# AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

| 1. CONTRACT ID CODE | PAGE | OF | PAGES |
|---|---|---|---|
| J | 1 | | 7 |

| 2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NUMBER | 3. EFFECTIVE DATE | 4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQUISITION NUMBER | 5. PROJECT NUMBER *(If applicable)* |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0002 | 02 Jul 2026 | | |

6. ISSUED BY CODE H92257

MARSOC H92257
400 RR (BLDG), RIFLE RANGE ROAD, CAMP LEJEUNE ATTN G4 CONTRACT
SNEADS FERRY, NC 28460-0101
UNITED STATES
SPENSER GAGNON, Email: spenser.e.gagnon.civ@mail.mil Telephone: 9104402303

7. ADMINISTERED BY *(If other than Item 6)* CODE

SCD: PAS:

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR *(Number, street, county, State and ZIP Code)*

CODE FACILITY CODE

(X)

☒ 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NUMBER H9225726RE005

9B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 11)* 12 Jun 2026

☐ 10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NUMBER

10B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 13)*

## 11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

☒ The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers ☐ is extended. ☒ is not extended.

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing items 8 and 15, and returning 1 copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or electronic communication which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by letter or electronic communication, provided each letter or electronic communication makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

***12.*** ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA *(If required)*

See Section G - Contract Administration Data

## 13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NUMBER AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

| CHECK ONE | |
|---|---|
| ☐ | A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: *(Specify authority)* THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NUMBER IN ITEM 10A. |
| ☐ | B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES *(such as changes in paying office, appropriation data, etc.)* SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b). |
| ☐ | C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF: |
| ☐ | D. OTHER *(Specify type of modification and authority)* |

**E. IMPORTANT:** Contractor ☐ is not ☐ is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.

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

The purpose of this amendment is to update is to:
1. Update Section L and M of the solicitation.
2. Update the draft DD254.

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

| 15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER *(Type or print)* | | 16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER *(Type or print)* | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Samuel Williams | |
| 15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR | 15C. DATE SIGNED | 16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA | 16C. DATE SIGNED |
| *(Signature of person authorized to sign)* | | *(Signature of Contracting Officer)* | 09 Jul 2026 |

*Previous edition unusable*

**STANDARD FORM 30 (REV. 11/2016)**
Prescribed by GSA FAR (48 CFR) 53.243

## SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

# SUMMARY OF CHANGES

## Instructions, Conditions, & Notices to Offerors or Quoters

**Header Miscellaneous Text (Modified):**

**SECTION L - PROPOSAL PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS**

1.0 General Instructions & Administrative Information

This is a competitive, best-value tradeoff acquisition conducted in accordance with FAR Part 12 and FAR Part 13.5 (Simplified Procedures for Certain Commercial Products and Commercial Services). The Government intends to award a Single Award Indefinite-Delivery/Indefinite-Quantity (IDIQ) contract resulting from this solicitation. Task orders issued under this IDIQ will be Firm-Fixed-Price (FFP). The Government reserves the right not to award a contract depending on the quality of the proposals submitted and the availability of funds.

**Administrative Item Details & Instructions**

**Primary Contracting Points of Contact (POC):** All questions must be submitted via email to: Spenser E. Gagnon, CIV: spenser.e.gagnon.civ@socom.mil Samuel Williams, CIV: samuel.williams1@socom.mil

**Submission Email:** Address Fully completed proposals must be submitted via email to: Spenser E. Gagnon, CIV: spenser.e.gagnon.civ@socom.mil Samuel Williams, CIV: samuel.williams1@socom.mil

**Questions Deadline:** 12:00 PM Eastern Standard Time (EST) on June 26, 2026. All questions must be submitted in writing. Responses will be published via an RFP amendment.

**Proposal Submission Deadline:** 12:00 PM Eastern Standard Time (EST) on July 13, 2026. Late proposals may not be evaluated IAW FAR 52.212-1(f). Proposal Validity Period: Offerors must agree to hold proposed prices firm for a minimum of 180 calendar days from the solicitation closing date.

