

## **Section L - Instructions, Conditions, and Notices to Offerors (ICNTO)**

### **L.1.0 Program Structure and Objectives**

The scope of this contract is to perform Research, Test, Development and Evaluation (RTD&E) and Operations and Maintenance (O&M) tasks for Modeling and Analysis Mission (MMA) in accordance with (IAW) separately issued task orders providing technical services, software, testing, data, and documentation as specified in the task order.

This effort will provide the Air Force Technical Application Center (AFTAC) Meteorological Modeling and Analysis Mission (MMA) with scientific services and support in developing and maintaining state-of-the-art ensemble numerical weather prediction (NWP) systems and advanced source estimation applications to enhance operations by improving the accuracy of the simulations and characterizing uncertainties. The objective is to obtain meteorological modeling support in an effort to provide incremental improvements to AFTAC's existing meteorological and material transport and dispersion modeling capabilities.

### **L.2.0 Proposal Format**

#### **General Instructions**

- (a) Non-compliance with these instructions may render your proposal unacceptable. These instructions prescribe the format of proposals and presentation of proposal data. Refer to Section L and M, RFP Attachment 9, to see the Instructions to Offerors. Carefully review this section prior to commencing preparation of the proposal. The instructions contained herein are intended to serve as guidelines for the preparation of the proposal and are not intended to be all-inclusive. All information you provide in the proposal must be UNCLASSIFIED. Specific instructions for each of the Volumes required by these instructions are contained in paragraphs L.2.2 through L.6.3.3. Proposals will be evaluated up to the page limits listed in the format instructions listed in paragraph 3.1 below. Material exceeding the page limits will not be evaluated, and the excess material will be returned to the offeror.
- (b) The offeror's proposal shall include all data and information requested by this ICNTO and shall be submitted in accordance with these instructions. The offer shall be compliant with the requirements as stated in the Performance Work Statement (PWS), RFP Attachment 1, and the Contract Data Requirements List (CDRL), Exhibit A. If a joint venture arrangement exists for this acquisition, the offeror shall provide a copy of the joint venture agreement that is signed and dated by all joint venture members as part of the proposal submission.
- (c) Offerors shall submit only one (1) proposal for the ADAMTD II effort as the Government will review only one proposal per offeror.
- (d) The proposal shall be clear, concise, and shall include sufficient detail for effective evaluation and for substantiating the validity of stated claims. The proposal should not simply rephrase or restate the Government's requirements but rather provide convincing rationale to address how the offeror intends to meet these requirements. Offerors shall assume that the Government has no prior knowledge of their facilities and experience and will base its evaluation on the information

presented in the offeror's proposal. Any reference to day(s) stated in the RFP, attachments and other contractual documents should be considered as "calendar" days unless specifically stated otherwise. Offerors are advised their proposals are presumed to represent their best efforts and the most complete responses to this solicitation. Demonstration of capability and qualifications that clearly support the offeror's claims are essential. The absence of such evidence will adversely influence evaluation of the proposal. Offers will be evaluated using the Factors and Subfactors under Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award.

- (e) The offeror shall ensure that accurate contact information is provided for all references. The Government will make reasonable attempts to contact the listed Point of Contact (POCs). If the Government is unable to reach the listed POCs after reasonable attempts, the Government will not consider that reference.

### **L.2.1 General Information**

**L.2.1.1 Point of Contract:** The Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO) is the sole points of contact for this acquisition. Written requests for clarification and questions regarding this RFP are encouraged to be submitted as soon as possible but no later than 4:00PM EST on 13 January 2023 and shall be sent to the PCO at:

AMIC DET 2 OL/PKA (Patrick SFB FL)

**Attn: Mrs. Laytesha Batchelor / Mr. James Uram**

Email: [laytesha.batchelor.1@us.af.mil](mailto:laytesha.batchelor.1@us.af.mil) / [James.uram@us.af.mil](mailto:James.uram@us.af.mil)

Telephone: (321) 494-8950 / (321) 494-9020

**L.2.1.2 Debriefings:** The PCO will promptly notify offerors of any decision to exclude them from the competitive range; where upon, they may request and receive a debriefing in accordance with FAR 15.505. Offerors excluded from the competitive range may request a pre-award debriefing or they may choose to wait until after the source selection decision to request a post-award debriefing. However, offerors excluded from the competitive range are entitled to no more than one debriefing for each proposal. The CO will notify unsuccessful offerors in the competitive range of the source selection decision in accordance with FAR 15.506. Upon such notification, unsuccessful offerors may request and receive a debriefing. Offerors desiring a debriefing shall make their request in accordance with the requirements of FAR 15.505 or 15.506, as applicable.

**L.2.1.3 Discrepancies:** If an offeror believes that the requirements in these instructions contain an error, omission, or are otherwise unsound, the offeror shall immediately notify the PCO in writing with supporting rationale, as well as the remedies the offeror is asking the PCO to consider as related to the omission or error. Questions from prospective offerors must be submitted **no later than 13 January 2023**. Offerors must clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and provide complete accompanying rationale. The offeror is reminded that the Government reserves the right to award this effort based on the initial proposal, as received, without discussion. This reservation includes matters of omission, errors, and additional or substitute pages of the initial proposal.

**L.2.1.4 Electronic Reference Documents:** All unclassified referenced documents for this solicitation are

available on the System for Award Management website at <https://sam.gov>. Potential offerors are encouraged to subscribe for real-time e-mail notifications when information has been posted.

L.2.1.5 The proposal acceptance period is specified in Section A of the model contract/solicitation. In compliance with FAR 4.8 (Contract Files), the Government will retain one copy of all proposals electronically. All volumes shall be **UNCLASSIFIED**. Elaborate brochures or documentation, detailed artwork, or other embellishments are unnecessary and are not desired.

L.2.1.6 **Communications:** Exchanges of source selection information between Government and offerors will be controlled by the PCO. Email may be used to transmit such information *only* if the email can be sent encrypted and must include “**Source Selection Information – See FAR 2.101 and 3.104 - CUI**” in the subject line of the email. In order to facilitate the sending and receiving of encrypted emails, offerors may use the DoD SAFE file transfer site (This site is for UNCLASSIFIED documents only). When using DoD SAFE, offerors must first send an unencrypted email to the Contracting Officer, indicated on the face page of the solicitation, to request a DoD SAFE drop-off. When submitting source selection information via email, file suppression utilities, to include but not limited to zip files, **will not** be accepted.

L.2.1.7 **Notice to Offeror(s)/Supplier(s):** Funds are not presently available for this effort. No award will be made under this solicitation until funds are available. The Government reserves the right to cancel this solicitation, either before or after the closing date. In the event the Government cancels this solicitation, the Government has no obligation to reimburse an offeror for any costs.

## **L.2.2 Organization/Number of Copies/Page Limits:**

L.2.2.1. Submittal instructions. To ensure timely and equitable evaluation of proposals, offerors must follow the instructions provided. Offerors are required to submit all documentation/information detailed herein, including terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements. Failure to submit all required documentation/information may result in a proposal being ineligible for award. In submitting a proposal, offerors are agreeing to the terms and conditions as written in this Request for Proposal, as amended (if applicable).

