

Volume II Technical

The inner packaging of the SECRET ANNEX should be addressed to the following POC:

Naval Sea Systems Command, PEO IWS 6.0

Attn: Joe Bagnall

1333 Isaac Hull Avenue SE, Stop 4401

Washington Navy Yard, DC 20376

The SECRET ANNEX should be mailed to the following POC:

Naval Sea Systems Command, PEO IWS 6.0

Attn: Joe Bagnall

Operational Security Lead

Document Control

1333 Isaac Hull Avenue SE

Washington Navy Yard, DC 20376- 7039

Technical Proposal

The Offeror shall provide a comprehensive overview of the Cooperative Engagement Capability (CEC) Common Array Block (CAB) Family of Antennas (FoA) approach that includes its antenna design, system engineering, integrated logistics support, and management approach. Unsupported promises to comply with contractual requirements will not be sufficient. Proposals must contain supporting rationale for any statements relating to proposed performance. Each proposal will be rated strictly in accordance with its written content. No assumptions will be made by evaluators regarding areas that are not addressed in the Offeror's written proposal (i.e. antennas built in the past).

Antenna Design

Hardware/Software Design/Architecture - The Offeror shall provide a conceptual antenna design and describe its ability to meet the requirements of the Performance Specification and Statement of Work (SOW) of this solicitation. At a minimum, this description shall include:

- A functional block diagram identifying the major sub-assemblies, LRUs and Interfaces
- Loss budgets for transmit/receive chains
- First order array design, including aperture layout and proposed radiating element
- EIRP, G-F, beam width, and scan volume analyses
- Digital control architecture
- Built in Test (BIT) and calibration schemes
- Conceptual packaging layout
- Thermal management design
- First order thermal, weight and power analyses, that at a minimum, meet performance requirements
- CAB-S RCS mitigation approach
- Approach to achieve each required operational Antenna Mode
- Description of the CAB-E ancillary equipment
- Approach for multi-beam operation
- Any unique equipment required to maintain the system
- Requirements cross-reference matrix that identifies how the Offeror will be compliant with the requirements of the Performance Specification

The Offeror shall describe how its concept design optimizes reliability, availability, maintainability, and supportability for lowest life cycle cost. The Offeror shall include its sparing philosophy and projected LRU reliability. The Offeror shall describe its design process for optimizing life cycle cost throughout the design and development process.

The Offeror shall describe how its design maximizes commonality of Line Replaceable Units (LRUs) and other components, assemblies, software/firmware, and hardware across the CAB-E/S systems. The Offeror shall provide a list of common LRUs, assemblies, software/firmware, and hardware.

The Government is strongly interested in limiting TOC of the CEC system by developing a FoA that is producible and maintainable at low costs over its lifetime. As such, the Offeror shall detail how its design will allow for low cost production and support. The Offeror shall describe how its conceptual design will utilize common industry manufacturing facilities and processes. The Offeror shall identify any unique processes or equipment that would limit or inhibit producibility of the CAB FoA at a common industry manufacturing facility.

The Government desires, to the maximum extent practicable, at least Government Purpose Rights (GPR), as defined at DFARS 252.227-7013 and -7014, in all technical data and computer software/firmware relating to the CAB FoA and all of its component systems and subsystems and to any other data relating to the antenna design that the Government deems necessary for the unimpeded, innovative, and cost effective production, operation, maintenance of the CAB (FoA) throughout its life cycle and allow for open and competitive procurement of CAB FoA components and systems. The Government would have GPR to all data relating to all items, components or processes produced under this effort and at least partially funded by the Government.

