

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT				1. CONTRACT ID CODE J	PAGE OF PAGES 1 12
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0003	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 20-Sep-2016	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. SEE SCHEDULE		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)	
6. ISSUED BY NAVSUP WEAPON SYSTEMS SUPPORT ROYCE HOFFMAN, CODE N742.07 5450 CARLSLE PIKE MECANICSBURG PA 17050	CODE N00104	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6) See Item 6			
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code)				X	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. N00104-16-R-K017
				X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 06-Jun-2016
					10A. MOD. OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.
					10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)
CODE	FACILITY CODE				
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of offer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input type="checkbox"/> is not extended. <p>Offer 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 <u>1</u> copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram 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 telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.</p>					
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)					
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.					
A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.					
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, 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 <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> 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.)					
1) Section L, Instructions to Offerors - Part B, Section 2.0, Volume II, Sub-Factor 2 is revised to read "Provide proof of a current ISO 9001:2008 compliant certification or equivalent QMS that was approved within the past 36 months from issuance of this solicitation." 2) Section M, Evaluation Factors - Part B, Section 2.0, Sub-Factor 2 is revised to read "Adequate proof of a successful QMS that is certified to a current ISO 9001:2008 or an equivalent approved QMS within the past 36 months from issuance of this solicitation." 3) All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.					
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)		
			TEL: _____ EMAIL: _____		
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR _____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)		16C. DATE SIGNED 20-Sep-2016	

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

SECTION A - SOLICITATION/CONTRACT FORM

The required response date/time has changed from 06-Jul-2016 02:30 PM to 21-Sep-2016 01:00 PM.

SECTION L - INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS AND NOTICES TO BIDDERS

The following have been modified:

SECTION L**PART A – GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS****1.0 - GENERAL**

The Offeror is required to submit sufficient information concerning the following areas to enable Government personnel to fully ascertain the capabilities of the Offeror to perform the requirements. The proposal must be sufficient in detail and scope to permit evaluation and provide evaluators a clear understanding of the Offeror's capability to meet the defined elements as required by the solicitation. All proposals must clearly and convincingly demonstrate that the Offeror has a thorough understanding of the requirements and is able, willing and competent to devote the resources necessary to meet the requirements, and that the Offeror has valid and practical solutions for all requirements. The Offeror must respond to all requirements of the solicitation and not alter or rearrange the solicitation. The Offeror has the burden of proof to demonstrate compliance with all the evaluation factors identified in this solicitation. Offerors are advised that the Government may incorporate any part of the Offeror's proposal deemed beneficial to the Government into the final contract. With the exception of the Price volume, cost or pricing information shall not appear in any volume. In addition to submitting a proposal which is fully compliant to the solicitation, alternate proposals are acceptable; however, the proposal must meet all requirements of the solicitation.

In presenting material in the proposal, the Offeror is advised that quality of information is more important than quantity. Clarity, brevity, and logical organization should be emphasized during proposal preparation. It is the responsibility of the Offeror to present enough information to allow the various work efforts and price to be meaningfully evaluated without discussions. Unsubstantiated statements that the prospective Offeror understands, can or will comply with the requirements, or paraphrasing the requirements or parts thereof are considered inadequate and may render a rating of unacceptable.

The Offeror shall include all data, including packaging data, that illustrates the adequacy of the various assumptions, approaches, and solutions to problems. Failure to address clearly a specific factor or element may be considered a deficiency. There is no need to repeat information in more than one volume if an overlap exists. The detailed information must be included in the most logical place and summarized and referenced in other areas. Unnecessarily elaborate brochures or other presentation materials beyond that sufficient to present a complete and effective proposal are neither necessary nor desired.

