

DRAFT HR001123R0001 Sections L & M
DARPA Technical & Analytical Support Services
January 11, 2023

Section L: Proposal Preparation and Submission

L.1 Solicitation Point of Contact

Mary Beth Colavito
Contracting Officer
Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency
Contracts Management Office (DARPA/CMO)
675 N. Randolph St.
Arlington, VA 22203-2114
Email: TASSIDIQREQUIREMENT@darpa.mil

L.2 Overview

Solicitation HR001123R0001 is a Request for Proposal (RFP) issued by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) under North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Code 541990 “All Other Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services.” DARPA Contracts Management Office (CMO) intends to award several (approximately seven (7)) multiple-award ID/IQ contracts under a single full and open competition solicitation.

The DARPA-wide Technical and Analytical Support Services (TASS) contract will be a centrally managed multiple-award Advisory and Assistance Services (A&AS) ID/IQ contract, with a combination of Fixed Price (FP), Cost-Reimbursement (CR), and Labor Hour (LH) Task Orders (TOs).

L.3 Proposal Due Date

Proposals are due by 10:00 AM Eastern on **XXday, March XX, 2023**, via email (Subject Line: TASS ID/IQ Proposal – [Offeror Name]) to DARPA CMO Contracting Officer at TASSIDIQRequirement@darpa.mil.

L.4 Questions Due Date

Questions/clarifications to this solicitation are due by 10:00 AM Eastern on **XXday, February XX, 2023**. The DARPA CMO Contracting Officer is the sole point of contact for all questions under this solicitation. Offerors shall submit all questions using the Questions Matrix in Attachment 7 via email (Subject Line: TASS ID/IQ Questions – [Offeror Name]) to the Contracting Officer at TASSIDIQRequirement@darpa.mil. Questions will be answered in the form of an amendment to this solicitation and posted electronically on SAM.gov.

DRAFT HR001123R0001 Sections L & M
DARPA Technical & Analytical Support Services
January 11, 2023

L.5 Offer Acceptance Period

The offer acceptance period is a minimum of **180 calendar days** from the proposal due date and should be appropriately represented in block 12 of the signed Standard Form (SF) 33, *Solicitation, Offer and Award*. The Offeror agrees to hold its offered prices firm for the services solicited herein and to accept any resulting contract subject to the terms and conditions stated herein. If there is a discrepancy between the offer acceptance period requirement in this solicitation and the SF 33, the date entered on the SF 33 will take precedence. Offers with an acceptance period of less than 180 calendar days will not be accepted.

L.6 Proposal Submission Requirements

Offerors are instructed to read the entire solicitation document, including all attachments, prior to submitting questions and/or preparing your proposal. Omission of any information from the proposal submission requirements during the Contracting Officer's compliance review may result in the rejection of the proposal.

Offerors shall submit their proposals via email to TASSIDIQRequirement@darpa.mil.

The proposal shall be formatted into a transmittal letter and five separate electronic folders by volume number and title as follows:

- Volume I - Transmittal Letter
- Volume II - Administrative
- Volume III - Technical Experience
- Volume IV - Management Approach
- Volume V - Past Performance
- Volume VI - Small Business Participation
- Volume VII - Price

The file shall be labeled with the solicitation number and company name. It is the sole responsibility of the Offeror to ensure that the electronic files submitted are virus free and can be opened and read by the Government. Submissions shall not be locked, encrypted, or otherwise contain barriers to opening. All proposal documents shall be in Adobe (.pdf) or compatible format except portions of the price submission, which shall be in MS Excel 2016 (.xlsx) or compatible format.

Offerors shall adhere to Volume numbers, format and/or templates, and page limitations. Offerors shall include their company name or company name abbreviation and Volume number in the filename (e.g., CMPNYA - Vol. II). If page limitations are exceeded, where page limits are expressed, the excess pages will not be evaluated.

DRAFT HR001123R0001 Sections L & M
DARPA Technical & Analytical Support Services
January 11, 2023

Classified submissions will not be accepted.

L.7 Volume I - Proposal Transmittal Letter (3 page limit)

The Volume shall contain a letter formally transmitting the proposal to include the following:

- a. *Statement of Compliance.* Each Offeror shall include a statement indicating complete compliance with this solicitation, or detailed analysis of any objections, exceptions, contingencies, or additions. Any objections, exceptions, contingencies, or additions shall also cross-reference the particular paragraph(s) in this solicitation to which it applies.
- b. *Proprietary Information.* Each Offeror shall include a statement indicating whether the Offeror intends to make use of any proprietary information.
- c. *Format and Content.* Each Offeror shall describe any deviations in their proposal from the specified format of this solicitation. If the content of the Offeror's proposal differs significantly from these guidelines, state the differences, and explain the reason for the differences.
- d. *Points of Contact.* Each Offeror shall include primary and alternative points of contact to include title, mailing address, email, and phone number.
- e. *Business size status (under NAICS Code 541990)*
- f. *Unique Entity Identifier (UEI) and Commercial and Government Entity (CAGE) Code(s).*

L.8 Volume II - Administrative (No page limit)

This Volume shall include all solicitation documents as outlined below and in this order. If an Offeror fails to provide or adequately comply with any of the following requirements, the proposal may be rejected without further evaluation.

L.8.1 Joint Venture/Teaming Arrangements

The Offeror shall provide, if applicable, a summary describing the Joint Venture/Teaming Arrangement established for this solicitation and a document establishing the legally binding nature among the joint venture/teaming parties. The Government encourages teaming to the maximum extent practicable required to meet solicitation requirements. The Offeror shall indicate on the summary if any teaming arrangements are exclusive. In order to promote maximum competition, the Government discourages exclusive teaming arrangements.

L.8.2 Security

DRAFT HR001123R0001 Sections L & M
DARPA Technical & Analytical Support Services
January 11, 2023

- a. The Offeror shall provide, as part of this proposal Volume, a copy of its letter from the Defense Security Service, Facility Clearance Branch, or equivalent accreditation agency, that grants its facility and security clearance level at the Top Secret level proving it was granted by time of proposal submission.*
- b. Include a statement certifying the Offeror's ability to provide and maintain contractor personnel up to and including a Top Secret / Sensitive Compartmented Information (SCI) minimum with Special Program Access eligibility.

