

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT				1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES
				S	1 36
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0001	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 16-Jan-2014	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.		5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)	
6. ISSUED BY CODE COMMANDER, SPACE AND NAVAL WARFARE SYSTEMS COMMAND 02 CONTRACTS 4301 PACIFIC HIGHWAY SAN DIEGO CA 92110-3127	N00039	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6) See Item 6		CODE	
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code)				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. N00039-14-R-0002	
				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 07-Jan-2014	
				10A. MOD. OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
				10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
CODE	FACILITY CODE				
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input type="checkbox"/> is not extended.					
<p>Offer must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended by one of the following methods:</p> <p>(a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning <u>1</u> copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.</p>					
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)					
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.					
A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.					
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(B).					
C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:					
D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)					
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.					
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.) The purpose for this Amendment is to extend the proposal due date to 12 February 2014 and provide administrative changes.					
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.					
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)			16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)		
			TEL: HELDI RADAFORD EMAIL:		
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR		15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		16C. DATE SIGNED
(Signature of person authorized to sign)			BY <u>Radaford</u>		16-Jan-2014
			(Signature of Contracting Officer)		

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

SECTION A - SOLICITATION/CONTRACT FORM

The required response date/time 12-Feb-2014 02:00 PM has been added.

The depository location SPAWAR OT-4 San Diego has been added.

The number of offeror copies required 1 has been added.

SECTION L - INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS AND NOTICES TO BIDDERS

The following have been modified:

L-317 SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS (COMPLEX) (JUL 1999)**L-317.1 INTRODUCTION**

This Request for Proposal (RFP) is for C4I Testing, Integration, and Installation (CTII).

L-317.2 OFFEROR QUESTIONS REGARDING SOLICITATION

Offerors may submit questions concerning, or request clarification of, any aspect of this RFP. Questions shall only be provided in writing via email to the following email address: heidi.radaford@navy.mil no later than fifteen (15) calendar days before the closing date of this RFP. The Government may make available to the general public any offeror questions and requests for clarifications and any Government responses to such questions and requests for clarifications; therefore, offerors are hereby instructed not to submit comments of a proprietary nature. Offerors are also advised that the Government may not respond to questions and requests for clarifications.

L-317.3 TIME & DATE FOR RECEIPT OF PROPOSALS

The deadline for the Government's receipt of proposals is **2:00PM PST on 12 February 2014**. Submissions are subject to the late proposal provisions of FAR 52.215-1, "Instructions to Offerors-Competitive Acquisition". All times are local time in San Diego, California.

L-317.4 MANDATORY REQUIREMENT

In the event that a proposal contains a deficiency in the following mandatory area, the proposal SHALL be determined to be unacceptable regardless of an otherwise overall acceptable rating and not considered for further evaluation: Within 60 days of contract award, the contractor shall establish and maintain sufficient office space for the performance of this contract to include production for cable fabrication, testing, and material storage, within 25 miles of Joint Base Charleston, North Charleston, SC. The contractor shall provide a facility with a minimum of 2,000 square feet. Offerors shall provide a statement and supporting evidence e.g. floor plan, lease agreement, etc. with its facility space availability in response to the mandatory requirement in Volume III Contracts Documents of the offeror's proposal, Section F.

L-317.5 MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS

L-317.5.1 The offeror shall print or type its name on the Schedule and each continuation sheet of the RFP thereof on which page an entry is made.

L-317.5.2 Proposals submitted in response to this RFP must contain comprehensive information on all pertinent aspects of the effort being offered to enable the Government to evaluate the offeror's understanding of, and capability to accomplish, all the stated requirements covered in the Performance Work Statement (PWS). Throughout the proposal, the offeror shall provide sufficient detail to substantiate the validity of all stated claims. Proposals shall be submitted in accordance with the instructions herein. Non-conformance with the RFP requirements may render the proposal unresponsive and removed from further consideration. An offeror's proposal is presumed to represent their best efforts to respond to the solicitation. **Further, the offeror shall indicate that the proposal is in compliance with each requirement of the RFP and shall explain how compliance is achieved.** The proposal must demonstrate how the offeror proposes to comply with the requirements of the RFP. Clarity, completeness and conciseness are essential, and the overall quality of the proposal will be evaluated in the context of being representative of the offeror's capabilities. Responses must adequately address all specific RFP requirements.

L-317.5.3 The proposal should only contain material that is directly related to the PWS or is in response to the RFP. Statements such as "the offeror understands," and "the offeror shall/can comply," along with responses that paraphrase the RFP, are considered inadequate. Phrases such as "standard procedures will be employed" or "well known techniques will be used," without a specific Government or industry reference, will be considered inadequate and unsatisfactory.

L-317.5.4 Unnecessarily elaborate presentations, elaborate artwork, expensive paper, and expensive visual aids are not desired and may be considered as an indication of the offeror's lack of cost consciousness.

L-317.5.5 Validity of Proposals. Proposals submitted in response to this solicitation shall be valid for **270 days** from the solicitation closing date.

The offeror is to identify its cognizant Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) and Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) Offices in the Volume II Cost Proposal, providing the following for each cognizant office:

Point of Contact Name,
Address,
Telephone Number,
Email Address, and
FAX Number.

The offeror shall submit one (1) identical copy of the cost/price proposal to their DCAA Office, as further explained below.

L-317.6 PROPOSAL ORGANIZATION

The offeror's proposal submitted in response to this solicitation shall be unclassified and consist of three (3) separate Volumes:

Volume I: Technical Approach, Management Approach, and Past Performance Proposal
Volume II: Cost Proposal
Volume III: Contract Documents

Offerors shall submit an electronic copy as specified below at L-349 "Electronic Submission of Proposal: two (2) hard copies of Volume I, two (2) hard copies of Volume II, two (2) hard copies of Volume III, and three (3) CD ROMs, one for each volume.

L-317.7 SUBMISSION OF PAPER AND CD COPIES

Electronic copies, in accordance with L-349, must contain separate files for Cost and Technical/Management files. Paper copies of the proposal shall be submitted as follows:

1. **Binding and Labeling:** Each volume of the proposal shall be separately bound in a 3-ring binder. A cover sheet shall be affixed to each volume, clearly marked as to the volume number, the copy number, the RFP identification and the offeror's name. The volume and copy numbers shall appear on the spine of the volume binder to permit rapid accounting when the volume is placed in a vertical position in a storage cabinet. CD copies must be provided for each volume.
2. **Format:** The proposal shall be on 8 1/2" × 11" white bond paper with single-spaced typed lines, including figures, glossaries, table of contents, and cover sheets. Each sheet shall be printed on one side only. Type size shall be Times New Roman and no smaller than 12 point in the text, 10 point in spreadsheets, and 6 point on drawings, figures, and tables. Foldouts may be used, but shall be no larger than 11" × 17", shall be printed on one side only, and shall count as two pages. Standard margins shall be a minimum of one inch, excluding header and footer. The volumes shall contain a glossary of abbreviations and acronyms used and an explanation of each. No pen and ink changes are allowed.
3. **Numbering:** Pages shall be numbered consecutively within each section, showing volume, section, and page. As an example, page 19 of Volume I, Section 3 would be numbered I-3-19.

The format and numbering requirements listed above apply likewise to the electronic and CD copies.

Paper copy and CD shall be submitted to:

ADDRESS: Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command
Attn: Heidi Radaford, PCO, Code 2.1B
Bldg. OT-4, Room 1015
4301 Pacific Highway
San Diego, CA 92110-3127

NOTE:

1. *The electronic, paper, and CD copies of the proposal must be identical. If the electronic documents are not identical, the paper copy and/or CD will be rejected.*
2. *The paper and CD copies shall be postmarked or hand delivered prior to the receipt due date and time listed in the RFP.*

L-317.8 PROPOSAL FORMAT

In addition to all other requirements of this solicitation, each offeror shall demonstrate its capability by means of a detailed written proposal in each of the areas indicated under Section M – Evaluation Factors

for Award. **Proposals submitted for consideration for award must address the full scope of the solicitation. Proposals which address only part of the solicitation will be considered unacceptable.**

Offerors' proposal volumes shall include the following:

# OF HARD COPIES	ITEM	LIMITATIONS
Two (2) Hard Copies	VOLUME I: TECHNICAL PROPOSAL	
	Factor 1. Technical Approach	Twenty-five (25) pages maximum (excluding Subfactor 4 (Data Rights))
	Subfactor 1: Systems Engineering	
	Subfactor 2: Production and Integration	
	Subfactor 3: Sample Technical Task	
	Subfactor 4: Data Rights	
	Factor 2. Management Approach	Thirty-five (35) pages maximum (excluding Subfactor 4 (Small Business Utilization))
	Subfactor 1: Program Management/Execution Plan	
	Subfactor 2: Sample Management Task	
	Subfactor 3: Key Personnel	
	Subfactor 4: Small Business Utilization	
	Factor 3. Past Performance	Prime contractor: Three (3) pages per reference max. Subcontractors: Three (3) pages per reference max. No page limitation on PPIRS or CPARS.
Two (2) Hard Copies	VOLUME II: COST PROPOSAL	
	Factor 4. Cost Proposal	Cost/Labor information compatible with Microsoft Excel 2007
Two (2) Hard Copies	VOLUME III: CONTRACT DOCUMENTS	
	Section A: Letter of Transmittal, Completed Standard Form (SF) 33, and Completed RFP Section B through K	Three (3) pages maximum, excluding SF 33 and Section B-K of the RFP
	Section B: Exceptions To The RFP	No page limit
	Section C: Security clearance levels as required by DD Form 254	No page limit
	Section D: Organizational Conflict of Interest Mitigation Plan(s)	No page limit
	Section E: Response to Mandatory Requirement	No page limit

Note: Failure to submit complete information in the manner above may be considered a “no response” and may result in the exclusion of the proposal from further consideration.

