

SECTION IV – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

Table of Contents

1.0 52.217-5 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (JUL 1990)..... 2

2.0 AWARD WITHOUT DISCUSSIONS..... 2

3.0 SOURCE SELECTION AND EVALUATION FACTORS – GENERAL..... 2

4.0 52.212-2 EVALUATION—COMMERCIAL PRODUCTS AND COMMERCIAL SERVICES (NOV 2021)..... 3

5.0 MISSION SUITABILITY FACTOR..... 5

6.0 PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR..... 12

7.0 PRICE FACTOR..... 13

8.0 ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST (OCI)..... 16

1.0 52.217-5 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (JUL 1990)

Except when it is determined in accordance with FAR 17.206(b) not to be in the Government's best interest, the Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price of all options to the total price for the basic requirements. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the options(s).

(End of provision)

2.0 AWARD WITHOUT DISCUSSIONS

As provided for in FAR 52.212-1 "Instructions to Offerors—Commercial Products and Commercial Services," the Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussion with Offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). Therefore, the Offeror's initial proposal should contain the Offeror's best terms from a price and technical standpoint. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer later determines them to be necessary. If the Contracting Officer determines that the number of proposals that would otherwise be in the competitive range exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted, the Contracting Officer may limit number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly rated proposals (see NFS 1815.306(c)(2)).

(End of provision)

3.0 SOURCE SELECTION AND EVALUATION FACTORS – GENERAL

a) General

The proposals will be evaluated using procedures prescribed by the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and the NASA FAR Supplement (NFS).

The attention of Offeror's is particularly directed to NFS 1815.305, "Proposal evaluation" and to NFS 1815.305-70, "Identification of unacceptable proposals."

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

b) Source Selection

The proposals will be evaluated by a Source Evaluation Board (SEB) appointed by the Source Selection Authority (SSA). The SEB will be supported by subject matter experts during the evaluation. The SEB is tasked with conducting a thorough and impartial evaluation of each proposal received and reporting those evaluation findings to the SSA. It is the responsibility of the SSA to make the final source selection decision.

c) Source Selection Authority

The SSA for this procurement is the Executive Director for the NASA Shared Services Center, Anita Harrell.

d) Source Evaluation Board (SEB) Membership

The voting members of the SEB are:

Troy Taylor, Deputy Service Delivery Director, NSSC

Lewis Hansen, Deputy Procurement Officer, NSSC

Daniel Costello, Deputy Director of Human Resources Office, JSC

Chidilim “Chi” Okonkwo, Office of the Chief Financial Officer, HQ

(End of provision)

4.0 52.212-2 EVALUATION—COMMERCIAL PRODUCTS AND COMMERCIAL SERVICES (NOV 2021)

(a) The Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible offeror whose offer conforming to the solicitation will be most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered.

The following evaluation factors are listed in descending order of importance with Mission Suitability being most important and Past Performance being least important:

Factor 1: Mission Suitability (Section 5)

Factor 2: Price (Section 7)

Factor 3: Past Performance (Section 6)

However, as Offerors’ proposals approach equivalent ratings under the non-price factors, the importance of price will increase.

(b) Options. The Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. The Government may determine that an offer is unacceptable if the option prices are significantly unbalanced. Evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

(c) A written notice of award or acceptance of an offer, mailed or otherwise furnished to the successful offeror within the time for acceptance specified in the offer, shall result in a binding contract without further action by either party. Before the offer’s specified expiration time, the Government may accept an offer (or part of an offer), whether or not there are negotiations after its receipt, unless a written notice of withdrawal is received before award.

(End of provision)

The Government will interpret failure to provide sufficient detail and rationale or use of ambiguous terms as a lack of understanding on the part of the Offeror and may result in an applicable weakness or deficiency.

Pages submitted in excess of the limitations specified in Section III, Provision 10.0, *Proposal Preparation Instructions (General)*, will not be evaluated by the Government and will be returned to the Offeror.