* Note: Facility clearance must be current at time of proposal submission, and the Government will not sponsor facility clearances in anticipation of this award.

L.8.3 Organizational Conflict of Interest

The Offeror shall disclose complete information of any work performed by its company that is in any way associated with the contemplated acquisition or which could result in a potential organizational conflict of interest. Under DARPA organizational conflict of interest policy, without prior approval or a waiver from the DARPA Deputy Director, in accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 9.503, *Waiver*, a contractor cannot simultaneously be a scientific, engineering, technical assistance (SETA) support contractor and also be a research and development performer at DARPA. Therefore, all Offerors, as well as proposed subcontractors and consultants, must affirm whether they (its organizations and individual team members) are acting as a research and development performer to DARPA through an active contract or subcontract. All affirmations must identify the prime contract number(s). Affirmations shall be furnished at the time of proposal submission. All facts relevant to the existence or potential existence of organizational conflicts of interest (FAR 9.5, *Organizational and Consultant Conflicts of Interest*) shall be disclosed. The disclosure shall include a description of the action the Offeror has taken or proposes to take to avoid, neutralize, or mitigate such a conflict. If, in the sole opinion of the Government, after full consideration of the circumstances, a proposal fails to fully disclose potential conflicts of interest and/or any identified conflict situation cannot be effectively mitigated, the proposal will be rejected without technical evaluation and withdrawn from further consideration for award.

If a prospective Offeror believes that any conflict of interest exists or may exist (whether organizational or otherwise) or has questions on what constitutes a conflict of interest, the Offeror should promptly raise the issue with DARPA by sending his/her contact information and a summary of the potential conflict to the Contracting Officer before time and effort are expended in preparing a proposal and mitigation plan.

DRAFT HR001123R0001 Sections L & M
DARPA Technical & Analytical Support Services
January 11, 2023

The Offeror shall acknowledge the requirement for a Non-Disclosure Agreement in the format prescribed by Attachment 2 by including a copy within this Volume submission for the authorized representative listed in in Section L.8.4. This Non-Disclosure Agreement will be included in successful IDIQ awards and will be mandatory for all personnel working under task order awards.

L.8.4 Standard Form 33

The Offeror shall complete blocks 12 through 19 of the Standard Form (SF) 33. If any amendments to this solicitation are issued, the Offeror shall acknowledge each amendment number and date in block 14 of the SF 33. The Offeror's legal name and address in block 15A must match the information for the Offeror in System for Award Management (SAM) (<http://www.sam.gov>), including the corresponding Commercial and Government Agency (CAGE) Code number and Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number. The name, title, signature, and date identified in blocks 16, 17, and 18, must be an authorized representative with the authority to commit the Offeror to contractual obligations.

L.8.5 Accounting System

The Offeror shall provide proof of a Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA)-approved accounting system or must fill out the Accounting System Checklist in Attachment 6 and include it within this Volume submission. Offerors should note that if they are awarded an ID/IQ contract without already having a DCAA-approved accounting system, they will not be eligible to submit proposals for task order requirements with Cost-Reimbursement Contract Line Item Numbers (CLINs) until a DCAA Cost Accounting System Audit is performed and approved after ID/IQ award.

L.8.6 Subcontracting Plan

Small businesses, as defined in FAR 52.219-1 as a Small Business Concern, are not required to submit a Subcontracting Plan. For other than small businesses, the Offeror shall provide a Subcontracting Plan. An Individual Subcontracting Plan is preferred, but an Offeror may submit any type of Subcontracting Plan as long as it conforms with FAR 19.704, Subcontracting Plan Requirements, and FAR 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan (Deviation 2016-O0009), including a Department of Defense Comprehensive Subcontracting Plan as long as it is approved by the Defense Contract Management Agency. Subcontracting plans shall reflect the Offeror's commitment, in terms of the value of the total acquisition, to small businesses as proposed in response to Factor 4: Small Business Participation. Subcontracting plans that do not reflect at least the same small business participation (e.g., percentage and type of small business concern) as proposed in response to Factor 4 will be considered non-compliant with this solicitation.

L.8.7 Meeting Space Capability

DRAFT HR001123R0001 Sections L & M
DARPA Technical & Analytical Support Services
January 11, 2023

The Offeror shall provide either proof of existing facilities or proof of a contingency offer within the proposal that can be executed upon ID/IQ contract award to meet meeting requirements outlined in PWS paragraph 7.9.3.

L.8.8 Representation, Certification, and other Statements of Offerors

The Offeror shall complete representations, certifications, acknowledgments, and statements via the System for Award Management (SAM) (<http://www.sam.gov>). A completed copy from SAM and any additional Section K information required by this solicitation shall be included in this Volume.

L.8.9 Terms and Conditions

The Offeror is 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. By submission of its proposal, the Offeror accedes to all solicitation requirements, including terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements.

L.9 Volume III - Evaluation Factor 1: Technical Experience (15 page limit)

This Volume shall be specific, detailed, and complete to demonstrate clearly and fully that the Offeror has the technical experience to accomplish all requirements of the PWS. Offerors shall document their current, relevant technical experience as it relates to the following exemplar sections of the PWS:

- PWS Section 7.1.2 (Technical Expertise/Subject Matter Expertise (SME))*
- PWS Section 7.2.2 (Program Financial Execution)
- PWS Section 7.9.1 (Event Assistance)

Statements that the Offeror has demonstrated experience to accomplish the listed functions without supporting information or narrative is inadequate. This section shall be written to enable evaluators to make a thorough evaluation as to whether the Offeror has demonstrated experience and shall contain specific descriptions and examples of work performed to include value, complexity, and nature in exemplar PWS Sections 7.1.2, 7.2.2, and 7.9.1 (listed in order of importance).

*For PWS Section 7.1.2, the Offeror shall show experience across the breadth of the technologies performed within technical offices identified in PWS Section 4 (i.e., Biological Technologies, Defense Sciences, Information Innovation, Microsystems Technology, Strategic Technology, and Tactical Technology).

