

SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

SOLICITATION PROVISIONS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

M-1.0. BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD

- a. This is a Lowest Price Technically Acceptable (LPTA) source selection conducted in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15, Contracting by Negotiation, as supplemented by the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS), the Air Force Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (AFFARS), Department of Defense (DoD) Source Selection Procedures, 20 Aug 2022 and Air Force Mandatory Procedures 5315.3. These regulations are available electronically at the Government FAR Site, <https://www.acquisition.gov/>. The Government will select the proposal(s) with the lowest Total Proposed Price from among those meeting the acceptability standards for non-price factors. Contract(s) may be awarded to those offeror(s) who are deemed responsible in accordance with the FAR Part 9.1, as supplemented. Those offeror(s) whose proposals conform to the solicitation's requirements (to include all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and all other information required by Section L of this solicitation) and are judged, based on the evaluation factors and subfactors, to represent the lowest price technically acceptable proposal(s). While the Government will strive for maximum objectivity, the source selection process, by its nature, is subjective, and therefore professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire process. The Government reserves the right not to award any contracts under this solicitation.
- b. First, the Government will review all documents for compliance with Section L.
- c. **Proposal responses submitted that do not use the EWAAC PRG and associated templates as provided IAW Section L, will not be evaluated and therefore, will not be considered for award.**
- d. When all requested documents are received and confirmed to be compliant, the offeror's proposal package will then be submitted for evaluation.
- e. The Government technical evaluation team will evaluate the technical and pricing proposals on a pass/fail basis, assigning ratings of ACCEPTABLE or UNACCEPTABLE. An unacceptable technical rating and/or unacceptable pricing rating will result in offerors being ineligible for award. Offerors shall clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and provide complete accompanying rationale.
- f. The Government pricing evaluation team will evaluate the cost/ price proposals for reasonableness.

M-1.1 AWARD WITHOUT DISCUSSIONS

The Government intends to award without discussions but reserves the right to hold discussions with offerors within the competitive range, if it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government. Offerors are advised to give an offer suitable for an award decision in the initial proposal. The Government does not intend to use non-government advisors or evaluators in this source selection. If, during the evaluation period, it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government to hold discussions, offeror responses to Evaluation Notices (ENs) and the Final Proposal Revisions (FPRs) shall be considered in making the source selection decision. If FPRs are required, the Government will determine if written discussions are required.

If the offeror's proposal has been evaluated as acceptable at the time discussions are closed, any changes or exceptions in the FPR are subject to evaluation and may introduce risk that the offeror's proposal be determined unacceptable and ineligible for award.

M-1.2 NUMBER OF CONTRACTS TO BE AWARDED

The Government anticipates making multiple awards, potentially 30 to 60 awards, of \$1,000.00 to attend the post-award conference. The Source Selection Authority (SSA) will consider the Government's expected volume of work, available funding, and adequate competition. NAICS Code 332993 (Ammunition) is used as a basis for size determination.

M-1.3 SOLICITATION REQUIREMENTS, TERMS AND CONDITIONS

Offerors shall 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.

M-2.0 EVALUATION PROCESS FACTORS AND SUBFACTORS TO BE EVALUATED

The following evaluation factors and subfactors shall be used to evaluate each proposal. The Government will evaluate proposals for acceptability but will not rank the proposals by the non-price factors or subfactors.

Factor I: Management/Technical Proficiency

Sub factor A. Digital Trinity Capabilities or Roadmap Plan

Sub factor B. Technical (Armament/ Weapons Development, Enterprise Analytics, and Innovation Hub)

Factor II: Cost/Price

M-3.0 FACTOR I: MANAGEMENT/TECHNICAL PROFICIENCY

The Government's technical evaluation team shall evaluate the technical proposals on an acceptable or unacceptable basis, assigning one of the ratings described below for each subfactor. Any subfactor evaluated as "Unacceptable" shall render the entire proposal unacceptable and, therefore, unawardable. Only those proposals determined to be technically acceptable, either initially or as a result of discussions, shall be considered for award. However, the offeror is reminded that the Government reserves the right to award this effort based on the initial proposal, as received, without discussion.

