

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT				1. Contract ID Code Firm Fixed Price		Page 1 Of 28	
2. Amendment/Modification No. 0001		3. Effective Date 2022AUG03		4. Requisition/Purchase Req No. SEE SCHEDULE		5. Project No. (If applicable)	
6. Issued By ARMY CONTRACTING COMMAND - NJ TIMOTHY CASSIDY PICATINNY ARSENAL, NJ 07806-5000 EMAIL: TIMOTHY.J.CASSIDY12.CIV@ARMY.MIL		Code W15QKN		7. Administered By (If other than Item 6)		Code	
8. Name And Address Of Contractor (No., Street, City, County, State and Zip Code)				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		9A. Amendment Of Solicitation No. W15QKN-22-R-0057	
						9B. Dated (See Item 11) 2022JUL12	
				<input type="checkbox"/>		10A. Modification 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 Offers <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input type="checkbox"/> is not extended. 2022SEP26 03:00pm Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended by one of the following methods: (a) By completing items 8 and 15, and returning <u>2</u> signed copies of the amendments; (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.							
12. Accounting And Appropriation Data (If required)							
13. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS It Modifies The Contract/Order No. As Described In Item 14.							
<input type="checkbox"/> A. This Change Order is Issued Pursuant To: The Contract/Order No. In Item 10A.		The Changes Set Forth In Item 14 Are Made In					
<input type="checkbox"/> B. The Above Numbered Contract/Order Is Modified To Reflect The Administrative Changes (such as changes in paying office, appropriation data, etc.) Set Forth In Item 14, Pursuant To The Authority of FAR 43.103(b).							
<input type="checkbox"/> C. This Supplemental Agreement Is Entered Into Pursuant To Authority Of:							
<input type="checkbox"/> 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.) SEE SECOND PAGE FOR DESCRIPTION							
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)			
15B. Contractor/Offeror (Signature of person authorized to sign)		15C. Date Signed		16B. United States Of America By _____ /SIGNED/ (Signature of Contracting Officer)		16C. Date Signed	
NSN 7540-01-152-8070 PREVIOUS EDITIONS UNUSABLE				30-105-02		STANDARD FORM 30 (REV. 10-83) Prescribed by GSA FAR (48 CFR) 53.243	

CONTINUATION SHEET	Reference No. of Document Being Continued W15QKN-22-R-0057 PIIN/SIIN	Page 2 of 28 MOD/AMD 0001
Name of Offeror or Contractor:		

SECTION A - SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Buyer Name: TIMOTHY CASSIDY
Buyer Office Symbol/Telephone Number: CCNJ-MC/(973)724-3244
Type of Contract 1: Firm Fixed Price
Kind of Contract: Supply Contracts and Priced Orders

*** End of Narrative A0000 ***

The purpose of Amendment 0001 to W15QKN-22-R-0057 is to answer questions received from industry, include additional language in Section H, and update the proposal submission information.

Question 1: Regarding the Contract Opportunity Notice ID W15QKN22R0057 for the Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Contract, (XYZ Company) respectfully requests a 45 day extension for this solicitation response. This request is due to the time needed to obtain needed information from our supply base, many of who are currently at full capacity and/or on summer holiday.

Answer 1: 30 Day Extension has been granted. Proposals are now due at 3:00PM EST on 26 September 2022.

Question 2: Regarding Attachment 0014 page 2, first paragraph: should the Contracting Officer identified be Jennifer Rustwick instead of Renee Prendergast?

Answer 2: Yes, Attachment 0014 page 2 has been updated to reflect Jennifer Rustwick.

Note: If you have already submitted this information, please ensure this is forwarded to Jennifer Rustwick at email jennifer.m.rustwick.civ@army.mil.

Question 3: Are 11X17 fold-out pages allowed? If so, do they count as one page or two pages against the page limit?

Answer 3: Yes they are allowed. They count as two pages.

Question 4: Is there a limit to the number of Past Performance reference programs the Offeror can submit?

Answer 4: No. The efforts must be recent and relevant as defined in Sections L and M.

Question 5: RFP section L.3.8 on page 92 states: Submission of the identified contracts shall be in Excel format to include contractually scheduled delivery dates, actual delivery dates, quantities and how many days over / under (i.e., early / late deliveries). Does the Government need the Excel file submitted separately from the volume V proposal PDF file? Does the Excel file count against the volume V page count?

Answer 5: Yes, the Excel file should be submitted as part of Volume 5. It does count against the Volume 5 page count.

Question 6: For the technical volume, a TDP example is required for CLIN 0435 Inert 40mm HE Frag. This does not match the description and CLIN number in the pricing matrix. Is the TDP requirement for CLIN 0434 Inert HE Frag or CLIN 0435 Inert 40mm HE Bounding?

Answer 6: The TDP requirement is for Item Number 0434 Inert 40mm HE Frag. RFP sections L.3.6.1 and M.6.1. have been updated to reflect.

Question 7: Could you please reconfirm the subject matter solicitation offer submission due date as posted solicitation SF 33 does not listed it. Is it 8/26/2022 03:00 PM EST?

Answer 7: As mentioned in Answer 1, the proposal due date and time has been amended to 03:00 PM EST on 26 September 2022. This information is found within the first page of Amendment 0001 SF33.

Question 8: In A.6. Arms Ammunition & Explosives (AA&E), it states upon receipt of this information, a Pre-Award Safety and Security Survey will be requested. What does a Pre-award safety and security Survey consist of? Rational: Ensure compliance?

Answer 8: As a reminder, any Offeror who utilizes contractors (whether foreign or domestic) and/or sub tier contractors, who will provide energetics or touch labor of energetics by base contract or delivery orders, shall submit to the Government a listing, so a Pre-Award Safety and Security Survey can be performed. All DoD Contract Safety requirements should be followed.

Question 9: Does Executive Order 13662 dated 20 March 2014 apply to this solicitation? Rationale for this question is to ensure compliance with applicable EOs.

Answer 9: Please see language added in Amendment 0001 Section H which addresses this question.

CONTINUATION SHEET	Reference No. of Document Being Continued W15QKN-22-R-0057 PIIN/SIIN	Page 3 of 28 MOD/AMD 0001
Name of Offeror or Contractor:		

Question 10: Does the Policy Statement by the U.S. Department of State Regarding DoD Sourcing from Russian Federation-Affiliated Entities apply to this solicitation?