DRAFT HR001123R0001 Sections L & M
DARPA Technical & Analytical Support Services
January 11, 2023

Factor 1: Technical Experience will focus on what work the Offeror has done correlated to this requirement, while Factor 3: Past Performance will focus on how well the Offeror has historically performed. Therefore, Offerors shall demonstrate a direct link between technical experience cited in this factor and contracts submitted for past performance.

Any technical experience referenced must not have ended prior to January 1, 2018, and must have a contract/order value over \$15 million. An ID/IQ contract must have individual task orders exceeding \$5,000,000. All contract values shall be representative of obligation amounts; when submitting for an ID/IQ contract, the obligation amount shall represent the combined obligation of all awarded task orders.

Given the value, complexity, and nature of this procurement, all past or current contract performance referenced as technical experience shall be performance as a prime contractor. All referenced contracts shall be listed in Attachment 4, providing a minimum of the following information: contract number, period of performance (including months/years), contract value, the amount invoiced to date, and Government point of contact (POC).

Attachment 4 will not count against established page limits but shall not include any more information than required.

There is no limit on the number of contracts/orders that can be referenced and listed within Factor 1: Technical Experience. However, all of the past performance submissions (up to six) used for Factor 3: Past Performance must be referenced in Factor 1.

L.10 Volume IV - Evaluation Factor 2: Management Approach (10 page limit)

The Offeror shall provide its proposed management approach for delivering high quality support services to accomplish all requirements of the PWS. The Offeror shall address their management approach to include the information below. Sections (a) through (d) are for factor organization purposes only and are not to be considered subfactors for evaluation. Each Offeror will on receive a singly rating for Factor 2.

a. Overall ID/IQ Management Plan

- Plan for managing multiple task orders and multiple subcontractors. The plan shall describe how the offeror is able to manage several orders and several subcontractors across the full range of PWS requirements.
- Program Management Team construct, qualifications, and commitment. The Program Management Team is defined, at a minimum, as the overall Contract Program Manager and any other members required to successfully manage an ID/IQ of this size and complexity (e.g., office leads, functional leads, etc.). Offerors shall provide resumes of

DRAFT HR001123R0001 Sections L & M
DARPA Technical & Analytical Support Services
January 11, 2023

the proposed Program Management Team, the type of commitment individual(s) has with the company (e.g., contingent, employed, representative), and letter(s) of intent (if applicable). The proposed Program Management Team will be considered Key Personnel at the ID/IQ level. Note: Resumes submitted are restricted to three (3) pages per individual on Program Management Team and do not count towards the overall 10-page limit. Letters of intent are restricted to one page per individual on Program Management Team and do not count towards the overall 10-page limit.

b. Recruitment and Retention

- The Offeror shall describe their overall staffing/hiring methodology to address evolving DARPA needs. The Offeror shall describe what subcontracting and hiring practices will be used and illustrate the process for filling vacancies for extremely technically advanced expertise in a timely manner. Identify how the corporation/team can readily obtain the experience and expertise required to accomplish the full range of PWS support requirements. Offeror shall include the historical average time(s) to execute services subcontracts (i.e., not commodity purchases) for all contracts described in Technical Experience via Attachment 4.
- The Offeror shall describe their plan to incentivize on-site, off-site, and hybrid employees with varying levels of telework available per task order and position.
- The Offeror shall describe a specific detailed plan for effectively retaining Science & Technology (S&T) and Research & Development (R&D) professional support in efforts to minimize the turnover rate to avoid mission degradation.
- In accordance with FAR 52.222-46, *Evaluation of Compensation for Professional Employees*, the Offeror shall submit a total compensation plan setting forth salaries and fringe benefits proposed for all personnel who will work under the contract. The compensation levels proposed should reflect a clear understanding of work to be performed and should indicate the capability of the proposed compensation structure to obtain and keep suitably qualified personnel to meet mission objectives. The salary rates or ranges must take into account differences in skills, the complexity of various disciplines, and professional job difficulty. **NOTE:** Total Compensation Plan submission will be evaluated under Factor 2 but shall only be included within Volume VI submission and therefore does not have a page limit and does not count towards the allotted 10 pages for Management Approach.

c. Training

- The Offeror shall describe in detail how they plan to quickly and effectively train and mentor new personnel on DARPA procedures and policy.

DRAFT HR001123R0001 Sections L & M
DARPA Technical & Analytical Support Services
January 11, 2023

d. Culture

- The Offeror shall describe their methodology for measuring, strengthening, and promoting its organizational culture in a hybrid (in-person and virtual) work environment. Specifically, the Offeror shall describe their approach to promoting their organizational culture among their on-site, off-site, and hybrid employees, including their plan to:
 - Rapidly onboard and successfully assimilate new personnel to DARPA culture, and then create, promote, and preserve a sense of community between their personnel, as well as government and other contractor personnel, in a hybrid environment;
 - Facilitate knowledge sharing across multiple contractor and Government teams supporting DARPA;
 - Ensure that provided collaboration tools are available and maximally leveraged to integrate hybrid personnel.

L.11 Volume V - Evaluation Factor 3: Past Performance (13 page limit)

The Offeror shall submit a Past Performance Volume containing the following information:

a) Table of Contents; b) Summary Page; c) Past Performance Information Submissions; d) Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) and Questionnaire Submissions; and e) Organization Structure Change History, if applicable.

- a. Table of Contents (No page limit)** The table of contents should include page numbers for each CPARS evaluation by contract and applicable Period of Performance.
- b. Summary Page (1 page limit)** The Summary Page shall describe the role of the Offeror and each teaming partner, if applicable, for the proposed TASS effort.
- c. Past Performance Information Submissions (12 page limit)**

Offerors may provide up to six (6) past performance information submissions, of which at least half of the submissions must be from the prime contractor. Given the value, complexity, and nature of the procurement, all past or current contract performance information submitted for the prime or any subcontractors shall be performance as a prime contractor. All submissions shall relate to experience submitted within Factor 1: Technical Experience and shall only be for contracts/orders over \$15 million or for an ID/IQ contract with individual task orders exceeding \$5,000,000. All contract values shall be representative of obligation amounts; when submitting

DRAFT HR001123R0001 Sections L & M
DARPA Technical & Analytical Support Services
January 11, 2023

for an ID/IQ contract, the obligation amount shall represent the combined obligation of all awarded task orders.

