

STOCII-13-KOV-0001 SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

PROPOSAL SUBMISSION.

1. INTRODUCTION.

- a. Hard Copy/Electronic Submission: Volumes I, Volume II and Volume IV proposals are due in hard copy and electronically (via CD ROM) no later than 3:00 PM, EST on 29 April 2013 to the POC listed in Section c, below. Please note special instructions for early submission of past performance information under Volume III. See Table 1, below for additional details pertaining to proposal submission.
- b. OFFERORS ARE HEREBY ON NOTICE THAT A FAILURE TO SUBMIT ALL THE REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION IN EXACTLY THE MANNER (TIMELINESS AND FORMAT) SPECIFIED IN THE REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP) MAY CONSTITUTE A BASIS FOR THE GOVERNMENT TO REJECT A PROPOSAL AS NON-COMPLIANT AND THEREFORE UNACCEPTABLE, AT THE SOLE DISCRETION OF THE PROCUREMENT CONTRACTING OFFICER (PCO)

Furthermore, should an Offeror indicate in its proposal that: it cannot or will not meet one or more requirements; provide an approach that clearly does not meet one or more requirements; or, include proposal information that prompts the Government to question the Offeror's compliance with one or more requirements, the PCO, may determine at their discretion, that the Offeror's proposal is deficient and/or non-compliant, and therefore, ineligible for award.

- c. The point of contact (POC) for this RFP is Bob Baird.

Program Executive Office for Simulation, Training and Instrumentation
ATTN: Bob Baird, Contract Specialist, SFAE-STRI-KOV
STOCII-13-KOV-0001
12350 Research Parkway
Orlando, FL 32826-3276
Telephone number: 407-208-3485
E-mail: bob.baird@us.army.mil

The alternate POC (APOC) for the RFP is Lauren Bushika.

Program Executive Office for Simulation, Training and Instrumentation
ATTN: Lauren Bushika, Contract Specialist, SFAE-STRI-KOV
STOCII-13-KOV-0001

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 3.104

12350 Research Parkway
Orlando, FL 32826-3276
Telephone number: 407-208-3343
E-mail: lauren.bushika@us.army.mil

- d. The PCO for this RFP is Richard Boast.

Program Executive Office for Simulation, Training and Instrumentation
ATTN: Richard Boast, Procurement Contracting Officer, SFAE-STRI-KOV
STOCII-13-KOV-0001
12350 Research Parkway
Orlando, FL 32826-3276
Telephone number: 407-208-3290 or 407-247-8326
E-mail: richard.boast1@us.army.mil

- e. All proposals must clearly and convincingly demonstrate the Offeror has a thorough understanding of the requirements and associated risks, and is able, willing, and competent to devote and maintain the resources necessary to meet the requirements and has valid and practical solutions for all requirements. Statements that the prospective Offeror understands, can, or will comply with the specifications, and statements paraphrasing the requirements or parts thereof are considered inadequate and unsatisfactory. Mere reiteration of the requirement or standard reference material is discouraged and will be considered inadequate and non-compliant. It is the Offeror's responsibility to present sufficient information to be meaningfully evaluated without discussions. In presenting material in their proposals, Offerors are also advised that quality of information is more important than quantity.
- f. Any data previously submitted in response to another solicitation/RFP, whether submitted to the PEO STRI or another agency should be assumed to be unavailable during this proposal evaluation and source selection process. Proposal data shall not be incorporated into the proposal by referring to another proposal or other source.
- g. The Offerors shall ensure that each proposal volume submitted contains only the information relevant to that specific volume. The Offerors are cautioned that each volume of the proposal is evaluated standalone against the criteria set forth in Section M of the RFP and the evaluators for one volume may be different than the evaluators of another volume. It is incumbent upon the Offerors to ensure they properly submit their proposals. If the data is not contained in the appropriate volume of the proposal it will not be evaluated. For example, if the Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) is submitted under the Past Performance Volume rather than the Technical Volume as specified, the proposal will be evaluated as if no IMS were submitted at all.

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 3.104

- h. If a discrepancy exists between the paper copy of the proposal and the electronic copy, the electronic Portable Document Format (PDF) copy will take precedence.
- i. The proposal shall be valid for not less than 180 calendar days from the proposal due date.
- j. The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a delivery order without discussions/exchanges, other than clarifications. "Exchanges" and "clarifications" are defined in FAR Subpart 15.306, but these terms are used without otherwise importing the policies and procedure of FAR Part 15. Therefore, the Offeror's initial proposal should contain the offeror's best terms from a cost or price and technical standpoint. However, the Government reserves the right to conduct discussions at the sole discretion of the PCO. The Government will evaluate all proposals in accordance with FAR Subpart 16.505(B)(1), and if discussions are to be conducted, establish a competitive range comprised of all of the most highly rated proposals, based upon the ratings of each proposal against all evaluation factors and subfactors. The decision to establish a competitive range will be made at the sole discretion of the PCO.

After evaluating all proposals in accordance with FAR Subpart 16.505(B)(1), the PCO may also determine that the number of most highly rated proposals that might otherwise be included in the competitive range exceeds the number at which efficient competition can be conducted. Offerors are therefore advised that the PCO, for purposes of efficiency, may also limit the number of competitive range Offerors, at their sole discretion.

- k. Proposals shall not contain classified information.
- l. Security Clearance Requirements: Contractor employees working under the resultant contract must have a Secret Security Clearance issued by the U.S. Government.
- m. Offerors may submit a request to obtain additional Government Technical Data in support of proposal preparation. In order to obtain this Government Furnished Information (GFI) the Offeror shall complete the Distribution Agreement, included as Attachment 9 to the RFP, and email to Bob.Baird@us.army.mil with a copy to Lauren.Bushika@us.army.mil. The deadline for this request is 3:00 PM, EST on 3 April 2012. Please note, the GFI that will be provided to Offerors includes the items indicated in Attachment 4 of the RFP. The email shall also include the following:
 - 1) The Offeror's preference for receipt of the technical data package (pick-up from Government location or Government will mail the package).
 - 2) If Offeror prefers the package to be mailed, include a point of contact, phone number and address to which the package will be mailed.

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 3.104

The Government will provide for pick-up or will mail the technical data package within five business days from receipt of email request including all of the above, as applicable.