Throughout these instructions, Offeror is defined as the prime contractor with its CAGE code identified in Block 15A on Standard Form (SF)-33, Solicitation, Offer, and Award. A “principal subcontractor” is defined as a subcontractor who provides at least 10% of the proposed total price (excluding the Offeror’s profit/fee) for the contract. “Team member” is defined as those entities that make up a joint venture or any other partnership or teaming arrangement formed for the purpose of responding to this solicitation. “Critical team member” is defined as those entities of the Offeror that perform a critical function in the performance of the resulting contract, whether it is technical or financial, and/or that have important roles in any high or medium risk areas identified in the Offeror’s proposal.

2.0 PROPOSAL FORMAT

Written proposals must be formatted using at least a 12 point font (no reduction permitted), single-spaced and not exceed the page limitation listed below. All pages to include drawing and milestone charts shall be formatted for standard 8.5 x 11 inch paper. All pages shall be numbered with section and page numbers. Drawings and milestone charts may be provided separately and will count as 1 page. If provided, drawings and milestone charts shall not exceed the page limitations listed below, and shall be included as part of Volume II.

Volume Number	Volume Title	Page Limit
I	PRICE	No Limit
II	TECHNICAL	30 pages
II-A	DRAWINGS	10 pages
II-B	MILESTONE CHARTS	5 pages
III	PAST PERFORMANCE	10 pages

The Offeror will provide one complete copy of their proposal as electronic files fully compatible with Microsoft Office 2010 and, for information not supported by MS Office products, with Adobe Acrobat XI. All spreadsheets shall be unlocked with all formulas intact. Failure to follow the described format will result in an offer being determined Unacceptable. Each volume shall contain the following administrative information:

- a) The solicitation number
- b) The name, address, and telephone and facsimile numbers of the Offeror
- c) Proposal Volume Number

3.0 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

The complete proposal, as described above, shall be electronically submitted to the Contract Specialist, and must be received by the Contracting Specialist, no later than the due date and time specified in the solicitation and any subsequent amendments. Proposals submitted by mail or hand-carried will not be evaluated. Offers shall submit electronic proposals to the email address listed below. Electronic mail proposal submissions shall not exceed a size limit of 10MB. It is highly recommended that the Offeror request a Return Receipt or other form of acknowledgement to verify that the proposal submission was received.

Email: Royce.Hoffman@navy.mil

PART B – SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS

1.0 PROPOSAL CONTENT AND VOLUMES

The proposal shall consist of three (3) separate volumes as set forth below:

VOLUME I - PRICING

The pricing volume shall consist of--

- Standard Form 33 "Solicitation, Offer, and Award" with Blocks 14 through 18 completed by the Offeror;
- RFP Section B "Schedule of Supplies" with all pricing information completed by the Offeror; and
- RFP Section K "Representations, Certifications and Other Statements of Offerors or Respondents" completed by the Offeror.
- Completion of annual representation and certifications as required by FAR Provision 52.204-8, *Annual Representations and Certifications* and DFARS Provision 252.204-7007, *Alternate A Annual Representation and Certifications*.

VOLUME II - TECHNICAL APPROACH

The technical approach volume shall consist of two (2) evaluation factors and (2) Sub-Factors and shall not include any unit pricing information:

Technical Approach Evaluation Factor:

Sub-Factor 1 Manufacturing Plan: The Offeror shall provide a Manufacturing Plan for producing the MK 107 MOD 1 Impulse Cartridge. The Offeror is responsible for providing a proposal that is complete, detailed, and clearly stated to allow for an accurate evaluation without the need for further clarifications/discussions. The Offeror shall accomplish this by providing detailed narratives that address the complete requirement.

