<u>United States Air Force</u>

AFLCMC/WLT Tinker AFB
KC-135 Center Console Refresh (CCR)

Attachment 5 Section M

EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

21 May 2026

DRAFT

Contents

1.0 Source Selection (SS) 4
1.1. Basis for Contract Award 4
1.2. Number of Contracts to be Awarded 4
1.3. Correction Potential of Proposals 4
1.4. Rejection of Offers 5
1.5. Facility Clearance 5
1.5.1. Facility Clearance Information 5
1.6. Competitive Range Determination 5
1.7. Negotiations 6
1.7.1. Reviews and Visits 6
1.8. Solicitation Requirements (Terms and Conditions) 6
2.0 Evaluation Factors 6
2.1. Evaluation Factors and Subfactors 6
2.1.1. Evaluation Factors used to Evaluate each Proposal 6
2.1.2. Relative Importance of Factors 7
2.1.3. Evaluation Methodology 7
2.2. Factor 1 – Technical 7
2.2.1. Subfactor 1: Technical Solution 9
2.2.2. Subfactor 2: Exceeding Requirements and Demonstrating System Strengths 10
2.2.3. Subfactor 3: Data Rights 11
2.2.4. Subfactor 4: Schedule 12
2.3. Factor 2 – Technical Risk 12
2.4. Factor 3 – Past Performance 14
2.4.1. Ratings 14
2.4.2. Evaluation Process 14
2.4.3. Assigning Ratings 17
2.5. Factor 4 – Cost/Price 18
2.5.1. Reasonableness 18
2.5.2. Balanced Pricing 19
2.5.3. Price Realism 19
2.5.4. Cost Realism 19
2.5.5. Total Evaluated Price (TEP) 20
2.5.6. Cost or Pricing Data Requirements/Data Other Than Certified Cost or Pricing Data 21
2.5.7. Rounding 21
2.5.8. Proposed Price Reduction per Corporate/Management Decision 21

DRAFT

2.5.9. Business Systems and Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) Disclosure Statement 21
2.5.10. Subcontractor Pricing 22
2.5.11. Price Assumptions Used in Development of Proposed Pricing 22
2.5.12. Government Furnished Property/Equipment/Material (GFP/GFE/GFM) 22
2.5.13. Contractor Furnished Property/Equipment/Tooling/Material (CFP/CFE/CFT/CFM) 22
2.5.14. Government Field Support Agencies 22
2.5.15. Other Documentation 23
2.5.16. Submission of Excel Pricing Workbook 23
2.5.17. Submission of Cost/Price Narrative 23

DRAFT

1.0 Source Selection (SS)

1.1. Basis for Contract Award

This acquisition will utilize Tradeoff Source Selection procedures, with technical proposals, to make an integrated assessment for a best value award decision. Tradeoffs will be made only between Subfactor 2 Exceeding Requirements and Demonstrating System Strengths, Technical Risk, Past Performance and Price among those offerors who have been determined technically acceptable in subfactors 1, 3, and 4. Award will be made to the Offeror who is deemed responsible in accordance with the Revolutionary Federal Acquisition Regulation Overhaul (RFO) Part 9, as supplemented, whose proposal conforms to the solicitation's requirements (to include all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and all other information required by Section L– Instructions to Offerors of this solicitation) and is judged, based on the evaluation factors, to represent the best value to the Government. This may result in an award to a higher rated, higher priced Offeror, where the decision is consistent with the evaluation factors, and the Source Selection Authority (SSA) reasonably determines the technically acceptable proposal in Factor 1, Subfactors 1, 3, and 4, and superior technical in Factor 1, Subfactor 2, and/or superior Factor 2 technical risk, and/or superior Factor 3 past performance of the higher priced offeror outweighs the price difference with lower priced offerors.

1.1.1. The SSA will base the source selection decision on an integrated assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria in the solicitation (described below). While the Government Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) 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.

1.1.2. This source selection is conducted in accordance with Revolutionary Federal Acquisition Regulation Overhaul (RFO) Part 15, Contracting by Negotiation, as supplemented by the Revolutionary Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (R-DFARS) Part 215 and R-DFARS Procedures, Guidance and Information (PGI) part 215 , the Department of the Air Force (DAF) Part 15, and DoD Source Selection Procedures dated 20 August 2022. These regulations are available electronically at https://www.acquisition.gov/far-overhaul.

1.2.Number of Contracts to be Awarded

The Government intends to award one contract for this solicitation. However, the Government reserves the right not to award a contract at all, depending on the quality of the proposals and prices submitted and the availability of funds.

A single contractor will be responsible for the design, development, integration, testing, and production for the KC-135 Center Console Refresh effort.

1.3. Correction Potential of Proposals

The Government will consider throughout the evaluation, the correction potential of any proposal aspect evaluated as a deficiency, weakness, and/or significant weakness. The correction potential is based on the amount and/or complexity of the corrections needed to meet Government requirements. If a deficiency/weakness/significant weakness is not considered correctable, or if the amount and/or complexity of the corrections needed to meet the Government requirement requires a major proposal revision, the Offeror may be eliminated from the competitive range.

DRAFT

The Government also reserves the right to eliminate an Offeror from the competitive range where the technical proposal does not require a major proposal revision, but the Offeror is not among the most highly rated offerors.

1.4. Rejection of Offers

The Government may reject any evaluated proposal that fails to adequately address a significant portion of the requirement or contract terms and conditions. This may include rejection of a proposal that does not demonstrate an adequate understanding of the contract/program requirements and/or displays a fundamental lack of competence or failure to comprehend the complexity and risk of the program. All aspects/volumes of the proposals may be reviewed to ensure adequate resources are available to perform the proposed technical approach.