All material in excess of the page limits will neither be read nor evaluated.

Do not include cost information in any volume other than the Cost Proposal.

L-317.9 PROPOSAL CONTENT

Each volume of the proposal shall be submitted in accordance with L-317.5 “Minimum Requirements”, L-317.6 “Proposal Organization”, and L-349 “Electronic Submission of Proposals” to permit a detailed evaluation. Proposals are to be neat, legible and orderly. Content is more important than quantity.

Proposals shall correlate directly and sequentially with the following specific proposal preparation instructions. Proposals shall be complete and self-sufficient, relate exactly to what is requested and proposed, and strictly adhere to the requirements of this solicitation. Use of documentation by reference, and not incorporated into the proposal, will not be allowed. Where cross-referencing is used, the volume, attachment, exhibit and paragraph numbers, as appropriate, shall be referenced.

Tables of contents, blank pages, coversheets, requirements compliance matrices, lists of tables, lists of drawings, lists of figures, glossaries, and lists of proprietary data do not count against the page limitations.

TECHNICAL PROPOSAL (VOLUME I)

General Guidelines for Content

Each offeror shall submit a technical proposal to enable the Government to make a thorough evaluation and arrive at a sound determination as to whether or not the proposed approach/services will meet the requirements of the Government. To this end, each technical proposal shall be so specific, detailed, and complete as to clearly and fully demonstrate that the prospective contractor has a thorough knowledge and understanding of the requirements and has valid and practical solutions for any technical problems. Each proposal must be sufficiently adequate to demonstrate how it is proposed to comply with the requirements of the PWS, with a full explanation of techniques and procedures. The contractor’s discussion in each section must include sufficient detail to allow the Government to adequately evaluate the contractor’s ability to accomplish the proposal requirements in accordance with Section M.

Wherever relevant, the offeror is encouraged to use cross-references to the applicable sections of the proposal rather than repeating that information in the several sections of this Volume. Hypertext links shall be used in the electronic version. **No cost information shall be included in this technical proposal.** Proposals that do not present sufficient information to permit complete technical evaluation by the Government may be rejected.

Offerors shall prepare Volume I in three (3) separate Factors as follows:

- Factor 1. Technical Approach
- Factor 2. Management Approach
- Factor 3. Past Performance

VOLUME 1 – FACTOR 1: TECHNICAL APPROACH

The offeror shall clearly demonstrate the proposed technical approach and the ability of that approach to meet the requirements of the PWS as follows:

Factor 1 – Technical Approach Subfactors are as follows:

<u>SUBFACTOR</u>	<u>TITLE</u>
1.1	Systems Engineering
1.2	Production and Integration
1.3	Sample Technical Task
1.4	Data Rights

Subfactor 1.1 SYSTEMS ENGINEERING

The offeror’s proposal shall describe their approach and ability to provide technical services that will satisfy the PWS requirements in three key areas: **Systems Engineering (PWS section 3.1), Design Engineering (PWS section 3.2), and Configuration Management (PWS section 3.3).**

Subfactor 1.2 PRODUCTION AND INTEGRATION

The offeror’s proposal shall describe their processes for production and integration as set forth in **PWS sections 3.4 (Platform C4I Testing) and 3.5 (Production/Integration).** The proposal shall focus upon the offeror’s knowledge, development, and use of platform test and integration plans, procedures, equipment, and documentation both in the TIF and on board ship.

The offeror’s proposal shall clearly demonstrate knowledge of the Total Ship Test Program (NAVSEA S9095-AD-TRQ-010/TSTP) concepts, Military test procedure development guidance (DoD-STD-2106) and processes and procedures for executing the testing requirements of the PWS.

Subfactor 1.3 SAMPLE TECHNICAL TASK

The offeror’s proposal shall provide an effective approach to the sample technical task below in accordance with PWS Sections 3.2 and 3.3:

An existing system in a C4I baseline previously installed on a ship class consists of the following elements: two 3-foot dishes, two below-deck standard 72-inch racks. A proposed new system for the ship class (this ship and all others going forward) includes the following elements: two 3.5-foot dishes, two 2-ft x 2-ft phased arrays, and three below-deck standard 72-inch racks. Assumptions include:

- Each platform is “delivered” the third year after procurement
 - During the first three years, C4I systems requirements are designed, analyzed, and integrated, material is procured, TIF is built, equipment is tested, integrated, delivered, and installed
 - Post-Sea Trials Support takes place in the fourth year for each platform

Present an innovative solution to incorporate the new system into the platform class design and complete installation of the new system on the current ship procurement. Include at a minimum the following factors:

- Basic scope of the tasks, including required Technical personnel
- Critical elements of the new system design (Technical Data Package)
- Risk areas associated with system changes, to include cost and schedule risks
- Cost-saving measures to be used/recommended

Subfactor 1.4 DATA RIGHTS

The Government desires “Government Purpose Rights” as defined in DFARS 252.227-7013 and DFARS 252.227-7014 for all noncommercial Technical Data/Computer Software (TD/CS) deliverables. For each item of noncommercial TD/CS that the offeror asserts should be delivered with specifically negotiated license rights or other non-standard rights (as discussed at DFARS 252.227-7013 “Rights in Technical Data – Noncommercial Items”, the offeror shall set forth a complete description of all such proposed non-standard restrictions on the Government’s ability to use, modify, release, perform, display, or disclose such technical data. Similarly, the Government desires the commercial equivalent of Government Purpose Rights for all commercial TD/CS deliverables. These rights would include the Government’s right to disclose the commercial TD/CS to third parties outside the Government, for transactions where the Government is a party (including procurements), but the third party recipient must sign an NDA that prevents any further use of the TD/CS. For all commercial TD/CS that the offeror (including its sub-offerors or suppliers, or potential sub-offerors or suppliers, at any tier) intends to deliver with commercial license rights that are less than these rights, the offeror shall provide: (1) identification of the data or software; (2) basis for asserting restrictions; and (3) asserted rights category.

The offeror shall provide a completed copy of the Section K certification DFARS 252.227-7017, “Identification and Assertion of Use, Release, or Disclosure Restrictions,” identifying what, if any, restrictions to the Government’s rights to use, release or disclose the technical data that will exist for each and every CDRL to be delivered under this contract. The offeror shall also provide a completed copy of the Section K certification DFARS 252.227-7028, “Technical Data or Computer Software Previously Delivered to the Government” (JUN 1995), identifying all noncommercial technical data that it intends to deliver with other than Government Purpose Rights and that are identical or substantially similar to technical data that the offeror has delivered to, or is obligated to deliver to, the Government under any contract or subcontract.

If there are any costs associated with receipt of Government Purpose Rights or costs associated with license fees for commercial TD/CS licenses, the offeror shall provide those proposed costs in the Cost Volume, and the Government may, but is not obligated to, modify the resulting contract to include those costs as an Option CLIN to Section B of the RFP. The offeror shall also complete and provide with their proposal the Data Rights table set forth in Section B as part of their response to this Subfactor. The table in Section B delineates the Government’s technical data documentation rights by CDRL item. The rights classification would only be applicable to the extent the CDRL item or parts thereof meet the definition of technical data.

An offeror will not be deemed non-responsive if it offers to provide rights more restrictive than Government Purpose Rights on any portion of the technical data, and/or software to be delivered under this contract for which it is entitled to assert those restrictions pursuant to the DFARS 252.227-7013 and 252.227-7014; nor is the Government’s goal of acquiring Government Purpose Rights a condition of award; rather, it is a factor in the source selection decision.

VOLUME 1 – FACTOR 2: MANAGEMENT APPROACH

The offeror’s proposal shall clearly demonstrate the proposed Management Approach as follows:

Factor 2 – Management Approach Subfactors are as follows:

<u>SUBFACTOR</u>	<u>TITLE</u>
2.1	Program Management/Execution Plan
2.2	Sample Management Task

- 2.3 Key Personnel
- 2.4 Small Business Utilization

Subfactor 2.1 PROGRAM MANAGEMENT/EXECUTION PLAN

The offeror shall describe its approach and capability for managing all aspects of the program. The offeror’s proposal shall clearly demonstrate an understanding of the overall task with respect to design, execution, and delivery of an integrated product as described in **Task Order Management (PWS Section 4.1); Quality Control and Quality Assurance (PWS Section 4.2); Platform Logistics Support (PWS Section 4.3); Material Management (PWS Section 4.4); Systems Packaging and Transportation (PWS Section 4.5); Crew Support and Familiarization (PWS Section 4.6); Communications Security (PWS Section 5.1.1); Facilities (PWS Section 1.2.2)**, and address the approach for identifying and managing schedule dependencies to meet the requirements. The offeror’s proposal shall also address its approach to provide planning, direction, coordination, control, and quality assurance for all CTII activities within the offeror’s organization and subcontractors.

The offeror’s proposal shall clearly describe the strategy for managing shipyard installation and support including: installation planning, installation preparation, system installation or support, technical support, evaluation reporting, trials support, and pre- and post-trial support to the designated installation site.

Additionally, the offeror shall describe any certifications and qualifications such as Capability Maturity Model Integration (CMMI) and ISO 9000 that may indicate a defined standard for processes and procedures.

Subfactor 2.2 SAMPLE MANAGEMENT TASK

The offeror shall provide an approach to the below sample management task in accordance with PWS Sections 3.26, 3.27, 3.4, 3.5, 4.0, and 5.0.

