<u>United States Air Force</u>

AFLCMC/WLT Tinker AFB OK

KC-135 Center Console Refresh (CCR)

Attachment 4 Section L

INSTRUCTIONS TO OFFERORS

1 July 2026

Contents

1.0 Program Structure and Objective 5
1.1 Budget/Funding Information 5
1.2 Facility Clearance Information 5
1.2.1 COMSEC 5
1.3 Contractor Technical Proposal 6
2.0 General Instructions 6
3.0 General Information 6
3.1 Point of Contact 6
3.2 Debriefings 7
3.3 Discrepancies 7
3.4 Electronic Reference Documents 7
3.5 Amendments to Solicitation 7
3.6 Submission, Modification, Revision, and Withdrawal of Proposals 7
3.7 Exchanges 7
3.8 Organization/Number of Copies/Page Limits 7
3.8.1 Title Pages 7
3.8.2 Team List 8
3.8.3 Names 9
3.8.4 Page Limitations 9
3.8.5 Pricing Information 10
3.8.6 Cross Referencing 10
3.8.7 Indexing 11
3.8.8 Tables and Figures 11
3.8.9 Glossary of Abbreviations and Acronyms 11
3.9 Page Size and Format 11
3.10 Labeling 11
3.11 Electronic Offers 11
3.12 Distribution 13
4.0 Factor 1 – Technical 13
4.1 General 13
4.2 Format and Specific Content 13
4.2.1 Technical 13
4.2.2 Volume Organization 14

4.2.3 Subfactor One: Technical Solution 14
4.2.4 Subfactor Two: Exceeding Requirements and Demonstrating System Strengths 16
4.2.5 Subfactor Three: Data Rights 17
4.2.6 Subfactor Four: Schedule 17
5.0 Factor 2 – Technical Risk 18
5.1 General 18
6.0 Factor 3 – Past Performance 18
6.1 General 18
6.1.1 Attachment 1.4 Consent Letter 19
6.1.2 Attachment 1.5 Client Authorization Letter 19
6.1.3 Attachment 1.6 Commitment to Perform as Proposed Letter 19
6.2 Early Proposal Information 19
6.3 Relevant Contracts 20
6.3.1 PPI Relevant Contract Narrative 20
6.3.2 Organizational Structure Change History 21
7.0 Factor 4 – Cost/Price 21
7.1 Cost/Price General Instructions 21
7.1.1 Reasonableness 21
7.1.2 Balanced Pricing 22
7.1.3 Price Realism 22
7.1.4 Cost Realism 23
7.1.5 Total Evaluated Price (TEP) 23
7.1.6 Cost or Pricing Data Requirements/Data Other Than Certified Cost or Pricing Data 23
7.2 Cost/Price General Instructions 24
7.2.1 Rounding 25
7.2.2 Proposed Price Reduction per Corporate/Management Decision 25
7.2.3 Business Systems 25
7.2.4 Proposed Subcontractor Pricing and/or IWO/IWT Pricing 26
7.2.5 Assumptions Used in Development of Proposed Prices 27
7.2.6 Government Furnished Property/Equipment/Material (GFP/GFE/GFM) 27
7.2.7 Contractor Furnished Property/Equipment/Tooling/Material (CFP/CFE/CFT/CFM) 27
7.2.8 Government Field Support Agencies 28
7.2.9 Other Documentation 28
7.3 Pricing Support Information 28
7.3.1 Format and Specific Content Required 28

7.3.2 CBOM 30
7.3.3 FPRA/FPRR Information 30
7.3.4 Excel Pricing Workbook (EPW) – Additional Information 31
8.0 Contract Documentation 36
8.1 Model Contract/Representations and Certifications 36
8.3 Supplies or Services and Prices (Section B) 36
8.4 Contract Clauses (Section I) 36
8.5 Representations, Certifications, and other Statements of Offerors (Section K) 36
8.6 Exceptions to Solicitation Requirements 36
9.0 Other Information Required 37
9.1 Ombudsman 37
9.2 Authorized Offeror Personnel 37
9.3 Government Offices 37
9.4 Company/Division Address, Identifying Codes, and Applicable Designations 37
9.5 Attachments to the Model Contract 37

Table 1: KC-135 CCR LRUs 5
Table 2: Proposal Organization Table 8
Table 3: Cross-Reference Matrix 10
Table 4: Solicitation Exceptions 37

Figure 1: Security Alert Pop-up 40
Figure 2: Setup Pop-Up 40
Figure 3: Application Setup Screen 40
Figure 4: Continue the Application Setup 40
Figure 5: Contractor's Menu 40
Figure 6: Business Relationships 40
Figure 7: Enter New Business Relationship 40
Figure 8: Past Performance 40
Figure 9: Enter Past Performance Information 40
Figure 10: Select Report to Print 40
Figure 11: Submission Instructions 40
Figure 12: Change Name and RFP Number - Application Setup 40

1.0 Program Structure and Objective

The government plans to award a single Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract for the KC-135 Center Console Refresh (CCR) program to address obsolescence and enhance long-term sustainability, the USAF is seeking an integrated flight deck solution that replaces the Fuel System (FS), Flight Display System (FDS), and Integrated Processing Cabinet (IPC). The new solution must improve supportability, maintainability, and offer growth potential. The program scope also includes the addition of autothrottle systems. As configured today, the line-replaceable units (LRUs) that make up each of these systems are outlined in Table 1 below. Descriptions of these systems can be found in the KC-135 Center Console Refresh System Requirements Document (SRD), Attachment 2.

Table 1: KC-135 CCR LRUs

Flight Display System (FDS)	Fuel System (FS)	Integrated Processing Cabinet (IPC)	Autothrottle
• Multi-Function Displays (MFD) • Control Display Units (CDU)	• Integrated Fuel Management Panel (IFMP) • Fuel Management Advisory Computer (FMAC) • Tank Interface Unit (TIU)	• Common Computing Module (CCM) • Input/Output Concentrator (IOC) • Power Environmental Module (PEM) • Digital Switching Module (DSM)	• Proposed solution dependent

The government desires a modernized solution for the KC-135 that retains or improves the functions and capabilities of the aging parts and components that are replaced.

1.1 Budget/Funding Information

Funding will be obligated on individual orders, as required, for the Cost-Plus Incentive Fee (CPIF) and Firm Fixed Price (FFP) Contract Line-Item Numbers (CLINs) established in the basic contract, as well as the Cost Reimbursable (CR) for Travel.

1.2 Facility Clearance Information

The Offeror, and subcontractors working classified requirements with access to classified information, must possess a final facility clearance equal to the highest classification specification (DD Form 254) prior to Source Selection Authority Decision Briefing. The Industrial Security Facilities Database (ISFD) will be used to verify final facility clearances. Offerors who do not possess a final facility clearance will be considered non-responsive and will not be eligible for award. Any determination that an Offeror is non-responsible will be in accordance with (IAW) Revolutionary Federal Acquisition Regulation Overhaul (RFO) Part 9.

1.2.1 COMSEC

Proscribed Classified COMSEC Information Notice to Offerors and any and all subcontractors: Proscribed classified COMSEC information may be involved in this effort. Therefore, US companies operating under

Foreign Ownership, Control or Influence (FOCI) as defined in the National Industrial Security Program Operating Manual (NISPOM) with a Special Security Agreement as the mitigation instrument are on notice that a National Interest Determination (NID) will be required. The NID decision will be made by the Government and documented prior to award of the contract. The Government is not obligated to delay contract award in order to complete the NID process. If the NID is denied, the contractor will be determined non-responsible and will not be eligible for award. Any determination that an Offeror is non-responsible will be in accordance with RFO Part 9.

1.3 Contractor Technical Proposal

All or parts of the Contractor's Technical Proposal may be added to the contract at the government's discretion. Should there be any discrepancies between the Technical Proposal and the Statement of Work (SOW), the SOW will take precedence unless otherwise approved by the Procuring Activity.

2.0 General Instructions

This section of the Instructions to Offerors (ITO) provides general guidance for preparing proposals as well as specific instructions on the format and content of the proposal. The Offeror's proposal must include all data and information requested by the ITO and must be submitted in accordance with these instructions. Any Offeror who submits an incomplete package may be considered non-responsive to the solicitation and therefore ineligible for award. The offer shall be compliant with the requirements as stated in the SOW and appendices. Non-conformance with the instructions provided in the ITO may result in an unfavorable proposal evaluation.

The proposal shall be clear, concise, and include sufficient detail for effective evaluation and for substantiating the validity of stated claims. The proposal shall not simply rephrase or restate the government's requirements but rather shall provide convincing rationale to address how the Offeror intends to meet these requirements. Offerors shall assume that the government has no prior knowledge of their facilities and experience and shall base its evaluation on the information presented in the Offeror's proposal.

Elaborate brochures, documentation, binding, detailed artwork, or other embellishments are unnecessary and are not desired.

The proposal acceptance period is specified in Section A of the model contract/solicitation. The Offeror shall make a clear statement in Section A of the proposal documentation volume that the proposal is valid until this date.

In accordance with RFO Subpart 4.309, the government will retain one copy of all unsuccessful proposals.

All, or parts of the Offeror's technical proposal will be added to the contract at the government's discretion. Should there be any discrepancies between the technical proposal and the SOW or Systems Requirement Document (SRD), the SOW and SRD will take precedence unless otherwise approved by the requiring activity.

3.0 General Information

3.1 Point of Contact

The Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO) is the **sole** point of contact for this acquisition. Address any questions or concerns you may have to the PCO. Written requests for clarification may be sent to the PCO at the address located in Section A of the model contract/solicitation.

3.2 Debriefings

The PCO will promptly notify offerors of any decision to exclude them from the competitive range, whereupon they may request and receive a debriefing in accordance with RFO 15.206-2. 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. The PCO will notify unsuccessful offerors in accordance with RFO 15.207-2. Upon such notification, unsuccessful offerors may request and receive a debriefing. Offerors desiring a debriefing must make their request in accordance with the requirements of RFO 15.206-2 or RFO 15.301, as applicable.

3.3 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 PCO in writing with supporting rationale as well as the remedies the Offeror is asking the PCO to consider as related to the mission or error.

3.4 Electronic Reference Documents

All referenced documents for this solicitation are available on the System for Award Management (SAM) website at https://www.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.

3.5 Amendments to Solicitation

If this Request for Proposal (RFP) is amended, all terms and conditions that are not amended remain unchanged and in full force and effect. Offerors shall acknowledge receipt of any amendment and provide confirmation upon submission of the Offeror's proposal. Any unacknowledged amendments in the Offeror's proposal will render the proposal ineligible for award.

3.6 Submission, Modification, Revision, and Withdrawal of Proposals

Proposal packages shall be transmitted to the Solicitation PCO via the Solicitation Module of the Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE) (https://piee.eb.mil). No other submission method, such as mail, hand carried, or other electronic system (e.g. DoDSAFE) are authorized by the solicitation unless specifically authorized by the PCO pursuant to paragraph 3.11 below. Detailed submittal instructions are located in ITO paragraph 3.11 and 3.12.

3.7 Exchanges

Exchanges of source selection information between Government and offerors will be controlled by the PCO. E-mail (encrypted when possible or with password protected attachments) may be used to transmit such information to offerors and shall include "Source Selection Information – See RFO 2.101 & 3.104 – CONTROLLED UNCLASSIFIED INFORMATION" in the subject line.

3.8 Organization/Number of Copies/Page Limits

3.8.1 Title Pages

The title page of each volume shall contain the solicitation number, name, address, and telephone and facsimile numbers of the Offeror and electronic e-mail address if available.

3.8.2 Team List

A team list of the Offeror's primary point of contacts shall be submitted in each volume using the format shown in Attachment 2 of the ITO. The Offeror shall prepare the proposal as set forth in the Proposal Organization Table (Table 2 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 and with the number of electronic copies as specified in Table 2. Each Volume identified in Table 2 below shall be submitted as a distinct electronic file and uploaded to PIEE as described in paragraph 3.6. and 3.11. The contents of each proposal volume are described in the ITO paragraph as noted in the table below.