**System for Award Management (SAM):** Offerors must be actively registered in SAM.gov under NAICS code 6114309 (or the designated NAICS for this effort) prior to award.

1.1 Use Of Artificial Intelligence (Ai) Tools In Proposal Evaluation

1.1.1 Use of AI tools in Support of Evaluations: The Government may employ AI as a tool to assist in the analysis and review of offeror proposals. AI tools may be used to support tasks such as summarizing proposal content, identifying compliance with request for task order proposal / solicitation requirements, and highlighting areas of potential strength, weakness, or risk.

1.1.2 Maintaining Inherently Governmental Functions: Notwithstanding the use of AI tools to support the evaluation process, all final evaluation judgements and award decisions will be made exclusively by duly appointed Government personnel. The Government retains sole responsibility for all inherently governmental functions and will not delegate decision-making authority to any AI tool.

1.1.3 Offeror Confidentiality and Data Protection: The AI tools utilized by the Government will be employed in a manner consistent with applicable regulations that govern the protection of proprietary and procurement sensitive information. The AI tool will be an output-only system. Any generated report data is not saved. No proposal data will be transmitted to or processed by external, non-Government systems without appropriate safeguards and authorizations in place.

**2.0 Proposal Format and Page Constraints**
Proposals shall be submitted electronically across four (4) distinct volumes as outlined below. Email submissions must conform to standard military network limitations.

Email Attachment Size Limit: Individual emails (including attachments) shall not exceed 10 MB. It is the offeror's responsibility to request and obtain electronic receipt confirmations.

Page Layout: 8.5" x 11" pages, 1-inch margins all-around, with a font size of no less than 10 pitch (or 11-point Calibri/Times New Roman for proportional fonts). Exclusions: Cover sheets, glossaries, table of contents (TOC), and dividers do not count toward volume page limits.

Volume Title Page Limit Evaluation Type

Volume I Qualifying Criteria Maximum 3 Pages (excluding requested fill-ins/DD254 plan), Pass / Fail (Go / No-Go)

Volume II Factor I: Technical Maximum 25 Pages (excluding resumes and matrices), Color / Adjectival Rating

Volume III Factor II: Past Performance Maximum 5 Pages, Confidence Assessment

Volume IV Factor III: Price No Page Limit, Price Reasonableness & Realism

**3.0 Evaluation Factor Importance (Tradeoff Statement)**
This is a competitive, best-value tradeoff acquisition. The Government reserves the right to award to other than the lowest-priced offeror. The relative importance of the evaluation factors is as follows:

Non-cost factors (Technical and Past Performance), when combined, are significantly more important than Price. However, as the technical merit of competing proposals becomes more equal, the proposed Price will become increasingly important in the award decision. In accordance with FAR 13.106-2(b)(3), the Government may award a contract to other than the lowest-priced offeror if the Contracting Officer determines that the technical advantages, reduced performance risk, and/or superior past performance of a higher-priced proposal offer identifiable benefits that justify the payment of the associated price premium. The Government will not, however, make an award at a price premium it considers unreasonable.

**4.0 Volume I: Qualifying Criteria (Pass/Fail)**
The Qualifying Criteria will be evaluated on a strictly pass/fail basis. Failure to meet any individual qualifying criterion may render the entire proposal unacceptable and eliminate it from further evaluation.

1. Administrative & Contact Information: Provide the complete corporate name, physical address, remittance address, parent company details (if applicable), and primary POC contact information (name, phone, email) for negotiations.

2. CAGE, UEI, and TIN: Provide the offeror's Commercial and Government Entity (CAGE) code, Unique Entity Identifier (UEI), and Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN).

3. Terms & Conditions Statement: Include an explicit statement confirming that the offeror agrees to all terms, conditions, and provisions of this solicitation and subsequent amendments. Any proposed exception must be clearly detailed with supporting rationale; however, the Government reserves the right to reject any proposal containing exceptions as technically unacceptable.