The offeror shall provide recent/relevant experience for all focus areas of Subfactor A: Digital Trinity or submit a plan detailing the offeror's roadmap for meeting those capabilities within two (2) years from the award of the initial delivery order. Failure to be digital trinity capable may prevent an option award. The offeror shall provide recent/relevant experience in at least one area of Subfactor B. This experience shall meet a recency period of within the past five years from the proposal due date. Each experience example shall relate to an entity (e.g. prime, subcontractor, etc.) that the contractor proposes to perform in relation to the work element outlined in the SOO. This information shall be reflected in the written proposal.

TABLE 1 – PROPOSAL RATINGS	
Rating	Description
Acceptable	Proposal clearly meets the minimum requirements of the solicitation.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not clearly meet the minimum requirements of the solicitation.

M-3.1 SUBFACTOR A: DIGITAL TRINITY CAPABILITIES

Offeror has met the requirements by demonstrating proficiency in ALL the Digital Trinity categories below; or submitting a roadmap for meeting them within two years from the award of the initial delivery order.

M-3.1.1 DIGITAL ENGINEERING AND MANAGEMENT

Examples which could be used to demonstrate a proficiency include (but are not limited to) the following. Supporting examples shall be included in the proposal:

- Development of program DE Ecosystem that integrates the authoritative technical data, analytical models and analysis, and associated digital artifacts which define the Authoritative Source of Truth (ASoT) to be utilized throughout the system's life cycle segregated into Digital System Models (DSMs)
- Establishment of processes, infrastructure and environment that utilize technical data and digital artifacts to support integration, sharing and reuse, and collaborative analysis/decision-making throughout the life cycle
- Creation of framework to develop and incorporate into the DE Ecosystem depictions of the system to include at a minimum, but not limited to, the following: requirements analysis; system architecture; design evaluations; definition and integration of system and subsystems, testing, cost estimations; and manufacturing
- Employment of a Model-Based Systems Engineering (MBSE) approach across the spectrum of Systems Engineering, Integration, and Test (SEIT) activities (e.g., requirements flowdown, specifications development, Systems Engineering Management Plan (SEMP) development, risk management)
- Use of digital models as an integral part of the technical baseline that includes requirements, analysis, design, implementation, verification/validation, manufacturing, and general product life-cycle management
- Integration of Modeling, Simulation, and Analysis (MS&A) (i.e. analytical) models into the DE Ecosystem
- Development of DE strategies that will enable the DE Ecosystem and integration of technological innovations to mature into the system's Digital Thread (DTh) and Digital Twin (DTw) in a future effort
- Utilization and implementation of Government Reference Architectures (GRAs) in the DE Plan. The GRA is a general-purpose architecture design consisting of data models that capture the physical, logical, and functional description of a common open systems architecture
- Development of Contractor Implementation Model that is derived from and is consistent with the GRA
- Utilization of a standard system modeling language for development of the Contractor Implementation Model

M-3.1.2 AGILE PROCESSES

Examples which could be used to demonstrate a proficiency include (but are not limited to) the following. Supporting examples shall be included in the proposal:

- Agile Methodologies: Use of Scaled Agile Framework environments (SAFE) and Modified Agile for Hardware Development (MAHD) Frameworks practices and procedures

- Agile Validation and Verification Processes: Use of Modeling and Simulations of system/ subsystem digital models for risk reduction or to satisfy Validation and Verification requirements
- Agile Software Development: Established agile development processes that allow the defining/refining of requirements and developing solutions through the collaborative effort with the customer/end user
- Agile Test Methods: Use of Behavior-Driven Development (BDD), where Product Managers and Product Owners collaborate with their teams to create tests for features and stories; developers create tests for code/material changes using Test-Driven Development (TDD) to include surrogate test beds or accelerated test methodologies. Agile testing is a continuous process that's integral to Lean and Built-In Quality. Agile Teams and Agile Release Trains (ARTs) are enabled by high quality and ability to implement a Continuous Delivery Pipeline and achieve Release on Demand by employing continuous, and mostly automated testing. Wherever possible, that means testing—and even test automation—come first. In agile testing, everyone on the team is a tester. With these general tests created by their team members, testers can focus their attention on exercising edge cases and the less intuitive interactions with the system.
- Agile Compliance Processes: Support the Government in the accelerated coordination with Government compliance organizations as needed, including but not limited to: Cyber Security Approval Agencies, Platform System Program Offices (SPOs), Safety Organizations (e.g. Non-Nuclear Munitions Safety Board (NNMSB)), Frequency Coordinators, Test Ranges, Air Force SEEK EAGLE Office (AFSEO), Naval Air Systems Command (NAVAIR), and System Security Authorizations Offices
- Agile Validation and Verification Processes: Support the Government in their coordination efforts with the test ranges to establish accelerated processes for an Environmental Assessment (EA)/Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) in accordance with (IAW) the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process

