AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE: K

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO.	3. EFFECTIVE DATE	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO (If applicable)
SPRHA1-26-R-4646-0001	20 FEB 2026	FD20202600030	KC-46 Landing Gear PBL

6. ISSUED BY — CODE: SPRHA1

DLA AVIATION - OGDEN, DLR PROCUREMENT OPS/AUB
6051 GUM LANE BLDG 1225
HILL AIR FORCE BASE UT 84056-5820
BUYER: Kyle Swaner/DLA
kyle.swaner@us.af.mil
Phone: (385) 591- 8732

7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6) — CODE:

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)

CODE — FACILITY CODE

X — 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO.: SPRHA126R4646

9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11): 11-FEB-2026

10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.:

10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13):

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

[X] The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers [ ] is extended, [X] is not extended. Offers 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 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 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 AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).

[ ] C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:

[ ] D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor [ ] is not, [X] is required to sign this document and return 1 copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)

ROUTINE

See Page 2

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)	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR BY _____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)	16C. DATE SIGNED

Continuation of block 14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION

The purpose of this amendment is to do the following:

1. Clarify requirements in sections L & M. The following sections have been updated.

    Section L: 3.5.1 and 3.5.1.4

    Secton M: 2.3.5, 3.1, 3.1.4

2. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

SECTION L
INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS (ITO)
KC-46 Landing Gear Performance Based Logistics (KC-46 LG PBL)
SOURCE SELECTION

SECTION CONTENT

1 – Proposal Preparation Instructions
2 – General Instructions
3 – Volume I – Technical (Factor One)
4 – Volume II – Price (Factor Two)
5 – Volume III – Past Performance (Factor Three)
6 – Volume IV – Contract Documentation

1. PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS

1.1 This acquisition will utilize Tradeoff source selection procedures in accordance with (IAW) the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.101-1 as supplemented. The Government intends to select one contractor for the KC-46 LG PBL program. However, the Government reserves the right to award no contract if the Source Selection Authority (SSA) determines it is in the Government's best interest.

1.2 To assure timely and equitable evaluation of proposals, **Offerors shall follow the instructions contained herein. Failure to meet a requirement may result in an offer being ineligible for award.** Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, including all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as evaluation factors or sub-factors. Offerors must clearly identify any exception to the RFP terms and conditions and provide a complete accompanying rationale. Proposals shall consist of four (4) separate volumes; Volume I – Technical, Volume II – Price, Volume III – Past Performance; and Volume IV - Contract Documentation.

The Contracting Officer (CO) has determined there is a high probability of adequate price competition in this acquisition. Upon examination of the initial offers, the CO will review this determination and if, in the CO's opinion, adequate price competition exists no additional pricing information will be requested and certification under Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.406-2 will not be required. However, if at any time during this competition the CO determines that adequate price competition no longer exists, Offerors may be required to submit information to the extent necessary for the CO to determine the reasonableness and affordability of the price offer.

1.3 Budget / Funding Information - Funding will be obligated on each delivery order awarded under the basic contract.

2. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

2.1 This section provides general guidance for preparing proposals as well as specific instructions on format and content. The offeror's proposal shall include all data and information requested and shall be submitted IAW these instructions. Any offeror who submits an incomplete package may be eliminated from the competition. The offer shall be compliant with the requirements as stated in the Technical Requirements Document (TRD) Contract Data Requirements Lists (CDRLs), and Contract / Solicitation. **Non-conformance with these instructions may result in an "Unacceptable" proposal evaluation.**

2.2 Include Sufficient Detail – The proposal shall be clear, concise, and shall include sufficient detail for effective evaluation and for substantiating the validity of stated claims. **The proposal shall not simply copy and paste, rephrase, or restate the Government's requirements**, but rather shall provide convincing rationale to address how the offeror intends to meet or exceed these requirements. **Offerors shall assume that the Government has no prior knowledge of their experience and will base its evaluation on the information presented in the proposal.**

2.3 Technical Data For Purposes of Proposing – Due to data release restrictions, the required overhaul/remanufacture Component Maintenance Manuals (CMMs) for the KC-46/-2C landing gear will not be provided prior to contract award. The successful offeror will receive access to these CMMs upon contract award. For proposal purposes, offerors are required to leverage their understanding of the 767-300F series landing gear and demonstrate their experience and

capability to remanufacture that version of landing gear. However, offerors are encouraged to identify and discuss any remanufacture gaps between the 767-300F and the -2C gear.

2.4 Definition of a "Shipset" – For evaluation purposes a shipset is defined as, the complete build-up of the Electrical, Hydraulic, and Structural installation assemblies integrated together (ready for install) of the nose, left main, and right main landing gear for the 767-300F.

2.5 Embellishments Not Preferred – Elaborate brochures or documentation, binding, detailed artwork, or other embellishments are unnecessary and are not preferred.

2.6 The proposal acceptance period is specified on the front page of the Standard Form (SF) 1449 Solicitation/Contract. Offerors providing less than the specified calendar days for Government acceptance after the date proposals are due, may be eliminated from the competition.

2.7 IAW FAR 4.8, the Government will retain one copy of all unsuccessful proposals. Unless the offeror requests otherwise, the Government will destroy extra copies of such unsuccessful proposals.

2.8 Point of Contact – The Contracting Officer (CO) is the sole point of contact for this acquisition. Address any questions or concerns you may have to the CO. Requests for clarification may be sent to the following:

<u>Contracting Officer</u>
DLA Weapons Support
Kyle Swaner
Office (385) 591-8732
kyle.swaner@us.af.mil

2.9 Pre-Award Debriefings – The CO will promptly notify offerors of any decision to exclude them from the competitive range, whereupon they may request and receive a debriefing IAW FAR 15.505. Offerors excluded from the competitive range may request a pre-award debriefing or they may choose to wait until after the source selection decision to request a post-award debriefing. However, Offerors excluded from the competitive range are entitled to no more than one debriefing for each proposal.

2.10 Post-Award Debriefings – The CO will notify unsuccessful offerors in the competitive range of the source selection decision IAW FAR 15.506. Upon such notification, unsuccessful offerors may request and receive a debriefing. Offerors requesting a debriefing must make their request IAW the requirements of FAR 15.505 or 15.506, as applicable.

2.11 Discrepancies – If an offeror believes that the requirements in these instructions contain an error, omission, or are otherwise unsound, the offeror shall immediately notify the CO in writing with supporting rationale as well as remedies the Offeror is asking the CO to consider as related to the omission or error.

2.12 Electronic Reference Documents – All referenced documents for this solicitation are available on the System for Award Management (SAM) website at https://sam.gov. Potential offerors are encouraged to subscribe for real-time e-mail notifications when information has been posted to the website for this solicitation.

