

In accordance with (IAW) FAR 52.232-19 - Availability of Funds (Apr 1984)

Funds are not presently available for this contract. The Government's obligation under this contract is contingent upon the availability of appropriated funds from which payment for contract purposes can be made. No legal liability on the part of the Government for any payment may arise until funds are made available to the Contracting Officer for this contract and until the Contractor receives notice of such availability, to be confirmed in writing by the Contracting Officer.

(End of Clause)

M-1. FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION (48CFR, CHAPTER 1) CLAUSES

Clauses are located in Section I of the SF 33.

M-2. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION (48 CFR, CHAPTER 2) PROVISIONS

None at this time.

M-3. EVALUATION CRITERIA

1.0 BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD.

- 1.1 Best Value.** This is a best value source selection conducted in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.3, Source Selection, and FAR 15.101-1, Tradeoff Process, as supplemented by the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) and the Air Force Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (AFFARS). These regulations are available electronically at the Air Force (AF) FARSite, <http://farsite.hill.af.mil>.

The Government intends to make a single award by selecting the best value offeror, who is deemed responsible in accordance with FAR 9.1, Responsible Prospective Contractors, as supplemented by the DFARS 209.1. The Offeror's proposal shall conform to the solicitation's requirements (to include all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and all other information required by the Instructions to Offerors) and will be assessed based on the evaluation factors and subfactors to represent the best value to the Government. The SSA will base the source selection decision on an integrated assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria in the solicitation (described below). The Government will select the best overall offer, based upon an integrated assessment of Technical and Cost/Price. Among the acceptable proposals, a tradeoff will be made between Technical and Cost/Price. This may result in an award to other than the lowest priced proposal where the decision is consistent with the evaluation factors, and the Source Selection Authority (SSA) reasonably determines that the offer is in the best interest of the Government.

While the Government source selection evaluation team and the SSA 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 SSA

may consider recommendations, minority opinions, and reports and analyses prepared by others; the source selection decision shall be based upon the SSA's independent judgment.

- 1.1.1 Number of Contracts to be Awarded.** The Government intends to award a single contract as a result of this solicitation. However, the Government reserves the right to make no award at all.
- 1.1.2 Responsibility Determination.** To be eligible for award, the offeror must be deemed responsible in accordance with FAR 9.104. Past performance will not be evaluated pursuant to FAR 15.304, but will be considered as a component of contractor responsibility to ensure a history of satisfactory performance. The past performance portion of the responsibility determination will examine the selected contractor's performance record to ensure a history of at least satisfactory performance. A lack of demonstrated history of satisfactory past performance will be a basis for a determination of non-responsibility.
- 1.1.3 Competition.** The Contracting Officer (PCO) has determined there is a high probability of adequate price competition in this acquisition. Upon examination of the initial offers, the PCO will review this determination, and if in the PCO's opinion adequate price competition exists, no additional data will be requested and certification under FAR 15.406-2, Certificate of Current Pricing Data, will not be required.
- 1.1.4 Discussions.** In accordance with FAR 52.215-1(f)(4), the Government intends to award the contract without discussions (except clarification as described in FAR 15.306(a)) but reserves the right to conduct discussions if necessary. In the event discussions are held, the Final Proposal Revision (FPR) will be considered in making the source selection decision. 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.
- 1.1.5 Competitive Range.** IAW FAR 15.306(c)(2), the Contracting Officer may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition among the most highly rated proposal. The Government intends to conduct Two Phase Approach. Phase I will be a gate approach in which All eligible 8(a) Offerors must pass to advance in the source selection process. If an Offeror's Phase I does not pass Phase I, the Government will not evaluate their Phase II proposal and will notify the Offeror that they were eliminated from further consideration.
- 1.1.6 North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Code.** This acquisition is a competitive 8(a) set aside. The prime contractor must be an 8(a) company under NAISC Code 541715 Research & Development (R&D) in the Physical, Engineering & Life Sciences, with a small business size standard of 1000 employees, and perform at least 51% of the work. If a Joint Venture, then the 8(a) company needs to perform at least 51% work. This acquisition will be conducted using a Two-Phased approach. All