1.5. Facility Clearance

1.5.1. Facility Clearance Information

The Offeror, and subcontractors as required, must possess or acquire prior to Source Selection Authority Decision Brief a final facility clearance equal to the highest classification specification (DD254) attached to this solicitation and be entitled to COMSEC information without additional authorization (i.e. National Interest Determination (NID)). Therefore, all final facility clearances must be approved prior to the Source Selection Authority Decision Brief. The Industrial Security Facilities Database (ISFD) will be used to verify final facility clearances one business day prior to the Source Selection Authority Decision Brief. Offerors who do not have a final facility clearance equal to the highest classification specification (DD254) attached to this solicitation in the ISFD database one business day prior to the Source Selection Authority Decision Brief will be considered non-responsible and will not be eligible for award. The Source Selection Authority Decision Brief may occur without negotiations if there is a fully acceptable and awardable initial proposal among the offers tendered or may occur following negotiations and receipt of the final proposal revisions. The Government is not obligated to delay the Decision Brief awaiting Offeror completion of the facilities clearance requirement. Any determination that an Offeror is non-responsible will be in accordance with RFO Part 9.

DRAFT

1.6.Competitive Range Determination

If negotiations are conducted, the Government shall establish a competitive range comprised a group of evaluated proposals that the contracting officer determines are best suited for further negotiations, in accordance with RFO 15.204-1. During the evaluation process multiple competitive range determinations may be made that eliminate offerors from the competition IAW DoD Source Selection Procedures 3.4. The competitive range determination can be based on Factor 1: Technical, Factor 2: Technical Risk, Factor 3: Past Performance, Factor 4: Cost/Price, or a combination of the factors. A competitive range determination may eliminate offerors based on their initial proposal evaluation results, after negotiations (if necessary), prior to issuance of the final proposal revision (FPR) request, or for efficiency. If offerors are excluded from the competitive range, they may request a debriefing IAW RFO 15.206-2 or RFO 15.301.

1.7. Negotiations

The Government intends to conduct negotiations with Offerors in the Competitive Range. Therefore, it is imperative that offerors submit their best terms initially. The Government will issue ENs as part of negotiations. The Government will determine if responses to valuation Notices (ENs) received during negotiations will be considered formal proposal revisions, or if offerors will be required to include EN responses in the Final Proposal Revision (FPR). The request for FPR letter will include specific instructions on how offerors will submit FPRs. The Government also reserves the right to request draft FPRs during negotiations. Offeror responses to ENs for Volume II (Past Performance) shall not be included in the FPR. Offeror responses to Past Performance ENs during negotiations will automatically be considered in the final evaluation.

Additionally, The Government reserves the right to conduct clarifications in accordance with RFO 15.202(a)(2)(i-iv).

1.7.1. Reviews and Visits

Site visits are not planned. The SSEB may conduct site visits during the evaluation phase to gather information for judging the Offeror's potential for correcting deficiencies, quality of development of manufacturing practices/processes, or other areas useful in evaluating the offer. If conducted, the results will be assessed under the applicable factors/subfactors and will be used to validate and confirm the Offeror's written proposal.

1.8. Solicitation Requirements (Terms and Conditions)

Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions, representations and certifications, System Requirements Documents (SRD) and Statement of Work (SOW) requirements, other than those identified as factors and subfactors. Requirements included in the factors and subfactors will be evaluated in accordance with the process described for each factor and subfactor. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the solicitation may result in the Offeror being ineligible for award. Offerors must clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and must provide complete supporting rationale. The Government reserves the right to determine any such exceptions unacceptable, and the proposal, therefore, ineligible for award.

DRAFT

2.0 Evaluation Factors

2.1. Evaluation Factors and Subfactors

2.1.1. Evaluation Factors used to Evaluate each Proposal

Award will be made to the Offeror proposing the combination of factors deemed most advantageous to the Government based upon an integrated assessment of the evaluation factors described below.

Factor 1: Technical

Subfactor 1: Technical Solution

Subfactor 2: Exceeding Requirements and Demonstrating System Strengths

Subfactor 3: Data Rights

Subfactor 4: Schedule

Factor 2: Technical Risk Factor

Factor 3: Past Performance Factor

Factor 4: Cost/Price

2.1.2.Relative Importance of Factors

For this solicitation, technical acceptability in Technical Subfactors 1, 3, 4 is a prerequisite to the best value analysis and potential trade-off between Factor 1- Subfactor 2 Exceeding Requirements and Demonstrating System Strengths, Factor 2 Technical Risk, Factor 3 Past Performance and Factor 4 Cost/Price. The Order of Importance is used to explain how the other factors will be traded off on technically acceptable proposals.

For all technically acceptable proposals, the following is the order of importance in the integrated assessment:

- Technical Subfactor 2 Exceeding Requirements and Demonstrating System Strengths, Factor 2 Technical Risk, and Factor 3 Past Performance will be evaluated on a basis approximately equal to each other.
- Technical Subfactor 2 Exceeding Requirements and Demonstrating System Strengths, Factor 2 Technical Risk, and Factor 3 Past Performance individually are more important than Factor 4 Cost/Price.
- Technical Subfactor 2 Exceeding Requirements and Demonstrating System Strengths, Factor 2 Technical Risk, and Factor 3 Past Performance when combined are significantly more important than Factor 4 Cost/Price

DRAFT

2.1.3.Evaluation Methodology

The Government will evaluate all factors concurrently for all proposals. Initial ratings for all factors will be established for each offeror in determining the competitive range. The Government technical evaluation team will evaluate the Technical Subfactors 1, 3, and 4 on a pass/fail basis in accordance with paragraph 2.2 below, assigning ratings of Acceptable (Green) or Unacceptable (Red). Technical Subfactor 2 will be evaluated in accordance with paragraphs 2.2 and 2.2.2 below. Technical Risk will be evaluated as described in paragraph 2.3 below. Past Performance will be evaluated as described in paragraph 2.4 below. Price will be evaluated as described in paragraph 2.5 below. For the best value award decision, the SSA will assess the Factor 1 Technical ratings for Subfactor 2, Factor 2 Technical Risk ratings, and Factor 3 Past Performance ratings, along with supporting information, and Factor 4 Price for all technically acceptable offers to make an integrated assessment of which offeror provides the overall best value.

2.2.Factor 1 – Technical

The Technical evaluation will be based on each's offeror's approach for meeting the technical requirements listed below. The evaluation focuses on the technical approach as described in each

offeror's technical volume. The technical evaluation does not consider price. Each subfactor within the technical factor will receive one of the ratings described below based on the criteria listed below.