The Offeror shall provide a listing of all technical data (including manufacturing processes and techniques, and computer software/firmware documentation) and computer software/firmware (including source code) deliverables relating to the CAB FoA and all of its component systems and subsystems for which the Offeror will provide less than unlimited rights. This list shall include, but not be limited to, the source of the technical data or computer software/firmware; items which are either commercial or non-commercial as per DFARS Subparts 227.7100 et. seq and 227-7200 et. seq and whether or not data or computer programs are conformant with OACE guidelines. The CDRLs and the Statement of Work must be construed broadly so as to provide rights in technical data and computer software/firmware that would allow a second source to independently produce a CAB (FoA) of same design. The Government desires to have at least GPR in the TDP to be provided under the contract. Where less than GPR are being provided to the Government, the Government requests that the offeror provide the price of buy-out options for GPR. The Offeror shall not include the prices of the buy-out options in the Technical volume of the proposal. Rather, for each technical data/computer software/firmware deliverable which is being offered with less than GPR, prices for buy-out options for conversion of the deliverable data rights to GPR shall be included in the price volume, see Volume IV. The Offeror shall provide a consolidated table in response to DFARS 252-227-7013, 7014, 7017 and 7028 in this section of the technical volume.

Offerors shall also include: (1) Identification of the level (e.g., subsystem or component) at which the approach implements proprietary technology and standards and (2) A description of the extent to which the Offeror's proposed rights in technical data (TD), computer software (CS), and computer software documentation (CSD) offered to the Government ensure the unimpeded, innovation, and cost effective production, operation, maintenance of the CAB (FoA) throughout its life cycle and allow for open and competitive procurement of the CAB (FoA). Additionally, the Government may contact past performance references provided pursuant to the Past Performance section of this solicitation and may also rely on any first-hand experience of the Government evaluators in gathering the information relating to past deliveries of technical data, with the understanding that previous issues that adversely affected the Government's ability to use portions of a TDP or TD/CS/CSD are indicative of significant likelihood of future difficulties.

The Offeror shall describe its notional approach to utilize the Transmit/Receive (T/R) Monolithic Microwave Integrated Circuits (MMICs). The Offeror shall provide a notional design approach for integrating the MMIC into the next higher assemblies. The Offeror shall include its anticipated approach for supporting MMIC development activities.

The Offeror shall describe the proposed software/firmware development approach to ensure the Offeror understands the software/firmware development requirements of this solicitation and for compliance with the requirements in the SOW. The Offeror shall submit software/firmware development approach that illustrates their intended method for accomplishing all the software/firmware development requirements defined in the SOW. The software/firmware development approach shall describe the Offeror's software/firmware development processes and shall provide a description of the system software/firmware including: timing, techniques, partitioning (for Source Lines of Code

(SLOC) and CSCI), code, top level architecture, complexity and expandability. The Offeror shall describe its plan to design, develop, test, modify, integrate, optimize and document software/firmware drivers using estimated SLOC, function points or other appropriate software/firmware size measurement. Size shall be broken down into new, reused, modified, and deleted code. The software/firmware development approach shall address the proposed software/firmware components to determine the use of firmware and software. The software/firmware development approach may be formatted as desired by the Offeror but must be within the page count limit set for the RFP.

The Offeror shall describe how their system uses a layered, modular architecture that makes maximum use of Commercial-Off-The-Shelf /Non-Developmental Item (COTS/NDI) hardware, operating systems, and software/firmware. The Offeror shall identify the key COTS/NDI components (hardware, operating systems, and software/firmware).

The Offeror shall provide a detailed description of its requirements traceability approach to ensure that all requirements are met and adequately flow down through the WBS.

The Offeror shall describe their open systems approach for using common components, standards-based interfaces, and widely-supported, consensus-based standards. The Offeror shall provide a detailed description of the approach to facilitate the sharing of system or component (e.g., software/firmware, hardware, middleware) design information in support of peer reviews and the incremental development process. The Offeror shall describe how its design will be documented and modeled using industry standard formats (e.g., Unified Modeling Language), and how it will use tools that are capable of exporting model information in a standard format (e.g., Extensible Markup Language Metadata Interchange (XML) and AP233/ISO 10303). The Offeror shall identify the proposed standards and formats to be used. The Offeror shall provide a detailed description of how the proposed system will allow for rapid and affordable technology insertion and technology refresh (TI/TR), including a description of how the proposed system will allow incremental systems improvement through upgrades of individual hardware or software/firmware components. The Offeror shall describe their plan to report open architecture metrics to the Government.