- (a) Offerors shall submit one (1) electronic copy as described below. Submissions of proposals will be sent via DoD SAFE Site – Please send email request to [laytesha.batchelor.1@us.af.mil](mailto:laytesha.batchelor.1@us.af.mil) no later than 10:00 AM EST on **27 February 2023** to receive a code for submission. Include the First Name, Last Name, Email and Phone Number of the individual who will be submitting the proposal. Facsimiles (FAX) proposals will NOT be considered.
- (b) All pages of the electronic version will be submitted as indicated in the instructions found below. The RFP response shall consist of four (4) separate files as indicated in Table L.2.2- Proposal Organization.

Table L2.2 – Proposal Organization				
VOLUME	ICNTO	VOLUME TITLE	COPIES	PAGE LIMIT
I	L.3.0	Completed RFP	Electronic: 1 (email/DoD SAFE)	Unlimited
II	L.4.0	Cost/Price	Electronic: 1 (email/DoD SAFE)	Unlimited
III	L.5.0	Technical Capability Subfactor 1 TS/SCI Cleared Subfactor 2 Technical Approach to Task Order (TO) 01 (RFP Attachment 10) Subfactor 3 Small Business Participation	Electronic: 1 (email/DoD SAFE)	30 Pages
IV	L.6.0	Present/Past Performance	Electronic: 1 (email/DoD SAFE)	No More than 5 Pages per reference, maximum of 5 references

**L.2.2.2 Page Limitation.** All material shall be contained within the page limit identified for each volume or appendix. The page limitations specified in Table L2.2 above shall be treated as maximum limits to assist in the evaluation of each proposal. Total page count will be based on the electronic proposal submission. Each page shall be counted toward the above page limits except for cover pages, tables of contents, index tabs, glossaries, list of key terms, cross-reference pages, blank pages, and appendices to technical volume such as tables, charts, graphs, and illustrations. Also excluded from the page limits are consent letters, client authorization letters, company financial statements, security clearance documents, model contract, and Organizational Structure Change History. If exceeded, the excess pages will not be read or considered in the evaluation of the proposal. Page limitations may be placed on responses to Evaluation Notices (ENs). The specified page limits for EN responses will be identified in the letters forwarding the ENs to the offerors.

**L.2.2.2.1 Page Size and Format.** These instructions shall apply to electronic copy of proposals. These page format restrictions may also apply to Final Proposal Revisions (FPRs), if required.

- (a) Standard Page Format. Page size shall be 8.5 x 11 inches. Proposal pages shall be in a font size not less than 10-point font, single-spaced. The typeface should be a common medium condensed typeface (Arial or Times Roman). Margins shall be no smaller than one inch around the perimeter of each sheet of paper. Each volume shall use a consistent page numbering system.
- (b) Legible charts and graphs should be used where practical to depict organization and layout. These charts and graphs should be uncomplicated to preserve clarity. The size 10 font requirement includes the caption of the figures, charts, tables, and graphs. Any text within figures, charts, tables, and graphs which do not meet this requirement will not be considered in the evaluation.
- (c) The background color of each page of the proposal submission shall be white or ivory.
- (d) Each page should contain the following legend at the bottom of each sheet:  
**SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION--SEE FAR 2.101 and 3.104 - CUI**

**L.2.2.3 Cost/Price or Pricing Related Data.** The source selection will be conducted with the expectation of adequate price competition per FAR 15.403-1(c)(1)(i); therefore, certified cost and pricing data is not required. However, the offeror may be required to submit data other than certified cost or pricing data to the extent necessary for the Contracting Officer to determine price reasonableness IAW one or more of the proposal analysis techniques described in FAR 15.404. If adequate competition is not achieved, an offeror will be required to submit certified cost and pricing data IAW FAR 15.403-4 and 15.403-5 and submit a revised cost/price proposal which complies with FAR 15.408 Table 15-2.

**L.2.2.4 Classified Information.** The Government will not accept any classified information to be included as part of your proposal.

**L.2.2.5 Glossary of Abbreviations and Acronyms.** Each volume shall contain a glossary of all abbreviations, acronyms and key terms used, with an explanation for each. Glossaries do not count against the page limitations for their respective volumes.

**L.2.3 Electronic Offers.** Offerors shall provide proposal documents in Adobe Acrobat (.pdf). Offerors are requested to provide pricing spreadsheets in Excel (.xlsx) format showing the formulas.

### **L3.0 PROPOSAL CONTENT**

#### **L.3.0 Volume I – COMPLETED RFP**

**L.3.1 Narrative – Volume I, Completed RFP** shall consist of the completed and signed RFP, to include any amendments issued, with a cover letter delineating any exceptions taken to the RFP terms and conditions with accompanying rationale. However, offerors are cautioned that any noncompliance with the terms and conditions of the RFP may cause their proposal to be determined not eligible for award. Offerors shall ensure that all clauses and provisions that require “fill-in” information are appropriately completed.

#### **L.3.2 Other Information Required**

**L.3.2.1 Authorized Offeror Personnel.** Provide the name, title, and telephone number of the company/division point of contact regarding decisions made with respect to your proposal and who can obligate your company contractually. Also, identify those individuals authorized to negotiate with the Government and the name, title, and telephone number of the CEO, Division President, or Vice President of the offeror.

**L.3.2.2 Government Offices.** Provide the mailing address, telephone, e-mail address (if known), and facility codes for the cognizant Contract Administration Office and DCAA for the prime contractor and critical subcontractors. Also, provide the name, e-mail, and telephone for the Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO).

**L.3.2.3 Company/Division Address, Identifying Codes, and Applicable Designations.** Provide company/division's street address, facility code, CAGE code; Unique Entity ID (UEI), size of business (large or small), and labor surplus area designation. This same information must be provided if the work for this contract will be performed at any other location(s). Provide the same information for your critical subcontractors. List all locations where work is to be performed and indicate whether such facility is a division, affiliate, or subcontractor, and the percentage of work to be performed at

each location.

**L.3.2.4 Model Contract/Representations and Certifications.** The offeror's proposal shall include a digitally signed copy of the offer and Sections A through K. This includes:

**L.3.2.4.1 Section A – Solicitation/Contract Form.** Complete blocks 12 through 18 of the SF 33. In doing so, the offeror accedes to the contract terms and conditions as written in the RFP Sections A through K, which constitute the model contract. Note: An official having the authority to bind the offeror contractually must sign the SF 33.

**L.3.2.4.1.1 Proposal Validity.** Block 12 of the SF33 is hereby superseded with the following proposal Acceptance terms: Offeror's proposal shall be valid for a period of 365 days.

**L.3.2.4.2 Section B –** All instructions can be found in section L.4.2.2 SECTION 2.

**L.3.2.4.3 Section F – Deliveries or Performance.** Acknowledge content of Section F.

**L.3.2.4.4 Section G - Contract Administrative Data.** Complete the "fill-in" required in Contractor's Contract Administration, in Section G. If not applicable, state so.

**L.3.2.4.5 Section H – Special Contract Requirements.** Acknowledge or address content of Section H, as applicable.

**L.3.2.4.6 Section I – Contract Clauses.** Complete fill-ins as applicable.

**L.3.2.4.7 Section K - Representations, Certifications, and other Statements of Offerors** completed IAW FAR 52.204-8.

**L.3.2.4.8 SF30 - Acknowledgment of all solicitation amendments issued (if applicable).**

**L.3.2.5 Status of 8(a).** If applicable, provide a copy of the letter from the Small Business Administration (SBA) showing proof of Section 8(a) status.

**L.3.2.6 Organizational Financial Information.** Submit a copy of your latest available financial statement covering the organization(s), which will perform the contract. Include any information, which may have a bearing on your ability to handle the financial management of the contract. If you are proposing a joint venture, describe how you will handle financial matters.