This scenario involves the procurement and delivery of three different nominal platforms as shown in the following table, with the following assumptions:

- Each platform includes 25 C4I systems, consisting of a total 100 racks (50 Program of Record (POR) racks; 50 non-POR racks) plus 4,000 cables to be built
- Schedule below shows years of platform procurement
- Each platform is “delivered” the third year after procurement
 - During the first three years, C4I systems requirements are designed, analyzed, and integrated, material is procured, TIF is built, equipment is tested, integrated, delivered, and installed
 - Post-Sea Trials Support takes place in the fourth year for each platform
- Each platform undergoes a C4I Baseline “Tech Refresh” after 3 years
- WBS Elements: 1.0 Management; 2.0 Requirements / Design; 3.0 TIF; 4.0 Ship Installation; 5.0 Fleet Support

Platform Procurement Schedule

Platform	Platform Procurement Quantities					
	FY00	FY01	FY02	FY03	FY04	FY05
A	1	0	3	0	1	0
B	1	1	3	1	1	1
C	3	3	3	3	3	3

Based on the above, develop an innovative solution to address the following factors:

Program Management

- TIF Concepts: Identify a basic TIF strategy (including schedule, task descriptions, material procurement, stand up, execution, and packaging and shipping of the C4I suite)
- Identify personnel and phasing plan on a total platform quantity basis
 - Keep at given WBS elements given above
 - For change in staffing elements, identify source(s) for personnel (e.g., shared, hired, furloughed, etc.)
- Identify any cost-saving measures related to schedule, staffing, and material management that will be used/recommended

Subfactor 2.3 KEY PERSONNEL

To perform effectively under this contract, the contractor's personnel must possess certain knowledge and experience related to the work to be performed. Key Personnel's relevant education and experience will be evaluated to assess the Offeror's ability to perform the requirements identified in the PWS. A description of the education and experience required for each of the labor categories is specified in the "Key Personnel Qualifications" section below. Resumes shall be no more than two (2) pages in length and shall be provided for each individual proposed as one of the following Key Personnel:

KEY PERSONNEL LABOR CATEGORIES

Program Manager (1)

Senior Engineer (1)

Configuration Manager (1)

Platform Manager (2), one for Force Level Platform (CVN, CVN RCOH, LHA/LHD, and LPD/LSD/LX(R)), and one for Unit Level Ships (e.g., LCS, Frigates, JHSV, etc.)

To facilitate proposal evaluation, all resumes shall be in the format in Section L, Attachment 11 (Resume Format) to this solicitation. Resumes that do not conform may be considered unacceptable.

Offerors are advised that by submission of a resume, the offeror is understood to affirm that the individual shall be made available upon award of a resultant contract to the extent noted in the resume, with the exception of Platform Managers, who shall be made available according to the issuance of the first Task Order for each different platform or the first unit level ship.

KEY PERSONNEL QUALIFICATIONS

The contractor shall provide personnel who are fully qualified and competent to perform the full range of tasks described in this solicitation. Proposed Key Personnel shall meet the following minimum qualification requirements:

Position Title: Program Manager

Education/General Experience:

- MA/MS in Business or Engineering or equivalent and at least 8 years of program management experience or
- BA/BS in Business or Engineering or equivalent and at least 10 years of program management experience

Specialized Experience:

- At least 4 years of experience managing shipboard engineering, integration, installations and testing of C4I or combat systems,
- At least 5 years of experience managing multi-site installation, production, and integration efforts, and
- At least 5 years of experience leading teams to manage systems engineering and production efforts, schedules, risks, and Government contracts

Position Title: Senior Engineer

Education / General Experience:

- MS in Computer Science/Engineering, or equivalent, and at least 8 years of engineering experience in system concept formulation, system and subsystem design analysis, interface design analysis, network design, modeling and simulation, communication information systems concept formulation/design/analysis in the field of C4I or combat systems, subsystems, and equipment or
- BS in Computer Science/Engineering, or equivalent, and at least 10 years of engineering experience in system concept formulation, system and subsystem design analysis, interface design analysis, network design, modeling and simulation, communication information systems concept formulation/design/analysis in the field of C4I or combat systems, subsystems, and equipment

Specialized Experience:

- 5 years of experience with military C4I or combat systems

Position Title: Configuration Manager

Education / General Experience:

- MS in Computer Science/Engineering, or equivalent, and at least 3 years of configuration planning, management, and control of electronic equipment and C4I or combat systems or
- BS in Computer Science/Engineering, or equivalent, and at least 5 years of configuration planning, management, and control of electronic equipment and C4I or combat systems

Specialized Experience:

- 3 years of experience with military C4I or combat systems, managing alteration information, system hierarchy structure, and requirement documents.

Position Title: Platform Manager (total of 2 managers)

Education / General Experience:

- MS in Electrical/Electronic Engineering, Computer Science/Engineering, Business Management, or equivalent, and at least 3 years of program management, leading teams in systems engineering and production efforts (including design, integration, installation, and testing of C4I or combat systems), schedules, risks, and Government contracts or
- BS in Electrical/Electronic Engineering, Computer Science/Engineering, Business Management, or equivalent, and at least 5 years of program management, leading teams in systems engineering and production efforts (including design, integration, installation, and testing of C4I or combat systems), schedules, risks, and Government contracts

Specialized Experience:

- 3 years of experience with military C4I or combat systems, performing analyses and studies, design engineering, and requirements analysis on Navy ships

Subfactor 2.4 SMALL BUSINESS UTILIZATION

Offerors, unless otherwise exempt due to being a small business* concern or a company performing outside of any state, territory, or possession of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, shall, in accordance with FAR 19.7 and FAR 52.219-9, submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan. Failure to submit and negotiate a Small Business Subcontracting Plan acceptable to the Contracting Officer shall make the offer ineligible for award of a contract.

Small Business Category	SPAWAR Target (Based upon percentage of subcontracted amount)
Small Business	37%
Small Disadvantaged Business	5%
Women-Owned Small Business	5%
Veteran-Owned Small Business	3%
HUB Zone	3%
Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business	1%

**Small Businesses include Small Disadvantaged Businesses, Women-Owned Small Businesses, Veteran-Owned Small Businesses, Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Businesses, HUBZone Small Businesses and Historically Black Colleges or Universities and Minority Institutions.*

Large Business Concerns shall describe the extent to which their companies have identified and committed to provide for participation by Small Business Concerns, Small Disadvantaged Concerns, Women-Owned Small Business Concerns, Veteran-Owned Small Business Concerns, HUBZone Small Business Concerns and Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business Concerns in the performance requirements addressed within this solicitation. The offeror shall provide sufficient information to demonstrate that the tasks assigned the selected Small Business subcontractors are meaningful in the overall success of the program and also broaden the subcontractor's technical capability. The offeror shall describe their management approach for enhancing Small Disadvantaged, Women-Owned Small Business, Veteran-Owned Small Business, HUBZone Small Business, and Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business subcontractor's technical capability. Of special interest is the amount and type of work to be performed by the subcontractor(s). The offeror shall explain the reasons for and advantages of selecting particular subcontractors.

Large Business Concerns shall also provide evidence of the extent to which they have met small business subcontracting goals on previous contracts/orders. To demonstrate previous goal achievement, the Offeror shall submit the two most recently filed Individual Subcontract Reports (ISR) (formerly SF 294) for each of their prime contracts identified in Factor 3 Past Performance.

A table that lists all their proposed first tier subcontractors individually by name with their addresses and their business type (large, small, small disadvantaged, women-owned, HUB Zone, veteran-owned, service-disabled veteran-owned small) as determined by the SBA size standard for the specific work being subcontracted. The table shall also include:

- a. The principal service being provided by the subcontractor, and

b. The complexity of the service provided. A brief narrative on complexity of subcontract services must describe advanced professional skills or application of innovative technologies.

A sample table is provided below:

Name of 1st Tier Subcontractor	Subcontractor Address	Type of Business (Large, SB, HUB Zone, SDB (incl. HBCU/MI), WOSB, VOSB, SDVOSB) <i>List all Applicable Categories</i>	Principal Supply/ Service Provided	Complexity of Product/Service Provided (Brief Narrative)
XYZ Corp.	123 Main St. Anytown, NY 01345	Large	Castings	Manufactured to .01 tolerance
Acme, Ltd.	456 First Ave. Somewhere, NY 54321	SB, SDB, VOSB	Logistics Software	Utilizing ISO 9000 and S100D standards with XML

The System for Award Management (SAM) (<https://www.sam.gov>) database will be viewed to verify the small business category or categories of the proposed small businesses in the table. The offerors shall list all applicable business types for which each subcontractor qualifies. The definition of a small business concern is as set forth in 13 CFR 121.105.

NOTE 1: This information is for source selection evaluation purposes only. The Small Business Subcontracting Plan shall be submitted by the offeror in accordance with FAR 52.219-9 stating cumulative subcontracting goals in both dollars and percentages of total subcontracted amount.

NOTE 2: Offerors are reminded that all goals accepted and incorporated into the resulting contract will be subject to FAR Clause 52.219-16, "Liquidated Damages-Subcontracting Plan."

NOTE 3: Offerors are reminded that the Small Business Subcontracting Plan (required from large businesses only) shall correlate with the proposal information on small business participation.