4. Fill-In Clauses & Certifications: Submit all required fill-in clauses and certifications from this RFP. (Exempt from the 3-page limit).

5. DD254 & Facility Clearance: Provide a management plan to address DD254 requirements and validate proof of the required Facility Clearance. (Exempt from the 3-page limit).

6. SPRS & CMMC Validation: Provide proof of a valid self-assessment score in the Supplier Performance Risk System (SPRS) and a minimum of Level 2 (Self) Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification (CMMC) compliance. (Exempt from the 3-page limit).

**5.0 Volume II: Factor I: Technical**
Offerors must provide comprehensive, detailed narratives showing how they will execute the requirements. General statements of capability or restatements of the Statement of Work (SOW) are insufficient.

**Subfactor I: Staffing Approach & Key Personnel Resumes**

Recruiting and Retention: Describe the processes to recruit, hire, on-board, and retain highly qualified personnel who meet or exceed the mandatory minimum qualifications set forth in PWS Section 4.0 (Personnel and Minimum Skill Requirements). Offerors are encouraged to substantiate this approach with active candidate pipeline data, or historical retention metrics on similar efforts).

Resumes & Cross-Reference Matrix: Provide resumes for all proposed personnel. Mandatory Requirement: Each resume must be accompanied by a Cross-Reference Matrix mapping each minimum SOW qualification/skill (e.g., years of experience, specific operational backgrounds, required systems familiarity) to the exact page and paragraph of the resume where that credential is demonstrated.

Offerors shall submit resumes for all Key Personnel positions. (Letters of Commitment/Intent no longer required). Resumes shall clearly demonstrate compliance with minimum qualifications and relevant operational experience.

**Subfactor II: Transition Plan**

Day One Readiness: Detail a Transition Plan and Day One Execution Approach to ensure all required personnel meet qualification requirements and are fully operational on Day One of performance.

Risk Mitigation: Address personnel onboarding, credential verification, and security clearance validation. Outline strategies to minimize or eliminate performance gaps, including plans to retain or replace incumbent personnel.

SOW Continuity: Provide processes to ensure uninterrupted continuity of JTAC instruction, evaluation, qualification tracking, and MTN operations.

**Subfactor III: Management Approach**

Operational Execution: Detail the approach to manage day-to-day operations, coordinate geographically dispersed personnel, and maintain alignment with MARFORSOC G-3 Air/Fires mission requirements (including MRB, MRSG/FCP, and SOTACC).

Task Leadership: Describe the role of the Task Lead in coordinating with the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) and Government Technical Representatives (TRs) to ensure performance quality.

Resource Allocation: Describe the structures, work plans, and reporting mechanisms used to balance cost, schedule, and performance.

**Subfactor IV: Cybersecurity & Issue Management**

Information Safeguarding: Provide the offeror's current reported self-assessed SPRS score and detail the concrete safeguarding measures taken to achieve the security requirements of DFARS 252.204-7012 in accordance with NIST SP 800-171.

Quality Control & Reporting: Outline the processes for generating SOW-required reports, incorporating knowledge capture from field personnel, and early issue identification. Note: The final, detailed Quality Control Plan (QCP) must be submitted within 10 days of award.

Travel Management Plan: Provide a Travel Management Plan that outlines the methodologies and tracking tools used for real-time tracking, administrative oversight, and allocation of travel hours within the standard 1,920-hour FTE threshold, adhering to FAR 31.204-46.

**Subfactor V: Corporate Experience**

Demonstrated Capability: Submit up to three (3) examples of corporate experience performed by the offeror (Prime Contractor or proposed Subcontractors) within the last five (5) years from the issuance date of this solicitation. For each example, provide a detailed narrative demonstrating the offeror's corporate capability to execute requirements of similar size, scope, and complexity to the MARFORSOC JTAC/MTN mission.

