

PART IV- REPRESENTATIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS

SECTION M

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

SECTION M – REPRESENTATIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS**M.1 EVALUATION AND SOURCE SELECTION****A. General**

This competitive negotiated acquisition will be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.3, "Source Selection", and NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.3, "Source Selection". The Source Evaluation Board procedures at NFS 1815.370, "NASA Source Evaluation Boards", apply. A trade-off process, as described at FAR 15.101-1, will be used in making source selection. The information contained in your proposal may be supplemented by information obtained by the Government from other Government organizations and personnel, commercial sources, public information sources, and data gathered during discussion, if there is a discussion phase of the evaluation. The Government intends to award a contract based on the initial offers received without discussion of such offers. Accordingly, each offeror should submit its initial proposal executed by an individual with the authority to bind the offeror to the Government using the most favorable terms from a cost and technical standpoint.

B. Discussions will be held only if award on the basis of initial offers is determined not to be in the Government's best interest. If written or oral discussions are conducted, the Government will seek revised proposals from offerors within the competitive range. Pursuant to FAR 15.306(c) (2), "The Contracting Officer 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." Pursuant to the NFS 1815.306(c)(2), "a total of no more than three proposals shall be a working goal in establishing the competitive range." At the conclusion of discussions, as stipulated in FAR 15.307, offerors within the competitive range will be requested to submit a final proposal revision. This final proposal revision shall be submitted in the form of a contractual document which has been executed by an individual with the authority to bind the offeror, as well as revisions to the original proposal submitted. Selection shall be made without subsequent discussions or negotiation.

C. A Source Evaluation Board (SEB) will perform the evaluation of proposals received in response to this RFP. In carrying out its responsibility, the Board will evaluate proposals with respect to the following three factors: Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost. The SEB will be supported as needed by appropriate advisors in conducting the evaluation.

D. When the SEB concludes its evaluations, it will present its findings to the John C. Stennis Space Center, Center Director, who is the Source Selection Authority (SSA) for this acquisition. The SSA will make award selection considering the results of the Mission Suitability evaluation, the Past Performance evaluation, and the Cost evaluation. Award will be made to the responsible offeror whose proposal meets the requirements of the RFP and offers the best value to the Government.

E. Evaluation Factors and Subfactors

1. There are three evaluation factors for this acquisition: Mission Suitability, Past Performance, and Cost. A general definition of these factors may be found at NFS 1815.304, "Evaluation factors and significant subfactors." Proposals will be evaluated using the following factors and subfactors.

FACTOR – MISSION SUITABILITY

Subfactor – Technical Performance

Subfactor – Management

Subfactor – Safety, Health, and Mission Assurance

Subfactor – Small Disadvantaged Business Participation

FACTOR – PAST PERFORMANCE

FACTOR – COST

2. The information required to be submitted in Section L-II, Instructions for Proposal Preparation, will be evaluated under the above factors and subfactors. The Mission Suitability Factor will be weighted and scored in accordance with the numerical system established in M.4, below. The other factors (i.e., Past Performance and Cost) are not similarly weighted and scored. The SSA will make his decision on the basis of an integrated assessment of all factors.
3. Proposal risk will be carefully considered in evaluating proposals. The proposal risks to be assessed are those associated with technical and cost performance. Risk assessments will be considered in determining Mission Suitability strengths, weaknesses, deficiencies, and numerical/adjectival ratings. Identified risk areas and the potential for cost impact will be considered in the cost evaluation.

(End of Provision)

M.2 RELATIVE ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF EVALUATION FACTORS

Mission Suitability Factor and Past Performance Factor when combined, are significantly more important than the Cost Factor. As individual factors, the Mission Suitability Factor, the Past Performance Factor and the Cost Factor are of essentially equal importance.

(End of Provision)

M.3 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (FAR 52.217-5) (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 cost-plus-award fee for all options to the total cost-plus-award fee for the basic requirement. Evaluation of options will not obligate the government to exercise the option(s).

(End of Provision)

M.4 MISSION SUITABILITY FACTOR (VOLUME II)**A. Weighting and Scoring**

1. The Mission Suitability Factor indicates the excellence of the proposed work and the offeror's ability to perform that work. Evaluation of the Mission Suitability Factor will focus on the offerors understanding the requirements and your proposed management, subcontracting, and technical approaches to meeting the requirements. The Mission Suitability subfactors and the total Mission Suitability Factor will be evaluated using the adjectival rating, definitions and percentile ranges at NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(A). The total weighting for the Mission Suitability Factor will be 1,000 points. The Mission Suitability subfactors will be scored in accordance with the numerical system established below.

SUBFACTORS	WEIGHT
TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE	450
MANAGEMENT	300
SAFETY, HEALTH, AND MISSION ASSURANCE	150
SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS (SDB) PARTICIPATION	100
TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS	1,000

2. The maximum points available for each subfactor will be multiplied by the evaluated percent for each subfactor to derive the score for the particular subfactor. For example, if a subfactor has a possible 300 points and receives a rating of 80%, then the score for that subfactor would be 240 points.
3. The numerical weights assigned to the subfactors identified above are indicative of the relative importance of those evaluation areas. The weights are used by the SSA only as a guide. The SSA will use the evaluation factors and subfactors set forth in the solicitation to make the source selection decision. The SSA will consider the SEB findings to determine which of the proposals submitted in response to the solicitation would prove most advantageous to the Government, all factors considered. However, the SSA will not be bound to accept the weights and scores of the SEB.

B. Adjustment for Cost Realism

1. Although Mission Suitability and Cost are separate factors, the proposed cost of the work (and rates proposed) may be a significant indicator of an offeror's understanding and ability to perform the PWS. Therefore, Mission Suitability scores may be adjusted for lack of cost realism. Since Phase-in cost will not be evaluated as part of the probable cost, the Phase-in plan, which is included within the Management Subfactor, will not be a part of any adjustment for Cost Realism.
2. In accordance with NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(B), a structured approach will be used to adjust an offeror's overall Mission Suitability score based on the degree of cost realism. The mission suitability point score adjustment will be based on the percentage difference between proposed cost/fee and probable cost (cost plus fee) (as defined in the Cost Factor M.6), excluding those cost adjustments necessary to reflect the current incumbent

Contractor's Direct Labor rates when proposed. The following Mission Suitability cost realism point adjustment shall be subtracted from the Mission Suitability score.

Services	Point Adjustment
+/- 5 percent	0
+/- 6 to 10 percent	-50
+/- 11 to 15 percent	-100
+/- 16 to 20 percent	-150
+/- 21 to 30 percent	-200
+/- more than 30 percent	-300

C. Risk Assessment

Risk analysis which identifies risk areas and the recommended approaches to minimize the impact of those risks on the overall success of the program will be evaluated. The Government will make an independent judgment of the probability of success, the impact of failure, and the alternatives available to meet the requirements but will not limit its judgement to the offeror's risk analysis.