The Government will evaluate proposals by classifying findings as significant strengths, strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, or deficiencies using the classifications set forth in Table IV-1 below:

TABLE IV-1 CLASSIFICATION OF FINDINGS	
Type of Finding	Definition
Significant Strength (not in FAR/NFS)	A proposal area that greatly enhances the potential for successful performance or contributes significantly toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the Government.
Strength (not in FAR/NFS)	A proposal area that enhances the potential for successful performance or contributes toward exceeding the contract requirements in a manner that provides additional value to the Government (this could be associated with a process, technical approach, materials, facilities, etc.).
Weakness	A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
Significant Weakness	A proposal flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
Deficiency	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.

5.0 MISSION SUITABILITY FACTOR

The Mission Suitability Factor is the only one of the three factors which will receive both a numerical score (maximum of 1,000 points) and an adjectival rating (see Table IV-2 for adjective ratings). This factor is used to evaluate an Offeror’s ability to successfully perform the requirements of the performance work statement in a manner that meets established timelines and schedules, maximizes value for each dollar spent, and minimizes overall program risk. Under the Mission Suitability Factor, there are three subfactors which will be used by the Government to evaluate an Offeror’s overall mission suitability. These subfactors and their corresponding weights are listed below:

<u>Subfactor</u>	<u>Points</u>
Management Approach	450
Technical Approach	400
Subcontracting Management and Goals	<u>150</u>
TOTAL	1,000

The adjectival rating definitions and percentile ranges delineated in Table IV-2 are found in the NASA FAR Supplement at NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(A). The maximum points available for a subfactor are multiplied by the SEB’s evaluated percentage for that subfactor to derive a numerical score. For example, if a subfactor worth 200 points receives a percentage rating of 80% from the SEB, the numerical score for that subfactor would be 160 points.

TABLE IV-2 ADJECTIVAL RATINGS FOR MISSION SUITABILITY FACTOR & SUBFACTORS		
Adjective Rating	Percentage	Definition
Excellent	91% – 100%	A comprehensive and thorough proposal of exceptional merit with one or more significant strengths. No deficiency or significant weakness exists.
Very Good	71% – 90%	A proposal having no deficiency and which demonstrates overall competence. One or more significant strengths have been found, and strengths outbalance any weaknesses that exist.
Good	51% – 70%	A proposal having no deficiency and which shows a reasonably sound response. There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both. As a whole, weaknesses not off-set by strengths do not significantly detract from the Offeror’s response.

Fair	31% – 50%	A proposal having no deficiency and which has one or more weaknesses. Weaknesses outbalance any strengths.
Poor	0% – 30%	A proposal that has one or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses that demonstrate a lack of overall competence or would require a major proposal revision to correct.

5.1 Subfactor 1: Management Approach: This evaluation subfactor will be used to evaluate the Offeror’s ability to manage all requirements of the contract in an effective and efficient manner while minimizing program risk. Specifically, the Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror’s management approach provides the methods and processes required to effectively manage the provision of multiple lines of business and services to a large, geographically dispersed customer base; staffing; personnel compensation approach; customer relations; and the Phase-in of services prior to the start of contract performance. This subfactor will receive a numerical score and an adjectival rating. The Government will evaluate the Offeror’s proposal based on the following:

(a) MA-1: Management Structure

- (1) Degree to which the Offeror’s organizational structure (corporate and local) and the lines of communication within this structure will promote effective and efficient contract performance.
- (2) Extent of autonomy the Offeror grants to the local NTSS Program Manager to make key business decisions affecting the contract.
- (3) Extent to which the Offeror’s approach to customer relations promotes open communication between the Contractor and Government (including but not limited to NASA customers, supporting contractors, etc.) and a methodology to address feedback and any corrective action to improve contract performance.
- (4) Extent to which the Offeror explain what forum(s) it plans to use to ensure an ongoing and open dialogue with the Government as it relates to all aspects of contract performance.
- (5) Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates the ability to innovate and transform Management Structure.

(b) MA-2: Staffing

- (1) Degree to which the Offeror’s proposed approach for retaining incumbent personnel (personnel working under the current NSSC NexGen contract) including target capture rate (if any) as a percentage of the total workforce; the

basis for this rate; and the strategy proposed to recruit, hire, and retain incumbents for this contract will contribute to successful contract performance.

(2) How the Offeror demonstrates the proposed skill sets, qualifications, and labor mixes meet contract requirements. (Attachment I-18, *Staffing Profile*).