- n. Questions regarding this RFP shall be submitted by electronic mail to the POCs identified in paragraph (c), with the RFP number in the subject line utilizing the RFP Question and Comment Matrix, listed as Attachment 13 to the RFP. If the Government deems the question appropriate, the answer will be published through the issuance of a RFP amendment prior to the deadline for final proposal submissions provided those questions are received by 3:00 PM, EST on 09 April 2013. If an Offeror perceives the questions may reveal proprietary or protected information they must clearly mark the subject sentence or paragraphs and notify the Government that they consider the information proprietary (if the Government does not agree the information is proprietary the Government may choose not to answer the question). Questions received after the above referenced deadline may not be answered prior to proposal submission or at all. The Government does not anticipate that the closing date for receipt of offers will be extended. The Government will post the non-proprietary answers, without Offeror identification, to STRIBOP website located at <https://bop.peostri.army.mil/sites/bop/default.aspx>
- o. Offerors shall not make any changes to the RFP. Any objections to the terms and conditions of the RFP should be addressed to the PCO as follows: if the proposal takes exceptions to the terms and conditions of the RFP, all exceptions shall be denoted in a cover letter to the proposal; however, exceptions to the RFP taken in the proposal may result in the Offer being non-compliant, at the sole discretion of the PCO. Offerors are advised to submit all exceptions to the terms and conditions during the draft RFP stage. Once the final RFP is released the Government does not envision any changes to the terms and conditions will be accepted or made.

2. PROPOSAL MAILING/DELIVERY.

- a. Submission of telegraphic or facsimile offers is not authorized for this RFP. The outside shipping container shall be marked with the RFP Number. Proposals shall be mailed/delivered as follows:

Program Executive Office for Simulation, Training and Instrumentation
ATTN: Bob Baird, SFAE-STRI-KOV
STOCII-13-KOV-0001
12350 Research Parkway
Orlando, FL 32826-3276

Program Executive Office for Simulation, Training and Instrumentation
ATTN: Lauren Bushika, SFAE-STRI-KOV

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 3.104

STOCII-13-KOV-0001
12350 Research Parkway
Orlando, FL 32826-3276

- b. If the proposal/final proposal revision is hand carried, the Offeror shall notify the PCO and the POCs identified above, by email 48 hours in advance of its intent to hand deliver its proposal. The email must include the name of the organization, the name and phone number of the individual delivering the proposal, and the make, model, and license plate number of the delivery vehicle.
- c. For hand carried proposals, the Offeror shall obtain a Proposal Receipt Form from the POC identified in paragraph (a) above and deliver the completed form with the proposal. The POC will date/time stamp the original of the form, annotate the number of boxes received and sign in the "Signature of Contract Specialist" portion of the form. This information will also be annotated on the copy that will be provided to the Offeror. The Specialist's signature only denotes the receipt of the proposal; they are not responsible for the proposal contents.

3. PROPOSAL FORMAT.

- a. Paper Copies - Binding. Offerors shall submit all volumes in standard size 3-ring binders that will facilitate the insertion of change pages and additional information the Offeror may be required to provide during the source selection process.
- b. Paper Copies - Format. The submission shall be clearly indexed and logically assembled. Each volume shall be clearly identified and shall begin at the top of a page. All pages of each volume shall be appropriately numbered (X of Y) and shall contain the company name, date and RFP number in the header and/or footer. A Table of Contents should be created using the Table of Contents feature in Microsoft (MS) Word 2007. MS Word Files shall use the following page setup parameters:

Margins – Top, Bottom, Left, Right - 1”

Gutter – 0”

From Edge – Header, Footer - 0.5”

Page Size, Width – 8.5”

Page Size, Height – 11”

The following additional restrictions apply:

- Each paragraph shall be separated by at least one blank line. Page orientation shall be portrait style and easily readable font with a size of no smaller than 10 point.

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 3.104

- Tables or figures may be printed on fold out sheets, which shall not exceed 11 x 17 inches. Font size for tables and figures shall be no smaller than 8-point and may use landscape orientation.
 - Pages shall be numbered sequentially by volume and marked with the Offeror's name and any applicable data use restrictions in the header/footer area of each page.
 - All printed pages shall contain the phrase: "SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION" (printed or stamped) in addition to the FAR 3.104 proprietary data notice.
- c. **Electronic File Packaging.** Offerors shall submit each proposal volume on a separate compact disc (CD). CDs shall be appropriately marked with the Offeror's name and address, volume identification, and distribution restrictions. All files on each CD shall be directly supported by Microsoft Office 2007 and verified to free of any virus or malware. All files shall be clearly identified with a filename appropriate to the content (e.g., Volume-1_Technical_Appendix-A). A PDF version of all electronic documents shall also be included as a control copy.

4. PROPOSAL VOLUMES.

The proposal must consist of Volumes I through IV as set forth in Table 1, below.

Table 1- Proposal Volumes VOLUME	TITLE	COPIES	SIZE LIMITS	DUE DATE
I	Technical	1 Original, 5 Copy, *1 Electronic Submission; Electronic Submission ONLY for IMS	Volume I not to exceed 50 total pages. No page limit on IMS	3:00PM EST 29 April 2013
II	Past Performance	1 Original, 5 Copies, *1 Electronic Submission	Volume II not to exceed 30 pages total (5 programs)	3:00 PM, EST on 15 April 2013
III	Cost/Price	1 Original, 3 Copies, *1 Electronic Submission	Volume III Unlimited relevant and required pages	3:00PM EST 29 April 2013
IV	Administrative Information	1 Original, 1 Copy, *1 Electronic Submission	Volume IV not to exceed 30 pages total	

*Electronic Submission = CD ROM

- a. Page Count: If proposal volumes/sections exceed the page limitations set forth herein, excess text will be removed from the back of that volume/section and will not be evaluated. PAGE COUNTS DO NOT INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING ITEMS:
- i. Cover Sheet, Table of Contents, List of Figures and Tables, Lists of Acronyms (if used), section separators, and any blank pages marked "Not used."
 - ii. Delivery order Attachments (e.g., completed Section B, IMS, Compliance Matrix, etc.)
 - iii. Executive and Volume Summaries. The Executive Summary shall not exceed five pages. However, each Volume Summary (applies to Factors I-IV) shall be limited to one page each.

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 3.104

- b. Content Requirements: All information shall be confined to the appropriate volume. The Offeror shall confine submissions to essential matters, sufficient to define the proposal and provide adequate basis for evaluation. Offerors are responsible for including sufficient details, in a concise manner, to permit a complete and accurate evaluation of each proposal. Each volume of the proposal shall consist of a Table of Contents, Volume Summary, and the Narrative discussion. The Volume Summary Section shall contain a brief abstract of the Volume. Proprietary information shall be clearly marked. Cost/Price information shall be contained ONLY in the Cost/Price Volume or Administrative Volume where specifically required. An Executive Summary shall be provided as a top-level overview of the proposal, and included in the proposal before the individual volumes.
- c. Failure of an Offeror to provide all requested proposal information may result in a determination that an Offeror is ineligible to be considered for award, at the sole discretion of the PCO.

