Call for Solution for
Guam Defense System (GDS) Battle Manager Suite

Project Number	N/A
Munitions Open Solicitation for Advanced and Innovative Capabilities (MOSAIC) Call Number	MOSAIC-26-04
Call for Solution Title	Guam Defense System (GDS) Battle Manager Suite (BMS)
Issued By	Portfolio Acquisition Executive (PAE) Fires, 5250 Martin Road Redstone Arsenal, AL 35898
Submission Instructions	To respond to this Call for Solution, please refer to Sections 7 and 10 of this Call for Solution
*Solution Briefs Due Date/Time (Suspense)	15 July 2026 - 4:00 PM Eastern Time
Point(s) of Contact for Solution Brief Submission:	Agreements Officer Representative: Barbara Cantrell, barbara.a.cantrell2.civ@army.mil Agreements Specialist: Sydney Horn, sydney.m.horn.civ@army.mil

1.0 General

1.1 Introduction

Portfolio Acquisition Executive (PAE) Fires, on behalf of the Guam Defense System (GDS) Joint Project Office (JPO), is issuing a Request for Solution Brief (RFSB) with the intent of awarding one (1) or more Other Transaction Agreement for Prototype (pOTA) in accordance with (IAW) 10 U.S.C. § 4022. **Only U.S. companies with the ability to process and store SECRET information and hardware are eligible to submit a solutions brief.**

1.2 Project Description

The Battle Manager Suite (BMS) is a critical component of the GDS, serving as a joint Command and Control (C2) layer that integrates data from existing Department of Defense (DoD) C2 systems. The C2 data integration provides a comprehensive and unified capability to defend against both ballistic and non-ballistic threats.

Solution Briefs are sought to satisfy the GDS JPO requirements to prototype a BMS in support of the GDS JPO mission. This effort will design, develop, integrate, and test a secure, scalable, and flexible prototype BMS.

1.3 RFSB Overview and Key Milestones

PAE FIRES intends to exercise 10 U.SC. § 4022 authority. This RFSB and any subsequent activities are intended to satisfy competition requirements of the statute. This phased competition will consist of the following three (3) phases in the review and selection process as follows:

1. Phase 1 – RFSB: The Solutions Brief (SB) will be based on the attached Performance Work Statement. Instructions for submission provided in Paragraph 3.2 below.

2. Phase 2 – Vendor Demonstration: Following the evaluation of Solution Briefs, the Government may invite companies with particularly meritorious solutions to a capability demonstration. The Government reserves the right to limit the number of Demonstration invitations; therefore, a solution may be deemed to have merit but not be selected for a capability demonstration.

   The Government intends to issue a Request for Prototype Proposal (RFPP), subject to the availability of funding, to the most advantageous offeror invited to the demonstration.

   The Government may, at its discretion, elect to issue RFPPs prior to, simultaneously with, following, or without a Demonstration/Proposal invitation.

Any Solution Brief which offer to prototype beyond the scope of the PWS may be determined non-compliant and unacceptable and thus not further reviewed. The Government will not consider or evaluate any partial solutions.

Only U.S. companies with the ability to process and store SECRET information and hardware are eligible to submit a SB. Interested Offerors shall submit Commercial and Government Entity (CAGE) code and Offeror POC to the following Government Security POC:

- Mo Burbank, morris.w.burbank.civ@army.mil
- Barbara Cantrell at barbara.a.cantrell2.civ@army.mil
- Sydney M. Horn, sydney.m.horn.civ@army.mil

Upon validation of facility clearances, the Government will coordinate with the Offeror's POC to provide the CONTROLLED UNCLASSIFIED INFORMATION (CUI) PWS on the date indicated in Table 1. The PWS will support the creation of the Solution Brief technical content and the ROM cost. Offerors shall submit a Solution Brief in accordance with the Format and Content of Solution Brief described below. Failure to submit required CAGE Code information in a timely manner, or related Offeror errors, will not be a basis for extensions of time for questions or Solution Brief submissions.

