

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT				1. CONTRACT ID CODE Y		PAGE OF PAGES 1 33	
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0001		3. EFFECTIVE DATE 3 July 2017		4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.		5. PROJECT NO. (if applicable)	
6. ISSUED BY CODE HDTRA1 DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY/400 8725 JOHN J. KINGMAN RD. FT. BELVOIR VA 22060-6201		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6) CODE See Item 6					
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code) CODE FACILITY CODE				X 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. HDTRA1-16-R-0027			
				X 9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 01-Jun-2017			
				10A. MOD. OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.			
				10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)			
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS							
☒ The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offer ☒ is extended ☐ is not extended. Offer must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning <u>1</u> copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.							
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)							
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACT ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.							
A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.							
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(B).							
C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:							
D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)							
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor ☐ is not, ☒ is required to sign this document and return <u>1</u> copies to the issuing office.							
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation contract subject matter where feasible.) The purpose of this amendment is to make changes to the solicitation. The changes are in bold font							
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.							
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)				16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print) Tammy Feige TEL: 703-767-2993 EMAIL: tammy.m.feige.civ@mail.mil			
15B. CONTRACT OR/OFFEROR (Signature of person authorized to sign)		15C. DATE SIGNED		16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY		16C. DATE SIGNED	
				(Signature of Contracting Officer)			

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

SECTION A - SOLICITATION/CONTRACT FORM

The required response date/time 14-Jul-2017 11:00 AM has been deleted.

SECTION C - DESCRIPTIONS AND SPECIFICATIONS

The following have been modified:

DESCRIPTION

This is an Indefinite Delivery/ Indefinite Quantity (ID/IQ) multiple award contract that shall provide a broad range of services and products to provide sustainable chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and explosives (CBRNE) threat reduction capabilities to partner nations. The Government intends to award up to six (6) contracts and the ordering period will contain a five (5) year base period with an optional ordering period of three (3) years for a total of eight (8) years. Additionally, Task Orders issued under this ID/IQ may be for a duration of three (3) years past the last ordering date of the ID/IQ contracts. The minimum order guarantee is \$500,000.00 for each contract holder and it does not include the total award amount for Task Order 0001 as that will be awarded separately. The aggregate total for all contracts awarded under this ID/IQ shall not exceed **\$970,000,000.00**.

SPECIFICATIONS

The North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) for this acquisition is 541990: All Other Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services. The small business size standard of \$15M does not apply to this solicitation.

The location of work to be performed may be in the United States and its outlying areas. Additionally, work may be performed in one or more of the following countries: Afghanistan, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Ethiopia, Georgia, Guinea, India, Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Liberia, Malaysia, Moldova, Pakistan, Philippines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Tanzania, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, and Vietnam.

Refer to Section J, Attachment 1 for the Statement of Objectives (SOO).

SECTION J - LIST OF DOCUMENTS, EXHIBITS AND OTHER ATTACHMENTS

The Table of Contents has changed from:

Exhibit/Attachment Table of Contents

DOCUMENT TYPE	DESCRIPTION
Attachment 1	SOO
Attachment 2	DD 254
Attachment 3	Bidders Library List
Attachment 4	Section L PPQs
Attachment 5	Section L TO 0001 CDRLs

Attachment 6	Section L TO 0002 SOW
Attachment 7	Section L TO 0003 SOW
Attachment 8	Cost Price Summary
Attachment 9	TO 0003 Cost Summary Template

to:

Exhibit/Attachment Table of Contents

DOCUMENT TYPE	DESCRIPTION
Attachment 1	SOO
Attachment 2	DD 254
Attachment 3	Bidders Library List
Attachment 4	Section L PPQs
Attachment 5	Section L TO 0001 CDRLs
Attachment 6	Section L TO 0002 SOW
Attachment 7	Section L TO 0003 SOW
Attachment 8	Cost Price Summary
Attachment 9	TO 0003 Cost Summary Template
Attachment 10	Revised SOO
Attachment 11	Revised DD254
Attachment 12	Revised PPQ
Attachment 13	Revised PPQ Word File
Attachment 14	Cost Excel File
Attachment 15	TO 0002 CDRLs
Attachment 16	TO 0003 CDRLs
Attachment 17	Revised TO 0002 SOW
Attachment 18	Revised TO 0003 SOW

SECTION L - INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS AND NOTICES TO BIDDERS

The following have been modified:

CONTENTS

Section L - Instructions, Conditions and Notices to Bidders

Contents:

- L1. General Instructions to Offerors
- L2. Volume I: ID/IQ Proposal Documentation
- L3. Volume II: ID/IQ Mission Capability
- L4. Volume III: ID/IQ Past Performance
- L5. Volume IV: Task Order 0001 (QASP Reporting)
- L6. Volume V: Task Order 0002 (Senegal)
- L7. Volume VI: Task Order 0003 (Philippines)

L1. General Instructions to Offerors

1. Communication:

The primary point of contact is the Contract Specialist (CS), Ms. Joyce L. Gamboa who can be reached via

email at joyce.l.gamboa.civ@mail.mil. The alternate point of contact is the Contracting Officer (CO), Ms. Tammy M. Feige who can be reached via email at tammy.m.feige.civ@mail.mil.

All questions, concerns, or requests for clarification shall be submitted electronically to **dtra.belvoir.j4-8.mbx.fbo-notices@mail.mil** no later than 3pm EST on 08 June 2017. Questions received after this date and time may not be responded to by the Government. All emails shall be clearly labeled in the subject line of the email with the RFP Number: HDTRA1-16-R-0027: CTRIC III. Offerors shall clearly identify the specific section of the solicitation to which each question relates when submitting questions. Reference should be made to the solicitation Section Heading, page number of the solicitation, and specific location on the page (e.g., third paragraph) in order to facilitate the Government's response to each question. Questions shall be submitted in a Microsoft Excel file following a format similar to the table below:

Question No.	Reference	Question Category	Question
#	Solicitation or Attachments, and Section	Contract or Technical	Question

Responses to submitted questions will be provided to all Offerors via an Amendment to this solicitation through FedBizOpps at <https://www.fbo.gov>. If Amendments to the solicitation are issued, all Offerors must acknowledge the Amendments by signing the accompanying Standard Form (SF) 30 and returning the signed SF 30 for all Amendments issued with the Offeror's proposal submission. Failure to acknowledge all Amendments issued by the Government may result in the proposal submitted in response to the solicitation being found non-responsive by the Government.

2. Errors, Omissions, or Ambiguities:

If an Offeror believes the solicitation, including the instructions to Offerors, contains an error, omission or ambiguity, or is otherwise unsound, the Offeror shall immediately notify the Contract Specialist and Contracting Officer in writing with supporting rationale at any point prior to the proposal submission deadline.