5. BASIS FOR AWARD

The award will be made based on the best overall (i.e., Best Value) proposal that is determined to be the most beneficial to the Government, with appropriate consideration given to the three published evaluation factors:

1. Technical Approach
2. Past Performance
3. Cost/Price

Best value means the expected outcome of an acquisition that, in the Government's estimation, provides the greatest overall benefit in response to the requirement. Subjective judgment against objective criteria is implicit in the evaluation process.

Offerors are cautioned that award may be made to other than the lowest-priced proposal if the Government determines that paying a price premium is warranted due to the evaluation of technical factors. The Government may also award to other than the highest technically rated proposal, if the Government determines that paying a price premium is not warranted. As proposal ratings tend toward equality, price will become a more determinative factor. The Government intends to make one award to the Offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government. The Government anticipates awarding without holding discussions, based upon initial offers.

Regarding the Technical evaluation factor, the Government will use two separate ratings which include: an assessment of risk which considers the potential for disruption of schedule, increased costs, degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight, or the unlikelihood of unsuccessful delivery order performance; and, a adjectival technical rating for the quality of the Offeror's technical solution for meeting the Government's requirements. To be

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 3.104

eligible for delivery order award, the Offeror must achieve a Technical risk rating of “Low” or “Moderate” for the Technical evaluation factor and sub-factors. A technical risk rating other than “Low” or “Moderate” for any Technical sub-factor may result in a less than “Low” or “Moderate” Risk Rating for the overarching Technical evaluation factor. In addition, Offerors must achieve a rating of Acceptable or higher for the Technical evaluation factor and subfactors in order to be considered (eligible) for delivery order award. Offerors are on notice that receiving a rating of less than Acceptable for any Subfactor may cause the overarching Technical factor to be rated as less than Acceptable, at the sole discretion of the Government. The Government will assign an adjectival rating for all non-cost portions of the proposal, excluding Past Performance and Technical Risk, which corresponds to a Past Performance Relevance Rating, Past Performance Confidence Assessment Rating, and Technical Risk Ratings, respectively. All Past Performance information that demonstrates the Offeror’s capability shall be restricted only to the Past Performance Volume.

6. FACTORS AND SUB-FACTORS TO BE EVALUATED.

The Government’s evaluation of proposals will be based on the Factors and Sub-factors listed below.

FACTOR 1 – TECHNICAL APPROACH

Sub-factor 1.1- Open Architecture and Government Purpose Rights

Sub-factor 1.2- Baseline Management and Integration

Sub-factor 1.3- Architecture Understanding and Approach

FACTOR 2- PAST PERFORMANCE

FACTOR 3- COST/PRICE

The relative importance of the Factors is as follows: Factor 1 Technical is more important than Factor 2 Past Performance. Factor 1 Technical and Factor 2 Past Performance, when combined, are significantly more important than Factor 3 Cost/Price.

Sub-Factor 1.1 Open Architecture and Government Purpose Rights is more important than Sub-Factor 1.2 Baseline Management and Integration and Sub-Factor 1.3 Architecture Understanding and Approach, which are equal.

a. FACTOR 1 – TECHNICAL APPROACH.

Offerors shall prepare and submit a Technical Volume containing no more than the number of pages outlined in Table 1. This volume provides Offerors with an opportunity to demonstrate how they will meet the requirements and specifications of this Delivery Order. The Government’s interest is in selecting a Prime Contractor who develops a UH-72A collective training solution using an open architecture that provides the government with Government Purpose Rights (GPR). The proposed solution will have to address how the Offeror will overcome the limited Government availability to actual aircraft data and has the ability to

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 3.104

coordinate and manage hardware and software baseline activities with multiple Contractors, to include giving and receiving multiple software baseline drops, while demonstrating a thorough understanding of the AVCATT System and architecture necessary to meet the full breadth of requirements of the IDIQ. The Offeror's Technical Volume shall address the following Sub-factors:

(1) SUB-FACTOR 1.1 OPEN ARCHITECTURE AND GOVERNMENT PURPOSE RIGHTS.

The Offeror shall describe how it will utilize an open architecture in its design in order to promote maintainability, sustainability and support future upgrades to the AVCATT system.

The Offeror shall describe the design (such as, but not limited to: simulation, emulation, etc.) and how it plans to modify, replace, gain access to, interface with, and/or integrate with existing AVCATT proprietary software or technical data as defined in AVCATT Data Rights Matrix (DRM), provided as Attachment 12 to the RFP. If the solution requires access to AVCATT proprietary software and/or technical data, the Offeror shall provide a separate signed and dated binding agreements which clearly identifies the software and/or technical data being used and affirmation from the rights owner that they are providing the Government with GPRs.

The Offeror shall describe how they plan to meet the Statement of Work (SOW), System Requirements Document (SRD) and Fidelity Analysis (FA) requirements given the limited availability of the UH-72A platform data, including flight model, that is prevalent on the UH-72A COTS-based aircraft and for which the government has little to no access. The contractor shall describe what aircraft data and software they have access to and describe solutions for each element of data they do not have access to.

The Offeror shall confirm that all new software and technical data will be provided to the Government with GPRs. Additionally, the Offeror shall confirm they will provide to the Government GPRs for the Offeror's existing software and technical data used from previous efforts, programs or contracts if applicable. Additionally, the Offeror shall confirm they will provide to the Government GPRs for any existing proprietary software or technical data that is modified under this effort to include any modified software or technical data from any other source such as but not limited to any subcontractors or suppliers.

(2) SUB-FACTOR 1.2 BASELINE MANAGEMENT AND INTEGRATION.

The Offeror shall describe how they plan to design, develop, integrate their software and hardware while coordinating all baseline activities (as defined in paragraph 3.2.2.1 of SOW) with the current AVCATT Post Deployment Software Support (PDSS) Contractor, L3, and any future Contractor. This description shall also include a detailed Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) for CLINs 0001 and 0002, showing major milestones and their interdependencies with this and other ongoing AVCATT efforts. The Offeror's solution shall account for multiple on-going developmental efforts being performed by other Contractors external to their efforts on this delivery order, such as the Concurrency Upgrades, annual AVCATT Technology Refresh efforts, and Discrepancy Report corrections via the AVCATT PDSS contract. Additionally, the Offeror shall show delivery of retrofits for CLINs 0004-

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 3.104

0013 on the IMS. The Offeror shall provide the Microsoft Project file, as well as a portable document format (pdf) file on the critical path with supporting text. There is no page limit for the IMS.