Table 2: Proposal Organization Table

Volume	ITO Paragraph Number	Volume Title	Electronic Copies	Page Limit
I	4.0	Technical	1	75
	3.8.1	Title Page (Not included in 75-page limit)		1
	3.8.2	Team List (see ITO Attachment 2.0) (Not included in 75-page limit)		5
	3.8.8 4.2.2	Table of Contents (Not included in 75-page limit) Volume Organization		Unlimited
	3.8.8	List of Tables, Drawings, and Figures (Not included in 75-page limit)		Unlimited
	3.8.9	Glossary of Abbreviations and Acronyms (Not included in 75-page limit)		Unlimited
	3.8.6	Cross Reference Matrix (See Table 3) (Not included in the 75-page limit		Unlimited
	4.2.3 4.2.4 4.2.5 4.2.6	Subfactor 1 Technical Solution Subfactor 2 Exceeding Requirements and Demonstrating System Strengths* Subfactor 3 Data Rights* Subfactor 4 Schedule*		Included as part of the 75-page limit *Substantiating documentation (such as proof of environmental testing, Microsoft Project file, letters of attestation, ACAs, and proof of data rights) is not included as part of the 75-page limit
	5.0	Technical Risk		Included as part of the 75-page limit
II	6.0	Past Performance	1	Unlimited
	3.8.1	Title Page		1
	3.8.2	Team List (See ITO Attachment 2.0)		5
	3.8.6	Cross Reference Matrix (See Table 3) (Not included in the 75-page limit		Unlimited

	6.3.1	Past Performance Information Forms (PPIF) (See ITO Attachment 1.1)		N/A
	6.1.1	Consent Letter (See ITO Attachment 1.4)		Unlimited
	6.1.2	Client Authorization Letters (See ITO Attachment 1.5)		Unlimited
	6.1.3	Commitment to Perform as Proposed Letter (See ITO Attachment 1.6)		Unlimited
	6.2	Present/Past Performance Questionnaires (See ITO Attachment 1.2)		Not included in the Offeror's Proposal
	6.3.1	Relevant Contract Narrative		Request Max 5 pages per contract
	6.3.2	Organizational Structure Change History		2
III	7.0	Cost/Price	1	Unlimited
	7.1	General Information		Unlimited
	3.8.6	Cross Reference Matrix (See Table 3) (Not included in the 75-page limit		Unlimited
	7.4	Volume Organization		Unlimited
IV	8.0	Contract Documentation	1	Unlimited
	3.8.1	Title Page (SF33)		1
	3.8.2	Team List (see ITO Attachment 2.0)		5
	3.8.7. 4.2.2	Table of Contents Volume Organization		Unlimited
	3.8.8	List of Tables, Figures, and Drawings		Unlimited
	3.3.8.9	Glossary of Abbreviations and Acronyms		Unlimited
	3.8.6	Cross Reference Matrix (See Table 3) (Not included in the 75-page limit		Unlimited
	8.1	Model Contract (Sections A-J)		N/A
	8.5	Representations and Certifications (Section K)		N/A
	9.2-9.4	Contact Information		Unlimited
	9.5	Attachments to the Model Contract		Unlimited

3.8.3 Names

Offerors shall submit volumes with the following file names: Volume I – Technical.doc or .docx with IMS.mpp, Volume II – Past Performance.doc or .docx, Volume III – Price.doc or .docx with PricingMatrix.xlsx, and Volume IV – Contract.doc or docx. Files provided in .pdf format are also acceptable if conversion is made from a Word document or equivalent Word processing software while maintaining searchable text.

3.8.4 Page Limitations

Page limitations shall be treated as maximums. If exceeded, the excess pages will not be considered in the evaluation of the proposal. Page limitations may also be placed on responses to Evaluation Notices (ENs). The specified page limits for EN responses will be identified in the letters forwarding the ENs to the offerors. Each

page shall be counted except the following: blank pages, title pages, tables of contents, tabs, indexes, glossaries, and those noted in the Proposed Organization Chart as unlimited.

3.8.5 Pricing Information

All pricing information shall be addressed ONLY in the Price Proposal and Contract Documentation volumes (Volumes III and IV). Price Trade-Off information, work-hour estimates, and material kinds and quantities may be used in other volumes only as appropriate for presenting rationale for alternatives or design and Trade-Off decisions.

3.8.6 Cross Referencing

The technical volume shall be written on a stand-alone basis so that its contents may be evaluated without cross-referencing to other volumes of the proposal. Information required for the technical proposal evaluation, which is not found in the technical volume, will be assumed to have been omitted from the proposal, and will not be considered in the technical evaluation.

Cross-referencing within a proposal volume is permitted when its use would conserve space without impairing clarity. The past performance and price evaluation will utilize information from each's respective volume for the evaluation but may also utilize information from other volumes as well. The Offeror shall complete the cross-reference matrix provided in Table 3 that will indicate the corresponding proposal paragraph or location which addresses the referenced item, and this shall be included in the Technical Volume submission. Table 3 is not included as part of the Technical Volume page limit.

Table 3: Cross-Reference Matrix

Cross Reference	SOW Para (not all inclusive)	RFP Attachment 4 – Section L	RFP Attachment 5 – Section M	Proposal (Volume & Para)
FACTOR 1: TECHNICAL		4.0.	2.2	
Subfactor 1 – Technical Solution	2.2, 2.3, 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3, 5.13, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.6, 6.9.1, 7.0, 9.0, 9.4, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3, 12.4, 12.5, 12.6, 12.7, 17.0	4.2.3	2.2.1	
Subfactor 2 – Exceeding Requirements and Demonstrating System Strengths	2.3.2, 6.2, 6.5.2, 6.9.1	4.2.4	2.2.2	
Subfactor 3 – Data Rights	5.1, 5.13, 5.15, Appendix A	4.2.5	2.2.3	
Subfactor 4 - Schedule	5.4, 5.5, 7.0, 9.4	4.2.6		
FACTOR 2: TECHNICAL RISK	SOW 5.1, 5.12, 5.13, 9.8, 13.2, 13.2.1, and SOW references included in Subfactors 1-4	5.1	2.3	
FACTOR 3: PAST PERFORMANCE	N/A	6.0	2.4	
FACTOR 4: COST/PRICE	N/A	7.0	2.5	

3.8.7 Indexing

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

3.8.8 Tables and Figures

Include an indexed list of tables, figures, and drawings.

3.8.9 Glossary of Abbreviations and Acronyms

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

3.9 Page Size and Format

A page is defined as each face of a sheet of paper containing information. When both sides of a sheet display printed material, it shall be counted as two pages. Page size shall be 8.5 x 11 inches, not including foldouts. Page line spacing shall be 1.5 lines. Except for the reproduced sections of the solicitation document, the text size shall be no less than Arial 12 point. Offerors are prohibited from using other Arial fonts such as Arial Black, Arial Narrow or Arial Rounded MT Bold. 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 side margins. Pages shall be numbered sequentially by volume. These page format restrictions shall apply to responses to Evaluation Notice (ENs).

Legible tables, charts, graphs, and figures shall be used wherever practical to depict organizations, systems, layouts, implementation schedules, plans, and related information. These displays shall be uncomplicated and shall not exceed 11 x 17 inches. If foldout pages are printed, they shall fold entirely within the volume and shall count as a single page. Foldout pages may only be used for large tables, charts, graphs, diagrams, and schematics; they shall not be used for pages of text. The following text-size limitation shall apply only to the technical volume: Text intended for evaluation within all figures, charts, tables, and graphs, including embedded images, shall be no less than Arial 10 point. These limitations shall apply to electronic proposals, and noncompliant text will not be considered in the evaluation.

3.10 Labeling

A cover sheet shall be included in each proposal volume, clearly marked as to volume number, title, copy number, solicitation identification, and the Offeror's name. For each proposal volume, the Offeror shall apply all appropriate markings including those prescribed IAW RFO 52.215- 1(e), Restriction on Disclosure and Use of Data, and RFO 3.104-4, Disclosure, Protection, and Marking of Contractor Bid or Proposal Information and Source Selection Information.

3.11 Electronic Offers

All proposals shall be submitted in the PIEE Solicitation Module, https://piee.eb.mil/. For instructions on how to post an offer, please refer to the Posting Offer demo at https://pieetraining.eb.mil/wbt/sol/Posting_Offer.pdf or https://pieetraining.eb.mil/wbt/sol/Posting_Offer.html. Be advised that classified information cannot be transmitted via the PIEE Solicitation Module. The PIEE Solicitation Module does allow the safe and secure transmission of CUI.

Offerors shall submit all proposal documents against Solicitation Number FA810526RB001 in the PIEE Solicitation Module. If a proposal is not submitted in the PIEE Solicitation Module against this Solicitation Number, then the submission will not be considered as having been submitted in response to this Solicitation. For example, any proposals that are submitted under the PIEE Solicitation Module's "Unsolicited Proposal" section are not considered to have been submitted in response to this Solicitation Number. Additionally, if a proposal is inadvertently submitted against a different Solicitation Number in the PIEE Solicitation Module, then that proposal will not be considered as a response to this Solicitation. Similarly, if a portion of a proposal is incorrectly submitted (such as in the wrong PIEE module, the PIEE Solicitation Module "Unsolicited Proposal" section or under another solicitation number), then the incorrectly submitted portion of the proposal will not be considered as having been submitted in response to this Solicitation and will therefore not be evaluated by the Government.

It is the Offeror's responsibility to follow the registration instructions found on the PIEE website. It is advised that all potential prime Offerors and their subcontractors ensure the proper company points of contact are registered in the PIEE Solicitation Module based on their CAGE codes and have the proper roles assigned well in advance of the solicitation closing date. Subcontractors are only required to register in the PIEE Solicitation Module if they want to submit their proprietary proposal information separate from the prime offer. Documents submitted by the subcontractor directly to the Government must have the prime contractor's name, CAGE, and RFP number on the first page of the document.

As described above, the Government will not search for incorrectly submitted proposals in the PIEE Solicitation Module. The submission date for all Volumes shall be no later than the date and time specified in the solicitation. Offerors are on notice that the PIEE Solicitation Module will determine a proposal as late, or untimely, if the submission is not fully submitted prior to the time specified in the solicitation. For example, if the time specified in the solicitation is 3:00 pm CST, then the PIEE system will consider a proposal as later if it is submitted at 3:00:01 pm CST, one second after the deadline. The PIEE Solicitation Module should notify an Offeror if the proposal was submitted after the deadline for submission, and whether a proposal is late. However, even if the PIEE Solicitation Module does not provide this notification, the PCO will utilize the time stamp(s) of the proposal submission(s) to make a determination if the proposal submission(s) was timely submitted. If multiple drop-offs occur, any drop-off after the time identified in the solicitation would render the entire proposal as late. Offerors are responsible for ensuring that the Government receives the complete proposal by the due date and time for proposal submission.

If there is an unanticipated PIEE System outage within 24 hours of the proposal due date and the outage has interrupted normal Government processes so that proposals cannot be received by the exact time specified in the solicitation, the Offeror shall immediately notify the PCO. This notification shall occur prior to the proposal submission deadline and shall be made in writing. The Offeror shall obtain written approval from the PCO to submit the proposal via an alternate method or the PCO may advise the Offeror that the Government will follow the procedures set forth in RFO 15.107(c) for amending the solicitation closing date.

Offerors should consider the following suggestions for avoiding last-minute proposal submission problems:

- Verify your account's ability to submit the necessary proposal information (either as a prime or subcontractor) well in advance of the closing time. This may be accomplished through the following steps:
    a. Login to the PIEE system as the Proposal Manager and access the Solicitation Module.

b. To access the Solicitation Module, Offerors are required to register for a PIEE account. If an Offeror already has a PIEE account, the role of Proposal Manager can be added to the existing PIEE account. If an Offeror does not already have a PIEE account, the Offeror can self-register for a PIEE user account and add the role of Proposal Manager.

- Review resources on how to navigate the PIEE Solicitation Module are available at https://dodprocurementtoolbox.com/site-pages/solicitation-module.

For questions related to the PIEE Solicitation Module please contact disa.global.servicedesk.mbx.eb-ticket-requests@mail.mil. You can also reach PIEE support by phone at 866-618-5988.

All electronic documents and files submitted shall contain the volume number and title. Use separate files to permit rapid location of all portions, including subfactors, required plans, exhibits, appendices, and attachments, if any. The Offeror shall submit volumes I through IV in electronic format. Each volume shall be submitted as a separate file. The electronic copies of the proposal shall be submitted in a format readable by Microsoft (MS) Office 365 Word, MS Office 365 Excel, MS Office 365 Power Point, MS Project or compatible version (as applicable), and Adobe PDF Note: files must be searchable and able to copy and paste. For amendment purposes to the proposal, the "original" proposal shall be clearly identified.

3.12 Distribution

Once the Offeror has uploaded the Offeror's proposal in its entirety to PIEE Solicitation Module, the Offeror shall take a screen shot (Print Screen function) of the Offeror's PIEE Solicitation Module submission screen showing all the uploaded files included in the proposal submission. The Offeror shall notify the PCO, Ms. Brandi Shelden (brandi.shelden@us.af.mil) and Contract Specialist (CS), Ms. Catina Baker (catina.baker@us.af.mil) by email that the files have been uploaded and provide a copy of the PIEE Solicitation Module submission screen shot.

4.0 Factor 1 – Technical

4.1 General

The Technical Volume should be specific and complete, ensuring legibility, clarity, and coherence. Responses will be evaluated against the technical subfactors defined in Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award. Therefore, using the instructions provided below, offerors should specifically detail the methodology they would employ for accomplishing and/or satisfying these subfactors. Offerors should assume the government has no prior knowledge of their experience or facilities; the evaluation will be based solely on the information presented in the proposal. All requirements specified in the solicitation are mandatory; submission of the proposal represents the offeror's commitment to fulfilling these requirements. It is neither necessary nor desirable to simply reiterate the objectives or reformulate the requirements stated in the solicitation.

4.2 Format and Specific Content

4.2.1 Technical

The Offeror shall address its proposed approach to meeting the minimum performance or capability requirements of each technical subfactor in the Offeror's technical volume.