M-3.1.3 OPEN ARCHITECTURE

Examples which could be used to demonstrate a proficiency include (but are not limited to) the following. Supporting examples shall be included in the proposal:

- Creation of open systems architecture and designs that adopt consensus-based standards supporting a modular, loosely coupled, and highly cohesive system structure that includes the publishing of key interfaces within the system and relevant design disclosure
- Use of Weapon Open System Architecture (WOSA) to support the rapid and affordable insertion/integration and refreshment of technology through modular open design
- Development of WOSA implementation plans
- Use of commercially available software tools and formats in the DE Ecosystem

M-3.2 SUBFACTOR B: TECHNICAL

- a. This sub factor evaluates the offeror's management approach to meet the technical requirements of the Statement of Objectives (SOO). Offeror responses shall be evaluated relative to the offeror's knowledge and ability to address all facets of the technical requirements listed in this section.
- b. The proposals shall be evaluated against Subfactor B. Offerors shall describe their direct (organic, in-house, or subcontracted) capability to perform technical functions associated with technical areas listed in section M 3.2. The remainder of the technical areas shall be satisfied through strategies the offeror deems suitable, for example, subcontracts or partnering. The offeror shall provide information on how the remaining requirements shall be satisfied.

M-3.2.1 TECHNICAL: ARMAMENT/WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT

Offeror has met the minimum competency requirements for Armament/Weapons by demonstrating armament related expertise in three (3) of the five (5) categories below.

M-3.2.1.1 TRADE SPACE AND CAPABILITIES STUDIES

Examples which could be used to demonstrate a proficiency include (but are not limited to) the following. Supporting examples shall be included in the proposal:

- Problem Definition
- Development of an analysis plan
- Data gathering and review
- Model development and population
- Hypothesis testing
- Running Models
- Data Analysis

- Documentation/presentation of results

M-3.2.1.2 DESIGN AND ENGINEERING DEVELOPMENT

Examples which could be used to demonstrate a proficiency include (but are not limited to) the following. Supporting examples shall be included in the proposal:

- Design approaches
- Validation of analytical models
- Quantification of contract technical performance and manufacturing quality
- Measurement of progress in a system engineering design and development
- Minimization of technical risks
- Compatibility, interoperability, and integration of all interfaces between the system and its operating environment, including electrical/electronic and mechanical hardware design and software development
- Prediction of integrated system operational performance (effectiveness and suitability) in the intended environment
- Identification of system problems (or deficiencies) to allow for early and timely resolution
- Essential information to decision-makers, assess attainment of technical performance parameters, and determine whether systems are operationally effective, suitable, survivable, and safe for intended use
- Employment of agile test methods (test platforms, facilities, modeling and simulation)

M-3.2.1.3 PROTOTYPING AND EXPERIMENTATION

Examples which could be used to demonstrate a proficiency include (but are not limited to) the following. Supporting examples shall be included in the proposal:

- Hardware and software design approaches
- Digital Modeling/simulation
- Laboratory testing
- Agile prototype development and test methodologies
- Small scale production of prototypes to support demonstration/test
- Quantification of contract technical performance
- Ability to measure progress in prototype design and development
- Ability to characterize technical risks
- Compatibility, interoperability, and integration of all interfaces between the system and its operating environment, including electrical/electronic and mechanical hardware design and software development.
- Prediction of integrated system operational performance (effectiveness and suitability) in the intended environment
- Identification of system problems (or deficiencies) to allow for early and timely resolution
- The ability to: a) provides essential information to decision-makers, b) assess achievement of technical performance, and c) determine whether systems are operationally effective, suitable, survivable, and safe for intended use.
- Employment of agile test methods (test platforms, facilities, modeling/simulation)