The Offeror shall propose a development, integration, and test strategy based on the government's options as shown in paragraph 4.0 of the SOW or one of their own to show how they intend to perform development, integration, and acceptance testing with the limited test resources available to the contractor.

The Offeror shall describe their approach to managing multiple software baseline drops to and from PDSS during their development.

(3) SUB-FACTOR 1.3 ARCHITECTURE UNDERSTANDING AND APPROACH.

The Offeror shall provide a description of the anticipated changes they will have to make as it relates to the AVCATT System to meet the requirements as stated in the SOW, SRD, and FA. This description shall clearly mention each affected AVCATT sub-system and the hardware/software (HW/SW) changes they will have to make, and any potential technical consequences that may result from executing the change to the overall AVCATT system and rank order each item in relative level of complexity from low, medium, to high. If the offeror thinks that the system or subsystem does not require modification, they must explicitly acknowledge this and state the rationale. The current sub-systems and the HW/SW are specified in the GFI list provided as Attachment 4 to the RFP.

The Offeror shall describe their knowledge of the UH-72A aircraft. The Offeror shall describe the systems and subsystems that will require addition or modification in order to meet the FA and Collective Task List.

The Offeror shall describe their approach to storing any new required hardware within the current AVCATT suite footprint without impacting current suite operation, transportation, maintenance, access, cooling, power, storage, and safety.

b. FACTOR 2 – PAST PERFORMANCE.

This Factor provides Offerors with an opportunity to identify recent and relevant past performance that demonstrates and substantiates their experience and capability to perform the required work as proposed. Offerors are advised that the Government is not limited to Past Performance information identified by Offerors in conducting Past Performance evaluations. This will include:

Past Performance List. This section shall include a list of recent and relevant Government contracts award to the business unit or division proposed to perform this effort. Relevant efforts are defined as efforts involving work on rotary wing aviation simulation systems, virtual simulations, or simulation systems that required significant software upgrades to an existing baseline that include content such as that required on this program. This may include work where the relevant business unit or division was a prime or major subcontractor. Recent and

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 3.104

relevant Government contracts award concerning the proposed major subcontractor, in alphabetical order should also be listed. A major subcontractor is defined as one whose subcontract is proposed significant portion of the total program either through price or task content.

c. FACTOR 3 – COST (FOR COST CLINS) / PRICE (FOR FFP CLINS).

This Factor requires Offerors to submit the basis of estimates (BOEs) and include cost or pricing data (CLIN-by-CLIN) in support of all cost-type Contract Line Items Numbers (CLINs) associated with CLIN 0002). In addition, Offerors shall submit a summary of the proposed cost for each CLIN except CLINs 0014 and 0015, as well as the total price including fee. Details of cost proposal will be submitted separately in the cost proposal section below. Each Offeror shall show their rationale for fee percentage for those applicable Cost Plus Fixed Fee (CPFF) CLINs. No fee shall exceed Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) guidelines for maximum fee in accordance with (IAW) FAR 15.404-4(c) (4) (i) (A) (NTE 15%).

Offerors shall prepare and submit a Cost/Price Volume containing the following information:

(1) The Offeror shall complete and provide Section B of this RFP for all Cost and FFP CLINs (to include options) and shall be included as Appendix A to the Cost/Price Volume. All CLINs shall be supported with detailed data in support of the efforts proposed except CLINs 0014 and 0015. The Offeror shall identify the cost breakdowns. The cost breakdown spreadsheets shall be presented in Microsoft Excel 2007 that are editable and executable by the Government evaluator(s), clearly showing the calculations and formulas used in each cell. There shall be no hidden formulas or protected cells. Spreadsheets shall show the formulas used to calculate the new rates/factors for each entry. Mathematical explanations shall be provided for any embedded macro/extended formula utilized, clearly describing the functioning of the macro or extended formula. Any narrative regarding the Cost/Price Volume may be submitted in Microsoft Word format; however, any spreadsheets included as exhibits supporting the Cost Volume (e.g., supporting basis of estimates, etc.) must be in Excel format as described and shall not be included as an un-executable, un-editable or flat files such as an embedded picture (Enhanced Metafile). Offerors must clearly present (historical or factual) data upon which their costs are based. The submittals should provide documentation such that a reviewer or auditor can readily understand the estimating and accounting practices being used. The proposal shall include a chart or table of all direct labor categories and labor rates for each of the years of performance. Rates should be provided by calendar year. The chart will also include the indirect rates, including Cost of Money (if proposed). The Offeror shall complete and provide Section B of the RFP for all priced CLINs as Appendix A of this Volume. The Offeror's proposal will be considered Non-Responsive if CLIN 0001 exceeds \$200,000 and the total of CLIN's 0001 and 0002 exceed \$14M. In this case, the proposal will be returned to the Offeror.

(2) Breakdown of prices into their elements of cost to include FFP CLINs, is required under this RFP as set forth below. Certified Cost and Pricing Data will not be required if adequate competition exists. If the Government determines adequate competition was not obtained, the Government reserves the right to request certified cost and pricing data.

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 3.104

(3) On modification issued under the resultant Delivery Order, the successful Offeror will submit cost/price proposals IAW the requirement of FAR Subpart 15.4 including Certificate of Current Cost and Pricing when the order is \$700k or greater.

(4) The Offeror shall provide a cross-reference between the Statement of Work, WBS and CLINs/Sub Line Item Numbers (SLINs). The Offeror's cost proposal (for all cost CLINs) shall mirror the structure of the proposed IMS. All cost-type CLINs shall be supported with detailed data in support of the efforts proposed. The Offeror shall identify the BOE.

(5) The Offeror shall submit contact information (name, telephone number and email address) for their cognizant Defense -* Management Agency (DCMA) Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO) and cognizant Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) supervisory auditor. If the Offeror is not assigned to DCMA for contract administration or is not assigned to DCAA for contract audit, the Offeror will identify their cognizant federal agency or agencies (and include the individual contact information). The Offeror shall submit a copy of the most recent ACO letter regarding the status of their accounting system. If that letter is more than a year old and the Offeror has a more current DCAA audit report commenting on the status of their accounting system, a copy of that report will also be submitted. If the Offeror's accounting system was disapproved or deemed to be not adequate, the Offeror will identify all deficiencies along with steps taken, or to be taken, to correct the deficiencies and a timeline to include audit by the cognizant audit agency after corrective action has been implemented. If the Offeror's accounting system has never been audited by their cognizant federal audit agency, the Offeror will so state.