4.2.2 Volume Organization

The technical volume shall be organized according to the following general outline:

- Team List ITO Attachment 2.0
- Table of Contents
- List of Tables, Figures, and Drawings
- Glossary
- Cross Reference Matrix
- Subfactor One – Technical Solution
- Subfactor Two – Exceeding Requirements and Demonstrating System Strengths
- Subfactor Three – Data Rights
- Subfactor Four- Schedule
- Technical Risk

4.2.3 Subfactor One: Technical Solution

The offeror shall provide an approach that demonstrates their understanding and ability to meet the threshold requirements, in the CCR Systems Requirements Document (SRD) through the EMD & Production phases. As a minimum, the approach shall address the following elements:

a) The Offeror shall provide an approach to teaming arrangements and Associated Contract Agreements (ACA) and describe how the members will support EMD and Productions phases. The proposed approach shall include identification of all significant subcontractors, teaming partners, and or joint venture partners proposed to perform the work outlined in this solicitation in accordance with (IAW) SOW paragraph 5.13 and provide ACAs IAW SOW 17.0. If signed ACA are unavailable, provide a Letter of Intent and a statement with rationale describing the steps the Offeror will take to satisfy the requirement of signed ACAs by contract award. If the Offeror does not have any teaming partners or Subcontractor, then provide a statement of "no subcontractors" in your proposal.

b) An approach to the Engineering Manufacturing and Design (EMD) Phase IAW SOW 1.2.1 that includes the identification of Title 10 §4401 compliance; Technical Readiness Level (TRL) of each system at proposal submission; model-based systems engineering, model-based design, and Technical Data Package digital files; SIL stand-up, integration, and testing; autothrottle solution; Diminishing Manufacturing Sources and Material Shortages (DMSMS), integration, and testing; and the need, if any, to reverse engineer interfaces with KC-135 legacy systems.
    i. For Title 10 §4401 compliance, as a minimum, Offeror shall provide a detailed explanation and diagram of their Modular Open Systems Approach (MOSA) that will be designed into the CCR system. This design must comply with 10 U.S.C. § 4401 (c)(1)(B)(i) or (c)(1)(B)(ii) and prioritize maximum adaptability to potential future mission requirement changes. (SOW 6.2.)
    ii. A description of how Digital Material Management principles and tools will be applied throughout the integration, test, and certification process. As a minimum, the approach should include specific examples of how Digital Material Management will improve efficiency, reduce

risk, and enhance collaboration. (SOW 6.1, 6.3)

iii. Offeror shall provide a detailed explanation and diagram of their approach to standing up a SIL and utilizing the SIL for integration and testing. (SOW 7.0, 9.4)

iv. Offeror shall provide a detailed explanation of their approach to integrating and testing autothrottle. (SOW 2.2, 9.0)

v. Offeror shall identify the need to reverse engineer any interfaces with the KC-135 systems based on the technical data provided in the Bidder's Library. Offeror shall identify any technical gaps in the Bidder's Library and describe the complexity of the reverse engineering effort. (SOW 6.6)

c) An approach to the Production Phase that describes how the Offeror will meet kit and installation requirements IAW SOW 1.2.2.

   i. Offeror shall provide a comprehensive approach for the production, packaging, transportation, storage, and tracking of A- and B-Kits. As a minimum, the approach must address that complete installation kits are available at the designated location(s) at least 30 calendar days prior to the scheduled installation. (SOW 12.1, 12.2, 12.3, 12.4, 12.5)

   ii. Offeror shall describe the process for installing the new CCR system on the aircraft. As a minimum, the approach should include detailed key milestones, dependencies, procedures, diagrams, and any applicable special instructions (SOW 12.6, 12.7)

d) An approach for Small Business Participation. As a minimum, the approach shall provide the following essential components:

   a. A narrative description demonstrating the offeror's commitment to small business utilization during the performance of the contract

   b. Submit a completed Small Business Participation Commitment Document (SBPCD) as an attachment. (See ITO Attachment 3.0 for SBPCD Template).

      i. The offeror shall include the small business minimum quantitative requirement (MQR) of 15%. Second tier subcontracting or lower will not be considered in the evaluation of the percentage.

      ii. The offeror shall describe their small business participation based on total evaluated price (TEP) for this contract effort.

   Other than small businesses may achieve their proposed level of small business participation through subcontracting to small businesses and small business socioeconomic categories. Small businesses may achieve their proposed level of small business participation through their own performance/participation as a prime and also through a joint venture, teaming arrangement, and subcontracting to other small businesses; small businesses are not required to subcontract to other small businesses in order to achieve their proposed level of small business participation.

   NOTE: The SBPCD differs from the subcontracting plan* requirements IAW RFO 19.109. Also, work to be performed directly by a small business prime offeror shall be evaluated as Small Business Participation. Small business prime offerors shall include their information in the provided SBPCD template as required.

   *The subcontracting plan will only be required within the Contract Volume per Section L paragraph 9.5.a (SOW 5.13)

4.2.4 Subfactor Two: Exceeding Requirements and Demonstrating System Strengths

The Offeror is afforded an opportunity to receive a best value credit by identifying and explaining how and why different aspects of their solution exceed requirements and/or demonstrate system strengths as outlined in the CCR SRD and/or SOW. As a minimum, the Offeror shall provide the following:

a) Exceeding Threshold Requirements:

   i. The Offeror is afforded an opportunity to receive a best value credit for a proposed solution which utilizes a glass cockpit that incorporates the majority of objective requirements in SRD Paragraph 3.16 Trade Space Adaptability Components.

   ii. The Offeror is afforded an opportunity to receive a best value credit for the proposed solution that includes meeting Objective requirements for Fuel System improvements (SRD 3.14.3, 3.14.6, 3.14.7, 3.14.13, 3.14.5, 3.14.8, 3.14.14, 3.14.16).

   iii. The Offeror is afforded an opportunity to receive a best value credit for a proposed solution that improves navigation as defined in SRD Paragraph 3.6.4.2.

   iv. The Offeror is afforded an opportunity to receive a best value credit for a proposed solution that meets system MTBF objective requirements as defined in SRD Paragraph 3.28.3.2.

   v. The Offeror is afforded an opportunity to receive a best value credit for a proposed solution which replaces the current Electronic Engine Instrument Display (EEID) as defined in SRD Paragraph 3.16.14.

   vi. The Offeror is afforded an opportunity to receive a best value credit for a proposed solution that meets objective requirements for Annunciator Lights/Warning, Cautions, and Advisories in SRD Paragraph 3.4.

b) Demonstrating System Strengths:

   i. The Offeror is afforded an opportunity to receive a best value credit by providing documentation and assessments of environmental testing results, environmental standard adherence, and environmental certifications that have already been accomplished on LRUs that are proposed as part of your CCR solution. (SOW 6.5.2)

   ii. The Offeror is afforded an opportunity to receive a best value credit by providing a plan for how the Government can incorporate new technologies and incorporate upgrades over the system's lifecycle. This plan should include a roadmap for technology insertion, a description of the processes for evaluating and integrating new technologies, and identify areas that would be dependent on the OEM for integration of new capability. The Offeror should consider the following topics in the submitted plan: hardware and software additions for new requirements; autonomous refueling capabilities; new or upgraded communication capabilities that include displaying federated systems onto CCR displays; and future addition of TEMPEST requirements. (SOW 2.3, 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3, 6.2)

   iii. The Offeror is afforded an opportunity to receive a best value credit by providing Technical Standard Order (TSO) authorization for the offeror's solution. (SOW 6.9.1)

iv. The Offeror is afforded an opportunity to receive a best value credit by identifying and describing how their approach provides additional capabilities or exceedances of threshold requirements that provides a relevant and significant benefit to the Government. (SOW 2.3.1 and 2.3.2)

4.2.5 Subfactor Three: Data Rights

The Offeror shall provide a completed Data Rights Assertion Matrix (DRAM) (RFP Attachment 6) indicating proposed data rights asserted with complete rationale. An explanation is required for anything less than what the Government requested on the DRAM (RFP Attachment 6) and meets the Government intent of removing vendor lock.

If licensing is necessary to fulfill data rights requirements, the offeror shall identify the number of enterprise-wide, site, or seat licenses to technical data and computer software pertaining to commercial products or commercial services it will grant the Government to any part of any CDRL listed in the DRAM (RFP Attachment 6).

If a subcontractor owns and is providing any data rights required to perform this contract, the Offeror shall submit a letter of attestation from the subcontractor, affiliate, and/or vendor at all tiers to establish that all of the technical data and computer software the Offeror is required to deliver will be delivered to the Government, regardless of who owns the IP. The letters will clearly show which data rights the subcontractor, affiliate, or vendor will deliver to the Offeror and/or Government.

4.2.6 Subfactor Four: Schedule

The Offeror shall provide two (2) separate and distinct artifacts for the Schedule volume: 1) a Schedule Approach Narrative in a written document, and 2) a detailed Integrated Master Schedule (IMS):

a) The Offeror shall provide a written Schedule Approach Narrative that furnishes a summary explanation of the methodology and rationale behind their proposed schedule. This document explains the "how" and "why" of the Offeror's plan. At a minimum, the narrative must address the following elements:

   (i) Integrated Master Plan (IMP) and Schedule Execution: The Offeror shall provide a rationale for how the IMS and IMP will be executed. This shall include a discussion of the approach to managing significant events, key milestones, combined events, and schedule slack. The narrative should describe the processes for monitoring and controlling the schedule throughout the period of performance. (SOW 5.4, 5.5, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3, 12.4, 12.5, 12.6 and 12.7)

   (ii) Long-Lead Time Material Management: The Offeror shall identify all materials, components, or parts identified as long-lead time items. The narrative must detail the procurement and supply chain strategy that ensures these items will be available to meet the master schedule requirements without causing delays. (SOW 5.4, 5.5, 12.5)

   (iii) System Integration Laboratory (SIL) Stand-Up, Verification, Validation (V&V), and Utilization: The Offeror shall provide a detailed description of their approach to standing up, verifying, validating, and utilizing the SIL for all planned integration and testing activities. This section should explain how the SIL activities are logically integrated into the overall master schedule. (SOW 7.0, 9.4)

(iv) Contractor Fly-In Facility Option: The Offeror shall identify and explain the lead time requirements and major dependencies associated with standing up and exercising the Contractor Fly-In Facility option, should the Government choose to exercise it. (SOW 12.7)

b) The Offeror shall provide an initial Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) delivered in a native Microsoft Project (.mpp) format. If a different scheduling tool is used, the Offeror must provide the file in its native format and as a Microsoft Project-compatible version.

(i) The IMS must be detailed and comprehensive, clearly showing a thorough understanding of the project requirements and include all items detailed in the Schedule Approach Narrative. It must, at a minimum, include: all significant events, key milestones, combined events; logical dependencies (i.e., predecessors and successors) for all tasks; durations, start dates, and finish dates for all tasks; a clearly identifiable critical path; and calculated total float (slack) for all activities. (SOW 5.4, 5.5, 7.0, 9.4, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3, 12.4, 12.5, 12.6 and 12.7)

5.0 Factor 2 – Technical Risk

5.1 General

The Offeror shall address technical risk associated with the approach provided in the following:

Subfactor One, Technical Solution to include reverse engineering without ICDs or data rights

Subfactor Two, Exceeding Requirements and Demonstrating System Strengths to include how COTS items being certified to military airworthiness requirements and environmental testing

Subfactor Three, Data Rights

Subfactor Four, Schedule to include long-lead and supply chain strategy encompassing single-source supplier and foreign-produced components

The Offeror shall address all technical risks that the Offeror considers having potential to disrupt schedule, increased cost, degradation of product performance, increase need for Government oversight, or the increased likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance. For each identified risk, the Offeror shall provide the rationale for the risk and quantitative estimates for both potential consequence (to cost, schedule, and/or performance) and the probability of the risk to occur. The Offeror shall also outline a mitigation approach describing how each risk is eliminated or reduced to a Low or Moderate overall (combined potential and consequence) level.

As part of the technical risk assessment, the Offeror shall address the maturity of the proposed solution. The Offeror shall clearly state the current Technology Readiness Level (TRL) of hardware and software of the proposed solution. To demonstrate the claimed TRL the Offeror must provide objective evidence that includes but is not limited to test data, analysis reports, and/or integration documentation. A higher demonstrated TRL may be considered indicative of lower technical risk.

6.0 Factor 3 – Past Performance

6.1 General

Each Offeror shall submit a past performance volume with its proposal, containing past performance information in accordance with the format contained in ITO Attachment 1.1.

The Offeror shall provide a team list, which includes the prime contractor, all significant subcontractors, teaming partners, and/or joint venture partners proposed to perform the work outlined in the solicitation. The Offeror shall describe the portion of effort each team member is proposed to perform in relation to the Factor 1 Technical subfactors (Technical Solution, Data Rights and Schedule); Factor 4 Cost/Price, and Scope, Magnitude, and Complexity. The Government's Past Performance Evaluation Team (PPET) evaluates each member of the Offeror's team for relevancy and performance quality, based on their proposed portion of effort. Therefore, it is important for the Offeror to provide a detailed portion of effort description, in order for the PPET to conduct an accurate assessment. Offerors shall also provide approximate percentages for portion of effort for each team member. For the past performance evaluation, the government will use data provided by the Offeror in the past performance volume, as well as data obtained from other sources.