3. Proposal Organization:

The Offeror shall organize the proposal as set forth in the table below. The titles and contents of the volumes as well as the page limitations and number of required copies are specified. In the event that the table conflicts with the detailed instructions in the paragraphs that follow, the detailed instructions shall take precedence.

Volume	Volume Title	Soft Copy	Page Limit
I	ID/IQ PROPOSAL DOCUMENTATION	1	No Limit
II	ID/IQ MISSION CAPABILITY	1	45
III	ID/IQ PAST PERFORMANCE	1	No Limit
IV	TASK ORDER 0001 - QASP REPORTING	1	1
V	TASK ORDER 0002 - SENEGAL	1	20
VI	TASK ORDER 0003 - PHILIPPINES	1	25

4. Proposal Format:

The Offeror shall address the factors, subfactors, and their related elements as listed in Section L of the solicitation. Section M will describe how the Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposal. Be clear, concise, and include detailed explanations for substantiating the validity of stated assertions. Extraneous, repetitious, or wordy submissions are not desired and could result in lower ratings. Do not simply rephrase or restate the Government's requirements, but rather provide convincing rationale to address how the Offeror intends to meet the requirements. Walk the Government through your management and technical approaches and your cost estimating or pricing methods so that the Government has a clear understanding how you will execute the Government's requirements. Assume that Government has no prior knowledge of the Offeror's

capabilities and experience and will base its evaluation solely on the information presented in the Offeror's proposal.

Physical Appearance of Submissions:

Elaborate brochures or documentation, detailed artwork, or other embellishments are unnecessary and are not desired. Proposals will be submitted in electronic copies. No models, mockups, or videos will be accepted.

Proposal Submission Instructions:

Volumes I through IV shall be submitted no later than 11:00 EST on 14 July 2017 via electronic submission. Volumes V and VI shall be submitted no later than 11:00 EST on 31 July 2017 via electronic submission.

In order for the entire proposal package to be complete, responsive, and timely, the volume submissions SHALL be submitted on or before their required deadlines indicated above. As a reminder, only pertinent information to that specific volume shall be submitted; do not resubmit Volumes I through IV on 31 July 2017; do not submit any duplicative information. Failure to submit all volumes within the stated deadlines will be determined incomplete, unresponsive, untimely, and the Offeror will be determined ineligible for award.

Electronic copies of each volume shall be submitted through the U. S. Army Aviation and Missile Research Development and Engineering Center (AMRDEC) tool which can be accessed at <https://safe.amrdec.army.mil/safe/Welcome.aspx>. All Offerors may utilize the "non-CAC users" option and submit proposals to the following recipients: joyce.l.gamboa.civ@mail.mil; tammy.m.feige.civ@mail.mil; and dtra.belvoir.j4-8.mbx.fbo-notices@mail.mil. Offerors are responsible for ensuring electronic copies are virus-free and shall run an anti-virus scan before submission. Electronic copies of each volume shall be compatible with the following software products: Adobe Acrobat Reader 11 and Microsoft Office Suite (Excel and Project) 2010. Note: The electronic copy shall be in Adobe Acrobat (except for Microsoft Excel) portable document file (pdf) searchable text format. Electronic files shall be clearly identified for each volume, section, and item. The Offeror shall not embed sound or video (e.g., MPEG) files into the proposal files. It is the Offeror's responsibility to obtain written confirmation of receipt of all electronic files of the full proposal by the DTRA Contracting office. In the event that the AMRDEC website is down, the alternate method for proposal submission is via email to: dtra.belvoir.j4-8.mbx.fbo-notices@mail.mil only. However, this is not the preferred method as inboxes get full and can easily bounce back emails. If AMRDEC has never been utilized by the Offeror, it is highly recommended to test document submissions and gain familiarity with this tool.

Minimum Cross-Referencing:

Each volume shall be written to the greatest extent possible on a stand-alone basis, so that its contents may be evaluated with a minimum of cross-referencing to other volumes of the proposal. Information required for proposal evaluation that is not found in its designated volume will be assumed to have been omitted from the proposal. Organizational Conflicts of Interest assertions submitted in section L.2.10 may be cross-referenced in other volumes.

Glossary of Abbreviations and Acronyms:

Each volume shall contain a glossary of all abbreviations and acronyms used with an explanation for each. Glossaries do not count against the page limitation for their respective volumes.

Page Format Restrictions and Limitations:

Page Size:

Pages shall be 8.5 x 11 inches. Font size shall be twelve (12) point Times New Roman. Lettering within tables, charts, graphs, and figures shall be no smaller than ten (10) point Times New Roman. Margins on all four edges of each sheet will be at least one-inch. Proprietary statements, security markings, and page numbers shall be placed within the defined margin area. Pages shall be numbered sequentially by volume. In the event discussions are held, these page format restrictions shall apply to the Final Proposal Revisions

(FPRs). **Schedules may be submitted in 11 x 17 page format and each 11 x 17 page shall be counted as two (2) pages towards the page limitation noted below.**

Page Limitations:

Page limitations shall be treated as maximums. If exceeded, the excess pages will not be read or considered in the evaluation of the proposal. The excess pages will be deleted from the electronic copy of the proposal. Schedules are required for each Task Order (TO) requirement. Schedules shall be submitted in as a .pdf and .mpp files and are limited to 10 pages.

Pages Counted:

Pages furnished for organizational purposes only, such as a "Table of Contents" or divider tabs, are not included in the page limitation. Each page shall be counted except the following:

- Cover pages
- Table of Contents
- RFP cross-reference matrix
- Past performance consent letters
- Past Performance Questionnaires
- Glossary of Abbreviations and Acronyms
- List of figures, tables, or drawings
- Tabs/Dividers

Indexing:

Each volume shall contain a more detailed table of contents to delineate the sections within that volume. Tab indexing shall be used to identify sections.

Debriefings:

Pre-Award Debriefings:

Offerors excluded from the competitive range or otherwise excluded from the competition before award may request a debriefing by submitting a written request to the CS within three (3) business days after receipt of the notice of exclusion from the competitive range. The Government shall make every effort to debrief unsuccessful Offerors as soon as practicable.

Post-award Debriefings:

Offerors may request a debriefing by providing a written request to the CS within three (3) business days after receipt of the Contract Specialist's notification. To the maximum extent practicable, debriefings will be conducted within fifteen (15) business days of the Offeror's request.

Intent to Award without Discussions:

The Government reserves the right and intends to award without discussions. If, during the evaluation period, it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government to hold discussions, the discussions will be held with only those Offerors determined to be in the competitive range.

L2. Volume I – ID/IQ Proposal Documentation

1. Required Form: SF 33

Offerors are required to complete and submit SF33 as part of its proposal along with any amendment receipt acknowledgement(s). Completion of SF 33 Blocks 12 through 18 is required. Signature and date by the Offeror on the SF 33 Blocks 17-18 constitutes an offer, which the Government may accept.