**L.3.2.7 Subcontractors/Partners.** Provide company/division's street address, facility code, CAGE code, UEI, size of business (large or small), and labor surplus area designation for joint venture partners and intended critical subcontractors. Critical subcontractors are those proposed to perform 10 percent or more of the effort based on the total proposed price OR perform aspects of the effort the offeror considers critical to overall successful performance. Provide copies (redacted as necessary) of any firm agreements or contracts between business entities.

### L.3.3 Exceptions to Solicitation Requirements

Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as evaluation factors or subfactors. Offerors are cautioned that any noncompliance with the terms and conditions of the RFP may cause their proposal to be determined not eligible for award. Offerors shall clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and provide complete accompanying rationale. Each exception shall be specifically related to each paragraph and/or specific part of the solicitation to which the exception is taken. Provide rationale in support of the exception and fully explain its impact, if any, on the performance, schedule, cost/price, and specific requirements of the solicitation. This information shall be provided in the format and content of Table L3.3.

Table L3.3 - Solicitation Exceptions			
Solicitation Document	Page/Paragraph	Requirement/Portion	Rationale
SOO, SOW, SPEC, Model Contract, ICNTO, etc.	Applicable Page and Paragraph Numbers	Identify the requirement or portion to which exception is taken	Describe why the requirement can/will not be met

**L.3.4 GFP and/or Base Support Requirements.** If the offeror requires the use of Government furnished items other than those specified in the ADAMTD II PWS, the offeror shall provide a listing including quantity, federal stock number, nomenclature, date needed and duration of availability, rental value per FAR 45.1 and 45.2, reason for need, and cross reference to cost/price volume paragraphs which pertain to GFP and/or base support. The offeror shall also provide the written authorization from the cognizant ACO as applicable. The offeror shall supply this information in the format shown in Table L3.4 below.

Table L3.4 - Required Information for Using GFP/Base Support						
Quantity	Federal Stock Number	Nomenclature	Duration of Need	Rental Value	Reason for Need	Cross Reference to Price Proposal

### L.4.0 Volume II – Cost/Price (Factor 1)

#### L.4.1 General Instructions

**L.4.1.1 Cost/Price Reasonableness:** To aid in the Government's understanding of the offeror's proposal, describe the methodology and basis used to support how the offeror's proposed price is reasonable, complete, and balanced for the work to be performed IAW with the requirements stated in the RFP and PWS. This section is to assist you in submitting data other than certified cost or pricing data that is required to evaluate the reasonableness of your proposed cost/price. Compliance with these requirements is mandatory and failure to comply may result in rejection of your proposal. Costs or rates which are unbalanced, i.e., overstated or understated, may also be grounds for eliminating a proposal from competition. Offers should be sufficiently detailed to demonstrate their reasonableness. The burden of proof for credibility of proposed costs/prices rests with the offeror.



**L.4.1.2 Completeness.** A proposal is complete when all pricing data required under this solicitation is provided in the format prescribed and the offer has complied with all pricing requirements of the solicitation.

**L.4.1.3 Cost/Price Data.** Information beyond that required by this instruction shall not be submitted unless you consider it essential to document or support your cost/price position. All information relating to the proposed cost/price, including all required supporting documentation shall be included in the section of the proposal designated as the Cost/Price Volume. **Under no circumstances shall this information and documentation be included elsewhere in the proposal.**

**L.4.1.4 Price** will be evaluated for balance. Unbalanced pricing may increase performance risk and could result in payment of unreasonably high prices. Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable total evaluated price, the price of one or more line items is significantly over or understated as indicated by the application of price analysis techniques. Per FAR 15.404-1(g), the greatest risks associated with unbalanced pricing occur when startup work or mobilization **(there is no transition period in this effort)** is a separate line item, and the evaluated price is the aggregate of estimated quantities to be ordered under separate line items of an indefinite-delivery contract. An offer may be rejected if the contracting officer determines that the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.

**L.4.1.5 Professional Employee Compensation Realism** is a separate evaluation from the TEP evaluation. Professional Employee Compensation that is unrealistically low or not in a reasonable relationship to the various job categories, since it may impair the offeror's ability to attract and retain competent professional service employees, may be viewed as evidence of failure to comprehend the complexity of the contract requirements.

**L.4.1.6 Rounding.** All labor rates shall be rounded to the nearest penny.

**L.4.1.7 Contract Line Item Number (CLIN) Structure**

Contract CLIN 0001, O&M Labor will be firm-fixed-price (FFP).

CLIN 0002, R&D Labor will be cost plus fixed fee (CPFF). The fully burdened labor rates provided in RFP Attachment 2, CPFF Tab, will be incorporated into the basic IDIQ and will apply; however, the level of effort required to accomplish research and development per PWS paragraph 2 will be negotiated if, and when, a task order for CLIN 0002 is issued.

CLIN 0003, Travel and Other Direct Costs (O&M), will be reimbursed on a cost-only basis (plus G&A, if applicable).

CLIN 0004, Data Deliverables, will be Not Separately Priced.

**L.4.2 Volume Organization**

The Cost/Price Volume shall consist of the following:

**L.4.2.1 SECTION 1.** Table of Contents; summary descriptions of estimating, purchasing, and accounting systems; changes to estimating, accounting practices, or Cost Accounting Standards (CAS)



Disclosure Statement. Small Businesses shall provide either CAS Disclosure Statements or evidence of an acceptable accounting system as described in DFARS 252.242-7006(a)(1), and System Criteria described in 252.242-7006(c).

(a) Provide any supporting Forward Pricing Rate Recommendations (FPRR)/Forward Pricing Rate Agreements (FPRA) issued by DCMA or supporting audits issued by DCAA. If the proposed direct hourly rate for one or more labor categories does not match the applicable FPRR/FPRA with the cognizant DCMA or if an FPRR/FPRA is not available, then the offeror shall provide an explanation of the methodology used to develop both the direct labor rates and indirect rates proposed.

(b) If applicable, provide calculations showing the development of composite and/or average rates from contractor fiscal year to government fiscal year.

(c) If applicable, provide supporting documentation (DD Form 1861 and CASB-CMF) for proposed Facilities Capital Cost of Money.

(d) Provide any other pricing data believed prudent and necessary to justify the cost/price proposal.

(e) Estimating System. Provide a summary description of your standard estimating system or methods. The summary description shall cover separately each major cost element (e.g., Direct Material, Engineering Labor, Manufacturing Labor, Indirect Costs, Other Direct Costs, Overhead, G&A). Also, identify any deviations from your standard estimating procedures in preparing this proposal volume. Indicate whether you have Government approval of your system and if so, provide evidence of such approval.

(f) Purchasing System: Provide a summary description of your purchasing system or methods (e.g., how material requirements are determined, how sources are selected, when firm quotes are obtained, what provision is made to ensure quantity and other discounts). Also, identify any deviations from your standard procedures in preparing this proposal. Indicate whether you have Government approval of your system and if so, provide evidence of such approval.

(g) Accounting System: Indicate whether you have Government approval of your accounting system and if so, provide evidence of such approval. Also, identify any deviations from your standard procedures in preparing this proposal.

#### **L.4.2.2 SECTION 2:**

(a) **Section B:** Will not be completed. RFP Attachment 5 will be utilized to calculate the Total Evaluated Price (TEP), and will be filed in Volume II, Cost/Price.