Solution Briefs are due at **4:00 PM/1600 ET on 15 July 2026**, via the following PAE FIRES email addresses. Contact the individuals below if you require a DOD SAFE site drop for CUI submissions:

- Sydney M. Horn, sydney.m.horn.civ@army.mil
- Barbara Cantrell at barbara.a.cantrell2.civ@army.mil
- Simone Brightmon, simone.l.brightmon.civ@army.mil

Key Milestones are listed in Table 1 below. Dates are subject to change at Government's discretion.

RFSB Release Date	25 June 2026
Offeror Submission of CAGE Code	30 June 2026
Release of PWS to Cleared Offerors	01 July 2026
RFSB Questions Due	08 July 2026
RFSB Responses Due	15 July 2026
Demonstration Invite	07 August 2026
Demonstrations	17-21 August 2026
RFPP Release	28 September 2026
RFPP Responses Due	27 October 2026
OTA Award	TBD

TABLE 1

This RFSB consists of the submission of a SB, ROM and demonstrated performance data. If selected, a Request for Prototype Proposal (RFPP) to include a technical submission and cost proposal will be requested. This RFSB satisfies competition IAW 10 U.S.C. § 4022. Key milestones are listed in Table 1 and described in more detail below.

Upon validation of facility clearances, the Government will coordinate with the Offeror's POC to provide the CONTROLLED UNCLASSIFIED INFORMATION (CUI) Performance Work Statement (PWS) on the date indicated in Table 1. The PWS will support the creation of the SB technical content and the ROM costing. Offerors shall submit a SB in accordance with the Format of SBs and Content of SBs contained in Section 3.2 and 3.3, respectively. Failure to submit CAGE Code information in a timely manner, or related Vendor errors, will not be a basis for extensions of time for questions or SB submissions.

Upon receipt of SBs, the Government will evaluate submitted SBs IAW the specified SB Evaluation Criteria, Section 5.1. The Government will not consider or evaluate any partial solutions. At that time, the Government may elect to invite Offeror(s) to demonstrate their proposed solutions as described in Paragraph 5.2 Phase 2 Demonstration. This demonstration may involve Government feedback for improving what appears to be the best SB(s). Offerors that submitted SBs that are not selected for demonstration or award (or even additional presentation, if that occurs) may not be notified until after award.

The Government will notify the selected Offeror that submitted a SB deemed to represent the most advantageous solution to provide a RFPP including a cost proposal and suggested PWS changes to the Government. The Prototype Proposal will be evaluated as described in Paragraph 5.3 below.

All documents necessary for the review and evaluation of SBs, cost proposal submissions and updated PWS shall be provided as described in this RFSB.

1.4 Non-Government Personnel

Offerors are advised that employees of the firms identified below may serve as non-Government advisors in the review and evaluation of SBs. Such firms are expressly prohibited from competing on the subject acquisition. The non-Government advisors will be required to submit to the Government a Non-Disclosure Agreement reflecting the effort(s) that they will be supporting. The Offeror's submission of a SB under this RFSB indicates concurrence with the aforementioned use of non-Government advisors.

Capstone Research
6723 Odyssey Dr NW, Suite 320, Huntsville, AL 35806
POC: Melanie Swinea
Email: melanie.swinea@capstoneresearchcorp.com
Work phone: 256-724-7951

KODA Technologies
620 Discovery Drive Building 2, Suite 100 Huntsville, AL 35806
POC: Amanda Zimmerman
Email: amanda.zimmerman@kodatech.com
Work: (256) 509-2710

In accomplishing their duties related to the SB evaluation, the aforementioned firms may require access to proprietary information contained in the Offerors' SB. Therefore, these firms may execute an agreement with each Offeror that states that they will: (1) protect the Offerors' information from unauthorized use or disclosure for as long as it remains proprietary; and (2) refrain from using the

information for any purpose other than that for which it was furnished. To expedite the evaluation process, each Offeror must contact the above companies to effect execution of such an agreement prior to the submission of proposals. Each Offeror shall submit copies of the agreement with their SB, if applicable.

