SECTION M

1. Multiple Awards

1.1. The Government intends to make multiple IDIQ contract awards and one TO award resulting from this solicitation. Initial awards will occur in two cycles: (1) award of COMET IDIQ contract(s); and (2) award of one live TO in the (BLANK) quarter FY XXXX (anticipated).

2. EVALUATION FACTORS AND SUBFACTORS:

2.1. Phase 1 (IDIQ Award)

The Government will use the following evaluation Factors and Subfactors to evaluate each Offeror's Proposal. Award will be made to the Offeror proposing the combination most advantageous to the Government based upon an integrated assessment of the evaluation Factors and Subfactors described in Table 1, with the following requirements:

- To be eligible for award an Offeror must receive a rating of Pass for Factor I (Security). An Offeror receiving a rating of Fail for Factor 1 will not receive further evaluation.
- To be eligible for an IDIQ award an Offeror must receive an Acceptable rating for all Factors.
- Within any Factor or Subfactor, each Measure of Merit is of equal importance.

The evaluation of proposals will consider two groups of Offerors: Other Than Small Business and Small Business. When considering the relative merit of each proposal, comparisons will be made separately for each group (i.e., Other Than Small Business proposals will not be compared with Small Business proposals, and vice-versa).

2.2. Phase 2 (TO Award)

TO Award (This Section XX applies only after the IDIQ contracts are awarded).

- Within Factor V, all Measures of Merit are of equal importance.

Fair Opportunity in Accordance with FAR 16.505(b). The Government will make an award determination for the TO award using Phase 2 process of this proposal.

3. The Government intends to award a single (Contract Type to be Determined) Task Order as a result of this solicitation but reserves the right to make no award if it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government. The Task Order award will be made to the Highest Technically Evaluated Proposal HiTERP offeror. The HiTERP will be determined via the multi-step process described below. The Government further intends to request a Price Proposal from only the HiTERP Offeror to ensure the Government is receiving a Fair and Reasonable

Price. The Highest Technically Rated Offeror's Price proposal will be compared to the other offeror's price submissions to aid in the Government's price/cost analysis in making a fair and reasonable determination. Award will be made to the responsible Offeror whose proposal represents the best solutions to the Government. The Government may make no contract award where it concludes that no proposal exists with a reasonable probability of achieving program and contract terms and conditions at an acceptable risk or price. RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF THE EVALUATION FACTORS: All evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined are significantly more important than cost or price.

4. MULTI-STEP PROCESS: In accordance with FAR 16.505(b), this provides for streamlined ordering procedures that include the multi-step process described below.

5. Offerors may be eliminated from consideration for award at any step of the process and / or may not be permitted to advance to a subsequent step at the discretion of the Government. Examples of when an offeror may be eliminated from consideration or not permitted to advance to a subsequent step include but are not limited to the following: the offeror' s proposal does not comply with proposal instructions; the offeror' s proposal is deemed unacceptable under a step; the offeror' s proposal is not likely to be selected for award; the offeror's proposal is not the most highly evaluated; or the offeror' s price proposal is deemed not fair and reasonable.

6. An offeror eliminated from consideration may be readmitted at the discretion of the Government and a readmitted offeror may be allowed to advance to subsequent steps. Examples of when re-admission may occur include when the Government is unable to negotiate a fair and reasonable price in the final step.

7. An offeror permitted to advance to a subsequent step will be given an opportunity to submit the corresponding step proposal if the step proposal has not otherwise already been submitted.

8. OFFEROR RESPONSIBILITY AND ELIGIBILITY FOR AWARD: Per FAR 9.103, contracts will be placed only with contractors that the Contracting Officer determines to be responsible; that is, those who can satisfactorily perform the necessary tasks and deliver the required services on time. Prospective Offerors, to qualify as sources for this acquisition, must be able to demonstrate that they meet the standards of responsibility set forth in FAR 9.104. In addition, the Government may assess each Offeror's financial ability to meet the TOPR requirements. The Government reserves the right to conduct a Pre-Award Survey on any or all Offerors (or their Significant Subcontractors) to aid the CO on the evaluation of each Offeror's proposal and ensure that a selected contractor is responsible. No award can be

made to an Offeror who has been determined to be not responsible by the Contracting Officer.