6.1.1 Attachment 1.4 Consent Letter

This letter shall be executed and signed by each subcontractor, teaming partner, and/or joint venture partner. The letter authorizes the release of adverse past performance information to the Offeror so the Offeror can respond to such information.

6.1.2 Attachment 1.5 Client Authorization Letter

For each identified effort for a commercial customer, the Offeror shall submit a client authorization letter (ITO Attachment 1.5) authorizing release to the Government of requested information on the Offeror's performance.

6.1.3 Attachment 1.6 Commitment to Perform as Proposed Letter

This letter shall be executed and signed by the Prime Contractor and each Subcontractor. The letter states that, in the event a contract is awarded to the Prime Contractor, the Prime Contractor and Subcontractor (to include teaming partners, and/or joint venture partners) commit to joint contract performance as described in the proposal. A separate letter shall be completed for each subcontractor separately. If the signed commitment is not fully executed by both parties and provided with the Past Performance Proposal, the subcontractor references will not be evaluated or considered. In the event the signed letter is not submitted with the initial proposal, but is later submitted during the evaluation, the subcontractor references will be considered at that point, if practicable for the government.

6.2 Early Proposal Information

Each Offeror is requested to submit the Past Performance volume fifteen (15) calendar days prior to the solicitation's closing date. The Past Performance volume early proposal information is a request and not a requirement. Failure to submit early proposal information will not result in Offeror disqualification, nor will offerors be penalized.

As soon as practicable, offerors shall complete Section 1 of the attached Past Performance Questionnaire (ITO Attachment 1.2) and e-mail it and the Sample Questionnaire Cover Letter (ITO Attachment 1.3) to all points of contacts (POCs) the Offeror has listed in the Past Performance Information Form (ITO Attachment 1.1). The POCs will complete the questionnaires and forward them directly to the PCO. Email address for questionnaires is brandi.sheldon@us.af.mil. 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 PPET will conduct such follow-up with any POC as necessary.

6.3 Relevant Contracts

The Offeror shall provide Past Performance Information (PPI) on current or previous contracts (or efforts). The PPI shall be completed in accordance with ITO Attachment 1.1, Past Performance Information Form (PPIF). The Offeror shall submit PPIFs for contracts which include all or some performance within the past five (5) years, as defined in Section M, paragraph 2.4.2.1, Recency Assessment. The government requests that each Offeror submit up to three (3) PPIFs for the prime contractor, and up to 3 PPIFs for each significant subcontractor/teaming partner. Significant subcontractor is defined as a contractor who is proposed to perform over 5% of the total effort, or a contractor who is proposed to perform less than 5% of the total effort but is determined to be performing a critical function. NOTE: The requested number of PPIFs for the prime and subcontractors are preferences and not requirements. Offerors may submit more than the preferred number if the Offeror believes the extra contracts are needed to fully describe their relevancy. Offerors who submit less than the preferred number of PPIFs are not automatically assigned a "Neutral Confidence" rating. Fewer numbers may be acceptable, if the government determines there is sufficient information to determine a confidence rating. Request each PPIF not exceed a target of 5 pages, although more or less may be submitted, if necessary and relevant to the KC-135 CCR program.

6.3.1 PPI Relevant Contract Narrative

For each PPIF, the Offeror shall provide a narrative explaining what aspects of the contract is deemed relevant to the proposed effort, and to what aspects of the proposed effort they relate. Specifically, the narrative should focus on similarities to the Factor 1 Technical Subfactors (Technical Solution, Data Rights and Schedule); Factor 4 Cost/Price; and Scope, Magnitude, and Complexity as defined in Section M, paragraph 2.4.2.2, and should be tailored to the proposed portion of effort. Categorize the relevant information into the specific technical subfactors and overall cost/price of previous efforts used to evaluate the proposal. The narrative may include a discussion of efforts accomplished by the Offeror to resolve problems encountered on prior contracts as well as past efforts to identify and manage program risk. Merely having problems does not automatically equate to a Limited or No Confidence rating, since the problems encountered may have been on a more complex program, or an Offeror may have subsequently demonstrated the ability to overcome the problems encountered with corrective actions. 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. This may allow the Offeror to be considered a higher confidence candidate. For example, submittal of quality performance indicators or other management indicators that clearly support that an Offeror has overcome past problems is required. The Offeror is requested to limit the narrative to a maximum of 5 pages. However, the Offeror may exceed the requested page limit, if determined necessary to fully describe relevancy. Affiliate companies, sister companies, teaming arrangements, joint venture agreement, etc., will be considered, provided that sufficient documentation is included in the proposal. The Prime contractor must demonstrate that the affiliate will perform significant and critical aspects of the contract if awarded. Proposal documentation should include a copy of the signed arrangement such as documented affiliation, a copy of the teaming agreement, a copy of the joint venture agreement, etc. If the required information is not included in the proposal, the proposed affiliate companies, sister companies, joint venture companies, etc. will not be evaluated or considered.

6.3.2 Organizational Structure Change History

Many companies have acquired, been acquired by, or otherwise merged with other companies and/or reorganized their divisions, business groups, subsidiary companies, etc. In many cases, these changes have taken place during the time of performance of relevant past efforts or between the conclusion of recent past efforts and this source selection. As a result, it is sometimes difficult to determine what past performance is relevant to this acquisition. To facilitate this relevancy determination, offerors shall include a "roadmap" describing all such changes in the organization of the Offeror's company. A pamphlet or other commercial document describing such reorganizations may suffice. As part of this explanation, show how these changes impact the relevance of any efforts you identify for past performance evaluation/performance confidence assessment. Since the government intends to consider past performance information provided by other sources as well as that provided by the Offeror(s), the "roadmap" should be both specifically applicable to the efforts identified, yet general enough to apply to efforts on which the government receives information from other sources.

7.0 Factor 4 – Cost/Price

7.1 Cost/Price General Instructions

In the Cost/Price Volume, the Offeror shall provide information in their proposal narrative as described in Section 7.0 in addition to the Cost Model/Pricing Matrix referred to herein as the Excel Pricing Workbook (EPW) in RFP Attachment 3A, EPW - PRIME (and RFP Attachment 3B, EPW – SUB, if applicable). (Throughout the Cost/Price Volume, the term "Offeror" is defined as the prime Offeror which may be a joint venture.) The instructions provided serve to assist Offerors in submitting information required to evaluate the reasonableness, balance, and realism of your proposed costs/prices. Compliance with these instructions is mandatory and failure to comply may result in rejection of your proposal. The Government will evaluate each proposal in accordance with (IAW) the Cost/Price Factor in Section M. For CLINs 0001, 0002, and 0003 only, the Government will perform a price analysis with cost realism analysis based on the Offeror's technical and estimating approach. For all firm fixed price (FFP) priced CLINs, a price analysis will be performed. Detailed information regarding the cost/price evaluation will be provided in Section M.

The burden of proof for credibility of proposed costs/prices rests with the Offeror. Proper presentation and adequate supporting documentation are necessary to ensure the cost/price proposal is efficiently evaluated and all assumptions are understood. If the Offeror does not, in the Government's judgment, substantiate its cost/price proposal in part or as a whole, the Government may consider other data and the judgment of the members of the source selection evaluation team in determining the probable cost.

7.1.1 Reasonableness

The Government will evaluate proposals for reasonableness. Normally, reasonableness is established through adequate price competition but may also be determined through other price analysis techniques. Offerors shall provide sufficient rationale describing how costs/prices were developed (such as assumptions, historical data, projections, expertise, management decisions, etc.). It shall be noted that completeness is one aspect of reasonableness. For completeness, the Offeror shall provide all required inputs in RFP Attachment 3A, EPW – PRIME, to include FFP unit prices for CLINs X007 – X009, X011 – X016, and X020 - X021 (all specified performance periods) in addition to sufficient data other than cost or pricing data for the Basic Period target costs

(which are based on required inputs in the cost model worksheets by task) and target fees for Cost Plus Incentive Fee (CPIF) CLINs 0001 – 0003 (to include major subcontractor costs in RFP Attachment 3B, EPW – SUB, if applicable). Target fees shall be input into the worksheet entitled "PRIME CPIF RATES (ALL)" in the EPW and will be applied in the cost model by task within each CPIF EMD CLIN. If applicable, commercial material proposed at price (and thus excluded from Target Costs) for EMD CLINs 0001, X002, and 0003 shall be specified in the "PRIME CPIF TOTAL MATERIAL" worksheet (see Paragraph 7.2.4 for additional instructions). For the FFP Production CLINs (CLINs X007 – X009, X011 – X016, and X020 - X021), if an Offeror's proposed unit price is zero ($0), then the Offeror is required to provide rationale in the Cost/Price Volume narrative to support the zero-dollar entry

7.1.2 Balanced Pricing

The Offeror is cautioned against submitting an offer that exhibits unbalanced pricing. Unbalanced pricing may increase performance risk and could result in payment of unreasonable or unrealistic prices. Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable total evaluated cost/price, the cost/price of one or more CLINs is significantly overstated or understated as indicated by the application of cost/price analysis techniques, such that:

a. There is reasonable doubt the offer would result in the lowest overall cost to the Government, even though it is the lowest priced offer; or

b. The offer is so grossly unbalanced that its acceptance would be tantamount to allowing an advanced payment.

An overstated or understated CLIN cost/price may also be due to an illogical progression of unit costs/prices between program years, (b) unit costs/prices that do not take into account quantity variations, or (c) the "front-loading" of CLINs; these situations could reflect an inaccurate "true" cost/price for that CLIN. Front-loading occurs when a larger than normal amount of costs/prices are concentrated in an early contract period. The Government may consider any "front-loaded" CLIN as unbalanced, because acceptance of the proposal could result in advanced payment. Offerors shall provide rationale in the Cost/Price Volume narrative for any proposed FFP Production CLIN unit price increase greater than 5% from one year to the next, or <u>any</u> proposed CLIN unit price decrease from one year to the next. It is in the Offeror's best interest to provide explanations or supporting rationale for any significant annual CLIN unit price variances.

Offers that are determined to be unbalanced may be rejected if the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.

7.1.3 Price Realism

For FFP Production CLINs X007 – X009, X011 – X016, and X020 – X021, price realism analysis will be performed by the Government to determine whether proposed prices are based on an adequate understanding of contract requirements and to ensure the proposed prices do not pose unacceptable risk to performance. Offerors shall provide sufficient rationale describing how prices were developed (such as assumptions, historical data, projections, expertise, management decisions, etc). All proposed prices shall be sufficient and adequately proposed to ensure performance is not at an unacceptable risk with prices proposed too low.

7.1.4 Cost Realism

Cost realism is the process of independently reviewing and evaluating specific elements of the Offeror's cost estimate to determine whether the estimated proposed cost elements are realistic for the work to be performed, reflect a clear understanding of the requirements, and are consistent with the unique methods of performance described in the Offeror's technical and estimating approach. For this effort, cost realism analysis will be performed on the proposed costs for CPIF EMD CLINs 0001, 0002, and 0003. See paragraph 7.1.6 for additional information regarding the requirement for cost realism analysis.

7.1.4.1 Probable Cost (PC)

IAW RFO 15.404-3, the PC estimate is the Government estimate of the cost to acquire specific goods and/or services based on each Offeror's proposed approach. The result of the cost realism analysis on CLINs 0001, 0002, and 0003 is the PC, which will reflect the Government's best estimate of the cost that is most likely to result from the Offeror's proposal and may differ from the costs proposed by the Offeror. The PC will be utilized to make a best value determination. The overall evaluated PC includes the likely cost to the Government for CLINs 0001 - 0003.

7.1.5 Total Evaluated Price (TEP)

The Offeror's TEP is calculated in the EPW (RFP Attachment 3A, EPW - PRIME) based on the Offeror's inputs. To calculate the TEP, the proposed costs and prices will be multiplied by the best estimated quantities (BEQs) in the EPW for the Basic Period and all Option Periods. The product of each calculation (by CLIN) will be summed to arrive at the TEP. For the TEP calculation methodology by CLIN, refer to the worksheet in RFP Attachment 3A, EPW - PRIME entitled "Calculation Methodology." The TEP is calculated as the sum of the four (4) year Basic Period and six (6) one-year Option Periods. The "SUMMARY" worksheet of Attachment 3A reflects the Offeror's proposed TEP amount broken out by CLIN and performance period, and the "TOTAL EVALUATED PRICE ROLLUP" worksheet reflects the total TEP amount broken out by performance period. Offerors must ensure all required cost information and prices are provided in the EPW and that all periods of performance are priced.

For CPIF EMD CLINs 0001, 0002, and 0003, the Offeror's proposed Target Costs (excluding commercial material at price, if applicable) and Target Fees will be automatically populated in the "CPIF CLIN BREAKDOWN" worksheet based on cost inputs from the "CPIF CLIN 000X-TASK 1.XX INPUTS" worksheets in the EPW. Share ratios and minimum/maximum fees are provided by the Government in this worksheet.

Note: The BEQs provided in the EPW are the Government's best estimates. They are provided for evaluation purposes only and do not obligate the Government to exercise options or guarantee such quantities during the contract period of performance.