Tradeoff considerations will only be applied to Subfactor Exceeding Requirements and Demonstrating System Strengths. The remaining subfactors (1, 3, and 4) will be rated Acceptable (Green) or Unacceptable (Red) and will not include tradeoff considerations. To be eligible for award, an offeror must be rated Acceptable (Green) in all subfactors, either initially, or as a result of negotiations. Any subfactor rated as Unacceptable (Red) will be considered un-awardable. A single deficiency identified within any subfactor will result in an Unacceptable (Red) rating for that subfactor and therefore un-awardable. Only those proposals determined to be technically acceptable, either initially, or as a result of negotiations, will be considered for award. A deficiency is defined as any part of an offer that does not conform to a material requirement of a RFP. A material requirement is one that affects price, quantity, quality, or delivery, or that the RFP requires to be met at the time of proposal submission. See RFO 15.001.

Table 1: Technical Rating Method

Color Rating	Adjectival Rating	Description
Blue	Outstanding (O)	Proposal demonstrates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements, contains multiple strengths and/or at least one significant strength.
Purple	Good (G)	Proposal demonstrates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength or significant strength.
Green	Acceptable (A)	Proposal demonstrates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements.
Yellow	Marginal (M)	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements.
Red	Unacceptable (U)	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation and, thus, contains one or more deficiencies and is un-awardable

DRAFT

The ratings will be applied to each subfactor as follows:

a. For Subfactor 2 Exceeding Requirements and Demonstrating System Strengths, the only ratings that apply to this subfactor are Acceptable (Green), Good (Purple), and Outstanding (Blue). To receive an Outstanding (Blue) or Good (Purple) rating, an offeror's proposal must include one or more strengths and or a significant strength, as identified by the Government evaluation team, and in accordance with the definitions described above. Subfactor 2 will only be evaluated in relation to Exceeding Requirements and Demonstrating System Strengths, and the assignment of strengths/significant strengths. Tradeoff considerations for Subfactor 2 will be based on identified strengths/significant strengths within an offeror's proposal.
b. For Subfactor 1 Technical Solution and Subfactor 3 Data Rights and Subfactor 4 Schedule, the only ratings which apply to these subfactors are Acceptable (Green) and Unacceptable (Red). There are no tradeoff considerations for any of these subfactors. As a minimum, the offeror must

meet all criteria for Subfactor 1, Subfactor 3, and Subfactor 4 to be awardable. For the best value award determination, all offerors rated as Acceptable (Green) will be considered equal for these subfactors.

The evaluation criteria for each subfactor is as follows:

2.2.1.Subfactor 1: Technical Solution

The government will assess the Offeror's Technical Solution approach. Offerors are required to present all the information as stated in the Section L, Instruction to Offerors (ITO). The subfactor minimum is met when the Offeror's proposal indicates an adequate understanding of the requirements, and provides convincing rationale how their approach will meet the requirements for all of the following essential elements:

a. The proposal must ensure the approach to teaming arrangements, including either an Associated Contract Agreements (ACA) or Letter of Intent with statement of rationale, meets the requirements in SOW paragraphs 5.13 and 17.0.
b. A sufficient approach to the Engineering Manufacturing and Design (EMD) phase to include the identification of Title 10 §4401 compliance; Technical Readiness Level (TRL) of each system at date of proposal submission; model-based systems engineering, model-based design, and Technical Data Package digital files; SIL stand-up, integration, and testing; autothrottle solution, integration, and testing; and the need, if any, to reverse engineer interfaces with KC-135 legacy systems, which ensures the requirements are met in accordance with SOW 1.2.1, 2.2, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.6, 6.9.1, 7.0, 9.0, 9.4.
c. An approach to the Production Phase which ensures kit and installation requirements are met in accordance with SOW 1.2.2, 12.0, 12.1, 12.2.
d. Offerors (both small businesses and other than small businesses) will be evaluated based on the narrative description on the extent of the proposed participation/commitment to use of U.S. small businesses in the performance of this acquisition and a fully completed Small Business Participation Commitment Document (SBPCD). The Offeror's proposed SBPCD must be successfully completed IAW Section L, Attachment 3.0. In addition, the Offeror's proposed small business participation must be 15%.
    a. The MQR percentage must be equal to or greater than 15% to meet the MQR requirement. Rounding is not permissible. Second tier subcontracting or lower will not be considered in the evaluation of the percentage. The Offeror shall describe their small business participation based on total evaluated price (TEP) for this contract effort IAW SOW 5.13.

       For example: A proposed MQR of 14.97% would result in a deficiency. A proposed MQR of exactly 15.00% or greater (e.g., 15.01%) would be acceptable.

       (NOTE: The work to be performed directly by a small business prime offeror shall be evaluated as Small Business Participation. Small business prime offerors shall include their information in the provided SBPCD template, as required).

DRAFT

2.2.2.Subfactor 2: Exceeding Requirements and Demonstrating System Strengths

Offerors are afforded an opportunity to receive best value credit for a proposed approach which meets SRD Objective Requirements and/or exceeds SRD threshold requirements listed below. The best value credit will be applied as strengths/significant strengths to the offeror's proposal. A strength/significant strength is defined as follows:

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

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

For this evaluation, the words in the strength and significant strength definitions, "advantage of the Government" refers to the anticipated level of benefit the Government receives during contract performance as a result of the strength/significant strength.

To receive consideration as a strength/significant strength under Subfactor 2, Offerors must specifically identify which requirements the proposed approach exceeds and provide convincing rationale supporting the strength/significant strength. The Government will assess the rationale for each proposed strength/significant strength and apply professional judgment to determine if the proposed strength/significant strength is an actual strength/significant strength and if so, the level of anticipated benefit during contract performance the Government will receive from the strength/significant strength.

