

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT				1. CONTRACT ID CODE Y		PAGE OF PAGES 1 15	
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0002		3. EFFECTIVE DATE 19-Jul-2017		4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.		5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)	
6. ISSUED BY CODE HDTRA1 DEFENSE THREAT REDUCTION AGENCY/J4CO 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)				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)	
CODE		FACILITY CODE					
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 a 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 CONTRACTS/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: Contract or ☐ is not, ☐ is required to sign this document and return _____ 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 Amendment 02 of this solicitation is to revise the following: Revised DFARS Clause 252.209-9002, Non Government Support Personnel (JAN 2008) Revised Section M6.2 The submission of Volumes V and VI remain due no later than 11AM on 31 July 2017.							
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)			
				TEL: _____ EMAIL: _____			
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR		15C. DATE SIGNED		16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		16C. DATE SIGNED	
_____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)				BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)		19-Jul-2017	

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

SECTION I - CONTRACT CLAUSES

The following have been modified:

252.209-9002- Non Government Support Personnel (JAN 2008)

The following companies may have access to contractor information, technical data or computer software that may be marked as proprietary or otherwise marked with restrictive legends: Tenica, LLC (contract specialist support); Booz Allen Hamilton and Subcontractors At-Risk, ~~BAI, Inc.~~ Culmen, Dade Moeller, Engility, GS5, Millennium, Octant Associates, ~~Roesler Thompson~~, SoundWay Consulting, T.H. Byce Consulting, Toeroek, TS2, WSP Group (advisory and assistance services). Each contract contains organizational conflict of interest provisions and/or includes contractual requirements for non-disclosure of proprietary contractor information or data/software marked with restrictive legends. The contractor, by submitting a proposal or entering into this contract, is deemed to have consented to the disclosure of its information to the Contractors listed above.

(End of clause)

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.

Filename: HDTRA1-16-R-002702
Directory: \\user.dtra.dec\hdi\home\gamboaj\Documents
Template: C:\Users\gamboaj\AppData\Roaming\Microsoft\Templates\Normal.dotm
Title:
Subject:
Author: Feige, Tammy M. CIV
Keywords:
Comments:
Creation Date: 7/19/2017 12:51:00 PM
Change Number: 4
Last Saved On: 7/19/2017 2:38:00 PM
Last Saved By: Gamboa, Joyce L CIV
Total Editing Time: 20 Minutes
Last Printed On: 7/19/2017 2:39:00 PM
As of Last Complete Printing
Number of Pages: 10
Number of Words: 4,451 (approx.)
Number of Characters: 25,371 (approx.)