

			version in conjunction with software Final Release.
6.7	Software Requirements Specification	A011 – Electronically via DI2E and IDE	Draft version no later than 20 calendar days prior to TFR. Final version- 60 calendar days prior to Full Material Release OR 60 calendar days prior to contract expiration, whichever comes first.
6.7	Software Version Description	A012 – Electronically via DI2E and IDE	As required
6.7	Interface Requirements Specification	A013 – Electronically via DI2E and IDE	Draft version 20 calendar days prior to TFR. Final version-60 calendar days prior to Full Material Release OR 60 calendar days prior to contract expiration, whichever comes first.
6.7	Interface Control Document	A014 – Electronically via DI2E and IDE	30 calendar days after completion of TFR. In conjunction with final delivery of

			every software baseline
6.7	Status Report	A015 – Electronically via DI2E and IDE	Bi-weekly
6.8	Configuration Management Plan	A016 – Electronically via DI2E	60 calendar days after award
6.8	Engineering Change Proposal	A017 – Electronically via DI2E and IDE	As Required
6.8	Request for Waiver Deviation	A018 – Electronically via DI2E and IDE	As Required
6.9	Quality Assurance Program Plan	A019 – Electronically via IDE	30 calendar days after award
6.9	Status of GFE Report	A020 – Electronically via IDE	180 calendar days after award. Semi-annually thereafter. Final submission 60 calendar days prior to contract expiration.
6.10	Software User Manual Software Administration Manual	A021- Electronically via DI2E and IDE	Interim draft acceptance criteria for each draft deliverable cycle.
6.10	Interactive Electronic Technical Manuals, Technical Bulletin	A022-Electronically via DI2E and IDE	Interim draft acceptance criteria for each draft deliverable cycle.
6.11	Instructional Media Package	A023- Electronically via DI2E and IDE	Interim draft acceptance criteria for each draft

			deliverable cycle.
6.11	Program of Instructions, Lesson Plans, Doctrine and Tactics Training, New Equipment Training, Tactics, Techniques, Procedures Handbooks, Quick Reference Card Sets	A024- Electronically via DI2E and IDE	Interim draft acceptance criteria for each draft deliverable cycle.
6.12.8	Scientific and Technical Report	A025- Electronically via IDE	Draft 30 calendar days prior to Test Readiness Review. Final- 15 calendar days after Test Completion Review (TCR).
6.12.8	Technical Report – Study/Services	A026- Electronically via IDE	Draft 45 calendar days prior to baseline cybersecurity scan. 60 calendar days after baseline cybersecurity scan. 5 calendar days after Government approval of any Engineering Change Proposals
6.12.8	Operations Security Plan	A027- Electronically via IDE	90 calendar days after award; as required.
6.12.8	Technical Report – Study/Services	A028-Electronically via IDE	Draft 45 calendar days prior to

			baseline cybersecurity scan. 60 calendar days after baseline cybersecurity scan. 5 calendar days after Government approval of any engineering change proposals
6.12.8	Program Protection Implement Plan	A029- Electronically via IDE	130 business days after award; as required
6.12.9	Technical Report – Study/Services	A030- Electronically via IDE	Draft 45 calendar days prior to baseline cybersecurity scan. 60 calendar days after baseline cybersecurity scan. 5 calendar days after Government approval of any engineering change proposals
6.12.10	Technical Report – Study/Services	A031- Electronically via IDE	Draft 45 calendar days prior to baseline cybersecurity scan. 60 calendar days after baseline

			cybersecurity scan. 5 calendar days after Government approval of any engineering change proposals
6.13	System Safety Program Plan	A032- Electronically via IDE	15 business days after award
6.13	Safety Assessment Report (SAR)	A033- Electronically via IDE	Draft SAR 30 calendar days prior to preliminary design review. 15 business days after completion of TFR; as required.
6.14	Software Test Plan	A034- Electronically via DI2E and IDE	90 calendar days prior to contractor system test; as required.
6.14	Software Test Description (STD)	A035- Electronically via DI2E and IDE	Within 5 working days of completing preliminary design of respective function; as required.
6.14	Software Test Report	A036- Electronically via DI2E and IDE	60 calendar days after completion of TCR
6.15	Computer Software Product	A037- Electronically via DI2E and IDE	As required

7.2.8 Required Submittals

The offeror shall provide the following submittals in response to the RFP:

- a. Transmittal Letter, Form SF33, Solicitation, Offer, Award, and SF50s for any amendments issued
- b. On-Line Representations and Certifications and Section K Representations and Certifications outlined in the RFP.
- c. OCI Mitigation Plan (if applicable)
- d. Subcontracting Plan
- e. Small Business Participation Plan
- f. Past Performance Information Sheets (Section L, Attachment L-1)
- g. Past Performance Consent Letters (Section L, Attachment L-4)
- h. Past Performance Client Authorization Letter (Section L, Attachment L-5)
- i. Technical/Management Document- Performance Work Statement IMP, CWBS, sample training CD/DVD (Section L, Paragraph 4.0)
- j. Cost Model (Section L, Attachment L-6)
- k. Tracking Number (embedded training session in CD-ROM or DVD format)
- l. All items listed within Table 2.2

SECTION L ATTACHMENTS

Section L LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

TITLE	ATTACHMENT NUMBER
Past Performance Information	L-1
Sample Questionnaire Cover Letter	L-2
Past Performance Questionnaire	L-3
Consent Letter	L-4
Client Authorization Letter	L-5
Cost Template	L-6

ATTACHMENT L-1 PAST PERF INFO

ATTACHMENT L-1 PAST PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Provide the information requested in this form for each contract reference. Provide frank, concise comments regarding your performance on the contracts you identify. Provide a separate completed form for each contract/program submitted. Limit the number of references submitted and the length of each submission to the limitations set forth at paragraph 5.2 of Section L of this solicitation.

A. Offeror Name (Company/Division): _____

CAGE Code: _____

DUNS Number: _____

B. Program Title: _____

C. Contract Specifics:

1. Contracting Agency or Customer

2. Contract Number _____

3. Contract Type _____

4. Period of Performance _____

5. Initial Contract Cost/Price _____

6. Current/final Contract Cost/Price _____

7. Annual Contract \$ Value _____

8. 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 procurement)

E. Completion Date:

1. Original date: _____

2. Current Schedule: _____

3. Estimate at Completion: _____

4. How Many Times Changed: _____

5. Primary Causes of Change: _____

F. Primary Customer Points of Contact: (For Government contracts, provide current information for both individuals. For commercial contracts, provide points of contact fulfilling these same roles.)

1. Program Manager:

Name _____

Office _____

Address _____

Telephone _____

2. Contracting Officer:

Name _____

Office _____

Address _____

Telephone _____

- G. Address any technical/management (or other) area about this contract/program considered unique.
- H. For each of the applicable subfactors under the technical/management factor in Section M, illustrate how your experience on this program applies to that subfactor.
- I. Include relevant information concerning your compliance with subcontracting plan goals for small disadvantaged business (SDB) concerns, monetary targets for SDB participation, and notifications submitted under FAR 52.219-25, Small Disadvantaged Business Participation Program—Disadvantaged Status and Reporting.
- J. Include relevant information concerning your compliance with FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns, on the contract you are submitting.
- K. Identify whether a subcontracting plan in accordance with FAR 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan, was required by the contract you are submitting. If one was required, identify, in percentage terms, the planned versus achieved goals during contract performance. If goals were not met, please explain.
- L. 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).
- M. Identify any Earned Value Management or similar metrics required to track contract performance. If such metrics were required for this contract, provide the summary level data.

ATTACHMENT L-2 COVER LETTER

**ATTACHMENT L-2
SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE COVER LETTER**

**LETTERHEAD
(Date)
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY**

The Defense Information Systems Agency is in the process of selecting a contractor for Advanced Field Artillery Tactical Data System (AFATDS) 7.0 Modernization program. This requirement includes system architecture design and analysis, system software interface support,

design/system engineering and system integration. This effort includes software design and development, programmatic, engineering, testing, training, and integration for the implementation of the AFATDS capability in support of fires operational requirements within the Army and Marine Corps operational architecture from fires platoon to echelon above Corps, Joint and Coalition command staffs, Artillery Systems Cooperation Activities, and other international agreements. The Request for Proposal number is HC1028-16-R-0005. One of the considerations in proposal evaluation is the verification of the offerors' past and present performance on contracts, which reflect the offeror's ability to perform on the proposed effort. We depend on information received from agencies such as yours, which have had firsthand experience with an offeror, for the evaluation of the offeror's performance on those contracts.