Answer 10: Please see language added in Amendment 0001 Section H which addresses this question.

Question 11: Technical/nomenclature questions by CLIN:
4a. CLIN0017: What grain weight is being requested?
4b. CLIN0034: Same as CLIN0035?
4c. CLIN0035: Same as CLIN0034?
4d. CLIN0296: Same as MAT-120?

Answer 11:
4a. CLIN0017: What grain weight is being requested? No grain weight is specified
4b. CLIN0034: Same as CLIN0035? They are not the same item.
4c. CLIN0035: Same as CLIN0034? They are not the same item.
4d. CLIN0296: Same as MAT-120? Line Item 0296 and the MAT-120 are equivalent items.

Question 12: Request the CLINS in the attachment not be renumbered in the event CLINs are removed in future revisions. This will avoid confusion against lists that have already been provided to the manufacturers.

Answer 12: If the event occurs in which Line Items are removed, they will not be replaced and they will be intentionally left blank.

Question 13: Request that L.3.1 be updated to allow use of 11 x 17 foldouts. Also recommend having each foldout count as one page. Use of 11x17 foldouts is standard practice in solicitations to provide the Government concise, content-rich details. Foldouts are particularly useful for large tables, flow diagrams and other types of illustrations.

Answer 13: See Answer 3.

Question 14: Should the IMS required in Subfactor 1 (Program Management Plan) be based on a notional delivery order, or should it be a copy of the IMS provided in Subfactor 4 (Delivery Order 0001)?

If notional, should we assume information and timelines for certain tasks (item listing, source of supply, delivery location, EUC receipt, export license processing, material production, etc.)?

Answer 14: As stated on Pg. 87 of the RFP (W15QKN-22-R-0057), L.3.5.1. This subfactor evaluates the Offerors Program Management Plan using the examples in the Table below. All Key Points (including Key Point #2 IMS) should be developed using the Table below on page 88 of the RFP. Page 88 includes a table of items including Item Numbers, Quantities and Destinations and it correlates to the Item Numbers found within Attachment 0001 Price Matrix. The Item Numbers found within the Attachment 0001 Price Matrix include a schedule which should be used to develop the IMS and other Key Points for the Subfactor 1 Program Management Plan.

Question 15: Volume I implies submission of DDTC brokering license and ATF type 11 license. Is this requirement mandatory (prospective non-U.S. offeror does not possesses these licenses)?

Answer 15: The Offeror is responsible to review each Letter of Contemplation or RFP requirement for the applicability for any mandatory requirements. The Arms Export Control Act requires that all manufacturers, exporters, temporary importers, and brokers of defense articles and brokers of defense articles (including technical data) as defined on the United States Munitions List (ITAR part 121) and furnishers of defense services are required to register with the Directorate of Defense Trade Controls (DDTC) as described in ITAR part 122 (part 129 for brokers). It is primarily a means to provide the U.S. Government with necessary information on who is involved in certain ITAR controlled activities and does not confer any export or temporary import rights or privileges. Registration is generally a precondition for the issuance of any license or other approval and use of certain exemptions. Offerors are free to provide letters from the respective agencies noting not required for non-US offeror.

Question 16: Is it acceptable not to offer all the items of the request from the Attachment 1 (price matrix)?

Answer 16: The USG will not provide direction to Offerors in regards to the submission of Attachment 0001 Price Matrix. Failure to comply with the RFP requirements for Price Information may result in an adverse assessment of an Offerors proposal and reduce or eliminate its change for being selected for award. Please remember that awardees will have the choice on whether or not to compete for the individual orders.

Question 17: Please advise if M249 Conversion Kit is required to support CLIN 0032 5.56mm Non-Toxic MMR Linked and the CLIN 0060 5.56mm Non-Toxic LBBR Linked Products.

Answer 17: No M249 is not required to support Item Number 0032. No, it is not required to support Item Number 0060.

CONTINUATION SHEET	Reference No. of Document Being Continued W15QKN-22-R-0057 PIIN/SIIN MOD/AMD 0001	Page 4 of 28
---------------------------	---	---------------------

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

RFP Paragraph L.2.1 has been updated to replace the following sentence: "In the event that the PEE Solicitation Module is down, the alternate method for proposal submission is via email" with "In the event that the PEE Solicitation Module is down, the alternate method for proposal submission is via email to: usarmy.pica.acc.mbx.acc-nj-proposal-submissionarmy.mil@army.mil".

Additionally, RFP Paragraph L.2.1 has been updated to remove the following sentence, "The Contracting Officer will provide the alternate email address at that time".

*** END OF NARRATIVE A0002 ***

CONTINUATION SHEET	Reference No. of Document Being Continued W15QKN-22-R-0057 PIIN/SIIN MOD/AMD 0001	Page 5 of 28
---------------------------	---	----------------------------

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

SECTION H - SPECIAL CONTRACT REQUIREMENTS
Sourcing Requirements

H1: Contractors are required to comply with Executive Order 13662, dated 20 March 2014, and as such any restricted parties are prohibited to be involved with the production of the items procured under this contract or any resulting delivery order or in the End Use Certificate (EUC) process. The U.S. Government will not accept items manufactured or furnished by any restricted parties under Executive Order 13662 dated 20 March 2014.

H2: Policy Statement by the U.S. Department of State Regarding DoD Sourcing from Russian Federation-Affiliated Entities

For Official Use Only by Project Director Special Ammunition and Weapons Systems, Picatinny Arsenal

Consistent with the U.S Department of States implementation of Section 231 of the Countering Americas Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (CAATSA 231), it is the State Departments position that the U.S. Government should avoid contracting with or using sources that are part of, or operate for or on behalf of, the defense or intelligence sectors of the Government of the Russian Federation for purposes of CAATSA 231.

H.3: Prohibited Source If there is any suspicion that a proposed source/supplier might be, has a connection to, or may use a prohibited source, contractors shall provide the Government with supporting documentation within their proposal that provides adequate assurance that they will be compliant with the aforementioned prohibitions.

H.4: Contractors shall be in compliance with International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR) (Title 22 CFR 120-130).