Required Mission Areas: The narrative must clearly map the historical experience to the core tasks in the SOW. To be considered relevant, the submitted corporate experience must specifically address and demonstrate historical capability in the following operational areas:

* SOF JTAC support

* SOF training support

* Joint Fires support

* Strike cell operations

* Operational Air/Fires support

* JICO/MTN operations

*Evaluation Distinction:* Offerors are permitted (and encouraged) to use the same reference contracts submitted for Factor II (Past Performance). However, the narrative provided for this Subfactor must focus exclusively on the scope, magnitude, and complexity of the work performed (what was done).

Offerors shall not discuss the quality of performance, CPARS ratings, or customer satisfaction in this volume, as those elements will be evaluated strictly under Factor II.

**6.0 Volume III: Factor II: Past Performance**
Quantity & Currency: Submit a minimum of three (3) and a maximum of five (5) recent and relevant contracts or agreements. Recent is defined as work performed within the past five (5) years from the issuance date of this solicitation.

Relevance: Relevant efforts are those of similar size, scope, and magnitude to the MARSOC JTAC/JICO PWS requirements. Required Data Points: For each reference, include:

Contract/Task Order Number and Period of Performance Total Contract/Task Order Dollar Value

Point of Contact (Name, Phone, Email) for both the Government PM/COR and, if applicable, the Prime Contractor. A concise narrative explaining how the prior work directly maps to the SOW tasks.

**7.0 Volume IV: Factor III: Price**
7.1 Pricing Template & Mathematical Responsibility:

Offerors shall complete and submit their price proposal using the attached Government-provided Excel pricing template.

Modification of Formulas: The Government has populated the template with basic formulas for convenience; however, offerors are authorized and expected to unlock, edit, and modify the formulas as necessary to accurately calculate and reflect their proposed labor rates, burdens, escalation, and accounting practices.

Restriction on Modifications: While offerors may edit formulas, offerors shall not alter, delete, or modify any Government-provided baseline data, such as the pre-populated Labor Categories, Contract Line Item Numbers (CLINs), or estimated labor hours (if provided for evaluation purposes).

Ultimate Responsibility: The Offeror bears full, sole, and ultimate responsibility for the mathematical accuracy, integrity, and completeness of all pricing data, formulas, and roll-ups submitted in their proposal. The Government will not be held responsible for any formula errors, broken links, or calculation mistakes inherent in the initial template or introduced by the Offeror.

Resolution of Math Errors: In the event of a discrepancy between a unit rate (e.g., fully burdened hourly rate) and the extended total, the unit rate will generally govern. However, the Offeror is legally bound by the final Total Evaluated Price (TEP) submitted. The Government reserves the right to evaluate the proposal as submitted, or to correct obvious mathematical errors during the evaluation process.

7.2 Basis of Estimate (BOE) & Price Narrative: The BOE must provide sufficient detail for the Government to evaluate price realism and reasonableness. The narrative must break down the calculation of each fully burdened hourly labor rate (FBLR), detailing the direct labor rate, fringe benefits, overhead, G&A, and fee.

The BOE must explicitly address the Offeror's compliance with the Government's established unburdened rate floors detailed below.

The BOE must detail the annual escalation percentage applied to option years (or lack thereof) and provide the mathematical basis for this rate.

7.3 Total Compensation Plan (TCP): IAW FAR 52.222-46, the prime contractor and all subcontractors proposing professional services must submit a TCP detailing proposed salaries and fringe benefits. Subcontractors may submit proprietary TCPs directly to the Contracting Officer and Contract Specialist via email prior to the closing date.

7.4 SOFARS 5652.215-9010 Cost and Pricing Data Not Required (1998): Certified cost or pricing data is not anticipated based on adequate price competition. However, the Government reserves the right to require data other than certified cost or pricing data IAW FAR 13.106-3(a) if necessary to determine price reasonableness.

7.5 Total Evaluated Price (TEP) and FAR 52.217-8 Pricing:

The Offeror's pricing proposal must be structured to facilitate the calculation of the Total Evaluated Price (TEP).

7.5.1 The TEP will consist of the Base Period, all subsequent Option Periods, and the calculated value of a six (6) month extension under FAR 52.217-8.