Our areas of interest in the offeror are summarized in the enclosed questionnaire. We are requesting a written response no later than seven calendar days after receipt of this letter. To assist you in preparing your response and expediting your reply, the questionnaire may be filled out by hand and "faxed" to 618-229-9440 (Attention: Dustie Thompson or Karen Kinzel) or you can e-mail your completed questionnaire to dustie.m.thompson.civ@mail.mil or karen.m.kinzel2.civ@mail.mil.

Please call Dustie Thompson at 618-229-9127 prior to fax transmission or if you have any questions. Your completed questionnaire will become a part of the official contract file. Your help is greatly appreciated and your prompt response will be one of the keys to the successful and timely completion of this Source Selection.

Signature

1 Atch
Questionnaire

ATTACHMENT L-3 QUESTIONNAIRE

**ATTACHMENT L-3
PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE**

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

SECTION I: CONTRACT IDENTIFICATION

1. Contractor: _____
2. Cage Code of contractor contract was awarded to: _____
3. Contract number: _____
4. Contract type (e.g., firm fixed price, cost plus, etc.): _____
5. Was this a competitively awarded contract? Yes _____ No _____
6. Period of performance: _____
7. Initial contract cost: \$ _____

8. Current/final contract cost: \$ _____

9. Reasons for differences between initial contract cost and final contract cost:

10. Description of products/service provided: _____

11. Geographic description of services under this contract, e.g., local, nationwide, worldwide, other Commands, etc.: _____

SECTION II. EVALUATOR AND AGENCY IDENTIFICATION

A. Agency (customer) name:

B. Evaluator's name and title: _____

C. Evaluator's phone number and email address:

SECTION III. PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONS/EVALUATION

(Circle your response, and/or provide written responses, when applicable.)

1. Technical Performance

a. Did the contractor meet the technical requirements of the Statement of Objectives/Statement of Work/Performance Work Statement?

Yes No

If no, please explain:

b. What was the overall quality of the contractor's performance? _____

2. Program Management

a. Did the contractor effectively manage and direct the contract?

Yes No

If no, please explain:

b. Did the contractor maintain good business relations with the agency?

Yes No

If no, please explain:

3. Transition/Phase-In

Did the contractor smoothly transition its resources and personnel?

Yes No

If no, please explain:

4. Employee Staff and Retention

a. Did the contractor recruit, hire, train and retain a qualified workforce with the appropriate skill levels during the term of the contract, and maintain a low turnover rate?

Yes No

If no, please explain:

b. Did the contractor replace departing personnel with employees of the same quality and skills and do so with minimal disruption to contract performance?

Yes No

If no, please explain:

5. Cost Performance

a. Did the contractor effectively forecast, manage and control costs? Did it alert the agency of unforeseen costs before they occurred?

Yes No

If no, please explain:

b. Did the contractor meet forecasted costs and perform within contract costs?

Yes No

If no, please explain:

For question number 6, please use ONE of the following performance levels to answer the question:

EXCEPTIONAL (E) (Blue) - During the contract period, contractor performance meets or met contractual requirements and exceeds or exceeded many to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were highly effective.

VERY GOOD (VG) (Purple) - During the contract period, contractor performance meets or met contractual requirements and exceeds or exceeded some to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective

SATISFACTORY(S) (Green) – During the contract period, contractor performance meets or met contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed contained some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor appear or were satisfactory.

MARGINAL (M) (Yellow) – During the contract period, contractor performance does not or did not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions. The contractor's proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.

UNSATISFACTORY (U) (Red) – During the contract period, contractor performance does not or did not meet most contractual requirements and recovery in a timely manner is not likely. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective.

6. What is your **OVERALL level of satisfaction with the contractor's performance?**

Acceptable Unacceptable

SECTION IV. RETURN OF COMPLETED FORM

Please return your completed form to:

Emailing Address: karen.m.kinzel2.civ@mail.mil and dustie.m.thompson.civ@mail.mil

ATTACHMENT L-4 CONSENT LETTER

ATTACHMENT L-4 SUBCONTRACTOR/TEAMING PARTNER CONSENT LETTER FOR THE RELEASE OF 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 contractor during exchanges. In an effort to assist the Government's Past Performance Evaluation Team in assessing your past performance relevancy and confidence, we request that the following consent letter be completed by the major subcontractors/teaming partners identified in your proposal. The completed consent letters should be submitted as part of your Present/Past Performance Volume.

SAMPLE

Dear "Contracting Officer:"

We are participating as a (subcontractor/teaming partner) with (prime contractor or name of entity providing proposal) in responding to the DISA Request for Proposal HC1028-16-R-0005 for the Advanced Field Artillery Tactical Data System 7.0 Modernization contract.