2.13 Communications – Exchanges of source selection information after submission of the initial proposal packages between the Government and Offerors will be controlled by the Contracting Officer. Email may be used to transmit such information only if the email can be sent encrypted and must include "Source Selection Information – See FAR 2.101 and 3.104" in the subject line of the email. In order to facilitate the sending and receiving of encrypted emails, offerors must use MS Outlook email configured to support encryption or a different email product that is S/MIME compatible and configured to support encryption.

2.14 Discussions – The Government intends to award without discussions but reserves the right to conduct discussions if determined necessary. Discussions, if necessary, will be conducted IAW FAR 15.306.

2.15 Oral Presentation – Oral Presentations will not be allowed.

2.16 Amendments to Solicitation – If this Request for Proposal (RFP) is amended, all terms and conditions that are not amended remain unchanged. Offerors shall acknowledge receipt of any amendment to this request by the date and time specified in the amendment(s) by signing and returning the front page of each.

2.17 Submission, Modification, Revision, and Withdrawal of Proposals.

2.17.1 Proposals and modifications to proposals shall be submitted electronically via DoD SAFE in accordance with the following DoD SAFE (Secure Access File Exchange) Proposal Submission Process:

2.17.1.1 Offeror shall email the Contracting Officer, Kyle Swaner, at (kyle.swaner@us.af.mil) of their intent to submit a proposal and request a DoD SAFE Drop Off link. Unless otherwise specified in the request, the Government will use the email account from the request to process the drop-off request.

Note: Drop-off requests are only valid for 14 days. It is recommended that this request is submitted no sooner than 14 days and no later than 72 hours prior to the proposal due date and time. Note: The file limit for drop-off is 25 files. If the offeror intends to submit more than 25 files, it is the offeror's responsibility to request a 2nd drop off link with its request.

2.17.1.2 The Government will send a one-time submission link through the "Request a Drop Off" feature of DoD SAFE. For tracking purposes, the Government will only provide this to a single email account on behalf of the offeror.

2.17.1.3 The offeror will receive an email from DoD SAFE with a link that can be used to submit a proposal for this solicitation. The offeror opens the link and adds the files.

2.17.1.4 If the offeror chooses to encrypt its submission, a passphrase will need to be created. This passphrase should be provided to Kyle Swaner (kyle.swaner@us.af.mil) for pick-up.

2.17.1.5 Proposals are only considered officially submitted when the file upload process is completed through DoD SAFE. The Government determines the official proposal receipt time based on the "Drop-off Completed" timestamp that DoD SAFE applies when the offeror completes submission.

Note: It is highly recommended that the offeror utilize the print details button/feature in DoD SAFE to show the "Drop-Off Completion" and email it to Kyle Swaner (kyle.swaner@us.af.mil).

2.17.1.6 If the offeror needs to update its submission prior to the RFP closing date, it shall follow the same steps outlined above.

Note: In accordance with FAR 15.208, it is the responsibility of the Offeror to ensure the proposal is received by the date and time specified on the cover page of this solicitation. Please note that when submitting through DoD SAFE, there is no "expected" or "target" length of time for proposal submission; size and content may be factors, therefore offerors are strongly cautioned when submitting proposals to allow adequate time for submission.

2.17.2 All submissions shall show the time and date specified for receipt, the solicitation number, and the name and address of the offeror. Late proposals will be handled IAW FAR 15.208.

2.17.3 Proposals may be withdrawn by written notice received at any time before award. Proposals may also be withdrawn in person by an offeror or an authorized representative, if the identity of the person requesting the withdrawal is established and the person signs a receipt for the proposal before award.

2.18 Organization / Page Limits – The title page of each volume must show:

2.18.1 Title Page Content:

- Solicitation Number
- Company Name, Address, Commercial and Government Entity (CAGE) Code and Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) Number
- Primary point of contact name, telephone number and email address

- Volume number and name (e.g. Volume I, Technical and copy number (i.e. Original, copy 1, copy 2, etc.)
- The offeror shall prepare the proposal as set forth in Table 1 – Proposal Organization below. The titles and contents of the volumes shall be as defined in this table, all of which shall be within the required page limits.

Table 1 – Proposal Organization

VOLUME	SECTION L PARAGRAPH #	TITLE	COPIES	PAGE LIMIT
I	3	Technical	Digital	150 pages
II	4	Price	Digital	Unlimited
III	5	Past Performance	Digital	30 pages
IV	6	Contract Documentation	Digital	Unlimited

2.18.2 Page Limitations – Page limitations shall be treated as maximums. If exceeded, the excess pages will not be read or considered in the evaluation of the proposal; rather, the Offeror will be notified of which pages of the proposal were determined excess as soon as practical. Each page shall be counted except the following: blank pages, title pages, tables of contents, tabs, Glossary of Abbreviations and Acronyms, Cross Reference Matrix, and those noted in the Proposal Organization Table as "Unlimited." Page limitations may be placed on responses to Evaluation Notices (ENs) if applicable. The specified page limits for EN responses will be identified in the letters forwarding the ENs to the offerors.

2.19 Pricing Information – All pricing information shall be addressed in the Price Volume (Volume II) only.

2.20 Cross Referencing – Each volume shall be written on a standalone basis so that its contents may be evaluated without cross-referencing to other volumes of the proposal. Information required for proposal evaluation that is not found in its designated volume will be assumed to have been omitted from the proposal. Cross-referencing within a proposal volume is permitted.

2.21 The offeror shall fill out the Technical Volume section of the Cross Reference Matrix in the format as provided in Table 2 – Sample Cross Reference Matrix below, indicating the proposal reference information as it relates to Section L, Section M, and the TRD. The Cross Reference Matrix shall be included in the Technical Volume (Volume I). The Cross Reference Matrix addresses each requirement within the TRD, and Section L&M Technical sub-factors. The offeror shall fill in the Technical Volume section independently labeled with the appropriate paragraph number or page number from its proposal that addresses the requirement or factor and sub-factor.

Table 2 – Sample Cross Reference Matrix

Section L	*Section M*	*TRD*	*Technical Volume*
Para. X.x.	*Para. X.x.*	*Para. X.x.*	*Para. X.x.*

2.22 Indexing

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

2.22.2 Include an indexed list of Tables and Figures.

2.22.3 Glossary of Abbreviations and Acronyms – Each volume shall contain a glossary of all abbreviations and acronyms used, with an explanation for each. Glossaries do not count against the page limitations for their respective volumes.

2.23 Page Size, Format, and Labeling

2.23.1 A page is defined as a single digital page size of 8.5 x 11 inches. Except for the reproduced sections of the solicitation document, the text shall be Times New Roman and font size shall be no less than 12 points and lines shall be single spaced. Tracking, kerning, and leading values shall not be changed from the default values of the word processing or page layout software. Use at least 1-inch margins on the top, bottom, and sides. Pages shall be numbered sequentially by volume. These page format restrictions shall also apply to responses to ENs if applicable. Each page containing proprietary information should be marked.