The negotiated fully burdened rates from Attachment 3, Direct Rates FFP and the direct/indirect rates from Attachment 2, Direct-Indirect Rates CPFF, will be incorporated into the basic contract, for pricing task orders for the O&M and R&D work performed under CLINs 0001 and 0002, respectively. The information provided in Attachment 2 will not be included in the TEP; however, the rates will be used to determine the direct/indirect rates Fair and Reasonable.

Pricing Task Order 1: Task Order 1 will be issued at the time of basic contract award, to cover all R&D and O&M work required by the Task Order 1 PWS (RFP Attachment 10). The proposed (and accepted) labor categories, hours, and rates entered in Attachment 2 of the RFP, Direct-Indirect Rates CPFF, “Year 1” and Attachment 3 of the RFP, Direct Rates FFP “Year 1”, for the period of performance indicated, will be utilized to price and award Task Order 1 to the successful offeror, (subject to FAR 52.232-18 – Availability of Funds).

Any subsequent task order issued against CLIN 0001 and CLIN 0002, will be negotiated at the individual task order level.

(b) **Labor Rates.** Offerors shall provide the labor rates that will be used during contract performance, and for billing purposes. The proposed rates shall show an unburdened rate and a fully burdened rate which includes allocable and allowable costs (e.g., labor, fringe, overhead, G&A, Fee/Profit) required to perform the requirements as stated in the PWS. Offerors shall provide a detailed schedule which shows the development of each labor rate on the ordering period on RFP Attachment 2, Direct-Indirect Rates, Offerors shall also provide a narrative that describes the offeror’s rationale used to develop each labor rate (e.g., labor categories, estimated hours, fringe, escalation factors and other allowable indirect expenses). Provide all other considerations and assumptions made in developing the rates. For RFP Attachment 3, Direct Rates FFP, Offerors shall provide the Fully Burdened Labor rate required to perform the requirements as stated in the PWS.

The Government estimated workload data is based on anticipated mission requirements and historical data. Contractor may propose alternative workload data (hours). Proposed changes to workload estimates shall be highlighted for ease of government evaluation. Offerors should be cognizant that this requirement is an IDIQ contract, and as such, could change; the Government reserves the right to negotiate in-scope changes to increase or decrease hours when mission needs drive such a decision.

(c) **Labor hours and categories.** The labor categories included in **Appendix D** of the PWS represent the government’s anticipated **labor categories**. If an offeror uses different titles for labor categories, or different skill sets for labor categories, proposals shall map labor category to those provided by the Government. Additionally, for labor categories that are different than those provided in **Appendix D** of the PWS, the contractor shall provide a clear and concise description including experience, duties, and education.

(d) **Subcontracts:** Offerors shall:  
Provide a summary listing of all anticipated subcontractors.

IAW FAR 15.404-3, provide the prime offeror’s cost/price evaluations and negotiations on each subcontract exceeding 10 percent of the total proposed price, if the percentage is above the TINA threshold. Describe the evaluation and rationale, including all relevant facts and data which led to the subcontract amount incorporated in the cost proposal. Identify all adjustments made to the subcontractor’s proposed costs. Prime contractors with an approved purchasing system shall submit this data in addition to and in accordance with their approved purchasing plan.

Subcontractors may submit subcontract proposals directly to the Contracting Officer if the cost information is considered proprietary data. All required data shall be received by the same date/time as the prime’s proposal.

(e) **Solicitation Total Evaluated Price.** Offerors shall fill in and return RFP Attachment 5. The TEP will be calculated by the sum of all elements of the price/cost proposal, to include all five (5) years of

the ordering period for CLINs 0001-0004 and the 6-month Option to Extend Services for CLINs 0001-0004.

If at any time during this source selection, the Contracting Officer determines that adequate price competition no longer exists or that price reasonableness cannot be determined, Offerors may be required to submit certified cost or pricing data or additional data other than certified cost or pricing data, as appropriate, for the Contracting Officer to determine price reasonableness.

(f) **ADAMTD II Pricing and Professional Compensation Matrix (RFP Attachment 7)**

The ADAMTD II Pricing and Professional Comp Matrix shall be completed in accordance with the following instructions. Offerors shall fill in the “Green” shaded cells as appropriate to fulfill the requirements specified in the PWS.

The ADAMTD II Pricing and Professional Comp Matrix shall be in Excel Format and the spreadsheet **shall be unlocked**. Offerors shall not alter any formulas in the ADAMTD II Pricing and Professional Comp Matrix. However, if there are additional indirect burdens required, please provide a similar spreadsheet to account for the change that utilizes the same/similar formulas.

**Professional Compensation Plan**

The offeror shall submit a Professional Compensation Plan, consisting of both a narrative, and RFP Attachment 7 – “Professional Comp Matrix”. IAW FAR Provision 52.222-46, Evaluation of Compensation for Professional Employees (Feb 1993), As part of their proposals, offerors shall submit a total compensation plan setting forth salaries and fringe benefits proposed for the professional employees who will work under this contract.

**Compensation Plan Narrative**

Provide a narrative of planned compensation for all professional employee labor categories proposed to perform the effort. Fringe benefit data shall include a description of the benefits offered, and to which professional employee category(ies) the fringe benefits apply.

**Professional Comp Matrix Instructions**

Offerors shall complete all “Green” shaded cells and shall not alter any formulas in the Professional Comp Matrix.

- Offeror shall enter the Prime/Subcontractor(s) names in Column B.
- In Column C, the offeror shall enter the corresponding Offeror's labor category, as applicable, if they are different from the Government labor categories identified in Column A.
- In Column D, the offeror shall enter the quantity of FTEs being proposed for each labor category.
- Additionally, offerors shall provide the base (raw) hourly rates in Column E, exclusive of all cost factors (e.g., fringe, indirect labor, G&A, profit, etc.); do not enter fully burdened labor rates or any other markups.
- Offerors shall also enter in fringe percentage rates (not dollars) in Column F. “Yellow”

shaded cells are locked and will automatically calculate when Columns E and F are completed correctly by offeror.

The prime offeror's Compensation Plan (Narrative and Professional Comp Matrix) shall be included in the prime contractor's proposal.

The prime may instruct subcontractors/teaming partners to electronically submit their Compensation Plans (Narrative and Professional Comp Matrix) directly to the Contracting Officer, if applicable.

Offerors may propose one (1) Compensation Plan Narrative and one (1) Professional Comp Matrix for the entire team.

Offerors shall map proposed labor categories (to include Subcontractors) to the corresponding Government labor category if they deviate from the Government's labor category, and map salary support documentation to each proposed labor category in "Labor Rate Support Data" (Column H).

Offeror shall provide salary support data from recent surveys and/or studies from professional, public, and private organizations (e.g., Salary.com, Bureau of Labor Statistics, etc.) used to support the proposed compensation. Identify the source of the provided surveys and studies. Data may be in the form of reports, payrolls, table of labor categories with salary ranges, etc. If not using one of the sources listed above, explain the credibility of the source providing the surveys and studies. Support data shall be included in the Compensation Plan Narrative.

Unrealistically low professional employee salaries may impair the offeror's ability to attract and retain competent professional employees and may be viewed as evidence of failure to comprehend the complexity of the contract requirements.

(g) **Travel/ODC:** Travel/ODC CLIN shall be Cost-Reimbursement (COST) Non-Fee bearing CLIN, which include provision for the cost of all travel and associated burdens (G&A expenses). Offerors shall use the government-provided not-to-exceed values stated for CLINs 0003 in RFP Attachment 2.