(3) Degree to which the Offeror's proposed key personnel's education, training, experience, availability, and commitment to the contract will ensure contract success (Model Contract Clause 6.7, *Key Personnel*)

(4) Degree to which the Offeror's approach for initial and continuous employee training ensures a qualified, multi-skilled workforce capable of cross-utilization and the ability to respond to fluctuating work requirements.

(5) Degree to which the Offeror's approach for inclusion of members of Underserved communities and approach to attract, hire, subcontract, retain, promote, and provide equity in professional compensation.

(c) MA-3: Phase-in Plan

(1) Extent to which the Offeror's proposed Phase-in Plan ensures a seamless continuation of the services being provided by the NSSC.

(2) Adequacy of the Offeror's proposed Phase-in Plan in ensuring hiring, pre-employment screenings, background checks, and badging procedures are completed prior to the start of contract performance.

5.2 Subfactor 2: Technical Approach: This evaluation subfactor will be used to evaluate the Offeror's overall technical approach and capability as it relates to all requirements defined in Attachment I-1, *Performance Work Statement (PWS)*. The adequacy, completeness and technical soundness of the Offeror's technical approach will be evaluated. This subfactor will receive a numerical score and an adjectival rating. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's technical approach and understanding of the requirements based on the following:

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's most significant technical risks and the approach managing those risks for TA-1 through TA-6, its assessment of the risk posture and the approach to mitigating those risk factors. Proposals will be evaluated on how the Offeror assessed the probability of the risks it identified.

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed approach to innovation or transformation for TA-1 through TA-6. Proposals will be evaluated on the technical merit of innovative or transformative methods, techniques or technologies, formal continuous service improvement methodologies, and/or process improvements for how those innovative or transformative methods will impact the completion of the functional requirements presented in Attachment I-1, *Performance Work Statement (PWS)*.

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed approach for new or revised Service Level Indicators or Performance Measures for TA-1 through TA-6. Proposals will be evaluated as to how those new or revised metrics will impact the completion of the requirements presented in Attachment I-1, Performance Work Statement.

(a) TA-1: Shared Services Administration

(1) Degree to which the Offeror's proposal demonstrates an effective approach to providing the various shared services administration functions necessary for the effective support of NTSS services (PWS Section 2.0 - risk management, safety and occupational health, records management, emergency preparedness, etc.)

(2) Extent to which the Offeror's approach demonstrates a thorough understanding of performance management as it relates to defined service level indicators (SLI) and performance measures contained in Attachment I-3, *Performance Requirements Summary*.

(3) Extent to which the Offeror's approach to implementing a Quality Management System and its ability to demonstrate a thorough understanding of quality management as it applies to the delivery of services.

(4) Degree to which the Offeror's proposal demonstrates a thorough understanding of the importance of the customer experience and over-all customer satisfaction; knowledge and incorporation of industry best practices; and analysis and statistical modeling of customer satisfaction data.

(5) Extent to which the Offeror's proposal demonstrates and understands the importance of integration between NTSS and other supporting contracts (Model Contract 6.9, Associate Contractor Agreement).

(b) TA-2: Financial Management Services

(1) Extent to which the Offeror demonstrates the knowledge of and capability to use the various major systems used by NASA to provide innovative and transformational NTSS Financial Management Services.

(2) Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates an effective understanding of the NTSS requirements to provide Financial Management Services and the technical capability to implement these requirements.

(3) Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates their ability and approach to implementing changes in processes and procedures that occur to ensure they are documented and updated.

(4) Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates a depth of knowledge and understanding of applicable Government Financial Management regulations and policies.

(c) TA-3: Human Resource Services

(1) Extent to which the Offeror demonstrates the knowledge of and capability to use the various major systems used by NASA to provide innovative and transformational NTSS Human Resource Services.

(2) Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates an effective understanding of the NTSS requirements to provide Human Resource Services and the technical capability to implement these requirements.

(3) Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates their ability and approach to implementing changes in processes and procedures that occur to ensure they are documented and updated.

(4) Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates a depth of knowledge and understanding of applicable Government Human Resource regulations and policies.