2.23.2 Legible tables, charts, graphs and figures shall be used wherever practical to depict organizations, systems and layout, implementation schedules, plans, etc. These displays shall be uncomplicated and legible. Oversized images or figures should be designed to be easily navigable and viewable within the digital document. Text within tables, charts, graphs, and figures shall be no smaller than 10 point.

2.23.3 Be sure to apply all appropriate markings including those prescribed IAW FAR 52.215-1(e), Restriction on Disclosure and Use of Data, and FAR 3.104-4, Disclosure, Protection, and Marking of Contractor Bid or Proposal Information and Source Selection Information. Each page must contain the following legend at the bottom of each sheet:

SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION—SEE FAR 2.101 AND 3.104 FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

2.23.4 The proposal shall be submitted in a format readable by Adobe Acrobat and MS Excel (Microsoft 365) for all spreadsheets. PDF formats shall not be used for the TEP worksheet. Excel spreadsheets – Set “Save as type” to Excel Workbook (*.xlsx).”

3. VOLUME I – FACTOR ONE, TECHNICAL

3.1 General – The Technical Volume shall be clear, specific, complete, and include sufficient detail for effective evaluation. Legibility, clarity and coherence are very important. Offerors responses will be evaluated against the Technical sub-factors defined in Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award. Offerors shall review Section M criteria to ensure the KC-46 LG PBL requirements are met. Provide as specifically as possible the actual methodology the offeror would use for accomplishing/satisfying each Technical sub-factor. Offerors shall assume that the Government has no prior knowledge of their experience or facilities and will base its evaluation only on the information presented in the offeror’s proposal. All the requirements specified in the solicitation are mandatory. By the offeror’s proposal submission, the offeror is representing that they will perform ALL the requirements specified in the solicitation; it is not necessary to tell the Government so in the proposal.

3.2 Adequate Responses – It is imperative that the offeror fully describe and provide detail as to how the offeror shall meet all Technical sub-factor requirements. Do not merely copy and paste, rephrase, or restate the objectives or reformulate the requirements specified in the solicitation.

3.3 Exceeding Requirements – Offerors shall highlight areas of the Technical proposal where they assert exceedance of sub-factor requirements as defined in each Technical sub-factor in section M. Any areas in the proposal where the offeror exceeds the requirement shall be clearly defined from a cost, schedule, and execution standpoint. Beneficial aspects of the selected offeror’s proposal will be incorporated into the resulting contract, and a modification to the TRD for inclusion will take place prior to award.

3.4 Volume Organization – Offeror’s response to the Technical Volume (Volume I) shall be structured in a logical manner at the offeror’s discretion and must clearly address the offeror’s technical approach to all aspects of the sub-factors below. The Technical approach must clearly identify each sub-factor as addressed throughout the proposal. Within each sub-factor the offeror shall identify applicable team members, as defined in section M 2.3.6, and their responsibilities in relation to the sub-factor.

3.5 Sub-Factor One, Remanufacture Capability and Capacity:

3.5.1 The offeror shall submit a detailed remanufacture plan that thoroughly demonstrates experience and capability to remanufacture the entire 767-300F shipset, covering all processes from start to finish IAW TRD Appendix C paragraph 2.0 Remanufacturing Process through 2.18 Rob-Back/Cannibalization. The plan must also provide evidence that the offeror possesses facilities and equipment with the capacity to remanufacture Landing Gear shipsets IAW the Time Change Interval (TCI) schedule (section J attachment 5). To mitigate program risk and ensure a single point of accountability, the prime contractor shall possess the in-house capacity and capabilities to meet the majority of the throughput requirements. At a minimum, the plan shall include:

3.5.1.1 A diagram that clearly illustrates the physical layout of the primary facility or facilities where the offeror proposes to perform remanufacture and the interior layout (including interior square footage) of each location. This diagram shall also provide evidence that the facility can accommodate all necessary equipment to satisfy the remanufacturing requirements.

3.5.1.2 Identification of the equipment the offeror will use to complete each remanufacturing process and demonstrate how that specific equipment will be used to meet the requirements of TRD Appendix C paragraph 2.0 Remanufacturing Process.

3.5.1.3 Proof of possession must be demonstrated through written documentation such as a lease agreement, property deed, etc. that demonstrates possession of the facilities for the life of the contract.

3.5.1.4 FAA compliance/ Offeror holds a Title 14 CFR Part 145 Certified Repair Station certificate per 14 CFR 145.61.b.7 landing gear accessory.

3.5.1.5 Provide evidence of AS9110 certification.

3.5.2 In addition, the remanufacture plan must also comprehensively address the following areas:

3.5.2.1 Sourcing for all subcomponents required for remanufacturing while adhering to lead time requirements and guaranteeing parts availability including risk mitigation to absorb any supply inconsistencies.

3.5.2.2 Provide a description of the engineering approach for addressing parts or processes that are not in conformance with technical data criteria. The offeror must detail how engineering will assess the non-conformance, determine the appropriate corrective action, and ensure compliance with all applicable technical data and regulatory requirements.

3.5.2.3 Describe a plan and approach for meeting the Parts Control Program requirements detailed in TRD Appendix C, paragraph 2.4. In addition, explain how the offerors proposed Parts Control Program will fulfill the reporting and tracking requirements outlined in TRD Appendix C, paragraphs 2.4.1 and 2.4.2.

3.6 Sub-Factor Two, Exchange Lead Time (ELT, Shipsets):

3.6.1 Submit an approach detailing how the offeror intends to meet the 82-day ELT metric for shipset remanufacture for the 767-300F IAW TRD Appendix B paragraphs 2.0 - 2.2 Exchange Lead Time (ELT) Definition. The approach must include the following:

3.6.1.1 A detailed description, schedule, and flow chart of the entire remanufacturing process, from the date the asset was received to final delivery.

3.6.1.2 Specific time intervals for: disassembly, cleaning, assembly, paint, plating, baking, inspection, stripping, NDI, machining, temper etch, functional test/check, and packaging/shipping.

3.6.1.3 Address any subcontracting efforts and associated timelines required to support the 82-day ELT.

3.6.1.4 Identify risk mitigation strategies for situations that may arise during the re-manufacturing process. (e.g. situations where a supplier is late, a machine is down, etc.).

3.6.1.5 The offeror shall provide a detailed and comprehensive transition plan demonstrating the ability to achieve full operational support within the specified timeframe (Minimum of 3 months) between contract award and the first shipset delivery date. This plan must ensure 100% supportability upon the delivery of the first shipset IAW with TRD Appendix A paragraph 1.0 Phase–In.