M-3.2.1.4 PRODUCTION AND DEPLOYMENT

Examples which could be used to demonstrate a proficiency include (but are not limited to) the following. Supporting examples shall be included in the proposal:

- Ability to fabricate complex systems and ensure proper manufacturing planning
- Ability to assess system designs to ensure they are producible
- Ability to track program status and ensure that quality standards are being met during production

M-3.2.1.5 OPERATIONS AND SUPPORT

Examples which could be used to demonstrate a proficiency include (but are not limited to) the following. Supporting examples shall be included in the proposal:

- Ability to plan for and execute operations and logistics support throughout the lifecycle of the system to include system design, test, production, deployment, operations, sustainment, and disposal/demilitarization.
- Integration of logistics-related readiness, combat capability, systems commonality, and supportability design parameters into system and equipment design
- Ability to integrate and install a system into its operational environment and train user communities as required.
- Ability to provide integrated logistics support for the installed system as required.

M-3.2.2 ENTERPRISE ANALYTICS

Offeror has met the minimum requirements for this category by demonstrating competence in two (2) of the three (3) categories below.

M-3.2.2.1 BUSINESS INTELLIGENCE (BI) TOOLS

Offeror has met the requirement for this category by demonstrating the ability to leverage DoD High Performance Computing Centers.

M-3.2.2.2 DATA MINING AND TRANSFORMATION FOR BI TOOLS

Examples which could be used to demonstrate a proficiency include (but are not limited to) the following. Supporting examples shall be included in the proposal:

- Capitalization of data fusion, analytics, artificial intelligence, and decision tools
- Enterprise interdependencies
- Supply chain risk assessment
- Industry execution ability
- Investigating procurement for experimental purposes

M-3.2.2.3 DEVELOPMENT OF CONCISE REPORTING AND ANALYSIS PRODUCTS

Examples which could be used to demonstrate a proficiency include (but are not limited to) the following. Supporting examples shall be included in the proposal:

- Contract analyses
- Enterprise risk analyses
- Integrated enterprise capabilities analyses
- Workforce volatility analyses
- Industrial health/capacity analyses
- Enterprise Diminishing Material Sources (DMS) analyses
- Future threat/capabilities trade analyses
- Portfolio Cost-Benefit analyses
- Business Case analyses
- Cost per effectiveness analyses
- Inventory/production capacity vs capability analyses

M-3.2.3 INNOVATION HUB

Offeror has met the minimum requirements for this category by demonstrating competence in three (3) of the four (4) categories below.

M-3.2.3.1 DEVELOPMENTAL [OPS] ENVIRONMENT

Examples which could be used to demonstrate a proficiency include (but are not limited to) the following. Supporting examples shall be included in the proposal:

- A developmental ops environment that is ICD 705 compliant and accredited located in the greater Okaloosa County area locality, within 10 miles of Eglin Air Force Base, FL
- Sufficient capacity for developmental operations, demonstration labs, collaboration space, and technology integration to conduct the full range of day-to-day programmatic and operational capabilities for Armament missions.

M-3.2.3.2 INTEGRATED HARDWARE, SOFTWARE, AND NETWORK SERVICES

Examples which could be used to demonstrate a proficiency include (but are not limited to) the following. Supporting examples shall be included in the proposal:

- Environment includes dedicated network bandwidth, Wi-Fi, power, and security suitable to meet AF and DoD requirements for a DevSecOps environment to support armament and weapons mission needs.
- IT support by personnel with the expertise, certifications, skills, and ability in maintaining and solving environment, network, and service issues.
- IT support tasks (anticipated during standard business hours) include monitoring and maintaining the IT environment; installing and configuring computer systems; diagnosing hardware and software operating system faults; and solving technical and applications problems, either over the phone or in person.

M-3.2.3.3 SOFTWARE LICENSE MANAGEMENT

Examples which could be used to demonstrate a proficiency include (but are not limited to) the following. Supporting examples shall be included in the proposal:

- Personnel authorized by the USAF to install, maintain, and manage licenses for software and business tools that support the Armament mission to include tasks such as conducting software security assessments, software and business tool product research, recommendations, and procurement
- Monitoring license expirations and renewals; system administration; and addressing integration issues.
- Providing situational awareness into which Product Teams are using what tools, when the subscriptions expire, and providing recommendations to continuously improve our tools.