9. REJECTION OF OFFERORS: Offerors shall carefully read, understand, and provide all the information requested in the Proposal Submission section. If there are parts of the Proposal Submission section instruction the Offeror does not understand, the Offeror may request clarification from the Contracting Officer in writing before the closing date of the TOPR. In accordance with FAR 52.215-1, contained in the TOPR, the Government may reject any or all proposal is such action is in the Government's interest. Examples include, but are not limited to, the following:

10. The proposal fails to meaningfully respond to the Proposal Preparation Instructions specified in the Proposal Submission section of this solicitation. Examples of failure to meaningfully respond include:

11. When an Offeror's proposal merely offers to perform work according to the TOPR terms or fails to present more than a statement indicating its capability to comply with the TOPR terms or does not provide support and detail as specified in this solicitation.

12. When an Offeror's proposal provides some data and information, but omits significant material data and information required.

13. When an Offeror's proposal merely repeats the contract PWS without elaboration.

14. The Government may reject any Offeror's proposal that offers a product or service that does not meet all stated material requirements of the TOPR.

15. The Government may reject an Offeror's proposal that takes exception(s) to the attachments, exhibits, enclosures, or other TOPR terms and conditions.

16. The Government may reject any Offeror's proposal that is unbalanced as to price in accordance with FAR 15.404-1(g).

17. The Government will reject any Offeror's proposal that is late. Late proposals that are rejected will not be evaluated. It is the responsibility of the Offeror to ensure that its proposal is received in a timely manner. Offerors are responsible for submitting proposals, and any modification, or revisions, so as to reach the Government office designated in the solicitation by the time specified in the TOPR. In accordance with FAR 15.208(b), any proposal, modification, or revision that is received at the Government office designated in the this solicitation after the exact time specified for receipt of offers is late and will not be considered unless it is received before award is made; and the CO determines that accepting

the late offer would not unduly delay the acquisition; and if it was transmitted through an electronic commerce method authorized by the solicitation, it was received at the initial point of entry to the Government infrastructure not later than 5:00 P.M. ET (Eastern Time) one working day prior to the date specified for receipt of proposals; or there is acceptable evidence to establish that is was received at the Government installation designated for receipt of offers and was under the Governments control prior to the time set for receipt of offers; or it is the only proposal received. However, a late modification of an otherwise successful proposal that makes its terms more favorable to the Government will be considered at any time it is received and may be accepted. Proposals may be withdrawn by written notice received at any time before award.

18. The Government may reject an Offeror's proposal that obtains a rating of unacceptable for any technical requirement set forth in the Technical Factor.

Table 1: Evaluation Factors (Phase 1)
Factor I: Security (Pass/Fail)
Factor II: Technical/Management Capability
Factor III: Past Performance
Factor IV: Small Business Participation Commitment
Table 1: Evaluation Factors (Phase 2)
Factor V: Scenario - Air Defense Weapon System Detailed Analysis
Factor VI: TO Cost Proposal

19. FACTOR I: SECURITY (Pass/Fail)

Each offer will be evaluated to determine that all corporate Security documentation requirements are met as specified in PWS 5.2. This is a Pass/Fail factor. If the Offeror **does not** receive a Pass in the Security Factor of the Proposal, the Proposal will not be evaluated further.

According to PWS 5.2.1, the Offeror has the option of submitting documentation for an existing SCIF (Option 1), or submitting a SCIF Development Plan (Option 2) demonstrating the Offeror's capability and intent to develop the required SCIF capability. If Option 1 is selected, the documentation will be reviewed in this Security Factor to determine if the documentation is complete and if the SCIF meets the requirements specified in PWS 5.2.1.1. If Option 2 is selected, the SCIF Development Plan documentation will be reviewed in this

Security Factor to determine if all the required components were provided, but the SCIF Development Plan will be evaluated in the Technical/Management Factor 1, Subfactor 2.2, Program Management Processes, for its technical merit to meet the requirements in PWS 5.2.1.2.

During evaluations of each Proposal, the Government will assign a rating based on the ratings defined in Table 2, Security Assessment Rating, and provide a written narrative supporting the evaluation as either Pass or Fail.

Table 2: Security Assessment Rating	
Rating	**Narrative**
Pass	The prime Offeror, at the time of Proposal submission, demonstrated the existence of a SCIF that meets the requirements, or has provided a complete SCIF Development Plan.
Fail	The prime Offeror, at the time of Proposal submission, has not demonstrated the existence of a SCIF that meets the requirements, and has not provided a complete SCIF Development Plan.