This plan must specifically describe any manpower gaps to include a detailed staffing ramp-up plan, clearly state the existing manpower levels as a percentage of the total required workforce at the time of proposal submission and project the anticipated manpower percentage at the expected contract award date. Additionally, a clear breakout by position, outlining current staffing and the staffing required to achieve full supportability. Including all training of personnel, schedules, and estimated completion times to ensure all personnel are fully equipped to perform their duties by contract award.

3.7 Sub-Factor Three: Remanufacture Turn Around Time (RTAT, Sub-Components):

3.7.1 Submit an approach detailing and demonstrating a step-by-step process for how the offeror intends to meet the RTAT for subcomponents IAW TRD Appendix B paragraphs 3.0 - 3.2 Remanufacture Turn Around Time (RTAT) Definition. Included in the approach, provide a detailed description and flow chart of the entire remanufacturing process for each of the following NSNs:

A. NSN: 1560-01-689-8315, P/N: 161T1133-1, MLG Tow Fitting Assembly
B. NSN: 1560-01-694-8122, P/N: 162T1400-1, NLG Torque Tube Support
C. NSN: 1620-01-655-8317, P/N: 161T1131-19, MLG Bogie Beam Assembly

3.7.2 For each of the NSNs listed above the offeror must also:

3.7.2.1 Detail the time required for completion of each individual step within the remanufacturing process, starting from the initial asset receipt and concluding with the final delivery. The submission must also clearly indicate the overall proposed lead time for the entire process.

3.7.2.2 Identify any process constraints and how they will be overcome.

3.7.2.3 Identify where any subcontracting or shipping is performed.

3.7.2.4 Specifically describe each process required to remanufacture each NSN, to include all tooling, equipment, and material necessary for proper and complete re-manufacture. Include detailed descriptions for; disassembly, cleaning, assembly, paint, plating, baking, inspection, stripping, NDI, machining, temper etch, functional test/check, DCMA inspection, and packaging/shipping.

4. VOLUME II - FACTOR TWO, PRICE

4.1 General Instructions - The price evaluation criteria will be: (1) Completeness, (2) Reasonableness, (3) Balance, (4) Realism (if necessary), and (5) Total Evaluated Price (TEP) as defined in Section M paragraph 4.7, which will be assessed from the information provided in this volume. Offerors shall review Section M criteria to ensure the minimum requirements are met.

4.2 Submit a copy of the completed Total Evaluated Price (TEP) worksheet in the Price Volume (Volume II) in Microsoft Excel format (non-PDF format)

4.3 Offerors shall complete the TEP worksheet IAW the instructions provided in Tab 1 of the TEP Workbook and input the following:

4.3.1 FFP: Annual Firm Fixed Price per Remanufacture for the 3 KC-46 LG shipset NSNs listed in the TEP worksheet (section J attachment 6).

4.3.2 FFP: Annual Firm Fixed Price per Eaches, and an RTAT for all sub-component NSNs listed in the TEP worksheet (section J attachment 6).

4.4 All prices shall be fully burdened and include all direct costs, indirect rates (Overhead, General and Administrative, etc.) and profit necessary for the performance of the entire requirement. All proposed prices will be contractually binding.

4.4.1 Cost or Pricing Information Requirements - IAW FAR 15.402, FAR 15.403-1(b) and 15.403-3(a), "information other than certified cost or pricing data" may be required to support price reasonableness. If after receipt of proposals, the CO determines that there is insufficient information available to determine the reasonableness of the proposed pricing the offeror may be required to submit additional information other than certified cost or pricing data. If, during the source selection process, the CO determines that adequate competition no longer exists, then certified cost and pricing data may be required.

4.4.2 Rounding – All dollar amounts provided shall be rounded to the nearest dollar.

4.4.3 Pricing Assumptions – Provide an explanation of the method used to develop all proposed prices. Summarize all significant pricing assumptions, scope limitations and qualifications of the Price Volume (Volume II). Pricing assumptions shall not exceed 20 pages.

4.4.4 Estimating Techniques and Methods – When responding to the Price Volume requirements in the solicitation, the offeror may use any generally accepted estimating technique to develop their proposal. Provide a summary description of your standard estimating system or methods. Also, provide a summary description of your purchasing system or methods. In addition, identify deviations (if any) from your standard estimating procedures (including overhead and G&A applications) in preparing this proposal volume. Indicate whether you have Government approval of your estimating and purchasing systems and provide evidence of such approval. Provide a summary description of your pricing methodology as it pertains to this acquisition.

5. VOLUME III - FACTOR THREE, PAST PERFORMANCE

5.1 General – Submit a past performance volume containing past performance information IAW the format stated in Section 2 – General Instructions, and corresponding subparagraphs, as required in Section 2 – General Instructions of this document. This requirement is for all companies listed in the teaming arrangement. Offerors are advised that the Government will use data provided by each offeror in this volume and data obtained from other sources in the evaluation of past performance.

5.2 Consent and Client Authorization Letters – The Offeror shall submit a consent letter (see RFP Section J Attachment 7, Past Performance Consent Letter), signed and executed by the subcontractors, teaming partners, and joint venture partners as applicable, authorizing release of adverse past performance information to the offeror so the offeror can respond to such information. For each identified effort for a commercial customer, the Offeror shall submit a client authorization letter signed by the commercial client (see Section J Attachment 8, Past Performance Client Authorization Letter), authorizing the release of requested information on the Offeror's performance to the Government.

5.3 Questionnaires – As soon as possible, offerors shall complete Section 1 of the Past Performance Questionnaire (RFP Section J Attachment 9, Past Performance Questionnaire). Offerors shall invite the third parties identified in (RFP Section J Attachment 10, Past Performance Information Sheets (PPIS)) to complete and transmit the questionnaire (Section J Attachment 9, Past Performance Questionnaire) to the CO describing their experience regarding the offeror. The third-party POCs are instructed to complete the questionnaire and transmit it directly to the CO in electronic format. The third parties are further instructed NOT to transmit the completed questionnaires back to the offeror but to the CO (identified email on questionnaire document). Questionnaires transmitted directly by the offeror will not be evaluated, or considered. Once questionnaires are completed, they shall be considered source selection sensitive and shall not be released to the offeror. RESPONDENTS TO THE QUESTIONNAIRES SHALL NOT SEND THE COMPLETED INFORMATION SHEETS BACK TO THE OFFEROR! Offerors shall not follow-up with respondents to ensure they have completed the questionnaires. The performance evaluation team will conduct such follow-up with any POC as necessary.

