

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

1 RESPONSIBILITY DETERMINATION

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

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

2 BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD

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

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

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

2.1 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

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

Table 2.1-1: Evaluation Factors and Subfactors

Factors				Rating Methodology				
Minimum Gate - Approved Certification Plan				Acceptable		Unacceptable		
1	Technical	Subfactors		Combined Technical and Technical Risk Color Rating				
				Outstanding	Good	Acceptable	Marginal	Unacceptable
		1	System Capability					
		2	Category B					
		3	Category C					
		4	System Risks and Mitigations					
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.

3 NUMBER OF CONTRACTS TO BE AWARDED

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

4 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

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

4.1 DISCUSSIONS

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

4.2 SOLICITATION REQUIREMENTS

Offerors are required to meet or exceed all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions, small business subcontracting plan, organizational conflict of interest analysis results, 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. The Government reserves the right to cross-reference between volumes and sections of volumes to support proposal evaluation.

5 COMPETITIVE RANGE

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

6 EVALUATION OF MINIMUM GATE: APPROVED CERTIFICATION PLAN

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

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

Table 6.2-1: Minimum Gate Rating

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

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

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

7 EVALUATION OF FACTOR 1: TECHNICAL

7.1 EVALUATION OF TECHNICAL SUBFACTORS

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

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

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

A "strength" 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.

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

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

A "deficiency" 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.

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

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

7.2 RATINGS

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

162

Table 7.2-1: Combined Technical/Risk Ratings

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

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

Adjectival Risk Rating	Description
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**

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

7.4 SUBFACTOR 2: CATEGORY B

7.4.1 CATEGORY B SAMPLE MISSIONS

7.4.1.1 Category B LEO

7.4.1.1.1 LEO Launch Operations Concept of Operations (CONOPS)

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

7.4.1.2 Category B Molniya

7.4.1.2.1 Molniya Mission Profile

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

7.4.1.3 Category B GEO 1.5 Co-Manifested Mission

7.4.1.3.1 GEO 1.5 Mission Profile and Sequence of Events

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

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

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

7.4.1.3.3 GEO 1.5 Classified Payload Management:

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

7.4.2 CATEGORY B SYSTEM READINESS

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

7.4.2.1 Category B System Technical Assessment

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

7.4.2.2 Category B System Eastern Range Schedule Assessment

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

7.4.2.3 Category B System Western Range Schedule Assessment

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

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

7.6 SUBFACTOR 4: SYSTEM RISKS AND MITIGATIONS

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

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

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

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

8 EVALUATION OF FACTOR 2: PAST PERFORMANCE

8.1 PAST PERFORMANCE

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

8.2 EVALUATION PROCESS

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

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

8.3 REGENCY EVALUATION

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

8.4 RELEVANCY EVALUATION

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

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.

8.5 QUALITY ASSESSMENT

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

8.6 PAST PERFORMANCE RATING

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

Table 8.6-1: Past Performance Rating

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.
---------------	---

9 EVALUATION OF FACTOR 3: SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION

9.1 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY OF SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION

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

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

9.2 SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION

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

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

10 EVALUATION OF FACTOR 4: PRICE

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

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

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

10.1 REASONABLENESS

The Offeror's proposal will be assessed for reasonableness, where reasonableness is an assessment of whether the price is too high. In accordance with FAR 31.201-3(a) the price is reasonable, if, in its nature and amount, does not exceed that amount which would be paid by a prudent person in the conduct of competitive business. Reasonableness of an Offeror's proposed price will be evaluated using one or more analysis techniques, as identified in FAR 15.404-1. In accordance with FAR 15.403-1(b) and 15.403-3(a), data other than certified cost or pricing data may be required to support a determination of price reasonableness. 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. If, after receipt of proposals, the PCO determines that there is insufficient data available to determine price reasonableness, the Offeror shall be required to submit additional data other than certified cost or pricing data.

10.2 UNBALANCED PRICING

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed prices for unbalanced pricing IAW FAR 15.404-1(g). Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable Total Evaluated Price (TEP), the price of one or more price inputs in the pricing tables 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.

10.3 RESERVED

10.4 TOTAL EVALUATED PRICE

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

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

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

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

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

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