7.1.6 Cost or Pricing Data Requirements/Data Other Than Certified Cost or Pricing Data

It is anticipated that pricing of this action will be based on adequate price competition. IAW RFO 15.403-1(a)(1), prices based on adequate price competition do not require submissions of certified cost

or pricing data by Offerors, Interdivisional Work Organization/Interdivisional Work Transfer (IWO/IWT), or major subcontractors. IAW RFO 15.403-1(b), however, data other than certified cost or pricing data may be required to support reasonableness. The RFO does not preclude the requirement for obtaining data other than certified cost or pricing data under certain circumstances and the Government reserves the right to obtain data as appropriate. Should the Contracting Officer (CO) determine proposed prices appear unreasonable or the possibility that an Offeror does not fully understand the requirement, the Offerors may be required to submit data other than certified cost or pricing data to support reasonableness or realism.

If after receipt of proposals it is determined that adequate price competition does not exist, certified cost or pricing data shall be required IAW R-DFARS 252.215-7992 (Deviation 2026-O-0048).

Price analysis techniques shall be used to ensure fair and reasonable pricing IAW RFO 15.404-1(a)(4). Providing information to assist with cost/price evaluation to further support proposed pricing will expedite the source selection process.

IAW RFO 15.404-3, cost realism analysis shall be performed on cost-reimbursement contracts. This is applicable only to CPIF EMD CLINs 0001, 0002, and 0003 on this effort. All prime Offerors valued at equal to or greater than $2,500,000 for the cost-type CLINS (in aggregate) shall provide data other than certified cost or pricing data using the provided cost model format to substantiate the cost realism for CLINs X001, X002, and X003. This requirement also applies to major subcontractors with a value exceeding $2,500,000 and who propose a cost-type arrangement with the prime Offeror (RFP Attachment 3A, EPW - PRIME is the for Prime Offeror cost/price proposals and RFP Attachment 3B, EPW - SUB is for major subcontractor cost proposals, if applicable). See Paragraph 7.2.4 for additional information. Offerors should refer to the information provided in Table 15-1 of RFO 15.408-2 for instructions on submitting acceptable cost information. Any significant (unexplained) inconsistency, could raise a fundamental issue with the Offeror's understanding of the nature and scope of work required and ability to perform the contract, and could be grounds for rejection of the proposal. The burden of proof as to the credibility of the cost proposal rests with the Offeror.

The reasonableness and realism of indirect rates is fundamental to a successful acquisition. Proposing unreasonable indirect rates has a powerful negative impact on the affordability of an Offeror's proposed price. On the other hand, unrealistic proposed indirect rates are a particular concern because such rates are unfair to conscientious Offerors and lead to cost overruns after contract award. The realism of indirect cost including fringe benefits will be assessed by cost analysis performed by the Government.

Throughout the Cost/Price Volume, the term "major subcontractor" is defined as, and includes, any subcontractor or IWO/IWT at any tier whose total proposed aggregate total is equal to or greater than $2,500,000. The term "minor subcontractor" is defined as, and includes, any subcontractor or IWO/IWT at any tier whose total proposal is less than $2,500,000. (reference Paragraph 7.2.4 for additional information pertaining to subcontractor pricing.) Based on the proposals received, the Government reserves the right to determine the appropriate level of cost realism analysis to be performed on major subcontract proposals

7.2 Cost/Price General Instructions

This section is to assist Offerors in submitting other than certified cost or pricing data that is required to evaluate the Offeror's proposal IAW Section M. All information relating to the proposed costs/prices including all required supporting documentation must be included in the section of the proposal designated as

the Cost/Price Volume. **Under no circumstances shall this information and documentation be included elsewhere in the proposal, with the exception of Contract Documentation Volume 8.0.** In submitting its proposal, the Offeror grants the CO or an authorized representative the right to examine, at any time before award, books, records, documents or other directly pertinent records concerning the reasonableness and realism of proposed costs or prices

7.2.1 Rounding

All costs/prices in the EPW shall be provided in US currency and rounded to the nearest cent unless otherwise noted. All proposed labor rates shall be rounded to the nearest cent (two decimal places to the right of the decimal). Proposed percentages for indirect rates, etc. shall be rounded to four decimal places to the right of the decimal (example: .0751, or 7.51%).

7.2.2 Proposed Price Reduction per Corporate/Management Decision

If proposed costs/prices to perform the proposed effort have been decreased due to a management decision, provide a summary of the reduction in the Cost/Price Volume narrative by major cost/price element (e.g., material, labor, overhead, etc.). Also, provide complete rationale for the reduction. Provide the estimated dollar and percentage of the reduction, explaining how such reductions are ensured not to increase performance risk to the Government. If the Offeror has not proposed any price reductions, then state accordingly in the Price Volume

7.2.3 Business Systems

7.2.3.1 Accounting System

IAW RFO 16.301-3(a)(2) the Offerors must use an accounting system that can adequately segregate, accumulate and allocate costs specifically attributed to the contract. Offerors must state whether their accounting system has been reviewed by the Government and provide evidence of the review and approval by Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA)/Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA). If the system has not been reviewed by the Government, then Offerors must provide a summary description of the Offeror's accounting system and state whether it is compliant with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles. Provide any known/cited accounting system deficiencies and identify any deviations from the Offeror's standard procedures in preparing this proposal. The Offeror shall provide any known/cited accounting system deficiencies and identify any deviations from the Offeror's standard procedures in preparing this proposal. If there are no deviations, then state accordingly. For known/cited accounting system or non-compliances, provide a schedule and description of corrective actions the Offeror is taking to eliminate the non-compliance issues. DCMA determines the adequacy of a contractor's accounting system following an audit performed by DCAA.

If the Offeror does not currently have an adequate accounting system, the Offeror shall complete and submit the attached RFP Attachment 9 entitled "Contractor Self Assertion - Pre-Award Survey of Prospective Contractor accounting system Checklist." If required to make a responsibility determination, the Government will forward the checklist to the cognizant DCAA office in order to initiate their review of the Offeror's accounting system(s) to determine if it is adequate for a cost-reimbursement contract.

Any potential contract awardee must have an accounting system determined adequate before contract

award can be made. Contract award will not be delayed awaiting an Offeror to receive determination of adequacy of their accounting system.

7.2.3.2 Estimating System

The Offeror shall provide a summary description of the Offeror's standard estimating system or methods, current policies, and/or new policies. The Offeror shall state whether the estimating system and new policies have been reviewed by the Government and shall provide evidence of review and/or Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO) approval. The Offeror shall provide any known/cited estimating system deficiencies and identify any deviations from the Offeror's established/standard estimating procedures used in preparing this proposal. For known/cited estimating system or methods non-compliances, provide a schedule and description of corrective actions the offeror is taking to eliminate the non-compliance issues.

7.2.3.3 Purchasing System

The Offeror shall provide a summary description of the Offeror's purchasing system or methods. The Offeror shall state whether the purchasing system has been reviewed by the Government and provide evidence of review and/or ACO approval. The Offeror shall provide any known/cited purchasing system deficiencies and identify any deviations from the Offeror's established/standard purchasing procedures used in preparing this proposal. For known/cited purchasing system or methods non-compliances, provide a schedule and description of corrective actions the Offeror is taking to eliminate the non-compliance issues.

7.2.3.4 Cost Accounting Standards (CAS) Disclosure Statement

The Offeror shall provide a summary description of the Offeror's current CAS Disclosure Statement. The Offeror shall state whether the current CAS Disclosure Statement has been reviewed by the Government and provide evidence of review and/or ACO approval. The Offeror shall provide any currently known/cited CAS non-compliances and identify any deviations from the Offeror's CAS Disclosure Statement used in preparing this proposal. For known/cited CAS non-compliances, provide a schedule and description of corrective actions the Offeror is taking to eliminate the non-compliance issues.

7.2.4 Proposed Subcontractor Pricing and/or IWO/IWT Pricing

In the Cost/Price Volume narrative, the Offeror shall submit a list of all proposed probable subcontractors and IWO/IWTs included in the proposal. For each entry, the Offeror shall identify:

(a) the supplier or vendor

(b) description of effort or item

(c) type of contract for <u>all</u> CLINs (i.e. fixed price, cost-type, etc.)

(d) Whether the item was obtained competitively or sole source, and

(e) Commercial item determination support and other than cost and pricing data to support commercial prices, if applicable

For the cost-type CLINs specifically, provide the total price, by CLIN, for each major subcontractor. If a major subcontractor proposes a cost-type arrangement, the subcontractor shall provide cost information at the same level of detail as required by the prime Offeror. This information is not considered certified cost or pricing data and will be used solely for the cost realism evaluation. Because this is a competitive procurement, certified cost

or pricing data is not required from the Offeror or its subcontractors. However, the Offeror shall provide the same supporting documentation it relied upon to determine the pricing reasonable for any major subcontract, vendor quote, or material element. This may include competition results, catalog pricing, market research, historical pricing, or other price analysis support IAW RFO 15.404-8.

As prime contractor, documentation is required to demonstrate subcontractor commercial quotes are considered fair and reasonable. Include a detailed description of your process/methodology for evaluating subcontractor pricing and a determination of subcontractor proposed prices as fair and reasonable. Offerors are required to provide an explanation of how Prime indirect costs, General and Administrative (G&A) and profit/fee are applied to subcontractor proposed prices and whether all subcontractor costs, including indirect rates, G&A, and profit/fee are included as a total subcontract amount (i.e., Prime treats all subcontractor/vendor costs as their direct cost to which the Prime applies their own indirect costs, G&A, cost of money (COM) and profit/fee).

For any subcontractors associated with CPIF EMD CLINs 0001, 0002, and 0003, to include minor subcontractors, Offerors shall include roll-up cost data in the "PRIME CPIF TOTAL SUB" worksheet of RFP Attachment 3A, EPW - PRIME. If necessary, the Contracting Officer may request additional minor subcontractor cost data during negotiations.

If a major subcontractor associated with CPIF EMD CLINs 0001, 0002, or 0003 considers any portion of its cost or price determination proprietary (e.g. detailed material, labor, or indirect rate information, etc.), preventing that documentation from being fully integrated with the prime contractor's Cost/Price Volume, a separate, unsanitized Cost/Price Volume, or portion thereof, may be provided directly to the Government with proprietary restrictions clearly noted via the Solicitation Module of the Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE) (https://piee.eb.mil). The Government will protect such information IAW applicable regulations. When a Cost/Price volume submission is made directly to the Government, the major subcontractor must clearly identify the Offeror and RFP to which their submitted cost data applies. Major subcontractor submissions must conform to the same compliance standards set forth as applicable to the Offeror (including electronic submissions). Alternatively, in lieu of direct submission to the Government, major subcontractors may provide unsanitized electronic submittals to the Offeror for inclusion with the Offeror's Cost/Price Volume submittal to the Government. Whether integrated or provided separately, all cost or price documentation shall follow the instructions provided in this solicitation including, but not limited to, submission of RFP Attachment 3B, EPW - SUB and compliance with the proposal receipt deadline.

7.2.5 Assumptions Used in Development of Proposed Prices

All significant assumptions, scope limitations and/or qualifications affecting the pricing proposal shall be addressed and explained in the Cost/Price Volume narrative. If there are no proposed price assumptions, then state accordingly

7.2.6 Government Furnished Property/Equipment/Material (GFP/GFE/GFM)

In the Cost/Price Volume narrative, provide assumptions regarding usage of all GFP, including GFE and GFM as reflected in your cost/price proposal.

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

In the Cost/Price Volume narrative, provide assumptions regarding usage of all CFP, including CFE, CFT, and CFM as reflected in your cost/price proposal. It is the contractor's responsibility to obtain property, equipment, tooling, and/or material required for performance of this contract.

7.2.8 Government Field Support Agencies

In the Cost/Price Volume narrative, identify the cognizant DCAA and DCMA office(s) responsible for administration of the Offeror's, major subcontractor's, and/or IWO/IWTs, etc. Government contracts. Include names, addresses, telephone numbers, and email addresses

7.2.9 Other Documentation

Other documentation considered by Offerors to be essential for support of proposed costs/prices shall be presented in this section of the Cost/Price Volume narrative. For the FFP portion of this effort (CLINs X007 – X009, X011 - X016, and X020 - X021), the Offeror shall provide a statement confirming their understanding that all risk associated with fluctuations in estimated quantities, subcontractor pricing at all tiers, market changes, etc. has been considered and incorporated into the proposed price.

7.3 Pricing Support Information

7.3.1 Format and Specific Content Required

Pertaining to Cost/Price, the Offeror shall submit RFP Attachment 3A, EPW – PRIME, RFP Attachment 3B – SUB (if applicable) and the Cost/Price Volume narrative to address Section L requirements, as discussed below:

a. Excel Pricing Workbook (EPW): The Prime Offeror shall complete the RFP Attachment 3A, EPW - PRIME, which includes cost model worksheets for CPIF EMD CLINs 0001 – 0003 and a Pricing Matrix worksheet for FFP Production CLINs X007 – X009, X011 - X016, and X020 - X021. The TEP will be calculated based on inputs in the EPW (Attachment 3A, EPW – PRIME). Refer to the Calculation Methodology worksheet in the EPW for additional information. The EPW file(s) shall be submitted to the PCO via PIEE Solicitation Module, https://piee.eb.mil/ in .xls file format (Microsoft (MS) Office 365-Excel) without passwords or hidden information. The proposed pricing must be consistent with your approved accounting system and must duplicate the logic reflected in the Cost/Price Volume. Refer to Paragraph 7.3.6 for additional EPW instructions.