5.4 Recent (as defined in section M paragraph 5.3.1) and Relevant (as defined in Section M paragraph 5.4 and Table 4) Contracts – Submit information in accordance with (RFP Section J Attachment 10, PPIS) for a maximum of 5 recent and relevant contracts from the team. The offeror is encouraged to submit PPISs for the prime and each subcontractor performing major or critical aspects of the requirement. In no case shall a team submit more than 5 total PPISs. Within each PPIS, offerors are required to provide a narrative explaining what aspects of the contracts are deemed relevant to the proposed effort and to what Technical sub-factors they relate. This may include a discussion of efforts accomplished by the offeror to resolve problems encountered on prior contracts as well as past efforts. The offeror shall clearly demonstrate

management actions employed in overcoming problems and the effects of those actions in terms of improvements achieved or problems rectified. If past performance information is being submitted under a basic ID/IQ contract/agreement, the offeror shall identify the delivery/task order relevant to KC-46 LG PBL. Each delivery or task order will count as one contract. The offeror shall use one PPIS for each delivery/task order cited.

5.5 Completed Team Roles & Responsibilities Worksheet – The offeror shall provide a completed roles and responsibilities worksheet in accordance with the format contained in RFP (Section J Attachment 11, Team List, Roles and Responsibilities) worksheet, for all proposed team members or subcontractors that meet the definition in section M Paragraph 2.3.5. The offeror has discretion in determining the most beneficial mix and quantity of contracts by prime offeror, key partners, or subcontractors covering as many of these elements as is practical.

5.6 Past Performance Citation Reference Sheet – Submit a matrix of the Prime and their team members and the contract citations that have been documented in the Past Performance Information Sheets.

5.7 An offeror's failure to address performance problems/issues within this volume does not preclude the Government from using such information in determining a past performance rating.

6. VOLUME IV – CONTRACT DOCUMENTATION

6.1 Provide all Volume IV Contract Documentation in the prescribed format identified in Table 1 – Proposal Organization.

6.2 Solicitation/Contract Representations and Certifications.

6.3 Section A – Solicitation/Contract Form: Complete blocks 12 (offerors must input 365 days for acceptance) and 16 of the SF 1449. Signature by the offeror on the SF 1449 constitutes a binding proposal.

6.4 Section B – Supplies or Services and Costs/Prices: Do not input pricing information in Section B of the Solicitation/Contract. All required prices shall be proposed in the TEP Worksheet.

6.5 Section I – Contract Clauses

6.6 Section K – Representations, Certifications, and other Statements of Offerors: Complete representations, certifications, acknowledgments and statements. Offeror must have filled out an online provision FAR Clause 52.204-8 Annual Representations and Certifications (May 2014), Online Reps and Certs at System for Award Management (http://www.sam.gov). Offer shall ensure certification as a small business under North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) 336413.

6.7 Exceptions to Solicitation Requirements – Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and Technical requirements, in addition to those identified as evaluation factors or sub-factors. Failure to meet a requirement may result in an offer being ineligible for award. Offerors must clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and provide complete accompanying rationale. Each exception shall be specifically related to each paragraph and specific part of the solicitation to which the exception is taken. Provide rationale in support of the exception and fully explain its impact, if any, on the performance, schedule, cost, and specific requirements of the solicitation. This information shall be provided in the format and content of Table 3 – Solicitation Exceptions.

Table 3 – Solicitation Exceptions

SOLICITATION Document	Page/ Paragraph	Requirement/ Portion	Rationale
TRD, Model Contract/Solicitation, Section L, etc.	Applicable Page and Paragraph Numbers	Identify the requirement or portion to which exception is taken	Describe why the requirement can/will not be met

6.8 Other Information Required

6.8.1 Teaming arrangement – If the Offeror intends to utilize critical subcontractors in order to meet the requirements of the Technical Volume, a Teaming Arrangement shall be identified. The teaming arrangement must

consist of a prime contractor (who will be the sole point of contact, and have overall responsibility for the contract) and any team members IAW the definition in section M 2.3.5.

6.8.1.1 Offeror shall submit a signed formal agreement between the prime contractor and any other critical sub-contractors listed in the teaming arrangement meeting the definition of section M 2.3.5. The agreement must provide evidence that it will be valid beginning on the date of contract award and remain valid and binding for the potential 10-year life of the contract. Additionally, the general roles and responsibilities of the applicable member of the teaming arrangement shall be listed in each individual agreement. This agreement does not preclude offerors from adding team members after contract award. Failure to provide this agreement may be considered non-responsive, and therefore ineligible for award.

6.9 Authorized Offeror Personnel – Provide the name, title, telephone number, and email address of the company/division point of contact responsible for negotiating with the Government.

6.10 Adequate Financial resources – Submit documentation demonstrating that offeror possesses adequate financial resources to perform the contract. This information will be used as part of the Contracting Officer's determination of responsibility IAW FAR 9.104.

6.11 Supply Chain Risk Management (SCRM): Submit a SCRM Plan IAW TRD Main, paragraph 3.5 (10 pages maximum) detailing the offeror's supply chain risk management approach to: a.) Continuity of Operations, b.) Foreign Influence, and c.) Cybersecurity. The offeror must detail the specific supply chain risk (listed below) and provide a management and mitigation plan identifying how the offeror will ensure Supply Chain Risk Management is effective over the life of the contract.

6.11.1 Cybersecurity - The Plan must describe prevention measures for the following:

6.11.1.1 Unauthorized access to information systems.
6.11.1.2 Interruption of communications.
6.11.1.3 Insertion of counterfeits/malware.
6.11.1.4 Unauthorized data reproduction.
6.11.1.5 Tampering and theft.
6.11.1.6 Insertion of malicious software and hardware.
6.11.1.7 Systems functionality alteration.
6.11.1.8 Disruption of operation.

6.11.2 Continuity of Operations (COOP) – The plan must describe:

6.11.2.1 Clear lines of authority and communication between the Offeror and the Government as well as the Offeror and its subcontractors and/or vendors.
6.11.2.2 Security management procedures ensuring the protection of informational and physical assets.
6.11.2.3 Deviated work plan to ensure adequate personnel support for continued operational capability.
6.11.2.4 Operational capacity to support continued operations to include facilities, equipment, personnel, IT systems, security, vendor support, and others that impact production.
6.11.2.5 Contingency measures for continued supply chain logistics and transportation, facilities and business operations, and IT support.

6.11.3 The plan must describe:

6.11.3.1 Facility and operations security.
6.11.3.2 Data protection.
6.11.3.3 Personnel security clearances & background checks.
6.11.3.4 Monitoring (including sub vendors) foreign investment, mergers, acquisitions, and operating locations.