(6) The Offeror will provide a schedule of all proposed subcontracts and interdivisional work orders or inter/intra-company transfers of cost. As a minimum, the schedule will contain the following seven columns (with explanatory footnotes):

- a. Company Name (footnote[s] to the schedule will contain DCMA ACO and DCAA supervisory auditor POC info [name, telephone number and email address])
- b. City and State
- c. Subcontract Price/Estimated Amount (explanatory footnote if the work is proposed to be done by another division of your company or another subsidiary of your global parent corporation)
- d. Type (FFP, T&M, Cost, etc.)
- e. Competitive or Non-competitive ([1] if competitive, include footnote[s] to schedule with competitor info [as a minimum, name, city/state and amount], most recent analysis/negotiation document and basis for selection or [2] provide your cost or price analysis of all that are classified as Non-competitive)
- f. Period of Performance (beginning mo/yr and ending mo/yr)
- g. Applicable CLINs (with footnote[s] to identify the subcontracted work scope and the WBS paragraphs)

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 3.104

For non-competitive subcontracts or inter/intra-company work orders or cost transfers with a price/value of \$700k, or more, the subcontractor will provide a breakdown of the subcontract proposal that is sufficiently adequate for the Government reviewer to understand the proposal submitted. The subcontractor proposal shall be submitted in the same level of detail as the prime proposal, to include labor build-up, indirect rate information and material/ODCs compositions. If the subcontractor's proposal contains company proprietary data, and the subcontractor does not wish to reveal the proprietary data to the Offeror, the subcontractor must provide a "redacted" proposal copy to the Offeror and submit their FAR 15.404 compliant proposal directly to the assigned Contract Specialist(s) identified in Section 1.c. of this document.

(7) The Offeror will provide a cost breakdown for each CLIN. The format and content will be in accordance with the instructions in FAR Table 15-2 (located at the end of FAR 15.408). If there are subcontractors, the subcontractors' costs must be traceable to the prime's proposal (by CLIN, by WBS, by year and by labor category). The prime's proposal shall include an excel file (editable and executable with formulas for all subtotals and totals) including all labor hours; prime and all subcontractors. The hours in that file shall be stratified by CLIN, by WBS, by year, by labor category and by company name. Since adequate competition is anticipated, the Offeror is not required to certify the data or provide updates (unless subsequently required by the Contracting Officer).

(8) A cost breakdown (as described above) is also required for any/all cost reimbursable subcontracts. The subcontract proposals will be submitted with the prime proposal unless the subcontractor considers some of the data to be company proprietary and objects to providing all of the details to the prime Contractor. If not provided with the prime's submission, the detailed proposal will be submitted directly to the assigned Contract Specialist(s) identified in Section 1.c of this document, with a "redacted" proposal copy to the Offeror. (to be received no later than the prime proposal due date).

(9) If a cost reimbursable subcontract is planned to be awarded on a competitive basis, the Offeror will provide the list of competitors, their quoted prices and the basis for selection of the successful subcontractor; including the results of any cost realism analysis that was performed. If a cost realism analysis of the subcontractor's proposal was not performed by the Offeror, the Offeror's proposal will so state.

(10) Offeror will provide sufficient information to support the reasonableness of their proposed direct labor rates and indirect rates. The order of preference is:

- a. FPRA (Forward Pricing Rate Agreement)
- b. FPRR (Forward Pricing Rate Recommendation) by their cognizant ACO
- c. ACO approved interim billing rates

If none of the above is available (or, if they do not include direct labor rates), the Offeror will provide the following:

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 3.104

(11) Direct labor rates: Offeror will submit the most recent actual average rate for each and every proposed category. Offeror will submit the actual average rate, as of the end of each of the last two completed fiscal years, for each and every proposed category. The “as of” date must be shown for each calculation. For each category and each year, the Offeror will identify the number of employees in each calculation. The timing of wage/salary increases will be identified in the Offeror’s proposal (i.e., employee’s anniversary date, yearly during [month], or other [with explanation]).

(12) Indirect rates (for each and every proposed indirect rate): Offeror will identify the start and end of their fiscal year and the allocation/application base for each indirect rate. Offeror will provide actuals for the most recent year-to-date period (base, pool and calculated rate) and the last two completed fiscal years (base, pool and calculated rate). Offeror will state whether or not the prior years’ actuals have been audited by DCAA. Offeror will submit forecasted rates for each fiscal year covered in the RFP (base, pool and calculated rate). If Offeror does not have a budget or detailed forecast for all fiscal years covered in the RFP, only the calculated rate information will not be required for those fiscal years. Offeror will submit actual sales for each of the last two completed fiscal years and year-to-date actual sales. Offeror will submit forecasted sales (for the current fiscal yearend and each fiscal year covered by this RFP).

(13) The identified direct labor and indirect rate information will be submitted for both the Offeror and each and every subcontractor proposal that is required to be submitted (see paragraphs ix and xv). These same rates will be used as Not-to-Exceed (NTE) rates for any/all Cost Reimbursement (CR) CLINs.

(14) If a proposed rate is substantially less than the corresponding historical rate, the Offeror (and/or subcontractor) will provide narrative to explain the underlying reason(s) for the reduced rate.

(15) The Total Evaluated Price (TEP) is the sum of all Schedule B priced CLINs, assuming CLINs 0002 through 0013 are exercised upon award. The TEP will be evaluated and adjusted based on the Offeror’s approach to suite level integration and test. The TEP will be adjusted based on government established costs to ship and support a suite and for training hours lost while not in use. The TEP will include an addition of \$50,000 for Suite transport cost plus \$45,000/month if the Offeror proposes use of an AVCATT Suite at their facility with support of a CLS crew; an addition of \$50,000 for Suite transport cost plus \$15,000/month if the Offeror proposes use of an AVCATT Suite at their facility without support of a CLS crew; an addition of \$5,000/month if the Offeror proposes use of an AVCATT Suite at its home station. In the cost/price volume the Offeror shall identify the total number weeks and/or months required for use of an AVCATT suite, whether it is in plant or at site, with or without CLS crew. The identified approach must be identical to the approach discussed in the Technical Volume. Any inconsistencies or conflicts between the approach discussed in the Technical Volume and that identified in the Cost/Price Volume may lead to evaluation of a significant weakness or deficiency.

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 3.104

(16) The TEP is the sum of all Section B priced CLINs of Delivery Order 0001 (Section J, Attachment 11). The TEP will not include those CLINs that are identified as NSP, TBD, or N/A. The rate table/schedule will also be evaluated for reasonableness and will not include those CLINs that are identified as NSP, TBD, or N/A.