*** END OF NARRATIVE H0004 ***

CONTINUATION SHEET	Reference No. of Document Being Continued	Page 6 of 28
	W15QKN-22-R-0057 PIIN/SIIN MOD/AMD 0001	

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

SECTION J - LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

<u>List of</u> <u>Addenda</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Number</u> <u>of Pages</u>	<u>Transmitted By</u>
Attachment 0014	PAST PERFORMANCE QUESTIONNAIRE (01 AUG 2022)	01-AUG-2022	006	DATA

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

SECTION L - INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES TO OFFERORS
L. PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

L.1 Offerors shall provide information by addressing each Factor / Subfactor in the format and sequence identified in the solicitation. The Offerors must provide information in sufficient detail to allow the Government to make a best value assessment of the Offerors capability to support the proposed response to the evaluation criteria. Proposals that do not contain the information requested in the solicitation risk being determined unacceptable by the Government. The Government will not assume the Offeror possesses any capability, understanding, or commitment not specified in the proposal. The proposal must not merely repeat the solicitation requirements, but rather must provide convincing documentary evidence in support of conclusive statements of how contract requirements will be met.

L.1.2 Alternate Proposals: Alternate proposals will not be accepted.

L.1.3 Proposals shall be valid through 270 calendar days from date the solicitation closes.

L.1.4 All questions concerning this procurement, either technical or contractual, must be submitted in writing to the Contracting Office. No direct communication between the technical representative and a prospective Offeror shall be conducted. Questions and proposals shall be submitted to the following Point of Contact (POC):

Army Contracting Command New Jersey
ACC-NJ-MC, Bldg. 10
ATTN: Timothy Cassidy, Telephone: (973) 724-3244
Picatinny Arsenal, NJ 07806
E-mail: timothy.j.cassidy12.civ@army.mil

Responses to submitted questions will be provided to all Offerors via Contract Opportunities at <https://beta.sam.gov/> and the Solicitation Module at <https://piee.eb.mil/sol/xhtmll/unauth/index.xhtmll>

L.2 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

L.2.1. The Offeror shall submit their proposal electronically through the Solicitation Module of the Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE) suite at <https://piee.eb.mil/pee-landing/> In order to do so, vendors must be registered as a Proposal Manager in PIEE. Vendor registration instructions can be found at: https://www.acq.osd.mil/asda/dpc/ce/cap/docs/piee/PIEE_Solicitation_Module_Vendor_Access_Instructions.pdf Proposals submitted by mail or hand carried will not be evaluated. Proposals sent through proprietary or third party File Transfer Protocol (FPT) sites or DoD Secure Access File Exchange (SAFE) will not be retrieved. It is the Offeror's responsibility to obtain written confirmation of receipt of all electronic files of the full proposal by the ACC-NJ Contracting Office. Any portion of the proposal that is changed (as a result of discussions or proposal revisions) should be annotated and dated. Each volume shall begin at the top of a page and be clearly labeled with its Title and a copy number (e.g., one of five). In the event that the PIEE Solicitation Module is down, the alternate method for proposal submission is via email to usarmy.pica.acc.mbx.acc-nj-proposal-submissionarmy.mil@army.mil. It shall be noted that the size limit on incoming messages for this alternate email is 35MB. The Offeror must obtain prior approval from the Contracting Officer via email to use the alternate submission method. All proposals received after the exact time specified for receipt shall be treated as late submissions and will not be considered except under facts and circumstances allowed by the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR). For instructions on how to post an offer, please refer to the Posting Offer demo: https://pieetraining.eb.mil/wbt/sol/Posting_Offer.pdf

Offerors are responsible for ensuring electronic copies are virus-free and shall run an anti-virus scan before submission. Electronic copies of each volume shall be compatible with the following software products: Adobe Acrobat Reader DC and Microsoft Office Suite 2016. Narrative portions of the proposal shall be in Adobe Acrobat portable document file (pdf) searchable text format. The Offeror shall not embed sound or video (e.g., MPEG) files into the proposal files. Electronic files shall be clearly identified for each volume, section, and item.

L.2.2 Each paragraph should be single spaced, and shall be separated by at least one blank line. A standard, 12-point minimum font size applies. Arial or Times New Roman fonts are required. Tables and illustrations may use a reduced font size no less than 8-point and may be produced in landscape mode.

L.2.3. The following volumes of material shall be submitted:

Volume	Title	Maximum Pages
I	Go / No-Go: Licensing	No page limit
	Item 1	
	U.S. Department of State	
	Directorate of Defense Trade Controls (DDTC) Brokering License	

CONTINUATION SHEET	Reference No. of Document Being Continued		Page 8 of 28
	PIIN/SIIN	MOD/AMD	

W15QKN-22-R-0057

0001

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

	Item 2		
	Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF) Type 11 License		
<hr/>			
II	Management	180 for the entire Management Volume	
	Subfactor 1 Program Management Plan		
	Subfactor 2 Manufacturer Supply List		
	Subfactor 3 Transportation Plan		
	Subfactor 4 Delivery Order 0001		
<hr/>			
III	Technical	100 for the entire Technical Volume	
	Subfactor 1 Technical Description		
	Subfactor 2 Technical Verification		
<hr/>			
IV	Price	No page limit	
<hr/>			
V	Past Performance	40	
<hr/>			
VI	Small Business Participation	50	
<hr/>			
VII	Solicitations, Offer and Award Documents	No page limit	
	and Certifications / Representations		
<hr/>			

Each volume shall be as brief as possible, consistent with complete submission. Pages that exceed the required page limitations will not be evaluated. Additional pages over the maximum allowed will be removed or not read and will not be evaluated by the Government. The page count will be made by counting the pages from left to right, consecutively. Pages that exceed the page limitation will be returned to the Offeror and will not be evaluated. Each paragraph shall be separated by at least one blank line. Annexes, documentation and attachments that are submitted by the Offeror, which are not required as part of the RFP, will count against the page limitations. If pages are printed on both sides, each side will count as a separate page. The following will not count against page limitations: volume title pages, table of contents pages, cross-referencing pages, indices, acronym lists and page dividers (used to separate proposal sections). Pages should not exceed 8-1/2 inches in width by 11 inches in length; pages printed on both sides depicting such items as sketches, factory floor layouts, etc. will be counted as two pages. The font used shall not be less than 10 point.

L.2.4. There shall be no classified material within the proposal.