All submissions must be recent, as defined by services performed since January 1, 2018.

Offerors shall provide a two-page summary for each Past Performance Information Submission. The summary shall include the following (in the below order):

- i. Identify the full contract number (and task/call order number if applicable – each task/call order is considered a submission) and program/requirement title.
- ii. Identify the Period of Performance to include the months, days, and years (MM/DD/YYYY; e.g., 02/15/2018 – 02/14/2022).
- iii. Identify the current obligation dollar amount, total contract value, and/or potential ceiling, as applicable.
- iv. Identify contract type(s).
- v. Identify whether the submission was performed by the Offeror or a proposed Subcontractor as the prime.
- vi. Identify the Government customer office name for the submission and provide the names, titles/roles, phone numbers, and email addresses of the following Government customer points of contact (POC) that may be knowledgeable of the Offeror's performance on the submission: Program Manager, Contracting Officer (CO), Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO), and Contracting Officer's Representative/Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COR/COTR).
- vii. Provide a brief description of the effort performed as a prime (do not claim past performance/experience performed by contract's subcontractors).
- viii. Demonstrate how the Offeror's or proposed Subcontractor(s)' performance is relevant (in scope, magnitude, and complexity) to the PWS requirements.
- ix. Describe any problems encountered on the identified contract and any corrective action taken, to include response to any adverse past performance information available to the Government, as well as any efforts to identify and manage program risk.*

*Note: Merely having problems does not automatically equate to a "Limited Confidence" or "No Confidence" assessment, since the problems encountered may have been unavoidable, or an Offeror may have subsequently demonstrated the ability to overcome the problems encountered. The Offeror (or Subcontractor) shall clearly demonstrate management actions employed in overcoming problems and the effects of those actions in terms of improvements achieved or problems rectified. This may give the Offeror a higher confidence assessment rating. For example, submittal of quality performance indicators or other management indicators that clearly support an Offeror has overcome past problems would assist the Government when assigning the confidence assessment rating.

DRAFT HR001123R0001 Sections L & M
DARPA Technical & Analytical Support Services
January 11, 2023

If the Offeror does not have any past performance information, the Offeror must state in this section that they possess no relevant past performance. Offerors with no relevant past performance will receive a past performance rating of “Neutral Confidence.”

In the conduct of its past performance evaluation of Offerors, DARPA may use a variety of sources in addition to information provided by the Offeror. DARPA/CMO may use past performance information obtained from sources other than those identified by the Offeror. These sources may include, but are not limited to, CPARS, Past Performance Information Retrieval Systems (PPIRS), technical reports, evaluator’s personal knowledge, commercial or any available published information, and information derived from present or past Government or commercial customers of the Offeror. Those Offerors who have no relevant past performance history will not be evaluated either favorably or unfavorably on past performance. DARPA reserves the right to determine which contracts submitted by the Offeror are relevant to the requirements and to utilize only those references.

d. CPARS and/or Past Performance Questionnaires (No page limit)

For each Past Performance Information Submission, Offerors shall submit ALL Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) evaluations that were completed for the relevant time period (since January 1, 2018).

If CPARS evaluations are not available, Offerors (or subcontractors) shall request that their **Government customer submit** past performance information on the Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) found at Attachment 5. The POCs identified on the questionnaire must be able to provide information on the quality of the Offeror or subcontractor’s performance. Each CPARS evaluation or PPQ must correspond to the past performance experience cited in Offeror’s Factor 1: Technical Experience submission. The **Offeror’s customers** must send past performance information to TASSIDIQUIREMENT@darpa.mil by the proposal due date. The Offeror shall include in this section proof of correspondence with Government customer requesting past performance information (e.g. copy of date-stamped email).

When CPARS are not available, the Offeror shall request that their **Government customer submit** past performance information on the Past Performance Questionnaire found at Attachment 5. Each past performance questionnaire must correspond to the past performance experience cited in Offeror’s Technical Experience Volume. The POCs identified on the questionnaire must be able to provide information on the quality of your performance.

e. Organization Structure Change History (No page limit)

DRAFT HR001123R0001 Sections L & M
DARPA Technical & Analytical Support Services
January 11, 2023

Many Offerors have acquired, been acquired by, or otherwise merged with other companies, and/or reorganized its 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 past performance is relevant to this procurement. To facilitate this relevancy determination, include in this proposal Volume (if applicable), a “roadmap” describing all such changes in the company within the past seven (7) years. As part of this explanation, show how these changes impact the relevance of any efforts identified for past performance evaluation/performance confidence assessment. Since the Government intends to consider past performance information provided by other sources, as well as that provided by the Offeror, the Offeror’s “roadmap” should be specifically applicable to the efforts identified but general enough to apply to efforts on which the Government receives information from other sources. This information is required for the Offeror and any teaming partner(s) being used for past performance information submissions. The Government reserves the right to exclude sources due to conflicts of interest.

Determination of Responsibility: Even though the assessment of past performance information as a specific evaluation factor is separate and distinct from the determination of responsibility required by FAR 9.1, *Responsible Prospective Contractors*, past performance information obtained herein may be used to support the determination of responsibility for successful Offerors.

Note: Subcontractors, in order to protect proprietary information, may send CPARS evaluations or responses to adverse past performance directly to TASSIDIQUIREMENT@darpa.mil, but it shall conform to the requirements of this solicitation and be received by the proposal due date.

L.12 Volume VI - Evaluation Factor 4: Small Business Participation (5 page limit)

All Offerors, with the exception of small businesses, shall submit a Small Business Participation Plan separate from the subcontracting plan. The Small Business Participation Plan shall:

- a. Identify specific small businesses, their role, and the type of commitment between the prime and small business.
- b. Describe the expertise, variety, and appropriateness of work small businesses are to perform.
- c. List extent of participation of small business by small business type (e.g., service-disabled veteran-owned, HUBZone, small disadvantaged, and women-owned small businesses) in terms of value of the total acquisition.

DRAFT HR001123R0001 Sections L & M
DARPA Technical & Analytical Support Services
January 11, 2023

- d. Provide Offeror's past performance in complying with the requirement at FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns, and FAR 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan.