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 past performance evaluation/confidence assessment process we are signing this consent letter 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:

ATTACHMENT L-5 AUTH. LETTER

**ATTACHMENT L-5
CLIENT AUTHORIZATION LETTER**

Past performance information concerning private sector contractors, subcontractors and joint venture partners cannot be disclosed to the Government without their consent. Client authorization letters are required for each identified effort for a commercial customer. This letter will authorize release to the Government of requested information on the offeror's performance. The Government will need that consent before contacting commercial customers to assess the offeror's past performance. In an effort to assist the Government's Performance Confidence Assessment Group in assessing your past performance relevancy and confidence, we request that the following client authorization letter be completed by any commercial customers identified in your proposal. The completed client authorization letters should be submitted as part of your Present/Past Performance Volume.

Offerors should send with their list of references a letter similar to the following authorizing the reference to provide past performance information to the Government.

Dear "Client:"

We are responding to a DISA Request for Proposal HC1028-16-R-0005 for the AFATDS 7.0 Modernization contract.

In their procurements, the Government is placing increased emphasis on past performance as a source selection factor. They are requiring those clients of entities responding to their solicitation to be identified, and their participation in the evaluation process is requested. In the event that you are contacted for information on work performed, you are hereby authorized to respond to those inquiries.

We have identified Mr./Ms. _____ of your organization as the point of contact based on his/her knowledge of our work. Your cooperation is appreciated. Any questions may be directed to _____.

ATTACHMENT L-6 COST TEMPLATE

**ATTACHMENT L-6
COST TEMPLATE**



Cost Template 4 1
2016.xlsx

CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

52.214-34	Submission Of Offers In The English Language	APR 1991
52.214-35	Submission Of Offers In U.S. Currency	APR 1991
52.215-1	Instructions to Offerors--Competitive Acquisition	JAN 2004
52.215-20	Requirements for Certified Cost or Pricing Data or Information Other Than Certified Cost or Pricing Data	OCT 2010
52.222-24	Preaward On-Site Equal Opportunity Compliance Evaluation	FEB 1999
52.222-46	Evaluation Of Compensation For Professional Employees	FEB 1993
52.252-1	Solicitation Provisions Incorporated By Reference	FEB 1998
52.252-3	Alterations in Solicitation	APR 1984
52.252-5	Authorized Deviations In Provisions	APR 1984
252.227-7017	Identification and Assertion of Use, Release, or Disclosure Restrictions	JAN 2011

CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY FULL TEXT

52.216-1 TYPE OF CONTRACT (APR 1984)

The Government contemplates award of a single award contract resulting from this solicitation.

(End of provision)

52.233-2 SERVICE OF PROTEST (SEP 2006)

(a) Protests, as defined in section 33.101 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation, that are filed directly with an agency, and copies of any protests that are filed with the Government Accountability Office (GAO), shall be served on the Contracting Officer (addressed as follows) by obtaining written and dated acknowledgment of receipt from

Karen Kinzel- Contracting Officer
DISA/DITCO/PL8312
2300 East Drive
Scott AFB, IL 62225

(b) The copy of any protest shall be received in the office designated above within one day of filing a protest with the GAO.

(End of provision)

Section M - Evaluation Factors for Award

SECTION M**SECTION M****EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD****M001 SOURCE SELECTION****a. Basis for Contract Award**

This is a best value trade-off source selection conducted in accordance with FAR 15.3, Source Selection, as supplemented by the DFARS and the DARS. These regulations are available electronically at <http://www.ditco.disa.mil/hq/aqinfo.asp> and <http://farsite.hill.af.mil>. The Government will select the best overall offeror, based on integrated assessment of the evaluation factors and subfactors described below. Contracts may be awarded to the offeror who is deemed responsible in accordance with the FAR, as supplemented, whose proposal conforms to the solicitation's requirements (to include all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and all other information required by Section L of this solicitation) and is judged, based on the evaluation factors and subfactors to represent the best value to the Government. The Government seeks to award to the offeror who gives DISA the greatest confidence that it will best meet, or exceed, the requirements.

b. Evaluation

The technical proposal should include all information the offeror wants the Government to consider and evaluate regarding its company's ability to perform all required tasks and conform to all required terms and conditions. The best value determination will be based on the stated evaluation factors.