Validity Statement

The proposal shall be valid for at least 180 calendar days. In addition, the Offeror shall make a clear statement that the proposal will be valid for the duration of the acceptance period.

2. Volume Organization:

As identified below, the Offeror shall submit each section in a separate document and shall be organized in the following order:

Section 1	Table of Contents List of Table and Drawings Glossary of Abbreviations and Acronyms RFP Cross-Reference Matrix
-----------	---

3. Company Information:

Provide the company's street address, county, and facility code; Commercial and Government Entity (CAGE) Code; Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number; Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN); and size of business (large or small).

4. Authorized Offeror Personnel:

Provide the name, title, telephone number, and e-mail address of the company and division points of contact regarding decisions made with respect to the Offeror's proposal. Additionally, identify those individuals authorized to negotiate with the Government and who can obligate the Offeror contractually.

5. Teaming Arrangements:

IAW FAR Subpart 9.6, proposal submissions shall clearly specify the prime contractor in the Volume itself. A contractor team arrangement is defined when two or more companies form a partnership or joint venture to act as a potential prime contractor; or a potential prime contractor agrees with one or more other companies to have them act as its subcontractors under a specified Government contract or acquisition program. The Offeror shall provide a matrix of all proposed subcontractors/team members and the specific area(s) within the SOO for which they will be utilized. The matrix shall clearly identify the CAGE and DUNS for each team member.

6. Government offices:

Provide the mailing address, telephone, and facility codes for the cognizant Contract Administration Office, Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA), and Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA).

7. Security Requirements:

Provide information relative to Offeror's facility clearance and the contact information for the Offeror's security office. Information relative to subcontractor security requirements shall be included. Offeror's shall complete and submit Attachment 2, Department of Defense (DD) Form 254- Contract Security Classification

Specification.

8. **Cost/Price Summary:**

~~The Offeror shall complete and provide Attachment 8, Cost/Price Summary.~~

9. **Exceptions to Terms and Conditions:**

Exceptions taken to the terms and conditions of the solicitation, or to any of its formal attachments, including the TOs, shall be identified. Each exception shall be specifically related to each paragraph and/or specific part of the solicitation to which the exception is taken. The Offeror shall provide rationale in support of the exception and fully explain its impact, if any, on the performance, schedule, cost, and specific requirements of the solicitation. This information shall be provided in the format and content of the table below. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the solicitation may result in the Offeror being removed from consideration for award.

Exception No.	Reference	Requirement	Rationale
#	Solicitation or Attachments, and Section	Identify the requirement or portion to which the exception is taken	Justify/explain the basis for exception and impact on contract

10. **Representatives, Certifications, and Other Statements of Offerors (Section K):**

The Offeror is responsible for ensuring that all representations, certifications, acknowledgements, and statements required by the provisions in this solicitation are current at the time of proposal and provided in www.sam.gov.

11. **Pre-Award Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCIs):**

If the Offeror has a potential OCI, they shall be submitted to the CS and CO not later than seven (7) calendar days after the RFP issuance. If the submission involves or affects a teaming partner, the affected teaming partner shall be carbon copied on the submission. Relevant information regarding possible OCIs will not be treated like a separate evaluation factor. The OCI statement shall concisely describe all relevant facts concerning any past, present, or planned interest (financial, contractual, organizational, or otherwise) relating to the work to be performed under the proposed contract and bearing on whether the Offeror has a possible organizational conflict of interest. Additionally, Offerors shall submit a written statement that identifies all known DTRA contracts and/or subcontracts that it or any of its teaming partners, a description of the work it is executing under its contract and/or subcontract, whether the contract and/or subcontract poses a conflict or a potential conflict with the execution of the requirements within this solicitation, and, if necessary, a viable mitigation plan.

If there are no potential OCIs, the Offeror shall include a statement to certify that: "To the best of its knowledge, it is not aware of any facts which create any actual or potential organizational conflicts of interest relating to the award of this contract."

12. **Contractor Systems:**

IAW DFARS 252.242-7005, the Offeror shall have the following ~~approved~~ business systems: **approved**¹ Accounting and Property Management systems, and adequate or acceptable² Estimating, ~~Material Management~~ and Purchasing systems. Without DCMA approval of business systems ~~below~~ at the time of award, the Offeror will be ineligible for award. Note that an approved Earned Value Management System **and Material Management System** are not required at the time. **The approved business systems are required at**

¹ Reference FAR 16.104, DFARS 242.7502 and FAR 45.105

² Reference FAR 15.207-5, DFARS 215.407-5-70, FAR 44.201

the time of award as a matter of responsibility.

13. Additional Information:

The Contracting Officer may require further relevant information from an Offeror and may, at his/her discretion, permit an Offeror to clarify errors or omissions in relevant information or in a statement required by the Proposal Certification above. Refusal to provide a statement required, refusal to provide further relevant information required by the CS/CO, or the misrepresentation of any relevant information will result in disqualification of an Offeror from further consideration for award under this solicitation.

L3. Volume II – ID/IQ Mission Capability

1. General Information:

This volume shall describe the Offeror's capability to satisfy the SOO. The proposal shall be prepared simply and economically, providing straightforward, concise delineation of the management and technical approaches to perform the contract. Particular capability strengths or unique approaches should be emphasized. Asserted capability and/or intent to meet the requirements must be supported by detailed descriptions of approach, its successful application in past projects, and personnel qualifications to support the approach. The Government will not assume that an Offeror possesses any capability unless specified in the proposal. Offerors are reminded that, according to Section L, General Instructions, paragraph (4), the Offeror is responsible for providing sufficient detail to enable the Government to evaluate the proposal. All the requirements specified in the SOO are mandatory and the Offeror must demonstrate its ability to deliver the full spectrum of goods and services. By submitting a proposal, the Offeror is representing that its firm is capable and committed to performing all the requirements specified in the solicitation.

2. Volume Organization:

As identified below, the Offeror shall submit each section in a separate document and shall be organized in the following order:

Section 1	Table of Contents List of Table and Drawings Glossary of Abbreviations and Acronyms RFP Cross-Reference Matrix
Section 2	Management Approach Technical Approach

3. RFP Cross-Reference Matrix (RCRM):

The Offeror shall fill out an RCRM indicating where the proposal addresses the solicitation requirements. The purpose of the RCRM is to show critical interrelationships and dependencies among the documents. The matrix ensures that all requirements are addressed, requirements do not conflict, and proposal sections are internally consistent. ~~This matrix only applies to Volume II.~~ This information shall be provided in the format and content of the table below.