D. Mission Suitability Subfactors

1. Technical Performance Subfactor

- (a) This subfactor will be used to evaluate the offeror's technical approach, management operating plans and programs, resources, customer support, and risk management. Under this subfactor, an evaluation will be made of the offeror's understanding of and ability to meet all technical requirements of each Section.
- (b) An evaluation will be made of the offeror's proposed innovations and supporting rationale to promote a better way of doing business. Offeror's exceptions, if any, to the PWS and supporting rationale will be evaluated. The evaluation will determine if PWS paraphrasing or statements such as "shall comply with the requirement", "standard procedure will be employed", or "well known techniques will be used" are included in the offeror's proposal, as this type of response is not adequate to indicate a sufficient level of awareness or understanding.
- (c) Under this subfactor, an evaluation will be made of the offeror's management operating plans and programs. The SEB will evaluate the proposed approach for receiving/originating, validating, planning, prioritizing, coordinating, estimating, scheduling, controlling, completing, tracking, closing out work, and reporting the status of work requests to be performed under the PWS. The approach will be assessed on the basis of work controls, configuration management, efficiency, features to detect and accommodate problems in fluctuations in workload, and compatibility for rapid reaction to changes in priority assignments. Plans for compliance with the NASA/SSC Management Accounting and Statusing System and IFMP will be evaluated.

- (d) In addition, the offeror's plans for upgrading and advancement of procedures and methods, and recommendations for equipment and facilities will be evaluated. This includes a willingness to adopt new procedures, methods, and equipment as soon as they are proven workable.
- (e) Under this subfactor, an evaluation will be made of the proposed resources for performance of requirements of the contract. Proposed key personnel will be evaluated by the SEB, to determine the relevant experience and qualifications to effectively manage the functions for which they will have authority and responsibility. The reasonableness of the offeror's rationale for designating appropriate key positions will be evaluated. The qualifications and ability of key personnel will be substantiated by the resumes and reference checks. Independent knowledge of the Government will also be considered. The degree of commitment of the offeror to use those proposed as key personnel will also be considered. The offeror's approach for providing backup for key personnel for absences due to vacation, illness, etc., will be evaluated, as well as the offeror's approach to filling key personnel vacancies. The availability and firmness of commitment of key personnel to the contract will be part of the evaluation.
- (f) The proposed Staffing Plan will be evaluated for soundness and adequacy for obtaining and maintaining a qualified workforce, including subcontractors. The numbers, skill categories, (particularly critical skills), and qualifications of personnel for each organizational element will be evaluated for the ability to perform assigned tasks, flexibility of approach and an overall understanding of the requirements. The offeror's staffing plans and procedures will be evaluated for realism, particularly in terms of fluctuating work force requirements, cross-utilization of multi-skilled personnel and retention of qualified personnel. The offeror's Staffing Plan should identify retention of key personnel, and should identify by name and position or classification of all additional personnel. The offeror's sources and indicated availability of personnel will be evaluated for realism in providing the staffing compatible with the approach. It will also be evaluated for adequacy in applying, implementing, and administering the provisions of the Service Contract Act (SCA).
- (g) The Offeror's approach to recruitment and employment methods will be evaluated to ensure its ability to appropriately staff the contract, initially and during the contract term. Additionally the offeror's mix and availability of required personnel will be evaluated.
- (h) The offeror's resource control plans and arrangements for the orderly adjustment of the work force, while effectively controlling costs associated with changes in personnel requirements and skill mix requirements, will be evaluated.
- (i) Also evaluated under this subfactor will be the Total Compensation Plan (TCP) (salaries/wages, fringe benefits, employee policies and uncompensated overtime) proposed for all employees. Compensation that is unrealistically low or not in reasonable relationship to the various job categories, since it may impair the Contractor's ability to attract and retain competent employees, may be viewed as evidence of a failure to comprehend the complexity of the contract requirement. The TCP evaluation will consider the quality and stability of the workforce.

- (j) An evaluation will be made of the corporate resources; in the form of services, facilities, equipment, and staff assistance; available to this contract. The plan to obtain these resources and the availability of these resources will be evaluated. The overhead or burden charges over and above those proposed on this contract will be considered in terms of Corporate's priority placed on this contract.
- (k) Under this subfactor, an evaluation will also be made of the offeror's approach to customer support, specifically, the approach for information exchange with multiple test facilities at two NASA centers. Also discuss how you will handle interfaces with the other contractors at each site to resolve any problems that may occur. An evaluation will be made of the effectiveness and efficiency of the method used to assess and plan for short and long-range requirements, and the effectiveness of methods for identifying, prioritizing and satisfying those requirements. In addition, the offeror will be evaluated on the proposed customer service mechanism or system, which is responsive to customer needs and concerns.
- (l) An evaluation will be made of the offerors assessment of relevant risk areas as well as the offerors recommended approaches to mitigate the impact of the identified risks on the overall success of the contract requirements.

2. Management Subfactor

- (a) This subfactor will be used to evaluate the offeror's management and business approaches. Under this subfactor, an evaluation will be made of the offeror's overall management approach to planning, directing, coordinating, controlling, and managing the services in the PWS from start-up through the life of the contract. Any proposed off-site business management operations will also be examined to insure Government requirements are met.
- (b) The offeror's planned organizational structure/composition, including lines of authority, roles and responsibilities of the project manager, other key personnel, and supervisors, will be evaluated. Specifically, this subfactor will evaluate the extent of local autonomy invested in the project manager by the corporation. In addition, the project manager's ability to make decisions and flexibility in meeting the requirements of the PWS will also be evaluated. The relationship and lines of authority and responsibility between SSC and MSFC contractor management will be evaluated. The offeror's relationships and interfaces with the corporate or home office operations will be examined. Specifically, an understanding will be sought of who will be in a position of authority over, or could impact, the technical, management, or cost performance of the performing entity (periodic and routine administrative reporting does not constitute authority over, or a significant ability to impact performance). For the purposes of this evaluation, the performing single entity is the entity that provides direct labor and overall project management for all contract work. The SEB will seek to clearly understand the roles, responsibilities and relationships between the performing entity and any other entities identified by the offeror. The evaluation will consider methods or features for maintaining organizational flexibility, interface between SSC and MSFC portions of the contract, efficiency, and relationships with the Government, subcontractors, and teaming arrangements, if proposed.

- (c) The SEB will examine how well the offeror integrates personnel, policies, and procedures to allow the organization to function as a single entity. The use of joint ventures, subcontracts, or other teaming arrangements, if proposed, will be evaluated based on their benefits to NASA and the effectiveness of the proposed approach, including effective organizational relationships and responsibilities, for managing these arrangements to assure that the Government obtains an integrated team. The effectiveness of the proposed operational and management interfaces from lower levels (first-line supervisors) up to top-level management for interacting with subcontractors, other contractors, and NASA will be evaluated. The logic of keying all functions proposed for each organization block down to each Section of the PWS to indicate where all requirements are covered in your organization will be examined.
- (d) The offeror's proposed management systems will be evaluated to determine that a sound approach is in place to ensure that the services provided meet the specified requirements.
- (e) The SEB will evaluate the offeror's Quality Management System in terms of ISO 9001:2000 standards and implementation across the entire contract.
- (f) The SEB will evaluate the adequacy of the offeror's approach to measuring and responding to the level of the performance as it relates to the PWS.
- (g) The SEB will also evaluate the offeror's approach to managing the Government provided and contractor acquired property management systems.
- (h) Under this subfactor, an evaluation will also be made of the offeror's overall business approach for contract phase-in including identification of major steps, needed training, critical tasks, skills, efforts toward retention, continuity of services and any other prerequisites necessary for successful phase-in. The phase-in plan will be evaluated based on the offeror's demonstrated ability to assume full contractual responsibility for the PWS on August 1, 2003.
- (i) An evaluation of the proposed approach to labor relations will be made including an assessment of labor relations, including those of your major subcontractors, expertise and approaches, policies, plans, and steps to ensure amicable labor relations within appropriate business constraints.
- (j) The offeror's small business subcontracting plan as stated in L-I-14, which includes the description of the type of work and your rationale in designating that portion of the PWS to subcontractors in support of the contract will be evaluated. The subcontractors technical capability and relevant experience will be evaluated against the portion of the PWS designated for their performance. Consideration will be given to utilization of small, small disadvantaged, women-owned small business, veteran owned small business and HUBZone concerns over and above the stated goals. The degree of commitments from proposed small, small disadvantaged, women-owned small business, veteran owned small business and HUBZone business firms in the subcontracting plan will also be considered.