M-3.2.3.4 INTEGRATED AND CONFIGURABLE TECH LABS SUPPORTING DOD MISSION-SETS

Examples which could be used to demonstrate a proficiency include (but are not limited to) the following. Supporting examples shall be included in the proposal:

- Lab/workspace, equipment, and infrastructure that will foster the creation of new technology demonstrations in a central location/marketplace.
- Labs may offer hands-on learning opportunities and demonstrations of technology, support to startups of interest to the Armament Directorate, projects, risk reduction efforts, and corporate innovation programs designed to prototype new solutions for the USAF.
- Labs may foster new partnerships and collaborations of partner institutions to push the bounds of technological advancements and create breakthroughs from which new ventures will emerge to enable a lighthouse effect within the Armament portfolio and its enterprise.

M-4.0 FACTOR II – COST/PRICE

M-4.1 GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

To be eligible for award for the first delivery order, offerors shall provide the following:

- a. Staffing Proposal/Price Template
 - The template must be completed;
 - The Government intends to pay \$1,000 for the post award conference;
 - The offeror's proposed price must equal \$1,000;
 - The offeror's staffing proposal for the post-award conference will be evaluated for reasonableness and balanced pricing and be assigned a rating of acceptable or unacceptable. The Government will review the submissions for completeness and compliance with Section L of the solicitation. The burden of proof for credibility of proposed costs/prices rests with the offeror.
- b. Compliance Statement
 - The compliance statement must demonstrate how the offeror will comply with Section L, para 4.1.1.b to receive an acceptable rating.

M-5.0 SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLAN (SBSP)

- a. The Government will assess the extent to which the offeror proposes acceptable use of Small Business, Small Disadvantaged Business, Women-Owned Small Business, Historically Underutilized Business Zone (HUB Zone) Small Business, Veteran-Owned Small Business, and Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB) concerns in the performance of the proposed contract. The extent of the commitment to such firms, including the proposed percentages of the acquisition, the probability that the offeror shall satisfy the requirements of FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns, and achieve the levels of Small Business Participation identified in their proposal shall be considered.
- b. The Other than Small Business offeror's Small Business Subcontracting Plan shall be assessed as acceptable or unacceptable in accordance with FAR Clause 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan, Alternate II, FAR 19.704, FAR 19.705, and DFARS 219.704. The Small Business Subcontracting Plan requirement is mandatory for award and the plan shall be incorporated into any

resultant contract.

c. This sub factor shall be assessed as acceptable when:

- The offeror's Small Business Subcontracting Plan meets the requirements of FAR 52.219-9.
- The offeror proposes to meet or exceed goals shown in Table L-5.1 or provides substantiated rationale for proposed goals which are lower than those in the table.
- The offeror provides methodology (e.g., use of SB industry days, databases, tools, etc.) for meeting the offeror's proposed goals.

M-6.0 INITIAL DELIVERY ORDER SUBMISSION

The Government intends to conduct evaluations on an incremental, first-in-first-out basis as proposals are received. Contractors are encouraged to submit proposals early. The Government will evaluate as received. The Government will not make award to any contractor prior to the solicitation closing date and time in order to allow contractors to update the proposal and/or to fix any discrepancies discovered after early submission. All awardees will have the same effective date of award in block 3 of their DD FM 1155, regardless of the date of proposal submission. Notice of award will be no later than five (5) business days prior to the effective date via email to Contractor's obligation POC.

Offers shall submit Staffing Proposal/ Pricing Template for the post-award conference. The Government intends to award a minimum Delivery Order of \$1,000 for the post-award conference.

The post-award conference will be held in-person and by video/ teleconference. The post-award conference will be in two parts, one general session with a duration of no more than 45 minutes, and sidebar conferences individually each lasting no more than 15 minutes. Attendance in person is voluntary and not seen differently as virtual attendance. The purpose of the post-award conference is to establish the contractual relationship and educate on the AFPEO Weapon's goals and the Digital Trinity application within programs. The Government will prepare minutes for the post-award conference and provide to Contractors afterward for concurrence and acceptance.

M-7.0 SOLICITATION REQUIREMENTS, TERMS AND CONDITIONS

Offerors shall 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. Upon Government's request, offerors shall clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and shall provide complete supporting rationale.