eligible 8(a) companies must submit a proposal for Phase I and Phase II. Upon receipt of proposals, the Government will verify that the Offeror is an 8(a) before proceeding to evaluating their Phase I proposals. If the Offeror is not an 8(a), the Government will notify an Offeror that they are not eligible for considerations since they are not an 8(a) and are eliminated from consideration for this award. Government will evaluate All 8(a) offerors' Phase I proposal and will deem them as "pass" or "fail". If an 8(a) offeror's Phase I proposal passes, then the Government will evaluate their Phase II proposal IAW 15.3, Source Selection, and FAR 15.101-1, Tradeoff Process, as supplemented by the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) and the Air Force Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (AFFARS).

- 1.1.7 Non-compliant.** Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions, representations and certifications as required in Section K, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as factors or subfactors. This also includes being an 8(a) company under the NASIC Code Listed above, and not graduating from the 8(a) program before award. To confirm this, the Government intends to conduct a compliance check on both Offerors' Phase I and Phase II. If the Government finds either Phase I or Phase II proposal to be non-compliant with the terms and conditions of the solicitation, the Offeror's overall proposal may result in the Offeror being excluded from the competition or ineligible for award.

2.0 EVALUATION FACTORS. The evaluation process shall proceed as follows:

- 2.1 Two-Phased Approach.** The Government requests Offerors submit proposals for Phase I and Phase II at date/time listed in Section L-4, 3.1. Failure to submit proposal at the exact date/time may result in the Offeror being considered unresponsive and ineligible for award. The Government will evaluate first an Offeror's Phase I proposal and determine whether the Offeror met the criteria to "pass" this gate. If an Offeror does receive a "pass" rating for Phase I, then the Government will evaluate an Offeror's Phase II proposal. If the Offeror does not pass, the Government will not evaluate an Offeror's Phase II proposal.
- 3.0 Phase I - Technical Qualification Gate.** This is a gate approach consistent with DoD Source Selection Procedures dated 20 Aug 2022. Offeror must receive a "pass" rating on all 12 elements to receive an overall "pass" on Phase I. See Section Attachment 15, Section L, Paragraph 4.3-4.6. To pass an element, an Offeror must provide at least one example of prior experience*, on going, or completed within the past 3 years from the date of the solicitation, that meets the criteria outlined in Table 1 below. Examples needs to be from the prime, Joint Venture, affiliate company, sister companies, division, and teaming arrangements/subcontractors who will be working on this effort. Offeror's must identify the company the example is from. The examples and explanations need to be within page limitation identified in Section L-4, 2.2.1, Table 1. Each element will be rated against the following table.

(NOTE: Experience means the experience of the prime, Joint Venture, affiliate company, sister company, divisions, and teammates/subcontractors who will be working on this effort.)

Table 1 - Phase I Technical Qualification Rating

Rating	Definition
Pass:	Offeror does demonstrate the understanding of the element and will be successful in performing the work.
Fail:	Offeror does not demonstrate the understanding of element and will not be successful in performing the work.

If any of the 12 elements are rated as “fail”, then the overall rating for Phase I will be “fail”. If this occurs, the Government will notify an Offeror, and they will not advance in the source selection and the Government will not evaluate their Phase II proposal.

4.0 Phase II. Technical & Price/Cost Evaluation.

4.1 Factors and Subfactors. All Offerors’ Phase I proposal determined a “pass”, will advance in the source selection process and the Government will evaluate their Phase II proposal IAW FAR 15.101-1, Technical Price Trade off, basis. Phase II proposal will be evaluated using the following factors and subfactors.

4.2 Factor 1: Technical

Subfactor 1: Information Technology

Subfactor 2: Wargaming

Subfactor 3: Combat Training Support

Subfactor 4: Test and Evaluation

Factor 1 will be evaluated at the subfactor level. All Subfactors under Factor 1 are equal importance, and will be assigned a combining technical/risk rating IAW DoD Source Selection Procedures dated 20 Aug 2022.