3. FACTOR II: TECHNICAL/MANAGEMENT CAPABILITY

Technical/Management Capability will be rated as Acceptable or Unacceptable.

Table 3: Combined Technical/Management Risk Ratings	
Rating	**Description**
Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths and weaknesses are offsetting or will have little or no impact on contract performance. Risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies and is not awardable. Proposals receiving unacceptable ratings will be eliminated from further consideration.

3.1 Subfactor 2.1: Scientific & Technical Intelligence Capabilities

The Government will assess the Offeror's Proposal for determination of the Offeror's depth and breadth of technical experience across MSIC Missions and Domains (PWS paragraphs 1.1 and 1.2), and will differentiate proposals based on the following:

Measure of Merit 2.1.1: Foundational & Technical Intelligence. Degree to which the Offeror clearly addresses and articulates their experience, knowledge, and skills to perform Foundational & Technical Intelligence as described in PWS paragraph 1.1.1.

Measure of Merit 2.1.2: Foreign Missile Exploitation. Degree to which the Offeror clearly addresses and articulates their experience, knowledge, and skills to perform Foreign Material Exploitation as described in PWS paragraph 1.1.2.

Measure of Merit 2.1.3: Information Technology Operations. Degree to which the Offeror clearly addresses and articulates their experience, knowledge, and skills to perform Information Technology Operations as described in PWS paragraph 1.1.3.

Measure of Merit 2.1.4: Modeling & Simulation. Degree to which the Offeror clearly addresses and articulates their experience, knowledge, and skills to perform Modeling & Simulation as described in PWS paragraph 1.1.4.

Proposals will not be eligible for award unless the overall Subfactor 2.1 rating is deemed "Acceptable" or better.

3.2 Subfactor 2.2: Program Management Processes

The Government will assess the Offeror's proposed organization and management structure to meet the requirements of the COMET IDIQ PWS. The Government will differentiate proposals based on the following:

Measure of Merit 2.2.1: Subcontractor Management. Degree to which the Offeror clearly addresses and articulates a sound approach to manage subcontractors utilized on the contract.

Measure of Merit 2.2.2: Organizational Conflict of Interest. Degree to which the Offeror clearly addresses and articulates an approach that ensures detection, disclosure, avoidance and mitigation of OCI issues and risks, to include those resulting from teaming arrangements, at the COMET IDIQ contract and task order levels. The approach must include adequate employee conflict of interest training and compliance with non-disclosure policies and directives and include specific Prime experience or staff qualifications to substantiate the Offeror's capability.

Measure of Merit 2.2.3: IDIQ Management. Degree to which the Offeror clearly addresses and articulates a sound approach to manage the COMET IDIQ contract, maintain continuity of mission support during transition following award, and cites specific Prime experience as appropriate to substantiate Offeror's capability to successfully manage multiple annual task orders on an IDIQ and/or individual services contracts.

Measure of Merit 2.2.4: Human Resources. Degree to which the Offeror clearly addresses and articulates a sound approach to perform approximately 75% of the work within 25 miles of Redstone Arsenal, AL; reflects a sound management strategy including the ability and experience to attract, recruit, hire, train, and retain qualified management and technical personnel to meet contract and task order requirements.

Measure of Merit 2.2.5: Security. Degree to which the Offeror clearly addresses and articulates a sound approach for security procedures, processes, and provision of SCI facilities. The Offeror must provide specific Prime experience as appropriate to substantiate the Offeror's capability to manage a TS//SCI contract.

4. FACTOR III: PAST PERFORMANCE

The past performance evaluation assesses the Offeror's probability of meeting the solicitation requirements. The past performance evaluation considers each Offeror's demonstrated recent and relevant record of performance in supplying services that meet the contract's requirements.

4.1 Ratings. The Past Performance Factor will receive one of the performance relevancy ratings described below in Table 4: Past Performance Relevancy Ratings and one of the performance confidence assessments described below in Table 5: Performance Confidence Assessment Ratings.

4.2 Evaluation Process. The past performance evaluation considers the Offeror's recent past performance, focusing on performance that is relevant to the contract requirements. 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 independently obtained from other Government sources such as the Contractor Performance Assessment Rating Systems (CPARS) and Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) or similar systems, Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA), and commercial sources. Adverse past performance records that are considered recent and relevant will be evaluated and included as part of the Confidence Assessment.