Solicitation	Proposal		Solicitation	Proposal
Solicitation Section/Paragraph	Proposal Volume/ Section/Paragraph		Solicitation Section/Paragraph	Proposal Volume/ Section/Paragraph

4. Management Approach:

The Offeror shall submit a comprehensive and detailed Management Approach for managing projects arising from this ID/IQ contract vehicle and the SOO. The Offeror shall include a Management Approach that discusses how the Offeror will provide for maximum flexibility to innovatively and cost-effectively manage mission execution. Specifically,

a. The Management Approach shall address the SOO Sections 3.1 and 3.2 to discuss the Offeror's approach to assemble, leverage, and integrate highly qualified teams and/or performers for discrete projects requiring specialized expertise throughout the entire period of performance and to maximize participation in TO opportunities. The Offeror shall provide a description of the business relationship or teaming partner arrangement(s).

b. The management approach shall address the SOO Sections 3.3 through 3.7 and Section 4 and describe the processes and techniques that demonstrate the Offeror's ability to effectively and

efficiently perform program management and logistics objectives.

c. The management approach shall describe how the Offeror will continuously and accurately identify, assess, mitigate, monitor, and report risks relating to performing work in foreign countries including but not limited to: (1) lack of formal agreements and protections and (2) recipient state licensing, permitting, site access, and certification. The Offeror shall describe its plan to provide for routine communication of issues, corrective actions, and status reports to the Government.

5. Technical Approach:

The Offeror shall describe its capability and capacity in meeting the objectives referenced in the SOO Section 2. The Offeror shall include the capabilities of any team members and/or other intended subcontractors. The proposed teaming structure, team member roles and responsibilities should be discussed or clearly delineated. The Offeror's discussion of its teaming structure shall be consistent with the teaming arrangement matrix submitted in Volume I, Proposal Instructions.

L4. Volume III – ID/IQ Past Performance

1. Volume Organization:

Volume III is limited to PPQs and Consent Letters. No Executive Summary or other supplemental documents shall be submitted and will not be considered for evaluation. As identified below, the Offeror shall submit each section in a separate document and shall be organized in the following order:

Section 1	Table of Contents Description of Team
Section 2	Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs)

2. Description of Team:

The Offeror shall submit a consent letter, executed by each team member authorizing release of adverse past performance information to the Offeror, so the Offeror can respond to such information. For each teaming partner identified effort for a commercial client, the Offeror shall submit a client authorization letter, authorizing release to the Government of requested information on the Offeror's performance.

3. Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ):

The Offeror (**and/or its team members**) shall submit PPQs for each of the topics listed below. The same contract number may be used for each PPQ but a separate form must be completed for each topic. A maximum of 14 PPQs may be submitted and shall be submitted on the forms provided in Section J, Attachment 4.

	Topic	Max Quantity
1	Executing Design-Build, Equipping and Training	2
2	Implementing Command & Control	2
3	Implementing Bio-Security and Safety Enhancements	2
4	Developing and/or Executing Bio-Surveillance Plans	2
5	Securing and Eliminating CBNRE Materials	2
6	Enhancing Physical Security Systems	2
7	Executing Overseas Project Management ³	2
	Total	14

Recency

If applicable, the references provided shall be within five (5) years of proposal submission in response to the subject solicitation.

Ratings

The Offeror shall utilize best efforts to obtain PPQs and ensure submission to the Government.

Relevance

When completing Attachment 4, Item 5, the Offeror shall provide a detailed description of work per topics listed above. This description shall illustrate how the Offeror's experience on the referenced contract(s) relates to the scope of the proposed effort on this solicitation. Each Past Performance reference should be valued at \$2M or greater.

³ Projects in one or more of the following countries: Afghanistan, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Cambodia, Cameroon, China, Ethiopia, Georgia, Guinea, India, Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Lao PDR, Lebanon, Liberia, Malaysia, Moldova, Pakistan, Philippines, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Tanzania, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, Uzbekistan, and Vietnam.

L5. Volume IV – Task Order 0001 (QASP Reporting)

1. Volume Organization:

As identified below, the Offeror shall submit each section in a separate document and shall be organized in the following order:

Section 1	Table of Contents Glossary of Abbreviations and Acronyms RFP Cross-Reference Matrix
Section 2	Reporting Statement
Section 3	Price

2. Reporting Statement:

The Offeror shall provide an affirmative statement indicating that it will comply with the reporting requirements and that it will abide by the 50% task order participation threshold identified in the SOO with reference to the Quality Assurance Plan (QASP).

3. Price:

All price information shall be addressed ONLY in Volume IV, Section 3 for price only. The task order will be FFP. TO 0001 will be issued to every contract holder under this ID/IQ with the intent of providing a payment mechanism for carrying out the performance reporting requirements under the SOO. As provided in Section J, Attachment 5, the Contractor shall submit CDRL A001, Bid Report, on a quarterly basis. The Contract Line Item Number (CLIN) and Period of Performance (PoP) is as follows:

Item No	Type	PoP	Qty	Unit Price	Total
CLIN 0001	FFP	April 2018 –April 2023	20		
CLIN 0002 – opt	FFP	April 2023 – April 2026	12		

L6. Volume V – Task Order 0002 (Senegal)

1. General Information:

The Offeror shall describe its practical application of the processes, procedures, and approaches to perform the SOW which is included in Attachment 6, TO 0002 SOW.

2. Volume Organization:

As identified below, the Offeror shall submit each section in a separate document and shall be organized in the following order:

Section 1	Table of Contents Glossary of Abbreviations and Acronyms RFP Cross-Reference Matrix
Section 2	Management Approach Technical Approach
Section 3	Past Performance
Section 4	Price

3. Management Approach:

The Offeror shall provide a detailed description of its processes and techniques that demonstrate the Offeror's ability to effectively and efficiently perform the tasks specified in the TO 0002 SOW **paragraph 2.1** and to ensure the successful execution of the TO through:

- a. A staffing plan that demonstrates a team with relevant skills and capabilities to efficiently execute the requirements of this contract. Describe the roles and responsibilities, how the team will be managed, and how communications will flow within the contractor team. Resumes (limited to 2 pages and will not count towards the overall page limitations) may be submitted for **key** members of the team.
- b. An approach that is structured to be Value-Added Tax (VAT) exempted. If the contractor is relying on the United States and Government of Senegal Status of Armed Forces Agreement (SOFA) agreement to obtain a VAT exemption for this project, then the Contractor shall provide a practicable approach in executing VAT exemption mechanism or process, and demonstrate an understanding of local processes in implementing the VAT exemption mechanism, so as to not to delay the execution of the technical tasks.

4. Technical approach:

The Offeror shall provide a detailed description of its approach to executing the technical requirements specified in Items 0002, 0003, 0004, and 0005 of the SOW. The Offeror's approach shall demonstrate an understanding of the project and how to ensure successful completion of the tasks, such that biosecurity and biosafety measures are enhanced in Senegal's National Public Health Laboratory. The contractor shall provide a logically sequenced schedule (down to 3 sublevels).