VOLUME I - FACTOR 3: PAST PERFORMANCE

Factor 3 – Past Performance

Using the format provided with Attachment 9, Relevant Experience Form, offerors (prime and/or significant subcontractors) are to provide relevant experience information on current contracts performed by the offeror and/or its proposed significant subcontractors for efforts similar and relevant to the requirements of this Request for Proposal. This data shall be submitted for (3) three of the most current and relevant contracts. Significant subcontractor is defined as subcontractor whose proposed cost is greater than 10% of the total of prime contractor's cost. Current is defined as a contract performed within the last five years.

If offeror does not have relevant Federal Government contracts experience, then provide data on state and local government or commercial contracts, in that order, to complete this report.

Offerors that have no record of past performance (i.e., new businesses) must submit a signed and dated statement to that effect.

The Government does not assume the duty to search for data to cure the problems it finds in the information provided by the offeror. The burden of providing thorough and complete past performance information remains with the offeror.

The Government reserves the right to use past performance information obtained from sources other than those identified by the offeror. The Government reserves the right to contact references for verification or additional information. This past performance information will be used for the evaluation of past performance.

The submitted Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) or Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) reports shall not count against the page limitations established for this proposal volume.

FACTOR 4 - COST PROPOSAL (VOLUME II)

General Guidelines for Content

(a) COST PROPOSAL

The offeror's Cost Proposal shall consist of the following:

- (1) Costs required by Section B
- (2) Cost Proposal in accordance with the labor mix detailed in (b) below. The offeror shall populate the Government-provided Prime and Subcontractor Cost spreadsheets/templates (Attachment 10).
- (3) An explanation of all direct and indirect rates along with any supporting documentation to validate proposed rates i.e. Forward Pricing Rate Agreements (FPRA).
- (4) Offeror and any proposed significant subcontractors shall provide a copy of the Cost Proposal in Microsoft Excel 2007 or compatible format, to the cognizant DCAA office. This is in addition to the copies to be provided to the PCO per L-317.7 above. (A significant subcontractor is defined as a subcontractor that will be performing at least 10 percent of the total of the prime contractor's cost.) The Microsoft Excel version of the proposal must be functional with working formulas, i.e., NOT read-only. The Microsoft Excel version of the proposal should be annotated with the solicitation number and closing date and advise DCAA as follows: **'DO NOT DISCARD OR DESTROY. REQUEST FROM SPAWAR HEADQUARTERS SAN DIEGO PENDING.'**
- (5) Professional Employees Compensation Plan
- (6) Statement of the offeror's policy on Uncompensated Overtime (if any)
- (7) Identification of cognizant DCAA and DCMA, name, address, telephone number, fax number, and e-mail address
- (8) Advise if offeror waives the evaluation adjustment under FAR 52.219-4, "Notice of Price Evaluation Preference for HUBZone Small Business Concerns." Reference Section I.
- (9) Wage Determination

(b) COST/LABOR INFORMATION

- (1) The offeror shall complete Section B by proposing estimated cost and fixed fees for all CPFF, Cost, and FFP CLINs. The offeror should propose these costs in accordance with the labor mix (categories and hours) stated in **Section L-328**. However, if offerors elect to propose a level of labor effort and/or skill mix different than that identified in the solicitation, the offeror shall describe in detail in its technical proposal how it intends to fulfill the Government's requirement at the changed level of effort and/or skill mix. The Government will analyze this description for realism and may determine to adjust the offeror's costs upward if the lower level of effort is deemed unrealistic (See Section M on cost evaluation). Although **Section L-328** contains the Government's best estimate of the number of hours the contractor will be required to provide during contract performance based upon historical data and projections of future requirements, actual contract performance may vary from this estimate. Accordingly, the Government cannot guarantee the contractor will perform either the estimated quantities of man-hours shown for individual labor categories or the total estimated hours. Labor rates for all individuals are based on the employee's home office location. For example, if an individual employed/based in Charleston, SC, travels from there to Mobile, AL, the wage determination does not change to Mobile, AL, because Mobile is only the travel destination.

See Section L-328 for breakout of all labor categories - Government Estimate of Labor Categories, including Service Contract Act (SCA) Labor Categories, and the Estimated Number of Hours per Category

It is recognized that some of the Labor Category titles used in **Section L-328** may not exactly match the titles normally used in a particular company operation. Accordingly, in order to permit a rapid comparison between the anticipated labor team and the offeror's actual labor mix, each proposal must provide the following:

- (a) Direct labor rates related to the categories specified in the solicitation;
 - (b) A statement of the offeror's normally used nomenclature for each labor category included herein, together with a copy of the offeror's own position description for each labor category;
 - (c) A statement of any additional labor categories, estimated hours, and related qualifications for labor cost that will be a direct cost based on the offeror's accounting procedures (e.g. management and administrative labor costs); and
 - (d) Subcontractor labor hours at all tiers should be shown in the same manner as described in paragraphs (a) through (c) above.
- (3) As discussed in FAR 52.237-10, "Identification of Uncompensated Overtime", actual hourly rates submitted shall be derived by dividing the proposed individual's actual annual salary by 2,080 hours, which is based on a 40-hour work week. Any uncompensated overtime proposed shall be clearly identified within the cost proposal and will be evaluated in accordance with FAR 52.237-10 and L-331 of this solicitation.
 - (4) All labor categories to be used in the performance of the proposed contract shall be included in the Government provided Prime and Subcontractor Cost spreadsheet/template (Attachment 10). All hours required by the solicitation and proposed shall be accounted for in the Attachment.

- (5) Failure to provide this information may impact the Government's evaluation of offeror's proposals. If this information is proprietary to subcontractors, it may be provided under separate cover. However, it must be easily identifiable and readily combined with the rest of the proposal.

(c) REQUIREMENT FOR INFORMATION OTHER THAN COST AND PRICING DATA

In accordance with FAR 15.403-3(b), the following information as prescribed below is required for the purposes of assisting the Contracting Officer in determining the cost realism of competing offers. The terms "Cost Realism" and "Information Other Than Cost or Pricing Data" are defined in FAR 2.101.

The offeror shall provide comprehensive narrative support for the Cost Proposal. Costs shall be summarized and presented for each contract line item. At a minimum, the offeror shall address separately the following areas to support proposed contract costs.

- (1) **ESTIMATING METHODOLOGY** - Explain, in whatever detail is required to demonstrate cost reasonableness and supportability, the methodology used to estimate each element of cost (e.g., labor, material, etc.). Enough data shall be provided so that independent cost analysis verification can be performed.

In all cases where cost estimates are based on past experience, the offeror shall identify the past experience, explain how the past experience relates to the current effort, and explain how cost data available from that experience were adapted to the current effort.

In all cases where cost estimates are based upon learning/improvement curve applications, identify the specific area subject to learning, the curve hypothesis (unit or cumulative) and the slope of the curve as a percentage. Also, the offeror shall explain what data were used to develop the slope, how these data relate to the current effort, and how entry into the learning curve was attained.

- (2) **DIRECT LABOR** - Identify the various labor categories required/intended for use under this contract including the number of labor hours, labor rates, and total cost for each labor category proposed for each year of the contract. The labor specified under this category shall only be for the prime contractor's direct labor and shall not include any subcontracted labor (see "Subcontracted Labor" below). For the Service Contract Act (SCA) categories, offerors are required to comply with the appropriate SCA occupation codes. If this solicitation requires work to be performed at both the Government and contractor sites, then the proposal must include company policy concerning any stipulations as to when Government site / contractor site rates are effective.

Current, actual unloaded rates are to be submitted for any proposed individual. A "proposed individual" is defined as a current employee specifically proposed to perform an estimated number of hours for a labor category. In accordance with the offeror's disclosed estimating system practices, average unloaded direct labor rates may be submitted for all remaining labor categories/hours, i.e., those labor categories/hours not accounted for under the proposed individual's data. Do not submit composite rates encompassing more than one labor category. This cost information shall include, at a minimum, the cost data elements contained in Attachment 10, Prime Contractor and Subcontractor Cost Spreadsheets/templates. Offerors should include additional elements such as overtime rates/hours, premium time rates/hours, etc. as applicable. Note: All labor categories shall be escalated for each year in

- the ordering period. Offerors shall use an annual labor escalation rate of 3% for each year in the ordering period for the SCA labor categories, which are subject to the applicable wage determinations, for cost realism purposes. For the non-SCA (exempt) labor categories, offerors shall use actuals, if known, or rates based on historical data, standard practice, or those accepted by DCAA for bidding purposes. The Cost Proposal must include supporting rationale for the escalation rate proposed.
- (3) **FRINGE BENEFITS** - If applicable and in accordance with offeror's normal accounting procedures, identify the fringe benefit rate(s) and total fringe benefit cost being proposed and identify the cost elements for which the fringe benefit rate is being applied.
- (4) **OVERHEAD** - Identify the current and/or projected overhead rate(s) and total overhead cost being proposed under this solicitation and identify the various cost elements for which overhead is being applied.
- (5) **SUBCONTRACTED LABOR** - Identify, if applicable, any proposed subcontracting labor intended for use under this contract. Identify the labor categories for which subcontracting is being proposed and include the subcontractor's direct labor rates, number of hours proposed for each labor category, fringe benefits, overhead, G&A, fee, etc., that has been submitted by the subcontractor to the prime contractor for consideration under this contract. For the SCA categories, offerors are required to comply with the appropriate SCA occupation codes. This information may be submitted by the subcontractor under separate cover directly to the Contracting Officer.
- (6) **OTHER COSTS:**
- (a) **Direct Costs** - Identify any other direct cost elements being proposed which are not included above but are applicable to offeror's cost proposal (e.g., royalties, Special Tooling, Material, Travel, Computer Usage, etc.). Refer to Clause L-329 "Other Direct Costs" paragraph (e). Include the basis for the proposed amount. If there are any costs associated with data rights, the offeror shall provide those proposed costs in the Cost Volume, and the Government may modify the resulting contract to include those costs as an Option CLIN to Section B of the RFP. Any costs associated with data rights shall be cost only and shall not be fee-bearing. The decision as to whether costs are handled as direct or indirect costs rests with the offeror, but shall be consistent with the offeror's approved cost accounting practices as disclosed in the offeror's Disclosure Statement, or consistent with the offeror's established practices if the offeror is not required to submit a Disclosure Statement.
- (b) **Indirect Costs** - Identify any other indirect cost element (e.g., Facilities Capital Cost of Money) being proposed which has not been included above and identify the various cost elements for which the rate is applied. Advise if the rates proposed are in accordance with any Forward Pricing Rate Agreements and period of the agreement.
- (7) **GENERAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE** - Identify the General and Administrative Expense (G&A) rate(s) and the total G&A cost proposed and identify the various cost elements for which the G&A is being applied.