L.3. PROPOSAL FILES

L.3.1 Format. The submission shall be clearly indexed and logically assembled. Each volume shall be clearly identified and shall begin at the top of a page. All pages of each volume shall be appropriately numbered and identified by the complete company name, date and RFP number in the header and / or footer. A Table of Contents should be created using the Table of Contents feature in MS Word. All proposal volumes shall be marked with the appropriate Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI) markings. MS Word (doc) files shall use the following page setup parameters:

Margins Top, Bottom, Left, Right 1
Gutter 0
From Edge Header, Footer 0.5
Page Size, Width 8.5
Page Size, Height 11

The following additional restrictions apply:

L.3.2 File Packaging. All of the proposal files shall be compressed (zipped) into one file entitled proposal zip using WinZip version 6.2 or later, or as separate uploads in their narrative format (i.e., doc, xls, ppt, etc.). Files shall be in read-only format, using PDF files. All price breakdown information to aid in the price evaluation shall be submitted in Microsoft Office Excel Read / Write format and viewable in Microsoft Excel 2016. All information submitted as part of the proposal shall be submitted as searchable text (i.e., CTRL+F enabled) including explanations referencing images. All images shall be clear and evaluators shall be able to clearly identify text and markings within the images at 100% view. **Please note Self-extracting .exe files are not acceptable.

L.3.3 Content Requirement. All information shall be confined to the appropriate file. The Offeror shall confine submissions to essential

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

matters, sufficient to define the proposal in a concise manner, to permit a complete and accurate evaluation of each proposal. Each file of the proposal shall consist of a Table of Contents, Summary Section, and the Narrative discussion. The Summary Section shall contain a brief abstract of the file. Proprietary information shall be clearly marked. The following shall be included in the Narrative discussion:

Offerors are responsible for including sufficient details (i.e., drawings, test data) to permit a complete and accurate evaluation strictly from a technical standpoint. The non-Price Factor submittals shall have a separate index, which contains narrative titles that are cross-referenced to both the applicable SOW paragraph and page number. This index shall not count against the Page limitation for the Technical Volume. The narrative discussions shall also be related to the applicable SOW paragraph by placing the appropriate SOW number at the beginning of the discussion text. The proposal shall be detailed and clearly stated to allow an assessment by the Government without the need for additional clarifications. The Offeror shall provide detailed narrative discussions that address both the SOW and the Contract Data Requirements Lists (CDRLs) of the solicitation. All information and data provided shall be specific to SAWS, except for the area of Past Performance. In response to the RFP, the Offeror must address the following Factors and Subfactors:

L.3.4 VOLUME I Go / No-Go: Licensing. Proposal shall demonstrate that the Offeror is capable of meeting solicitation requirements by providing copies of the necessary Licensing documents associated with the importation process. The volume shall be organized into the following sections:

L.3.4.1 Section 1 Item 1 U.S. Department of State Directorate of Defense Trade Controls (DDTC) Brokering License. This item demonstrates the Offerors ability to meet the DDTC Brokering License requirement. The Offeror shall provide a current, unexpired electronic copy of their DDTC Brokering License or if recently expired, evidence of renewal submission prior to the expiration date. Offerors shall submit "in process" paperwork if the Offeror does not currently hold a license with the DDTC.

L.3.4.2 Section 2 Item 2 Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF) Type 11 License. This item evaluates the Offerors ATF Type 11 License. The Offeror shall provide a current, unexpired electronic copy of their ATF Type 11 License or if recently expired, evidence of renewal submission prior to the expiration date. Offerors shall submit "in process" paperwork if the Offeror does not currently hold a license with the ATF.

L.3.5 VOLUME II Management. The volume shall be organized into the following Subfactors:

L.3.5.1 Subfactor 1 Program Management Plan. This subfactor evaluates the Offerors Program Management Plan using the examples in the Table below. The Offeror shall provide a detailed Program Management Plan for the items in the Table below. The Plan shall include details to effectively manage, meet schedule and monitor performance of the Offerors major / key Subcontractors. Major / key Subcontractors are defined as those that will be providing critical hardware, or process, or whose subcontract is for more than 25% of the proposed price. At a minimum, the Offeror will provide information to substantiate the following:

KEY POINT #1: The Offeror shall provide a detailed Integrated Master Schedule (IMS), which identifies all program tasks required for successful execution (milestones, events and program tasks from receipt of DO, through delivery, highlighting the critical path and closeout of the DO identified with associated manufacturer) to include the tasks and milestones identified in the Government SOW, and General Specifications, including deliverables and data items. The IMS shall be provided in a Gantt chart (or similar presentation format). File shall be submitted in PDF format.

KEY POINT #2: The Offerors Program Management Plan shall also include a description of each of the tasks included in the IMS with references to the tasks and milestones identified in the Government SOW, and General Specifications, including deliverable and data items.

KEY POINT #3: The Offeror shall provide evidence that substantiates the Offerors experience and ability to effectively manage schedule and performance of the Offerors major / key Subcontractors. Evidence can be submitted in the form of deliveries of substantially similar contract actions.

Offeror shall use the following items to illustrate their capability to provide a complete and detailed Program Management Plan.

***PLEASE NOTE: This plan is for Evaluation Purposes ONLY.

Item Numbers	Item	Quantity	Destination
0010	7.62x54mm Ball	1,000,000	Mogadishu International Airport, Somalia
0010	7.62x54mm Ball	100,000	Crane Army Ammunition Activity, IN
0357	7.62x54mm Linking Machine	2	Mogadishu International Airport, Somalia
0024	12.7x108mm Ball	250,000	Mogadishu International Airport, Somalia

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

0024	12.x7108mm Ball	50,000	Crane Army Ammunition Activity, IN
0352	12.7x108mm Ball Linking Machine	2	Mogadishu International Airport, Somalia

L.3.5.2 Subfactor 2 Manufacturer Supply List. This subfactor evaluates the Offerors current Manufacturer Supply List. The Offeror shall provide its current manufacturer supply list for each item listed in Section J, Attachment 0001 - Price Matrix for all Item Numbers, with a minimum of one manufacturer listed for each item. A Letter of Commitment from that respective manufacturer should support each manufacturer proposed. If Letter of Commitment is to an entity other than the Offeror, the other entity should provide a Letter of Commitment to Offeror and a copy of Letter of Commitment from the manufacturer. The Offeror shall provide, at a minimum, the following:

- KEY POINT #1: The manufacturer of each Item Number shall have the following information, at a minimum:
- Item.
 - Quantity.
 - Manufacturer location(s).
 - Supply type - new production and / or surplus with ammunitions range of years manufactured and service life. As defined in the General Specifications, stock ammunition must be less than five years old for all ammunition, except for small caliber ammunition, which shall be less than ten years old.
- If multiple manufacturers, the quantity should be reflected for each manufacturer.