1.5 Points of Contact

All UNCLASSIFIED questions regarding SB submissions must be emailed to ALL the following personnel:

- Sydney M. Horn, sydney.m.horn.civ@army.mil
- Barbara Cantrell, barbara.a.cantrell2.civ@army.mil

1.6 Response Dates

Offerors must submit CAGE Code to Security POCs listed in Section 1.3 no later than 4:00 PM ET on 30 June 2026. Failure to submit CAGE Code information in a timely manner, or related Vendor errors will not be a basis for extensions of time for questions or SB submissions. All questions regarding this RFSB shall be submitted via email no later than 4:00 PM ET on 08 July 2026 to the points of contact listed in Section 1.5. All contacts listed in Section 1.5 must be included in the email. It is preferred that only one set of questions be submitted by each Offeror instead of submitting multiple sets of questions. Questions received by the Government after 4:00PM ET on 08 July 2026 may not be answered prior to the closing date/time for receipt of solution brief submissions. Questions submitted by any method other than email will not be accepted or answered. The Government may post responses to relevant questions received and any amendments issued as a result of submitted questions.

All SBs must be received no later than 4:00 PM ET on 15 July 2026 by the POCs listed in Section1.5. All contacts listed in Section 1.5 must be included in the email. It is the responsibility of the submitting party to confirm receipt of submissions.

Information and dates regarding questions about, and submission of, cost proposal will be included in the notifications sent to selected Offeror(s).

2.0 Award Information

2.1 Funding

The Government reserves the right to consider all, some, or none of the SBs or cost proposals received in response to this RFSB for selection of award. The Government reserves the right to cancel this RFSB at any time for any reason or for no reason. Issuance of this RFSB does not commit the Government to pay for any preparation costs incurred by the contractor in compiling a response to any aspect of this RFSB. All potential Offerors should be aware that due to unanticipated budget fluctuations, funding in any or all areas may change with little or no notice, and any award is subject to the availability of funding.

2.2 Instrument Type

The preferred instrument type is a 10 U.S.C. § 4022 pOTA awarded under a firm-fixed-price (FFP) arrangement. This agreement type allows for fixed payable milestones based on the agreed-upon milestone schedule. Funding arrangements are at the discretion of the Government.

2.3 Project Award Value

Offerors should provide a ROM that is commensurate with the proposed level of effort to complete the proposed approach and meet the requirements of the PWS as outlined herein.

2.4 Period of Performance

The period of performance of the anticipated pOTA is up to 12 months for the Base period after contract award, and four 12-month option periods. The USG estimates pOTA award in 1QFY27.

3.0 Solution Brief Preparation & Submission Instructions

3.1 Solution Briefs

Only UNCLASSIFIED/CUI summaries of technical approaches, schedules and ROM costs. SBs shall not contain any information above UNCLASSIFIED or contain any restrictive markings (e.g., SECRET, special access program (SAP), NATO, CNWDI, WNTEL, etc.). The CONFIDENTIAL marking is reserved as a security marking in accordance with AR 380-5 and the NISPOM and shall not be used as a marking for company proprietary information. All material submitted in response to this RFSB must be properly marked. The Government evaluation team reserves the right to request further clarification to enhance our understanding of the Offeror's submittal. The Government's decision to invite an Offeror to submit a final prototype proposal and cost proposal will be based upon the evaluation results of the SB and vendor demonstration submission.

In the event of a possible or actual compromise of CLASSIFIED information in the submission of the Offeror's SB, the Offeror must immediately and within no more than 24 hours, bring this to the attention of the POCs in Section 1.5.

3.2 Format of Solution Briefs

Offerors shall submit the SB IAW the following:

1. Number of Pages: The SB is limited to ten (10) pages for summary of UNCLASSIFED/CUI technical approach, including 1 page for UNCLASSIFIED/CUI proposed schedule, and 1 page for UNCLASSIFIED/CUI ROM costs. The SB cover sheet and data rights assertions are not included in the page limit. Pages submitted in excess of the SB page limit will not be read or evaluated.