4.3 Recency Assessment. An evaluation of the past performance information will be made to determine if the Offeror and the prime Offeror's teaming partners, joint ventures, and/or significant subcontractors provided past performance information within three (3) years prior to Proposal submission, or for ongoing efforts, if they were in place at least nine (9)

months before the Proposal due date. Past performance information that fails this condition will be assessed as "not meeting the recency requirement." A teaming partner, joint venture and/or significant subcontractor is considered to be a company that provides 20% or more of the support required, and/or a company that provides a critical portion of the effort required and/or that influences the results of performance.

4.4 Relevancy Assessment. The Government will assess the Offeror's capability to perform task orders under the COMET IDIQ contract by evaluating the past performance information, of either a prime contractor or a subcontractor, on previous or on-going contracts with similar scopes. Only relevant past performance efforts completed within the last three (3) years, prior to Proposal submission, or for ongoing efforts will be evaluated. More relevant past performance will typically be a stronger predictor of future success and have more influence on the past performance confidence assessment than past performance of lesser relevance. All past performance efforts rated as "Not Relevant" will not be evaluated for performance confidence assessment. The lack of relevant past performance information will result in an "Unknown Confidence" (Neutral) rating (i.e., neither favorable nor unfavorable). In conducting relevancy determination, each reference shall be assigned one of the ratings in the Table 4, Past Performance Relevancy Ratings.

Table 4: Past Performance Relevancy Ratings

Degree	Description
Very Relevant (VR)	Past/present performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Relevant (R)	Past/present performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Somewhat Relevant (SR)	Past/present performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

Not Relevant (NR)	Past/present performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

4.5 Confidence Assessment. The Government will review this past performance information and determine the quality and usefulness as it applies to the performance confidence assessment. The Government will review past performance in the areas of Quality, Schedule, Cost Control, Business Relations, and Management of Key Personnel. The Government may use additional information that is readily available to the Government including both the information received from Offerors, information contained in the Past Performance Questionnaires, and information obtained from other sources. During the evaluation of an Offeror's past performance, the Government may query the Government agency references provided by the Offeror. Other sources may include interviews with program managers and contracting officers, available DoD and other agency past performance databases and available data from previous source selections or contractor capability assessments. Offerors are reminded that both independent data and data provided by Offerors in their proposals may be used to evaluate Offeror past performance. The Government does not assume the duty to search for data to cure problems it finds in proposals. The Offeror bears the burden of demonstrating the quality of its past performance. Offerors may be asked to respond to adverse past performance information. In conducting a performance confidence assessment, each Offeror shall be assigned one of the ratings in the Table 5, Performance Confidence Assessment Ratings.

Table 5: Performance Confidence Assessment Ratings

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.
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 successfully perform the required effort.
Unknown Confidence (Neutral)	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.

6. FACTOR IV: SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION COMMITMENT

The small business goal of 30% established below is mandatory. To be deemed Acceptable an Offeror must propose to meet or exceed one or more socioeconomic objective/goals below. None of the socioeconomic categories' objective/goals below 2% shall be rated UNACCEPTABLE.

The Government will evaluate the extent to which the Offeror meets or exceeds the socioeconomic objectives / goals below. For Other Than Small Businesses, the goals are based on subcontracted value. For Small Business, the goals are based on total contract value.

Total Small Business Goal (Mandatory):

Small Business: {30%}

Socioeconomic objectives / goals for the contract are as follows.

(None of the socioeconomic categories's objective/goals below shall be lower than 2%):

Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB): {5.0%}

Woman-Owned Small Business (WOSB): {5.0%}

Historically Underutilized Business Zone (HUBZone) Small Business: {3.0%}

Service-Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business (SDVOSB): {3.0%}

(Note, for example, that a participation plan that reflects {1%} of the contract value for WOSB would also count towards the overall Small Business Goal of 30%.)

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's Proposal to identify all teaming partners and describe the complexity and variety of work each Small Business will perform.

The Government will evaluate the Other Than Small Business's recent and relevant past performance in compliance with FAR 52.219-8 "Utilization of Small Business Concerns" and maximizing opportunities for US Small Businesses. The Offeror shall provide justification for non-compliance of FAR 52.219-8. Small businesses will not be evaluated for compliance with FAR 52.219-8.

Table 6: Small Business Participation Commitment Document Rating Method

Adjectival Rating	Description
Acceptable	Proposal indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the Small Business objectives.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet Small Business objectives and is considered unawardable.