- (k) The offeror's Handling of Data plan will be evaluated to determine if effective internal controls are in place to protect sensitive third party data (e.g. technical data, computer software, generated test data, administrative, management information, or financial, including cost or pricing) from unauthorized use, release, duplication, or disclosure.

3. Safety, Health, and Mission Assurance Subfactor

- (a) The offeror's approach for satisfying the Safety, Health, and Mission Assurance requirements of this contract will be assessed. The offeror's safety and health and mission assurance plan will be evaluated for its effectiveness in ensuring:
 - i. Safety and health of all personnel
 - ii. Safety and quality of hardware, software and processes
 - iii. Reliability and maintainability of equipment and facilities
 - iv. Environmental Compliance to include operations and implementation
- (b) The offeror's Safety and Health Plan will be evaluated to determine if all requirements of DRD SA02 have been addressed and that an effective plan has been proposed from start-up through the life of the contract. Specific emphasis will be placed on the following Safety and Health Plan content items defined in DRD SA02: management leadership and employee participation, workplace analysis, and hazard prevention and control.
- (c) Offeror's understanding of VPP compliance will be evaluated.

4. Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB) Participation Subfactor

- (a) This subfactor will be used to evaluate the extent of participation of SDB concerns in performance of contracts in the targeted Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) Major Groups as determined by the Department of Commerce (DOC) and to the extent authorized by law. Only SDB concerns in the targeted SIC Major Groups will be evaluated. The extent of participation of SDB concerns in the SDB Participation Program-Targets, as determined by the DOC, will be evaluated for targeted SIC Major Groups for each contract year in terms of the proposed annual contract value, including cost and fee, as adjusted by the SEB for probable cost; the extent of participation of the SDB concerns in terms of the total proposed contract value of the acquisition for all six (6) contract years, including cost and fee, as adjusted by the SEB for probable cost; the extent to which SDB concerns are specifically identified; the extent of commitment to use the SDB concerns.
- (b) The effectiveness of the proposed approach to integration of the types of work into the overall requirements will be evaluated. SDB concerns that choose the FAR 19.11 price evaluation adjustment shall receive a zero score for this Mission Suitability subfactor. Targeted SIC Major Groups' participation can be achieved by an SDB prime contractor or subcontractor(s).

(End of Provision)

M.5 PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR (VOLUME III)

- A. Past performance is relevant information regarding a contractor's performance under previously awarded contracts. This past performance information is an indicator of an offeror's ability to perform the contract successfully. Relevant experience is the accomplishment of work similar to that required under this procurement which has occurred at least in part during the last three years immediately preceding release of this RFP. The government will focus on information that demonstrates quality of performance relevant to the size and complexity of the procurement. The currency and relevance of the information, source of the information, context of the data, and general trends in contractor's performance will be considered. Recent contracts will be examined to ensure that any necessary corrective measures have been implemented. Prompt corrective action in isolated instances may not outweigh overall negative patterns or trends. Contract value, scope, and complexity will be considered in judging relevance. The evaluation will take into account past and current performance information including all principals in joint ventures, business combinations, teaming arrangements, and subcontractors who will perform major or critical aspects of the contract. Failure of the offeror to submit its self assessment or of its customers to submit the completed questionnaires before March 10, 2003, shall not be a cause for rejection of the proposal nor shall it be reflected in the Government's evaluation of the offeror's past performance. In the event of new corporate entities/teaming partners, an evaluation will be made of the past or current performance of the parent/prior companies/divisions.
- B. The Government will consider pertinent information provided by the offeror as well as independently obtained information from Government and non-Government sources, in assessing the offeror's past performance. The government reserves the right to conduct site visits of past and present locations of offeror's contracts.
- C. Consideration will be given to the degree to which the offeror satisfied the requirements of previous contracts. Consideration will also be given to characteristics such as resiliency, resourcefulness, safety record, environmental record, and management determination to see that the organization lived up to its commitments to provide specific standards and skills, and in the recruitment and retention of experienced/competent key personnel. Included in this evaluation will be the offeror's past performance in the fulfillment of the technical requirements, cost/schedule management, subcontract management, financial reporting, quality management, Small Business and Small Disadvantaged Business subcontracting, and any serious performance problems such as termination for default.

D. This factor is not numerically scored but will be assigned an adjectival rating by the SEB in accordance with the adjectival ratings and definitions below.

Adjectival Rating	Definitions
Excellent	Of exceptional merit; exemplary performance in a timely, efficient and economical manner; very minor (if any) performance problems with no adverse effect on overall performance.
Very Good	Very effective performance, fully responsive to contract requirements; contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient and economical manner for the most part; only minor performance problems with no adverse effect on overall performance.
Good	Effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable performance problems but with little identifiable effect on overall performance.
Neutral	Neutral Rating. Assigned to offerors with no relevant past performance.
Satisfactory	Meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable performance problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance.
Poor/Unsatisfactory	Does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; performance problems in one or more areas which adversely effect overall performance.

E. If an offeror does not have any relevant past performance history as determined herein, it will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably, and will be given a neutral rating.

(End of Provision)

M.6 COST FACTOR (VOLUME IV)

A. The Cost Factor evaluates all cost associated with the contract in terms of validity, reasonableness, adequacy, and cost realism of proposed costs. Proposed costs are analyzed to determine the probable “cost of doing business” and to identify and weigh features that could cause a given proposal to cost more or less than the others, including proposal risk areas. The Cost Factor is not weighted or scored. Each offeror’s proposed costs will be evaluated to determine if the costs are realistic for the work to be performed, if the costs reflect an offeror’s understanding of the requirements, and if the costs are consistent with the various elements of the mission suitability proposal. The total compensation proposed will be evaluated in terms of enhancing the recruitment and retention of personnel and its realism and consistency with a total plan for compensation (both salaries and fringe benefits). Cost realism analyses will be performed to assess the reasonableness and realism of the proposed

costs. Proposed costs will be adjusted to reflect the probable "cost of doing business" for the basic 2-year contract and option periods. The proposed award fee for cost and performance will be considered under this evaluation factor and will become a part of the overall "cost of doing business." Phase-in costs will not be evaluated as part of the probable cost. The cost realism analyses will identify features that could cause a given proposal, including proposal risk areas, to cost more or less than proposed and by how much. Differences between proposed cost and probable cost will be used in measuring the realism of the proposed costs. Using a cost realism point adjustment, as defined in provision M.4B, the Government will proportionately adjust the offeror's Mission Suitability score for its assessed cost realism.

