



National Aeronautics and
Space Administration
Washington, DC 20546-0001

Procurement Notice

PN 17-11

June 28, 2017

Revisions to NASA Source Selection Guide (NFS Case 2017-N004)

PURPOSE: Revise NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.3 to reflect a revised NASA Source Selection Guide and remove duplicative text from the NFS that is in the revised NASA Source Selection Guide.

BACKGROUND: NASA recently embarked on plans for an agency-wide assessment that could lead to a more efficient operating model for current and future missions. Business Services Assessment (BSA) “deep dive” teams were established to assess the health of each business function such as procurement, business capability, program/project planning and technical capability. Based on the BSA Procurement Deep Dive recommendations for Decision # 4 “Optimizing Time: Evaluation Process” and Decision # 5 “Optimizing Time: Policy and Guidance”, the Team Leads for Decisions # 4 and # 5 were directed to “develop and adopt a Source Evaluation Board (SEB) Chair guide that can be used by SEB Chairs to (1) manage the overall process; (2) develop guidance on when to use alternative source selections such as Price Performance Trade Off (PPTO) and Lowest Price Technically Acceptable (LPTA); and (3) provide specific guidance for SEB evaluation criteria to limit the amount of proposal data requested to those that are most likely to produce the strongest discriminators – every item requested costs time and money for all parties”.

Decisions 4 and 5 Team Leads assigned specific section leads for each of the areas being updated in the NASA Source Selection Guide enlisting various SEB Managers and SEB Chairs across the agency as well as the Source Selection (SS) Community of Practice (CoP) for their input.

Along with the inclusion of this additional guidance into the NASA Source Selection Guide, the name is changed to Source Selection Guide since PPTO and LPTA guidance are now included in the guide.

NFS 1815.370 is amended to revise the website address for the revised NASA Source Selection guide and to remove duplicative text concerning recommended SEB presentation format that is already in the revised NASA Source Selection Guide.

ACQUISITIONS AFFECTED BY CHANGES: This requirement is applicable to all competitive negotiations after the effective date of this PN.

ACTION REQUIRED BY CONTRACTING OFFICERS: Ensure compliance with the revised NFS policy.

PROVISION AND CLAUSE CHANGES: None.

PARTS AFFECTED: Part 1815.370.

PIC or PCD CHANGES: None.

TYPE OF RULE AND PUBLICATION DATE: These changes do not have a significant effect beyond the internal operating procedures of NASA and do not have a significant cost or administrative impact on contractors or offerors, and therefore do not require codification in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) or publication for public comment.

HEADQUARTERS CONTACT: Andrew O'Rourke, Contract & Grant Policy Division, 202-358-4560, andrew.orourke@nasa.gov.

/s/

William P. McNally
Assistant Administrator for Procurement

Enclosures

DISTRIBUTION LIST:
PN List

PART 1815
CONTRACTING BY NEGOTIATION
(Revised ~~October 12, 2016~~[June 28, 2017])

* * * * *

Subpart 1815.3—Source Selection

* * * * *

1815.370 NASA source evaluation boards.

(a) The source evaluation board (SEB) procedures shall be used for those acquisitions identified in 1815.300-70(a)(1)(i). The NASA Source Selection Guide provides agency-wide guidance to individuals participating in the Source Evaluation Board (SEB) process and is available [on the NASA Headquarters Procurement Library] at [\[https://prod.nais.nasa.gov/portals/pl/sol_to_award.html\]](https://prod.nais.nasa.gov/portals/pl/sol_to_award.html).

* * * * *

(i) Recommended SEB presentation format.

——— ~~(1) Identification of the Acquisition.~~ Identify the installation, the nature of the services or hardware to be acquired, some quantitative measure including the Government cost estimate for the acquisition, and the planned contractual arrangement. ~~Avoid detailed objectives of the acquisition.~~

——— ~~(2) Background.~~ Identify any earlier phases of a phased acquisition or, as in the case of continuing support services, identify the incumbent and any consolidations or proposed changes from the existing structure.

