

(B) When contracting on a cost reimbursement basis, the Mission Suitability evaluation shall reflect the results of any required cost realism analysis performed under the cost/price factor. A structured approach shall be used to adjust Mission Suitability scores based on the degree of assessed cost realism. An example of such an approach would:

(a) Establish a threshold at which Mission Suitability adjustments would start. The threshold should reflect the acquisition's estimating uncertainty

(i.e., the higher the degree of estimating uncertainty, the higher the threshold);

(b) Use a graduated scale that proportionally adjusts a proposal's Mission Suitability score for its assessed cost realism;

(c) Affect a significant number of points to induce realistic pricing;

(d) Calculate a Mission Suitability point adjustment based on the percentage difference between proposed and probable cost as follows:

Services	Hardware development	Point adjustment
±5 percent	±30 percent	0
±6 to 10 percent	±31 to 40 percent	-50
±11 to 15 percent	±41 to 50 percent	-100
±16 to 20 percent	±51 to 60 percent	-150
±21 to 30 percent	±61 to 70 percent	-200
±more than 30 percent	±more than 70 percent	-300

(a)(4) The cost or price evaluation, specifically the cost realism analysis, often requires a technical evaluation of proposed costs. Contracting officers may provide technical evaluators a copy of the cost volume or relevant information from it to use in the analysis.

(b) The contracting officer is authorized to make the determination to reject all proposals received in response to a solicitation.

[63 FR 9954, Feb. 27, 1998, as amended at 63 FR 44408, Aug. 19, 1998; 65 FR 37059, June 13, 2000]

1815.305-70 Identification of unacceptable proposals.

(a) The contracting officer shall not complete the initial evaluation of any proposal when it is determined that the proposal is unacceptable because:

(1) It does not represent a reasonable initial effort to address the essential requirements of the RFP or clearly demonstrates that the offeror does not understand the requirements;

(2) In research and development acquisitions, a substantial design drawback is evident in the proposal, and sufficient correction or improvement to consider the proposal acceptable would require virtually an entirely new technical proposal; or

(3) It contains major efficiencies or omissions or out-of-line costs which discussions with the offeror could not reasonably be expected to cure.

(b) The contracting officer shall document the rationale for discontinuing the initial evaluation of a proposal in accordance with this section.

[63 FR 9954, Feb. 27, 1998, as amended at 63 FR 44408, Aug. 19, 1998]

1815.305-71 Evaluation of a single proposal.

(a) If only one proposal is received in response to the solicitation, the contracting officer shall determine if the solicitation was flawed or unduly restrictive and determine if the single proposal is an acceptable proposal. Based on these findings, the SSA shall direct the contracting officer to:

(1) Award without discussions provided for contracting officer determines that adequate price competition exists (see FAR 15.403-1(c)(1)(ii));

(2) Award after negotiating an acceptable contract. (The requirement for submission of cost or pricing data shall be determined in accordance with FAR 15.403-1); or

(3) Reject the proposal and cancel the solicitation.

(b) The procedure in 1815.305-71(a) also applies when the number of proposals equals the number of awards

contemplated or when only one acceptable proposal is received.

1815.306 Exchanges with offerors after receipt of proposals. (NASA supplements paragraphs (c), (d), and (e))

(c)(2) A total of no more than three proposals shall be a working goal in establishing the competitive range. Field installations may establish procedures for approval of competitive range determinations commensurate with the complexity or dollar value of an acquisition.

(d)(3)(A) The contracting officer shall identify any cost/price elements that do not appear to be justified and encourage offerors to submit their most favorable and realistic cost/price proposals, but shall not discuss, disclose, or compare cost/price elements of any other offeror. The contracting officer shall question inadequate, conflicting, unrealistic, or unsupported cost information; differences between the offeror's proposal and most probable cost assessments; cost realism concerns; differences between audit findings and proposed costs; proposed rates that are too high/low; and labor mixes that do not appear responsive to the requirements. No agreement on cost/price elements or a "bottom line" is necessary.

(B) The contracting officer shall discuss contract terms and conditions so that a "model" contract can be sent to each offeror with the request for final proposal revisions. If the solicitation allows, any proposed technical performance capabilities above those specified in the RFP that have value to the Government and are considered proposal strengths should be discussed with the offeror and proposed for inclusion in that offeror's "model" contract. If the offeror declines to include these strengths in its "model" contract, the Government evaluators should reconsider their characterization as strengths.

(e)(1) In no case shall the contacting officer relax or amend RFP requirements for any offeror without amending the RFP and permitting the other offerors an opportunity to propose against the relaxed requirements.

[63 FR 9954, Feb. 27, 1998, as amended at 63 FR 44408, Aug. 19, 1998]

1815.307 Proposal revisions. (NASA supplements paragraph (b))

(b)(i) The request for final proposal revisions (FPRs) shall also:

(A) Instruct offerors to incorporate all changes to their offers resulting from discussions, and require clear traceability from initial proposals;

(B) Require offerors to complete and execute the "model" contract, which includes any special provisions or performance capabilities the offeror proposed above those specified in the RFP;

(C) Caution offerors against unsubstantiated changes to their proposals; and

(D) Establish a page limit for FPRs.

(i) Approval of the Assistant Administrator for Procurement (Code HS) is required to reopen discussions for acquisitions of \$50 million or more. Approval of the procurement officer is required for all other acquisitions.

(iii) Proposals are rescored based on FPR evaluations. Scoring changes between initial and FPRs shall be clearly traceable.

[63 FR 9954, Feb. 27, 1998, as amended at 63 FR 44409, Aug. 19, 1998]

1815.308 Source selection decision. (NASA paragraphs (1), (2) and (3))

(1) All significant evaluation findings shall be fully documented and considered in the source selection decision. A clear and logical audit trail shall be maintained for the rationale for ratings and scores, including a detailed account of the decisions leading to the selection. Selection is made on the basis of the evaluation criteria established in the RFP.

(2) Before aware, the SSA shall sign a source selection statement that clearly and succinctly justifies the selection. Source selection statements must describe: the acquisition; the evaluation procedures; the substance of the Mission Suitability evaluation; and the evaluation of the Cost/Price and Past Performance factors. The statement also addresses unacceptable proposals, the competitive range determination, late proposals, or any other considerations pertinent to the decision. The statement shall not reveal any confidential business information. Except for certain major system acquisition competitions (see 1815.506-70), source