7. SECTION L – REQUIRED ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 7: Past Performance Consent Letter
Attachment 8: Past Performance Client Authorization Letter
Attachment 9: Past Performance Questionnaire
Attachment 10: Past Performance Information Sheet (PPIS)

Attachment 11: Team List, Roles and Responsibilities

SECTION M
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD
KC-46 Landing Gear Performance Based Logistics
(KC-46 LG PBL)
SOURCE SELECTION

1. BASIS FOR AWARDS

1.1 This acquisition will utilize Tradeoff Source Selection Process in accordance with (IAW) FAR 15.101-1, as supplemented. The KC-46 LG PBL contract will be awarded to the offeror who represents the best overall value to the Government, based upon an integrated assessment of Technical, Price, and Past Performance evaluation Factors, that is deemed responsible in accordance with the FAR, as supplemented, whose proposal conforms to the solicitation requirements. The solicitation requirements include all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and all other information required by Section L and the Technical Requirements Document (TRD) of this solicitation. The Government intends to award to the offeror that gives the Government the greatest confidence that it will best meet, or exceed, the requirements. 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 that the technical and overall business approach of the higher price offeror outweighs the cost difference. The SSA will base the source selection decision on an integrated assessment of proposals against the source selection criteria in section M. 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; therefore, professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire process. Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, including all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as evaluation factors or sub-factors and all other information required by Section L, Instructions to Offerors (ITO), of this solicitation.

1.2 Number of Contracts to be Awarded – The Government intends to award one contract for the KC-46 LG PBL program. However, the Government reserves the right to award no contract at all, if the SSA determines it is in the Government's best interest. If the Government determines not to award a contract, the Government is not liable for any costs incurred by potential offerors for proposal preparation and/or participation in the source selection process.

1.3 Correction Potential of Proposals – The Government will consider, throughout the evaluation, the "correction potential" of any deficiency or weakness. The judgment of such "correction potential" is within the sole discretion of the Government. If an aspect of an offeror's proposal does not meet the Government's requirements, the proposal may be considered "uncorrectable" and the offeror may be eliminated from the competitive range. A proposal will be considered "uncorrectable" if it is determined that a significant proposal revision will be required in order to meet the minimum requirements of the Request for Proposal (RFP).

1.4 Discussions – The Government reserves the right to award without discussions, if the SSA determines it to be in the best interest of the Government; therefore, each initial offer should contain the offeror's best terms from a price and technical standpoint. If, during the evaluation period, it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government to hold discussions, offeror responses to Evaluation Notices (ENs) and the Final Proposal Revision (FPR) will be the basis for making the source selection decision. If the offeror's proposal has been evaluated as acceptable at the time discussions are closed, any changes or exceptions in the Final Proposal Revision are subject to evaluation and may introduce risk that the offeror's proposal be determined unacceptable or receive a lower technical rating or higher technical risk, or all three.

1.5 Integrating Proposal into the Contract – the Contracting Officer shall incorporate the entire selected offeror's technical proposal into the contract.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

2. EVALUATION FACTORS AND SUB-FACTORS

2.1 The following evaluation factors and sub-factors will be used to evaluate each proposal. Award will be made to the offeror whose proposal is most advantageous to the Government, based upon an integrated assessment of the evaluation factors and sub-factors described below:

Factor One – Technical

Sub-factor One: Remanufacture Capability and Capacity
Sub-factor Two: Exchange Lead Time (ELT, Shipsets)
Sub-factor Three: Remanufacture Turn Around Time (RTAT, Sub-Components)

Factor Two – Price

Factor Three – Past Performance

2.2 Relative Importance of Factors and Sub-factors – The relative importance of each factor and sub-factor is as follows (in descending order of importance): First in importance is Factor One (Technical), second is Factor Two (Price) and Factor Three (Past Performance) is last in importance. Within the Technical Factor, the sub-factors are listed in descending order of importance. IAW FAR 15.304(e)(1), all evaluation factors other than price when combined, are significantly more important than price. In arriving at a best value decision, the Government reserves the right to give positive consideration, i.e., assign a strength, for technical merit in excess of the threshold requirements.

The KC-46 LG PBL Contract will be awarded to the offeror who represents the best overall value to the Government, based upon an integrated assessment (tradeoff) of Technical, Technical Risk, Price, and Past Performance.

2.3 Definitions – For purposes of this evaluation the following definitions will be used:

2.3.1 **Strength** – Is 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.

2.3.2 **Weakness** – Is a flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

2.3.3 **Significant Weakness** – Is a proposal flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

2.3.4 **Deficiency** – Is a material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.

2.3.5 **Team Member** – Is any critical subcontractor that will have program level responsibility and oversight whose, capability, certifications, capacity, or qualifications are utilized to satisfy the Technical Factor.

2.4 **FACTOR ONE, TECHNICAL -** The technical evaluation provides for two distinct but related assessments (Technical and Technical Risk). These two ratings impact the rating of each technical sub-factor.

2.4.1 **Technical Rating** - The Technical Rating provides an assessment of the quality and feasibility of the offeror's solution for meeting the Government's requirements.

2.4.1.1 Technical sub-factors One, Two, and Three will be evaluated and given a Technical Color Rating IAW Table 1A. An "Unacceptable" Rating IAW Table 1A for these sub-factors will render a proposal un-awardable.

2.4.1.2 Technical Risk Rating – A separate assessment of Technical Risk IAW Table 2 below, considers potential for disruption of schedule, increased costs, degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight, or the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance. An "Unacceptable" Rating IAW Table 2 for this assessment will render a proposal un-awardable.

Table 1A - Technical Color Ratings

Color	Rating	Description
Blue	Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths.
Purple	Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength.
Green	Acceptable	Proposal indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements.
Yellow	Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements.
Red	Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation and, thus, contains one or more deficiencies and is unawardable.

Table 2 - Technical Risk Ratings

Rating	Description
Low	Proposal may contain weakness(es) which have little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and normal Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.
Moderate	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which may potentially cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome difficulties.
High	Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which is likely to cause significant disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Is unlikely to overcome any difficulties, even with special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring.
Unacceptable	Proposal contains a material failure or a combination of significant weaknesses that increases the risk of unsuccessful performance to an unacceptable level.

2.5 FACTOR TWO, PRICE – A price evaluation will be performed for all offerors IAW Section 4 (Volume II – Factor Two, Price) of this document, and proposals will be evaluated based on a Total Evaluated Price (TEP).

2.6 FACTOR THREE, PAST PERFORMANCE – A past performance evaluation will be performed for all offerors. Past performance will be evaluated for Recency (IAW 5.3.1), Relevancy (IAW 5.4 and Table 4) and quality (IAW 5.5), and will receive an overall Performance rating based on the definitions in Table 3.

3. VOLUME I – FACTOR ONE, TECHNICAL

3.1 Sub-factor One, Remanufacture Capability and Capacity: This sub-factor is acceptable when it provides a remanufacture plan that thoroughly demonstrates experience and capability to remanufacture the entire 767-300F shipset, covering all processes from start to finish IAW TRD Appendix C, paragraph 2.0 - 2.18. The plan must also provide evidence that the offeror possesses facilities and equipment with the capacity to remanufacture Landing Gear shipsets IAW the TCI schedule (section J attachment 5). The prime contractor shall possess the in-house capacity and capabilities to meet the majority of the throughput requirements. Evidence shall include:

3.1.1 A diagram that clearly illustrates the physical layout of the primary facility or facilities where the offeror proposes to perform remanufacture and the interior layout (including interior square footage) of each location. This diagram shall also provide evidence that the facility can accommodate all necessary equipment to satisfy the remanufacturing requirements.