Subfactor 2 will receive one color rating based on the strengths/significant strengths identified. The available ratings for Subfactor 2 are Acceptable (Green), Good (Purple) and Outstanding (Blue). The definitions of each color are provided in Table 1. A general guideline for the ratings is as follows:

Acceptable (Green): A proposal in which there are no strengths identified by the Offeror in relation to Subfactor 2a: items i-vi and Subfactor 2b: items i-iv. This rating also includes a proposal in which there are one or more strengths identified by the Offeror in relation to Subfactor 2a: items i-vi and Subfactor 2b: items i-iv, however, based on the judgement of the Government, none of the proposed strengths includes convincing rationale to support the strength, and as a result, no strengths are assigned by the Government.

Good (Purple) or Outstanding (Blue): A proposal which includes one or more strengths/significant strengths identified by the Offeror in relation to Subfactor 2a: items i-vi and Subfactor 2b: items i-iv, and, based on the judgment of the Government, the proposal includes sufficient convincing rationale to support at least one of the proposed strengths/significant strengths. Each strength/significant strength, along with the supporting rationale, will be evaluated separately. The overall rating will be based on the number of strengths/significant strengths assigned by the Government, and the level of anticipated benefits the Government will receive during contract performance from the strengths/significant strengths.

For the best value determination, tradeoff considerations for Subfactor 2 will be based on any Government-assigned strengths/significant strengths in each Offeror's approach, along with the

DRAFT

anticipated level of benefit received by the Government during contract performance resulting from the strength(s)/significant strength(s).

The Government will assess the areas listed below, if provided, in the Offerors' proposed approach to the KC-135 Center Console Refresh (CCR) as it relates to exceeding requirements and demonstrating system strengths contained in SRD and SOW. Offerors are required to present all the information as stated in the ITO, Section L Paragraph 4.2.4.

a) Exceeding Requirements
   i. Utilizing a glass cockpit that incorporates the majority of objective requirements in SRD Paragraph 3.16 Trade Space Adaptability Components.
   ii. Meeting Objective requirements for Fuel System improvements (SRD 3.14.3, 3.14.6, 3.14.7, 3.14.13, 3.14.5, 3.14.8, 3.14.14, 3.14.16).
   iii. Improved navigation as defined in SRD Paragraph 3.6.4.2.
   iv. Meeting system MTBF as defined in SRD Paragraph 3.28.3.2.
   v. Replacement of the current Electronic Engine Instrument Display (EEID) as defined in SRD Paragraph 3.16.14.
   vi. Meeting objective requirements for Annunciator Lights/Warning, Cautions, and Advisories in SRD Paragraph 3.4.

b) Demonstrating System Strengths:
   i. Sufficient proof that greater than 50% of environmental testing is complete with a preliminary analysis for remaining environmental testing required in order to meet SOW 6.5.2 and SRD Table 4 requirements.
   ii. The evaluation will assess how effectively the Offeror's plan addresses the specific topics outlined in the instructions. This includes evaluating the described processes for identifying, evaluating, and integrating new technologies in a way that minimizes the combined effect of disruption, schedule, cost and risk while providing a flexible platform for incorporating evolving warfighter requirements (SOW 6.2). A plan that is deemed comprehensive, well-defined, provides a convincing and valuable approach to lifecycle technology management, and is not dependent on any Original Equipment Manufacturer (OEM) for future integrations can receive a higher best value credit in this paragraph.
   iii. Sufficient details of Technical Standard Order (TSO) authorization for flight critical components in the Offeror's solution as referenced in SOW 6.9.1.
   iv. The proposal should identify and describe any additional capabilities or exceedances of threshold requirements that provides a relevant and significant benefit to the Government as stated in SOW 2.3.1 and 2.3.2.

2.2.3.Subfactor 3: Data Rights

The Government will evaluate the Government requested data rights versus the Offeror's data assertions.

The Government will evaluate submitted letter(s) of attestation to see if they clearly document and map which data rights the subcontractor, affiliate, or vendor will deliver to the Offeror and/or Government.

The Subfactor 3: Data Rights is considered to be acceptable when the following criteria is met: The

DRAFT

DRAM (RFP Attachment 6) is filled and the information provided by the Offeror contains sufficient supporting documentation for any assertion less than the Government requested and meets the Government intent to remove vendor lock; the Offeror's DRAM clearly demonstrates the ability to meet the requirements; required licensing is identified; and subcontractor IP flow-down is clearly mapped with letters of attestation submitted when required.

2.2.4.Subfactor 4: Schedule

Offerors are required to present all the information as stated in the ITO, Section L, Technical Subfactor 4, Paragraph 4.2.6.

To be acceptable, at a minimum, the Offeror must indicate an adequate understanding of the following schedule requirements to ensure successful contract execution:

a) The Offeror shall provide a written Scheduled Approach Narrative consisting of all required elements from Section L, which ensures that the Offeror has a sound plan for contract execution. The Schedule Approach Narrative must ensure the execution, monitoring, and control of the Integrated Master Plan (IMP) and Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) throughout the period of performance, the proactive identification, procurement, and management of long-lead time materials to prevent delays, the plan for the System Integration Laboratory (SIL) stand-up, certification, and its utilization within the project timeline, the lead time requirements and major dependencies associated with the Contractor Fly-In Facility option are all met IAW with the SOW. (SOW 5.4, 5.5, 7.0, 9.4, and 12.2)

b) The Offeror's approach to IMS must be logically structured and demonstrate a comprehensive translation of the program requirements and the Offeror's narrative into a project schedule. The approach must ensure significant events, key milestones, and associated activities, logically sound dependencies (predecessors and successors) for all tasks, defined durations, start dates, and finish dates for all tasks, a clearly identifiable critical path that reflects the primary schedule drivers, systematically calculated total float (slack) for all activities are met and executable. (SOW 5.4, 5.5, 7.0, 9.4, and 12.2)

DRAFT

2.3.Factor 2 – Technical Risk

The Technical Risk evaluation assesses the degree to which the Offeror's technical approach under Factor 1 Technical may cause disruption of schedule, degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight, or increased likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance. Technical Risk is manifested by the identification of weaknesses or significant weaknesses.

The Technical Risk evaluation does not consider the Offeror's proposed price.