   RFP Attachment 3B, EPW-SUB is provided as a Cost Model for major subcontractor cost information for CPIF EMD CLINs 0001, 0002, and 0003 (if applicable). RFP Attachment 3B only includes the Cost Model portion of the EPW for input of major subcontract costs and shall be submitted for each major subcontractor.

   To enhance the efficiency of the proposal evaluation process and to mitigate potential spreadsheet formatting issues, the Government invites Offerors (and major subcontractors, if applicable) to submit a draft of their EPW for a preliminary format review via the PIEE Solicitation Module. Draft EPWs should be submitted no later than fifteen (15) calendar days prior to the formal proposal submission deadline. The Government will conduct a cursory review of the draft EPW, limited strictly to the workbook's format and structure. Feedback on the format will be provided to the respective Offeror no later than five (5) calendar days prior to the proposal submission due date. Draft EPWs submitted later than fifteen (15) calendar days prior to the formal proposal submission deadline are not guaranteed a cursory review and will be reviewed in the order received. The Government feedback for late submissions may be provided less than five (5) calendar days prior to the proposal submission due date if at all. It must be emphasized that this preliminary review will not include an evaluation of any proposed costs, prices, or other quantitative data.

The formal evaluation of all proposal elements, including cost and price, will occur only after the complete and proposal is received by the established deadline. Participation in this draft submission process is at the Offeror's discretion and is not a requirement of this solicitation. An Offeror's decision to submit or decline to submit a draft EPW will not be considered during the formal evaluation and will not be viewed either favorably or unfavorably.

(1) Cost Model Worksheets in EPW (CPIF): The Offeror shall complete a live, working cost model in the RFP Attachment 3A, EPW-PRIME for CPIF EMD CLINs 0001, 0002, and 0003 by task. All formulas in the cost model worksheets shall be included and no links to external Microsoft (MS) Excel files shall be permitted.
   - If applicable, the Prime Offeror shall submit the Cost Model in RFP Attachment 3B, EPW-SUB for each major subcontractors for CPIF EMD CLINs 0001, 0002, and 0003 with a proposed amount equal to or greater than $2,500,000 under a cost-type arrangement. Referencing Paragraph 7.2.4 above, the major subcontractor may submit this cost model directly to the Government, if necessary.

(2) Pricing Matrix Worksheets in EPW (FFP): The Offeror shall complete the Pricing Matrix worksheet entitled "FFP CLINs X007 – X021" in the EPW for Production CLINs X007 – X009, X011 - X016, and X020 - X021
   - For CLIN X021, the Offeror shall also complete the worksheet entitled "SPARES - FFP CLINs X021 INPUTS"

b. Cost/Price Volume Narrative: The Offeror shall provide a Cost/Price narrative in MS Word format to substantiate the EPW. The narrative should be sufficiently detailed to demonstrate the reasonableness, balance, and realism of the proposed costs/prices. The Cost/Price Volume narrative shall include the following:
   - Title page containing the solicitation number, name, address, and telephone of the Offeror and electronic e-mail address if available
   - Table of Contents
   - Glossary of all abbreviations and acronyms used
   - Definitions as necessary
   - CAGE Codes for the Prime Offeror and all subcontractors
   - Rationale for any proposed FFP Production CLIN unit price increase greater than 5% from one year to the next, or any proposed CLIN unit price decrease from one year to the next, if applicable (see Paragraph 7.1.2)
   - Rationale for proposed cost/price reductions based on management decision; if not applicable, a statement is required for confirmation (see Paragraph 7.2.2)
   - Information required for the Offeror's business systems (see Paragraphs 7.2.3.1, 7.2.3.2, 7.2.3.3, and 7.2.3.4)
   - A table identifying each major subcontractor and required information (see Paragraph 7.2.4)
   - Cost/Price assumptions made by the Offeror to build the proposed pricing (see Paragraph 7.2.5)
   - GFP/GFE/GFM Assumptions (see Paragraph 7.2.6)
   - CPF/CFE/CFT/CFM Assumptions (see Paragraph 7.2.7)
   - Cognizant DCAA and DCMA information for Offeror and major subcontractors (See Paragraph 7.2.8)
   - Other Documentation, if applicable and a statement confirming the Offeror's understanding of the risk associated with FFP pricing (see Paragraph 7.2.9)

- Consolidated Bill of Materials (CBOM) – confirm a CBOM has been provided as an attachment to Section L (in contractor format) (see Paragraph 7.3.2)
- A table identifying part numbers in the CBOM that are proposed as commercial at price (see Paragraph 7.3.2.1)
- Date of current Forward Pricing Rate Agreement/Forward Pricing Rate Recommendation (FPRA/FPRR) for Prime, and all major subcontractors for CPIF CLINs 0001, 0002, and 0003 (see Paragraph 7.3.3)
- If an FPRA/FPRR is not available, refer to Paragraph 7.3.3.1, Support Required in lieu of FPRA/FPRR

7.3.2 CBOM

Offerors shall submit a CBOM (as an attachment to the Cost/Price Volume narrative) presenting proposed amounts shown within the "CPIF CLIN X001-TASK 1.XX INPUTS" worksheets of the EPW (RFP Attachment 3A, EPW – PRIME) for all CPIF CLINs for the prime. The prime shall also include each subcontractor/vendor's data for their sole source CPIF CLINs. The CBOM provided shall be sortable and shall include vendor names, part numbers, nomenclature, unit prices, quantities, and extended prices. A column shall also be included that indicates whether the part number is commercial or non-commercial (see Paragraph 7.3.2.1 below). Provide the CBOM in electronic .xls format, with no macros, that lists proposed material cost allocations to individual CPIF CLINs by performance period. This cost data shall reconcile to the material estimates supported in the "PRIME CPIF TOTAL MATERIAL" worksheet in the EPW (RFP Attachment 3A, EPW - PRIME). The Offeror shall also submit the supporting documentation for the top eighty percent (80%) of the extended values contained in the total dollar of items on the CBOM, such as a copy of the vendor quote (sole source or competitive), or printout from the Offeror's/subcontractor's/vendor's historical database showing what was paid in the past to include timeframe and quantity.

Likewise, a CBOM for each major subcontractor with a cost-type proposal to the prime Offeror valued at or above $2,500,000 shall also be submitted, if applicable, and shall reconcile to the "SUB CPIF TOTAL MATERIAL" worksheet contained in RFP Attachment 3B, EPW – SUB, if applicable.

7.3.2.1 Commercial Material at Price

If applicable, the Offeror may opt to propose commercial material at price, i.e. inclusive of indirect costs and/or fee. If commercial material at price is proposed, the Offeror shall include a column in the CBOM identifying the part number proposed in this manner. In addition, the Offeror shall include a table in the Cost/Price Volume that lists all part numbers considered commercial and the proposed price of the material. The Offeror shall provide sufficient data to support the proposed commercial pricing IAW RFO 15.403-1.

7.3.3 FPRA/FPRR Information

Provide the date of the most current FPRA/FPRR for the Prime Offeror, and for all major subcontractors with a proposed value equal to or greater than $2,500,000 proposing a cost-type arrangement for CPIF CLINs 0001, 0002, and 0003. Rates and factors shall be supplied for the Offeror and all major subcontractors proposing a cost-type arrangement.

7.3.3.1 Support Required in lieu of FPRR/FPRA (if applicable)

In support of the elemental cost breakouts, all Offerors (prime and major subcontractors with a proposed value equal to or greater than $2,500,000 proposing a cost-type arrangement) who have neither a FPRA nor a FPRR

shall submit the following items/information as an attachment to their Cost/Price Volume narrative. If any of the items/information is not available for a particular Offeror, it shall be noted in the Offeror's response to the RFP.

1. Previous three years' actual historical rates for each individual cost element used in developing the proposed unit costs
2. Breakout of actual expenses included in the indirect cost pools and respective bases, from the previous three years
3. Breakout of the budgeted forecasts for the indirect pools and bases used in developing the proposed unit costs, covering the entire 4-year Basic Period
4. Certified payroll verification with current labor rates, cross-referenced to the respective proposed labor categories shall be provided in support of the proposed direct labor rates for the first year of the Basic Period. If year one proposed rates are not supported by current labor, Offeror shall provide assumptions for hiring individuals, and labor rates that will be offered.

All information submitted in support of items 1-3 above shall be in .xls file format with live working formulas, and no macros. Any other type of file format will not be accepted for items 1-3 but is acceptable for item 4. It is the Offeror's responsibility to review all proposals submitted by any major subcontractor for accuracy and format. It is also the Offeror's responsibility to submit all major subcontractor proposed unit costs, major subcontractor elemental cost breakouts, and major subcontractor documentation in support of the elemental cost breakouts, as part of the Offeror's proposal. For any of the above referenced information that a major subcontractor may not be willing to provide directly to the Offeror, the Offeror shall instruct the major subcontractor to provide that information directly to the Government IAW the terms and conditions of this solicitation.

7.3.4 Excel Pricing Workbook (EPW) – Additional Information

The EPW shall contain the required information to complete a cost realism and price analysis. The Offeror shall complete the Cost Model/Pricing Matrix contained in the EPW for all CLINs (live, working spreadsheet in MS Excel, including formulas). For CPIF EMD CLINs X001 – X003, amounts for all elements of proposed costs shall be provided. For Production FFP CLINs X007 – X009, X011 - X016, and X020 - X021, prices shall be provided for all CLINs by performance period. The format for the EPW is supplied in RFP Attachment 3A, EPW - PRIME. Offerors shall review all instructions contained in RFP Attachment 3A and shall ensure the information provided is compliant with the included instructions. All instructions contained in Attachment 3B, EPW – SUB shall be reviewed and the Offeror or major subcontractor (if submitting directly to the Government) shall ensure the information provided is compliant with the included instructions.

General information pertaining to inputs required in the Cost Model/Pricing Matrix is provided as follows.

<u>FFP Production (CLINs X007 – X009, X011 - X016, and X020 - X021) Pricing Matrix Inputs</u>

Input unit prices for each CLIN for all performance periods in the worksheet entitled "FFP CLINs X007 – X021". Unit prices shall be input into the yellow-highlighted cells and shall be proposed at sufficient dollar amounts to adequately cover any and all fluctuations in actual costs and to ensure adequate coverage of all labor costs, all indirect costs, and profit in the out-years.

For CLIN X021 LRU Spares specifically, input all required information into the yellow-highlighted cells in the worksheet entitled "SPARES-FFP CLIN X021 INPUTS", to include the National Stock Number (NSN), Part

Number (P/N), Item Description, quantity, and unit price for each B-Kit component (by performance period); the proposed totals for CLIN X021 will automatically link to the "FFP CLINs X007 – X021" worksheet. For CLIN X008AB Production B-Kit Complete Spare, Offerors shall provide proposed unit prices for a complete spare B-Kit for each performance period. Pricing of individual components may be provided in supporting rationale at the Offeror's discretion, but is not required).

CPIF EMD (CLINs X001, X002, and X003) Required Cost Model Inputs

To assist with determination of the PC, the Offeror must substantiate its proposed costs for CLINs 0001, 0002, and 0003 by demonstrating the accuracy and validity of the cost proposal. RFP Attachment 3A, EPW - PRIME contains multiple worksheets for cost inputs (highlighted in yellow) for Offerors to provide proposed cost information associated with CPIF EMD CLINs 0001, 0002, and 0003. These worksheets include:

"PRIME – CPIF RATES (ALL)" worksheet: Input all proposed direct labor categories and labor rates by year. Input all proposed indirect rates applicable to this requirement relating to labor, material, and Other Direct Costs (ODC) in the yellow-highlighted cells. Amend the worksheet as necessary to capture all proposed labor categories and applicable indirect rates.

"PRIME CPIF RATE DESC (ALL)" worksheet: Input descriptions of proposed labor categories in the yellow-highlighted cells. Input the indirect rate categories to be utilized, along with a brief description of the indirect rate category and the base upon which the indirect rate applies in the yellow-highlighted cells. Amend the worksheet as necessary to capture all proposed labor categories and indirect rates, etc.

"PRIME CPIF LABOR by TASK" worksheet: Provide the proposed labor categories, task to be performed, number of full-time equivalents (FTEs), number of hours, and rationale for all proposed labor; information shall be provided at the sub-task level. Amend the worksheet as necessary to capture the proposed labor categories by sub-task.

"PRIME CPIF LABOR INPUTS" worksheet: Input the labor categories and proposed labor hours for each task (at the sub-task level) in the yellow-highlighted cells. Ensure the corresponding labor rates link properly to the "PRIME CPIF RATES (ALL)" worksheet. Amend the worksheet as necessary to capture all proposed labor.