(d) TA-4: Procurement Services

(1) Extent to which the Offeror demonstrates the knowledge of and capability to use the various major systems used by NASA to provide innovative and transformational NTSS Procurement Services.

(2) Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates an effective understanding of the NTSS requirements to provide Procurement Services and the technical capability to implement these requirements.

(3) Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates their ability and approach to implementing changes in processes and procedures that occur to ensure they are documented and updated.

(4) Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates a depth of knowledge and understanding of applicable Government Procurement regulations and policies.

(e) TA-5: Agency Business Services

(1) Extent to which the Offeror demonstrates the knowledge of and capability to use the various major systems used by NASA to provide innovative and transformational Agency Business Support Services.

(2) Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates an effective understanding of the NTSS requirements to provide Agency Business Support Services and the technical capability to implement these requirements.

(3) Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates their ability and approach to implementing changes in processes and procedures that occur to ensure they are documented and updated.

(4) Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates a depth of knowledge and understanding of applicable Government regulations and policies.

(f) TA-6: Enterprise Services

(1) Extent to which the Offeror demonstrates the knowledge of and capability to use the Intelligent Automation Services (IAS), NASA Enterprise Automation Service (NEAS), and other various systems used by NASA to provide innovative and transformational Enterprise Services.

(2) Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates an effective understanding of the NTSS requirements to provide Enterprise Services and the technical capability to implement these requirements.

(3) Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates their ability and approach to implementing changes in processes and procedures that occur to ensure they are documented and updated.

(4) Degree to which the Offeror demonstrates a depth of knowledge and understanding of applicable Government regulations and policies.

(5) Extent to which the Offeror demonstrates an effective, comprehensive innovative and transformative approach to continuous improvement.

5.3 Subfactor 3: Subcontracting Management and Goals:

NASA will evaluate the Small Business Subcontracting Plan, as required by Section I, Model Contract FAR clause 1.4 52.212-5(a)(17) (i) 52.219-9, “Small Business Subcontracting Plan (Nov 2021) (iii) Alternate II (Nov 2016),” which applies to all Offerors, except small businesses. The evaluation of Commitment to Small Business Program applies to all Offerors.

(a) SB-1: Subcontractor Management/Structure

(1) Degree to which the Offeror’s proposed subcontracting or teaming arrangement provides for an organizational structure that ensures a seamless, effective, integrated, and efficient approach to the provision of NSSC services.

(2) Extent to which the Offeror's proposed subcontracting or teaming arrangement mitigates the potential loss of productivity or employee morale that could result from multiple subcontractors or teaming partners delivering services within a single line of business or service area.

(b) SB-2: Small Business Subcontracting

(1) Small Business Subcontracting Plan (the Plan) will be evaluated in terms of the Offeror's proposed subcontracting goals (overall subcontracting goals and individual subcontracting goals by small business category) in comparison to the Contracting Officer's assessment of the appropriate subcontracting goals for this procurement. The Offeror's Plan will also be evaluated in terms of meeting the requirements of FAR 19.704, *Subcontracting Plan Requirements*. NASA will consider the amount of work that the prime contractor plans to perform when determining whether a subcontracting plan is acceptable. The evaluation of the Plan will be on the basis of TOTAL CONTRACT VALUE and TOTAL SUBCONTRACT VALUE.

(2) Since small businesses are not required to submit subcontracting plans, NASA will only evaluate the amount of work proposed to be performed by the small business prime and any small business at the first-tier subcontract level. The proposed amount of work to be done by the prime small business and first tier small business subcontractors will be evaluated against the Contracting Officer's assessment of the overall subcontracting goal for this procurement. For small business primes and their first-tier subcontractors, individual subcontracting goals by small business categories will not be evaluated.

(c) SB-3: Commitment to Small Businesses

(1) NASA will evaluate the extent to which the identity of the small business subcontractor is specified in the proposal as well as the extent of the commitment to use small businesses. (For Small Business Offerors, NASA will evaluate this only if subcontracting opportunities exist.)

(2) NASA will evaluate the Offeror's established or planned procedures and organizational structure for small business outreach, assistance, participation in the Mentor Protégé program, counseling, market research and SDB identification, and relevant purchasing procedures. (For Other Than Small Businesses Offerors, this information should conform to its submitted Small Business Subcontracting Plan. For Small Business Offerors, NASA will evaluate this only if subcontracting opportunities exist.)