5. Past Performance:

The PPQs and past performance references submitted at the ID/IQ level will flow down and be used to assess the past performance of the Offeror for this TO requirement. Specifically, PPQs and references provided for the following topics referenced in Volume III, Paragraph 3, will be used for the Past Performances evaluation for this TO: Implementing Bio-Security and Safety Enhancements; Developing and/or Executing Bio-Surveillance; and Executing Overseas Project Management.

6. Price:

All price information shall be addressed ONLY in Volume V, Section 4 for price only. All labor rates shall be rounded to the nearest dollar. All price information, including all supporting documentation and references shall lend itself to review and analysis by the Government and shall be submitted in Microsoft Excel and Adobe PDF format. Offerors shall include formulas and working links to the maximum extent practicable. Do not hide columns or rows. The Offeror shall propose the CLIN structure and clearly identify the duration for each CLIN.

Narrative shall include:

Assumptions:

The Cost Narrative shall identify all assumptions derived by the Offeror relating to estimated costs and shall reference the applicable paragraph and page number in the technical and management sections of the proposal that provides a corresponding discussion of the particular assumption.

The Offeror shall provide a cost narrative that identifies all derived assumptions relating to estimated costs.

(1) In the SOW, Item 0004, assume the Contract kick-off will take place in Lorton, VA.

(2) In the SOW, Item 0002, assume a total of 40 SOPs.

Inconsistencies:

A cost proposal is presumed to represent an Offeror's best effort to respond to the solicitation. Any inconsistency, whether real or apparent, between promised performances and cost shall be explained in the cost narrative. For example, if the intended use of new and innovated techniques is the basis for an abnormally low estimate, the nature of these techniques and their impact on cost should be explained. If unexplained, any significant inconsistency that indicates a requirement misunderstanding may be grounds for proposal rejection or adjustment of the most probable cost. The burden of proof as to cost credibility rests with the Offeror.

Government Furnished Property (GFP)/ Government Furnished Equipment (GFE):

Assume no GFP or GFE will be provided for this TO.

L7. Volume VI – Task Order 0003 (Philippines)

1. General Information:

The Offeror shall describe its practical application of the processes, procedures, and approaches to perform the SOW which is included as Attachment 7, TO 0003 SOW.

2. Volume Organization:

As identified below, the Offeror shall submit each section in a separate document and shall be organized in the following order:

Section 1	Table of Contents List of Tables and Drawings Glossary of Abbreviations and Acronyms RFP Cross-Reference Matrix
Section 2	Management Approach Technical Approach
Section 3	Past Performance
Section 4	Cost/Price

3. Management Approach:

The Offeror shall provide a comprehensive plan that demonstrates the Offeror's understanding of the requirements specified in the SOW through:

- c. Identification of a cohesive project team that reflects relevant skills and experience necessary to perform the requirements of the SOW. The roles and responsibilities shall be clearly identified for each team member and shall demonstrate how the team will work with in-country stakeholders to execute the TO. Also, the Offeror shall discuss communication plans and how the team will communicate with DTRA and its stakeholders. **Resumes (limited to 2 pages and will not count towards the overall page limitations) may be submitted for members of the team.**
- a. Describing the approach and ability to mobilize in-country and comply with all local laws and regulations. Additionally, the Offeror shall demonstrate its ability to do business in the host country through an understanding of the geo-political positions, construction laws and permitting processes.
- ~~b. Inclusion of all applicable local taxes that the USG can expect to encounter for the duration of this project with respect to the Offeror's approach for associated foreign tax considerations. The Contractor shall list and explain what each tax is, its applicability to this TO, level of risk (low/medium/high) and estimate the cost for each expected tax. The Contractor shall apply best efforts to avoid VAT incurrence.~~

4. Technical Approach:

The Offeror shall describe its ability to execute the technical requirements for the SOW in Items 0002, 0003 and 0004. For this TO, the Offeror shall provide a comprehensive plan to coordinate and integrate interagency cooperation among and with NCWS partners. The Offeror shall identify all risks associated with the Technical Approach and submit a risk matrix using the format below:

Risk Factor	Impact	Risk Level	Mitigation	POC
Specific Risk & Rationale <i>Examples:</i>	Specific impact to scope, cost, or time.	Low, Medium, or High	Low, Medium, or High	Identify who is responsible for mitigating the risk.

Operations regulatory compliance, use of non-host country national, licensing, schedule delays	<i>Examples:</i> Scope change or scope creep, additional \$60K, or delay of 6 months.			
--	--	--	--	--

5. Past Performance:

The PPQs and past performance references submitted at the ID/IQ level will flow down and be used to assess the past performance of the Offeror for this TO requirement. Specifically, PPQs and references provided for the following topics referenced in Volume III, Paragraph 3, will be used for the Past Performances evaluation for this TO: Executing Design-Build, Equipment and Training; Implementing Command & Control Implementation; and Executing Overseas Project Management.

6 Cost/Price:

All cost/price information shall be addressed ONLY in Volume VI, Section 4 for price only. The Offeror shall complete and submit Attachment 9 (**also referred to as Attachment 14**), TO 0003 Cost Summary Template. All labor rates shall be rounded to the nearest dollar. All cost/price information, including all supporting documentation and references shall lend itself to review and analysis by the Government and shall be submitted in Microsoft Excel and Adobe PDF format. Offerors shall include formulas and working links to the maximum extent practicable.

The Offeror shall provide a detailed cost proposal for accomplishing the SOW requirements. The cost proposal shall include at a minimum: labor hours, labor categories, indirect costs (to include base and percentage used in calculation), other direct costs, General and Administrative, and fee for both the prime and subcontractors. The cost summary shall be itemized by Work Breakdown Structure (WBS), Contract Line Item Number (CLIN), and cost elements. All cost/price information, including all supporting documentation and references shall lend itself to review and analysis by the Government and shall be submitted in Microsoft Excel and Adobe PDF format. Offerors shall include formulas and working links to the maximum extent practicable. Do not hide columns or rows.

Narrative shall include:

Assumptions:

The Cost Narrative shall identify all assumptions derived by the Offeror relating to estimated costs and shall reference the applicable paragraph and page number in the technical and management sections of the proposal that provides a corresponding discussion of the particular assumption.

The Offeror shall provide a cost narrative that identifies all derived assumptions relating to estimated costs.

(1) In the SOW, Item 0004, assume that the Equipment Training is for 20 people.

(2) In the SOW, Item 0004, assume that the Workshop Training is for 75 people. **Of the 75 total participants, assume 25 local participants and 50 traveling participants. Travel support shall be included and translators are not required.**

(3) In the SOW, Item 0003, assume 12 months of payments.

(4) In the SOW, Item 0001, assume two (2) PMRs to take place CONUS.

(5) In the SOW, Item 0002, assume the building is operable, but in disrepair. All utility systems do not comply with local building code and power is not adequate to support air conditioning. Structure is stable and assume no structural renovations are required.

(6) In the SOW, Item 0004, assume 10 travelers per class with full travel support.