Trade Studies – The Offeror shall describe its approach for utilizing Total Ownership Cost (TOC) as a driver in developing system architecture tradeoffs, and defining LRUs and other major assemblies. The Offeror shall describe its approach and plan for conducting TOC analyses. The Offeror shall detail any rationale or assumptions that will be used in the TOC analyses, and provide a sample tradeoff analysis based on TOC.

The Offeror shall present any trade studies utilized in this proposal preparation, including rationale and assumptions. The Offeror shall describe any recommended trade studies that should be performed under this contract. The Offeror shall describe their plan to conduct the studies. The Offeror shall detail any rationale and assumptions that will be used in the trade studies. The Offeror shall describe what goal will be pursued in each study and how the study affects the system architecture.

Test and Evaluation – The Offeror shall describe its Test and Evaluation strategy for the entire CEC CAB FoA effort. The Test and Evaluation strategy shall show utilization of EDM assets and EDM subassemblies to meet test requirements and development schedule. The Contractor shall specify the number and types of EDM assets and EDM subassemblies utilized during Test and Evaluation.

The Offeror shall define a qualification test program to ensure issues are identified and resolved early in the design process prior to Government range testing. Consequently, this approach shall include, as a minimum, the following:

- The test approach of the program to support model verification and risk mitigation prior to testing;
- A specific list of test assets and facilities to be utilized for testing, to include needs for Government Furnished Test or other Government owned assets, equipment or facilities and when they will be required;
- Detailed information describing quantity, configuration and sequencing of EDM assets and test equipment. This information shall demonstrate that the Offeror's test approach meets schedule requirements;
- The flow down of the system requirements to the individual tests and verification methods to validate them;

The Offeror shall define a collaborative system integration approach that details the Offeror's approach to integrating the CEC CAB FoA into the CEC System for testing. The collaborative system integration approach shall include:

- The approach to integrating processes and resources of second and/or third party vendors, Government test agencies, independent test agencies, and the Offeror’s own testing efforts into an integrated test program;
- The approach to participating in the facilities coordination and installation of the contractor test equipment at the Government and Independent test sites;
- Test planning processes for testing at Government, Independent, and Offeror test sites.

Systems Engineering

The Offeror shall describe its Systems Engineering process, tailored specifically to the requirements of the CEC CAB FoA. The Offeror shall describe their plan to establish and maintain a process that will provide early design disclosure directly to the Government. The Offeror should not respond with a description of a generic system engineering process. This section shall discuss how the Offeror plans to allocate the system requirements and transition those requirements across the two capabilities (CAB-E and CAB-S) into a balanced system design. The discussion shall explain how the Offeror will allocate systems engineering roles and how the system engineering process will influence team selection and role allocation.

The Offeror shall describe its Configuration Management (CM) process and how that process will manage interfaces and maintain configuration control.

The Offeror shall demonstrate the availability of trained personnel to provide Engineering Support Services in accordance with Technical Instructions provided by the Contracting Officer’s Representative. Technical Instructions will specify tasks to be performed, period of performance, and required deliverables should Engineering Support Services be required. The following should be used only as a guide. Offerors are encouraged to propose labor categories and mixes as they see fit:

Electrical Engineer – Five years of experience in design and production of electrical equipment. Holds a Master of Science degree in electrical engineering from an accredited university.

Mechanical Engineer – Five years of experience in design and production of mechanical equipment. Holds a Master of Science degree in mechanical engineering from an accredited university.

System Engineer – Five years of experience in system engineering. Holds a Master of Science degree in system engineering from an accredited university.

SW/FW Engineer- Five years of experience in design and production of SW/FW. Holds a Master of Science degree in computer engineering from an accredited university.