Sub-Factor 2 Quality Assurance Plan: The Offeror shall provide proof of a successful Quality Management System (QMS) as validation that it has an established quality system in place that is capable of meeting Quality Assurance requirements as defined in the Solicitation at Section E - 52.246-11 *Higher-Level Contract Quality Requirement*. The Offeror shall describe its experience with executing higher level quality requirements, as required for this critical ammunition component. At a minimum, the Offeror shall:

- Provide proof of a current ISO 9001:2008 compliant certification or equivalent QMS that was approved within the past 36 months from issuance of this solicitation.
- Submit a quality test plan/procedure which includes the following:

- a) Identification of the make, model, calibration dates, and interval of calibration dates of equipment to perform in process testing as required by the technical drawing package,
- b) A description of how in process tests and inspections are to be performed and;
- c) Information on major assemblies and subassemblies

- Describe any Quality initiatives used to minimize defects such as statistical process control (SPC), Root Cause Analysis and Preventative Action, and automated equipment. Details shall be provided on previous program application(s) effectiveness, and why it would be appropriate and beneficial for this Solicitation.

Risk Evaluation Factor:

The Offeror shall provide proof of a manufacturing schedule capable of meeting the Required Delivery Schedule at Section F, 52.211-8 Time of Delivery. At a minimum, the Offeror shall submit an individual process map or milestone chart identifying inputs, and outputs with completion dates and materials/equipment used for every step in the manufacturing process including but not limited to:

- a) Steps required for manufacturing,
- b) Steps required for assembly,
- c) Steps required for inspection,
- d) Steps required for marking and packaging and;
- e) Coordination of subcontractor involvement in the manufacturing process.
- f) Compliance with all necessary packaging requirements

VOLUME III – PAST PERFORMANCE

The Offeror's signed and dated past performance proposal shall include all data and information required for evaluation of past performance. This volume shall exclude any reference to the pricing information of the offer. The following elements shall also be addressed in the Past Performance Volume:

- a) **Quality of Product and Processes:** The Offeror shall describe past compliance with contract requirements, accuracy of reports, appropriateness of personnel, technical excellence.
- b) **Timeliness of Performance:** The Offeror shall detail how it met interim milestones, provided reliable delivery, was responsive to technical direction, and completed work on time.
- c) **Customer Satisfaction:** The Offeror shall describe satisfaction of customers with the contractor's responsiveness to inquiries and services and/or products provided and actions taken to resolve problems.

Offerors are reminded that the Government may use information other than that provided by the Offerors in their proposals to evaluate past performance. The Government may use Past Performance information obtained from sources other than those identified by the Offeror. Additionally, the Past Performance Information Reporting system (PIIRs) or Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS) may be utilized to evaluate Past Performance. The Government does not assume the duty to search for data to cure the problems it finds in the information provided by the Offeror. The burden of providing thorough and complete past performance information remains with the Offeror.

Important Notes:

In the event any portion of the past performance proposal is written by anyone who is not a bona fide employee of the firm submitting the proposal, the Offeror shall identify the person's firm, the relationship of that firm to the Offeror, and the portion of the past performance proposal the person wrote.

Award may be made from initial offers without discussions. However, if discussions are held, Offerors will be given an opportunity to address adverse past performance information to which the Offeror has not yet had an opportunity to respond. Recent contracts will be examined to ensure that corrective measures have been implemented. Prompt corrective action in isolated instances may not outweigh overall negative trends.

In the past performance proposal, the Offeror shall describe its past performance on directly related or similar contracts it has completed within the last years (5) years which are of similar scope, magnitude and complexity to that which is detailed in the RFP. Offerors that describe similar contracts shall provide a detailed explanation demonstrating the similarity of the contracts to the requirements of the RFP. The Offeror shall provide the following information regarding its past performance:

1. Contract number(s),
2. Name and reference point of contact at the federal, state, local government or commercial entity for which the contract was performed,
3. Dollar value of the contract,
4. Detailed description of the work performed,
5. Names of subcontractor(s) used, if any, and a description of the extent of work performed by the subcontract(s), and
6. The number, type and severity of any quality, delivery or cost problems in performing the contract, the corrective action taken and the effectiveness of the corrective action.

Merely having problems does not automatically equate to an Unacceptable rating, since the problems encountered may have been on a more complex program, or an Offeror may have subsequently demonstrated the ability to overcome the problems encountered. The Offeror is required to clearly demonstrate management actions employed in overcoming problems and the effects of those actions, in terms of improvements achieved or problems rectified.