(17) Offeror will submit a table/schedule of all subcontracts. As a minimum, the table/schedule will include the subcontractor's name, city/state, CLIN reference, proposed amount, subcontract type (T&M, reimbursable, fixed price, etc.), competitive or non-competitive, and DCMA and DCAA POCs (name, telephone number and email address). For all subcontracts that are cost reimbursable, incentive type, time & material, or fixed price with progress payment provisions (but only if the prime contract contains progress payment provisions), the Offeror shall submit the following:

(a) A list of all proposed subcontractors that are required to have an adequate accounting system. The list will include the company name and their address.

(b) The list will also include subcontractor contact information (name, telephone number and email address) for their cognizant DCMA ACO and cognizant DCAA supervisory auditor. If the subcontractor is not assigned to DCMA for contract administration or is not assigned to DCAA for contract audit, the Offeror will identify the subcontractors' cognizant federal agency or agencies (and include the individual contact information).

(c) A copy of each subcontractor's most recent ACO letter regarding the status of their accounting system. If that letter is more than a year old and the subcontractor has a more current DCAA audit report commenting on the status of their accounting system, a copy of that report will also be submitted. If a subcontractor's accounting system is disapproved or not adequate, the Offeror will identify all deficiencies along with steps taken, or required to be taken, to correct the deficiencies and a timeline to include audit by the cognizant federal audit agency after corrective action has been implemented. If a subcontractor's accounting system has never been audited by their cognizant federal audit agency, the Offeror will so state and the Offeror will provide the results of their review of the subcontractor's accounting system.

(18) The Offeror's Cost Volume will include a summary of all direct labor hours that is stratified (and subtotaled) first by CLIN, then by WBS, then by program year, then by direct labor category and finally by company (the prime and each and every subcontractor). The Offeror will propose its own internal direct labor categories. The Offeror will require all subcontractors to propose those same categories. Each subcontractor will provide a "cross walk" between its own internal labor categories and the ones required by the terms of this RFP. If a subcontractor's labor category is split between two or more of the Offerors' labor categories, this "cross walk" will identify and list individuals' names, employee IDs, or some other means of identification. Each subcontractor will include the direct labor rate for both their internal direct labor categories and the categories specified by the Offeror. If the rates are not based on a simple average of all individuals within the category, the Offeror and/or the subcontractor will provide the details, an explanation and justification. If one individual is included in two or more categories the Offeror and/or the subcontractor will provide the details, an explanation and justification.

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 3.104

(19) Financial Responsibility- Unless the Offeror’s global parent files with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), the following will be provided: Financial statements (with notes) for the most recently completed fiscal year and status of any/all loans and lines-of-credit (used and unused amounts). Additional financial data may be required by the PCO prior to delivery order award.

(20) The Offerors shall specifically provide supporting data and rationale for performance period rates and factors, including labor rate development methodologies, basis for estimate, escalations applied, overhead, fringe benefit and G&A expenses, etc. Offerors shall provide labor rates based on a 40 hour work week. Should Offerors not have a standard 40 hour work week, the Offeror shall be required to document and provide rationale as such in the Cost Volume. In addition, if rates proposed are in accordance with an approved FPRA with DCMA, the Offeror shall provide those approved rates in the Cost Volume of the proposal.

(21) If the Offeror does not have an approved accounting system, as specified in section vi., Offeror shall complete the SF1408- Preaward Survey of Prospective Contractor Accounting System Checklist, below, and return the documentation as part of Cost Volume of the proposal.

Instructions:

1. Mark “X” in the appropriate column.
2. On Page 2 provide a narrative describing how the current accounting system supports your response to each item.

	Yes	No	N/A	Note
1. Is the accounting system in accord with generally accepted accounting principles?				<u>1</u>
2. ACCOUNTING SYSTEM PROVIDES FOR:				
a. Proper segregation of direct costs from indirect costs.				<u>2</u>
b. Identification and accumulation of direct costs by contract.				<u>3</u>
c. A logical and consistent method for the allocation of indirect costs to intermediate and final cost objectives. (A contract is final cost objective.)				<u>4</u>
d. Accumulation of costs under general ledger control.				<u>5</u>
e. A timekeeping system that identifies employees' labor by intermediate or final cost objectives.				<u>6</u>
f. A labor distribution system that charges direct and indirect labor to the appropriate cost objectives.				<u>7</u>

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 3.104

g. Interim (at least monthly) determination of costs charged to a contract through routine posting of books of account.				8
h. Exclusion from costs charged to government contracts of amounts which are not allowable in terms of FAR 31, Contract Cost Principles and Procedures, or other contract provisions.				9
i. Identification of costs by contract line item and by units (as if each unit or line item were a separate contract) if required by the proposed contract.				10
j. Segregation of preproduction costs from production costs.				11
3. Accounting system provides financial information:				
a. Required by contract clauses concerning limitation of cost (FAR 52.232-20 and 21) or limitation on payments (FAR 52.216-16).				12
b. Required to support requests for progress payments.				13
4. Is the accounting system designed, and are the records maintained in such a manner that adequate, reliable data are developed for use in pricing follow-on acquisitions?				
				14
5. Is the accounting system currently in full operation? (If not, describe in Page 2 narrative which portions are (1) in operation, (2) set up, but not yet in operation, (3) anticipated, or (4) nonexistent.) Do you currently have existing contracts with the U.S. Government?				
				15

Instruction: Use this section to explain how the current accounting system supports your response to each item. If a response is N/A provide further explanation. Use as much space as needed. Provide references to current policies and procedures if applicable.

Note	Narrative
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 3.104

7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	

7. VOLUME IV – ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION.

Offerors shall prepare and submit an Administrative Volume containing no more than the number of pages outlined in Table 1 and should contain the following information:

a. The Offeror shall provide all contract completion documents, to include Contractor information required by clauses. The Offeror shall also complete all (fill-in clauses with signatures) the RFP sections indicated below using the file (without modification to the file) provided with the RFP. An authorized official with the ability to bind the firm shall sign the SF 33 and all certifications requiring original signature. An Acrobat PDF file shall be created to capture the signatures for submission.