"PRIME CPIF TOTAL MATERIAL" worksheet: Provide a summary of the proposed material by task. There are two columns for each year of the Basic Period. The first column is provided for proposed commercial/non-commercial material costs to which the prime Offeror's indirect rates and target fee will be applied. If applicable, a second column has been provided to allow for inputs of commercial material costs proposed "at price", i.e. the proposed amount is considered by the prime Offeror to be inclusive of the prime Offeror's indirect rates and fee. The amounts provided in this worksheet shall reconcile to the CBOM (in contractor format) provided as an attachment to the Cost/Price Volume narrative (see Paragraph 7.3.2 and 7.3.2.1). Offeror shall link the total proposed material by task to each applicable worksheet (ex. "CPIF CLIN X001 – TASK 1.01 INPUTS, CPIF X001 – TASK 1.02 INPUTS", and so forth)

"PRIME CPIF TOTAL SUB" worksheet: Provide a summary by task for all subcontractor costs associated with the EMD effort, if applicable. The summarized amounts will include the costs for all subcontractor effort, to include the amounts proposed by minor subcontractors in addition to the amounts proposed for major subcontractors as reflected in RFP Attachment 3B, EPW – SUB submissions, if applicable. Offeror shall link the total proposed subcontractor costs by task to each applicable worksheet (ex. "CPIF CLIN X001 – TASK 1.01 INPUTS, CPIF X001 – TASK 1.02 INPUTS", and so forth)

"PRIME CPIF TOTAL ODC" worksheet: Provide a summary of the proposed ODCs by task. The amount provided in this worksheet shall reconcile to the breakdown of ODC costs (provided as an additional worksheet or as an attachment to the EPW), if applicable. Offeror shall link the total proposed ODC by task to each applicable worksheet (ex. "CPIF CLIN X001 – TASK 1.01 INPUTS, CPIF X001 – TASK 1.02 INPUTS", and so forth)

"CPIF CLIN X001 – TASK 1.0X INPUTS, CPIF CLIN X002 – TASK 1.0X INPUTS, and CPIF CLIN X003 – TASK 1.0X INPUTS" worksheets (for all task elements): Amend these worksheets as necessary to conform to the worksheets listed above. Ensure all base costs and rates are properly linked to their respective worksheets.

Based on cost inputs in the above referenced worksheets, proposed amounts (by tasks) for CLINs 0001, 0002, and 0003 will automatically populate in the "CPIF CLIN 000X-TASK 1.XX INPUTS" worksheets. For each CLIN, totals will automatically calculate in the "CPIF CLIN 000X TOTAL" and "CPIF CLIN 000X SUMMARY" worksheets, which ultimately flow into the "SUMMARY" and "TOTAL EVALUATED PRICE ROLLUP" worksheets to calculate the TEP. Offerors are permitted to alter the format of the "CPIF CLIN 000X-TASK 1.XX INPUTS", CPIF CLIN 000X TOTAL" and "CPIF CLIN 000X SUMMARY" worksheets to capture all of the Offeror's proposed cost information, as needed. The Offeror shall ensure proper linking between worksheets.

To summarize, the Offeror shall provide inputs in the following EPW worksheets as applicable. The format in the following worksheets may be amended by the Offeror to encompass all cost elements in the Offeror's proposed approach (if necessary):

FFP CLINs X007 – X021

SPARES-FFP CLIN X021 INPUTS

PRIME CPIF RATES (ALL)

PRIME CPIF RATE DESC (ALL)

PRIME CPIF LABOR by TASK

PRIME CPIF LABOR INPUTS

PRIME CPIF TOTAL MATERIAL

PRIME CPIF TOTAL SUB

PRIME CPIF TOTAL ODC

The following worksheets do not require Offeror input. However, the format in the following worksheets may be amended by the Offeror to encompass all cost elements in the Offeror's proposed approach (if necessary):

CPIF CLIN 0001 – TASK 1.01 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0001 – TASK 1.02 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0001 – TASK 1.03 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0001 – TASK 1.04 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0001 – TASK 1.05 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0001 – TASK 1.06 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0001 – TASK 1.07 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0001 – TASK 1.08 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0001 – TASK 1.09 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0001 – TASK 1.10 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0001 – TASK 1.11 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0002 – TASK 1.01 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0002 – TASK 1.02 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0002 – TASK 1.03 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0003 – TASK 1.01 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0003 – TASK 1.02 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0003 – TASK 1.03 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0003 – TASK 1.04 INPUTS

The following worksheets do not require inputs by the Offeror and shall not be amended by the Offeror:

INSTRUCTIONS

CALCULATION METHODOLOGY

SUMMARY

TOTAL EVALUATED PRICE ROLLUP

CPIF CLIN BREAKDOWN

The above EPW instructions shall be followed by the Prime Offeror at a minimum. At the discretion of the Offeror, additional information/data may be provided in the EPW if determined necessary. By doing so, the Offeror acknowledges that all data/information submitted is subject to analysis by the Government.

For Major Subcontracts Proposals Only:

RFP Attachment 3B, EPW - SUB includes the cost model worksheets specifically associated with major subcontractors proposing a cost-type arrangement with a total greater than or equal to $2,500,000 for CPIF EMD CLINs 0001, 0002, and 0003. The following worksheets require inputs by the Offeror (or major subcontractor if submitting directly to the Government) and may be amended to encompass all cost elements in the major subcontractor's proposed approach (if necessary):

SUB CPIF Rates (All)

SUB CPIF Rate Desc (All)

SUB CPIF LABOR by TASK

SUB CPIF LABOR INPUTS

SUB CPIF TOTAL MATERIAL

SUB CPIF TOTAL SUB

SUB CPIF TOTAL ODC

The following worksheets do not require Offeror/major subcontractor input. However, the format in the following worksheets may be amended by the Offeror/major subcontractor to encompass all cost elements in the major subcontractor's proposed approach (if necessary):

CPIF CLIN 0001 – TASK 1.01 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0001 – TASK 1.02 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0001 – TASK 1.03 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0001 – TASK 1.04 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0001 – TASK 1.05 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0001 – TASK 1.06 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0001 – TASK 1.07 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0001 – TASK 1.08 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0001 – TASK 1.09 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0001 – TASK 1.10 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0001 – TASK 1.11 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0002 – TASK 1.01 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0002 – TASK 1.02 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0002 – TASK 1.03 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0003 – TASK 1.01 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0003 – TASK 1.02 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0003 – TASK 1.03 INPUTS

CPIF CLIN 0003 – TASK 1.04 INPUTS

The above EPW instructions shall be followed by the major subcontractor at a minimum. At the discretion of the Offeror, additional information/data may be provided in the EPW if determined necessary. By doing so, the Offeror acknowledges that all data/information submitted is subject to analysis by the Government.

8.0 Contract Documentation

8.1 Model Contract/Representations and Certifications

The purpose of this volume is to provide information to the government for preparing the contract document and supporting file. The Offeror's proposal shall include a signed copy of the Model Contract, and Sections A through K.

8.2 Solicitation/Contract Form (Section A)

Completion of blocks 15-18 to include signature and date of the SF33. Signature by the Offeror on the SF33 constitutes an offer, which the government may accept. The "original" copy should be clearly marked under separate cover.

8.3 Supplies or Services and Prices (Section B)

Completed pricing information in Section B of the model contract.

8.4 Contract Clauses (Section I)

The Offeror shall provide required information to complete clauses as required.

8.5 Representations, Certifications, and other Statements of Offerors (Section K)

The Offeror has completed the annual representations and certification electronically via the System for Award Management (SAM.gov) website accessed through https://www.sam.gov. After reviewing the SAM database information, the Offeror verifies by submission of this offer that the representation and certifications currently posted electronically are correct.

8.6 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 subfactors. 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/or 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 4. Offerors are cautioned the government could determine any identified exceptions to be unacceptable, which would make the proposal ineligible for award.

Table 4: Solicitation Exceptions

Solicitation Document	Page/ Paragraph	Requirement/ Portion	Rationale
SOO, SOW, SPEC, Model Contract, ITO, 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

9.0 Other Information Required

9.1 Ombudsman

An Ombudsman has been appointed to hear concerns from offerors or potential offerors during the proposal development phase of this acquisition. The Ombudsman for this acquisition is AFSC/PZC, located at Tinker AFB, OK. This does not diminish the authority of the program director or CO, but communicates Offeror concerns, issues, disagreements, and recommendations to the appropriate government personnel. When requested, the Ombudsman shall maintain strict confidentiality as to the source of the concern. The Ombudsman does not participate in the evaluation of proposals or in the source selection process; interested parties are invited to call AFSC/PZC at 405-736-3273.

9.2 Authorized Offeror Personnel

Provide the name, title, and telephone number of the company/division point of contact regarding decisions made with respect to your proposal and who can obligate your company contractually. Also, identify those individuals authorized to negotiate with the government.

9.3 Government Offices

Provide the mailing address, telephone and fax numbers and facility codes for the cognizant Contract Administration Office, DCAA, and Government Paying Office. Also, provide the name and telephone and fax number for the Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO).

9.4 Company/Division Address, Identifying Codes, and Applicable Designations

Provide company/division's street address, county, and facility code; CAGE code; DUNS code; TIN; size of business (large or small); and labor surplus area designation. This same information must be provided if the work for this contract will be performed at any other location(s). List all locations where work is to be performed and indicate whether such facility is a division, affiliate, or subcontractor, and the percentage of work to be performed at each location.

9.5 Attachments to the Model Contract

The Offeror shall provide the following as attachments to the model contract:

a) Subcontracting Plan. Include a subcontracting plan IAW RFO 19.109. The plan must be approved by the PCO prior to contract award.

b) Supply Chain Risk Management Plan (SCRM) - As part of the terms and conditions of the solicitation requirements, Offerors are required to submit a Supply Chain Risk Management (SCRM) Plan in accordance with SOW 13.2.

c) Failure to include Subcontracting Plan, Supply Chain Risk Management Plan and Estimated Price List as part of your initial proposal may deem your proposal ineligible for award.

LIST OF DOCUMENTS, EXHIBITS OR ATTACHMENTS

See Section J of the RFP.

ITO ATTACHMENTS

ITO Attachment – 1.1 PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION FORM (PPIF)

ITO Attachment – 1.2 PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

ITO Attachment – 1.3 SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE COVER LETTER

ITO Attachment – 1.4 SAMPLE CONSENT LETTER

ITO Attachment – 1.5 SAMPLE CLIENT AUTHORIZATION LETTER

ITO Attachment – 1.6 COMMITMENT TO PERFORM AS PROPOSED LETTER

ITO Attachment – 2.0 PROPOSED TEAM LIST

ITO Attachment – 3.0 SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION COMMITMENT DOCUMENT (SBPCD)

ITO Attachment – 4.0 PRICING MATRIX/SAME AS ATTACH 5 OF SOLICITATION

ITO ATTACHMENT 1.1

PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION FORM

Provide the information requested in this form for each contract/program being described. Provide frank, concise comments regarding your performance on the contracts you identify. Request each offeror submit between 6 and 10 PPIS forms for the prime Contractor and between 4 and 7 for each significant subcontractor/teaming partner.

A. Offeror Name (Company/Division): _____
CAGE Code: _____
DUNS Number: _____
(NOTE: If the company or division performing this effort is different than the offeror or the relevance of this effort to the instant acquisition is impacted by any company/corporate organizational change, note those changes. Refer to the "Organizational Structure Change History" you provided as part of your Past Performance Volume).

B. Program Title: _____

C. Contract Specifics:

1. Contracting Agency or Customer:_____
2. Contract Number: _____
3. Contract Type: _____
(If multiple types (i.e. Firm-Fixed Price with Time & Material), list percentage and dollar amount of Firm-Fixed Price portion)
4. Period of Performance: _____
5. Original Contract $ Value:_____(Do not include unexercised options)
6. Current Contract $ Value: _____(Do not include unexercised options)
7. If Amounts for 5 and 6 above are different, provide a brief description of the reason:
_____
_____

D. Brief Description of Effort as _____Prime or _____Subcontractor
(Please indicate whether it was development and/or production, or other acquisition phase and highlight portions considered most relevant to current acquisition)

E. Completion Date:

1. Original date: _____
2. Current Schedule: _____
3. Estimate at Completion: _____
4. How Many Times Changed: _____
5. Primary Causes of Change:
_____

F. Are there Contractor Performance Assessment Reports (CPARS) or other Past Performance Reports available for this contract? _____YES _____NO

G. Primary Customer Points of Contact: (For Government contracts, provide current information on all three individuals. For commercial contracts, provide points of contact fulfilling these same roles).

1. Program Manager and/or Site Manager
   Name:_____
   Office:_____
   Address:_____
   _____
   Telephone:_____
   Fax Number:_____
   Email:
2. Contracting Officer
   Name:_____
   Office:_____
   Address:_____
   _____
   Telephone:_____
   Fax Number:_____
   Email:

3. Administrative Contracting Officer
   Name:_____
   Office:_____
   Address:_____
   _____
   Telephone:_____
   Fax Number:_____
   Email:

H. Address any technical (or other) area about this contract/program considered unique.

I. For each of the applicable subfactors under the technical factor in the "Evaluation Criteria for Award, illustrate how your experience on this program applies to that subfactor, if you are to perform the same effort on the proposed contract.

J. Specify, by name, any key individual(s) who participated in this evaluated program and are to support the proposed effort. Also, indicate their contractual roles for both acquisitions.

K. Describe the nature or portion of the work on the proposed effort to be performed by the business entity being reported here. Also estimate the percentage of the total proposed effort to be performed by this entity, and whether this entity will be performing as the prime, subcontractor or a corporate division related to the prime (define relationship).