4.2.1 Factor 2: Transition In. Factor 2 will be rated at the factor level and will be assigned a rating of acceptable or unacceptable.

4.2.2 Factor 3: Price/Cost. Factor 2 (Price/Cost) will not have a rating, but a Total Evaluated Price (TEP) will be established for source selection evaluation purposes only. An assessment will be made on reasonableness, realism, and balance as described in paragraph 4.5 below.

4.2.3 Relative Importance Factors and Subfactors. Factor 1, Technical, and Factor 2, Transition In, are equal importance but more important than Factor 3, Price/Cost. Factor 2 will be rated at the factor level and will be assigned a rating of acceptable or unacceptable. Factor 1 will be evaluated at the subfactor level. All Technical Subfactors under Factor 1 are equal importance, and will be assigned a combining technical/risk rating IAW DoD Source Selection Procedures dated 20 Aug 2022. When the subfactors under Factor 1 are combined, are equal of importance to Factor 2, but more important than Factor 3, Price / Cost.

4.2.4 Unawardability for Phase II. A “Unacceptable” combined technical/risk rating for any of the four (4) technical subfactors may render an offeror’s overall proposal as unawardable. Any Price/Cost proposal analyzed and found to be “unreasonable”,

“unrealistic” or “unbalanced” may result in an offeror’s proposal excluded from the competitive range or will render their overall proposal unawardable.

4.3 Phase II, FACTOR 1 - Technical.

- 4.3.1 General. The Offeror shall demonstrate their proposed technical approach for meeting the request for proposal requirements specified by each of the four subfactors.
- 4.3.2 The purpose is to assess whether the Offeror’s Phase II proposal will meet the Government’s requirements expressed below for each of the four technical subfactors. The Government shall utilize the combine technical/risk rating listed under DoD Source Selection Procedures dated 20 Aug 2022, Table 3; the risk “descriptions” set forth Table 2b, and definitions for significant strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, uncertainties, and deficiencies under paragraph 5.0, Definitions to evaluate and assign a rating for each technical subfactor. This is as follows:

Table 2: Combined/Technical Risk Rating Method

Color	Rating	Description
Blue	Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements, and contains <i>multiple strengths</i> , and <i>risk of unsuccessful performance is low</i> .
Purple	Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements, and <i>contains at least one strength</i> , and <i>risk of unsuccessful performance is low to moderate</i> .
Green	Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and <i>risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate</i> .
Yellow	Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and/or <i>risk of unsuccessful performance is high</i> .
Red	Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation, and thus, <i>contains one or more deficiencies</i> , and/or <i>risk of unsuccessful performance is unacceptable</i> . Proposal is unawardable.

Table 3: Technical Risk Rating Method

Risk Rating	Description
Low	Proposal may contain weakness/weaknesses which have low potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation of performance. Normal contractor emphasis and

	normal Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.
Moderate	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which may have a moderate potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.
High	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which is likely to have high potential to cause significant disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will unlikely be able to overcome any difficulties.
Unacceptable	Proposal contains a deficiency or a combination of significant weaknesses that causes an unacceptable level of risk of unsuccessful performance.

Definitions for significant strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, uncertainties, and deficiencies are as follows:

Significant Strength is an aspect of an Offeror's proposal with appreciable merit or will exceed specified performance or capability requirements to the considerable advantage of the Government during contract performance.

Strength is an aspect of an offeror's proposal with merit or will exceed specified performance or capability requirements to the advantage of the Government during contract performance.

Weakness means a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. See FAR 15.001.

Significant Weakness in the proposal is a flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. See FAR 15.001.

Uncertainty is any aspect of a non-cost/price factor proposal for which the intent of the offer is unclear (e.g., more than one way to interpret the offer or inconsistencies in the proposal indicating that there may have been an error, omission, or mistake.

Deficiency is a material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level. See FAR 15.001.