- Section A – Standard Form 1155
- Section G – Contract Administration Data
- Section K – Representations, Certifications and Other Statements of Offerors

b. The Offeror shall complete clause 5152.209-5004. Additionally, the Offeror shall also complete and sign DFARS 252.227-7017 Identification and Assertion of Use, Release, or Disclosure Restrictions which requires the Offeror to provide a definitive listing of all specific software and technical data the Offeror intends to provide with less than unlimited rights to the U.S. Government, including a listing of each item and the restrictions asserted. Please note that providing less than GPR will make the Offeror non-responsive to Technical Sub-factor 1.1.

c. The Offeror shall provide a statement of acceptance of all RFP terms and conditions. The Government will not permit alternate proposals or binding assumptions. The Government cautions Offerors that in order for its proposal to be eligible for award, the proposals shall be in compliance with the terms and conditions set forth in the RFP. If contractors propose

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 3.104

assumptions/conditions that conflict with the terms, conditions and requirements set forth in the RFP they shall be considered non responsive and eliminated from further consideration.

d. The Offeror shall populate the Requirements Traceability Matrix (RTM), provided as Attachment 10 to the RFP, with the requested proposal reference information as well as whether the Offeror's solution has, "MEETS, DOES NOT MEET, or EXCEEDS," the corresponding Government requirement. Additionally, the Offeror shall document in the RTM where the corresponding information is located in their proposal. The matrix will be used by the Government for evaluation in the Technical Volume. For items not specifically addressed in the Technical Volume, the offeror shall discuss how they shall meet all other RTM requirements.

e. The Offeror shall provide names, titles, and telephone and email addresses of persons authorized to negotiate on the Offeror's behalf with the Government as well as any limitations on their authority in connection with this RFP in the event that the Government deems discussions to be necessary.

f. The Offeror shall complete the delivery dates/period of performance found in Section F and they should correlate with the IMS provided in the Technical volume.

g. The Offeror shall provide a separate signed and dated binding agreements which clearly identifies the software and/or technical data being used and affirmation from the rights owner that they are providing the Government with GPR.

8. EVALUATION APPROACH.

All proposals shall be subject to evaluation by a team of Government advisors and non-Government support. Scientific, Engineering, and Technical Assistance (SETA) Contractors, specifically Electronic Consulting Services, Inc. (ECS), and Don Wellen & Associates may assist the Government throughout the performance of any resulting modification to the delivery order in a support capacity. These individuals will be authorized access only to those portions of the proposal data and discussions that are necessary for them to perform their respective duties. Such firms are expressly prohibited from competing on the subject acquisition.

In accomplishing their duties related to the source selection process, employees of the SETA firms may require access to proprietary information contained in the Offerors' proposals. SETA Contractors supporting the evaluation process will be required to sign and submit SSPAs and statements of financial interest to the Government.

a. FACTOR 1 –TECHNICAL EVALUATION APPROACH.

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's technical approach to meet the overall requirements of the Delivery Order. The Government's interest is in selecting a Prime Contractor who develops a UH-72A collective training solution with Government Purpose Rights (GPR) and has the ability to coordinate and manage hardware and software baseline activities with multiple

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 3.104

Contractors, to include giving and receiving multiple software baseline drops, while demonstrating a thorough understanding of the AVCATT System and architecture necessary to meet the full breadth of requirements of the Delivery Order (DO). Specifically, the Government will evaluate the following Sub-factors:

(1) SUB-FACTOR 1.1 OPEN ARCHITECTURE AND GOVERNMENT PURPOSE RIGHTS.

The Government will evaluate how the design provides a more open AVCATT architecture to support sustainability, future modifications and expandability; and allowing for interoperability and commonality of components.

The Government will evaluate the capability of the design and approach to modify, replace, gain access to, interface and/or integrate with AVCATT existing proprietary software and hardware to include a separate written, signed legal binding agreement if the Offeror's solution requires access to AVCATT proprietary software and/or technical data. (Note the Binding agreement must be submitted in the Administrative volume and signed by both parties.)

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's approach to meeting the SOW, SRD and FA given the lack of UH-72A platform data available to the government, including providing a non-proprietary flight model based on real certified instrumented aircraft data. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's intent to deliver all technical data and software with GPR, either new or the Offeror's existing software or technical data reused from previous efforts, programs or contracts or other sources or subcontractors.

(2) SUB-FACTOR 1.2 BASELINE MANAGEMENT AND INTEGRATION.

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's approach to design, develop, integrate, and test software and hardware while coordinating all baseline activities with the AVCATT PDSS Contractor. The Government will evaluate the Contractors developmental approach and ensure that it will account for multiple on-going developmental efforts within and external to the DO. The Government will evaluate the actual Microsoft Project file for CLINs 0001 and 0002 to ensure the Offeror's understanding of major project milestone timelines, and critical task relationships and durations and how it minimizes risk and impacts on other efforts.

The government will evaluate the Offeror's development, integration, and test strategy to ensure the requirements of the SOW are met given the limited assets available to the contractor.

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's approach to managing multiple software baseline drops to and from PDSS during their development.

(3) SUB-FACTOR 1.3 ARCHITECTURE UNDERSTANDING AND APPROACH.

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 3.104

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's understanding of the proposed changes they will need to make and any potential consequences to the AVCATT System to meet the requirements as stated in the SOW, SRD, and FA.

The Offeror will evaluate the Offeror's understanding of the UH-72A aircraft and the description of the systems and subsystems that will require addition or modification in order to meet the FA and Collective Task List.

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's storage strategy and its impact to current suite operation, transportation, maintenance, access, cooling, power, storage, and safety.

b. FACTOR 2 – PAST PERFORMANCE EVALUATION APPROACH.

For Past Performance, the Government will evaluate the Offeror's past performance and assign a Past Performance Relevance Rating and Past Performance Confidence Assessment Rating. Ratings will be assigned in accordance with Section M.5.2. The Past Performance evaluation will assess the relative risks associated with an Offeror's likelihood of success in performing the RFP's requirements as indicated by that Offeror's record of past performance. In this context, "Offeror" refers to the proposed prime Contractor and all proposed major subcontractors. A major subcontractor is defined as one whose subcontractor is for more than 20% of the proposed price. In either case, the prime Contractor and proposed major subcontractors will be assessed individually and the results will then be assessed in their totality to derive the Offeror's Past Performance rating. Past performance information (PPI) may be obtained through a number of methods, including but not limited to: Government assessments or report cards; Published commercial evaluations; References submitted by the Contractor; Surveys or questionnaires, verbal or written, conducted by Government personnel; PPI will also be obtained from a variety of sources, including but not limited to: Government contracts and databases; State, local, or foreign Governments; Commercial companies; Information regarding predecessor companies, key personnel, and subcontractors.

(1) The Government's intent in this assessment is to identify those Offerors whose relevant and recent past performance represents the lowest performance risk in providing beneficial solutions to the SOW requirements in the execution of this Delivery Order.