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

The following have been modified:

SECTION M

PART A: GENERAL INFORMATION

1.0 GENERAL

Award of the contract resulting from this solicitation will be made to the responsible Offeror whose proposal is technically acceptable, in full compliance to all other requirements set forth in the solicitation, and the best value to the Government. All evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are approximately as important as cost or price. When combined, Technical Approach and Risk are significantly more important than past performance, and Technical Approach is approximately as important as Risk. Within technical approach, the manufacturing plan is significantly more important than the quality assurance plan.

2.0 EVALUATION PROCESS

The Government intends to evaluate each proposal and award a contract without discussions to the responsible Offeror whose offer, conforming to the solicitation, provides the best value to the Government. Therefore, Offerors are cautioned that their initial offer should contain the Offeror's best terms from a price, technical, and past performance standpoint; however, the Government reserves the right to conduct discussions and request proposal revisions if the Contracting Officer later determines them to be necessary.

If 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 among the proposals. All proposals will be evaluated for compliance with the terms, conditions, and requirements set forth in the solicitation. Failure to address each of the areas identified in Section L may impact the resulting evaluation ratings.

PART B: SPECIFIC INFORMATION

1.0 PRICE.

The Price Factor Evaluation will be an evaluated factor; however, it will not be adjectivally rated. The Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) requires that contracts be awarded at fair and reasonable prices. The Government will evaluate pricing by using the total proposed price for all CLINs.

In its evaluation, the Government may use commercial published data, same or similar DOD contracts, Government estimates, industry standards, DCAA audit information, or other information as deemed appropriate by the Government. Normally, competition establishes price reasonableness. In limited situations, additional analysis will be required by the Government to determine reasonableness. If, after receipt of a proposal, the PCO determines that adequate price

competition does not exist and a determination is made that none of the exceptions in FAR 15.403-1(b) apply, the Offeror may be required to provide certified cost and pricing data in accordance with FAR 15.403-4.

2.0 TECHNICAL APPROACH

The evaluation process will consider the adequacy of responses for each proposal to determine whether the Offeror has adequately and completely satisfied the requirements specified in the solicitation. The evaluation process will also consider the feasibility of the Offerors approach to successfully accomplish the solicitation and TDP requirements within the required schedule.

Evaluation will be conducted at the sub-factor level with an overall Technical Approach factor rating assigned based on the individual sub-factor ratings and findings. The overall Technical Approach factor rating will take into consideration the Technical Approach sub-factors order of importance and each sub-factors evaluation. If any Technical Approach sub-factor is assigned a Red/Unacceptable rating, the overall Technical Approach factor rating will be Red/Unacceptable.

Sub-Factor 1 Manufacturing Plan: The Offeror will be evaluated on the adequacy of the narrative description of the process steps and demonstrated degree of understanding required to manufacture the MK 107 MOD 1.

Sub-Factor 2 Quality Assurance Plan: The Offeror will be evaluated on its ability to provide sufficient evidence of having a successful QMS in place. The U.S. Government will evaluate the Offerors' knowledge of and experience with higher-level quality requirements, and quality initiatives. The Offeror shall be evaluated on the specific areas as follows:

- Adequate proof of a successful QMS that is certified to a current ISO 9001:2008 or an equivalent approved QMS within the past 36 months from issuance of this solicitation.
- Adequate description of quality test plans/procedures which include the following:
 - a) Identification of the make model and calibration dates of equipment to perform testing as required by the technical drawing package,
 - b) A description of how the tests are to be performed and;
 - c) Information on testing of major assemblies and major subassemblies
- Description, appropriateness and effective implementation of any quality initiatives for use in the items being proposed.

Technical Ratings Table: 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 following Technical Ratings and definitions will be utilized in the evaluation of the Technical Approach Factor and Sub-factors:

Technical Ratings	
Rating	Description

Outstanding	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements. The proposal contains multiple strengths and no deficiencies.
Good	Proposal meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal contains at least one strength and no deficiencies.
Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal has no strengths or deficiencies.
Marginal	Proposal does not clearly meet requirements and has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies and is unawardable.