7.5.2 Instructions for FAR 52.217-8: Offerors shall not submit separate or unique labor rates for the FAR 52.217-8 Option to Extend Services. For evaluation purposes, the pricing for the 6-month extension will be calculated by taking exactly fifty percent (50%) of the Offeror's proposed pricing for the final Option Period. The fully burdened hourly labor rates proposed for the final Option Period will serve as the ceiling rates for any extension subsequently exercised under FAR 52.217-8.

## Evaluation Factors for Award

**Header Miscellaneous Text (Modified):**

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD
(ADDENDUM TO FAR 52.212-2 EVALUATION-COMMERCIAL PRODUCTS AND COMMERCIAL SERVICES)

**1.0 Basis for Award (Best Value Tradeoff)**

1.1 Tradeoff Methodology

The Government intends to award a Single Award Indefinite-Delivery/Indefinite-Quantity (IDIQ) contract to the responsible Offeror whose proposal conforms to the solicitation requirements and represents the best overall value to the Government. This is a competitive best-value tradeoff acquisition conducted in accordance with FAR Part 12 and FAR Part 13.5 (Simplified Procedures for Certain Commercial Products and Commercial Services). The Government is not utilizing the formal source selection procedures of FAR Part 15 or the DoD Source Selection Procedures.

Accordingly, the Government is not obligated to award to the lowest-priced offeror or the highest technically rated offeror. The Government may award to a higher-rated, higher-priced offeror if the Contracting Officer reasonably determines that the technical superiority and/or superior past performance of the higher-priced proposal outweigh the price difference. The Contracting Officer retains the ultimate discretion to determine whether the identifiable benefits of a higher-priced proposal justify the payment of the associated price premium.

1.2 Use Of Evaluative Tools

In accordance with the notice provided in Section L, the Government may use artificial intelligence (AI) or other automated tools to support the evaluation process. These tools serve an assistive function, such as summarizing content or verifying compliance with solicitation requirements. All technical, past performance, and tradeoff award judgments are, and will remain, the exclusive determination of Government personnel.

1.3 Relative Importance of Factors

The Government will evaluate proposals based on three main factors. The relative importance is defined as follows:

Factors I and II (the non-cost/price factors), when combined, are significantly more important than Factor III (Price). As competing proposals approach equality in the non-cost/price factors, Price will become a more significant determinant in the award decision. The Government will not make an award at a price premium it considers unreasonable.

1.4 Phased Evaluation Sequence

To ensure an efficient evaluation process, the Government will evaluate proposals in three sequential phases:

Phase 1: Qualifying Criteria (Pass/Fail Gate). Volume I will be evaluated first on a strict Pass/Fail basis. If a proposal receives a "Fail," no further evaluation will be conducted, the proposal will be eliminated from the competition, and it will not be considered for award.

Phase 2: Technical Evaluation. Proposals that successfully pass Phase 1 will advance to the Factor I (Technical) evaluation. If a proposal's overall Technical rating is evaluated as "Unacceptable" (Red), the proposal is deemed unawardable. Consequently, the Government will not evaluate the Offeror's Past Performance or Price, and the proposal will be eliminated from further consideration.

Phase 3: Past Performance & Price Evaluation. Only proposals that successfully pass Phase 1 and achieve a Factor I (Technical) rating of "Marginal" (Yellow) or higher will advance to the evaluation of Factor II (Past Performance) and Factor III (Price) to determine the final best-value tradeoff.

(Note: While a "Marginal" technical proposal may technically advance to Phase 3, an award is rarely made to a marginal proposal unless justified by a highly advantageous price and past performance, in accordance with the tradeoff methodology).

1.5 Intent to Award Without Exchanges

Award Without Exchanges: The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without conducting exchanges with offerors. Therefore, the Offeror's initial proposal should contain the Offeror's best terms from both a technical and pricing standpoint. Offerors should not assume that the Government will conduct communications, clarifications, or negotiations.

