICE**

393 The Offeror’s pricing will be evaluated for Reasonableness and Unbalanced pricing. Proposals  
 394 that are determined to be unreasonable are not awardable. Proposals that are determined to  
 395 contain unbalanced pricing are not awardable. In the reasonableness evaluation, the Government  
 396 may use data external to the Offeror’s proposal, such as, but not limited to, field pricing reports,  
 397 industry information, Government estimates, same or similar DoD contracts, and commercial  
 398 data.

399 Pricing that will be evaluated for Reasonableness and Unbalanced pricing include (Reference  
400 Attachment 12 Instructions to Offerors, Paragraphs 10.1, 10.2 and 10.3):

- 401 1. Basic launch service price by reference orbit, configuration, and mass-to-orbit by fiscal year
- 402 2. Mission Acceleration by fiscal year for 3-, 6-, 9-, or 12-month acceleration
- 403 3. Mission Unique Services by fiscal year
- 404 4. Launch Service Support (LSS) by contract year
- 405 5. Fleet Surveillance (FS) by contract year
- 406 6. Quick Reaction and Anomaly Resolution composite hourly rates as needed
- 407 7. Special Studies composite hourly rates as needed
- 408 8. Early Integration Studies (EIS) by Coordination and Mission Analysis components as  
409 needed.

#### 410 **10.1 REASONABLENESS**

411 The Offeror's proposal will be assessed for reasonableness, where reasonableness is an  
412 assessment of whether the price is too high. In accordance with FAR 31.201-3(a) the price is  
413 reasonable, if, in its nature and amount, does not exceed that amount which would be paid by a  
414 prudent person in the conduct of competitive business. Reasonableness of an Offeror's proposed  
415 price will be evaluated using one or more analysis techniques, as identified in FAR 15.404-1. In  
416 accordance with FAR 15.403-1(b) and 15.403-3(a), data other than certified cost or pricing data  
417 may be required to support a determination of price reasonableness. A determination of  
418 unreasonableness will render the proposal unawardable. In addition, proposals that have been  
419 assessed to be technically unacceptable are ineligible for award, and as a result, a reasonableness  
420 determination will not be made for technically unacceptable, unawardable proposals. If, after  
421 receipt of proposals, the PCO determines that there is insufficient data available to determine  
422 price reasonableness, the Offeror shall be required to submit additional data other than certified  
423 cost or pricing data.

#### 424 **10.2 UNBALANCED PRICING**

425 The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed prices for unbalanced pricing IAW FAR  
426 15.404-1(g). Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable Total Evaluated Price  
427 (TEP), the price of one or more price inputs in the pricing tables is significantly over or  
428 understated as indicated by the application of cost or price analysis techniques. An offer may be  
429 rejected if the contracting officer determines that the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk  
430 to the Government.

#### 431 **10.3 RESERVED**

#### 432 **10.4 TOTAL EVALUATED PRICE**

433 For source selection evaluation purposes and as an input for the best value tradeoff decision  
434 process, the TEP will be determined using the weighted sum of the following items over the PoP:

- 435 a) The Basic Launch Service Price for each fiscal year, identified by reference orbit and  
436 mass-to-orbit, plus,

- 437 b) The Mission Integration price for each launch service, plus,
- 438 c) The Acceleration price applied four times per year for fiscal years 1-5, plus,
- 439 d) For each fiscal year, for each mission, the associated Mission Unique Services, plus,
- 440 e) The total Rental Equivalency for Government Property Use amount, plus,
- 441 f) The annual FS price by order year, plus,
- 442 g) The annual LSS price by order year, plus,
- 443 h) The dollarized value for Quick Reaction, and Anomaly Resolution based upon
- 444 multiplying 100,000 hours by the proposed composite rate, plus,
- 445 i) The dollarized value for Special Studies based upon multiplying 100,000 hours by the
- 446 proposed composite rate, plus,
- 447 j) For non-NRO missions, Early Integration Studies (EIS), based upon mission analysis
- 448 components priced individually for all order years.

449 TEP will be calculated using the weighted sum of items a through h above. This is further  
450 detailed in the Attachment 12 ITO Appendix F, Pricing Tables. The weightings included in the  
451 notional pricing table are examples only. The Government will apply different weightings  
452 during the source selection that are representative of the expected requirements in the ordering  
453 period. These weightings will be generated prior to the receipt of proposals.

454 The Government-provided Appendix F will not automatically calculate the TEP from the inputs  
455 entered by the Offeror. The Government will provide the Offeror's TEP at time of Competitive  
456 Range Determination as well at the request for Final Proposal Revisions.

457 Note that Government acceptance of proposed TEP does not mean the Offeror's proposed prices  
458 are reasonable and not unbalanced. The reasonableness and unbalanced pricing is a different  
459 evaluation, which involves the evaluation of every price in Appendix F Price Input – Pricing  
460 Tables tab, which will be incorporated into the resultant contract as Attachment 7.