- (8) ACCOUNTING SYSTEM - Provide information as to the offeror's fiscal year, and a general description of their cost accounting system. The same information shall be provided for major subcontractors.

The cost breakdown shall indicate the offeror's total estimated proposed price for each year and the cumulative proposed price for all years. Any information submitted must support the cost proposed. Include sufficient detail or cross references to clearly establish the relationship of the information provided to the cost proposed. Support any information provided by explanations or supporting rationale, as needed to permit the Contracting Officer and authorized representatives to evaluate the documentation.

The offeror's proposal shall include a completed RFP Section B for each CLIN. All dollar amounts provided in response to these instructions shall be rounded to the nearest whole dollar.

The names and telephone numbers of persons authorized to conduct negotiations, as well as the name of the official authorized to contractually bind the offeror's organization, shall be clearly identified in the Cost Proposal.

As this is a competitive acquisition and adequate price competition is anticipated, the price supporting documentation requested is not considered certified cost or pricing data and shall not be certified in accordance with FAR 15.403-5. Should adequate price competition not exist after receipt of proposals, the PCO reserves the right to obtain certified cost or pricing data pursuant to FAR Part 15. Offerors may not increase the price of their proposal after certified cost or pricing data is requested. By submitting a proposal, the Offeror grants the PCO, or an authorized representative, the right to examine records that form the basis of the pricing proposal. This examination and review can take place at any time before award.

(d) PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES COMPENSATION PLAN

Professional Employee Compensation Plans will be evaluated in accordance with FAR 52.222-46, "Evaluation of Compensation for Professional Employees". The plan is required on both key and non-key professional (exempt) employees. For subcontractors/individual team members, a plan is not required unless assigned a meaningful number of professional (exempt) key and non-key employees. The term "meaningful" is defined as the equivalent of five Full-Time-Equivalent work years of professional (exempt) employee hours (at least 9,400 hours annually). The offeror shall indicate which proposed employees under any resulting contract will be eligible for which of the benefits, and at what benefit level. The plan shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- (1) Section I - Salaries. The offeror shall submit proposed annual salaries for each category of professional employee to perform under the contract. The annual salaries shall be delineated for each year of performance specified in the contract. If fewer than 40 hours per week are worked, hours and hourly rates shall be specified. The salaries proposed shall track back to the cost proposal submitted. In addition, the total estimated annual hours and total estimated hours to be worked under the contract shall be included.
- (2) Section II - Fringe Benefits. The offeror shall submit proposed fringe benefits for professional employees to perform under the contract. The offeror shall specify each benefit proposed and also shall specify the percentage of the proposed fringe benefits to the proposed annual salary.

- (3) Section III - Supporting Documentation. The offeror shall submit supporting documentation/information for Sections (1) and (2) above. This documentation/information includes data such as recognized national and regional compensation surveys and studies of professional, public, and private organizations, used in establishing the proposed total compensation structure (see FAR 52.222-46).
- (4) Section IV - Other. The offeror may provide any other information deemed necessary.

Offerors are cautioned that failure to submit a professional employee's compensation plan as outlined above may constitute sufficient cause to justify rejection of the proposal.

CONTRACT DOCUMENTS (VOLUME III)

General Guidelines for Content

Offerors shall prepare Volume III: Contract Documents in five (5) Sections as follows:

Section A	Letter of Transmittal, Completed Standard Form (SF) 33, and Completed RFP Sections B through K
Section B	Exceptions To The RFP
Section C	Security Clearance Levels as Required by DD Form 254
Section D	Organizational Conflict of Interest Mitigation Plan(s)
Section E	Response to Mandatory Requirement

VOLUME III - SECTION A: LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL, COMPLETED STANDARD FORM (SF) 33, AND COMPLETED RFP SECTION B THROUGH K

The offeror's proposal shall include a cover letter on the offeror's letterhead stationery and signed by an executive of the company who possesses authority to contractually bind the offeror. The cover letter shall acknowledge receipt of all amendments (if any are issued) to the RFP. The submittal letter shall identify all enclosures being transmitted as part of the response to the RFP. The letter shall reference the RFP number and acknowledge that it transmits an offer in response to the RFP. It shall state: (1) Commercial and Government Entity (CAGE) number, (2) Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) Number, (3) Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN), (4) address(es) of the location(s) at which the offeror intends to perform the proposed effort, (5) the name, address and telephone number of the cognizant DCAA audit office, (6) the name, address and telephone number of the cognizant DCMA office, and (7) a statement that the proposal is valid for no less than **270** calendar days after the date established for receipt of offers. The above listed information (items 1-7) shall also be provided for proposed first tier subcontractors. If subcontracting with another company(ies) is proposed, a copy of the subcontractor agreement(s) shall be provided as an enclosure(s) to the cover letter.

The offeror's proposal shall provide a completed RFP to include completed SF33 and Sections B and K.

VOLUME III - SECTION B: EXCEPTIONS TO THE RFP

The offer shall identify any exceptions to the RFP.

VOLUME III – SECTION C: SECURITY CLEARANCE LEVELS AS REQUIRED BY DD FORM 254

Offerors shall document that all facilities and personnel proposed to perform this contract possess at a minimum the security clearance levels required by the RFP (DD Form 254).

VOLUME III – SECTION D: ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST MITIGATION PLAN(S)

The Offeror shall submit draft versions of any required OCI Mitigation Plans, consistent with the guidance contained in L-339 “Notice of Organizational Conflict of Interest”.

VOLUME III – SECTION E: RESPONSE TO MANDATORY REQUIREMENT

Offerors shall provide a statement in response to the mandatory requirement provided in L-317.4.

(End of provision)

L-328 ESTIMATED LEVEL OF EFFORT (DEC 1999)

The quantities of labor hours for each labor category shown below, which are to be used by the Offeror for computing total labor costs, represent the Government’s current best estimate of requirements. However, The Government can guarantee neither the estimated quantities of man-hours shown for individual labor categories nor the total estimated staff hours. It is recognized that some of the Labor Category titles used in the solicitation may not exactly match the titles normally used in a particular company operation. Accordingly, in order to permit a rapid comparison between the anticipated labor team shown below and the Offeror’s actual labor mix, each proposal must provide the following:

- (1) Direct labor rates related to the categories specified in the solicitation.
- (2) A statement of the Offeror’s normally used nomenclature for each labor category included herein, together with a copy of the Offeror’s own position description for each labor category.
- (3) A statement of any additional labor categories, estimated hours and related qualifications for labor cost that will be a direct cost based on the offeror’s accounting procedures (e.g. management and administrative labor costs.)
- (4) Subcontractor labor hours at all tiers should be shown in the same manner as described in paragraphs (1) through (3) above.

Contractor Site						
	1st Year Ordering Period	2nd Year Ordering Period	3rd Year Ordering Period	4th Year Ordering Period	5th year Ordering Period	Total
<i>Charleston, SC Area Straight Time</i>	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours
Program Manager	1,685	7,745	6,845	3,755	2,420	22,450
Project Manager	125	5,660	3,420	1,930	1,925	13,060
Senior Engineer	155	6,155	5,290	1,505	1,095	14,200
Engineer	130	3,250	2,950	620	495	7,445
Field Engineer III	1,075	20,050	13,110	7,540	6,675	48,450
Field Engineer II	270	9,055	3,155	2,185	1,745	16,410
Field Engineer I	105	6,115	5,090	1,645	1,510	14,465
Junior Engineer	60	6,920	5,135	2,050	1,610	15,775