(h) **Solicitation Total Proposal Price.** Offerors shall fill in and return RFP Attachment 2, 3 and 5.

#### **L.4.3 Other Information:**

Service Contract Labor Standards Act (SCLSA). Labor under this effort is exempt from the SCLSA.

### **L.5.0 Volume III – Technical (FACTOR 2)**

#### **L.5.1 General**

This volume should be specific and complete. Legibility, clarity, and coherence are very important. Using the instructions provided below, and in consideration of the Assessment Criteria defined in Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award, provide as specifically as possible the actual methodology you would use to satisfy the requirements. All the requirements specified in the solicitation are mandatory. By your

proposal submission, you are representing that your firm is capable of performing all the requirements specified in the solicitation, to include RFP Attachment 1 - PWS.

## **L.5.2 Format and Specific Content**

### **L.5.2.1 Technical Proposal**

The following information shall be provided in the written technical proposal and will be evaluated as described in section M.2.2 - Step II - Technical Proposal Evaluation. The offeror shall submit their technical proposal that includes submission verification of proposed personnel with TS/SCI clearances. In addition, the technical proposal shall include a response to the technical approach to TO1, as well as submission of small business participation.

**L.5.2.3 Volume Organization.** The Technical Volume shall be organized according to the following general outline:

- 1) Table of contents
- 2) List of Tables/Charts/Graphs/Illustrations
- 3) Glossary of key words and acronyms
- 4) Short introduction and summary
- 5) Response to factors and subfactors

**L.5.2.4 Evaluation Factors and Subfactors.** The offeror shall submit responses to the following factors and subfactors:

**Factor 1: Technical Capability:** In the technical volume, address your technical solution for meeting or exceeding the Government's minimum performance or capability requirements of each technical subfactor.

#### **1. Subfactor One (1): Top Secret/Sensitive Compartmented Information (TS/SCI) Cleared**

The offeror's proposal shall provide verifiable proof/evidence that the Offeror has a Secret Facility Clearance in accordance with (IAW) the DD254 (RFP Attachment 8).

The offeror's proposal shall provide verifiable proof/evidence that key management personnel, along with all technical personnel performing classified work on this contract, possess at least a SECRET clearance at the time of contract award in accordance with PWS (RFP Attachment 1) Paragraph 5.3.

The offeror's proposal shall provide verifiable proof/evidence that the offeror will establish and maintain a TOP SECRET/SCI security clearance and be DCID 6/4 eligible with a current SSBI for a minimum of one (1) or more individual(s) that will be onsite at the AFTAC building to train AFTAC staff and to install software deliverables. This clearance must be obtained within twelve (12) months from contract initiation in accordance with PWS (RFP Attachment 1) Paragraph 5.3.

#### **2. Subfactor Two (2): Technical Approach to TO1**

The offeror's proposal shall detail a Technical Approach to ADAMTD II Task Order 01 (RFP Attachment 10). The offeror shall demonstrate a firm understanding of meteorology, meteorological model and data assimilation setup/implementation, High Performance Computing (HPC) applications, and software version control.

The government is looking at the offeror's demonstrated ability to perform the following:

- i. Model setup and Data Assimilation (DA) approach
- ii. Integration of software onto High Performance Computing (HPC)
- iii. Software version control and project management

### 3. Subfactor Three (3): Small Business Participation

Small Business Participation Commitment Document. All offerors (both small businesses and other than small businesses) shall provide the following SBPCD requirements and substantiating documentation to demonstrate how you will meet these requirements. This required information will be used to evaluate the extent of your proposed participation/commitment to use U.S. small businesses in the performance of this acquisition (as small business prime offerors or small business subcontractors) relative to Section M, Subfactor 3, and Small Business Participation Commitment. The SBPCD will be incorporated into any resulting contract(s).

- (a) Identify the small business concerns (SBC), as defined in FAR Part 19, that are to be used in your proposed approach to satisfying the solicitation requirements, should include company name, business category(ies), description of products or services and NAICS code to be provided by each SBC and the nature of the commitment with the SBC (i.e., letter of commitment, joint ventures, mentor protégé agreements, others). Use the table/format below to provide the required information.

Company Name	Small Business Category(ies) (SB, WOSB, SDB, HUBZone, VOSB, SDVOSB)	Product(s)/Service(s) to be Provided, including type & variety of work and PWS paragraph refer	NAICS Code	Nature of Commitment	Planned percentage of total proposed contract value

- (b) Offerors shall provide explanations/documentation to support quantitative small business participation. Such information should include (*all supporting documentation is excluded from the page count. Supporting documents will not be incorporated into any resulting contract*):
  - 1) Letters of commitment, mentor/protégé agreements, or other demonstrations of commitment;
  - 2) Identification of the type and variety of the work small firms are to perform;
  - 3) The extent of participation of small businesses in terms of the value of the total acquisition (total contract value);
  - 4) Detailed explanations/documentation supporting the proposed quantitative participation;
  - 5) Extent to which the offeror complied with requirements of FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns in previous contracts;
  - 6) Extent to which the offeror complied with requirements of FAR 52.219-9 Small Business Subcontracting Plan (when applicable) in previous contracts.

The Government has established the following minimum requirements for small business participation:

Minimum Quantitative Requirement (MQR) – **Small Business Participation** (Including small business prime offeror’s participation)

Business Category	Dollar Value	% of Contract Value
Total Proposed Contract Value – Prime Offeror	\$	%
Total Small Business ( <b>Must total at least 15%</b> )	\$	%
Small Disadvantaged Business	\$	%
Woman-Owned Small Business	\$	%
HUBZone Small Business	\$	%
Veteran-Owned Small Business	\$	%
Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business	\$	%

NOTE: The work to be performed directly by a small business prime offeror shall be evaluated as Small Business Participation.

- (c) **Small Business Subcontracting Plan.** All other than small businesses (a.k.a. ‘large’) offerors shall submit a subcontracting plan in accordance with FAR 52.219-9. Small business subcontracting plans will not be evaluated for source selection purposes; however, a plan must be negotiated with the apparently successful offeror and accepted by the government **prior to contract award**. Failure to submit and negotiate the subcontracting plan shall make the apparently successful offeror ineligible for award of the contract. Either individual or master subcontracting plans may be submitted.

## **L.6.0 Volume IV – Present/Past Performance (FACTOR 3)**

### **L.6.1 General**

L.6.1.1 The offeror shall submit Present/Past Performance Information for itself, any joint venture member, and each proposed critical subcontractor, if applicable, IAW the format contained in RFP Attachment 4 – Present/Past Performance Information, and the following paragraphs. A critical subcontractor is defined as an entity other than the offeror itself that will perform ten percent (10%) or more of the proposed effort based on the total proposed price; or that will perform aspects of the effort the offeror considers critical to overall successful performance such as serving in a ‘Principal’, ‘Lead’, ‘Senior’ or managerial designated role. See paragraph L.6.3.1 for specific guidance on the number of present/past performance examples requested. Offerors with no present/past performance shall provide a statement to that effect. Offerors are cautioned that the government will use data provided by each offeror in this volume and data obtained from other sources in the evaluation of present/past performance.

L.6.1.2 The offeror shall ensure that accurate contact information is provided for all references. The Government will make reasonable attempts to contact the listed Point of Contact (POCs). If the Government is unable to reach the listed POCs after reasonable attempts, the Government will not consider that reference.