The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without discussions with offerors. However, the Government reserves the right to conduct discussions or seek clarifications if the contracting officer determines they are necessary. In the event issues pertaining to a proposed contract cannot be resolved to the contracting officer's satisfaction, the Government reserves the right to withdraw and cancel the solicitation. In such event, offerors will be notified in writing. In the event a competitive range is established and the contracting officer determines that the number of proposals that would otherwise be in the competitive range exceeds the number at which an efficient competition can be conducted, the contracting officer may limit the number of proposals in the competitive range to the greatest number that will permit an efficient competition.

c. Evaluation of Options

The Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the base period. The offeror shall submit pricing for the base period and all option periods, including option pricing for an additional six-month extension period that may be

authorized in accordance with (IAW) FAR 52.217-8. See FAR 52.217-8 which authorizes the Government to require continued performance of any services within the limits and at the rates specified in the contract. The pricing proposal should include a separate line item for the additional six-month extension period IAW FAR 52.217-8. The pricing for the additional six-month extension period, IAW FAR 52.217-8, applies to the Engineering Support Services and ODC CLINs only. These prices shall be identical to the proposed pricing in the six months prior to expiration of the base period, or the final option period, if option periods are present. The total evaluated price will consist of the contractor's proposed price for the base period, all option periods, and the option pricing for the additional six-month extension period. The Government may determine that an offer is unacceptable if the option prices are significantly unbalanced. Evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise the options.

d. Number of Contracts to be Awarded

The Government intends to award one contract for the AFATDS 7.0 Modernization Program; however, the Government reserves the right to make no award at all.

e. Rejection of Offers

The Government may reject any proposal that is evaluated to be unrealistic in terms of program commitments, contract terms and conditions. Additionally, the Government may reject proposals that are unrealistically high or low in cost when compared to Government estimates, such that the proposal is deemed to reflect an inherent lack of competence or failure to comprehend the complexity and risks of the program.

M002 EVALUATION FACTORS

a. Evaluation Factors and Subfactors

Factor 1: Technical/Management

- (1) The following evaluation factors and subfactors will be used to evaluate each proposal and are listed in descending order of importance. The sub-elements under each respective subfactor are of approximate equal importance to that subfactor.

Subfactor 1: Contractor Developed Performance Work Statement (PWS), Integrated Master Plan (IMP), and Contractor Work Breakdown Structure (CWBS)- SOO Paragraph 6.1

The offeror shall provide its proposed PWS, IMP and CWBS for Government evaluation which outlines its proposed approach to modernization of AFATDS in alignment with the AFATDS 7.0 Statement of Objectives (SOO) and Software Requirements Specification. The offeror shall also provide a list of all assumptions and any Government requests to support its proposed approach. The

PWS, IMP and CWBS will be incorporated into Section C of the resultant contract.

The Government will evaluate the extent to which the offeror's proposed PWS, IMP, and CWBS:

- aligns to AFATDS 7.0 Program Objective, SOO paragraph 6.1
- presents a comprehensive and complete development/modernization approach
- incorporates the Government's defined milestones with applicable entry and exit criteria
- implements innovation while minimizing/balancing cost, schedule, and performance risk via an integrated program management approach that allows for Government insight and collaboration
- provides delivery of incremental capabilities rapidly while balancing feasibility based upon complexity of program and requirements

Subfactor 2: Modernization / Conversion Approach-SRS Appendix C - CPCE v3 Technical Guidance Section 3.2.6.1

The offeror shall provide its proposed approach to modernizing the Unit Manager (UM) Computer Software Configuration Item (CSCI) backend architecture into a service oriented architecture. Offeror's proposed approach must be reflective of offeror's overall strategy for converting the entire AFATDS baseline. The offeror's modernization approach for the UM CSCI shall specifically provide:

- detailed approach for converting the UM CSCI to a service oriented architecture; alignment to CPCE v3 architecture, as outlined in CPCE v3 Technical Guidance Section 3.2.6.1; and integration of services to the Mission Command Data Bus (MCDB), as outlined in CPCE v3 Technical Guidance Section 3.0; note, special attention should be paid to how the existing AFATDS enterprise service bus technology will be replaced by MCDB
- discussion of how the CSCI will be adapted to support Semantic Extensible Attribute Model (SEAM)
- discussion of how approach supports an extendable role based functionality and ease of ability to incorporate additional user roles to allow evolvable functionality
- discussion of how approach ensures the exclusion of ANY proprietary products or code and preserves Government Unlimited Rights while minimizing future sustainment licensing and support costs