(2) The Government will conduct a past performance confidence assessment based on the quality of the Offeror's relevant past performance, as well as that of its major subcontractors, as it relates to the probability of successful accomplishment of the required effort. Areas of relevance include: recent, previous work on other Department of Defense (DoD) simulation systems that include content such as that required on this program. When assessing performance risk, the Government will focus its inquiry on the past performance of the Offeror and its proposed major subcontractors as it relates to all RFP requirements. These requirements include all aspects of schedule, performance and supportability, including the Offeror's record of: 1) conforming to specifications and standards of good workmanship; 2) maintaining program execution within cost; 3) adherence to contract schedules, including the administrative aspects of performance (COST TYPE); 4) ability to resolve technical and problems quickly and effectively; 5) business-like

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 3.104

concern for the interest of its customers; 6) establishing and maintaining adequate management of subcontractors; 7) their ability to promptly and effectively execute Associate Contractor Agreements (ACAs) with other contractors to fulfill contractual obligations.

(3) Offerors will be cautioned that in conducting the past performance assessment, the Government may use data provided in the Offeror's proposal and data obtained from other sources. Since the Government may not necessarily interview all of the sources provided by the Offerors, it is incumbent upon the Offerors to explain the relevance of the data provided. Offerors are reminded that while the Government may elect to consider data obtained from other sources, the burden of proving low performance risk rests with the Offerors.

(4) Offerors without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance.

(5) The Government will use past performance information readily available in program and technical offices in addition to information contained on the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS), Past Performance Questionnaires, as well as any other source as determined by the Government.

c. FACTOR 3 – COST/PRICE EVALUATION APPROACH.

NO Cost/Price information shall be included in any volume other than Cost/Price Volume.

The total evaluated price will be the sum of all CLINs, to include all option periods. Cost/Price evaluations will be performed in accordance with FAR Subpart 15.404 (Proposal Analysis). Those items denoted as "Optional" in the RFP, Section B, will be placed into the delivery order as options. Evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise such options.

The Government will evaluate the cost realism of each Offeror's proposed costs in relation to the Offeror's specific technical approach. The Offeror's proposed costs will be evaluated by determining what the Government predicts the Offeror's approach would most probably cost the Government when the work performed under the contract is completed. To the degree that the Government's most probable cost estimate exceeds the Offeror's proposed cost, the cost will be adjusted upward for the purposes of evaluation only.

The Government will use Attachment 11, Total Evaluated Price Calculation for its evaluation.

(1) The Government will evaluate the cost realism of each Offeror's proposed costs for all cost reimbursable CLINs in relation to the Offeror's specific technical approach. The Offeror's proposed costs will be evaluated by determining what the Government predicts the Offeror's approach would most probably cost the Government when the work performed under the contract is completed for the cost CLINs only. To the degree that the Government's most probable cost estimate differs from the Offeror's proposed cost, the cost will be adjusted upward or downward for the purposes of evaluation only.

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 3.104

(2) Neither the requested accounting system adequacy nor the completed SF1408 is part of any factor evaluation; the information/data is gathered and analyzed strictly for the responsibility determination by the Contracting Officer.

(3) The financial information submitted by the Offeror will not be part of any factor evaluation. The information will only be used by the Contracting Officer in determining the financial responsibility of the Offeror.

(4) As part of this evaluation, the Government may consider DCAA audit information and other information the Government deems relevant.

(5) The Offeror's proposal will be considered Non-Responsive if CLIN 0001 exceeds \$200,000 and the total of CLIN's 0001 and 0002 exceed \$14M. In this case, the proposal will be returned to the Offeror.

(6) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's SF 1155 for completion and signature.

9. DEFINITIONS.

Factor and Sub-factor Rating. Ratings for the Technical factor and sub-factors will be expressed as two separate ratings. These ratings include a technical rating for the quality of the Offeror's technical solution for meeting the Government's requirements and an assessment of risk which considers the potential for disruption of schedule, increased costs, degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight, or the unlikelihood of unsuccessful contract performance. The technical ratings are given an adjectival assessment of Outstanding, Good, Acceptable, Marginal, and Unacceptable. Rating definitions will be according to the definitions in the Tables below:

10. COMPLIANCE RATINGS AND DEFINITIONS.

The Government will use two separate ratings which include a technical rating for the quality of the Offeror's technical solution for meeting the Government's requirements and an assessment of risk which considers the potential for disruption of schedule, increased costs, degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight, or the unlikelihood of unsuccessful contract performance.

a. **Technical Rating.** The Offeror's technical solution will be rated separately from the risk associated with its technical approach. The technical rating evaluates the quality of the Offeror's technical solution for meeting the Government's requirement. The risk rating considers the risk associated with the technical approach in meeting the requirement. Technical evaluations shall utilize the ratings listed in Table below.

Technical Ratings		
Color	Rating	Description

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 3.104

Blue	Outstanding	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements. The proposal contains multiple strengths and no deficiencies.
Purple	Good	Proposal meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal contains at least one strength and no deficiencies.
Green	Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal has no strengths or deficiencies.
Yellow	Marginal	Proposal does not clearly meet requirements and has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements.
Red	Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies and is unawardable.

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 3.104

b. Technical Risk Rating. Assessment of technical risk, which is manifested by the identification of weakness(es), considers potential for disruption of schedule, increased costs, degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight, or the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance. Technical risk shall be rated using the ratings listed in Table below. For FFP CLINs, the reference to increased cost is the sunk cost associated with schedule delays.

Technical Risk Ratings	
RATING	DEFINITION
Low	Has little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and normal Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.
Moderate	Can potentially cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome difficulties.
High	Is likely to cause significant disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Is unlikely to overcome any difficulties, even with special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring.

11. KEY EVALUATION TERMS AND DEFINITIONS –

Deficiency. A material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.

Strength. An aspect of the Offeror’s proposal that has merit or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Government during contract performance.

Significant Strength. An aspect of the Offeror’s proposal that appreciably enhances the merit of the proposal or appreciably increases the probability of successful contract performance.

Weakness. A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Significant Weakness. A flaw in the Offeror’s proposal that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

12. Past Performance Factor Rating Definitions.

a. The Government will use the following adjectival rating definitions in the evaluation of the Past Performance Factor based on both relevancy and confidence. The Government will assign a relevancy rating of Very Relevant, Relevant, Somewhat Relevant, or Not Relevant (as defined below) to the Past Performance Factor.

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 3.104

Past Performance Relevancy Adjectival Rating	
RATING	DEFINITION
Very Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this RFP requires.
Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this RFP requires.
Somewhat Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this RFP requires.
Not Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this RFP requires.

b. The Government will assign a confidence assessment of Substantial Confidence, Satisfactory Confidence, Limited Confidence, No Confidence, or Unknown Confidence (Neutral) to the Past Performance Factor.

Past Performance Confidence Assessment Adjectival Rating	
RATING	DEFINITION
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.
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.
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.
No Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
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.

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION - SEE FAR 3.104