(7) In the SOW, Item 0003, assume one additional quantity of the equipment noted in Appendix B is required.

(8) Assume that DTRA will have a VAT exemption agreement in place at time of award. No VAT shall be incurred under the contract, however, the Contractor shall be responsible for coordinating and

establishing a process to effect the VAT exemption.

(9) In the SOW, Item 0003, assume NCWS will perform maintenance after Transfer of Property as required by user manuals in order to maintain the required warranty. The Contractor shall be responsible for maintenance prior to the Transfer of Property.

Inconsistencies:

A cost proposal is presumed to represent an Offeror's best effort to respond to the solicitation. Any inconsistency, whether real or apparent, between promised performances and cost shall be explained in the cost narrative. For example, if the intended use of new and innovated techniques is the basis for an abnormally low estimate, the nature of these techniques and their impact on cost should be explained. If unexplained, any significant inconsistency that indicates a requirement misunderstanding may be grounds for proposal rejection or adjustment of the most probable cost. The burden of proof as to cost credibility rests with the Offeror.

Government Furnished Property (GFP)/ Government Furnished Equipment (GFE):

Assume no GFP or GFE will be provided for this TO.

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

The following have been modified:

CONTENTS

Section M – Evaluation Factors for Award

Contents:

- M1. General Evaluation Process
- M2. Volume I: ID/IQ Proposal Documentation
- M3. Volume II: ID/IQ Mission Capability
- M4. Volume III: ID/IQ Past Performance
- M5. Volume IV: Task Order 0001 (QASP Reporting)
- M6. Volume V: Task Order 0002 (Senegal)
- M7. Volume VI: Task Order 0003 (Philippines)

M1. General Evaluation Process

1. Basis of Award

The Government will award to the Offeror that presents the best value based on trade-off analysis taking into consideration the relative order of importance of the factors. The most highly ranked proposals will be awarded ID/IQ contracts based on an integrated assessment of all volumes, and including an assessment based on the relative order of importance of the evaluation factors outlined in paragraph 5 below.

These contracts are based on a best value source selection determination conducted In Accordance With (IAW) the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) and Defense FAR Supplement (DFARS). The Government will award contract(s) to the Offeror(s) deemed responsible according to the FAR and whose proposals conform to or exceed the solicitation requirements (including all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and all other information required by Section L of this solicitation). Offeror(s) proposals will be evaluated based on the factors and subfactors below, which represent the best value to the Government while considering both cost and non-cost factors. This may result in an award to a higher-priced Offeror where the decision is consistent with the evaluation factors and the Source Selection Authority (SSA) determines the proposal represents the best value to 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.

2. Solicitation Requirements, Terms, and Conditions

Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements such as terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and those identified as factors and subfactors to be eligible for award. If the Offeror(s) fail to comply with the terms and conditions of this solicitation, they may be removed from award consideration. However, the Government may consider exceptions to compliance with the requirements; any exception to solicitation terms and conditions must be fully explained and justified. Refer to the RFP Section L2, Paragraph 8.

3. Discussions/Competitive Range

The Government reserves the right and intends to award without discussions. Each Offeror should submit its best proposal, as the opportunity to submit a revised proposal is not anticipated. If, during the evaluation period, it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government to hold discussions these discussions will be held with only those Offerors determined by the Contracting Officer, with approval of the source selection authority, to be in the competitive range. The Contracting Officer may determine that the number of most highly rated proposals that might otherwise be included in the competitive range exceeds the number at which

an efficient competition can be conducted and 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. In addition, the Contracting Officer may also eliminate from the competitive range offerors originally determined to be in the competitive range based on results of written or oral discussions if those offerors no longer have a reasonable chance of being selected for award.

4. Pre-Award Survey

IAW FAR 9.106, the Government may conduct a pre-award survey as part of the source selection. If a pre-award survey is conducted, results will be evaluated to determine each Offeror's capability to meet the solicitation's requirements. The Government may also perform a financial capability analysis to verify that the offeror has the necessary financial resources to perform the effort through the life of the contract.

5. Evaluation Factors and Relative Order of Importance

Three evaluation factors will be utilized in this evaluation for the ID/IQ:

- Factor 1 – ID/IQ Mission Capability
 - Subfactor A: ID/IQ Management Approach
 - Subfactor B: ID/IQ Technical Capability
 - Subfactor C: TO 0001 QASP Reporting
 - Subfactor D: TO 0002 Mission Capability
 - Subfactor E: TO 0003 Mission Capability
- Factor 2 – Past Performance
- Factor 3 – Cost/Price

IAW FAR 15.304(d), Factor 1 (Mission Capability) is significantly more important than Factor 2 (Past Performance) or Factor 3 (Cost/Price). Factor 3 is more important than Factor 2.

Within Factor 1, the subfactors are as follows: Subfactor A (ID/IQ Management Approach); Subfactor B (ID/IQ Technical Capability); Subfactor C (TO 0001 QASP Reporting); Subfactor D (TO 0002 Mission Capability); and Subfactor E (TO 0003 Mission Capability). Subfactors A, B, C, D and E are of equal importance. IAW FAR 15.304(e), when combined, Factor 1 and Factor 3 are significantly more important than Factor 2.

The evaluation factors and subfactors are the primary determinants of the detailed information requested in RFP Section L, Instructions to Offerors. The Government will assess all compliant proposals against the solicitation requirements and criteria defined by the evaluation factors and subfactors below. In addition to the evaluation of specific factors, the Government will consider compliance with the solicitation terms and conditions and the status of contractor's and teaming member's accounting, estimating, ~~material management~~, property management, and purchasing systems. General considerations do not receive ratings; however, the Government may consider these factors when making the best value decision. **The approved business systems are required at the time of award as a matter of responsibility.**

6. Factor 1, Mission Capability Evaluation Process

The Government will review each Offeror's proposal and utilize a combined technical/risk rating that includes consideration of risk in conjunction with the significant strengths, strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, and deficiencies in determining technical ratings.

In determining the technical ratings, the evaluators assess not only the significant strengths, strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, and deficiencies, but their impacts on performance. Each subfactor within the Factor 1 (Mission Capability) will receive one of the following color ratings based on the aggregate strengths and weaknesses, and associated risk:

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

The following definitions will be used in the assessment of the technical ratings:

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

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

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

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

Deficiency: 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.

Subfactor ratings are not rolled-up into an overall color rating for Factor 1 (Mission Capability). Each subfactor will individually contribute to the overall assessment of the Offeror's understanding of the complexity and scope of the program and the feasibility of the Offeror's approach to satisfy the SOO.

7. Factor 2, Past Performance Evaluation Process

The Offeror will be evaluated based on relevant past performance to determine the Offeror's ability to perform as proposed. There are three (3) aspects of past performance: recency, rating, and relevancy. The Offeror will be evaluated based on the references provided to the Government IAW the instructions at L4 and evaluated IAW M4.