L.6.1.3 Along with the information required in this paragraph, the offeror shall submit a consent letter (see RFP Attachment 6) executed by each critical subcontractor and/or joint venture partner (if



applicable) for whom past performance is provided. The purpose of the consent letter is to authorize release of adverse present/past performance information to the prime offeror to allow the prime offeror an opportunity to respond to such information. If no subcontractor or joint venture partner present/past performance inputs are submitted as part of Volume IV, no consent letter is required

#### L.6.2. Recent Contracts

L.6.2.1 To be recent, the effort must be ongoing or must have been performed during the past five (5) years from the date of issuance of this solicitation.

#### L.6.3 Relevant Contracts

L.6.3.1 Submit information in accordance with paragraph L.2.2. Prime offerors shall submit Present/Past Performance Information on a maximum of three (3) recent contracts that they consider the most relevant in demonstrating their ability to perform the proposed effort and a total of two (2) recent contracts performed by joint venture partners and/or critical subcontractors (if applicable; no more than five total). Include rationale supporting your assertion of relevance. For a description of the characteristics or aspects the government will consider in determining recency and relevance, see RFP Attachment 9, Section M2.3.

L.6.3.2 Specific Content. Offerors are required to explain what aspects of the contracts are deemed relevant to the proposed effort and to what aspects of the proposed effort they relate. This may include a discussion of efforts accomplished by the offeror to resolve problems encountered on prior contracts as well as past efforts to identify and manage program risk. Merely having problems does not automatically equate to a limited or no confidence rating, since the problems encountered may have been on a more complex program, or an offeror may have subsequently demonstrated the ability to overcome the problems encountered. The offeror is required to clearly demonstrate management actions employed in overcoming problems and the effects of those actions in terms of improvements achieved or problems rectified.

On the (up to) five (5) contracts submitted in Volume IV, Present/Past Performance, include relevant information concerning the offeror's/joint venture member's and critical subcontractor's compliance with the requirements of FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns or FAR 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan, if these clauses were included in the present/past performance example contract. Copies of contractual reports may be submitted to validate compliance with requirements of FAR 52.219-8/52.219-9. Explanation of efforts where minimum quantitative requirements and/or goals were not met should be provided. (Please note FAR 52.219-8 applies to ALL businesses, whereas FAR 52.219-9 only applies to large businesses.)

L.6.3.3 Organizational Structure Change History. Many companies have acquired, been acquired by, or otherwise merged with other companies, and/or reorganized their divisions, business groups, subsidiary companies, etc. In many cases, these changes have taken place during the time of performance of relevant past efforts or between conclusion of recent past efforts and this source selection. As a result, it is sometimes difficult to determine what present/past performance is relevant to this acquisition. To facilitate this relevancy determination, include in this proposal volume a "roadmap" describing all such changes in the organization of your company. A pamphlet or other commercial document describing such reorganizations may suffice. As part of this explanation, show how these changes impact the relevance of any efforts you identify for present/past performance evaluation/performance confidence assessment. Since the Government intends to consider present/past performance information provided by other sources as well as that provided by the offeror(s), your "roadmap" should be both specifically applicable to the efforts you identify and general enough to apply to efforts on which the Government receives information from other sources.

## **Section M - Evaluation Factors for Award**

### **M.1.0 Source Selection**

#### **M1.1 Basis for Contract Award**

The Performance Price Tradeoff approach is a tradeoff source selection methodology on the Best Value Continuum that permits a tradeoff between price and performance in reaching the award decision; Past Performance is significantly more important than Price. The Government intends to award a single award Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract as a result of this solicitation. In using the best value approach, the Government seeks to award to the offeror who gives the Government the greatest confidence that it will best meet or exceed our requirements, price and present/past performance considered. Tradeoffs may be made between present/past performance and cost/price, with present/past performance considered significantly more important than cost/price. In this approach, the SSA has the discretion to award to offeror with a higher Performance Confidence rating, if the price differential is warranted. To arrive at a best value decision, the SSA will integrate the source selection team's evaluations of the factors and subfactors described in this solicitation. While the Government will strive for maximum objectivity, the tradeoff process, by its nature, is subjective; therefore, professional judgment is implicit throughout the selection process.

Award will be made to the responsible offeror whose proposal conforms to all required terms and conditions, includes all required representations and certifications, meets all requirements set forth in the RFP, has acceptable Small Business Participation, and provides the best value to the Government based on the results of the evaluation as described in section II below. Section L and M, RFP Attachment 9, includes the Evaluation Factors for award.

#### **M.1.2 Number of Contracts**

The Government intends to award a single award IDIQ contract and one initial Task Order concurrently.

#### **M.1.3 Competitive Advantage from Use of GFP**

The Government will eliminate any competitive advantage resulting from an offeror's proposed use of Government Furnished Property (GFP).

#### **M.1.4 Correction Potential of Proposals**

The Government will consider, throughout the evaluation, the "correction potential" of any deficiency or weakness. The judgment of such "correction potential" is within the sole discretion of the Government. If an aspect of an offeror's proposal does not meet the Government's requirements and is not considered correctable, the offeror may be eliminated from the competitive range. Those offers which fail to meet the material requirement of the RFP will be deemed unacceptable and removed from further consideration.

#### **M.1.5 Rejection of Unrealistic Offers**

The Government may reject any proposal that is evaluated to be unrealistic in terms of program commitments, contract terms and conditions, or unrealistically low in cost when compared to Government estimates, such that the proposal is deemed to reflect an inherent lack of competence or failure to comprehend the complexity and risks of the program.

## **M2.0 EVALUATION FACTORS**

By submission of its offer, the offeror agrees to all solicitation requirements, including terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as evaluation factors. The tradeoff will occur only between the present/past performance factor and the price factor. Failure to adhere to all solicitation requirements may result in an offer being determined unacceptable and ineligible for further evaluation. The determination to eliminate an offeror from further evaluation, for failure to adhere to solicitation requirements, is at the Government's sole discretion. Offerors must clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and provide complete accompanying rationale. The evaluation process shall proceed as follows:

### **M2.1 Step I – Cost/Price Proposal Evaluation**

- 1) Starting with the lowest TEP offered, cost/price proposals will be evaluated for cost/price reasonableness, balance, and understanding of the requirement (completeness) based upon the TEP for CLINs 0001-0003 using one or more of the techniques described in FAR 15.404. The Professional Employee Compensation Plan will be evaluated for realism and is separate from the TEP evaluation. Offerors whose TEP is incomplete, unreasonable, or unbalanced, or whose Professional Employee Compensation Plan is considered unrealistic may not be considered for award. The price evaluation will document Reasonableness, Professional Employee Compensation Realism, Balance, and Completeness as defined below.
- 2) Cost/Price Reasonableness. The proposed costs and prices will be evaluated for reasonableness. Analysis of proposals will be performed using one or more of the techniques defined in FAR 15.404-1 in order to determine reasonableness. Reasonableness must represent a cost/price to the Government a prudent person would pay in the conduct of competitive business (FAR 31.201-3(a)). Normally, cost/price reasonableness is established through adequate price competition but may be determined through analysis techniques as described in FAR 15.404-1.
- 3) Realism of Professional Employee Compensation Plan. For evaluation purposes only, offerors' proposals will be evaluated to determine compliance with the provisions at FAR 52.222-46 - Evaluation of Compensation for Professional Employees (Feb 1993). Failure to demonstrate a realistic Professional Compensation Plan may render a proposal ineligible for award on the basis that the offeror does not understand the requirement or proposed unrealistically low professional employee compensation.
- 4) Balanced Pricing. Proposals will be reviewed for unbalanced pricing. The Government will evaluate any supporting information provided by offerors explaining variances that appear unbalanced. Evaluated offers that are determined to be unbalanced may be deemed ineligible for award by the PCO if a determination is made that lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government. Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable total price, the price of one or more line items is significantly over or understated as demonstrated by application of price analysis techniques.
- 5) Completeness. A proposal is complete when all pricing data required in RFP Attachment 2, 3 and 5 is provided in the format prescribed. Further, all "Green" shaded cells within RFP Attachment

7, Professional Comp Matrix are completed, as applicable, and the TEP is correct. Submission of an incomplete proposal may result in rejection of the proposal.