——— ~~(3) Evaluation Factors and Subfactors.~~ Explain the evaluation factors, subfactor, and any special standards of responsibility. List the relative order of importance of the evaluation factors and the numerical weights of the Mission Suitability subfactors. ~~Presents the adjectival scoring system used in the Mission Suitability and Past Performance evaluations.~~

——— ~~(4) Sources.~~ Indicates the number of offerors solicited and the number of offerors expressing interest (e.g., attendance at a preproposal conference). Identify the offerors submitting proposals, indicating any small businesses, and type of small business.

——— ~~(5) Summary of Findings.~~ List the initial and final Mission Suitability ratings and scores, the offerors' proposed costs/prices, and identify any assessment of probable costs by the evaluators. ~~Introduce any clear discriminator, problem, or issue which could affect the selection. Address any competitive range determinations. List the adjectival rating (e.g. excellent, very good, etc.) assigned for each mission suitability subfactor for each offeror's proposal. List the total mission suitability point score for each offeror's proposal by adding all of the mission suitability subfactors points assessed out of the possible 1000 points.~~

——— ~~(6) Significant Strengths, Deficiencies, and Significant Weaknesses of Offerors.~~ Summarize the SEB's findings, using the following guidelines:

——— ~~(i) Present only the significant strengths, deficiencies, and significant weaknesses of individual offerors accompanied with a description of the benefits or risks associated with each discriminator.~~

~~———— (ii) Directly relate the significant strengths, deficiencies, and significant weaknesses to the evaluation factors, and subfactors.~~

~~———— (iii) Indicate the results and impact, if any, of discussions and FPRs on ratings and scores.~~

~~———— (7) Final Mission Suitability Ratings and Scores. Summarize the evaluation subfactors, the maximum points achievable, and the scores of the offerors in the competitive range.~~

~~———— (8) Final Cost/Price Evaluation. Summarize proposed costs/prices and any probable costs associated with each offeror including proposed fee arrangements. Present the data as accurately as possible, showing SEB adjustments to achieve comparability. Identify and document all significant issues and remaining uncertainties with regard to the probable cost.~~

~~———— (9) Past Performance. Provide a summary of the assessed level of confidence associated with each offeror's proposal.~~

~~———— (10) Special Interest. Include only information of special interest to the SSA that has not been discussed elsewhere, e.g., procedural errors or other matters that could affect the selection decision.~~

(j[i]) A source selection statement shall be prepared in accordance with 1815.308. For installation selections, the installation Chief Counsel or designee will prepare the source selection statement. For Headquarters selections, the Office of General Counsel or designee will prepare the statement.

(k[j]) SEB Records.

(1) The contracting officer shall retain in the official contract file, source selection documentation in accordance with [FAR 4.803\(a\)\(13\)](#), Contents of contract files. Specifically, upon completion of SEB activities, the contracting officer shall retain a copy of the following source selection evaluation documents in the official contract file for initial proposals and final proposal revisions (FPR), if applicable:

(i) Each offeror's proposal.

(ii) The competitive range determination(s).

(iii) The unsuccessful and successful notices sent to offerors.

(iv) If committees were utilized, the committee's evaluation for each evaluation factor, including all identified significant strengths, strengths, significant weakness, weaknesses, and deficiencies, together with supporting rationale, which the committee or any of its members brought to the attention of the SEB.

(v) Documentation of any clarifications and discussions held with offerors during the source selection process.

(vi) Initial and final reports containing the SEB's consensus findings, including minority reports, if any.

(vii) All presentations from the SEB to the SSA, including those containing the SEB's evaluation and rating of proposals.

(viii) The source selection decision.

(2) Extra copies of offerors' proposals should be stored in a secure facility and shall be properly disposed of after the time period for filing a protest has expired.

(3) Contracting officers shall handle electronic copies of materials containing source selection information in the same manner as the hardcopy information.

* * * * *