- B. In consonance with the Mission Suitability subfactor, Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB) Participation, SDB Participation Program - Targets, and in accordance with FAR 19.11, a price evaluation adjustment for small disadvantaged business concerns shall be applied as determined by the Department of Commerce (FAR 19.201(b)). The adjustment gives offers from targeted small business concerns a price evaluation adjustment by adding a ten percent (10%) adjustment factor to all offerors' total proposed contract value, as adjusted by the SEB for probable cost, including fee, for each contract year. In accordance with FAR 19.1103(a), this factor will be added to all offers except:
1. Offers from small disadvantaged business concerns that have not waived the evaluation adjustment;
 2. Otherwise successful offers of eligible products under the Trade Agreements Act when the acquisition equals or exceeds the dollar threshold in 25.402;
 3. Otherwise successful offers where application of the factor would be inconsistent with a Memorandum of Understanding or other international agreement with a foreign government; or
 4. Otherwise successful offers from historically black colleges and universities or minority institutions.
- C. In accordance with FAR 19.13, Historically Underutilized Business Zone (HUBZone) Program, a HUBZone factor will be applied in accordance with FAR 52.219-4. The HUBZone factor will be based on total proposed contract value, as adjusted by the SEB for probable cost, including fee for each contract year.
- D. A concern that is both a HUBZone small business concern and a small disadvantaged business concern shall receive the benefit of both the HUBZone small business price evaluation preference and the small disadvantaged business price evaluation adjustment (see subpart 19.11). Each applicable price evaluation preference or adjustment shall be calculated independently against an offeror's proposed contract value, as adjusted by the SEB for a probable cost, including fee, for each contract year. These individual preference and adjustment amounts shall both be added to the base offer to arrive at the total evaluated price for that offer.
- E. The SEB will not evaluate offers using the evaluation adjustment factor when it would cause award, as a result of this adjustment, to be made at a cost/fee that exceeds fair market price by more than the DOC determined 10% factor.
- F. The offeror's financial capability to properly perform a contract of this type and magnitude will be evaluated.

- G. Risk analysis for the Cost factor, which identifies risk areas and the recommended approaches to minimize the impact of those risks on the overall success of the program will be evaluated. The Cost factor, although not scored numerically, is relevant in determining the offeror's understanding of the requirements of the RFP and the resources required and will be reported by the SEB to the SSA.

(End of Provision)

[END OF SECTION]

SECTION J-13

Competition Review - Option/Sole Source Review Elements (OSSRE)

Element Number	SECTION I: General Contract Information:	Date Form Completed:	
1.	1. Center		
2.	Action # (Contract #, Cooperative Agreement #, Grant #)		
3.	Was the Contract Competitively Awarded (Yes/No)		
4.	If a Follow-on is Anticipated, will it be Competed? (Yes/No)		
5.	Title/Brief Description of Action		
6.	Contracting Officer Name/Phone		
7.	COTR Name/Phone		
8.	Prime Contractor		
9.	Prime Contractor Performing Business Unit		
10.	Large Business, Small, SDB or WOB? (Identify)		
11.	Predominant Contract Type (% of Total)		
12.	If Hybrid: Secondary Contract Type (% of Total)		
13.	Multiple Award Contract (Y/N)		
14.	GWAC/GSA or other Order? (Identify)		
	Period of Performance (P.O.P) & Contract Value:		
15.	Dates: Overall Contract P.O.P. if all Options Are Exercised	Start	End
16.	Total Years: Contract Length In Years (if all Opts Exercised)		
17.	Total Value: If All Options Are Exercised		Value
18.	Award Dates - Original Basic Contract		
19.	Value at Award - Original Basic Contract		
20.	Current Contract Value - Include Basic and Exercised Options		
21.	P.O.P - Option 1		
22.	Total Value - Option Period 1		
23.	P.O.P - Option 2		
24.	Total Value - Option Period 2		
25.	P.O.P - Option 3		
26.	Total Value - Option Period 3		

Competition Review - Option/Sole Source Review Elements (OSSRE)

Element		
7.	Continuity of Operations Was Considered	
8.	Cost of Disrupting Operations Was Considered	
9.	Cost Reasonableness of the Option Was Assessed	
10.	Economic Changes Affecting Cost/Tech Performance Considered	
Element		Date Form Completed:
Number		Page 3
SECTION III: Contract Performance:		
<i>For NF 1680 elements 1.a. - 1.d., rate each on a five point scale: Poor/Unsatisfactory - 1 Satisfactory - 2 Good - 3 Very Good - 4 Excellent - 5</i>		
1.	<u>Contractor Performance Evaluation From NASA Form 1680:</u>	---
a.	Quality:	On Basic Contract
b.	Timeliness:	On Exercised Options
c.	Price/Cost:	
d.	Other:	
<i>For Items 2. - 6., provide text answers</i>		
2.	Program Management Council (Local/HQs) Assessment/Status:	---
3.	Results of Independent Reviews (IARs/NARs/IRs etc.):	---
4.	<u>Responsibility (Ethics, compliance with law/regs, financial, etc):</u>	---
5.	<u>Effectiveness of Contract Structure:</u> (How are the contract structure, incentives, contract administration requirements, etc., serving NASA's interests)	---
6.	<u>Safety Performance:</u>	---

Competition Review - Option/Sole Source Review Elements (OSSRE)

Element

Date Form Completed:	Page 4

Element

SECTION IV: Conclusion:

Recommended Action: (Center) Select One and Explain:

1. Do Not Exercise Option - End Contract ---
2. Do Not Exercise Option - Compete/Execute Alternative Strategy ---
3. Exercise Option as Originally Stipulated in the Contract ---
4. Other: ---

Selected Action:

--	--

Narrative Explanation for Recommended Action:

--	--

Competition Review - Option/Sole Source Review Elements (OSSRE)

Element

Date Form Completed:

MSFC						
SPECIAL PURPOSE EQUIPMENT PROVIDED BY THE GOVERNMENT						
AND MAINTAINED BY THE GOVERNMENT						
ECN	MSFC #	ITEM NAME	MFG	BLDG	ROOM	SERIAL #
1082502	592	Truck Forklift	Yale	ETA	N/A	901-354
1082277	447	Truck Forklift	Hyster	WTA	N/A	CO19GO161 4L
1081869	2326	Truck Forklift	Hyster	ETA	N/A	BO10GO74734L
625624	590	Forklift	Silent Hoist	ETA	N/A	16950
624576	557	Forklift	Hyster	ETA	N/A	B3025641
674262	377	Forklift	Hyster	WTA	N/A	817L2440H
676867	429	Crane, Mobile	Pettibone	4670	N/A	364-190
674261	440	Forklift	Hyster	4670	N/A	None
678520	444	Forklift	Silent Hoist	4670	N/A	16752
674139	534	Forklift	Pettibone	4530	TS300	None
1082280	2325	Forklift	Hyster	4670	N/A	8160V02921L
625631	114613	Welding Machine	Miller	WTA	N/A	JD670821
G080468	G080468	Welding Machine	Miller	4651	Highbay	JK567685
185634	185634	Welding Machine	Miller	ETA	N/A	G138172
539903	675	Welding Machine	Hobart	ETA	N/A	160W10130
539910	674	Welding Machine	Hobart	ETA	N/A	16DW-10116
539911	704	Welding Machine	Lincoln	ETA	N/A	A-460551
1219393	856	Welding Machine	Miller	4559	OUTSIDE	KB107142
G84550		Welding Machine	Hobart	4650	OUTSIDE	N/A
1533281		Welding Machine	Hobart	ETA	N/A	195WS04276
1533282		Welding Machine	Hobart	ETA	N/A	195WS04274
1402152	858	Welding Machine	Hobart	WTA	N/A	194WR02018
1402153	859	Welding Machine	Hobart	WTA	N/A	194WR02015
674427	702	Welder	Lincoln	ETA	N/A	A-160550
1444291	707	Welder, Arc	Miller	ETA	4540	KF7745
625628	100435	Welder, Arc	Miller	ETA	4540	H513143818
836106	836106	Welder, Arc	Miller	ETA	4561	J1437808
859552	749	Crane, Trk Mounted	Linkbelt	ETA	N/A	32G9-711
677256	746	Crane, 60 Ton	P&H	ETA	N/A	None
G30934	747	Crane, 200 Ton	P&H	WTA	N/A	28H2-136B
674500	748	Crane, 120 Ton	Manitowoc	WTA	N/A	64-6090
1151633	750	Crane, 18 Ton	Linkbelt	ETA	N/A	6911-948
1221560	751	Crane, 50 Ton	P&H	WTA	N/A	56373
678782		Plate Welding Assy.	Challenge	4561	Cal Lab	N/A
1012904		Positioner, Load	Del Mar Av.	4650	Rig. Rm.	N/A
G30744	714	Portable Welder	Rod Runner	4582	Rigging Locker	87W575456
G30745	715	Portable Welder	Rod Runner	4582	Rigging Bldg.	875W75450
1726794	7607	Man Lift	Geni	WTA	4670	Z-45-004092
676889	2740	Trailer, Lowboy	Dorsey	ETA	N/A	78-74755525100
677138	2653	Trailer, Lowboy	U.S. Army	ETA	N/A	3497
677138	2653	Trailer, Utility Cargo		WTA	N/A	3497
676812	525	Fork Lift	Yale	ETA	N/A	AF068066
N/A	1226	Tractor	Ford	ETA	N/A	1FTY90R1RUA17118
N/A	1569	Tractor	Ford	ETA	N/A	1GDYW82A1LUA28379
1963862	7610	Genie 4WD Manlift	Genie	WTA	N/A	Z-45-004794

ECN	MSFC #	ITEM NAME	MFG	BLDG	ROOM	SERIAL #
1963112	597	Fork Lift	Hyster 155			F006G04004K
1963114	804	Air Compressor	Atlas Capco			ARP985333
1963115	805	Air Compressor	Atlas Capco			ARP985332
679348	692	65 Ton Crane	P&H			33496

FORM G-2

TEST OPERATIONS CONTRACT
EQUIPMENT
REPLACEMENT COSTS

FILENAME: dr-99.xls
PRIME:
SUB:

ELEMENTS	NON-CAP		Basic		Subtotal (CY 1, 2)	Option 1			Option 2		TOTAL	REFERENCE	
	CAP	CAP	CY1	CY2		CY3	CY4	CY5	CY6				
REPLACEMENT COSTS													
Class 2330					\$0								\$0
Class 2340					\$0								\$0
Class 2420					\$0								\$0
Class 3695					\$0								\$0
Class 3710					\$0								\$0
Class 3740					\$0								\$0
Class 3750					\$0								\$0
Class 5110					\$0								\$0
Class 5120					\$0								\$0
Class 5130					\$0								\$0
Class 5180					\$0								\$0
Class 7420					\$0								\$0
Class 7430					\$0								\$0
Class 7450					\$0								\$0
Class 7480					\$0								\$0
Class 7910					\$0								\$0
Total					\$0			\$0		\$0			\$0

TEST OPERATIONS CONTRACT
OTHER DIRECT COSTS (ODC)

FORM I

FILENAME: dr-101.xls

PRIME:

SUB:

ELEMENTS	Basic		Option 1			Option 2		TOTAL	REFERENC
	CY1	CY2	Subtotal (CY 1, 2)	CY3	CY4	CY5	CY6		
TRAVEL			\$0					\$0	
TRAINING			\$0					\$0	
LICENSES & CERTIFICATION			\$0					\$0	
RECRUITMENT			\$0					\$0	
RELOCATION			\$0					\$0	
OTHER ODC (LIST)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
TOTAL ODC	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	

TEST OPERATIONS CONTRACT
G & A EXPENSE POOL

FILENAME: dr-102.xls
PRIME:
SUB:

	Basic		Subtotal (CY 1, 2)	Option 1			Option 2			TOTAL	REFERENCE
	CY1	CY2		CY3	CY4	CY5	CY6				
TOTAL G & A EXPENSES	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
BASE (IDENTIFY											
RATE											

HISTORICAL DATA	RECORDED RATE	DCAA RECOMMENDED RATE	FINAL NEGOTIATED RATE
G & A:	MOST RECENT 2ND MOST RECENT 3RD MOST RECENT		

TEST OPERATIONS CONTRACT FORM K - MANAGEMENT/SUPV
SALARIES EXEMPT

FILENAME: df-103.xls

PRIME:

SUB:

NUMBER OF PROPOSED PERSONNEL	PROPOSED AVERAGE LABOR SALARY	PROPOSED MINIMUM LABOR SALARY	PROPOSED MAXIMUM LABOR SALARY	REF.

LABOR CLASSIFICATIONS
MANAGEMENT/SUPERVISION

TEST OPERATIONS CONTRACT
SUBCONTRACTING DOLLARS

FILENAME: df-105.xls
PRIME:

	Basic		Subtotal (CY 1, 2)	Option 1			Option 2			TOTAL	REF
	CY1	CY2		CY3	CY4	CY5	CY6				
Total Contract Value (CV)			\$0							\$0	
Small Business \$			\$0							\$0	
% of Total CV	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Small Disadvantaged \$			\$0							\$0	
% of Total CV	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Woman Owned \$			\$0							\$0	
% of Total CV	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
Veteran-Owned Small Business \$			\$0							\$0	
% of Total CV	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	

TEST OPERATIONS CONTRACT
FRINGE BENEFITS
ANALYSIS OF COMPENSATION PACKAGE

FORM M Exempt

FILENAME: dr-106.xls
PRIME:
SUB:

EXEMPT

CATEGORY	Basic		Subtotal (CY 1, 2)	Option 1			Option 2		TOTAL	REFERENCE
	CY1	CY2		CY3	CY4	CY5	CY6			
<u>HEALTH AND WELFARE:</u>										
LIFE INSURANCE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
DISABILITY INSURANCE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
HEALTH INSURANCE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
DENTAL INSURANCE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
SICK LEAVE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
CIVIC AND PERSONAL LEAVE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
OTHER LEAVE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
RETIREMENT	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
SAVINGS/THRIFT PLAN	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
SEVERANCE PAY	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
TUITION REIMBURSEMENT	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
OTHER (Identify)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
TOTAL HEALTH AND WELFARE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
TOTAL VACATION AND HOLIDAY	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
TOTAL FRINGE BENEFITS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
TOTAL PRODUCTIVE LABOR COSTS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
% OF TOTAL PRODUCTIVE LABOR COST	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
TOTAL PRODUCTIVE LABOR HOURS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
AVERAGE COST OF FRINGE BENEFITS PER LABOR HOUR	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	