Example Labor Mix and Hours Per Year	
Labor Category	Labor Mix %
Electrical Engineer	30%
Mechanical Engineer	10%
System Engineer	20%
SW/FW	15%
Program Management	4%
Manufacturing	3%
Technical Design Support	13%

Administrative Design Support	5%
Total	100%

Management

Schedule - The Offeror shall develop a draft project schedule for the program. The Offeror shall demonstrate its ability to manage the CEC CAB FoA program in order to meet all required program schedules, including hardware and software/firmware development and program reviews. The Offeror shall identify significant program events, including schedule interrelationships and critical paths, as well as all major milestones and the allocated timeframe to achieve each milestone. This plan shall include an example WBS expanded to least three levels. The Offeror shall provide a draft schedule that supports optional Pre-Production Unit (PPU) fabrication.

Risk Management - The Offeror shall describe its plans for identifying, managing and mitigating current risks as well as future risks. The Offeror shall describe how this has worked in the past and provide a specific example of implementing a Risk Management Process.

Initial Risk Assessment

The Offeror shall identify cost, schedule, performance and technical risks and why these were identified as risks. The Contractor shall:

- Discuss the event or task, impact and mitigation for each risk including an explanation on how the effect of mitigation plans will be measured.
- Describe how these risk items relate to system performance, schedule, and program cost.
- Discuss the external dependencies not under control of the Offeror that could have a serious impact on the ability to deliver the capabilities within the cost and schedule of the proposal. For each external dependency, identify the responsible organization and discuss at least one possible work-around if the dependency is late or does not meet the prescribed need.

Management Approach – The Offeror shall describe the proposed management approach including system integration and subcontractor management to include:

- The Offeror shall describe the strategy for subcontract management and control in the performance of this contract. The Offeror shall address its plans and processes for managing subcontractors and any unique agreements to maintain control and accountability to reduce the risk of potential schedule extensions for critical, time-sensitive modifications and negotiations. In describing its strategy, the Offeror shall describe its approach and the complexity and variety of the work the subcontractors are to perform, the rationale for selecting major subcontractors and their integration into the team, as well as the contract type. The Offeror shall identify its major subcontractor(s) and identify critical task(s) that will be subcontracted. The Offeror shall describe how its subcontractor management plan ensures that deliverable products comply with contract requirements.
- The Offeror shall address: 1) What reporting mechanisms are in place to track technical, cost and schedule performance – specifically the Offeror shall describe its Earned Value Management System (EVMS), 2) How has the EVMS been incorporated into past projects, and 3) How relevant the past work is compared to the work to be performed under this solicitation. The Offeror shall discuss what lessons were learned from past programs and how these were incorporated in to its current management plan.
- Capability to manage a complex family of antennas. Include one example of current or completed task requiring management of this level of complexity with enough detail to sufficiently portray the complexity, including a discussion of any obstacles and how they were overcome.
- Demonstrate how the proposed management approach successfully implemented a system engineering process on a contract of similar complexity. Specifically, what Systems Engineering processes were used and how did the process ensure success.
- Describe the internal processes for tracking and managing the design process and communicating those metrics to the Government in a timely manner. Specifically, 1) What metrics will be used to manage this

program, 2) How will the metrics be used to manage cost, schedule and technical performance, 3) How will these metrics be shared with the Government to ensure current, transparent Government oversight? , 4) How will subcontractor performance be managed to ensure timely, visibility to the Government. The Offeror shall describe how it has used similar metrics on other programs of similar complexity to identify and resolve problems early, and thereby avoid schedule and cost impacts.

- The Offeror shall describe the process for integrating and managing the Systems Engineering process to ensure requirements are properly allocated to each subcontractor and how they intend to manage and control all interfaces and integration between the subcontractors.
- The Offeror shall describe its Quality Management Plan. The Government requires the Contractor to be in compliance with ANSI/ISO/ASQ 9001:2000 standards or higher; registration though not required is preferable. If the Offeror is not registered as ANSI/ISO/ASQ 9001:2000 compliant, the Offeror shall describe how its Quality Management Plan is equivalent to ANSI/ISO/ASQ 9001:2000.