ITO ATTACHMENT 1.2

PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE

WHEN FILLED IN THIS DOCUMENT IS SOURCE SELECTION SENSITIVE INFORMATION IAW RFO 3.104

SECTION 1: CONTRACT IDENTIFICATION

A. Contractor: _____

B. Cage Code of contractor contract was awarded to: _____

C. Contract number: _____

D. Contract type: _____
(If multiple types (i.e. Firm-Fixed Price with Time & Material), list percentage and dollar amount of Firm-Fixed Price portion)

E. Was this a competitive contract? Yes _____ No _____

F. Period of performance: _____

G. Initial contract cost: $_____

H. Current/final contract cost: $_____

I. Reasons for differences between initial contract cost and final contract costs:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

J. Description of service provided:

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

SECTION 2: CUSTOMER OR AGENCY IDENTIFICATION

A. Customer or agency name:

_____

B. Customer or agency description (if applicable):

_____

C. Geographic description of services under this contract, i.e. local, nationwide, worldwide, other Commands:

_____

_____

_____

SECTION 3: EVALUATOR IDENTIFICATION

A. Evaluator's name: _____

B. Evaluator's title: _____

C. Evaluator's phone/fax number:_____

D. Evaluator's email: _____

E. Number of years evaluator worked on subject contract: _____

SECTION 4: EVALUATION

Please indicate your satisfaction with the contractor's performance by placing an "**X**" in the appropriate block using the scale provided to the right of each question. This scale is defined as follows:

CODE	PERFORMANCE LEVEL
B	BLUE/EXCEPTIONAL – The contractor's performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some or many (requirements) to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were highly effective.
G	GREEN/SATISFACTORY – The contractor's performance meets contractual requirements. The contractual performance contained some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor appear or were satisfactory.
Y	YELLOW/MARGINAL – Performance does not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions or the contractor's proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.
R	RED/UNSATISFACTORY – Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance contains serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective.
N	NOT APPLICABLE - Unable to provide a score.

Factor 1 Technical

Subfactor 1 Technical Solution

	B	G	Y	R	N
1. How well did the contractor adequately address requirement for Modular Open Systems Approach (MOSA)?					
2. Did the contractor deliver a design that met the operational, safety, suitability, and effectiveness requirements?					
3. Did the contractor adequately meet the design requirement without excessive engineering change orders?					
4. Did the contractor adequately rectify technical problems with its sub-contractors in a timely manner?					
5. Did the contractor adequately identify and supply the personnel and facilities required for integration and test?					
6. Did the contractor provide adequate and timely technical support post modification installation?					
7. Did the contractor deliver requirements without any defects, obsolescence, or deficiencies?					
8. How well did the contractor adequately identify and mitigate risk prior to delivery to the customer?					
9. Did the contractor adequately meet all preservation, packaging, packing, and marking needs?					
10. Did the contractor effectively implement a proactive DMSMS program?					
11. Did the contractor deliver a system architecture that satisfied the modularity requirements of the referenced contract?					

Additional Comments:

Subfactor 3 Data Rights

	B	G	Y	R	N
1. Did the contractor adequately address requirement for Data Rights Assertions Matrix?					
2. Did the contractor adequately deliver all contract requirements with the data rights requested?					
3. Did the contractor deliver all CDRLs with Government approved markings?					
4. Did the contractor comply with IP deliverable and IP license requirements?					
5. Did the contractor flow down requirements for IP deliverables, associated IP licenses, or both, to its subcontractors, affiliates, or vendors during its performance of the referenced contract?					
6. Did the contractor provide any resolution of any disagreements over contract requirements? and					
7. Did the government exercise any remedies in response to the contractor's failure to deliver that content to the Government (e.g., R-DFARS 252.227-7996 (Technical Data—Withholding of Payment) (Deviation 2026-O0036), R-DFARS 252.246-7998 (Warranty of Data) (Deviation 2026-O0035)), or issued any related Final Decisions under that reference contract?					

Additional Comments:

Subfactor 4 Schedule

	B	G	Y	R	N
1. The Contractor met schedule requirements established in the original contract					
2. The contractor adequately notified the customer of any schedule slips, staffing shortfalls, and technical issues					

Additional Comments:

Cost and Price

	B	G	Y	R	N
1. How well does the contractor manage proposed costs?					
2. How well does contractor manage subcontractor cost?					
3. Were funds status reporting accurate and timely? If not, please explain.					
4. Did the contractor submit timely proposals for additional customer and/or unscheduled requirements and perform within proposed					

prices? If not, please explain.					
5. Did the contractor promote savings for the customer and ensure best value-pricing in proposals? Please explain.					
6. Did the contractor adhere to contract price/cost. If not, please explain.					

Overall

	B	**G**	**Y**	**R**	**N**
1. How would you rate the contractor's overall performance against your requirements?					
2. Was the contractor responsive to your needs?					
3. Did the contractor team work will with stakeholders at working group meetings?					
4. Was the contractor proactive in heading off and mitigating unexpected challenges?					

Additional Comments:

1. Please discuss each and every response for which you indicated B (Blue), Y/M (Yellow/Marginal) or R/U (Red/Unsatisfactory) in response to the questions above (use additional sheets, if necessary).
2. Government Contracts Only: Has/was this contract been partially or completely terminated for default or convenience or are there any pending terminations?

Yes _____ Default_____ Convenience_____ Pending Terminations_____

No _____

If yes, please explain (e.g., inability to meet cost, performance, or delivery schedules, etc).

_____
_____
_____
_____

SECTION 5: NARRATIVE SUMMARY

What were the contractor's most positive aspects in the performance of the contract?

What were the contractor's most negative aspects in the performance of the contract?

Would you have any reservations about soliciting this contractor in the future or having them perform one of your critical and demanding programs?

Please provide any additional comments concerning this contractor's performance, as desired.

Evaluator's Signature Date

Thank you for your prompt response and assistance!

Please return this completed questionnaire to:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

OFFICE: AFMC AFLCMC/WLTK

ATTN: Ms. Brandi Shelden

3001 Staff Dr. 2AI85A

Tinker AFB OK 73145-3020

Telephone: 405-622-7835

brandi.shelden@us.af.mil

ITO ATTACHMENT 1.3 SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE COVER LETTER

LETTERHEAD

(Date)

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

SUBJECT: Present/Past Performance Questionnaire for the KC-135 Center Console Refresh Solicitation Concerning Contract Numbers(s) FA810526RB001. The effort was performed by (SPECIFIC ENTITY THAT PERFORMED THE WORK) under (CAGE CODE).

(a) We are currently responding to Air Force Life Cycle Management Center, Mobility Aircraft, Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma, Request for Proposal (RFP) FA810526RB001 for the KC-135 Center Console Refresh Program. This acquisition is being conducted as a price performance trade-off source selection. The RFP specifically requires that we, as an Offeror, send the attached questionnaire to several points of contact (POC) on recent and relevant efforts that we (or a proposed team member) have performed. As such, please take a few moments of your time to fill out the attached questionnaire.

(b) DO NOT RETURN THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE TO US. The information contained in the completed Present/Past Performance Questionnaire is considered sensitive and cannot be released to us, the Offeror. The completed Present/Past Performance Questionnaire should be sent directly to the Government not later than (DATE TO BE INSERTED BY OFFEROR).

The questionnaires should be e-mailed to the following address: brandi.shelden@us.af.mil

(c) If you have any questions regarding the source selection, contact the Contracting Officer, Brandi Shelden. If you have questions regarding the clarification of contract number, POC or program title on the questionnaire, please contact (CONTRACTOR'S POC AND PHONE NUMBER FOR PAST PERFORMANCE ISSUES).

(d) Thank you for your timely assistance.

Sincerely,

(TITLE AND NAME OF COMPANY OFFICIAL)

Attachment: Present/Past Performance Questionnaire

NOTE: Offeror to insert information where there is (italics text surrounded by parentheses) in the sample letter.

ITO ATTACHMENT 1.4 SAMPLE CONSENT LETTER

SUBCONTRACTOR/TEAMING PARTNER CONSENT FORM FOR THE RELEASE OR PAST AND PRESENT PERFORMANCE INFORMATION TO THE PRIME CONTRACTOR

Past performance information concerning subcontractors and teaming partners cannot be disclosed to a private party without the subcontractor's or teaming partner's consent. Because a prime contractor is a private party, the Government will need that consent before disclosing subcontractor/teaming partner past and present performance information to the prime during exchanges. In an effort to assist the Government's Past Performance Evaluation Team (PPET) in assessing your past performance relevancy and confidence, we request the following consent form be completed by the major subcontractors/teaming partners identified in your proposal. The completed consent forms should be submitted as part of your Past Performance Volume.

Dear (Contracting Officer)

We are currently participating as a (subcontractor/teaming partner) with (prime contractor or name of entity providing proposal) in responding to the Department of the Air Force (location) Request for Proposal (solicitation number) for the (program title or description of effort).

We understand that the Government is placing increased emphasis on past performance in order to obtain best value in source selections. In order to facilitate the performance confidence assessment process we are signing this consent form to allow you to discuss our past and present performance information with the prime contractor during the source selection process.

_____

(Signature and Title of individual who has the authority to sign for and legally bind the company)

Company
Name:

Address:

ITO ATTACHMENT 1.5 SAMPLE CLIENT AUTHORIZATION LETTER

In an effort to assist the Government's Past Performance Evaluation Team (PPET) in assessing your past performance on recent and relevant commercial contracts, we recommend that the following letter be sent to your points of contact for those commercial efforts that you identify in your Past Performance Volume:

SAMPLE CLIENT AUTHORIZATION LETTER

(For commercial contracts)
Note: This should be placed on company

letterhead Client Authorization Letter

Dear (Commercial Client/Customer)

We are currently responding to the Department of the Air Force, AFLCMC/WLTK Request for Proposal (RFP No.) for the (KC-135 Center Console Refresh (CCR)).

The Government is placing increased emphasis on past performance in order to obtain best value in source selections. They are requesting that clients of companies who submit proposals in response to their RFP for the program/effort identified above be identified and that their participation in the validation process be requested. Therefore, in the event you are contacted for information on work we have performed on (list program); you are hereby authorized to respond to those inquiries.

We have identified Mr./Ms. (Name) of your organization as the point of contact based on their knowledge concerning our work. Your cooperation is appreciated. Any questions may be directed to (Name, title, phone number and fax number for the POC)

ITO ATTACHMENT 1.6 SAMPLE COMMITMENT TO PERFORM AS PROPOSED LETTER

SUBCONTRACTOR/TEAMING PARTNER COMMITMENT TO PERFORM AS PROPSED LETTER

The Prime Contractor and Subcontractor shall complete and sign the letter. A separate letter is required for each subcontractor/teaming partner, etc.

SAMPLE COMMITMENT TO PERFORM AS PROPOSED LETTER

Note: This should be placed on company letterhead

Commitment to Perform as Proposed.

In the event a contract is awarded resulting from the proposal submitted by XXXX (prime contractor), Prime contractor XXXX and Subcontractor XXXX hereby commit to joint performance as described in the proposal.

_____

(Signature and Title of individual who has the authority to sign for and legally bind the company)

Company Name
Prime Contractor

_____

(Signature and Title of individual who has the authority to sign for and legally bind the company)

Company Name
Subcontractor

ITO ATTACHMENT 2.0 PROPOSED TEAM LIST

TEAMING LIST			
Offeror (Prime) Contractor:	CAGE Code:	DUNS Number:	
Designation Codes:			
Joint Venture: JV			
Informal Joint Venture: IJV			
Prime/Sub: PS			
Mentor/Protégé: MP			
Subs/Teaming Contractor:	Designation Code:	CAGE Code:	DUNS Number:
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			

ITO ATTACHMENT 3.0 SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION COMMITMENT DOCUMENT (SBPCD)

1. Prime Contractor Size:

   Indicate the applicable size and socioeconomic categories -- all that apply:

   { } Other than Small Business

   or

   { } Small Business also categorized as a

   { } Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB)

   { } Woman-Owned Small Business (WOSB)

   { } Historically Underutilized Business Zone (HUBZone) Small Business

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

2. Minimum Quantitative Requirement (MQR) -- Participation of Small Businesses*

   *CDRL A003, Small Business Subcontractor Report, reporting applies

Total Contract Value (Awarded) $_____

Minimum Quantitative Requirement (MQR)

Business Category	**Dollar Value**	**% of Total Contract Value**
Total Contract Value – Prime Contractor	$_____	_____%
Total Small Business	$_____	_____%
Small Disadvantaged Business	$_____	_____%
Woman-Owned Small Business	$_____	_____%
HUBZone Small Business	$_____	_____%
Veteran-Owned Small Business	$_____	_____%
Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business	$_____	_____%

3. Small Business Participants *

   **Changes must be pre-approved by Contracting Officer per: (insert required clause which should be written as a 'special contract requirement' if a canned clause does not fit for SBPCDs)*

Company Name	Business Category(ies) (SB, WOSB, SDB, VOSB, SDVOSB)	Product(s)/Service(s) to be Provided	NAICS Code	Nature of Commitment

ITO ATTACHMENT 4.0 SECTION L PRICING MATRIX