Reservation of Rights (FAR 13.106-2): The Government is utilizing the simplified evaluation procedures of FAR 13.106-2(b) and is not establishing a formal "competitive range" or conducting "discussions" as defined in FAR Part 15. However, the Government reserves the right to conduct clarifications, communications, or negotiations with one, some, or all offerors if the Contracting Officer determines it to be necessary and in the best interest of the Government to facilitate an efficient award.

**2.0 Volume I: Qualifying Criteria Evaluation (Pass/Fail)**
The Government will evaluate the Qualifying Criteria submitted in Volume I strictly on a Pass/Fail (Go/No-Go) basis.

Rating Definition

Pass: The proposal meets all requirements outlined in Section L, Volume I (e.g., Terms/Conditions agreement, DD254 plan, valid SPRS/CMMC status). The proposal proceeds to full evaluation.

Fail: The proposal fails to meet one or more of the mandatory criteria. The proposal is deemed unacceptable, eliminated from the competition, and will not be evaluated further.

**3.0 Volume II: Factor I - Technical Evaluation**
3.1 Technical Evaluation Approach

The Government will evaluate the Technical Factor to determine the Offeror's capability, understanding, and methodology to execute the requirements of the MARSOC JTAC/JICO PWS. The five Technical Subfactors are of equal importance.

The Government will evaluate the following Subfactors:

**Subfactor I: Staffing Approach & Key Personnel Resumes:**
The Government will evaluate the soundness, realism, and effectiveness of the offeror's approach to recruiting, onboarding, and retaining highly qualified

personnel. Higher confidence will be placed on approaches substantiated by concrete evidence (e.g., historical retention data, LOIs). Furthermore, the Government will evaluate the provided resumes and cross-reference matrices to verify that all proposed personnel meet or exceed the mandatory minimum qualifications outlined in PWS Section 4.0. Proposals that fail to demonstrate that all proposed personnel meet the minimum mandatory qualifications shall receive a deficiency and may be rated technically Unacceptable.

**Subfactor II: Transition Plan:**
The Government will evaluate the feasibility and comprehensiveness of the offeror's Transition Plan to ensure Day One readiness. The evaluation will assess the effectiveness of the offeror's risk mitigation strategies regarding clearance validation, credentialing, and incumbent capture/replacement to prevent gaps in performance. The Government will also assess the credibility of the processes proposed to ensure uninterrupted continuity of JTAC instruction and MTN operations during the transition period.

**Subfactor III: Management Approach:**
The Government will evaluate the adequacy and effectiveness of the offeror's proposed management structure to oversee day-to-day operations and coordinate geographically dispersed personnel. The evaluation will focus on the extent to which the Task Lead's role and the proposed resource allocation structures logically align with, and support, the MARFORSOC G-3 Air/Fires mission requirements.

**Subfactor IV: Cybersecurity & Issue Management:**
The Government will evaluate the offeror's compliance with DOD cybersecurity requirements, assessing the adequacy of the safeguarding measures detailed in accordance with DFARS 252.204-7012 and NIST SP 800-171. Additionally, the Government will evaluate the viability of the proposed Quality Control and reporting processes to proactively identify and resolve performance issues. Finally, the Government will evaluate the realism and effectiveness of the Travel Management Plan in tracking and executing travel within the standard 1,920-hour FTE threshold per FAR 31.204-46.

**Subfactor V: Corporate Experience:**
The Government may consider the extent to which the offeror's provided corporate experience examples demonstrate a credible, historical capability to perform work of similar size, scope, and complexity to the MARSOC JTAC/JICO SOW requirements. Specifically, the evaluation may assess the relevance and breadth of the offeror's historical experience across the following required mission areas performed within the last five (5) years:

1) SOF JTAC support,

2) SOF training support,

3) Joint Fires support,

4) Strike cell operations,

5) Operational Air/Fires support, and

6) JICO/MTN operations.

The Government may assess the depth of experience in these specific operational areas to validate the offeror's ability to successfully execute the technical approach proposed in Subfactors I through IV. The Government may evaluate how comprehensively the submitted examples address these six operational areas to determine the overall depth of the offeror's technical capability.