L.13 Volume VII - Evaluation Factor 5: Price (No page limit)

This Volume is to assist the Offeror in submitting information other than cost or pricing data that is required to evaluate the fair and reasonableness of the Offeror's proposed price for maximum labor hour rates. Compliance with these requirements is mandatory and failure to comply may result in rejection of the Offeror's proposal. Price fair and reasonableness and realism (as applicable) of cost or fixed price requirements for task orders will be evaluated at the task order level.

This Volume shall be a complete and detailed breakdown and shall include all elements of cost, and other data as considered appropriate, to support the Offeror's proposal. Particular emphasis will be placed upon the reasonableness of applied fringe and burden of the labor rates, along with any pass-through fees. The straight time hourly rates shall use a forty-hour week for the conversion of salaried employees to the hourly basis and shall be inclusive of loading factors, (i.e., vacation, sick leave, holidays, overhead, General and Administrative rates (G&A), fee, etc.). Offerors shall submit their cost/price for Labor Hour labor rates via Attachment 3, using 1920 hours as a baseline and shall not convert it to a .pdf file.

L.13.1 Estimating Techniques and Methods

When responding to the Price Volume requirements of this solicitation, the Offeror and associated subcontractor(s) may use any generally accepted estimating technique, including contemporary estimating methods (such as Cost-to-Cost and Cost-to-Non-Cost Estimating Relationships, commercially available parametric cost models, in-house developed parametric cost models, etc.) to develop its estimates.

L.13.2 Cost or Pricing Information Requirements

Information beyond that required by this instruction shall not be submitted, unless the Offeror considers it essential to document or support its cost/price position. All information relating to the proposed cost/price, including all required supporting documentation, must be included in the section of the proposal designated as Volume VII Price Proposal. Under no circumstances shall this information and documentation be included elsewhere in the proposal unless specifically stated otherwise.

DRAFT HR001123R0001 Sections L & M
DARPA Technical & Analytical Support Services
January 11, 2023

Note: The cost or price information in the Subcontracting Plan and Factor 4: Small Business Participation and is not included in this restriction.

In accordance with FAR 15.403-1(b) and 15.403-3(a), information other than cost or pricing data may be required to support the price reasonableness of proposed maximum labor hour rates. If, after receipt of proposals, the Contracting Officer determines that there is insufficient information available to determine price reasonableness and none of the exceptions in FAR 15.403-1 apply, the Offeror shall be required to submit cost or pricing data. Information shall be provided in accordance with FAR 15.403 through 15.405.

L.13.3 Volume Organization

The Price Volume shall contain the following:

- Table of contents;
- Summary descriptions of estimating, purchasing, and accounting systems;
- The most recent Forward Pricing Rate Proposal, Recommendation, and/or Agreement (FPRA) for prime (as available);
- Changes to estimating, accounting practices, or Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) Disclosure Statement (as applicable), cost/price information;
- Supporting data;
- Total Compensation Plan (submitted with Factor 5, but evaluated under Factor 2) ; and
- Completed Attachment 3

L.13.4 Estimating Method

a. Estimating System

Provide a summary description of the Offeror's standard estimating system or methods. The summary description shall cover separately each major cost element (e.g., Direct Material, Engineering Labor, Indirect Costs, Other Direct Costs, Overhead, G&A, etc.). Also, identify any deviations from the Offeror's standard estimating procedures in preparing this proposal Volume. Indicate whether the Offeror has Government approval of its system, and if so, provide evidence of such approval.

b. Purchasing System

Provide a summary description of its 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 the

DRAFT HR001123R0001 Sections L & M
DARPA Technical & Analytical Support Services
January 11, 2023

Offeror's standard procedures in preparing this proposal Volume. Indicate whether the Offeror has Government approval of its system and if so, provide evidence of such approval.

c. Explanation of Estimating Methods Used

Explain the method used to estimate each cost element used to derive final labor hour rates and include pass-through fees that will be used for subcontractor labor.

L.13.5 Price Fair and Reasonable

The Offeror shall propose ceiling rates for Labor Hour task orders by completing the Labor Hour Labor Category Pricing Spreadsheet (Attachment 3) with the proposed hourly labor rates for each labor category listed. The Offeror shall provide a loaded hourly rate for the National Capital Region for each labor category. The Offeror shall assume that the personnel proposed under these rates will receive Government furnished facilities and equipment in accordance with PWS Section 8. Proposed loaded hourly labor rates will be the maximum allowable rates used throughout the life of this contract for the aforementioned labor categories only on Labor Hour task orders. However, the contractor may discount rates for individual task orders. Actual rates for Fixed Price, Cost-Reimbursement, or any combination thereof, will be established via competition or negotiation at the task order level.

L.14 Submission Format Details

Each Volume shall be complete in and of itself. Unless otherwise specified, any form of presentation may be used, such as narrative, pictures, tables, graphs, schematics, logic and other functional block diagrams to provide a concise description of information. The proposal shall be clear, concise, and shall include sufficient detail for effective evaluation and for substantiating the validity of stated claims. The proposal shall not simply rephrase or restate the Government's requirements, but rather shall provide convincing rationale to address how the Offeror intends to meet the areas to be evaluated. Offerors shall assume that the Government has no prior knowledge of their experience and will base its evaluation on the information presented in the Offeror's proposal.

L.14.1 Text

Text shall be at least single-spaced, on 8 1/2 x 11 inch paper, with a minimum one-inch margin all around. Pages shall be numbered consecutively. A page printed on both sides shall be counted as two pages. No foldout pages shall be used. Pages submitted in excess of the page limitations stated throughout this document will be removed and not evaluated.

L.14.2 Illustrations and Tables

DRAFT HR001123R0001 Sections L & M
DARPA Technical & Analytical Support Services
January 11, 2023

Legible tables, charts, graphs and figures should be used wherever practical to depict organizations, systems and layout, implementation schedules, plans, etc. These displays should be uncomplicated, legible, and shall not exceed restrictions in Sections L.14.1 and L.14.3.

L.14.3 Font Size

Print shall be of a minimum 10-point font size or a maximum 10 characters per inch (10-pitch, Times New Roman) spacing including graphic presentations and tables. Bolding, underlining, and italics may be used to identify topic demarcations or points of emphasis.