Additionally, the Government reserves the right to use data obtained from other sources. Where the relevant performance record indicates performance problems, the Government will consider the number and severity of the problems. Furthermore, the Government will consider the appropriateness and effectiveness of any corrective actions taken (not just planned or promised). The Government may review more recent contracts or performance evaluations to ensure corrective actions have been implemented and to evaluate their effectiveness.

Offerors that do not possess a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is unavailable will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably for Past Performance.

8. Factor 3, Cost/Price Evaluation Process

The Government will not rate or score cost/price but will evaluate the Offeror's cost/price proposal IAW the M5, M6 and M7, respectively. The cost/price, inclusive of all options, will be rolled up as part of Factor 3 (Cost/Price) and evaluated as part of the ID/IQ trade-off analysis.

9. Task Order Awards

Should the Government decide to award one or all of the TOs under this ID/IQ, the Government reserves the option to request additional information from the Offerors beyond those submitted in response to this RFP. The Government intends to award Task Orders only to the successful awardees on the ID/IQ utilizing the ordering procedures described herein in lieu of the ordering procedures found in Section H. Specifically, the Government will not issue a separate Request for Proposal (RFP) but will utilize information submitted in response to the ID/IQ RFP.

M2. Evaluation of Volume I – ID/IQ Proposal Documentation

Volume I will not receive any ratings. Volume I will be assessed for compliance and conformity IAW RFP Section L2 and non-conformance may result in exclusion from the competitive range.

M3. Evaluation of Volume II – ID/IQ Mission Capability

The Mission Capability factor will be evaluated based on each of its subfactors. Specific elements considered within each subfactor are provided but will not be separately scored or rated. Each subfactor will be assigned a color rating based on the evaluation of the individual elements. The color ratings depict how well the Offeror's proposal meets the solicitation requirements and also includes evaluation of the associated proposal risks.

1. Management Approach

The Government will evaluate whether the Offeror provided a comprehensive and detailed Management Approach for managing projects arising from this ID/IQ contract vehicle and the SOO. The Government will evaluate whether the Offeror included a Management Approach that discusses how it will provide for maximum flexibility to innovatively and cost-effectively manage mission execution. Specifically, the Government will evaluate the Offeror's ability to:

- a. Assemble, leverage, and integrate highly qualified teams and/or performers for discrete projects at varying levels of complexity requiring specialized expertise throughout the entire period of performance and to maximize participation in TO opportunities, to execute multiple, simultaneous task order requirements throughout the entire period of performance, and to provide the continuous ability, willingness, and readiness to respond to smaller and/or niche requirements.
- b. Execute tasks in SOO Sections 3.3 through 3.7 and Section 4.
- c. Continuously and accurately identify issues and solving problems, incorporate lessons learned, and ensure timely communications of all action items, issues, and resolutions relating to performance in foreign countries including but not limited to: (1) lack of formal agreements and protections and (2) recipient state licensing, permitting, site access, and certification.

2. Technical Approach

The Government will evaluate whether the Offeror demonstrated proficient capability and capacity in meeting the objectives referenced in the SOO Section 2. The Government will also evaluate whether the Offeror adequately explained the capabilities of any team members and/or other intended subcontractors and how those capabilities will be leveraged during task order execution.

M4. Evaluation of Volume III – ID/IQ Past Performance

1. Description of Team

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's consent letters and ensure they are in compliance with Section L4, Paragraph 2.

2. Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs)

The Government will evaluate the submitted PPQs for each of the topics provided in Section L4, Paragraph 3. The past performance evaluation factor is intended to assess the degree of confidence that the Government has in an offeror's ability to supply the products and services that meet the Government's need based on a demonstrated record of performance. Past performance will be evaluated based on recency, rating, and relevancy.

Recency is used to evaluate the recency of the Offeror's past performance. 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. The Offeror's past performance will be considered recent if the referenced contract was performed within five (5) years of proposal submission.

Ratings are assigned by the evaluator for each contract or project referenced and provides a qualitative assessment of the offeror's performance. Ratings are represented in the PPQ(s) submissions, in a performance assessment provided under Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) or any other source available to the Government.

Relevancy is used to determine how relevant a recent effort accomplished by the Offeror is to the effort to be acquired through the source selection. Relevancy is established when 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. The definitions of relevancy are as follows:

Relevancy	Definition
Very Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Somewhat Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Not Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

Relevancy will be assessed based on how well the Offeror's description of work performed is correlated to topics identified in Section L4, Paragraph 3 for contracts valued at \$2M or more. In assessing relevancy, the Government will use the following rubric to make its determination:

Overall Relevance Key	
If all past performance references account for 0 to 1 of the topics,	then the Offeror receives a "Not Relevant"
If all past performance references account for 2 to 3 of the topics,	then the Offeror receives a "Somewhat Relevant"
If all past performance references account for 4 to 5 of the topics,	then the Offeror receives a "Relevant"
If all past performance references account for 6 to 7 of the topics,	Then the Offeror receives a "Highly Relevant"

Additionally, note that the Past Performance reference will be rated as less relevant if the entity is not identified as a team member with the same CAGE and DUNS as reported in the Teaming Arrangement matrix or if an explanation is not provided as to how the entity performing under this contract.

The Government may consider efforts performed for federal, state, or local government agencies and commercial customers as relevant. The Government may include relevant past and present performance for efforts performed by other divisions, teaming partners, if such resources significantly influence effort's proposed performance. The determination of relevancy will focus on the present and past performance as it relates to the work the other division or teaming partner is proposed to do for this effort.

The Government will evaluate the recency, rating, and relevancy of the evaluations to determine an integrated confidence rating. Offerors that do not possess a record of relevant performance or for whom information on present and past performance is not available will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on Past Performance. Such Offerors will receive a "Neutral" rating to signify an "Unknown" confidence rating for the Past Performance factor. A strong record of relevant performance will be considered more advantageous to the Government than a "Neutral/Unknown Confidence" rating.

In conducting the Performance Confidence Assessment, the Government reserves the right to use both data provided by the Offeror and data obtained from other sources. In assigning a confidence rating, the Government will consider the context of past performance, the quality of the Offeror's performance, general trends, and usefulness of the information and incorporate these aspects into the overall performance confidence assessment.

Each Offeror will receive one of the ratings described below:

Rating	Definition
Substantial Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Satisfactory	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.

M5. Evaluation of Volume IV – Task Order 0001 (QASP Reporting)

1. Reporting Statement

The Government will ensure that a Reporting Statement is provided and in compliance with RFP Section L5, Paragraph 2. If not in compliance, the Offeror will be determined unresponsive to the requirement and either ineligible for award, or, if the agency goes to discussions, excluded from the competitive range. The Government will not assign technical ratings to this task order. The Offeror will meet and satisfy the proposal requirements for this task order if it submits an affirmative statement indicating that it will comply with the reporting requirements identified in the SOO Bid Report CDRL.