The offeror's risk assessment provided IAW Section L, ITO, paragraph 5.0 will be evaluated by the Government in addition to any Government assessed risk. The evaluation will consider risk mitigations proposed by the offeror, and whether the mitigation approach is manageable. The Government will also evaluate the offeror's proposal to determine if there is any risk which was not identified by the offeror. The Government is not bound by the offeror's proposed risk rating. For the Technical Risk evaluation,

the Government will utilize the data, information, and the approach in the Volume I Technical Proposal submitted by the Offeror.

The Government will review and analyze the Offeror's approach and apply professional judgment in determining whether the approach includes weaknesses and/or significant weaknesses in relation to Subfactors 1, 2, 3, and 4. The Technical Risk evaluation will include an analysis of subfactors 1 - 4 listed in Factor 1 Technical. A single risk rating will be assigned for all four subfactors combined. The risk rating considers the risk associated with the technical approach in meeting the requirement. For any weakness or significant weakness identified, the evaluation will consider the probability of whether the weakness/significant weakness will occur, and the impact to the program if the weakness/significant weakness were to occur. The definitions of Weakness and Significant Weakness IAW the RFO 15.001 and DoD Mandatory Source Selection Procedures are outlined below.

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.

Each proposal will receive one of the risk ratings described below. To be eligible for award, an Offeror must receive a Low or Moderate Technical Risk rating either initially or as a result of negotiations. For the best value determination, tradeoff considerations for Technical Risk will be based on any identified weaknesses and/or significant weaknesses in each Offeror's approach. The source selection evaluation team will specifically consider the probabilities of whether the weakness(es)/significant weakness(es) will occur and the impacts to the program if the weakness(es)/significant weakness(es) were to occur.

DRAFT

Table 2: Technical Risk Rating Method

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

2.4.Factor 3 – Past Performance

The Past Performance evaluation assesses the degree of confidence the Government has in an Offeror's ability to supply products and services that meet users' needs, including cost and schedule, based on a demonstrated record of performance.

2.4.1.Ratings

The Past Performance factor will receive one of the following performance confidence assessment ratings IAW the Department of Defense (DoD) Source Selection Procedures Paragraph 3.1.3.3, Table 5.

Table 3: Performance Confidence Assessments Rating Method

Adjectival Rating	Description
Substantial Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Satisfactory Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Neutral Confidence	No recent/relevant performance record is available, or the Offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned. The Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on the factor of past performance.
Limited Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
No Confidence	Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the Offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

DRAFT

Note: With regards to the best value award decision, all offerors rated as "Substantial Confidence" will be considered equal for the Past Performance factor.

2.4.2.Evaluation Process

The Past Performance evaluation considers the Offeror's demonstrated record of performance in providing products and services that meet users' needs. Performance confidence is assessed at the overall Past Performance factor level after evaluating aspects of the Offeror's recent past performance, focusing on performance that is relevant to scope, magnitude, the Technical Subfactors, contract type of previous efforts, performance quality, and complexity. More relevant performance may have a greater impact on the Performance Confidence Assessment than less relevant effort. More recent performance may have a greater impact on the Performance Confidence Assessment than less recent performance. The Government may consider past performance in the aggregate in addition to on an individual contract basis. In conducting the Past Performance Evaluation, the Government reserves the right to use both the information provided in the Offeror's Past Performance proposal volume and information obtained from

other sources, such as, but not limited to, Contractor Performance Assessment Report (CPAR) or similar systems, Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA), and commercial sources. The Government reserves the right to use all information available to fully assess the Offeror's past performance.

2.4.2.1.Recency Assessment

An assessment of the past performance information will be made to determine if it is recent. To be recent, the effort must have been performed during the past five (5) years from the date of issuance of this solicitation. If any part of the performance falls within the above timeframe, the contract in its entirety may be evaluated for past performance. Past performance information that fails this condition will not be evaluated.

2.4.2.2.Relevancy Assessment

The Government will conduct an in-depth evaluation of all recent performance information obtained to determine how closely the products provided/services performed under those contracts relate to the technical subfactors and price assessment. Consideration will be given to things such as similar service, similar complexity of the effort, breadth and depth of skills, similar contract scope and type, contract magnitude and schedule. A relevancy determination of the Offeror's (including joint venture partner(s) and major and critical subcontractor(s)/teaming partner performing over 5% of the total proposed contract value or performing a critical function), as defined in Section L – Instructions to Offerors, section 6.3.1, past performance will be made based upon the aforementioned considerations. In determining relevancy for individual contracts, consideration will be given to the effort, or portion of the effort, being proposed by the Offeror, teaming partner, or subcontractor whose contract is being reviewed and evaluated. The Government will consider the portion of the effort accomplished on previous/current contracts compared to the portion to be performed on the proposed effort. For example: Past Performance for a subcontractor for Program Management will only be considered if that same subcontractor is to perform Program Management on the proposed effort.

The past performance information submitted by offerors along with information obtained from other sources will be used to establish the degree of relevancy of past performance. The Government will use the following degrees of relevancy described in the DoD Source Selection Procedures dated 20 August 2022 when assessing recent, relevant contracts.

Table 4: Past Performance Relevancy Rating Method

Adjectival Rating	Description
Very Relevant (VR)	Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Relevant (R)	Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Somewhat Relevant (SR)	Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Not Relevant (NR)	Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

DRAFT

Scope, magnitude, and complexity will be assessed based on the prime or subcontractor/teaming partners proposed role or effort as it relates to the past performance effort. The Government may or may not utilize all or some of the following to determine the elements examined within scope, magnitude, complexity, and price:

Scope: Relevancy regarding scope may be assessed based on, but not limited to, the similarities between a given Past Performance effort and the KC-135 CCR requirement. Primarily, consideration will be given to the design and integration of similar systems on a range of military or civilian aircraft platforms. This includes experience with (in descending order):

a. Large or heavy aircraft.

b. Smaller platform aircraft

Note: Large aircraft is defined as aircraft more than 41,000 pounds maximum certified takeoff weight up to 300,000 pounds. Heavy aircraft is defined as aircraft capable of takeoff weights of 300,000 pounds or greater.