L.14.4 Page Limits

Page limits are identified below. The page limits do not include tables of contents, response matrix, index, and/or glossary.

Volume	Title	Page Limit	Excluding
I	Transmittal Letter	3	N/A
II	Administrative Information	N/A	N/A
III	Factor 1: Technical Experience	15	Attachment 4
IV	Factor 2: Management Approach	10	Resume(s) (3 page limit each), Letter(s) of Intent (1 page limit each), Compensation (submitted with Volume VII)
V	Factor 3: Past Performance	13	Table of Contents, CPARS and Questionnaire Submissions, Organization Structure Change History
VI	Factor 4: Small Business Participation	5	N/A
VII	Factor 5: Price	N/A	N/A

L.15 Evaluation of Proposals

All information provided in proposals is subject to evaluation. The Government will evaluate proposals in accordance with the evaluation criteria set forth in Section M of this solicitation. This solicitation includes all evaluation criteria that the Government will use to evaluate Offerors' proposals. There are no subfactors or unstated evaluation criteria. In evaluating an Offeror's proposal under any of the evaluation criteria, the Government may use the solicitation and all of its attachments, including the PWS, to evaluate the Offeror's understanding, approach, and demonstrated performance to meet the Government's requirements. In evaluating an

DRAFT HR001123R0001 Sections L & M
DARPA Technical & Analytical Support Services
January 11, 2023

Offeror's proposal, Government evaluators may also rely on their professional experience, including their experience with the Offeror.

The Government may summarily reject any proposal not substantially in compliance with the terms and conditions of the solicitation. During the evaluation of proposals, the Government may determine a proposal is "Unacceptable" and ineligible for award without further evaluation. DARPA reserves the right to waive informalities and minor irregularities in proposals received in accordance with FAR 52.215-1(f)(3).

All proposal information is subject to verification by the Government. Falsification of any proposal submission, documents, or statements may subject the Offeror to civil or criminal prosecution under Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code (making false statements).

L.16 Exceptions/Assumptions

Offerors are prohibited from modifying, in any way, shape, or form, any documents, printed or electronic, associated with this solicitation or any amendment(s) thereto unless specifically authorized to do so. The electronic solicitation documents, as posted on <http://www.SAM.gov>, shall be the official documents for this solicitation.

The Government reserves the right to award without discussions; therefore, Offerors are advised that taking exception to any requirements specified in this solicitation may result in the Government rejecting the proposal. Clarification of Government requirements shall be resolved by submitting questions/recommendations by the date specified in Section L.4.

L.17 Use of Non-Government Advisors

Offerors are advised that technical and price data submitted to the Government in response to this solicitation may be released to non-Government advisors that have signed non-disclosure agreements for review and analysis. Any objection to disclosure shall be provided in writing to the Contracting Officer within 10 days of solicitation issuance and shall include a detailed statement of the basis for the objection. The detailed statement shall identify the specific portions of the proposal the Offeror objects to disclosure to non-Government advisors.

L.18 Incurring Costs

DARPA/CMO shall not be obligated to pay any cost incurred by the Offeror in the preparation and submission of a proposal in response to this solicitation. The Offeror is advised that the

DRAFT HR001123R0001 Sections L & M
DARPA Technical & Analytical Support Services
January 11, 2023

Contracting Officer is the only person who can legally obligate DARPA/CMO for the expenditure of public funds in connection with this procurement.

DRAFT

DRAFT HR001123R0001 Sections L & M
DARPA Technical & Analytical Support Services
January 11, 2023

Section M: Evaluation Factors for Award

M.1 BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD AND EVALUATION METHOD

The Government intends to award a contract or contracts resulting from this solicitation to the responsible Offeror(s) whose proposal(s) represents the best value after evaluation in accordance with the factors listed in the solicitation. The source selection process for the DARPA-wide TASS ID/IQ contracts will follow FAR 15.101, which defines best value as using any one or a combination of source selection approaches. Consistent with FAR 15.101, for the ID/IQ level contracts awarded under this Solicitation, the Highest Technically Rated Offerors with a Fair and Reasonable Price will determine the best value basis for contract awards. DARPA will select several (approximately seven (7)) highest rated Offerors as evaluated on the non-price factors that have a fair and reasonable price.

DARPA has determined that the Highest Technically Rated Offerors with a Fair and Reasonable Price best value evaluation approach will best achieve the objective of awarding contracts to Offerors with qualities, experience, and approaches that are most important to DARPA. Proposals will be rated in accordance with the following evaluation factors, listed in descending order of importance: Factor 1: Technical Experience; Factor 2: Management Approach; Factor 3: Past Performance; Factor 4: Small Business Participation; and Factor 5: Price.

Factor 5: Price is the least important Factor will be evaluated to determine whether the proposed price is fair and reasonable. However, between proposals evaluated as essentially technically equal, price may become more important in selecting the best value.

To be considered eligible for award, an Offeror must receive a minimum “Acceptable” rating under Factors 1 (Technical Experience), 2 (Management Approach), and 4 (Small Business Participation). Failure to meet a requirement will result in a deficiency being assessed during evaluation resulting in an “Unacceptable” rating, and the Offeror will be ineligible for award.

The following definitions will be used to document the evaluation of proposals:

- A *strength* is defined as an aspect of the proposal with merit or will exceed specified performance or capability requirements to the advantage of the Government during contract performance.
- A *significant strength* is defined as an aspect of the proposal with appreciable merit or will exceed specified performance or capability requirements to the considerable advantage of the Government during contract performance.
- A *weakness* is defined as a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

DRAFT HR001123R0001 Sections L & M
DARPA Technical & Analytical Support Services
January 11, 2023

- A *significant weakness* is defined as a flaw in the proposal that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.
- A *deficiency* is defined as 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.

M.2 AWARD WITHOUT DISCUSSIONS

The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award without discussions with Offerors (except clarifications as described in FAR 15.306(a)). Therefore, the Offeror's initial proposal should contain the Offeror's best terms from a cost or price and technical standpoint. The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if the Contracting Officer later determines discussions to be necessary. If the Contracting Officer determines the number of proposals that would otherwise be in the competitive range exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted, 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 proposals pursuant to FAR 15.306(c)(2).