TEST OPERATIONS CONTRACT
PERSONNEL AND FRINGE
BENEFITS POLICIES

FORM N

- CY1
- CY2
- CY3
- CY4
- CY5
- CY6

FILENAME: dr.107.xls
PRIME
SUB

DESCRIPTION	EXEMPT	NON-EXEMPT NON-UNION	NON-EXEMPT UNION	Ref.
Relocation				
Recruitment				
Per Diem, Subsistence, and Travel				
Insurance (Life)				
Insurance (Health) (Employee/Company Share)				
Insurance (Dental, Disability, Etc.)				
Retirement				
Reduction-in-Force				
Severance Pay				
Personal Leave				
Sick Leave				
Vacation				
Holidays				
Special Workweek				
Overtime Policy				
Uncompensated Overtime				
Pension Portability				
Pay Differentials Policy				
Shift				
Off-site				
Compensatory Leave Policy				
Incentive Plans				
Suggestion				
Other				
Bonus Plan				
Training/Education				
Employee Morale				
Other				

FORM O

SUMMARY OF CONTRACT REFERENCE DATA

Filename: dr-108.doc

#	Information Required	Information Submitted
1	Name and address of contracting activity (government or commercial) to which service is/was provided.	
2	Contract Number	
3	Contract Title	
4	Contract Type	
5	Type of Specification (performance, detailed, or mix)	
6	CAGE # and Major-Subcontractor CAGE #	
7	Contract SIC Code(s)	
8	Original contract amount (OCA) and current (or ending) contract amount (CCA). Explain the reasons for any difference.	
9	Contracting activity official's names, telephone numbers and e-mail address (if available)	
10	Program/Project manager's name, telephone number and e-mail address (if available)	
11	Contract level (prime or subcontract)	
12	Date of Award	
13	Contract completion/projected completion date	
14	Major subcontractors and/or teaming partners (List separately as needed/include scope/extent of work performed under this contract. Explain as needed.)	
15	Small business (SB) subcontracting dollar goal.	
16	SB subcontracting percentage goal (Identify applicable base, e.g., Total Contract Value or Subcontracting Dollars)	

FORM O

SUMMARY OF CONTRACT REFERENCE DATA

Filename: dr-108.doc

#	Information Required	Information Submitted
17	SB dollar achievements	
18	SB subcontracting percentage results (Identify and relate base shown in block 16.)	

PAST PERFORMANCE – OFFEROR’S INFORMATION

Offerors shall send a letter to their listed references authorizing the references to provide past performance information to the government. The Offeror shall ensure its references. Fax the hardcopy questionnaire(s) to (228) 688-3220 or e-mail it to James.D.Huk@NASA.gov the SSC source selection office by the submittal date.

TRANSMITTAL LETTER TO ACCOMPANY PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

FROM:

SUBJECT: Past Performance Questionnaire for Contract(s): _____

We are currently responding to NASA Stennis Space Center’s (SSC’s) Request for Proposal, RFP13SSC-O-02-38, for the procurement of a Test Operations Contract (TOC). The TOC solicitation is placing emphasis on relevant past performance as a source selection factor. For our proposal to receive consideration, this RFP requires Offerors to identify customers and solicit their response regarding our past performance.

We are providing past performance data to NASA relating to our performance on contract (contract number) and have identified (person’s name) of your organization as a point of contact based on their knowledge concerning our work.

The RFP instructs that we provide our customers with the attached questionnaire and requests that you submit the requested data by March 10, 2003 either by official U.S. Post or email. If sent by U.S. Post, use the following addressing instructions:

NASA Acquisition Management Office
John C. Stennis Space Center
Attn: BA31/James D. Huk II
Stennis Space Center, MS 39529-6000

The outside envelope must be marked as follows:

NOTE: TO BE OPENED BY ADDRESSEE ONLY
SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION – See FAR 3.104
SOURCE SELECTION SENSITIVE – FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

If sent by email, use the following SSC e-mail address: James.D.Huk@NASA.gov

The information contained in the completed Past Performance Questionnaire is considered sensitive and cannot be released to us, the offeror. If you have any questions about the acquisition or the attached questionnaire, your questions must be directed back to the SSC point of contact identified above. The Government reserves the right to contact the references directly.

Thank you for your timely assistance.

Sincerely,
(Company Official)

PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

I. CONTRACT INFORMATION

- 1. Name of Company Being Evaluated: _____
- 2. Address: _____
- 3. Contract Number: _____
- 4. Contract Type: _____
- 5. Period of Performance (basic and any options): _____
- 6. Contract Value: _____
- 7. Description of Contract:

- 8. Unusual Contract Features or Conditions:

- 9. Does a corporate or business relationship exist between the firm being evaluated and your organization? ___ Yes ___ No. If so, please describe.

II. EVALUATOR INFORMATION

- 1. Name: _____
- 2. Position Title: _____
- 3. Agency/Company Name and Mailing Address:

- 4. Telephone Number: _____
- 5. Facsimile Number: _____
- 6. E-Mail Address: _____
- 7. Your Role in the Program/Contract: _____
- 8. Length of Involvement in this Program/Contract: _____

III. EXPERIENCE RELEVANCY EVALUATION

Listed below are the major work elements within the Performance Work Statement of the Test Operations Contract. Please provide your assessment of the extent of relevant experience associated with the PWS that is/was present in the contract for which you are a reference.

“Significant” experience means that a full range of services indicated under the work element were routinely provided by the contractor.

“Moderate” experience means that some of the services indicated under the work element were routinely provided by the contractor or that all services were provided but not on a continuous or routine basis.

“Minimal” experience means that, although some aspects of the work element were performed, such work was of limited scope or frequency.

“N/A” means that the work element was not performed under your contract.

Check the appropriate box:

Administer Integrated Contract Team at multi-sites	S()	M()	Min()	N/A()
Effectively manage cost and schedule performance	S()	M()	Min()	N/A()
Engineer, operate, maintain, and manage test core capabilities	S()	M()	Min()	N/A()
Maintain and operate configuration management and control system	S()	M()	Min()	N/A()
Develop and maintain documentation	S()	M()	Min()	N/A()
Develop and maintain analytical tools and methodologies	S()	M()	Min()	N/A()
Identify, evaluate, and adapt new test technology and systems	S()	M()	Min()	N/A()
Plan, evaluate, engineer, and support construction	S()	M()	Min()	N/A()
Support, schedule, and manage projects	S()	M()	Min()	N/A()
Design and analyze test systems	S()	M()	Min()	N/A()
Fabricate and install test systems	S()	M()	Min()	N/A()
Activate test systems	S()	M()	Min()	N/A()
Conduct Tests	S()	M()	Min()	N/A()
Produce Quality Data	S()	M()	Min()	N/A()

IV. OVERALL PERFORMANCE

In assessing the Contractor’s performance, use the following rating definitions:

Adjectival Rating	Definitions
Excellent	Of exceptional merit; exemplary performance in a timely, efficient and economical manner; very minor (if any) performance problems with no adverse effect on overall performance.
Very Good	Very effective performance, fully responsive to contract requirements; contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient and economical manner for the most part; only minor performance problems with no adverse effect on overall performance.
Good	Effective performance; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable performance problems but with little identifiable effect on overall performance.
Neutral	Neutral Rating. Assigned to offerors with no relevant past performance.
Satisfactory	Meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable performance problems with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance.
Poor/Unsatisfactory	Does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; performance problems in one or more areas which adversely affect overall performance.