2. Number of Copies & Format: One (1) electronic copy of the response and cover sheet.

3. Text & Font Format: Text shall be at least single-spaced, on 8½ x 11-inch paper, with a minimum of one-inch margin all around. Pages shall be numbered consecutively. Font size shall be of minimum 12-point font. Bolding, underlining, and italics may be used to identify topic demarcations or points of emphasis. Graphic presentations, including tables, while not subject to the same font size and spacing requirements, shall have spacing and text no less than 9-point font that is easily readable.

4. Security: Do not lock or encrypt any files uploaded as part of your SB submission. Any locked or encrypted files will not be read or evaluated.

5. Use of a diagram(s) or figure(s) to depict the essence of the proposed solution is encouraged.

6. SBs containing data that is not to be disclosed to the public for any purpose or used by the Government except for evaluation purposes shall include the following sentences on the cover page:

   "This SOLUTIONS BRIEF includes data that shall not be disclosed outside the Government, except to non-Government personnel for evaluation purposes, and shall not be duplicated, used, or disclosed -- in whole or in part -- for any purpose other than to evaluate this submission. If, however, an agreement is awarded to this Offeror as a result of -- or in connection with – the submission of this data, the Government shall have the right to duplicate, use, or disclose the data to the extent agreed upon by both parties in the resulting agreement. This restriction does not limit the Government's right to use information contained in this data if it is obtained from another source without restriction. The data subject to this restriction are contained in sheets [insert numbers or other identification of sheets]"

   Each restricted data sheet should be marked as follows:

   "Use or disclosure of data contained on this sheet is subject to the restriction on the title page of this proposal."

7. Questions regarding the objectives or preparation of the SB should be addressed to the POC's listed in Section 1.5.

3.3 Content of SBs

The Offeror's SB must include the following:

1. Cover Sheet

Offerors shall provide the following information on the cover sheet:

   a. Organization Information: name, mailing address, technical POC, phone number, e-mail address, CAGE code, and Unique Entity ID (UEI)

b. Business POC, phone number, and e-mail address

c. Self-Certification of Offeror: (select all that apply)

(1) Small business
(2) Large business
(3) Academic institution
(4) Non-traditional defense contractor (see definition below)
(5) Other

Non-traditional defense contractor is defined in 10 U.S.C. § 3014 as an entity that is not currently performing and has not performed, for at least the one-year period preceding the solicitation of sources by the Department of Defense for the procurement or transaction, any contract or subcontract for the Department of Defense that is subject to full coverage under the cost accounting standards prescribed pursuant to section 1502 of title 41 and the regulations implementing such section.

2. Technical Approach: Describe how the proposed technical approach is innovative, feasible, achievable, and complete and is supported by a technical team that has the expertise and capabilities to accomplish the proposed tasks. The Offeror will ensure its SB adequately describes the proposed technical approach, capabilities and resulting contributions. The following must be addressed:

a. Project approach to meeting objectives and scope. Present approach to meet the technical characteristics and objectives as identified in the PWS. The GDS JPO will evaluate the entire Technical Approach holistically, considering these desired characteristics.

Proposed current and projected capabilities of the Offeror's BMS to include innovation.

b. Process and procedures on the development of functionality and interfaces.

c. Ability to integrate within the GDS JPO mission.

d. Overview of tasks and methods planned to achieve each objective and the final product delivery in accordance with the PWS.

e. Identify particular approaches the Offeror will take to ensure successful completion within the clear schedule constraints (e.g., opportunities to accelerate schedule.)