4.3.3 SUBFACTOR 1: Information Technology (Task Order 0002)

- 4.3.3.1 Demonstrates a comprehensive understanding and executable approach to staff, attract, recruit, retain, and replace contractor personnel with the required certification/qualifications and security clearance to staff the Information Technology to support the 12 Delta Organizations located at Schriever Space Force Base at Bldg 24 and Geographical Separated Location.
- 4.3.3.2 Demonstrates an effective approach to engineer, develop, operate, administer, support and maintain information system and network support for internal/external communications at an unclass, Secret, and TS/SCI classification levels.
- 4.3.3.3 Demonstrates an effective approach to develop, submit and obtain approval of A&A packages for all Delta 12 systems and networks at an unclass, Secret, and TS/SCI Classification level.

4.3.4 SUBFACTOR 2: Wargaming

- 4.3.4.1 Demonstrates a comprehensive understanding and executable approach to staff, attract, recruit, retain, and replace contractor personnel with the required certification/qualifications and security clearance to staff Wargaming to support Attachment X, Wargaming PWS.
- 4.3.4.2 Demonstrates an approach to prepare for, plan, and execute a scenario-driven, all-domain wargame within a DoD framework involving Blue (DoD; Commercial, Civil, and international partners; whole-of-government agencies; etc.) and Red (representative of an active and challenging adversary) participation.

4.3.5 SUBFACTOR 3: Combat Training Support (Task Order 0003)

- 4.3.5.1 Demonstrates a comprehensive understanding and executable approach to staff, attract, recruit, retain, and replace contractor personnel with the required certification/qualifications and security clearance to staff the Combat Training Support to support the requirements listed within Attachment X, Combating Training Support PWS.
- 4.3.5.2 Demonstrate a comprehensive understanding and executable approach to operate existing and future Modeling & Simulation (M&S) systems.
- 4.3.5.3 Demonstrate a comprehensive understanding and executable approach to plan, develop, and test the interface to other Distributed Mission Operations (DMO) domains.
- 4.3.5.4 Demonstrate a comprehensive understanding and executable approach to provide cradle-to-grave exercise support (design, develop, plan, execute, and assess) for exercises across all security classifications to include but not limited to Special Access Program/Special Access Required (SAP/SAR) Advanced Program.

- 4.3.5.5** Demonstrate a comprehensive understanding and executable approach to develop, plan, and execute Space participation in Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS), Combatant Command (CCMD), and other service exercises, experiments and demonstrations.

4.3.6 SUBFACTOR 4: Test & Evaluation

- 4.3.6.1** Demonstrates a comprehensive understanding and executable approach to staff, attract, recruit, retain, and replace contractor personnel with the required certification/qualifications and security clearance to staff the Test and Evaluation to support the requirements listed in Attachment X, Test & Evaluation of SBMW PWS.
- 4.3.6.2** Provide a narrative describing your approach to support integrated testing requirements of an Oversight Program through the life of the testing effort to include {planning, execution, analysis, reporting, and closeout.

4.4 Phase II, FACTOR 2 - Transition In (acceptable/unacceptable)

This factor evaluates the proposed approach to Transition In. The Transition In Plan will be assigned a rating of “acceptable” or “unacceptable” in accordance with Table 4. The proposal will be rated “acceptable” when the Transition In Plan contains the processes and procedures required for effective contract transition, including:

- 4.4.1** The process for effectively on-boarding cleared personnel.
- 4.4.2** The process for effectively hiring incumbent and non-incumbent personnel and issuance of CACs.
- 4.4.3** The process for ensuring all contract requirements, including ongoing Task Orders, continue seamlessly during the transition from the out-going contractor to the incoming contractor.

Table 4 - Ratings for Factor 2: From DoD Source Selection Procedures

Rating	Description
Acceptable	Proposal indicates an adequate approach and understanding of 3IS III Transition In objectives.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet all 3IS III Transition In objectives

4.5 Phase II - FACTOR 3 - Cost/Price

- 4.5.1 Overview.** The Government will evaluate the cost/price of the Task Order 0001, 0002, and 0003; and will use the total evaluated cost/price from Task Order 0002 and 0003 as a factor in determining the best-value offeror. The Government will use

one or more of the techniques defined in FAR 15.404-1, in order to determine if the costs/prices are reasonable, realistic, and balanced. The Government will base its evaluation on the total evaluated cost/price, which will be the total cost/price of Task Order 0002 & 0003, the results of price analyses and Government-provided amounts. The Government will evaluate the initial proposed costs/prices, as well as any revisions the offeror may make. The Government will not assign a color code rating to the Cost/Price Factor.