M.3 EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation criteria provided for Factor 1: Technical Experience; Factor 2: Management Approach; Factor 3: Past Performance; and Factor 4: Small Business Participation will utilize adjectival ratings to document the evaluations based upon criteria established before receipt of the proposals and will ensure the evaluations are a structured process employing fair and impartial measures. No adjectival ratings will be provided for Factor 5: Price. Evaluators will not compare one proposal against another, but rather evaluate each proposal on how well the Offeror meets the factors stated in this solicitation. Evaluators will then prepare a narrative description of the strengths and weaknesses, and identify risk areas lacking appropriate detail to support the proposal's rating. Past Performance will be rated against CPARS data, any questionnaires received by the Government, and any other information available to the Government.

The evaluation process will provide the necessary analysis of the proposals, which will allow the Source Selection Authority to complete a comparative analysis using the evaluation scheme discussed in Section M.1 and decide which proposals are the most highly rated.

M.3.1 FACTOR 1: TECHNICAL EXPERIENCE

The Government will evaluate how well the Offerors' technical experience in exemplar PWS Sections 7.1.2., 7.2.2, and 7.9.1 (listed in order of importance) demonstrates the ability to accomplish all requirements of the PWS. Demonstrated experience specifically and directly related to the value, complexity, and nature of the S&T and R&D requirements of the PWS will be rated higher. The more relevant the demonstrated experience is to the contemplated work, the

DRAFT HR001123R0001 Sections L & M
DARPA Technical & Analytical Support Services
January 11, 2023

more valuable the experience is to the Government. Likewise, Offerors who, within PWS area 7.1.2., demonstrate S&T and R&D expertise across the spectrum of required DARPA technical expertise (e.g., Biological Technologies, Defense Sciences, Information Innovation, Microsystems Technology, Strategic Technology, and Tactical Technology) will be rated higher. Offerors will receive a combined Technical/Risk rating for Factor 1 as defined in Table 4.1.

M.3.2 FACTOR 2: MANAGEMENT APPROACH

The Government will evaluate how well the Offeror's proposed management approach demonstrates the ability to deliver high quality support services to accomplish all requirements of the PWS through the following:

a. Overall ID/IQ Management Plan

- Plan for managing multiple task orders and multiple subcontractors across the full range of PWS requirements.
- Program Management Team construct, qualifications, and commitment. Adequacy to manage and experience in managing ID/IQ contracts with multiple orders and multiple subcontractors, as well as their experience managing S&T and R&D programs. Program Management Teams that demonstrate higher levels of commitment will be rated higher (e.g., contingent employee with letter of intent will be rated higher than representative employee).

b. Recruitment and Retention

- Overall staffing/hiring and subcontracting methodology and practices that will be used to address evolving DARPA needs including the historical time to accomplish subcontracts and ability to readily obtain the experience and expertise required to accomplish the full range of PWS support requirements.
- Plan to incentivize on-site, off-site, and hybrid employees with varying levels of telework available per task order and position.
- Plan for effectively retaining S&T and R&D professional support and minimizing turnover rate to avoid mission degradation.
- In accordance with FAR 52.222-46, Evaluation of Compensation for Professional Employees, Offerors will be evaluated on their total compensation plan.

c. Training

- Approach to quickly and effectively train and mentor new personnel on DARPA procedures and policy will be assessed.

DRAFT HR001123R0001 Sections L & M
DARPA Technical & Analytical Support Services
January 11, 2023

d. Culture

- Methodology for measuring, strengthening, and promoting its organizational culture in a hybrid (in-person and virtual) work environment. Approach to promoting their organizational culture among their on-site, off-site, and hybrid employees, including their plan to:
 - Rapidly onboard and successfully assimilate new personnel to DARPA culture, and then create, promote, and preserve a sense of community between their personnel, as well as government and other contractor personnel, in a hybrid environment;
 - Facilitate knowledge sharing across multiple contractor and Government teams supporting DARPA;
 - Ensure that provided collaboration tools are available and maximally leveraged to integrate hybrid personnel.

Offerors will receive a single combined Technical/Risk rating for Factor 2 as defined in Table 4.1 below.

M.3.3 FACTOR 3: PAST PERFORMANCE

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's performance as a prime contractor based on CPARS evaluations, Past Performance Questionnaires, and any other information sources including the Evaluators' personal experience with the Offeror. Past performance is the degree to which the Offeror has satisfied its customers. The Government evaluation will be subjective and based on the Offeror's reputation with its customers. Some or all of the Offeror's customers may be contacted and may be asked if they believe the Offeror was capable, efficient, and effective; if the Offeror's performance conformed to the terms of the contract; if the Offeror was reasonable and cooperative; and if the customer was committed to customer satisfaction.

More information on how this factor will be evaluated to include recency, relevancy, and confidence ratings are contained in Section M.4.2.

Past performance within the Department of Defense (DoD) Research and Development Organizations is considered more relevant than performance within other DoD, Government, or commercial customers.

M.3.4 FACTOR 4: SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION

DRAFT HR001123R0001 Sections L & M
DARPA Technical & Analytical Support Services
January 11, 2023

All Offerors, with the exception of small businesses, will be evaluated on their Small Business Participation Plan. Specifically, Offerors will be evaluated on how their proposal meets or exceeds the following:

- a. Extent to which small businesses, their role, and the type of commitment between the prime and small business are identified. Enforceable and in place commitments will be rated more highly.
- b. Expertise, variety, and appropriateness of work small businesses will perform.
- c. Extent of participation of small business by small business type (e.g., service-disabled veteran-owned, HUBZone, small disadvantaged, and women-owned small businesses) in terms of a percentage of the total value of the acquisition. DARPA's minimum small business subcontracting goal is 24%, with the desired goal of 30%, of the total value of the acquisition.
- d. Offeror's past performance in complying with the requirement at FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns, and FAR 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan.
- e. Realism of the small business participation plan.

Offerors will receive a single combined Technical/Risk rating for Factor 4 as defined in Table 4.1 below.