- KEY POINT #2: Letter(s) of Commitment from manufacturers should include, at a minimum:
- Name and address of the company providing the commitment.
 - Item of commitment.
 - Length of commitment; the Government prefers a minimum of 270 calendar days from date the solicitation closes.
 - Date received and signature of individual from manufacturer; the Government prefers and individual that is authorized to bind the company and provides a firm commitment.

L.3.5.3 Subfactor 3 Transportation Plan. This subfactor serves to evaluate the Offerors Transportation Plan using the eamples in the Table below. The Offeror shall provide a detailed Transportation Plan for the items in the Table below. The Plan shall include details to ensure effective management, meet schedule and monitor programmatic performance of the Offerors Subcontractors and Freight Forwarders. The Offerors plan at a minimum shall including the following substantiating information:

- KEY POINT #1: The Offerors Transportation Plan shall include the following at a minimum:
- Schedule milestones of each shipment.
 - Schedule milestones and terms of local and state permits, approval and / or clearances in manufacturers country and all foreign states and locality necessary for the movement and into final country.
 - Mode(s) of transportation from origin to final delivery point (to include inland transportation).
 - Identification of port(s) to be utilized.
 - Identification of freight forwarder companies with commitment letters.
 - Rough Order of Material (ROM) price for transportation costs.

***PLEASE NOTE: Transportation Plan is for Evaluation Purposes ONLY.

Item Numbers	Item	Quantity	Destination	Delivery Schedule
0297	40mm HE Frag	20,000	Camp Arifjan, Kuwait	180 calendar days after award or EUC, if required
0010	7.62x54mm Ball	5,000,000	Camp Arifjan, Kuwait	90 calendar days after award or EUC, if required
0010	7.62x54mm Ball	400,000	Crane Army Ammunition Activity, IN	90 calendar days after award or EUC, if required
0357	7.62x54mm Linking Machine	5	Camp Arifjan, Kuwait	180 calendar days after award or EUC, if required
0357	7.62x54mm Linking Machine	1	Picatinny Arsenal, NJ	180 calendar days after award or EUC, if required
0357	7.62x54mm Linking Machine	5	Crane Army Ammunition Activity, IN	180 calendar days after award or EUC, if required
0341	Belt, 7.62x54mm (100 rds)	5000	Camp Arifjan, Kuwait	90 calendar days after award or EUC, if required

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

0341	Belt, 7.62x54mm	10	Crane Army Ammunition Activity, IN	90 calendar days after award or EUC, if required	
	(100 rds)				
0444	Inert 125mm	25	Picatinny Arsenal, NJ	270 calendar days after award or EUC, if required	
	APFSDS				
0425	Inert 90mm	25	Picatinny Arsenal, NJ	270 calendar days after award or EUC, if required	
	HESH-TP-T				
0432	Inert 30mm	25	Picatinny Arsenal, NJ	270 calendar days after award or EUC, if required	
	HE Frag				

L.3.5.4 Subfactor 4 Delivery Order 0001.

Requirements of Delivery Order 0001 include:

Item Numbers	Item	Quantity	Destination	Delivery Schedule	
0005	7.62x39mm Ball	99,840	Blue Grass Army Depot, KY	90 calendar days after award or EUC, if required	
0005	7.62x39mm Ball	1,000	Picatinny Arsenal, NJ	90 calendar days after award or EUC, if required	
0001	5.45x39mm Ball	23,400	Blue Grass Army Depot, KY	90 calendar days after award or EUC, if required	
0001	5.45x39mm Ball	1,000	Picatinny Arsenal, NJ	90 calendar days after award or EUC, if required	

The Offeror shall submit a detailed IMS, Transportation Plan, Manufacturer Supply List, and Price for Delivery Order 0001. The Offerors response for Delivery Order 0001 shall include the following substantiating information at a minimum:

KEY POINT #1: The Offeror shall provide a detailed IMS (in accordance with the delivery schedule requested in the Table above, as well as Section J, Attachment 0003 Delivery Order Proposal Form - Delivery Order 0001), which identifies all program tasks required for successful execution to include the tasks and milestones identified in the Government SOW, and General Specifications, including deliverables and data items. The IMS shall be provided in a Gantt chart (or similar presentation format) with milestones, events, and program tasks from receipt of delivery order through delivery, highlighting the critical path with the associated manufacturer. Item shall be identified in IMS with associated manufacturer. File shall be submitted in PDF format.

KEY POINT #2: The Offeror shall provide a detailed Transportation Plan (in accordance with the delivery schedule requested in the Table above, as well as Section J, Attachment 0003 Delivery Order Proposal Form - Delivery Order 0001) and shall include at a minimum the following:

- Mode(s) of transportation from origin to final delivery point (to include inland transportation).
- Identification of port(s) to be utilized.
- Identification of freight forwarder companies.
- Transportation costs.
- Letter(s) of commitment from freight forwarder companies, to include the following:
 - o Name and address of the company providing the commitment.
 - o Length of commitment for a minimum of 270 days from the date the solicitation closes.

KEY POINT #3: The Offeror shall provide a Manufacturer Supply List and include at a minimum:

- Item.
- Quantity.
- Manufacturer and location.
- Date of Delivery.
- Supply type - new production and / or surplus with ammunitions range of years manufactured and service life.
- Identify any required EUC.
- Letter of Commitment from the manufacturer, to include the following:
 - o Length of commitment for a minimum of 270 calendar days from the date the solicitation closes.

L.3.6 VOLUME III Technical. The volume shall be organized into the following Subfactors:

L.3.6.1 Subfactor 1 Technical Description. The Offeror shall include sufficient information to complete an accurate evaluation from a technical standpoint. The Offeror shall provide a detailed narrative that addresses the Key Points as described below.

<p style="text-align: center;">CONTINUATION SHEET</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Reference No. of Document Being Continued W15QKN-22-R-0057</p> <p> PIIN/SIIN MOD/AMD 0001 </p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 12 of 28</p>
--	---	--

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

KEY POINT #1: The Offeror shall submit the following two completed examples of Technical Data Packages (TDPs) as defined in the applicable General Specifications (listed in Key Point #2, below) for the following items:

Item Number 0279: 82mm Mortar HE (Complete).
Item Number 0434: Inert 40mm HE Frag.