(3) NASA will evaluate the Offeror's participation and/or proposed participation in the Mentor Protégé program and their planned commitment to enter into mentor-protégé agreements to provide appropriate developmental assistance to enhance the protégé's ability to perform successfully under contracts and/or subcontracts.

(4) NASA strongly encourages small business concerns all offerors to propose participation with other small businesses. A proposal offering other small business subcontracting or teaming participation will be evaluated more favorably under this subfactor than a proposal not offering such small business participation. Also, a proposal offering higher levels of other small business participation subcontracting will be evaluated more favorably under this subfactor than a proposal offering lower levels of such other small business participation subcontracting. The level of other small business participation is defined as a percentage of the overall effort (expressed in total contract value) set forth in the contract’s scope of work.

(End of provision)

6.0 PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR

Past performance indicates how an Offeror performed on recent work and can be a significant indicator of how that firm can be expected to perform the work at hand. Relevant experience is defined as the accomplishment of work that is comparable in content, complexity, and size to the work required under this procurement. Relevancy of past performance will also be assessed by considering (1) services performed comparable in content, (2) size and complexity of the contract, (3) subcontract management, and (4) customer relationship management.

This evaluation factor will be used to evaluate an Offeror’s Past Performance, including its relevant experience that shall be within 3 years of the RFP release date. Past Performance is not numerically weighted or scored but will receive an adjectival rating per Table IV-3 below. The Government’s evaluation will be based on information provided by Offerors in their proposals, responses received on the Past Performance Questionnaire, GAO and/or IG report findings, as well as any other information obtained independently by the Government.

As described in FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv), an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance.

The Government may contact organizations for which an Offeror and major subcontractors have previously performed work to obtain performance appraisals. The Government may also use data from the Government-wide Past Performance Database.

The adjectival rating definitions delineated in Table IV-3 are found in the NASA FAR Supplement at NFS 1815.305(a)(2)(A)

TABLE IV-3 ADJECTIVAL RATINGS FOR PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR	
Adjective Rating	Definitions
Very High	The Offeror’s relevant past performance is of exceptional merit and is

Level of Confidence	very highly pertinent to this acquisition; indicating exemplary performance in a timely, efficient, and economical manner; very minor (if any) problems with no adverse effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
High Level of Confidence	The Offeror's relevant past performance is highly pertinent to this acquisition; demonstrating very effective performance that would be fully responsive to contract requirements with contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part with only minor problems with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a high level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Moderate Level of Confidence	The Offeror's relevant past performance is pertinent to this acquisition, and it demonstrates effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable problems, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a moderate level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Low Level of Confidence	The Offeror's relevant past performance is at least somewhat pertinent to this acquisition and it meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Changes to the Offeror's existing processes may be necessary in order to achieve contract requirements.
Very Low Level of Confidence	The Offeror's relevant past performance does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; problems in one or more areas which adversely affect overall performance. Based on the Offeror's performance record, there is a very low level of confidence that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Neutral	In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance [see FAR 15.305(a)(2)(ii)and(iv)].

(End of provision)

7.0 PRICE FACTOR

(1) The Government will perform a price analysis of each Offeror's proposal in accordance with FAR 15.305, *Proposal evaluation*, and 15.404-1, *Proposal Analysis Techniques*. The Government may use any of the various price analysis techniques and procedures identified in FAR 15.404-1(b)(2) to determine price reasonableness. An Offeror's price will be evaluated

for completeness, reasonableness, and performance risk as defined below. An Offeror's estimating assumptions, techniques, and/or pricing models must be reasonable, and based on current and anticipated labor market conditions.

- **Completeness.** Proposals will be evaluated to determine if the proposal includes all pricing information required by the Request for Proposal (RFP), and the pricing templates are accurately completed per the instructions in the RFP. The degree to which the proposal includes supporting rationale; estimating assumptions, techniques, and or models; and hourly rates and fringe benefits proposed for employees covered by the Service Contract Act (SCA) in sufficient detail that allows for an adequate evaluation and can be directly traced back to the proposed transactional service rates or fully burdened labor rates will also be considered.