M.3.5 FACTOR 5: PRICE

The Government will evaluate the price proposals of approximately seven (7) Offerors that are the highest rated based on the Government's evaluation of the proposals under non-price factors 1-4. For each of these highest rated Offerors, the Government will evaluate their price proposal to determine if it is fair and reasonable. The Government will evaluate labor hour rates for each labor category to determine they are fair and reasonable establishing maximum rates for Labor Hour orders (i.e., the Government will only evaluate price for the Offerors determined to be the highest technically rated within award limits set via Section L.2). The Government will also use FAR 15.404-1 proposal analysis techniques to determine proposed maximum rates are fair and reasonable. If any of the approximately seven (7) highest rated Offerors for the non-price factors are found not to have fair and reasonable price, or not to be responsible, such Offeror(s) will not be further considered, and the next highest rated Offeror will be considered for price evaluation.

Unreasonably high proposed prices may be grounds for eliminating a proposal from competition on the basis that the Offeror does not understand the requirement and cannot be found Responsible. Offers should be sufficiently detailed to demonstrate their reasonableness. The burden of showing reasonableness rests with the Offeror. Offerors are advised to clearly show

DRAFT HR001123R0001 Sections L & M
DARPA Technical & Analytical Support Services
January 11, 2023

justification for unique practices that significantly lower or raise costs. An assessment that the proposal is not reasonable, and hence not responsible, may result in the offer being unacceptable for award.

M.4 EVALUATION RATINGS TABLES

M.4.1 FACTOR 1: TECHNICAL EXPERIENCE AND FACTOR 2: MANAGEMENT APPROACH ADJECTIVAL EVALUATION RATINGS

Table 4.1 Combined Technical/Risk Rating Method

Adjectival Rating	Description
Outstanding	Proposal demonstrates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths and/or at least one significant strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength or significant strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low to moderate.
Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation and, thus, contains one or more deficiencies and is unawardable, and/or risk of performance is unacceptably high.

M.4.2 FACTOR 3 (PAST PERFORMANCE) EVALUATION RATING AND METHODOLOGY

There are three aspects to the past performance evaluation: recency, relevancy (including context of data), and quality (including general trends in Offeror performance and source of information).

DRAFT HR001123R0001 Sections L & M
DARPA Technical & Analytical Support Services
January 11, 2023

M.4.2.1 RECENCY

The recency of the Offeror's past performance as a prime contractor will be evaluated. Recency is generally expressed as a time period during which past performance references are considered relevant, and is critical to establishing the relevancy of past performance information. For the purposes of this evaluation, recency is defined as services performed since January 1, 2018.

M.4.2.2 RELEVANCE

The relevance of a recent effort accomplished by the Offeror as a prime contractor will be compared and evaluated to the effort being acquired through this source selection. In establishing what is relevant for the acquisition, the Offeror should consider those aspects of an Offeror's history of contract (or subcontract) performance that would provide the most context and give the greatest ability to measure whether the Offeror will successfully satisfy the current requirement. Common aspects of relevancy include, but are not limited to, the following: similarity of product/service/support (e.g., technical, analytical, study/challenges), complexity (e.g., S&T R&D environment), dollar value, contract type (e.g., ID/IQ contract with multiple orders), use of key personnel (for services), and extent of subcontracting/teaming.

There are four levels of relevancy as shown in Table 4.2.2 below. With respect to relevancy, more relevant past performance will typically be a stronger predictor of future success and have more influence on the past performance confidence assessment than past performance of lesser relevance.

Table 4.2.2 Past Performance Relevancy Rating Method

Adjectival Rating	Description
Very Relevant	Present/past performance effort as a prime contractor involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort (at least \$35 million for a contract/order or an ID/IQ contract with individual task orders exceeding \$20,000,000) and the same complexities this solicitation requires.
Relevant	Present/past performance effort as a prime contractor involved similar scope and magnitude of effort (at least \$25 million for a contract/order or an ID/IQ contract with individual task orders exceeding \$10,000,000) and similar complexities this solicitation requires.

DRAFT HR001123R0001 Sections L & M
DARPA Technical & Analytical Support Services
January 11, 2023

Somewhat Relevant	Present/past performance effort as a prime contractor involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort (at least \$15 million for a contract/order or an ID/IQ contract with individual task orders exceeding \$5,000,000) and some of the complexities this solicitation requires.
Not Relevant	Present/past performance effort as a prime contractor involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and little or none of the complexities this solicitation requires.

M.4.2.3 QUALITY OF PRODUCTS OR SERVICES

The overall quality of the Offeror's past performance as a prime contractor will be established per FAR 15.304(c)(2). The past performance evaluation conducted in support of a current source selection does not establish, create, or change the existing record and history of the Offeror's past performance on past contracts; rather, the past performance evaluation process gathers information from customers on how well the Offeror performed those past contracts. The Past Performance Evaluation Team will review all past performance information collected and determine the quality of the Offeror's performance, general trends, and usefulness of the information and incorporate these into the performance confidence assessment. A separate quality assessment rating is not required; rather, the past performance confidence assessment rating is based on the Offeror's overall record of recency, relevancy, and quality of performance.

M.4.2.4 PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT

As a result of the recency, relevancy, and quality of performance as a prime contractor, Offerors will receive a performance confidence assessment rating. Although the past performance evaluation focuses on performance relevant to the other non-price factors, the resulting performance confidence assessment rating is made at the factor level and represents an overall evaluation of the Offeror's performance. Offerors for whom no recent/relevant performance information is available or the Offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful performance confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned, will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on the factor of past performance and, as a result, will receive a "Neutral Confidence" rating for the Past Performance factor.

Each Offeror's proposal will receive a single performance confidence assessment for Factor 3: Past Performance in accordance with the table below:

Table 4.2.4 Performance Confidence Assessments Rating Method

DRAFT HR001123R0001 Sections L & M
DARPA Technical & Analytical Support Services
January 11, 2023

Adjectival Rating	Description
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 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.

M.4.3 FACTOR 4: SMALL BUSINESS PLAN EVALUATION RATING

Table 4.3 Small Business Rating Method

Adjectival Rating	Description
Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the small business objectives.
Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the small business objectives.
Acceptable	Proposal indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the small business objectives.
Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the small business objectives.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet small business objectives.

M.4.4 FACTOR 5: PRICE

Factor 5 will not receive an adjectival rating but will be evaluated in accordance with the parameters set forth in Sections M.1 and M.3.5.