The Offeror shall submit resumes for the following six (6) key personnel: (1) Program Manager, (1) Lead/Systems Engineer, (1) Antenna Engineer, (1) Mechanical Engineer, (1) RF Engineer, (1) Control System Engineer. Each resume is limited to 2 pages and shall provide the following information:

- Name, years of experience, training, unique or special qualifications, current level of security clearance, positions held and tenure
- Degrees held and/or other pertinent education. Include date(s), degree(s), and identify the respective college or university from which the degree(s) were received
- Work history as it relates to the anticipated SOW task(s) to be assigned to that individual

The resumes above do not count towards the proposal page limit stated in Table 1.

Integrated Logistics Support

The Offeror shall describe its plan to provide LMI source data to the Government. The Offeror shall also include the proposed software/firmware storage/retrieval system.

Volume III Past Performance/Relevant Experience

Past Performance

The Offeror shall provide a list of at least 3 contracts and subcontracts performed during the past five years (recent) of similar work scope or technical complexity to the efforts described herein (relevant). The Offeror shall also provide at least 3 recent and relevant contracts or subcontracts for each proposed major subcontractor (proposed subcontracts of \$650,000 or more per year), if any. Past performance is a measure of the degree to which an Offeror, as an organization: (1) satisfied its customers, and (2) has relevant past work compared to the work to be performed under this solicitation. The Offeror shall provide past performance references of recent and relevant work that provide information regarding customer satisfaction, timeliness of performance, technical success, cost control, and quality of product or service.

The Offeror and proposed major subcontractors, if any, shall submit the Past Performance Questionnaire, **Attachment 1**, to each of the references. The Offeror shall instruct the references to complete the Past Performance Questionnaire and return it directly to:

**Commander
Naval Sea Systems Command
Surface Systems Contracts Division, SEA 02521
Attention: Ms. Jamillah Prescott
1333 Isaac Hull Ave. SE
Washington Navy Yard, DC 20376-2040**

Relevant Experience Narrative

The Offeror's description of their relevant experience shall not exceed 10 pages in total. The summary shall contain the Offeror's relevant experience in each of the SOW task areas. It shall not parrot the SOW task descriptions, as that is ineffective in supporting the Offeror's claim of having gained relevant experience in the given task area. The Offeror shall address its relevant work processes and procedures associated with performing the work, as well as the difficulties and uncertainties encountered. The Offeror shall also provide information on problems encountered on previous contracts and the corrective actions taken. The narrative shall also contain the benefits gained from each contract or subcontract performed.

The Offeror shall address, if applicable, to what extent subcontractors were involved in gaining related corporate experience, and their level of involvement with respect to the scope of work, objective achieved, and personnel resources utilized, and how previous contracts relate to tasking under this effort. The Government will give greater weight to prime contractor experience than subcontract experience.

Technical Evaluation Factors

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposal in accordance with the factors and subfactors set forth below:

Factor 1 Antenna Design

Factor 2 Systems Engineering

Factor 3 Management Approach

Factor 4 Integrated Logistics Support (ILS)

Factor 5 Past Performance/Relevant Experience

These factors and subfactors, and the elements within each subfactor are listed in descending order of importance.

Factor 1 Antenna Design

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's:

- A) Hardware/Software Design/Architecture:
- i) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposal to determine its ability to meet the requirements of the Performance Specification and Statement of Work (SOW) of this solicitation.
 - ii) The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's design concept optimizes reliability, availability, maintainability, and supportability for lowest life cycle cost.
 - iii) The Government will evaluate the degree to which the Offeror's design concept maximizes commonality of Line Replaceable Units (LRUs) and other components, assemblies, software/firmware, and hardware across the requirements of this RFP. For the purposes of evaluation, commonality is defined as LRUs and significant assemblies that are form, fit and functionally identical and interchangeable between CAB-E and CAB-S platforms.
 - iv) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's design concept for producibility.
 - v) The Government will evaluate the extent to which the Offeror's proposed rights in technical data (TD), computer software (CS), and computer software documentation (CSD) offered to the Government ensures the unimpeded, innovative, and cost effective production, operation, and maintenance of the CAB (FoA) throughout its life cycle and allow for open and competitive procurement of CAB (FoA) components and systems. In the event an Offeror proposes to deliver any commercial or noncommercial TD/CS/CDS with less than GPR as desired by the Government, the Government will evaluate the impact on the Government's ability to use, modify, release, or disclose such TD, CS, or CSD.
 - vi) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's notional approach to integrate the MMIC into a functional RF assembly.
 - vii) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed software/firmware development approach to ensure it is appropriate for the CAB FoA and meets standard levels of completeness and process quality. For this evaluation, the Government will rely primarily on the draft Software Development Plan and its rationale.
 - viii) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's plan to develop a layered, common architecture that makes maximum use of Commercial-Off-The-Shelf/Non-Developmental Item (COTS/NDI) hardware, operating systems, and software/firmware.
 - ix) The Government will review the Offeror's detailed approach for ensuring that all requirements are accounted for through traceability to the CAB FoA Performance Specification.
 - x) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's open systems approach using common components, industry standards-based interfaces, and widely-supported, consensus-based standards. The Government will evaluate how the Offeror's proposed architecture will allow for rapid and affordable technology insertion and technology refresh (TI/TR), and how it will allow for incremental system improvements through upgrades of individual hardware or software/firmware components. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's plan to report open architecture metrics.

- B) Trade Studies:
 - i) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's plan to utilize Total Ownership Cost (TOC) analyses as a driver in developing CAB FoA architecture.
 - ii) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's trade studies utilized in this proposal preparation.
 - iii) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed trade studies and plan to utilize those studies in developing CAB FoA architecture.
- C) Test and Evaluation:
 - i) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's Test and Evaluation strategy;
 - ii) The Government will evaluate the Offeror's collaborative CEC System integration approach;

Factor 2 Systems Engineering

The Government will evaluate:

- A) The Offeror's System Engineering process and how this process allocates the performance and interface requirements and flows those requirements across CAB-E and CAB-S.
- B) The Offeror's Configuration Management (CM) process.
- C) The Offeror's availability of trained personnel to provide Engineering Support Services and the Offeror's proposed labor categories and mixes, if provided.

Factor 3 Management

The Government will evaluate the:

- A) Schedule – The Government will evaluate the Offeror's draft project schedule for the contract.
- B) Risk Management – The Government will evaluate the Offeror's plan for identifying, managing and mitigating risks. The Government will also evaluate the Offeror's initial risk assessment including:
 - i) Identified risk and proposed mitigation;
 - ii) Assessment of risk with regard to program schedule, cost and technical performance;
 - iii) Identification and Mitigation of external dependencies.
- C) Management Approach – The Government will evaluate whether the Offeror's management approach demonstrates an understanding of and capability to successfully execute the SOW. The Government will assess the Offeror's internal and subcontract management approach. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's ability to effectively implement and execute its Earned Value Management System (EVMS) to address cost and schedule management, and how it plans to flow these requirements down to all major subcontractors.

Factor 4 Integrated Logistics Support

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's plan to provide LMI source data to the Government.

Factor 5 Past Performance/Relevant Experience

The Government will assess the Offeror's and the Offeror's proposed major subcontractors' (subcontract valued equal to or greater than \$650,000) performance on previous contracts for work similar to that required herein. Assessment of the Offeror's past performance will be one means of evaluating the credibility of the Offeror's proposal and relative capability to meet performance requirements. The Government's evaluation of Past Performance will consist of a review to determine, among other areas, the Offeror's customer satisfaction, timeliness of performance, technical success, cost control, and quality of product or service..