3.1.2 Identification of the equipment the offeror will use to complete each remanufacturing process and demonstrate how that specific equipment will be used to meet the requirements of TRD Appendix C paragraph 2.0 Remanufacturing Process.

3.1.3 Proof of possession must be demonstrated through written documentation such as a lease agreement, property deed, etc. that demonstrates possession of the facilities for the life of the contract.

3.1.4 FAA compliance / Offeror holds a Title 14 CFR Part 145 Certified Repair Station certificate per 14 CFR 145.61.b.7 landing gear accessory.

3.1.5 Provide evidence of AS9110 certification.

In addition, the remanufacture plan must also comprehensively address the following areas:

3.1.6 Sourcing for all subcomponents required for remanufacturing while adhering to lead time requirements and guaranteeing parts availability including risk mitigation to absorb any supply inconsistencies.

3.1.7 Provide a description of the engineering approach for addressing parts or processes that are not in conformance with technical data criteria. The offeror must detail how engineering will assess the non-conformance, determine the appropriate corrective action, and ensure compliance with all applicable technical data and regulatory requirements.

3.1.8 Describe a plan and approach for meeting the Parts Control Program requirements detailed in TRD Appendix C, paragraph 2.4. In addition, explain how the offerors proposed Parts Control Program will fulfill the reporting and tracking requirements outlined in TRD Appendix C, paragraphs 2.4.1 and 2.4.2.

To exceed this sub-factor, the proposal must demonstrate a proactive, innovative, or value-added approach to remanufacture capability and capacity that goes beyond minimum requirements and provides clear advantages to the Government during contract performance.

This includes comprehensive approaches such as:

- Proactive capacity planning and optimization
- Innovative facility layout and workflow design
- Advanced sourcing and supply chain management
- Strategic engineering solutions

Additionally, proposals that identify and discuss differences between the 767-300F and -2C landing gear, demonstrating understanding of any additional equipment, support material, or spare parts required for the remanufacturing process and the associated risks and mitigation strategies, may be viewed as a strength.

3.2. Sub-factor Two, Exchange Lead Time (ELT, Shipsets): This sub-factor is acceptable when an approach demonstrates how the offeror will achieve the 82-day ELT metric for 767-300F shipset remanufacture, as outlined in TRD Appendix B, paragraphs 2.0 - 2.2. In addition, the following information is required:

3.2.1 A detailed description, schedule, and flow chart of the entire remanufacturing process, from the date the asset was received to final delivery.

3.2.2 Specific time intervals for; disassembly, cleaning, assembly, paint, plating, baking, inspection, stripping, NDI, machining, temper etch, functional test/check, and packaging/shipping.

3.2.3 Address any subcontracting efforts and associated timelines required to support the 82-day ELT.

3.2.4 Identify risk mitigation strategies for situations that may arise during the re-manufacturing process. (e.g. situations where a supplier is late, a machine is down, etc.).

3.2.5 A detailed and comprehensive transition plan demonstrating the ability to achieve full operational support within the specified timeframe (Minimum of 3 months) between contract award and the first shipset delivery date. This plan must ensure 100% supportability upon the delivery of the first shipset IAW with Appendix A paragraph 1.0 Phase–In.

This plan must specifically describe any manpower gaps to include a detailed staffing ramp-up plan, clearly state the existing manpower levels as a percentage of the total required workforce at the time of proposal submission and project the anticipated manpower percentage at the expected contract award date. Additionally, a clear breakout by position, outlining current staffing and the staffing required to achieve full supportability. Including all training of personnel, schedules, and estimated completion times to ensure all personnel are fully equipped to perform their duties by contract award.

The sub-factor is exceeded when the proposal clearly articulates and substantiates a proactive, innovative, and value-added approach that goes beyond simply meeting the minimum requirements. This may be achieved through clearly defined ELT reduction strategies, robust risk mitigation plans, and demonstrable continuous process improvement initiatives that will be advantageous to the Government during contract performance.

3.3. Sub-factor Three, Remanufacture Turn Around Time (RTAT, Sub-Components): This sub-factor is acceptable when an approach is provided that details and demonstrates a step-by-step process for meeting subcomponent RTAT, in accordance with TRD Appendix B, paragraphs 3.0 - 3.2. The approach must include a detailed description and flow chart of the complete remanufacturing process for each of the specified NSNs:

A. NSN: 1560-01-689-8315, P/N: 161T1133-1, MLG Tow Fitting Assembly
B. NSN: 1560-01-694-8122, P/N: 162T1400-1, NLG Torque Tube Support
C. NSN: 1620-01-655-8317, P/N: 161T1131-19, MLG Bogie Beam Assembly

The approach must also, for each NSN listed above:

3.3.1 Detail the time required for completion of each individual step within the remanufacturing process, starting from the initial asset receipt and concluding with the final delivery. The submission must also clearly indicate the overall proposed lead time for the entire process.

3.3.2 Identify any process constraints and how they will be overcome.

3.3.3 Identify where any subcontracting or shipping is performed.

3.3.4 Specifically describe each process required to remanufacture each NSN, to include all tooling, equipment, and material necessary for proper and complete re-manufacture. Also includes detailed descriptions for; disassembly,

cleaning, assembly, paint, plating, baking, inspection, stripping, NDI, machining, temper etch, functional test/check, DCMA inspection, and packaging/shipping.

The sub-factor is exceeded when the offeror's approach reflects process and procedure improvements that will likely result in; improved asset availability, improved asset reliability, and significant long-term enhancements to sub-component remanufacture turnaround times.

4. VOLUME II – FACTOR TWO, PRICE

4.1 The criteria used for evaluation of the Price Factor will be (1) Completeness, (2) Reasonableness, (3) Balance, (4) Realism (if necessary), and (5) Total Evaluated Price (TEP). The TEP will be computed and provided to the Source Selection Authority (SSA) for award purposes only and does not become part of the contract at award. However, all proposed rates and elements used to calculate the TEP will be fixed and contractually binding.

4.2 Evaluation of potential Options shall not obligate the Government to exercise such Options.

4.3 Completeness: The Government will review the pricing submissions for completeness and compliance with Section L of the RFP. Incomplete price submissions may not be evaluated, and the proposal may be eliminated from the competition.

4.4 Reasonableness: For a price to be considered reasonable, it must represent a price to the Government that a prudent person would pay when consideration is given to prices in the market. Generally adequate price competition is sufficient to satisfy the requirement for ensuring price reasonableness. If adequate price competition is not obtained or if price reasonableness cannot be determined, additional information will be required to support the proposed price. All CLINs will be reviewed for price reasonableness IAW the techniques described in FAR 15.404-1.