f. Identify and assert any restrictions on the Government's use, release, or disclosure of technical data or computer software pertaining to its solution. If the offeror has no restrictions for a particular section then it shall state "none." All assertions (including entries of "none") shall be signed by an authorized representative of the offeror. If all assertions are contained on one page, one signature is sufficient. If the assertions are separated, each assertion shall be signed (separately) as required. The offeror's assertions, including the assertions of its subcontractors or suppliers or potential subcontractors or suppliers, shall be submitted in the required format, dated, and signed

by an official authorized to contractually obligate the offeror. The offeror shall provide a detailed discussion of the degree to which asserted data rights restrictions, as well as any proposed option(s) for additional data rights, affect the proposed technical solutions and the Government's ability to use, modify, reproduce, release, perform, display, or disclose the resulting technical data and computer software for Government purposes as defined in DFARS 252.227-7013(a)(12) and DFARS 252.227-7014(a)(11). Note: The data rights assertions are not subject to the page limit specified for this part of the proposal.

3. Schedule: Provide a Gantt chart that outlines work to be performed with deliverables and key milestones, representative of the proposed technical approach.

4. ROM Costs: Describe the estimated costs and proposed fee for the proposed technical approach. Provide a rough order of magnitude (ROM) using the MIL-STD-881F WBS structure ~~Government provided WBS~~ and any assumptions pertaining to price for how this concept could be achieved. For ROM development, the Offeror should provide a breakout of the estimated costs associated with the tasks and methods planned to achieve the proposed technical approach. The Offeror should describe general methods (e.g. expert judgment, analogous estimating, and parametric estimating) used to define estimated costs for the technical approach. If applicable, include any suggested cost share distribution or creative costing approaches to maximize successful completion within the constrained schedule. Costs should be identified based on the following elements.

   a. Hardware cost per instance
   b. BM software development and support costs by year
   c. Planner development and support costs by year
   d. Annual licensing
   e. Yearly CLS
   f. Travel / ODCs

   g. Identify how the Offeror intends to meet the requirements of 10 U.S.C. § 4022(d)(1):

      (1) There is at least one nontraditional defense contractor or nonprofit research institution participating to a significant extent in the prototype project.

      (2) All significant participants in the transaction other than the Federal Government are small businesses (including small businesses participating in a program described under Section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. § 638) or nontraditional defense contractors.

      (3) At least one third of the total cost of the prototype project is to be paid out of funds provided by sources other than the Federal Government.

3.4 Submission of SBs

Information and dates regarding questions about, and submission of, SBs are stated above in Section 1.6.

Late submissions will not be accepted, and any other failure to comply with SB submission instructions (content, approach, etc.) may result in non- evaluation by the Government.

3.5 Solution Presentation

Prior to invitation to submit cost proposals, the Government may elect to request additional information or a solution presentation, either in person or virtually, from all Offerors, some Offerors, or from only the Offeror(s) that submitted the most advantageous SB solution.

4.0 Proposal Preparation and Submission Instructions

When invited to do so by the Government, an Offeror may develop and submit a proposal. A proposal is defined as a cost proposal and accompanying PWS. A notification will be sent to the Offeror(s) that submitted a SB that represents the most advantageous solution, requesting the Offeror(s) to submit a cost proposal.

4.1 PWS Content

1. The Offeror shall utilize Government PWS to develop proposed PWS performance requirements.

2. The Offeror shall identify the primary performer and the performer's certification status (non-traditional/traditional defense contractor) for each task.

3. The Offeror shall address and include all applicable deliverables.

4.2 Cost Proposal Content

1. Proposed detailed schedule

2. Proposed Milestone Payment Schedule

3. Data Rights, to include subcontractors and suppliers

4. Price (broken out by cost (detailed cost elements)) and profit

5. Subcontractor and supplier team roles, responsibilities and deliverables

Additional proposal and proposal formatting instructions may be provided in the notification to the selected Offeror.

The maximum page count for the cost proposal is three (3) pages. All pages shall be formatted for printing on 8-1/2- by 11-inch paper with a font size not smaller than 12-point. Font sizes no smaller than 9-point may be used for figures, tables and charts. Document files must be in .rtf, .txt, Portable Document Format (.pdf, ISO 32000-1), OpenDocument (.odx, ISO/IEC 26300:2006), .doc, .docx, .xls, or .xlsx formats. Submissions must be written in English.