A. TECHNICAL PERFORMANCE

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------|
| 1. Overall performance in planning and controlling the program | E() VG() G() N() S() U() |
| 2. Commitment to safety and administration of safety policies | E() VG() G() N() S() U() |
| 3. Compliance with technical requirements and performance standards | E() VG() G() N() S() U() |
| 4. Insight in understanding customer requirements and priorities | E() VG() G() N() S() U() |
| 5. Identification, surveillance, and management of major/critical subcontractors | E() VG() G() N() S() U() |
| 6. Contractor’s ability to correct performance deficiencies. | E() VG() G() N() S() U() |
| 7. Ability to use metrics and other tools to accurately measure and track programs. | E() VG() G() N() S() U() |
| 8. Compliance with contract terms and conditions pertaining to technical performance. | E() VG() G() N() S() U() |
| 9. Provided innovative concepts for R&D activities | E() VG() G() N() S() U() |
| 10. Quality of products and services provided | E() VG() G() N() S() U() |
| 11. Particular strong/weak points of contractor’s performance. | E() VG() G() N() S() U() |

Please comment to support the above ratings (at a minimum, N, S, or U ratings must be supported.)

B. SCHEDULE PERFORMANCE

- 1. Timely completion of change orders, technical direction. E () VG () G () N () S () U ()
- 2. Content, accuracy, and timeliness of technical reports E () VG () G () N () S () U ()
- 3. Adherence to technical schedules E () VG () G () N () S () U ()
- 4. Timeliness and cost of business reports E () VG () G () N () S () U ()

Please comment to support the above ratings (at a minimum, N, S, or U ratings must be supported.)

C. CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

- 1. Degree of contractor cooperation in working to solve problems? E () VG () G () N () S () U ()
- 2. Effectiveness of contractor recommended solutions E () VG () G () N () S () U ()
- 3. Contractor responsiveness to administrative issues of the contract E () VG () G () N () S () U ()
- 4. Responsiveness to customer requirements E () VG () G () N () S () U ()

Please comment to support the above ratings (at a minimum, N, S, or U ratings must be supported.)

D. COST PERFORMANCE AND CONTRACT MANAGEMENT

- 1. Adherence to estimated costs and contract cost targets. E () VG () G () N () S () U ()
- 2. Ability to effectively plan efforts, provide realistic cost and schedule estimates E () VG () G () N () S () U ()
- 3. Ability to anticipate, identify, and control cost growth E () VG () G () N () S () U ()
- 4. Ability to submit accurate and timely financial reports E () VG () G () N () S () U ()
- 5. If an award/incentive fee type contract, percent of available award fee earned _____%

Please comment to support the above ratings (at a minimum, S, M, or U ratings must be supported.)

E. KEY PERSONNEL/STAFFING

- 1. Ability to match personnel skills with requirements E () VG () G () N () S () U ()
- 2. Extent contractor coordinated, integrated, and provided for effective subcontractor management E () VG () G () N () S () U ()
- 3. Did the contractor provide the proposed key personnel? ___ Yes ___ No
If yes, how long did they remain on the contract?

- 4. Did the contractor experience a high or low employee turnover rate?

F. OTHER

1. Has this contract been partially or completely terminated for default or convenience? ___ Yes ___ No If yes, please explain the reason for termination (i.e. inability to meet cost or delivery schedules, performance, etc.)

2. Would you select this contractor again? ___ Yes ___ No
Why? _____

Additional Comments:

TEST OPERATIONS CONTRACT
 SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS (SDB)
 PARTICIPATION PROGRAM-TARGETS
 SUMMARY

FORM P - SUMMARY

FILENAME: dr-110.xls
 PRIME:
 SUB:
 REF: L-I-13

1. TOTAL CONTRACT VALUE				\$0
2. TOTAL PARTICIPATION OF SDBs (PRIME CONTRACT LEVEL 3B AND SUBCONTRACTS 4A)				
A. DOLLAR AMOUNT		B. PERCENTAGE		
\$0		0.00%		
3. SDB PARTICIPATION AT PRIME CONTRACT LEVEL				
A. SIC MAJOR GROUP	B. DOLLAR AMOUNT	C. PERCENTAGE		
TOTAL	\$0	0.00%		
4. TOTAL SDB SUBCONTRACT PARTICIPATION				
A. DOLLAR AMOUNT		B. PERCENTAGE		
\$0		0.00%		
5. BREAKDOWN OF SDB PARTICIPATION AT SUBCONTRACT LEVEL BY SIC MAJOR GROUP				
A. SIC MAJOR GROUP	B. DOLLARS	C. PERCENTAGE	D. NAME OF SDB (if identified)	

KEY PERSONNEL RESUME
(Complete one form for each key person)

Filename: dr-112.doc

Company:

Proposed Position Title	Proposed Annual Salary
Name	
Address	
Telephone Number	Work: Home:

CURRENT POSITION

Employer

Date From	Title in Current Position	
Date to	Annual Salary	Number of Personnel Directly Supervised
Job Description and Scope:		

Responsible for a total workforce of (Number of people):

Title	Name	Phone Number*
-------	------	---------------

Employer Reference

Customer Reference

***NOTE: It is the offeror's responsibility to ensure all references and their phone numbers are current and correct.**

FORM R

KEY PERSONNEL RESUME
(Complete one form for each key person)

Filename: dr-112.doc

WORK EXPERIENCE
(Past 10 years in chronological order)

Employer

Date From Title in Current Position
Date to Annual Salary Number of Personnel Directly Supervised
Job Description and Scope:

Reference Phone Number*

Employer Reference
Customer Reference

Employer

Date From Title in Current Position
Date to Annual Salary Number of Personnel Directly Supervised
Job Description and Scope:

Reference Phone Number*

Employer Reference
Customer Reference

Employer

Date From Title in Current Position
Date to Annual Salary Number of Personnel Directly Supervised
Job Description and Scope:

Reference Phone Number*

Employer Reference
Customer Reference

EDUCATION

FORM R

KEY PERSONNEL RESUME
(Complete one form for each key person)

Filename: dr-112.doc

College

Name of Institution
Major/Minor

Registrar Phone #
Year of Degree

Name of Institution
Major/Minor

Registrar Phone #
Year of Degree

Name of Institution
Major/Minor

Registrar Phone #
Year of Degree

NOTE: Provide sufficient information necessary to verify degree at the registrar phone number above. (i.e. full name, maiden name, social security number, student ID, etc.)