KEY POINT #2: The Offeror shall submit a comprehensive narrative description with process flow chart(s) that adequately demonstrates its means to ensure compliance to meet each of the technical, testing and inspection requirements, and verification procedure requirements as defined in the General Specifications listed below:

General Specification for Special Ammunition and Weapon Systems, dated 24 August 2020.
General Specification for Rocket Propelled & Spin Stabilized Grenade Ammunition, dated 24 August 2020.
General Specification for Mortar Ammunition, dated 24 August 2020.
General Specification for Small Caliber Ammunition, dated 24 August 2020.
General Specification for PdD SAWS Mortar Weapon Systems, dated 24 August 2020.

L.3.6.2 Subfactor 2 Technical Verification. The Offeror shall include sufficient information to complete an evaluation from a technical standpoint. The Offeror shall provide a detailed narrative that addresses the Key Points as described below:

KEY POINT #1: The Offeror shall submit the following two completed examples of Lot Acceptance Test Reports (LATRs) as defined in the applicable General Specifications (listed in Key Point #2 below) for the items listed below:

Item Number 0279: 82mm Mortar HE (Complete).
Item Number 0008: 7.62x39mm AP.

KEY POINT #2: The Offeror shall submit a comprehensive LATR narrative description with process flow chart(s) that adequately demonstrates its means to ensure compliance to meet the technical, testing and inspection requirements, and verification procedure requirements as defined in the General Specifications listed below:

General Specification for Special Ammunition and Weapon Systems, dated 24 August 2020.
General Specification for Rocket Propelled & Spin Stabilized Grenade Ammunition, dated 24 August 2020.
General Specification for Mortar Ammunition, dated 24 August 2020.
General Specification for Small Caliber Ammunition, dated 24 August 2020.
General Specification for PdD SAWS Mortar Weapon Systems, dated 24 August 2020.

L.3.7 VOLUME IV Price. The volume shall be organized into the following sections:

(1) Electronic Copy. Price requirements: Files contained on the Volume IV Price Volume may not be password protected. The Offeror shall provide a completed Section J, Attachment 0001 - Price Matrix. The Offerors Price Matrix and any documentation that is based on or includes mathematical calculations (e.g., calculations for rental value of Government property in the Offerors possession, calculations where there is the appearance of unbalanced pricing, etc.) shall be submitted in electronic, executable format utilizing Microsoft Excel. Any additional information necessary to explain the proposed pricing that does not contain mathematical calculations may be submitted in PDF, Microsoft Word or Microsoft Excel format. Electronic links are only permissible within the Price Volume. If files contain links, the links must be intact and maintained through all revisions. The Offeror shall not include pivot tables in Excel spreadsheets.

(2) Compliance. Failure to comply with the RFP requirements for Price information may result in an adverse assessment of an Offerors proposal and reduce or eliminate its chance of being selected for award. Offerors shall ensure that the information presented in this volume is consistent and correlates with the information contained in the other proposal volumes. Also, the Offeror shall ensure that the information submitted in this volume is consistent with and fully supports the amounts set forth in the Standard Form (SF) 33 and continuation sheets.

(3) General Instructions. In accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 15.402 and 15.403-1, certified cost or pricing data are not required based on the fact that adequate competition is expected for this procurement. Information other than certified cost or pricing data may be provided in Contractor format providing that sufficient information is made available. Information submitted shall be prepared following the instruction in FAR 15.403-5. If after receipt of proposals the Contracting Officer determines that there is insufficient information available to determine price reasonableness and none of the exceptions at FAR 15.403-1 apply, the Offeror may be required to submit cost or pricing data. Additionally, in the event that adequate competition is not obtained (i.e. single responsible Offeror), the Contracting Officer may incorporate FAR 52.215-20 entitled, Requirements for Cost or Pricing Data or Information Other Than Cost or Pricing Data, into the solicitation and request a Certificate of Current Cost or Pricing Data. There are no page limitations for this volume. Proposal information included in this volume which is not directly related to Price will be disregarded.

(4) The Offerors shall submit pricing in a Price Matrix for all Item Numbers, including all quantity ranges, when applicable. The proposed price for production Item Numbers shall be inclusive of all fabricating, testing, inspection, and packaging, but will be exclusive of the delivery / transportation of the solicited item. Delivery costs will be separately proposed and included in the competitive offers on a delivery order basis. Offerors must complete the Section J, Attachment 0001 - Price Matrix. The Offeror will

CONTINUATION SHEET	Reference No. of Document Being Continued W15QKN-22-R-0057 PIIN/SIIN	Page 13 of 28 MOD/AMD 0001
---------------------------	--	---

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

enter FFP unit prices (excluding transportation) for the specified quantity range for all ordering periods for all Item Numbers reflected in the Price Matrix. The unit prices will establish Not to Exceed (NTE) unit prices for the SAWS items during the Delivery Order phase. Awardees will be able to propose lower FFP unit prices on future delivery orders but cannot exceed the unit prices on contract. Unit prices shall be limited to two decimal places. The Government reserves the right to require the submission of any data other than certified cost or pricing data necessary to validate the reasonableness of an offer.

(5) In accordance with FAR 45.202(a), the Government shall consider any potentially unfair competitive advantage that may result from an Offeror using Government property that is already in their possession. To eliminate the competitive advantage, a rental equivalent evaluation factor shall be added to each offer, which is predicated on the use of Government property. Offerors shall propose the per unit value of Government property for each Item Number / quantity range in accordance with FAR 52.245-9, Use and Charges in the Section J, Attachment 0001 - Price Matrix, to the solicitation. Offerors shall provide detailed calculations demonstrating how the rental per unit value was derived and documentation supporting the rental charges in sufficient detail to permit verification of the rental charges and evaluation of the per unit rental value.

(6) Any HUBZone Small Business Concern shall provide proof of HUBZone certification with its proposal submission.

(7) Unbalanced Pricing. Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable total evaluated price, the price of one or more line items is significantly over or understated as indicated by the application of cost or price analysis techniques. The greatest risks associated with unbalanced pricing occur when (a) Startup work, mobilization, first articles, or first article testing are separate line items; (b) Base quantities and option quantities are separate line items; or (c) The evaluated price is the aggregate of estimated quantities to be ordered under separate line items of an indefinite-delivery contract. Offerors shall provide documentation, including data, calculations and supporting rationale, for any apparent unbalanced pricing, which will be used to determine if the proposed prices are balanced.