- 6) Total Evaluated Price (TEP). Price analysis will be conducted to verify the overall price offered is reasonable, complete, and balanced, and the professional employee compensation is realistic. The TEP will be calculated by the summation of all proposed costs/prices (CLINs 0001 – 0003) as provided in RFP Attachment 5. The Government will provide a plug number for the R&D Labor (CLIN 0002) for all years of the ordering period. This number shall not be altered. The Government will provide the Travel/ODC (CLIN 0003) amount for all years of the ordering period. This number shall not be [altered](#).

## **M2.2 Step II – Technical Proposal Evaluation**

Next, once it is determined which offeror has the lowest acceptable TEP, considering all the factors mentioned in section M.2.1, that offeror's Technical Proposal will be evaluated. The Government will evaluate proposals for technical acceptability on an "Acceptable/Unacceptable" basis. If the lowest TEP offeror receives an "Acceptable" technical evaluation rating, evaluation of that proposal will continue to Step III Present/Past Performance. If the lowest TEP offeror receives an "Unacceptable" technical evaluation rating, evaluation of that proposal will stop. In that instance, the Government will continue the evaluation process, in order by price, with the next lowest TEP offer, until an offeror receives an "Acceptable" technical evaluation rating. A proposal that receives an "Acceptable" technical evaluation rating is considered technically acceptable. Only those proposals determined to be technically acceptable, will be considered for award.

The technical factor will receive one (1) overall rating of either an "Acceptable" or "Unacceptable" based on the evaluation of Subfactor 1, Subfactor 2, and Subfactor 3. To receive an "Acceptable" rating, all three (3) subfactors will have to have received an "Acceptable" rating" on their respective evaluation below. Any rating of "Unacceptable" will stop any further evaluation of that proposal.

<b>Technical Subfactor 1 – TECHNICAL EVALUATION RATINGS</b>	
<b>Rating</b>	<b>Description</b>
Acceptable	<p>The offeror's proposal provides verifiable proof/evidence that the offeror has a Secret Facility Clearance in accordance with (IAW) the DD254 (RFP Attachment 8).</p> <p><a href="#">The offeror's proposal shall provide verifiable proof/evidence that key management personnel, along with all technical personnel performing classified work on this contract, possess at least a SECRET clearance at the time of contract award in accordance with PWS (RFP Attachment 1) Paragraph 5.3.</a></p> <p><a href="#">The offeror's proposal shall provide verifiable proof/evidence that the offeror will establish and maintain a TOP SECRET/SCI security clearance and be DCID 6/4 eligible with a current SSBI for a minimum of one (1) or more individual(s) that will be onsite at the AFTAC building to train AFTAC staff and to install software deliverables. This clearance must be obtained within twelve (12) months from contract initiation in accordance with PWS (RFP Attachment 1) Paragraph 5.3.</a></p>
Unacceptable	<p>The offeror's proposal does not provide verifiable proof/evidence that the offeror has a Secret Facility Clearance in accordance with (IAW) the DD254 (RFP Attachment 8).</p>

	<p>The offeror's proposal does not provide verifiable proof/evidence that key management personnel, along with all technical personnel performing classified work on this contract, possess at least a SECRET clearance at the time of contract award in accordance with PWS (RFP Attachment 1) Paragraph 5.3.</p> <p>The offeror's proposal does not provide verifiable proof/evidence that the offeror will establish and maintain a TOP SECRET/SCI security clearance and be DCID 6/4 eligible with a current SSBI for a minimum of one (1) or more individual(s) that will be onsite at the AFTAC building to train AFTAC staff and to install software deliverables. This clearance must be obtained within twelve (12) months from contract initiation in accordance with PWS (RFP Attachment 1) Paragraph 5.3.</p>
--	---

<b>Technical Subfactor 2 - TECHNICAL EVALUATION RATINGS</b>	
<b>Rating</b>	<b>Description</b>
Acceptable	<p>The offeror has clearly demonstrated, through the submission of adequate documentation detailing their Technical Approach to ADAMTD II Task Order 01 (RFP Attachment 10), that they have technical expertise to perform:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Model setup and Data Assimilation (DA) approach</li> <li>b) Integration of software onto High Performance Computing (HPC)</li> <li>c) Software version control and project management</li> </ul>
Unacceptable	<p>The offeror has not clearly demonstrated, through the submission of adequate documentation detailing their Technical Approach to ADAMTD II Task Order 01 (RFP Attachment 10), that they have technical expertise to perform:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Model setup and Data Assimilation (DA) approach</li> <li>b) Integration of software onto High Performance Computing (HPC)</li> <li>c) Software version control and project management</li> </ul>

<b>Technical Subfactor 3 - TECHNICAL EVALUATION RATINGS</b>	
<b>Rating</b>	<b>Description</b>
Acceptable	Proposal does meet small business objectives.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet small business objectives.

### **M2.3 STEP III PRESENT/PAST PERFORMANCE**

Next, once the Government has determined the offeror with the lowest "Acceptable" TEP, considering all the factors mentioned in section M2.1, and receives an "Acceptable" in the technical rating, the government will then evaluate the offeror's present/past performance in order to assign an overall performance confidence assessment rating. The present/past performance evaluation results in an assessment of the Government's confidence in the offeror's probability of meeting the solicitation requirements.

#### **Evaluation Process**

The present/past performance evaluation will result in an assessment of the offeror's probability of meeting the PWS requirements. The present/past performance evaluation will consider an offeror's demonstrated recent and relevant record of performance in supplying the services that meet the contract's requirements. The recency and relevance of the present/past performance information, the quality of performance, source of the information and context of the data will be considered. All of this information will then be combined to establish one performance confidence assessment rating for each offeror that is actually evaluated for present/past performance.

The present/past performance evaluation also includes applicable critical subcontractors/joint venture members demonstrated recent, relevant, and quality record of performance provided by the offeror. Performance confidence is assessed at the overall Present/Past Performance factor level after evaluating aspects of the offeror's recent and relevant present/past performance. In conducting the Present/Past Performance evaluation, the Government will contact all references listed in the RFP Attachment 4, Past Performance Information Sheet, to validate past performance information submitted by offerors. Therefore, the offeror shall ensure that accurate contact information is provided for all references. The Government will make reasonable attempts to contact the listed Point of Contact (POCs). If the Government is unable to reach the listed POCs after reasonable attempts, the Government will not consider that reference. The Government reserves the right to use both the information provided in the offeror's Present/Past Performance proposal volume and information obtained from other sources available to the Government, to include, but not limited to, the Present/Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS), Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), or other databases; the Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA); the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA); and interviews with Program Managers, Contracting Officers, and Fee Determining Officials.

#### Recency Assessment

An assessment of the present/past performance information will first be made to determine if it is recent. To be recent, the effort must be ongoing or must have been performed during the past five (5) years from the date of issuance of this solicitation. Present/Past performance information that fails this condition will not be evaluated for relevance or quality.