Reasonableness. Proposals will be evaluated to determine that the Phase-in price, Fixed Unit Price (FUP) Transactional service rates and fully burdened labor rates proposed for Level-of-Effort (LOE) services are fair and reasonable. The Phase-in price, transactional service rates and fully burdened labor rates may be determined to be fair and reasonable based on adequate price competition; comparison with other transactional service rates or fully burdened labor rates received in response to the solicitation; comparison to historical prices paid for the same or similar service; and/or comparison to Independent Government Cost Estimates.

- **Price Risk.** Proposals will be evaluated to determine that Offerors propose appropriate labor categories, labor hours, and labor rates necessary to perform each FUP Transactional service based on the information provided in the RFP. WYE proposed in Attachment I-18, *Staffing Profile* shall be consistent with WYE proposed in Attachment I-28, *Pricing Template*. Rates proposed in I-13, *Rates* shall be consistent with the rates proposed in Attachment I-28.

(2) The Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement (see Section III Provision 2.0 52.217-5, *Evaluation of Options*) using the total price computation methodology specified in Paragraph (3) below. The Government may determine that an offer is unacceptable if the option prices are significantly unbalanced. Evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

(3) The price stated in Cell TBD on the Excel worksheet entitled "Contract Summary" of the Excel Price Template (Attachment I-28, *Pricing Template, Instructions*) will be considered the Offeror's total price for evaluation and award purposes and will be reported to the SSA as such. The Excel Price Template calculates this price by adding together the Offeror's proposed prices for:

- Shared Services Administration for eight (8) contract years, plus a 6-month option to extend services.

- LOE services for eight (8) contract years, plus a 6-month option to extend services utilizing the Government specified labor categories, productive labor hours, and other direct costs and the offeror's proposed fully burden labor rates.
 - FUP Transactional services for eight (8) contract years, plus a 6-month option to extend services utilizing the Government-provided number of FUP transactions in Band 2 and the Offeror's proposed transactional service rates for Band 2. Band 2 Totals on each FUP Transactional service are included in the total contract price.
 - FUP Transactional services for eight (8) contract years, plus a 6-month option to extend services utilizing the Government provided number of FUP transactions in Band 1 and Band 3 and the offeror's proposed FUP Transactional service rates for Band 1 and Band 3 will be evaluated for reasonableness as compared to the proposed Band 2 rates but will not be evaluated as part of total price. Band 1 and Band 3 totals are not included in total contract price.
 - The Phase-in price Tab is not linked to the total contract value in the price template because Phase-in will be awarded as a separate purchase order; however, for evaluation purposes, the Phase-in price will be included in the total proposed contract.
- (4) The productive labor hours, labor categories, other direct costs, and quantities of FUP Transactional services identified in the Pricing Template are for evaluation and award purposes only. They represent the Government's best estimate of the FUP Transactional and LOE Services that the Government anticipates ordering during the term of the contract. There is no commitment or guarantee that the Government will order FUP Transactional and LOE Services in these exact quantities. The successful Offeror's fully burdened labor rates and FUP transaction rates for each Band will be incorporated into the contract for ordering purposes. Once again, the productive labor hours, labor categories, other direct costs, and quantities of FUP transactional services identified in the Excel Price Model are for evaluation and award purposes only.

(End of provision)

8.0 ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICTS OF INTEREST (OCI)

The Government will review the OCI Mitigation Plan submitted by the Offeror. All such information and any other relevant information will be used by the Government to determine whether an award to the Offeror may create an organizational conflict of interest. If found to exist, the Government may (1) impose appropriate conditions which avoid such conflict, (2) disqualify the Offeror, (3) determine that it is otherwise in the best interest of the Government to contract with the Offeror by including appropriate conditions mitigating such conflict in the contract award, or (4) seek a waiver. If the Contracting Officer determines that an actual or significant potential conflict of interest exists that cannot reasonably be avoided, neutralized or mitigated, the Offeror will be ineligible for award. The Government is free to communicate issues or non-acceptable aspects of the OCI approach with any Offeror and may allow Offerors to revise its submitted OCI approach without invoking “exchanges or discussions” in accordance with FAR 15.306.

(End of provision)

[End of Section]