Magnitude: Relevancy regarding magnitude may be assessed based on, but not limited to, the similarities between a given past performance effort and the proposed requirement. Consideration may be given to the following elements when determining relevancy regarding magnitude:

a. Quantity of systems installed on aircraft per year

b. Contract value as it relates to the portion of effort proposed to perform

Complexity: Relevancy regarding complexity may be assessed based on, but not limited to, the similarities between a given past performance effort and Technical Subfactor 1 – Technical Solution, Subfactor 3 Data Rights, and Subfactor 4 Schedule.

Critical functions are defined as: MOSA, Flight Controls (to include IPC and Autothrottle), and Fuel System.

Price Assessment Past Performance Relevancy: Relevancy in regard cost/price will be assessed primarily based on similarity between contract type (i.e., Cost-Plus Incentive Fee (CPIF), Firm-Fixed-Price (FFP) and Cost) of previous effort as compared to the KC-135 Center Console Refresh requirement.

2.4.2.3.Performance Quality Assessment

The Government will consider the performance quality of recent, relevant efforts. The quality assessment consists of an in-depth evaluation of the Past Performance Questionnaire responses, Contractor Performance Assessment Reports (CPARs) (including ratings and supporting narratives), interviews with Government customers and fee determining officials and, if applicable, commercial clients. It may include interviews with DCMA officials or other sources known to the Government. The quality assessment may result in positive or adverse findings.

Adverse is defined as past performance information which the Government determines to be less than satisfactory performance quality. For adverse information identified, the evaluation will consider the

DRAFT

number and severity of the problem(s), mitigating circumstances, and the effectiveness of corrective actions that have resulted in sustained improvements when determining the quality assessment. Taking mitigating corrective actions may or may not result in a higher quality rating. The Government will use the following quality levels when assessing recent, relevant efforts:

Table 5: Performance Quality Assessment Rating Method

Quality Assessment	Description
EXCEPTIONAL (E) (BLUE)	During the contract period, contractor performance is meeting (or met) all contract requirements and consistently exceeding (or exceeded) some or many. Very few, if any, minor problems encountered. Contractor took immediate and effective corrective action.
SATISFACTORY (S) (GREEN)	During the contract period, contractor performance is meeting (or met) all contract requirements. For any problems encountered, contractor took effective corrective action.
MARGINAL (M) (YELLOW)	During the contract period, contractor performance is not meeting (or did not meet) some contract requirements. For problems encountered, corrective action appeared only marginally effective, not effective, or not fully implemented. Customer involvement was required.
UNSATISFACTORY (U) (RED)	During the contract period, contractor performance is failing (or fail) to meet most contract requirements. Serious problems encountered. Corrective actions were either ineffective or non-existent. Extensive Customer oversight and involvement was required.
UNKNOWN (UK)	Unknown Performance rating due to lack of sufficient information to assign a rating.

DRAFT

2.4.3.Assigning Ratings

As a result of the recency, relevancy, and quality assessments of the contracts evaluated, offerors will receive an integrated performance confidence assessment rating based on the definitions provided in paragraph 2.4.1 above. Although the past performance evaluation focuses on performance that is relevant to the technical subfactors and price assessment, the resulting performance confidence assessment rating is made at the factor level and represents an overall evaluation of contractor performance. Offerors without a record of relevant past performance or for whom sufficient information on past performance is not available will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance and, as a result, will receive a "Neutral Confidence" rating for the past performance factor.

More relevant performance will have a greater impact on the performance confidence assessment than less relevant effort. A record of Somewhat Relevant to Very Relevant past performance, which may result in Satisfactory, or Limited Confidence (low, med, high), may be considered more advantageous to

the Government than a Neutral Confidence rating. Likewise, a more relevant past performance record may receive a higher confidence rating and be considered more favorably than a less relevant record of favorable performance.

2.5.Factor 4 – Cost/Price

The Government will evaluate each Offeror's pricing in Volume III, Cost/Price, for (1) reasonableness (including completeness), (2) balance, (3) cost realism (for the CPIF EMD CLINs), (4) price realism (for the FFP Production CLINs), and (5) Total Evaluated Price (TEP). Offerors whose price is determined to be incomplete, unreasonable, or unrealistic will not be considered for award. Additionally, an Offeror's price may be rejected if it contains unbalanced pricing to the extent it poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.

The Offeror's Cost/Price proposal will be based on the cost/prices proposed in the Excel Pricing Workbook (EPW) in RFP Attachment 3A, EPW – PRIME (which will include proposed costs reflected in RFP Attachment 3B, EPW – SUB for major subcontractors, if applicable). Offerors shall review all instructions contained within RFP Attachment 3A, EPW – PRIME and RFP Attachment 3B, EPW - SUB and shall ensure the information provided is compliant with the provided instructions. The Offeror's proposed costs/prices will be evaluated for reasonableness, balance and TEP calculation in accordance with Paragraphs 2.5.1, 2.5.2 and 2.5.6 below. The Offeror's proposed FFP Production prices (CLINs X007 – X016, X020, and X021) will be evaluated for price realism in accordance with (IAW) Paragraph 2.5.3. The Offeror's proposed costs in the cost model worksheets in RFP Attachment 3A (and RFP Attachment 3B, if applicable) for CPIF EMD CLINs 0001, 0002, and 0003 will be evaluated for cost realism IAW Paragraph 2.5.4.

DRAFT

2.5.1. Reasonableness

The proposed prices will be evaluated for reasonableness (to include completeness). Analysis of price proposals will be performed using one or more of the techniques defined in RFO 15.404 in order to determine reasonableness. Reasonableness must represent a price to the Government a prudent person would pay in the conduct of competitive business. Normally, reasonableness is established through adequate price competition, but may also be determined through price analysis techniques as described in RFO 15.404. The Government may also use other techniques as needed. To evaluate completeness, the Government will confirm unit prices for the FFP Production CLINs in the EPW (Attachment 3A, EPW - PRIME) have proposed inputs. If proposed unit prices of zero ($0) have been proposed for the FFP Production CLINs, the Government will confirm that rationale was provided by the Offeror in the Cost/Price Volume and will evaluate the rationale supporting the zero-dollar entry. For the CPIF EMD CLINs to be complete, the Government will confirm that Offerors provide sufficient data other than certified cost and pricing data in the EPW (RFP Attachment 3A, EPW – PRIME and RFP Attachment 3B, EPW – SUB, if applicable) to support the target prices proposed for the CPIF EMD CLINs (CLINs 0001 – 0003) to facilitate the cost realism evaluation.