<i>Straight Time</i>	Hours	Hours	Hours	Hours	Hours	Hours
Program Manager	1,110	1,145	850	1,700	850	5,655
Project Manager	490	1,040	615	1,230	615	3,990
Senior Engineer	615	1,400	705	1,405	705	4,830
Engineer	530	1,345	245	490	245	2,855
Field Engineer III	4,305	6,325	4,285	8,570	4,285	27,770
Field Engineer II	1,080	2,530	840	1,675	840	6,965
Field Engineer I	415	1,065	680	1,360	680	4,200
Junior Engineer	235	575	590	1,170	590	3,160
Systems Analyst	0	0	635	1,270	635	2,540
Configuration Mgr	320	865	410	820	410	2,825
Quality Assurance Specialist	40	40	35	70	35	220
Logistics Manager	0	0	0	1,040	4,940	5,980
Logistics Analyst	2,345	4,800	1,520	2,270	1,135	12,070
Senior Logistician	25	50	5	5	5	90
Logistics Technician	10	25	390	775	390	1,590
Management Analyst	470	1,065	390	785	390	3,100
Quality Control Inspector	730	730	205	405	205	2,275
SCA Categories						
Electronics Technician III	4,885	7,965	1,615	5,995	1,615	22,075
Electronics Technician II	8,110	11,025	2,930	7,380	2,930	32,375
Electronics Technician I	1,910	2,670	1,815	4,570	1,815	12,780
Engineering Technician III	2,600	7,800	915	1,830	915	14,060
Engineering Technician II	3,175	9,530	1,080	2,155	1,080	17,020
Engineering Technician I	1,780	5,340	1,350	2,705	1,350	12,525
Drafter/CAD Operator IV	430	2,580	940	1,860	940	6,750
Drafter/CAD Operator III	170	1,000	980	1,960	980	5,090
Technical Writer II	140	830	160	310	160	1,600
Total Hours	35,920	71,740	24,185	53,805	28,740	214,390
<i>Charleston, SC Area Overtime</i>	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours
SCA Categories						
Electronics Technician III	10	10	10	10	10	50
Electronics Technician II	10	10	10	10	10	50
Electronics Technician I	10	10	10	10	10	50
Engineering Technician III	10	10	10	10	10	50
Engineering Technician II	10	10	10	10	10	50
Engineering Technician I	10	10	10	10	10	50
Drafter/CAD Operator IV	10	10	10	10	10	50

Drafter/CAD Operator III	10	10	10	10	10	50
Technical Writer II	10	10	10	10	10	50
Total Hours	90	90	90	90	90	450
Norfolk, VA Area Straight Time	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours
Program Manager	0	0	0	0	0	0
Project Manager	2,270	4,540	2,270	2,270	2,270	13,620
Senior Engineer	695	1,380	695	935	935	4,640
Engineer	1,580	3,155	1,580	0	0	6,315
Field Engineer III	4,135	8,265	4,135	5,370	5,370	27,275
Field Engineer II	680	1,360	680	680	680	4,080
Field Engineer I	525	1,045	525	365	365	2,825
Junior Engineer	195	385	195	0	0	775
Systems Analyst	1,115	2,230	1,115	2,230	2,230	8,920
Configuration Mgr	505	1,010	505	960	960	3,940
Quality Assurance Specialist	85	165	85	0	0	335
Logistics Manager	0	0	0	0	0	0
Logistics Analyst	900	1,790	900	1,395	1,395	6,380
Senior Logistician	30	60	30	0	0	120
Logistics Technician	275	550	275	550	550	2,200
Management Analyst	890	1,775	890	965	965	5,485
Quality Control Inspector	670	1,335	670	1,335	1,335	5,345
SCA Categories						
Electronics Technician III	2,580	5,555	2,980	4,650	4,650	20,415
Electronics Technician II	4,015	8,100	4,095	5,965	5,965	28,140
Electronics Technician I	2,965	5,925	2,965	5,805	5,805	23,465
Engineering Technician III	625	1,245	625	170	170	2,835
Engineering Technician II	1,755	3,500	1,755	2,515	2,515	12,040
Engineering Technician I	920	1,830	920	1,015	1,015	5,700
Drafter/CAD Operator IV	445	885	445	65	65	1,905
Drafter/CAD Operator III	280	795	520	50	50	1,695
Technical Writer II	70	130	70	95	95	460
Total Hours	28,205	57,010	28,925	37,385	37,385	188,910
Norfolk, VA Area Overtime	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours
SCA Categories						
Electronics Technician III	10	10	10	10	10	50
Electronics Technician II	10	10	10	10	10	50

Electronics Technician I	10	10	10	10	10	50
Engineering Technician III	10	10	10	10	10	50
Engineering Technician II	10	10	10	10	10	50
Engineering Technician I	10	10	10	10	10	50
Drafter/CAD Operator IV	10	10	10	10	10	50
Drafter/CAD Operator III	10	10	10	10	10	50
Technical Writer II	10	10	10	10	10	50
Total Hours	90	90	90	90	90	450
<i>Pascagoula, MS Area</i>	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total
<i>Straight Time</i>	Hours	Hours	Hours	Hours	Hours	Hours
Program Manager	0	0	0	0	0	0
Project Manager	0	840	3,340	3,360	2,550	10,090
Senior Engineer	0	930	3,720	2,810	60	7,520
Engineer	0	0	0	0	0	0
Field Engineer III	0	6,700	26,780	20,200	330	54,010
Field Engineer II	0	5,340	21,340	16,010	0	42,690
Field Engineer I	0	1,560	6,240	5,860	3,540	17,200
Junior Engineer	0	1,130	4,500	3,640	780	10,050
Systems Analyst	0	20	80	60	0	160
Configuration Mgr	0	450	1,800	1,350	0	3,600
Quality Assurance Specialist	0	50	195	160	30	435
Logistics Manager	0	0	0	0	0	0
Logistics Analyst	0	1,600	6,400	4,820	70	12,890
Senior Logistician	0	100	380	290	0	770
Logistics Technician	0	0	0	0	0	0
Management Analyst	0	1,160	4,640	4,110	1,900	11,810
Quality Control Inspector	0	40	155	125	5	325
SCA Categories						
Electronics Technician III	0	6,500	13,140	9,795	640	30,075
Electronics Technician II	0	7,000	15,100	11,175	530	33,805
Electronics Technician I	0	3,910	4,840	3,660	915	13,325
Engineering Technician III	0	670	2,670	2,005	0	5,345
Engineering Technician II	0	735	1,880	1,465	240	4,320
Engineering Technician I	0	475	1,890	1,420	0	3,785
Drafter/CAD Operator IV	0	620	2,460	1,850	0	4,930
Drafter/CAD Operator III	0	290	1,140	860	0	2,290
Technical Writer II	0	150	600	460	30	1,240
Total Hours	0	40,270	123,290	95,485	11,620	270,665

<i>Pascagoula, MS Area Overtime</i>	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours
SCA Categories						
Electronics Technician III	0	10	10	10	10	40
Electronics Technician II	0	10	10	10	10	40
Electronics Technician I	0	10	10	10	10	40
Engineering Technician III	0	10	10	10	0	30
Engineering Technician II	0	10	10	10	10	40
Engineering Technician I	0	10	10	10	0	30
Drafter/CAD Operator IV	0	10	10	10	0	30
Drafter/CAD Operator III	0	10	10	10	0	30
Technical Writer II	0	10	10	10	10	40
Total Hours	0	90	90	90	50	320
<i>San Diego, CA Area Straight Time</i>	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours
Program Manager	0	0	0	0	0	0
Project Manager	0	0	0	0	0	0
Senior Engineer	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineer	0	0	0	0	0	0
Field Engineer III	0	0	0	0	0	0
Field Engineer II	0	0	0	0	0	0
Field Engineer I	0	0	0	0	0	0
Junior Engineer	0	0	0	0	0	0
Systems Analyst	0	0	0	0	0	0
Configuration Mgr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Quality Assurance Specialist	0	0	0	0	0	0
Logistics Manager	0	0	0	0	0	0
Logistics Analyst	0	0	0	0	0	0
Senior Logistician	0	0	0	0	0	0
Logistics Technician	0	0	0	0	0	0
Management Analyst	0	0	0	0	0	0
Quality Control Inspector	0	0	0	0	0	0
SCA Categories						
Electronics Technician III	0	0	0	0	3,930	3,930
Electronics Technician II	0	0	0	0	195	195
Electronics Technician I	0	0	0	0	10	10
Engineering Technician III	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering Technician II	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering Technician I	0	0	0	0	0	0

Drafter/CAD Operator IV	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drafter/CAD Operator III	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technical Writer II	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Hours	0	0	0	0	4,135	4,135
San Diego, CA Area Overtime	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours
SCA Categories						
Electronics Technician III	0	0	0	0	10	10
Electronics Technician II	0	0	0	0	10	10
Electronics Technician I	0	0	0	0	10	10
Engineering Technician III	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering Technician II	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering Technician I	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drafter/CAD Operator IV	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drafter/CAD Operator III	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technical Writer II	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Hours	0	0	0	0	30	30
Mobile, AL Area Straight Time	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours
Program Manager	0	0	0	0	0	0
Project Manager	0	0	0	0	0	0
Senior Engineer	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineer	0	0	0	0	0	0
Field Engineer III	0	0	0	0	0	0
Field Engineer II	0	0	0	0	0	0
Field Engineer I	0	0	0	0	0	0
Junior Engineer	0	0	0	0	0	0
Systems Analyst	0	0	0	0	0	0
Configuration Mgr	0	0	0	0	0	0
Quality Assurance Specialist	0	0	0	0	0	0
Logistics Manager	0	0	0	0	0	0
Logistics Analyst	0	0	0	0	0	0
Senior Logistician	0	0	0	0	0	0
Logistics Technician	0	0	0	0	0	0
Management Analyst	0	0	0	0	0	0
Quality Control Inspector	0	0	0	0	0	0
SCA Categories						
Electronics Technician III	0	3,595	1,795	0	0	5,390

Electronics Technician II	0	2,085	1,040	0	0	3,125
Electronics Technician I	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering Technician III	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering Technician II	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering Technician I	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drafter/CAD Operator IV	0	5,680	2,840	0	0	8,520
Drafter/CAD Operator III	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technical Writer II	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Hours	0	11,360	5,675	0	0	17,035
Mobile, AL Area Overtime	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours	Total Hours
SCA Categories						
Electronics Technician III	0	0	10	0	0	10
Electronics Technician II	0	0	10	0	0	10
Electronics Technician I	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering Technician III	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering Technician II	0	0	0	0	0	0
Engineering Technician I	0	0	0	0	0	0
Drafter/CAD Operator IV	0	0	10	0	0	10
Drafter/CAD Operator III	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technical Writer II	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Hours	0	0	30	0	0	30
Total Hours Contractor Site	10,460	102,575	65,090	41,930	32,495	252,550
Total Hours Gov't Site	64,305	180,650	182,375	186,945	82,140	696,415
Total Hours (Gov't & Contractor Site)	74,765	283,225	247,465	228,875	114,635	948,965