*Note to Evaluators:* Under Factor I (Technical), the Government will evaluate only the relevance and substance of the prior work to establish technical capability. The Government will NOT evaluate the quality of performance, customer satisfaction, or historical compliance under this Subfactor. The quality of the offeror's past work will be evaluated exclusively under Factor II (Past Performance).

3.2 Technical Rating Methodology

The Government will assign a combined Technical/Risk rating using the standardized DoD adjectival rating methodology outlined below. This rating assesses the quality of the offeror's technical solution and the associated schedule/performance risk.

Color Rating / Adjectival Rating / Description

Blue / Outstanding: Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low.

Purple / Good: Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low to moderate.

Green / Acceptable: Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.

Yellow / Marginal: Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is high.

Red / Unacceptable: Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation, and thus, contains one or more material failures to meet the requirements, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is unacceptable. Proposal is unawardable.

**4.0 Volume III: Factor II - Past Performance Evaluation**
4.1 Past Performance Evaluation Approach

The Past Performance evaluation will assess the Offeror's probability of meeting the solicitation requirements based on their historical record of performance on recent and relevant efforts. The evaluation is a two-step process: determining Relevancy and then determining Performance Confidence.

4.2 Step 1: Relevancy Determination

The Government will evaluate the provided references against the size, scope, and complexity of the current MARSOC PWS to determine relevancy using the following definitions:

Very Relevant: Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

Relevant: Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

Somewhat Relevant: Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

Not Relevant: Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

4.3 Step 2: Performance Confidence Assessment

Based on the quality of the recent and relevant past performance, the Government will assign an overall Performance Confidence Assessment rating using the following definitions:

Substantial Confidence: Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Satisfactory Confidence: Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Neutral Confidence: No recent/relevant performance record is available or the offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned. The offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on the factor of past performance.

Limited Confidence: Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

No Confidence: Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

**5.0 Volume IV: Factor III - Price Evaluation**

5.1 Price Evaluation Approach

Price will not be adjectivally scored but will be evaluated for completeness, reasonableness, and realism to determine the Total Evaluated Price (TEP).

Evaluation Metric Description

*Completeness:* The Government will review the pricing template and narrative to ensure all required elements are provided and are mathematically correct.

*Reasonableness:* The proposed TEP will be evaluated using price analysis techniques to ensure the overall price to the Government is fair and reasonable.

*Unbalanced Pricing:* The Government will evaluate proposals for materially unbalanced pricing , which may pose an unacceptable risk and render a proposal unawardable.

5.2 Professional Compensation & Price Realism Evaluation
In accordance with FAR 52.222-46, Evaluation of Compensation for Professional Employees, the Government will conduct a comprehensive price realism analysis.

Total Compensation Plan (TCP) Evaluation: The Government will evaluate the Offeror's and any Subcontractors' TCPs to assess whether the proposed salaries and fringe benefits are realistic and sufficient to attract and retain the highly qualified personnel required by the PWS.

Unburdened Rate Floor Analysis: The Government has established unburdened hourly rate floors for each professional labor category based on market research. These floors represent the lowest direct labor rate the Government believes is realistic to recruit and retain qualified personnel in accordance with FAR 52.222-46.

Established Rate Floors:
G-3 Air/Fires Joint Interface Control Officer (JICO): $65.00/hr
G-3 Air/Fires JTAC Instructor: $55.00/hr
SOTACC Instructor: $55.00/hr
MRB JTAC-I/E SMEs: $50.00/hr
FCP JTAC Instructor: $50.00/hr

Evaluation: Any proposal with an unburdened direct labor rate below these established floors will be evaluated as having a high performance risk and may be deemed unrealistically low and therefore unawardable. Offerors proposing rates at or near these floors must provide a robust justification in their BOE demonstrating how they will recruit and retain personnel with the required security clearances and JTAC certifications.

Finding: Failure to submit a compliant TCP, or submitting a proposal with an unrealistic compensation plan, may result in the rejection of the proposal.