#### Relevancy Assessment

Next, the Government will conduct an in-depth evaluation of all recent present/past performance information obtained to determine how closely the services performed under those contracts relate to the requirements of this solicitation. The Government will assign a relevancy rating using the following relevancy definitions when assessing each recent past performance citation:

<b>TABLE 4 – Past Performance Relevancy Rating Method</b>	
<b>Rating</b>	<b>Definition</b>
VERY RELEVANT	Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
RELEVANT	Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
SOMEWHAT RELEVANT	Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
NOT RELEVANT	Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

For each recent present/past performance record reviewed, the scope of work performed will generally be assessed as follows:

**Essentially the Same Scope** will include most of the requirements in each of the following areas:

- a) Develop and support software capabilities on High Performance Computing (HPC) systems.
- b) Implement strategy for software version control and project tracking.
- c) Institute high resolution Numerical Weather Prediction (NWP) modeling and data assimilation.
- d) Develop software in a containerized environment.
- e) Work through the scan process for government software deliveries.
- f) Conduct Technology Readiness Levels studies.

**Similar Scope** will include, as a minimum three (3) of the following:

- a) Develop and support software capabilities on High Performance Computing (HPC) systems.
- b) Implement strategy for software version control and project tracking.
- c) Institute high resolution Numerical Weather Prediction (NWP) modeling and data assimilation.
- d) Develop software in a containerized environment.
- e) Work through the scan process for government software deliveries.
- f) Conduct Technology Readiness Levels studies.

**Some of the Scope** will include, as a minimum two (2) of the following:

- a) Develop and support software capabilities on High Performance Computing (HPC) systems.
- b) Implement strategy for software version control and project tracking.
- c) Institute high resolution Numerical Weather Prediction (NWP) modeling and data assimilation.
- d) Develop software in a containerized environment.
- e) Work through the scan process for government software deliveries.
- f) Conduct Technology Readiness Levels studies.

**Little or None of the Scope** will include either one (1) or none of the following:

- a) Develop and support software capabilities on High Performance Computing (HPC) systems.
- b) Implement strategy for software version control and project tracking.
- c) Institute high resolution Numerical Weather Prediction (NWP) modeling and data assimilation.
- d) Develop software in a containerized environment.
- e) Work through the scan process for government software deliveries.
- f) Conduct Technology Readiness Levels studies.

A relevancy determination of the offeror's present/past performance will be made based upon the DoD Source Selection Procedures, Table 4 – Present/Past Performance Relevancy Rating Method, shown above. Where a relevant performance record indicates performance problems, the Government will consider the number and severity of the problems and the appropriateness and effectiveness of any corrective actions taken (not just planned or promised). The Government may review more recent contracts or performance evaluations to ensure corrective actions have been implemented and to evaluate their effectiveness. The Government is not bound by an offeror's opinion of a project's relevancy. In determining relevancy for individual contracts, consideration will be given to the effort, or portion of the effort, being proposed by the offeror, critical subcontractors/joint venture members whose contract is being reviewed and evaluated.

With respect to relevancy, present/past performance of greater relevancy will typically be a stronger predictor of future success and have more influence on the present/past performance confidence assessment than present/past performance of lesser relevance.

#### Quality Record of Performance

The Government will consider the performance quality of recent, very relevant, relevant, and somewhat relevant efforts (how well the contractor performed on the contracts) in determining the overall performance confidence assessment rating. The quality assessment consists of an evaluation of all present/past performance information available, regardless of its source. Performance information from any source will be incorporated into the performance confidence assessment. The quality assessment may result in positive or adverse findings. Adverse is defined as present/past performance information that supports a less than satisfactory rating on any evaluation element or any unfavorable comment received from sources without a formal rating system. For adverse information identified, the evaluation will consider the number and severity of the problem(s), mitigating circumstances, and the effectiveness of corrective actions that have resulted in sustained improvements.



### Assigning Performance Confidence Ratings

As a result of the relevancy and quality assessments of the recent contracts evaluated, the technically acceptable offeror will receive an integrated overall performance confidence assessment rating. The Performance Confidence Assessment ratings include Substantial Confidence, Satisfactory Confidence, Neutral Confidence, Limited Confidence, or No Confidence, as defined in DoD Source Selection Procedures, Table 5 – Performance Confidence Assessments Rating Method, shown below. Present/Past performance regarding predecessor companies or subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement will be rated as highly as present/past performance information for the principal offeror. The resulting performance confidence assessment rating is made at the factor level and represents an overall evaluation of contractor performance. In the case of offerors for which there is no information on present/past contract performance or where present/past contract performance information is not available, the offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on the present/past contract performance factor (FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv)). In this case, the offeror's present/past performance is unknown and assigned a performance confidence rating of "neutral". A strong record of very relevant present/past performance may be considered more advantageous to the Government than a "Neutral Confidence" rating. Likewise, a more relevant present/past performance record may receive a higher confidence rating and be considered more favorably than a less relevant record of favorable performance.

<b>TABLE 5 - Performance Confidence Assessments Rating Method</b>	
<b>Adjectival Rating</b>	<b>Description</b>
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.
Neutral Confidence	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. The offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on the factor of present/past performance.
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 be able to successfully perform the required effort.

### **Best Value Determination**

If the offeror with the lowest "Acceptable" TEP, considering all the factors mentioned in section M.2.1, and receives an "Acceptable" in the technical rating, and is judged to have a "Substantial Confidence" performance confidence assessment rating and is determined to be responsible, that offer represents the best value for the government and the evaluation process stops at this point. Award shall be made to that offeror without further consideration of any other offers.

If the offeror with the lowest "Acceptable" TEP, considering all the factors mentioned in section M.2.1,

and receives an “Acceptable” in the technical rating, and is not judged to have a “Substantial Confidence” performance confidence assessment rating, the next lowest TEP offeror will be evaluated utilizing the methodology above, and the process will continue (in order by price) until an offeror is judged to have an “Acceptable” technical rating and a “Substantial Confidence” performance confidence assessment rating or until all offerors are evaluated. At that point, whichever occurs first, the Source Selection Authority will then make an integrated assessment best value award decision. The SSA performs this assessment by comparing the performance confidence and the cost/price of all evaluated, technically acceptable proposals to determine which proposal represents the best value to the Government.

Offerors are cautioned to submit sufficient information and, in the format, specified in the proposal preparation instructions to permit a meaningful assessment of present/past performance. Offerors may be asked to clarify certain aspects of their proposal or respond to adverse present/past performance information to which the offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond. Adverse present/past performance is defined as present/past performance information that supports a less than satisfactory rating on any evaluation element or any unfavorable comments received from sources without a formal rating system. Clarifications conducted to resolve minor or clerical errors will not constitute discussions and the contracting officer reserves the right to award a contract without the opportunity for proposal revision.

The government intends to award a contract without discussions with respective offerors. The government, however, reserves the right to conduct discussions if deemed in its best interest. The government reserves the right to award one or no contract at all, depending on the quality of proposals submitted.

### **M3.0 SOLICITATION REQUIREMENTS, TERMS AND CONDITIONS**

Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as factors or subfactors. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the solicitation may result in the offeror being ineligible for award. Offerors shall clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and shall provide complete supporting rationale.

The offeror shall ensure that accurate contact information is provided for all references. The Government will make reasonable attempts to contact the listed Point of Contact (POCs). If the Government is unable to reach the listed POCs after reasonable attempts, the Government will not consider that reference.