The Government will evaluate the extent to which the offeror's proposed modernization approach to the UM CSCI demonstrates:

- a sound and feasible conversion strategy; alignment to CPCE v3 architecture requirements, as outlined in CPCE v3 Technical Guidance Section 3.2.6.1; and alignment to MCDB integration requirements, as outlined in CPCE v3 Technical Guidance Section 3.0
- support and alignment with SEAM
- extent of role based extendable solution and ease of ability to incorporate additional user roles to allow evolvable functionality
- exclusion of proprietary products or code; preservation of Unlimited Rights; and minimizes sustainment licensing and support costs

Subfactor 3: Mission Command Smart Client, Web Client and Common Services-SOO Paragraph 6.2.4

In alignment with SOO paragraph 6.2.4, the offeror shall provide its proposed approach to incorporating Common Operating Environment (COE) v3 common services. Offeror shall also discuss its approach to exposing AFATDS 7.0 capability via the COE Smart and Web Clients. Special attention should be given to if the offeror sees opportunities to standardize delivery of AFATDS 7.0 capability via the CPCE Web Client and Extensible Mapping Platform Wrapper for both Smart and Web environments, or if development of separate Web and Android applications to support both environments is best suited.

The Government will evaluate the extent to which the offeror's proposed approach aligns with the objectives of SOO paragraph 6.2.4 and demonstrates:

- maximum utilization of CPCE common services in lieu of organic AFATDS services, with a clear explanation of which portions of each CSCI will be replaced by a CPCE service
- a clear understanding of how AFATDS 7.0 capability will be exposed via the CPCE Smart and Web Clients
- use of the existing Fires Command Web application as the basis for establishing the AFATDS 7.0 Web Client

Subfactor 4: Embedded Training Session Sample- SOO Paragraph 6.2.11

The offeror shall submit an interactive and executable embedded training session for Government assessment. The training session must be submitted as a CD/DVD and shipped to:

Attention: Karen Kinzel
2300 East Drive
Scott Air Force Base, IL 62225

The tracking number shall be included in response to the RFP. Sample training session shall be no less than ten minutes in duration, allow user click and play functionality, and on-screen animation with visual and verbal guidance. The interactive and executable embedded training session can be either an AFATDS 7.0 mock-up OR a previously developed training session that represents the offeror's proposed approach for incorporation of AFATDS 7.0 embedded training capabilities. In addition, the offeror shall submit its proposed approach to address embedded training objectives as stated in SOO paragraph 6.2.11 sub-items d, e, g, and j, specifically the offeror shall discuss utilization of Commercial-off-the-shelf vs. custom developed training solutions and training capability implementation into the AFATDS 7.0 baseline.

The Government will evaluate the extent to which the sample training session demonstrates:

- click and play functionality that is responsive to trainee's request; quality and use of on-screen animation with visual and verbal guidance that provides a sound and comprehensive overview of trainee's request

The Government will evaluate the extent to which the offeror's proposed approach meets the objectives of SOO paragraph 6.2.11 sub-items d, e, g, and j and demonstrates:

- a sound and feasible approach for developing training products while managing maintainability of material and ease in which content can be added or modified
- a sound and feasible approach to embedding individual and collective training capability that supports 24/7 education at the Army unit level

- (2) Relative Importance of Factors and Subfactors. The relative importance of each factor and subfactor is as follows: Within the technical/management factor, the subfactors are in descending order of importance. The sub-elements under each respective subfactor are of approximate equal importance to that subfactor.

The technical/management approach factor is more important than the past performance factor. In accordance with FAR 15.304(e), all evaluation factors other than cost/price, when combined, are significantly more important than cost or price.

Factor 2: Past Performance

Factor 3: Small Business Participation

Factor 4: OCI Mitigation Plan (if required)

Factor 5: Cost/Price

b. Technical/Management Factor

The technical/management evaluation will be evaluated using two distinct but related assessments: the technical/management rating and the technical/management risk rating.

The offeror's technical solution will be rated separately from the risk associated with its technical approach. The technical rating evaluates the quality of the offeror's technical solution for meeting the Government's requirement. The risk rating considers the risk associated with the technical approach in meeting the requirement. Technical evaluations shall utilize the ratings listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Technical Ratings		
Color	Rating	Description
BLUE	Outstanding	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements. The proposal contains multiple strengths and no deficiencies.
PURPLE	Good	Proposal meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal contains at least one strength and no deficiencies.
GREEN	Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal has no strengths or deficiencies.
YELLOW	Marginal	Proposal does not clearly meet requirements and has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements.
RED	Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies. Proposal is unawardable.