(8) Delivery Order 0001. The Offeror shall submit pricing in accordance with Section J, Attachment 0003 - Delivery Order Proposal Form - Delivery Order 0001, based upon the following quantities and delivery destinations:

Item Numbers	Item	Quantity	Destination
0005	7.62x39mm Ball	99,840	Blue Grass Army Depot, KY
0005	7.62x39mm Ball	1,000	Picatinny Arsenal, NJ
0001	5.45x39mm Ball	23,400	Blue Grass Army Depot, KY
0001	5.45x39mm Ball	1,000	Picatinny Arsenal, NJ

Inspection/Acceptance terms are FOB Destination. Offerors shall also propose a total price for transportation costs for each solicited Item Number, separate from the hardware, with the identified method(s) of delivery and provide back-up delivery estimates / quotes to substantiate the proposed transportation costs.

Note: Section J, Attachment 0003 - Delivery Order Proposal Form - Delivery Order 0001 will only be used for the purpose of Delivery Order 0001 and therefore the proposed prices for Delivery Order 0001 have no bearing on the prices provided in the Section J, Attachment 0001 - Price Matrix. Stated differently, the Section J, Attachment 0001 - Price Matrix is separate and does not control what is proposed for Delivery Order 0001. It shall be noted that all future delivery orders will have a separate Delivery Order Proposal Form, in the same format as Section J, Attachment 0003 - Delivery Order Proposal Form - Delivery Order 0001.

(9) Future Delivery Ordering Procedures.

Delivery Orders will be issued in accordance with the procedures for Future Delivery Orders as stated in Section H of the solicitation.

a. Each awardee will be provided a fair opportunity to compete for individual orders in accordance with FAR 16.505(b)(1), unless one of the statutory exceptions stated in FAR 16.505(b)(2) applies. Letters of Contemplation (LOCs) or RFPs detailing the specific requirement, proposal instructions and evaluation factors will be issued via e-mail to all IDIQ awardees.

b. Awardees will have the ability to propose unit prices that are lower than the negotiated NTE FFP prices on contract for any of the competed Delivery Orders. Delivery Orders shall also include a total price for transportation costs for each solicited Item Number, separate from the hardware, with the identified method(s) of delivery and back-up delivery quotes to substantiate the proposed transportation costs (if applicable). Delivery locations will be identified on an order-by-order basis.

c. The negotiated NTE FFP unit prices will be based upon the applicable unit prices for the ordering period during which the orders are issued irrespective of when performance takes place. For instance, if a FFP order is issued on the first day of Ordering Period 2, then the applicable unit prices for Ordering Period 2 will apply. If an order is placed on the last day of Ordering Period 2, then the applicable FFP unit prices for Ordering Period 2 will also apply.

CONTINUATION SHEET	Reference No. of Document Being Continued W15QKN-22-R-0057 PIIN/SIIN	Page 14 of 28 MOD/AMD 0001
Name of Offeror or Contractor:		

d. Delivery Orders will be competitive and will be awarded using either a Lowest Price Technically Acceptable (LPTA) or Best Value Tradeoff approach. The source selection approach will be included as part of the LOC for the applicable delivery order. Price shall be an evaluation factor for every order, along with, but not limited to, any combination of the following: Technical, Source of Supplier, Delivery Schedule, and / or Transportation Plan. Detailed evaluation criteria will be provided with the RFP / LOC for each order.

e. If an Offeror proposes the use of Government property already in its possession for any competitive delivery order, the total evaluated price will be adjusted to include a rental equivalent factor for each item of such property calculated in accordance with FAR 52.245-9. This adjustment will apply for the use of Government property by the Offeror as well as any subcontractor.

L.3.8 VOLUME V Past Performance. This volume shall contain unclassified past performance information regarding similar contracts. This volume shall not exceed 40 pages plus five pages for each major Subcontractor, excluding Past Performance Questionnaire Forms. Offerors shall submit all Federal Government contracts for the Prime Offeror and each major Subcontractor in performance or awarded during the past three years, from the issue date of this RFP, which are relevant to the efforts required by this solicitation. Submission of the identified contracts shall be in Excel format to include contractually scheduled delivery dates, actual delivery dates, quantities and how many days over / under (i.e., early / late deliveries). Relevant efforts are defined as services / efforts that are the same as or similar to the effort (as compared to North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code 332993 required by the RFP. Data concerning the Offeror shall be provided first, followed by each proposed major Subcontractor, in alphabetical order. The Offeror shall also submit the written consent of its major Subcontractors to allow the disclosure of its Subcontractors past performance information to the Offeror. In addition, letters of commitment shall be included for all major Subcontractors for their past performance to be considered. This volume shall be organized into the following sections:

(1) Section 1 Contract Descriptions. This section shall include the following information in the following format.

(a) Contractor / Subcontractor place of performance, Government Entity (CAGE) Code and Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) Number. If the work was performed as a Subcontractor, also provide the name of the prime Contractor and POC within the Prime Contractor organization (name, and current address, e-mail address, and telephone and fax numbers).

(b) Government contracting activity, and current address, PCOs name, e-mail address, telephone and fax numbers.

(c) Governments technical representative / Contracting Officer Representative (COR) and current e-mail address, telephone and fax numbers.

(d) Government contract administration activity and the Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO)s name, and current e-mail address, telephone and fax number.

(e) Government contract administration activitys Pre-Award Monitors name, and current e-mail address, telephone and fax numbers.

(f) Contract Number and, in the case of Indefinite Delivery type contracts, Government Services Administration (GSA) contracts, and Blanket Purchase Agreements (BPAs), include Delivery Order Numbers.

(g) Contract Type (specific type such as Fixed-Price (FP), Cost Reimbursement (CR), Time & Material (T&M), etc.). In the case of Indefinite Delivery contracts, indicate specific type (Requirements, Definite Quantity, and Indefinite Quantity) and secondary contract type (FP, CR, T&M, etc.).

(h) Awarded price / cost.

(i) Final or projected final price/ cost.

(j) Original delivery schedule, including dates of start and completion of work.