4.5 Balance: Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable TEP, the price of one or more line items is significantly overstated or understated as indicated by the application of analysis techniques such as those defined by FAR Part 15.404-1, Proposal Analysis Techniques. The Government will analyze proposals to determine whether they are unbalanced with respect to prices, disclosed elements of price, and separately priced line items in accordance with FAR 15.404-1. An offer may be rejected if the CO determines that the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.

4.6 Realism: The Government may, if necessary, conduct a price realism analysis IAW FAR 15.404-1, in order to measure the offerors understanding of the contract requirements and support the assessment of risk inherent to the proposed approach. If a price realism analysis is conducted, it will not result in any adjustment to the offeror's price.

4.7 Total Evaluated Price (TEP) will be comprised of the sum of the following:

4.7.1 The sum of the offerors proposed Annual Firm Fixed Price per Remanufacture for the 3 KC-46 LG shipset NSNs listed in the TEP worksheet (Tab 2, TCI Shipset Pricing) multiplied by Government derived notional TCI inductions.

4.7.2 The sum of the offerors proposed Annual Firm Fixed Price per Eaches, for all sub-component NSNs listed in the TEP worksheet (Tab 3, Sub-Component Pricing) multiplied by the notional demand quantities provided by the Government.

4.7.2.1 The government has set a Not To Exceed (NTE) Remanufacture Turn Turnaround Time (RTAT) for sub-component National Stock Numbers (NSNs). This RTAT, based on industry market research and comparable assets, is considered achievable. Offerors must propose their optimal RTAT for sub-component support. While the Offerors proposed RTAT will not be evaluated against price or subject to a price/RTAT trade-off during source selection, it is a required submission. Submissions must also include 1-year of pricing and corresponding quantity ranges, consistent with the examples and instructions provided in the Total Evaluated Price (TEP) Workbook. Upon contract award and successful completion of all source selection evaluation criteria, the awardee's proposed RTAT will be incorporated as the contractual commitment.

4.8 Notional NSN quantities will be established using descriptive statistics to derive realistic expectations from historical requirements data. An annual order simulation will apply fixed notional quantities to each priced item, the notional number for a given NSN will automatically populate to the appropriate quantity range. Notional numbers will be applied equally to all proposals.

4.9 Proposed Prices shall be fully burdened and include all direct costs, indirect costs (Overhead, General and Administrative, etc.) and profit necessary for the performance of the entire requirement.

4.10 A no price or an omitted rate may result in an incomplete price submission.

5. VOLUME III – FACTOR THREE, PAST PERFORMANCE

5.1 Evaluation Process: The past performance evaluation considers each offeror's demonstrated recent and relevant record of performance in supplying products and services that meet the KC-46 LG PBL solicitation requirements. 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 available to the Government. Other sources include, but are not limited to: the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS); Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS); Electronic Subcontract Reporting System (eSRS), or other databases; and interviews/questionnaires with Government personnel, e.g. Program Managers and Contracting Officers (COs), Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA), as well as commercial sources.

5.2 The past performance evaluation results in an assessment of the offeror's probability of meeting the KC-46 LG PBL solicitation requirements. The past performance rating is based on the offeror's overall record of recency, relevancy, and quality of performance. For the past performance factor offerors will receive one of the performance ratings IAW Table 3 below.

Note: In the case of an offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available or so sparse that no meaningful past performance rating can be reasonably assigned, the offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance (see FAR 15.305 [a] [2] [iv]). Therefore, the offeror shall be determined to have unknown (or "neutral") past performance. In the context of acceptability/unacceptability, a neutral rating shall be considered acceptable.

Table 3 – Past Performance Acceptable/Unacceptable Method

Adjectival Rating	Description
Acceptable	Based on the offeror's performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort, or the offeror's performance record is unknown (see note above).
Unacceptable	Based on the offeror's performance record, the Government does not have a reasonable expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

5.3 When evaluating offeror's past performance, only recent and relevant past performance information will be considered.

5.3.1 Recency is defined as contract performance less than five years from the date of issuance of the solicitation.

5.4 Relevancy Assessment: The Government will conduct an evaluation of all recent performance information obtained to determine whether the products provided/services performed under those contracts relate to the technical sub-factors. For each recent past performance citation reviewed, the relevance of the work performed will be assessed for the Technical sub-factors. (However, all aspects of performance that relate to this acquisition may be considered). A relevancy determination of the offeror's past performance will be made based upon the aforementioned considerations, including all sub-factors identified in RFP Section J, Attachment 11 (Team List, Roles, and Responsibilities). In determining the relevancy of effort performed under individual past performance contracts, the Government will only consider the specific effort or portion consistent with that proposed by the prime, subcontractor or teaming partner. The Past Performance Information Sheets (PPISs) and information obtained from other sources will be used to establish the relevancy of past performance. The Government will use the following relevancy definitions when assessing recent contracts.

Table 4 - Relevancy Ratings

Rating	Descriptions

RELEVANT	Present/past performance effort involved similar 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.

5.5 Quality Assessment: The government will derive quality of performance from the results/level of success on previous contracts as outlined in the PPIS and other sources.

5.6 Assigning Ratings: As a result of the relevancy and quality assessments of the recent contracts evaluated, offerors will receive a past performance rating IAW Table 3. The Past Performance Evaluation Team will review all past performance, general trends, and usefulness of the information and incorporate these into the past performance rating. Although the past performance evaluation focuses on performance that is relevant to the Technical sub-factors, the resulting performance rating is made at the factor level and represents an overall evaluation of contractor performance. Past performance regarding predecessor companies, or subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement will be evaluated on an equal basis to the evaluation of the prime contractor's past performance.

6. VOLUME IV, CONTRACT DOCUMENTATION

6.1 This volume will be reviewed for completeness. The offeror's proposal shall include a signed copy of the SF 1449, Sections A through K, signed amendments to the solicitation (if any), and all other information required by Section L - ITO, Volume IV - Contract Documentation. An incomplete package may be excluded from the competitive range and award.

6.2 The proposal shall contain evidence of adequate financial resources. Acceptable evidence consists of a commitment or explicit arrangement that will be in existence at the time of contract award, to acquire the needed materials, equipment, personnel and other resources necessary to sustain operations.

7. SOLICITATION REQUIREMENTS, TERMS, AND CONDITIONS

7.1 Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as evaluation factors or sub-factors. Failure to meet a requirement may result in an offer being ineligible for award. Offerors must clearly identify any exception to the solicitation terms and conditions and provide complete accompanying rationale.

8. PRE-AWARD SURVEY

8.1 The Government may conduct a Pre-Award Survey (PAS) as part of this source selection. Results of the PAS (if conducted) will be evaluated to determine each Offeror's capability to meet the requirements of the solicitation.