The proposal must include a detailed timeline, including technical milestones and a schedule of deliverables. Payments will be made in accordance with the proposed Milestone Payment Schedule. The milestones on the Milestone Payment Schedule SHALL be based on meaningful and identifiable events and associated deliverables (monthly reports are not acceptable milestones). Payment will be made when those deliverables are accepted by the Government, and at no other time. As such, if a proposer is expecting to be paid monthly, then the proposal must include a Milestone Payment Schedule detailing monthly meaningful deliverables (e.g., incremental code drops, test results, etc.). The proposer should take this into account when planning their schedule.

For the prime and subcontractors, the proposal must include a detailed breakout of how the money will be spent and how prices and rates were determined. Direct and Indirect rates must be justified based on past commercial or Government rates, or by providing examples of equivalent rates for equivalent talent. If rates are based on Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) or Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) negotiated rates, the rate agreements shall be provided.

4.3 Submission of Cost proposal

Cost proposal(s) shall be submitted IAW the response dates provided in the notification to the selected Offeror(s). Failure to provide a complete cost proposal in a timely manner, to timely negotiate, or to satisfactorily agree to Government terms and cost/price goals may result in the prompt de-selection of your SB, allowing the Government to seek another proposal.

5.0 Evaluation Information

5.1 Solution Brief Evaluation Criteria

SBs will be evaluated using three (3) criteria. These criteria are listed below, in descending order of importance. The Government reserves the right to review the content of SBs against various AI tools to determine whether it appears Offerors relied on AI to write and submit SBs. If the Government, in its sole discretion, does this, and receives indication that a SB correlates closely to AI provided solutions, this will be viewed as an indication of a lack of knowledge and understanding by the Vendor, and the solution may be determined unacceptable or otherwise negatively rated.

1. Phase 1. SB Evaluation Criteria #1: Technical Approach

   The Government will evaluate acceptability of the Offeror's capability and approach to accomplish the technical objectives of the PWS. To be assessed as acceptable, the response must:

   (1) Vendor proposes realistic solution at a minimum of TRL 6 that provides a COP, Battle Management Aids, and Shot Recommendations – addressing the capabilities in PWS #1 – , ability to integrate BMS Solution on an Edge HW platform that can act as a Cloud-edge device, and that the BMS solution can be developed and fielded within one year. Vendor has a process approach for rapidly configuring and connecting to JREAP-C and JTMC-B.

(2) Vendor can accept GDS Planner source, maintain and extend it, while providing closer integration with BMS, and operational support for a distributed user base

(3) Vendor has process approach for keeping Planner and BMS blue and red force models in alignment and maintained with tactical system development, along with new models of red/blue forces

(4) Vendor has technical experience in JIAMD domain, programmatic experience in an Agile software environment with government integration, ability to provide CLS, conduct distributed training, and execute continuous training at a government facility.

(5) Vendor has an architecture that utilizes Cloud environment for future operations, has an approach for eventual AI-enabled decision making, can provide primary / backup capability and read-only instance in the Cloud for situational awareness and training.

(6) Vendor proposes ability to conduct unclassified and classified development with mature Agile process in government's AzureGov environment, along with Cloud systems administration capability. The evaluation of this criteria will also consider the degree to which asserted data rights restrictions, as well as any proposed option(s) for additional data rights, affect the proposed technical solutions and the Government's ability to use, modify, reproduce, release, perform, display or disclose the resulting technical data and computer software for Government purposes as defined in DFARS 252.227-7013(a)(12) and 252.227-7014(a)(11) in terms of demonstrating its ability to execute the proposed approach. Emphasis will be placed on the Government's ability to use, release, and disclose technical data or computer software documentation and preference may be given to solution brief submissions with the least amount of data rights restrictions.

2. Phase 1 SB Evaluation Criteria #2 – Schedule

   Whether the proposed schedule sufficiently correlated to the proposed technical approach is realistic and executable to meet the PWS objectives within the stated requested time and reflects a clear understanding of the Government's objectives.