Offerors are advised that in evaluating an Offeror's past performance, the Government may, at its sole discretion, consider information from sources outside the Offeror's proposal. For example, the Government may consider information based on its own experience with the Offeror and/or may contact the parties for whom the Offeror performed contracts and consider their response when evaluating the Offeror's proposal. The Government intends to review Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) ratings on relevant contracts and may also consider Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) ratings, regulatory agency databases, past

performance questionnaires, information submitted by each Offeror with its proposal, and other existing past performance information from other Government sources or non-Government sources. General trends in a Contractor's performance may also be considered.

The Government reserves the right to contact references provided by the Offeror, and otherwise verify statements and representations made in the Offeror's proposal, but reserves the right not to contact all references. In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance in accordance with FAR 15.305.

The Government will also evaluate the Offeror's relevant experience in each of the SOW task areas. With respect to relevancy, more relevant past performance will typically be a stronger predictor of future success and have more influence on the past performance confidence assessment than past performance of lesser relevance. The Government will specifically evaluate the Offeror's experience developing, producing and supporting active phased array antenna systems. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's relevant work processes and procedures associated with performing the work, as well as the difficulties and uncertainties encountered.

Best Value Determination

1.0 Relative Importance of Factors and Subfactors

Factors 1-5 are listed in order of importance, with Factor 1 being the most important factor. Within Factor 1, Subfactors A, B, and C are listed in order of importance, with Subfactor A being the most important subfactor. Within Factor 2, Subfactors A, B, and C are listed in order of importance, with Subfactor A being the most important subfactor. Within Factor 3 Subfactors A, B, and C are listed in order of importance, with Subfactor A being the most important subfactor.

Factors 1-5, when combined, are more important than the Government Total Evaluated Cost/Price. However, the importance of the Government Total Evaluated Cost/Price as an evaluation factor will increase with the degree of equality in overall technical merit of competing proposals, under the non-cost/price factors. A proposal need not include all of the attributes of the rating definitions defined below in order to be eligible for the rating adjectives specified.

2.0 Ratings

The Government will evaluate the non-cost factors and subfactors for strengths and weaknesses, cross impact, deficiencies, and risk. The information sought by the Navy for each factor and subfactor is detailed in Section L of this RFP. Each factor and subfactor will be assigned an adjectival rating as follows:

Outstanding: An outstanding proposal is characterized as follows:

Meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of requirements. The proposal contains multiple strengths and no deficiencies.

Good: A good proposal is characterized as follows:

Meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements. The proposal contains at least one strength and no deficiencies.

Acceptable: An acceptable proposal is characterized as follows:

Meets requirements and indicates and adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. The proposal has no deficiencies. Strengths, if any, are offset by weaknesses.

Marginal: A marginal proposal is characterized as follows:

The proposal does not clearly meet requirements and has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements.

Unacceptable: An unacceptable proposal is characterized as follows:

Does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies and is unawardable.

PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR:

Relevancy Ratings

Very Relevant: Very relevant present/past performance effort is characterized as follows:

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

Relevant: Relevant present/past performance effort is characterized as follows:

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

Somewhat relevant: Somewhat relevant present/past performance effort is characterized as follows:

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

Not Relevant: Non-relevant present/past performance effort is characterized as follows:

Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

Performance Confidence Ratings

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.

3.0 Source Selection Decision

The Government intends to award a contract to the responsible Offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government after evaluation in accordance with the factors in the solicitation. The best value proposal will be selected using a tradeoff process, as defined in FAR 15.101-1, which permits tradeoffs among cost/price and non-cost/price factors. Accordingly, the Government may accept other than the lowest cost/price proposal where the perceived benefits of the higher cost/price proposal merit the additional cost. Conversely, the Government may

select the lower cost/price, lower rated proposal if the Government determines that the premium associated with the higher-rated proposal is not justified. In making the best value determination, the Government will consider technical merit (i.e. all non-cost/price factors) to be more important than the Government Total Evaluated Cost/Price. However, the importance of the Government Total Evaluated Cost/Price as an evaluation factor will increase with the degree of equality in overall technical merit of competing proposals, under the non-cost/price factors.