Deficiency is a material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level. See FAR 15.001.

Strength is an aspect of an offeror's proposal that has merit or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Government during contract performance.

Assessment of technical risk, which is manifested by the identification of weakness (es), considers potential for disruption of schedule, increased costs, degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight, or the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance. Technical risk shall be rated using the ratings listed in Table 2.

Table 2. Technical Risk Ratings	
Rating	Description
Low	Has little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and normal Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.
Moderate	Can potentially cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome difficulties.
High	Is likely to cause significant disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Is unlikely to overcome any difficulties, even with special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring.

c. Past Performance Factor

The technical/management approach factor is more important than the past performance factor. In accordance with FAR 15.304(e), all evaluation factors other than cost/price, when combined, are significantly more important than cost or price. The past performance evaluation factor assesses the degree of confidence the Government has in an offeror's ability to supply products and services that meet users' needs, based on a demonstrated record of performance.

Performance confidence is assessed at the overall past performance factor level after evaluating aspects of the offeror's recent past performance. The information submitted shall reference only the offeror's, significant teaming partner's, or significant subcontractor's past performance on the submitted effort, rather than the past performance of other contractors on the submitted effort.

Past performance information shall be obtained from any other sources available to the Government, to include, but not limited to, the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS), Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System, Electronic Subcontract Reporting System, or other databases; interviews with program managers, contracting officers, and fee determining officials; and the Defense Contract Management Agency.

(1) Recency Assessment

An assessment of the past performance information will be made to determine if it is recent. Recent contracts are considered to be efforts that the prime offeror and its teaming partners, joint venture or significant subcontractors have performed within the past five years prior to original issuance of the solicitation, or for ongoing efforts the period of performance of which must have started at least nine months before the original proposal due date. Past performance information that fails this condition will not be further evaluated.

(2) Relevancy Assessment

The Government will conduct an in-depth evaluation of all recent performance information obtained. For each recent past performance reference reviewed, the relevance of the work

performed will generally be assessed as compared to the technical/management factor. A relevancy determination of the offeror's past performance will be made based upon the contractor's previous experience in taking an existing DoD Tactical Information system and modernizing it to a service-oriented architecture and/or implemented Android or HTML5 tactical applications. The past performance information forms and information obtained from other sources will be used to establish the degree of relevancy of past performance. The Government will use the following degrees of relevancy when assessing recent, relevant contracts (Department of Defense (DoD) Source Selection Procedures, paragraph 3.1.3.1).

Table 3. Past Performance Relevancy Ratings	
Rating	Definition
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.

(3) Performance Quality Assessment (How well the contractor performed on the contract.)

The Government will consider the performance quality of recent and relevant efforts. For each recent and relevant past performance reference reviewed, the performance quality of the work performed will be assessed. The quality assessment consists of an in-depth evaluation of the past performance questionnaire responses, PPIRS information, interviews with Government customers, and if applicable, commercial clients. It may include interviews with Defense Contract Management Agency officials or other sources known to the Government.

The Government will use the following quality ratings when assessing quality of relevant contracts (DISA Supplemental Source Selection Procedures, paragraph 3.1.3.1 (S-90)).

Table 4. Past Performance Quality Assessment	
Quality Assessment Rating/Color	Description

EXCEPTIONAL (E)/BLUE	During the contract period, contractor performance meets or met contractual requirements and exceeds or exceeded many to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were highly effective.
VERY GOOD (VG)/PURPLE	During the contract period, contractor performance meets or met contractual requirements and exceeds or exceeded some to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective.
SATISFACTORY (S)/GREEN	During the contract period, contractor performance meets or met contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed contained some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor appear or were satisfactory.
MARGINAL (M)/YELLOW	During the contract period, contractor performance does not or did not meet some contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being assessed reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions. The contractor's proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.
UNSATISFACTORY(U)/RED	During the contract period, contractor performance does not or did not meet most contractual requirements and recovery in a timely manner is not likely. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective.
NOT APPLICABLE (N)/WHITE	Unable to provide a rating. Contract did not include performance for this aspect. Do not know.