2.5.2. Balanced Pricing

The Government will evaluate proposals for balance. Proposed unit cost/prices will be compared and evaluated to ensure that a logical progression exists as related to cost/price and/or quantity changes within each Offeror's response to the pricing structure in RFP Attachment 3A (and 3B, if applicable). The Government will evaluate any supporting information provided by the Offeror explaining cost/price variances that appear unbalanced. For the FFP Production CLIN unit prices, the Government will evaluate rationale provided to support any FFP Production CLIN unit price increase greater than 5% from one year to the next, or <u>any</u> CLIN unit price decrease from one year to the next, if applicable.

Evaluated offers that are determined to be unbalanced may be deemed ineligible for award by the Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO) if a determination is made that lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.

2.5.3.Price Realism

Proposed unit prices for the FFP Production CLINs X007 – X009, X011 - X016, and X020 - X021 will be evaluated for price realism. To be realistic, the proposed price must demonstrate an adequate understanding of the requirement and must ensure the price does not pose unacceptable risk to performance. All documentation submitted to support price realism will be considered in making a determination of price realism. To evaluate price realism, the Government may use one or more of the price analysis techniques described in RFO 15.404. The Government may also use other evaluation techniques, as needed.

DRAFT

2.5.4.Cost Realism

The Government will perform a cost realism analysis on the data other than cost or pricing data provided to support CPIF EMD CLINs 0001, 0002, and 0003 IAW RFO 15.404-3. Cost realism is the process of independently reviewing and evaluating specific elements of each Offeror's proposed cost estimate to determine whether the estimated proposed cost elements are realistic for the work to be performed, reflect a clear understanding of the requirements, and are consistent with the unique methods of performance described in the Offeror's technical proposal. The burden of proof for cost realism rests with the Offeror. Accordingly, proposals will be evaluated to assess the likelihood that the proposed technical and estimating approach can successfully accomplish the Offeror's SOW at the competitively proposed cost for cost-type CLINs.

2.5.4.1. Probable Cost

Based on the results of the cost realism analysis, an independent review will be conducted on the Offeror's proposed cost elements to determine the Probable Cost (PC). To calculate a realistic cost for each CLIN, adjustments may be made to the Offeror's proposed cost, and fee when appropriate, to reflect any additions or reductions in cost elements to realistic levels based on the result of the cost realism analysis. The PC represents the Government's best estimate of the cost to acquire specified goods and/or services based on each Offeror's proposed technical and estimating approach. The PC may differ from the Offeror's proposal. The resulting PC will be included in the TEP for CPIF EMD

CLINs 0001, 0002, and 0003 and shall be utilized by the SSA in making the best value determination.

2.5.5.Total Evaluated Price (TEP)

Cost/price proposals will be reviewed for compliance with RFP Section L pricing instructions. The Government shall evaluate the TEP of all Offerors, including option periods. The TEP will be calculated as the sum of the proposed pricing for the following: one (1) 4-Year Basic Period for the CPIF EMD effort and six (6) 1-Year Option Periods for the FFP Production effort. The Offeror's price proposal will be evaluated based upon the TEP, which will include a cumulative sum of FFP Production CLINs and a Probable Cost for the CPIF EMD CLINs. The TEP will be presented to the Source Selection Authority (SSA) for consideration in making the best value determination.

The TEP calculation methodology is included in the EPW (RFP Attachment 3, EPW - PRIME) as a separate worksheet titled "Calculation Methodology". As illustrated in this worksheet, the TEP will be calculated as follows:

a) CPIF CLINs 0001 (EMD Development), 0002 (EMD Simulator Kit), and 0003 (EMD Systems Integration Laboratory (SIL)): The evaluated CLIN prices will be the Offeror's MPC, which will be calculated as the proposed fee times the Offeror's most probable cost (excluding most probable cost of money), yielding the evaluated total fee dollars. The Government will add the evaluated total fee dollars to the Offeror's most probable cost and most probable cost of money, yielding the evaluated price for each CLIN

b) FFP CLINs X007AA (Production A-Kits), X007AB (Production A-Kits – First Article), X008AA (Production B-Kits), X008AB (Production B-Kits – First Article), X014 (Simulator Kits - Production), X015 (SILs - Production), and X021 (Production Spares): The TEP for these CLINs will be calculated as the proposed unit price for each performance period multiplied by the respective best estimated quantity. The sum of all performance periods will yield the total evaluated CLIN price.

c) FFP CLIN X009 (Support Equipment - Production): The TEP for this CLIN will be calculated as the sum of the proposed lot prices for all performance periods.

d) FFP CLIN X010 (Installations Surge – Production) will remain To Be Negotiated (TBN) and will not be part of the TEP calculation.

e) FFP CLINs X011 (Production Configuration Control/Engineering Change Orders) X012 (Maintenance & Repair Support - Production), X013 (Technical Orders - Production), X016 (Training), and X020 (Program Management - Production): The TEP for these CLINs will be calculated as the proposed monthly prices multiplied by 12 months for each performance period; the sum of all performance periods will yield the TEP.

f) CPIF CLINs 0004 (EMD Data) and CLIN 0006 (EMD Intellectual Property), and FFP CLIN X017 (Production Data) are Not Separately Priced (NSP) and will not be part of the TEP calculation.

DRAFT

g) CPIF CLIN 0005 (EMD Travel), and FFP CLINs X018 (Production Travel) and CLIN X019 (Production Over & Above) are Cost-Reimbursable – No Fee (CR-NF) and will not be part of the TEP calculation.