Professional and/or Technical Training/Certification:

Type of Training

Where Received

Date

Other Pertinent Information (*Awards, OSHA/EPA citations*):

Degree of Commitment:

committed to the proposed position and ___ has ___ (has not) been contacted and ___ is ___ (is not) proposed. ___ has ___ (has not) indicated a willingness to accept the salary

Brief statement of why the proposed individual is uniquely qualified for the proposed position and what percent of his total available time will be devoted to this program.

I certify that the above information is complete and accurate:

Signature:

Contractor Representative

Date

THE GOVERNMENT MAY VERIFY QUALIFICATIONS AND COMMITMENTS WITH THE REFERENCES.

TEST OPERATIONS CONTRACT
SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED COST AND AWARD FEE

FILENAME: dr-93.xls

PRIME:

SUB:

ELEMENTS	Basic		Subtotal (CY 1, 2)	Option 1		Option 2		TOTAL	REFERENCE
	CY1	CY2		CY3	CY4	CY5	CY6		
DIRECT PROD. LABOR HOURS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
STRAIGHT TIME	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
OVERTIME	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
FULL TIME EQUIVALENT	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
COSTS:									
DIRECT PROD. LABOR COSTS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
STRAIGHT TIME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
OVERTIME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
FRINGE BENEFITS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
SUBTOTAL	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
EQUIPMENT LEASES/MINTNCE AGREEMENTS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
CONSTRUCTION SERVICES	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
GSA/LEASED TRANSPORTATION	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
SUBCONTRACTS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
OTHER DIRECT COSTS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
OVERHEAD	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
SUBTOTAL	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
GENERAL & ADMINISTRATIVE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
FAC. CAPITAL COST OF MONEY	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
TOTAL ESTIMATED COST	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
AWARD FEE COST	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
TOTAL COST & FEE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	

TEST OPERATIONS CONTRACT
SUMMARY OF PHASE-IN COSTS

FILENAME: dr-94.xls

PRIME:

SKILL CLASSIFICATION	HEAD COUNT	STRAIGHT TIME		OVERTIME		COST	REFERENCE
		HOURS	RATE	HOURS	RATE		
OTHER SKILL CLASSIFICATIONS						\$0	
TOTAL PRODUCTIVE LABOR COSTS		0	0	0	0	\$0	
FRINGE BENEFITS		0	0	0	0	\$0	
SUBTOTAL						\$0	
MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT						\$0	
EQUIPMENT LEASES/MNTNCE AGREEMENTS						\$0	
SUBCONTRACTS						\$0	
OTHER DIRECT COSTS						\$0	
OVERHEAD:						\$0	
SUBTOTAL						\$0	
GENERAL & ADMINISTRATIVE						\$0	
FAC. CAPITAL COST OF MONEY						\$0	
TOTAL ESTIMATED COST						\$0	
FEE						\$0	
TOTAL ESTIMATED COST AND FEE						\$0	

TEST OPERATIONS CONTRACT
 TOTAL ESTIMATED COST BY SECTION
 Section 1.0 SUMMARY SHEET

FILENAME: dr-96.xls
 PRIME:
 SUB:

ELEMENTS	Basic		Option 1				Option 2		TOTAL	REFERENCE
	CY1	CY2	Subtotal (CY 1, 2)	CY3	CY4	CY5	CY6			
DIRECT PROD. LABOR HOURS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
STRAIGHT TIME	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
OVERTIME	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
FULL TIME EQUIVALENT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
COSTS:										
DIRECT PROD. LABOR COSTS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
STRAIGHT TIME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
OVERTIME	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
FRINGE BENEFITS	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
TOTAL LABOR & FRINGES	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT									\$0	
EQUIPMENT LEASES/MNTNCE AGREEMENTS									\$0	
CONSTRUCTION SERVICES									\$0	
GS/LEASED TRANSPORTATION									\$0	
SUBCONTRACTS									\$0	
OTHER DIRECT COSTS									\$0	
OVERHEAD									\$0	
SUBTOTAL	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
GENERAL & ADMINISTRATIVE									\$0	
FAC. CAPITAL COST OF MONEY									\$0	
TOTAL ESTIMATED COST	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	
AWARD FEE COST									\$0	
TOTAL COST & FEE	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	

Summary Property Adjustments

SSC GOVERNMENT PROVIDED EQUIPMENT												
Summary Property Adjustments to Attachment J10 from Class Exceptions List 2 to List 1 No Class Exceptions												
Federal Supply Classification - 2330 - Trailers												
0593835	TRAILER, SEMI, HYDRAULIC	DGTW-I204	60668	\$36,274	2330	1965	E24	3305				
1224235	TRAILER, SEMI, HYDRAULIC	DGT-I204	60666	\$36,274	2330	1965	E24	3305				
0593839	TRAILER, SEMI, HYDRAULIC	DGT-I204	60667	\$36,274	2330	1965	E24	3305				
0593847	TRAILER, SEMI, HYDRAULIC	DGT-I204	60665	\$36,274	2330	1965	E24	3305				
1323527	TRAILER, TUBE BANK	6748	489715	\$11,118	2330	1961	E24	3305				
1323526	TRAILER, TUBE BANK	1597	489690	\$16,399	2330	1961	E24	3305				
1323525	TRAILER, TUBE BANK	1589	489537	\$16,783	2330	1961	E24	3305				
1323524	TRAILER, TUBE BANK	8205	489684	\$9,026	2330	1961	E24	3305				
1323523	TRAILER, TUBE BANK	9960	489719	\$26,103	2330	1961	E24	3202				
1323522	TRAILER, TUBE BANK	9096	489729	\$11,687	2330	1961	E24	3305				
1323521	TRAILER, TUBE BANK	6749	489718	\$10,659	2330	1961	E24	3305				
1323520	TRAILER, TUBE BANK	9404	489699	\$9,792	2330	1961	E24	3305				
1323519	TRAILER, TUBE BANK	9403	489683	\$9,792	2330	1961	E24	3305				
1323518	TRAILER, TUBE BANK	2542	489739	\$31,648	2330	1961	E24	3305				
1323517	TRAILER, TUBE BANK	6750	489731	\$10,639	2330	1961	E24	3305				
1323516	TRAILER, TUBE BANK	8343	489678	\$3,000	2330	1961	E24	3305				
1941011	TRAILER	941261-0	LAWU9412610	\$8,430	2330	1999	E3	4075				\$320,172
TOTAL LINE ITEMS 17												
Federal Supply Classification - Hand Tools, Nonedged, Nonpowered												
G032896	WRENCH, TORQUE	6006A	N/A	\$125	5120	1988	M12	4400				
G032897	WRENCH, TORQUE	6006A	N/A	\$125	5120	1988	M12	4400				
0132808	WRENCH, TORQUE	TOR600B	20313	\$358	5120	1987	M12	4400				
0396681	WRENCH, TORQUE	TW600FR	N/A	\$419	5120	1986	M12	4400				
1173426	MULTIPLIER, TORQUE	6232	J787	\$1,450	5120	1991	M12	4400				
TOTAL LINE ITEMS 5												
Federal Supply Classification - Measuring Tools												
0797402	CALIPER, 6" ELECTRONIC	PMF132	177990	\$140	5210	1986	E24	3305				
0591404	MICROMETER, OPTICAL	71-1110	104	\$1,342	5210	1965	E28	3300				
TOTAL LINE ITEMS 2												
												\$1,482