(4) Assigning Performance Confidence Assessment. As a result of the relevancy and quality assessments of the recent contracts evaluated, offerors will receive an integrated performance confidence assessment rating. The resulting performance confidence assessment rating is made at the past performance factor level and represents an overall evaluation of contractor performance. Offerors without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance and, as a result, will receive an "Unknown Confidence" rating for the past performance factor.

The past performance factor will receive one of the performance confidence assessments described in the DoD Source Selection Procedures, paragraph 3.1.3.3.

TABLE 5- Performance Confidence Assessments	
Rating	Description
SUBSTANTIAL CONFIDENCE	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
SATISFACTORY CONFIDENCE	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
LIMITED CONFIDENCE	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
NO CONFIDENCE	Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.
UNKNOWN CONFIDENCE (Neutral)	No recent/relevant performance record is available or the offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned.

d. Small Business Factor

All proposals will be evaluated as to the extent of participation of Small Business firms. The targets submitted in accordance with FAR 52.219-24, and Section L paragraph 7.2.4 will be incorporated into and become part of the contract. The successful offeror will be required to provide reports on small business subcontractor participation in accordance with FAR 52.219-25 in Section I of the contract.

If the offeror is other than a small business, the offeror's Small Business Subcontracting Plan submitted IAW FAR 52.219-9 and Section L paragraph 7.2.4.2 shall also be evaluated to determine the extent to which the offeror identifies and commits to the participation of small businesses, whether as joint venture members, teaming arrangement, or subcontractor. Failure to submit such a plan will render the offeror ineligible for award. The Government will evaluate the small business participation and subcontracting plans to determine whether it is acceptable or unacceptable, using the rating and descriptions outlined in Table 6.

TABLE 6- Acceptable/Unacceptable Ratings	
Rating	Description
Acceptable	Proposal clearly meets the minimum requirements of the solicitation.

Unacceptable	Proposal does not clearly meet the minimum requirements of the solicitation.
--------------	--

e. OCI Mitigation Plan (if required)

The offeror shall submit a Government-approved/acceptable OCI Mitigation Plan to the contracting officer which concisely describes all relevant facts concerning any past, present or current planned interest, (financial, contractual, organizational, or otherwise) relating to work to be performed under the AFATDS contract that will or may result in an actual or potential OCI. (See RFP Section H). The OCI Mitigation Plan shall explain how the OCI will be minimized to a level acceptable to the Government. The OCI Mitigation Plan will be evaluated as acceptable or unacceptable.

TABLE 7- Acceptable/Unacceptable Ratings	
Rating	Description
Acceptable	Proposal clearly meets the minimum requirements of the solicitation.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not clearly meet the minimum requirements of the solicitation.

f. Cost Factor

(1) The offeror's cost proposal will be evaluated for award purposes:

(a) based upon the total price proposed for basic requirements (basic award) and all options, including option pricing for an additional 6-month extension period that may be authorized IAW FAR 52.217-8, as described in Section L, above. The pricing for the

additional six-month option period applies to the Engineering Support Services and ODC CLINs only.

(b) at prices proposed for the evaluation quantities or based upon the applicable hourly rate multiplied by the corresponding quantity of labor hours specified for evaluation purposes

(c) by the probable cost (PC) computed by the Government for the basic requirements (basic award) and all options. The offeror's proposed estimated costs shall not be controlling for source selection purposes. PC shall be measured as follows:

- Government estimate of anticipated performance costs and proposed fee.
- Government estimate of anticipated performance costs plus any fee to be earned under the cost incentive.
- Government estimate of anticipated performance costs plus any base fee proposed plus any fee anticipated to be awarded. (See FAR 15.404-1(d))

(2) Evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise such options.

(3) The offeror's cost proposal will be evaluated, using one or more of the techniques defined in FAR 15.404, in order to determine if it is reasonable, realistic, and complete. For additional information see FAR 31.201-3.

(4) The Government will evaluate the realism of each offeror's proposed costs. This will include an evaluation of the extent to which proposed costs are sufficient for the work to be performed, reflective of a clear understanding of the requirements, and consistent with the unique methods of performance and materials described in the offeror's technical/management proposal (FAR 15.404-1(d)(1) and 2.101).

(5) In accordance with FAR 15.304(e), all evaluation factors other than cost/price, when combined, are significantly more important than cost or price.

M003 SOLICITATION REQUIREMENTS, TERMS AND CONDITIONS

Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, such as terms and conditions, representations and certifications, and technical/management requirements, in addition to those identified as factors or subfactors. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions of the solicitation may result in the offeror being ineligible for award.