Note: The Best Estimated Quantities (BEQs) provided in the EPW are only estimates. The TEP will be used for evaluation purposes only. Evaluation of option periods does not obligate the Government to exercise such options periods

2.5.6.Cost or Pricing Data Requirements/Data Other Than Certified Cost or Pricing Data

Data other than certified cost or pricing data shall be evaluated to support the proposed costs for the CPIF EMD CLINs.

If requested by the Contracting Officer, data other than certified cost or pricing data shall be provided and will be evaluated for the FFP Production CLINs, in order to support a determination of reasonable, balanced, and realistic pricing. This information will only be requested if all other sources have been insufficient to support a determination of reasonable and/or balance and/or realistic pricing. Offerors may provide any additional data other than certified cost or price data as believed necessary to support or justify proposed pricing. The Government will evaluate the data other than certified cost or pricing data provided.

2.5.7.Rounding

Compliance with Section L, Paragraph 7.2.1 regarding rounding will be verified during evaluation. All proposed dollar amounts shall be rounded to the nearest cent, including hourly labor rates. All indirect rates shall be rounded to four decimal places (ex. 7.55% or .0755). If any cost/price proposal deviates from this format, the Government will apply the specified format to determine the extended pricing and TEP.

DRAFT

2.5.8.Proposed Price Reduction per Corporate/Management Decision

The Government will review the Offeror's explanation of any reduction in proposed pricing as a corporate or management decision provided in the Cost/Price Volume, if applicable. This includes review of the areas of price reduction, such as labor, material, profit, volume or location discounts, indirect rate reductions, and so forth. Also, the Offeror's explanation of how the cited reduction(s) will not affect contractor responsibility or put the Government at unacceptable performance risk will be evaluated.

2.5.9.Business Systems and Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) Disclosure Statement

The status of the Offeror's business systems will be reviewed by the Government. Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA)/Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) analysis will be noted. Adequacy of the Offeror's Accounting System will be verified. If the Accounting System has not been reviewed by the Government or determined adequate, the Government will confirm the Offeror's compliance with the instructions set forth in Section L, Paragraph 7.2.3.1 to include the

submission of RFP Attachment 9, "Contractor Self-Assertion – Pre-Award Survey of Prospective Contractor Accounting System Checklist". Explanation of any deviations/non-compliances from the Offeror's Accounting System or deficiencies will also be reviewed by the Government. An Offeror must have an adequate accounting system in order to be awardable.

The summaries of the estimating and purchasing Systems and CAS Disclosure Statement (reference Section L, Paragraph 7.2.3.2, 7.2.3.3, and 7.2.3.4.) will also be reviewed. Any deviations/non-compliances shall be noted and reviewed. The Government reserves the right to obtain information from the Contract Business Analysis Repository (CBAR) as considered necessary.

2.5.10.Subcontractor Pricing

The Government will review the Cost/Price Volume regarding information pertaining to subcontractor pricing. The Offeror's determination of fair and reasonable pricing as it relates to subcontractors will be reviewed. Evaluation of subcontractor teaming arrangements will be reviewed, as well as the methodology of determining subcontractor pricing fair and reasonable. For the FFP Production effort, subcontractor pricing per se will not be evaluated. The Government will review Offerors' application of their (prime's) indirect costs, including G&A, cost of money, and profit to subcontractor costs/pricing. For the CPIF EMD effort, cost realism analysis will be performed on major subcontractor proposals and the results of this analysis will be incorporated into the Offeror's PC.

2.5.11.Price Assumptions Used in Development of Proposed Pricing

The Government will review information provided in the Cost/Price Volume regarding all price assumptions, limitations, and/or qualifications utilized in the development of proposed pricing. Such information will be used to understand the Offerors' proposed pricing basis of estimate. Additionally, these assumptions help provide support for the Government's determination of reasonableness, balance, and realism.

2.5.12.Government Furnished Property/Equipment/Material (GFP/GFE/GFM)

The Government will review all information provided in the Cost/Price Volume regarding the Offeror's compliance and understanding of Government Furnished Property/Equipment/Material.

2.5.13.Contractor Furnished Property/Equipment/Tooling/Material (CFP/CFE/CFT/CFM)

The Government will review all information provided in the Cost/Price Volume regarding compliance and understanding of contractor Furnished Property/Equipment/Tooling/Material.

2.5.14.Government Field Support Agencies

The Government will review and confirm submission of the required information for the cognizant DCAA and DCMA offices responsible for administration of the Offeror's Government contracts.

DRAFT

2.5.15.Other Documentation

In reviewing proposed costs/prices, all additional information from the Cost/Price Volume will also be considered. Offerors may provide any additional data, other than certified cost or pricing data, as believed necessary to support, justify, or clarify their proposed pricing. All pricing information provided in response to the solicitation will be reviewed and considered, and will contribute to the determination of reasonableness, balance, and realism.

The Government will verify that the Offeror has included a statement in the Cost/Price Volume confirming their understanding that the FFP Production CLINs are fixed price and associated risks have been incorporated into the proposed pricing

2.5.16.Submission of Excel Pricing Workbook

The Government will confirm receipt of a complete, electronically encoded RFP Attachment 3A, EPW – PRIME (and RFP Attachment(s) 3B, EPW – SUB, if applicable) in the required format, with all required costs/prices provided (reference Section L, Paragraphs 7.3.1a, and 7.3.4). An evaluation of the proposed cost/price inputs will be performed in accordance with the defined parameters within Section M.

2.5.17.Submission of Cost/Price Narrative

The Government will confirm receipt of a cost/price narrative that includes the required inputs IAW Section L, Paragraph 7.3.1b. A Consolidated Bill of Materials (CBOM) shall be submitted as an attachment to the Cost/Price narrative (reference Section L, Paragraphs 7.3.2 and 7.3.2.1), along with Forward Pricing Rate Agreements/Forward Pricing Rate Recommendations (FPRA/FPRR) for each Offeror (and major subcontractor, if applicable) (reference Section L, Paragraphs 7.3.3 and 7.3.3.1). All information provided by the Offeror in the Cost/Price narrative will be reviewed by the Government.

DRAFT