3. Phase 1 SB Evaluation Criteria #3 – ROM Cost

Whether the proposed cost or price is sufficiently correlated to the proposed technical approach, is realistic and affordable to meet the PWS objectives within the stated requested time, and whether the proposed cost/price generally reflects an understanding of the Government's objectives.

5.2 Phase 2 Demonstration Evaluation Criteria. Vendors selected to participate in the Demonstration will be directed to demonstrate their Solution's ability in the following technical areas.

1. Ability to rapidly configure and connect to JREAP-C and JTMC-B.

2. Ability to receive and display weapon system inventory from land, air and sea platforms, as well as mission capable status, in the GDS architecture.

3. Ability to calculate, display, and utilize threat propagation – with defended area determination – for each GDS threat.

4. Ability to issue shot recommendations using a stochastic decision algorithm.

5. Ability to provide Battle Management aids, including CombatID assistance, Duplicate track resolution, and unknown JU reporter assistance.

6. Ability to read and display ATO, and Air Control Order (ACO) files.

5.3 Proposal Evaluation Criteria

Upon receipt of the updated PWS, the Government will collaborate with the Offeror to finalize the PWS. During this collaboration, the Government may negotiate changes to the PWS to ensure the optimal solution, including reducing risks the Government may have identified in the initial SB, presentation, PWS or proposal. Upon receipt of the cost proposal, the Government will evaluate the cost proposal IAW the specified Proposal Evaluation Criteria, Section 5.2. If the cost proposal is deemed advantageous to the Government and a consensus on the terms of the agreement are agreed to, the Offeror(s) will be awarded the pOTA subject to the availability of funds.

All documents necessary for the review and evaluation of SBs, cost proposal submissions and updated PWS shall be provided as described in this RFSB.
The Government will evaluate the reasonableness of the cost/price and will evaluate whether the proposed cost/price reflect an understanding of and ability to meet the Government's objectives. Offerors shall describe the labor mix and labor hours necessary in sufficient detail to give evaluators a clear understanding of the Offeror's approach. The Offeror shall map hours to the appropriate PWS paragraph. Concurrent to this evaluation, the Government will ensure that the proposed PWS accurately reflects the full breadth of the project, including properly addressing the Government PWS and specific tasks, deliverables and milestones required to successfully complete the prototype project. As needed, the Government may negotiate with the Vendor to adjust the PWS, cost/price and other terms before award.

If agreement cannot be reached with the Offeror whose proposal is initially assessed to present the most advantageous technical approach, the Government will evaluate Cost/Price and PWS for the proposal of the Offeror with the next best technical solution.

6.0 Award Information

The demonstration is intended to provide additional insight into the submitted Solution Briefs and will be evaluated IAW the GDS BM Demonstration PWS, may inform decisions on whether to issue a RFPP, and may inform negotiation efforts.

If Demonstrations do not occur, the RFPP will be issued based on the technical evaluation of the Solutions Brief.

Awards of prototype projects as a result of this announcement will be in the form of a pOTA. To receive an award, the Offeror(s) must be in compliance with the statutory requirements at 10 U.S.C. § 4022.

To receive an award, an Offeror must register in the System for Award Management (SAM) and must have a UEI number. This system verifies identity and ensures that payment is sent to the right party. The Offeror must be considered a responsible party by the Agreements Officer, must not be suspended or debarred from such agreement by the Federal Government, and must not be prohibited by Presidential Executive Order or law from receiving such award.

7.0 Other Information

7.1 Follow-On Production

The authority at 10 U.S.C. § 4022, paragraph (f) provides the authority to enter into awards for follow-on production to successful participants of an agreement under the authority of a pOTA utilizing competitive procedures. This effort anticipates the need for possible follow-on production efforts. The requirement for competition has been met through the RFSB process, and upon successful completion of the prototype project and subject to the availability of funds, the Government reserves the right to proceed into a Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) based contract or production OTA on a non-competitive basis. This prototype project will be deemed completed and successful upon the result of the system characterization, as the Government determines.