2. Price

The proposed Firm Fixed Price for this effort, inclusive of all options, will be rolled up as part of Factor 3 (Cost) and evaluated as part of the ID/IQ trade-off analysis.

M6. Evaluation of Volume V – Task Order 0002 (Senegal)

1. Basis of Award

The Government will award to the Offeror that represents the best value based on trade-off analysis taking into consideration the relative order of importance of the factors noted below:

For this TO and IAW FAR 15.304(d), Factor 1 (TO 0002 Mission Capability) is more important than Factor 2 (Past Performance) and Factor 3 (Price) is more important than Factor 2 (Past Performance).

Within Factor 1, Subfactors A and B are of equal importance.

IAW FAR 15.304(e), when combined, Factor 1 and Factor 3 are significantly more important than Factor 2.

2. Management Approach

The Government will evaluate if the management approach provides a detailed description of its processes and techniques that demonstrate the Offeror's ability to effectively and efficiently perform the tasks specified in the TO 0002 SOW paragraph 2.1 and to ensure the successfully complete the TO. Specifically, the Government will also evaluate whether:

- a. The staffing plan demonstrates a team with relevant skills and capabilities to efficiently execute the requirements of this contract. The Government will also evaluate whether the roles and responsibilities are clearly identified and whether the Offeror demonstrated a clear management and communications approach. Resumes (limited to 2 pages and will not count towards the overall page limitations) may be submitted for key members of the team.
- b. The approach is structured to be VAT exempted. The Government will also evaluate whether the Offeror demonstrated a clear understanding of implementing a VAT exemption mechanism.

3. Technical Approach

The Government will evaluate whether the Offeror's technical approach:

- a. provides a sound plan for developing or adapting existing SOPs and whether its approach identifies in-country or other challenges IAW Item 0002 of the SOW;
- b. provides an effective approach for accomplishing the baseline report IAW Item 0003 of the SOW;
- c. provides an effective and executable training plan IAW Item 0004 of the SOW; and
- d. provides an effective approach to executing quality management standard as identified in Item 0005 of the SOW.

The Government will also evaluate whether the Offeror has provided a logically sequenced schedule.

4. Past Performance

The Government will evaluate past performance based on the specific PPQs specified in the RFP Section L6, Paragraph 5 and IAW the process stated in RFP Section M4.

5. Price

The Government will not assign a rating or score Section 4 but will evaluate each Offeror's price proposal for reasonableness and completeness.

IAW FAR 15.404, the Government will evaluate reasonableness of the proposed price using one or more of the price analysis techniques. In evaluating reasonableness, the Government will determine if the Offeror's proposed costs for the Task Order, in the nature and amount, do not exceed those which would be incurred by a prudent company in the conduct of a competitive business.

The Government will evaluate the completeness of each Offeror's price proposal by assessing whether the Offeror provides the required cost data in sufficient detail to fully support the offer and permit the Government to evaluate the proposal thoroughly. The Offeror must comply with the instructions specified in the RFP Section L6, Paragraph 6 in order to be considered to have submitted a complete price proposal.

The proposed Firm Fixed Price for this effort, inclusive of all options, will be rolled up as part of Factor 3 (Cost) and evaluated as part of the ID/IQ trade-off analysis.

M7. Evaluation of Volume VI – Task Order 0003 (Philippines)

1. Relative Order of Importance

The Government will award to the Offeror that represents the best value based on trade-off analysis taking into consideration the relative order of importance of the factors noted below:

For this TO and IAW FAR 15.304(d), Factor 1 (Mission Capability) is more important than Factor 2 (Past Performance) and Factor 2 (Past Performance) is more important than Factor 3 (Cost/Price).

Within Factor 1, Subfactors A and B are of equal importance.

IAW FAR 15.304(e), when combined, all other evaluation factors (Factors 1 and 2) are significantly more important than Factor 3 (Cost/Price).

2. Management Approach

The Government will evaluate whether the Offeror has provided a comprehensive plan that demonstrates its understanding of the requirements specified in the SOW through:

a. Identification of a cohesive project team that reflects relevant skills and experience necessary to perform the requirements of the SOW. The Government will evaluate whether the roles and responsibilities are clearly identified for each team member and demonstrates how the team will work with in-country stakeholders to effectively execute the TO. The Government will evaluate whether the Offeror demonstrates effective communication plans and how the team will communicate with DTRA and its stakeholders.

b. Describing the approach and ability to mobilize in-country and comply with all local laws and regulations. The Government will evaluate whether the Offeror demonstrates its ability to do business in the host country through an understanding of the geo-political positions, construction laws and permitting processes.

~~c. Inclusion of all applicable local taxes that the USG can expect to encounter for the duration of this project with respect to the Offeror's approach for associated foreign tax considerations. The Government will evaluate whether the Offeror lists and explains what each tax is, demonstrates its applicability to this TO, accurately determines the level of risk (low/medium/high) and estimates the cost for each expected tax.~~

3. Technical Approach

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's ability to execute the technical requirements for the SOW in Items 0002, 0003 and 0004. The Government will whether the Offeror provided a comprehensive plan to coordinate and integrate interagency cooperation among and with NCWS partners. The Government will evaluate whether the Offeror accurately identified all risks associated with the Technical Approach.

4. Past Performance

The Government will evaluate past performance based on the specific PPQs specified in the RFP Section L7, Paragraph 5 and IAW the process stated in RFP Section M4.

5. Cost/Price

The Government will not rate or score Section 4 for cost but will evaluate each Offeror's cost/price proposal for realism, reasonableness, and completeness. The information submitted in the cost proposal will be used as the basis for the cost evaluation.

The Government will evaluate the realism of the proposed cost/price by assessing whether the proposed cost elements for the Task Orders are realistic for the work to be performed, reflect a clear understanding of the requirements, and are consistent with the unique methods of performance and materials described in the Offeror's technical approach.

The Government will evaluate the reasonableness of the proposed cost using one or more of the cost/price analysis techniques defined in FAR 15.404. In evaluating reasonableness, the Government will determine if the Offeror's proposed costs and fee for the Task Orders, in nature and amount, do not exceed those which would be incurred by a prudent company in the conduct of competitive business.

The Government will evaluate the completeness of each Offeror's cost proposal by assessing whether the Offeror provides the required cost data in sufficient detail to fully support the offer and permit the Government to evaluate the proposal thoroughly. The Offeror must comply with the instructions specified in the RFP Section L6, Paragraph 6 in order to be considered to have submitted a complete price proposal.

The proposed Cost Plus Fixed Fee for this effort, inclusive of all options, will be rolled up as part of Factor 3 (Cost) and evaluated as part of the ID/IQ trade-off analysis.

(End of Summary of Changes)