

1872.403-2

minutes shall contain the categorizations with basic rationale for such ratings and the significant strengths and weaknesses of the proposals evaluated.

1872.403-2 Contractor evaluation process.

(a) The use of the contractor method for obtaining support for evaluation purposes of proposals received in response to an AO requires the approval of the Program AA. Prior to the use of this method, discussion should be held with the Office of Acquisition.

(b) It is NASA policy to avoid situations in the acquisition process where, by virtue of the work or services performed for NASA, or as a result of data acquired from NASA or from other entities, a particular company:

(1) Is given an unfair competitive advantage over other companies with respect to future NASA business;

(2) Is placed in position to affect Government actions under circumstances in which there is potential that the company's judgment may be biased; or

(3) Otherwise finds that a conflict exists between the performance of work or services for the Government in an impartial manner and the company's own self-interest.

(c) To reduce the possibility of an organizational conflict of interest problem arising, the following minimum restrictions will be incorporated into the contract:

(1) No employee of the contractor will be permitted to propose in response to the AO;

(2) The "Limitation on Future Contracting" clause contained in 1852.209-71 will be included in all such contracts; and

(3) Unless authorized by the NASA contracting officer, the contractor shall not contact the originator of any proposal concerning its contents.

(d) The scope of work for the selected contractor will provide for an identification of strengths and weaknesses and a summary of the proposals. The contractor will not make selections nor recommend investigations.

(e) The steps to be taken in establishing evaluation panels and the responsibilities of NASA and the contractor in relation to the panels will be as follows:

48 CFR Ch. 18 (10-1-02 Edition)

(1) The contractor will be required to establish and provide support to panels of experts for review of proposals to evaluate their scientific and technical merit;

(2) These panels will be composed of scientists and specialists qualified to evaluate the proposals;

(3) The agency may provide to the contractor lists of scientist(s) and specialist(s) in the various disciplines it believes are qualified to serve on the panels;

(4) The contractor will report each panel's membership to NASA for approval; and

(5) The contractor must make all the necessary arrangements with the panel members.

(f) The evaluation support by the contractor's panels of experts will be accomplished as follows:

(1) The panels will review the scientific and technical merit of the proposals in accordance with the evaluation criteria in the AO and will record their strengths and weaknesses;

(2) The contractor will make records of each panel's deliberations which will form the basis for a report summarizing the results of the evaluations. Upon request, the contractor shall provide all such records to NASA;

(3) The chairperson of each panel shall certify that the evaluation report correctly represents the findings of the review panel; and

(4) A final report will be submitted as provided in the contract.

(g) A subcommittee of the Program Office Steering Committee will be established on an ad hoc basis. Utilizing furnished data, the subcommittee will classify the proposals into the four categories enumerated in 1872.403-1(e)(1), Advisory Subcommittee Evaluation Process. A record of the deliberations of the subcommittee should be prepared by an assigned executive secretary and signed by the chairperson. The minutes should contain the categorizations with the basic rationale for such ratings and the significant strengths and weaknesses of the proposals evaluated.

[62 FR 4477, Jan. 30, 1997, as amended at 63 FR 9966, Feb. 27, 1998]