Phase 2

Only Proposals Evaluated as Overall Acceptable in Phase I will be awarded the IDIQ. IDIQ Recipients will be continued to be evaluated in Factor V and a Price or Cost Proposal will be requested for evaluation of Factor VI and possible award of the Active TO. Offerors receiving an Overall UNACCEPTABLE in Phase I will be notified their proposal will not be evaluated further.

Factor 6 will be The Offeror's approach to executing the SCENARIO/TO SPECIFICATIONS. The Offeror will be rated jointly with the risk associated with its technical solution. The technical and risk rating evaluates the quality of the Offeror's technical expertise and solution for meeting the Government's requirement. Factor 6 will receive one of the adjectival ratings described in Table 3, Combined Technical/Management Risk Ratings.

The combined technical/ risk rating includes consideration of risk in conjunction with the strengths and weaknesses associated with an Offeror's proposed approach and includes an assessment of the potential for disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight, and the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance.

The rating depicts how well the Offeror's Proposal meets the solicitation requirements.

A **Significant Strength** is defined as an aspect of an Offeror's Proposal that appreciably increases the likelihood of successful contract performance.

A **Strength** is defined as 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.

A **Weakness** is defined as a flaw in an Offeror's Proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

A **Significant Weakness** is a flaw in an Offeror's Proposal that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

A **Deficiency** is defined as a material failure of an Offeror's Proposal to meet the Government requirement or a combination of significant weakness in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.

Table 7: Combined Technical/Management Risk Ratings	
Rating	**Description**
Outstanding	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of requirements. Strengths far outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is very low.
Good	Proposal meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal contains strengths which outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths and weaknesses are offsetting or will have little or no impact on contract performance. Risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Marginal	Proposal does not clearly meet requirements and has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. The Proposal has one or more weaknesses which are not offset by strengths. Risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies and is not awardable. Proposals receiving unacceptable ratings will be eliminated from further consideration.

FACTOR V: SCENARIO/TO SPECIFICATIONS

Scenario: Air Defense Weapon System Detailed Analysis

The Government will assess the Offeror's Proposal to determine the degree to which they demonstrate sound technical knowledge and understanding to address the Scenario defined in Attachment X, and will differentiate proposals based on the following:

Measure of Merit 5.1: Technical Management / Analytic Approach. Degree to which the proposed technical management and analytic approach addresses the complexity of collaboration, integration, communication, and classified technical data transfer across multiple Defense Intelligence Enterprise mission partners, other Government mission partners, sub-contractors, and other Government contractors' to successfully meet the requirement;

Measure of Merit 5.2: Resourcing. Degree to which the proposed usage of labor categories, availability of personnel, experience levels, and supporting rationale would result in successful execution of the requirements;

Measure of Merit 5.3: Technical Analysis. Degree to which the proposed types of information, single source intelligence analysis, all-source intelligence fusion, modeling and simulation, and the rationale for the analytic approach is logical, feasible and would comprehensively address the all-source scientific and technical intelligence (S&TI) requirements;

Measure of Merit 5.4: Documentation, Databases, and M&S. Degree to which the proposed production process(es) / databases / workflows, written product type(s), computer generated data, modeling and simulation verification and validation (V&V) documentation, and any post-production or peripheral efforts would result in successful execution of the requirement;

Measure of Merit 5.5: Program Management. Degree to which the proposed project management scheme supports successful execution of the requirement; and

Measure of Merit 5.6: Delivery Workflow and Tradecraft. Degree to which the proposed analytic intelligence production processes, methodologies, and adherence to analytic tradecraft & standards would meet the requirement.

7. FACTOR VI: TO Cost/Price (Applicable only after contract award for purposes of awarding the TO)

The Government intends to award the TO as a (TBD Contract Type) TO. The Government will evaluate price for completeness and reasonableness. The realism of proposed may be evaluated depending on contract type. This TO is expected to be awarded in January 2019.

The Government will evaluate options in accordance with FAR clause 52.217-5, Evaluation of Options, July 1990, as prescribed in FAR 17.208(c)(1) plus for evaluation purposes the option to extend services under FAR Clause 52.217-8, Option to Extend Services, and DARSI provision 1052.217-91, Evaluation of Options, The Government will evaluate the Option to Extend Services by using the prices offered for the last option period to determine the price for a 6-month option period, which will be added to the base and other option years to arrive at the total price.

The Government will multiply the specified hours in the spreadsheet by the labor rate input by the offeror, and total all lines (base and option periods) to calculate the total evaluated price.