- 4.5.2 Information Other Than Cost or Pricing Data.** The Contracting Officer anticipates adequate price competition; therefore, certified cost or pricing data is not required. The Government will evaluate information other than certified cost or pricing data for purposes of determining cost realism and the best value.
- 4.5.3 Total Evaluated Cost/Price.** The Government will calculate the total evaluated cost/price as the sum of the evaluated cost/price of each TO. The Government will use the total evaluated cost/price for evaluation purposes only; evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise such options. The Government will establish the evaluated cost/price of each TO as follows:
- TO-0001 Transition: The evaluated cost/price will be the sum of all Contract Line Item Number (CLIN) evaluated costs and prices.
 - TO-0002 Information Technology: The evaluated cost/price will be the sum of all Contract Line Item Number (CLIN) costs and prices to include all options.
 - TO-0003 392d CTS: The evaluated cost/price will be the sum of all Contract Line Item Number (CLIN) costs and prices to include all options.
- 4.5.4 Total Evaluated Price (TEP).** For source selection evaluation purposes only, the Offeror will propose their calculated TEP. The resulting calculated total will be used as the evaluated dollar value that will be provided to the SSA for the Price/Cost Factor, for the purpose of making a source selection tradeoff decision. **The TEP is calculated by the sum of TO 0002 and 0003 to include the sum of all CLINs for the base period and all options.**
- 4.5.5 Reasonableness.** The Government will evaluate the reasonableness of all proposed costs/prices in all TOs to include the Transition In, TO 0001; Information Technology, TO 0002; and 329d Combat Training Squadron. For a cost/price to be reasonable, in its nature and amount, it must not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person in the conduct of competitive business (see FAR 31.201-3). The Government may determine an offer is unacceptable, and therefore unawardable, if the Government finds costs/prices not to be fair and reasonable. The techniques and procedures described under FAR 15.404-1 will be used to assess proposal reasonableness.
- 4.5.6 Cost/Price Realism Assessment.** The Government will evaluate the realism of the proposed costs/prices in TO 0002 and TO 0003. This will include an evaluation of the extent to which proposed costs are sufficient for the work to be performed, are reflective of a clear understanding of the requirements, reflect a sound

approach to satisfying the requirements, are consistent with the unique methods of performance and materials described in the offeror's technical proposal and reflect reasonable labor escalation and indirect factors (FAR 15.404-1(d)(1) and 2.101). For the cost to be realistic, it must reflect what it would cost the offeror to perform the effort, if performed with reasonable economy and efficiency. If the Government evaluates an offer as unrealistically low or high compared to the anticipated costs of performance, and the offeror fails to explain these differences, the Government will consider, under the Technical Risk Rating, the offeror's lack of understanding of the technical requirements of the applicable Technical Subfactor, which could cause the Government to rate the offeror's proposal as technically unacceptable.

4.5.7 Unbalanced Offers. The Government will also evaluate for unbalanced pricing in all TOs. The Government may determine a proposal is unacceptable if the proposed cost/price, including labor rates, is determined to be materially unbalanced. Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable total evaluated price, the price of one or more items is significantly overstated or understated as indicated by the application of price analysis techniques. If the Government evaluates an offer as unbalanced and the offeror fails to explain the rationale, the Government will consider, under the Technical Risk Rating, the offeror's lack of understanding of the technical requirements of the applicable Technical Subfactor, which could cause the Government to rate the offeror's proposal as technically unacceptable. The techniques and procedures described under FAR 15.404-1(g) will be the primary means of assessing unbalanced pricing.

4.5.8 Professional Compensation. The professional compensation proposed will be considered in terms of its impact upon recruiting and retention, its realism, and its consistency with a total plan for compensation. Compensation Plans determined to be unrealistic may be excluded for consideration for award.