(End of provision)

The following have been deleted:

252.211-7001 Availability of Specifications, Standards, and Data Item MAY 2006
 Descriptions Not Listed in the Acquisition Streamlining and
 Standardization Information System (ASSIST), and Plans,
 Drawings, and Other Pertinent Documents

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

The following have been modified:

M-307 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND BASIS FOR AWARD (BEST VALUE) (DEC 1999)-- ALTERNATE I (JAN 2004)

(a) The contract resulting from this solicitation will be awarded to that offeror whose offer, conforming to the solicitation requirements, is determined to provide the “best value” to the Government. The “best value” determination will be based on the merits of the offer and the offeror’s capability. The “best value” may not necessarily be the proposal offering the lowest cost, nor receiving the highest technical rating. As specified in FAR 52.215-1, “Instructions to Offerors--Competitive Acquisition,” the Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions. An offer must be acceptable for the offeror to be eligible for award. **Offers that take exception to, or do not conform to the requirements stated herein or do not respond to the mandatory requirement will be determined unacceptable and will be rejected without further evaluation.**

(b) Proposals will be rated and ranked on the Evaluation Factors listed below. It should be noted that cost is not a numerically weighted Factor. Although non-cost Factors, when combined, are significantly more important than cost, cost is an important Factor and should be considered when preparing responsive proposals. The importance of cost as an Evaluation Factor will increase with the degree of equality of the proposals in relation to the remaining Evaluation Factors. When the offerors within the competitive range are considered essentially equal in terms of technical capability, or when cost is so significantly high as to diminish the value of the technical superiority to the Government, cost may become the determining Factor for award. In summary, cost/technical trade-offs will be made, and the extent to which one may be sacrificed for the other is governed only by the tests of rationality and consistency with the established evaluation factors.

List of Factors and Subfactors

FACTOR 1: TECHNICAL APPROACH

Subfactor 1.1: Systems Engineering

Subfactor 1.2: Production and Integration

Subfactor 1.3: Sample Technical Task

Subfactor 1.4: Data Rights

FACTOR 2: MANAGEMENT APPROACH

Subfactor 2.1: Program Management/Execution Plan

Subfactor 2.2: Sample Management Task

Subfactor 2.3: Key Personnel

Subfactor 2.4: Small Business Utilization

FACTOR 3: PAST PERFORMANCE

FACTOR 4: COST/PRICE

Relative Importance of Evaluation Factors/ Subfactors

- Factors 1 – 4 are in descending order of importance. Factors 1 – 3 combined are significantly more important than Factor 4.
- Subfactors 1.1 (Systems Engineering), 1.2 (Production and Integration), 1.3 (Sample Technical Task), and 1.4 (Data Rights) within Factor 1 (Technical Approach) are in descending order of importance. When combined, Subfactors 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 are significantly more important than Subfactor 1.4.
- Subfactors 2.1 (Program Management/Execution Plan), 2.2 (Sample Management Task), 2.3 (Key Personnel), and 2.4 (Small Business Utilization) within Factor 2 (Management Approach) are in descending order of importance. When combined, Subfactors 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 are significantly more important than Subfactor 2.4.

(c) Evaluation of an offeror's proposal shall be based on the information presented in the proposal and information available to the contracting office from sources deemed appropriate. Sources typically considered include the DCAA and DCMA offices, other contracts with the same firms for similar items or services, known commercial sources such as Data Resources, Inc., Standard and Poor's, etc. Proposals which are unrealistic in terms of technical or schedule commitments, or unrealistically high or low in terms of cost, may be deemed to be reflective of an inherent lack of technical competence, or indicative of a failure to comprehend the complexity and risks of the proposed work and may be grounds for rejection of the proposal. If the proposed contract requires the delivery of data, the quality of organization and writing reflected in the proposal will be considered to be an indication of the quality of organization and writing which would be prevalent in the proposed deliverable data. Subjective judgment on the part of the Government evaluators is implicit in the entire process.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

The Government's evaluation will consist of an analysis of offerors' proposals as follows:

FACTOR 1: TECHNICAL APPROACH

The Government will assess the offeror's technical approach meets the PWS requirements in accordance with Section L of the RFP. The Government will also evaluate technical risks associated with the proposal, as well as the offeror's demonstrated understanding and ability to meet the PWS with respect to the following:

Subfactor 1.1 Systems Engineering

The offeror will be evaluated on the degree to which the offeror's systems engineering principles and processes will be effective in executing the requirements of the PWS in Sections 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3.

Subfactor 1.2 Production and Integration

The offeror will be evaluated on the degree to which the offeror's production and integration processes and procedures will be effective in executing the requirements of the PWS in Sections 3.4 and 3.5.

Subfactor 1.3 Sample Technical Task

The offeror will be evaluated on the degree to which the offeror has demonstrated the ability to develop a clear and comprehensive approach to the technical sample task in section L and demonstrated the ability to successfully design and integrate the changes required, in accordance with PWS sections 3.2 and 3.3.

Subfactor 1.4 Data Rights

The Government will evaluate the offeror's Sections B and K to determine the Technical Data/Computer Software(TD/CS) rights proposed for this contract and the extent to which "Government Purpose Rights" for Non-Commercial deliverables, and the Commercial equivalent of Government Purpose Rights for commercial TD/CS, are provided to the Government. "Government Purpose Rights" are as defined in DFARS 252.227-7013 & 252.227-7014. The offeror may receive higher consideration for proposing to provide greater than "Government Purpose Rights" for Commercial and Non-Commercial TD/CS, and computer documentation delivered under this contract.

FACTOR 2: MANAGEMENT APPROACH

The Government will assess the offeror's management approach and demonstrated ability to meet the requirements of the PWS in accordance with Section L of the RFP. The Government will also evaluate management risks associated with the proposal with respect to the following:

Subfactor 2.1 Program Management and Execution Plan

The offeror will be evaluated on the degree to which it has demonstrated the ability to provide and implement a comprehensive management approach covering all aspects of this program as stated in the PWS (Sections 4.0 and 5.1.1).

Subfactor 2.2 Sample Management Task

The offeror will be evaluated on the degree to which it has demonstrated the ability to develop a clear and comprehensive approach to the sample management task in section L in accordance with PWS Sections 3.2.6, 3.2.7, 3.4, 3.5, 4.0, and 5.0, and has demonstrated the ability to successfully manage the design, integration, and testing of multiple C4I platforms simultaneously.

Subfactor 2.3 Key Personnel

The offeror will be evaluated on the degree to which the proposed Key Personnel meet the required minimum qualifications identified in Section L. Resumes are equally weighted. Resumes will not be individually rated. The Government will consider the collective experience of all proposed Key Personnel in assessing a rating. While the inability to demonstrate compliance with one or more of the qualifications may result in evaluated weaknesses, such inability does not necessarily preclude an offeror from receiving a score of "Acceptable" or higher.

Subfactor 2.4 Small Business Utilization

The Government will evaluate the extent to which the proposal documents the offeror's commitment to meet the stated small business subcontracting goals. Commitment documented by contractually binding relationships with subcontractors, and demonstrated in the prime's cost proposal, will be evaluated more favorably than expressed promises. The Government will evaluate the extent to which the proposal documents that the tasks assigned the selected Small Business subcontractors are meaningful in the overall success of the program and also broaden the subcontractor's technical capability. The Government will evaluate the extent to which the offeror has met small business subcontracting goals on prior contracts/orders. The Government may consult various sources, including CPARS Assessments, Past Performance Questionnaires, the PPIRS and Electronic Subcontracting Reporting System (eSRS) databases, or any other relevant sources deemed appropriate to verify proposal statements. The

evaluation of an offeror's history of meeting subcontracting goals on prior contracts/orders will also be evaluated under the past performance Factor 3.

If the Offeror is a small business concern they will receive a "neutral" rating for this subfactor. Furthermore, the small business Offeror is not required to submit a small business subcontracting plan. *The Small Business Subcontracting Plan is a separate requirement and is in addition to the information required to evaluate this Subfactor.*

FACTOR 3: PAST PERFORMANCE

The Government will assess the past performance of each offeror and/or proposed significant subcontractor. The assessment will be an unbiased judgment about the quality of an offeror's past performance. The Government will use its subjective assessment to make a comparative assessment of an offeror's capability. Past performance is a measure of the degree to which an offeror satisfied its customers in the past and complied with the statement of work, contract schedule, and contract terms and conditions. Past performance is also a measure of the risk of performance associated with the offeror.

The Government will assess the offeror's past performance in the areas of:

- (1) Quality of Product or Service – Conformance to contract requirements, specifications, and standards of good workmanship; accuracy of reports; appropriateness of personnel; technical excellence;
- (2) Cost Control – Performance within budget; current, accurate, and complete billings; adherence of actual cost/rates to negotiated cost/rates; effective utilization of cost efficiency measures; adequacy of internal budgetary controls;
- (3) Schedule – Timeliness of performance; meeting of interim milestones; responsiveness to technical and contractual direction; timeliness of completion, including wrap-up and contract administration, with no liquidated damages assessed;
- (4) Business Relationships – Effectiveness of management; professionalism of correspondence and communications; responsiveness to contract requirements; reasonable/cooperative behavior; prompt notification of problems; presentation of flexible, proactive, and effective Contractor-recommended solutions; customer satisfaction; and
- (5) Key Personnel – How long key personnel were retained on the contract; whether contractor proposed substitute personnel that were unqualified to fulfill requirements; and the quality and relevancy of the products/services managed/generated by key personnel.