3.0 RISK

The Offeror will be evaluated on the adequacy of each process map's adequacy in addressing the timeline and steps required for manufacturing, assembly, inspection, marking and packaging; as well as identification of inputs, outputs, materials/equipment used for every step in the manufacturing process, and the proper identification of sub-contractor involvement within the manufacturing process map.

Risk Ratings Table: The Offeror's risk associated with its technical approach will be rated separately from the technical solution. The risk rating considers the risk associated with the technical approach in meeting the requirement. Assessment of technical risk, which is manifested by the identification of weaknesses, considers potential for disruption of schedule, degradation of performance, the need for increased Government oversight, or the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance. The following Risk Ratings and definitions will be utilized in the evaluation of the Risk Factor:

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.
------	---

4.0 PAST PERFORMANCE

Under the Past Performance factor, the Performance Confidence Assessment represents the evaluation of an Offeror's present and past work record to assess the Government's confidence in the Offeror's probability of successfully performing as proposed. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's demonstrated record of contract compliance in supplying products that meet user's needs, including quality and schedule. Each relevant contract shall have been completed during the past **5 years** from the date of issuance of this solicitation. The Past Performance Evaluation will be accomplished by reviewing aspects of an Offeror's recent and relevant past performance. A relevancy determination of the Offeror's present and past performance, including joint ventures, subcontractors and/or teaming partners, will be made. In determining relevancy for individual contracts, consideration will be given to the effort, or portion of the effort, being proposed by the Offeror, teaming partner, or subcontractor whose contract is being reviewed and evaluated. Higher relevancy will be assessed for contracts that are most similar to the effort, or portion of the effort, for which that contractor is being proposed. The Government is not bound by the Offeror's opinion of relevancy. The following relevancy definitions apply:

Very Relevant.	Past/present performance effort involved essentially the same magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Relevant.	Past/present performance effort involved much of the magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Somewhat Relevant.	Past/present performance effort involved some of the magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Not Relevant.	Past/present performance effort did not involve any of the magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

The Government evaluation team, known as the Performance Confidence Assessment Group (PCAG), will conduct an in-depth review and evaluation of all performance data obtained to determine how closely the work performed under those efforts relates to the proposed effort. The PCAG will, as deemed necessary, confirm past and present performance data identified by Offerors in their proposals and obtain additional past and present performance data, if available from other sources.

When a relevant performance record indicates performance problems, the Government will consider the number and severity of the problems and the appropriateness and effectiveness of

any corrective actions taken (not just planned or promised). The Government may review more recent contracts or performance evaluations to ensure corrective actions have been implemented and to evaluate their effectiveness.

The PCAG may consider the Offeror's, including subcontractors, joint ventures, and past performance in aggregate, in addition to an effort (contract) by effort basis.

As a result of an analysis of those positive and negative aspects indicators identified, each Offeror will receive an integrated Performance Confidence Assessment, which is the rating for the Past Performance factor. The resulting Performance Confidence Assessment is made at the Past Performance factor level and represents an overall evaluation of contractor performance.

Each Offeror will receive one of the ratings described below for the Past Performance factor.

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.

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.

Adverse past performance is defined as past performance information that supports a less than satisfactory rating on any evaluation element or any unfavorable comments received from sources without a formal rating system.

SOURCE SELECTION

Source selection will be made based on 4 factors--

- 1) Price
- 2) Technical Approach
 - a) Manufacturing Plan
 - b) Quality Assurance Plan
- 3) Risk
- 4) Past performance; relevancy/confidence

The best value decision shall be based on a comparative assessment of proposals against all source selection criteria in the solicitation, considering recommendations and minority opinions presented to the SSA by the Team Leader.

(End of Summary of Changes)