The Government may base its judgment about the quality of an offeror's past performance on:

- (1) Records of objective measurements and subjective ratings of specified performance attributes, if available, and
- (2) Statements of opinion about the quality of specific aspects of an offeror's performance, or about the quality of an offeror's overall performance

The Government may solicit information from an offeror's customers and business associates; Federal, state and local government agencies; and from other persons and organizations. The Government reserves

the right to limit the number of references it decides to contact and to contact references other than those provided by the offeror. The evaluation will take into account the same type of information regarding significant subcontractors proposed in the offeror's proposal.

Offerors that have no record of past performance (i.e., new businesses) must submit a signed and dated statement to that effect. If an offer submits a certification statement and the Government has no information available regarding the offeror's past performance, that offeror will receive a neutral rating (i.e., the offeror is evaluated neither favorably nor unfavorably) for past performance. If offerors (prime and significant subcontractors) provide reference information that is not relevant and current, the offeror will receive a neutral past performance rating for those contracts.

FACTOR 4: COST/PRICE

A Cost Proposal shall be submitted in accordance with Section B and Section L set forth in this solicitation.

(1) Proposals will be evaluated for price reasonableness.

Cost evaluation will be based on the total cost offered for all years for all CLINs. Each year consists of the total cost for labor, overhead, general and administrative expenses, fee, ODCs, contract data, data right costs (if applicable), and any miscellaneous cost items. Labor will be evaluated by multiplying the labor rate by the estimated annual hours specified by the offeror. Contract Data is "Not Separately Priced".

The ODC CLIN amounts, as specified in Section B, for all ordering years, will be added to all offerors' evaluated cost. The ODC costs, i.e. miscellaneous travel/per diem, and material will be evaluated by using the Government provided estimates inclusive of any burden factors such as G&A, material handling, etc, as specified in the Prime and Subcontractor Cost Spreadsheets/templates (Attachment 10) and Section L.

The FFP CLIN amounts, as specified in Section B, for all ordering years, will be added to all offerors' evaluated cost.

(2) Cost Realism

Cost realism will be performed as part of the proposal evaluation process. Cost realism analyses will be conducted in accordance with FAR 15.404-1(d) to determine probable costs. Cost realism analysis is the process of independently reviewing and evaluating specific elements of each contractor's proposed cost estimate to determine whether the estimated proposed cost elements are realistic for the work to be performed; reflect a clear understanding of the requirements; and are consistent with the unique methods of performance and materials described in the contractor's proposal. The purpose of this evaluation shall be (a) to verify the contractor's understanding of the requirements; (b) to assess the degree to which the cost proposal reflects the approaches and risk assessments made in the proposal as well as the risk that the contractor will provide the supplies and services for the offered cost; (c) assess the degree to which the cost included in the cost proposal accurately represents the work effort included in the proposal, and (d) other cost related information available to the contracting officer such as previous cost history information. Proposed costs may be adjusted for purposes of evaluation, based upon the results of the cost realism evaluation. The resulting estimate will be used in the evaluation of cost.

The evaluated cost is determined by adjusting each offeror's proposed cost, and fee when appropriate, to reflect any additions or reductions in cost elements to realistic levels based on the results of the cost realism analysis.

(3) Uncompensated Overtime Evaluation

The use of uncompensated overtime, as defined in FAR 52.237-10, is discouraged by the Government. Based upon our assessment of the technical services required herein, it is unrealistic to expect long-term employees to continually work in excess of the industry norm of 40 hours per week. Therefore, the use of uncompensated overtime in this acquisition represents significant risk to the Government. Offerors are advised that if uncompensated overtime is proposed, the alternate cost breakdown specified in paragraph (g) of L-331, will be used for cost evaluation purposes. Thus, no evaluation advantage will result when uncompensated overtime is proposed.

(4) TIF Facility

The Government will not pay for the development and building of a new contractor-proposed TIF facility. If the offeror provides use of an existing contractor-provided TIF within their technical approach, the offeror must clarify the labor hours and rates at the contractor-provided TIF versus at the Government-provided TIF consistent with the technical approach. The Government facilities will be provided at no additional cost to any offeror proposing to utilize the Government TIF. Therefore, for cost realism purposes, no cost will be applied to any offer that proposes to use the Government-provided TIF.

(5) Professional Employees Compensation Plan

The information provided under the Professional Employees Compensation Plan will be evaluated by the Government on an acceptable/unacceptable basis to determine if the offeror's plan and supporting documentation demonstrate the offeror's ability to meet the provisions of FAR 52.222-46.

ADJECTIVAL RATINGS

In evaluating proposals, the Government will assign a rating of Outstanding, Good, Acceptable, Marginal, or Unacceptable or Neutral (Past Performance only).

The adjectival ratings for Factor 1 Technical Approach, and Factor 2 Management Approach are defined below:

A) OUTSTANDING

TECHNICAL/MANAGEMENT: Proposal meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the program goals/objectives, resources, schedules, and other aspects essential to performance of the program. Strengths far outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is very low.

B) GOOD

TECHNICAL/MANAGEMENT: Proposal meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the program goals/objectives, resources, schedules, and other aspects essential to performance of this requirement. Proposal contains strengths which outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is low.

C) ACCEPTABLE

TECHNICAL/MANAGEMENT: Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the program goals/objectives, resources, schedules, and other aspects essential to the performance of this requirement. Strengths and weaknesses are offsetting or will have little or no impact on contract performance. Risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.

D) MARGINAL

TECHNICAL/MANAGEMENT: Proposal does not clearly meet requirements and has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the program goals/objectives, resources, schedules, and other aspects essential to the performance of this requirement. The proposal has one or more weaknesses which are not offset by strengths. Risk of unsuccessful contract performance is high.

E) UNACCEPTABLE

TECHNICAL/MANAGEMENT: Proposal does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies. Proposal is unawardable.

The adjectival ratings for Factor 3 Past Performance is defined below:

Past Performance Relevancy Ratings

There are two aspects to the past performance evaluation. The first is to evaluate the offeror's past performance to determine how relevant a recent effort accomplished by the offeror is to the effort to be acquired through the source selection.

There are four levels of relevancy as shown below. With respect to relevancy, more relevant past performance will typically be a stronger predictor of future success and have more influence on the past performance confidence assessment than past performance of lesser relevance.

A) Very Relevant: Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

B) Relevant: Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

C) Somewhat Relevant: Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

D) Not Relevant: Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

The second aspect of the past performance evaluation is to determine how well the contractor performed on the contracts. The past performance evaluation process gathers information from customers on how well the offeror performed those past contracts. Requirements for considering history of small business utilization is outlined at FAR 15.304(c)(3)(ii) and DFARS 215.305(a)(2). In conducting a performance confidence assessment, each offeror shall be assigned one of the ratings below.

Performance Confidence Assessments

A) Substantial Confidence: Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

B) Satisfactory Confidence: Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

C) Limited Confidence: Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

D) No Confidence: Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

E) Unknown Confidence (Neutral): No recent/relevant performance record is available or the offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned.

Definitions

The following provide details on the pertinent definitions used with evaluation ratings:

1. **“Strength”** means a benefit in the proposal that increases the ability to successfully perform the contract. It is that part of a response, which enhances the Offeror's ability to meet the Government's requirements or results in efficient or effective performance. Strengths are typically above-average quality personnel, facilities, organizational experience, management, past performance, and technical capabilities that may cause the Offeror to perform the work more cost-effectively and successfully meet requirements. A “major strength” in the proposal is a benefit that appreciably increases the ability to successfully perform contract requirements.
2. **“Weakness”** means a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. It is that part of a response, which detracts from the Offeror's ability to meet the Government's requirements or results in inefficient or ineffective performance. Weaknesses are typically less-than-average quality personnel, facilities, organizational experience, management, past performance, and technical capabilities that may cause the Offeror to perform the work less cost-effectively or not to meet requirements. A “significant weakness” in the proposal is a flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance
3. **Risks.** Those areas or events that have a probability of negative consequences associated with a set of conditions, actions or approaches. Risk implies that action must be taken to avoid failure. Risk should be identified as high, medium, or low as follows:
 - a. **High Risk:** The Offeror's approach is unlikely to meet the requirements of the RFP and/or may require substantial revisions or excessive Government assistance during performance.
 - b. **Moderate Risk:** The Offeror's approach is likely to meet the requirements of the RFP with minor revisions in most areas and moderate Government assistance during performance.

- c. **Low Risk**: The Offeror's approach is likely to meet the requirements of the RFP with few or no minor revisions and very little Government assistance during performance.
 - d. **Very Low Risk**: The Offeror's approach will meet the requirements of the RFP with no revisions and/or Government assistance during performance.
4. **Deficiencies**. Any part of a response that fails to meet a material Government requirement as established in the solicitation (e.g., omits data making it impossible to assess compliance with the evaluation factors, or contains ambiguities which must be resolved before an assessment of compliance can be made, takes exception to any of the terms and conditions of the solicitation; thereby, rendering the offer unacceptable or offers something that does not meet the RFP requirements), or a combination of major weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.
 5. **Omissions**. Information requested in Section L of the solicitation that was not provided in the response. An omission is not necessarily a deficiency.

(End of Alternate I)

(End of Summary of Changes)