(k) Final or projected final, delivery schedule, including dates of start and completion of work.

(2) Section 2 Performance. Offerors shall provide a specific narrative explanation of each contract listed in Section 1, Contract Description, describing the objectives achieved and detailing how the effort is relevant to the requirement of this RFP.

(a) For any contracts that did not / do not meet original schedule or technical performance requirements, provide a brief explanation of the reason(s) for the shortcomings and any corrective action(s) taken to avoid recurrence. The Offerors shall list each time the delivery schedule was revised and provide an explanation of why the revision was necessary. All Requests for Deviation and Requests for Waiver shall be addressed with respect to causes and corrective actions. The Offerors shall also provide copy of any Cure Notices or Show Cause Letters received on each contract listed and a description of any corrective action implemented by the Offeror or proposed Subcontractor. The Offerors shall indicate if any of the contracts listed were terminated and the type and reasons for the termination.

(b) For all contracts, the Offeror shall provide data on all manufacturing warranty returns. Data shall delineate total number of warranty returns, number of Could Not Duplicate (CND), number of failures attributable to Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) component

<p style="text-align: center;">CONTINUATION SHEET</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Reference No. of Document Being Continued W15QKN-22-R-0057</p> <p> PIIN/SIIN MOD/AMD 0001 </p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 15 of 28</p>
--	---	--

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

failures, and number and nature of failures attributable to the Offerors delivered product.

(3) Section 3 Subcontracts. Offerors shall provide an outline of how the effort required by the RFP will be assigned for performance within the Offerors corporate entity and among the proposed Subcontractors. The information provided for the prime Offeror and each proposed major Subcontractor must include the entire company name, company address, CAGE Code, DUNS Number and type of work to be performed by citing the applicable Government SOW subparagraph number. This includes all Subcontractors who will be providing critical hardware / services or whose subcontract is for more than 25% of the total proposed cost / price. This section will further include written consent of major Subcontractors to allow the disclosure of their Subcontractors past performance information to the Offeror. In addition, letters of commitment shall be included for all major Subcontractors.

(4) Section 4 New Corporate Entities. New corporate entities may submit data on prior contracts involving its officers and employees. However, in addition to the other requirements in this section, the Offeror shall discuss in detail the role performed by such persons in the prior contracts cited. Information should be included in the files described in the sections above. Letters of Commitment shall be included in the proposal for these employees in order to be considered.

(5) Past Performance Questionnaire. For all contracts identified in Section 1, Contract Descriptions, a Past Performance Questionnaire must be completed and submitted. The Offeror shall complete Part I of the Past Performance Questionnaire and e-mail the questionnaire to both the Government contracting activity and technical representative responsible for the past / current contract. The POCs shall be instructed to electronically complete Part II of the questionnaire and e-mail the entire questionnaire to the Contracting Office no later than the proposal due date, to timothy.j.cassidy12.civ@army.mil and jennifer.m.rustwick.civ@army.mil. The Offeror shall e-mail to the Contracting Officer a list of all the POCs who were sent a questionnaire. The Government must receive this list no later than the proposal due date. The POC List shall be submitted in Word for Windows Table Format to include the following fields: Solicitation Number; Company Name; Contract Number; Government Agency; POC Last Name, First Name; POC Title; POC Telephone Number; POC e-mail Address; and Date e-Mail to POC (month / day).

(6) Submissions. Offerors are discouraged from providing POCs with another Contractors facility, i.e., in case an Offeror (or one of his / her team members) is in a subcontract with another Contractor who has submitted a proposal on the same requirement. Offerors shall provide and submit the prime contract number and all Governmental agency POC in lieu of subcontract numbers or prime contract POCs in situations as described above.

(7) Small Business Participation Past Performance. All Offerors shall submit information substantiating the Offerors past performance in complying with FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns, maximizing opportunities for U.S. small business Subcontractors. Offerors shall also provide a statement indicating whether any negative information has been reported in the past six years concerning the Offerors past compliance with FAR 52.219-8. If any such negative information has been reported, the Offeror may submit explanations or comments responding to such negative information. Offerors with no prior contracts containing FAR 52.219-8 shall certify the same.

L.3.9 VOLUME VI Small Business Participation.

(1) The Small Business Participation Factor Volume is comprised of a single volume. Offerors are responsible for including sufficient detail to permit a complete evaluation. Any information provided as part of the Small Business Participation Volume may be used to correlate the evaluation of the other proposal volumes.

(2) This provision applies to every Offeror (U.S. and non-U.S.), regardless of size status or locations of working facilities or headquarters. For proposal preparation purposes, the Offerors Small Business Participation proposals shall be consistent with any subcontracting references / identification contained elsewhere in any other Factor Volume. Percentages are calculated using proposed total contract price as calculated in accordance with D.5.b.iv. This price becomes the denominator and includes first-tier subcontractors only. Offerors shall also explain their rationale as to why the percentage of small business (SB) participation being utilized for this effort is appropriate for their company. Offerors shall describe their approach and efforts undertaken to utilize SB. SB targets will be incorporated into any resulting prime contract and contractors will be required to report SB participation.

(3) All Offerors, including Offerors who are themselves U.S. small business concerns based on the NAICS code assigned to this requirement, are to identify the extent to which U.S. small business concerns will be utilized as first-tier subcontractors in the performance of this proposed contract. U.S. small business concerns are defined (1) in FAR 19.001 and (2) by the criteria and size standards in FAR 19.102 for the applicable NAICS code. U.S. small business concerns include Small Businesses (SBs), Small Disadvantaged Businesses (SDBs), Woman-Owned Small Businesses (WOSBs), HUBZone Small Businesses (HUBZone SBs), Veteran-Owned Small Businesses (VOSBs), and Service Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Businesses (SDVOSBs).

(4) If the Offeror (to include any U.S. small business concerns who are proposing as part of a joint venture or teaming arrangement) is itself a U.S. small business concern, the Offeror's own participation as a SB, SDB, WOSB, HUBZone SB, VOSB, or SDVOSB shall be detailed in the same manner as subcontracts to first-tier U.S. small business concerns.

(5) Small Business Amounts: All Offerors shall address anticipated U.S. small business concern participation and subcontracting based on the total contract dollars proposed by the Offeror.

(6) The Offeror shall provide information for small business participation and subcontracting in a table format in accordance with

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

the following example:

Small Business Participation Table (in Millions)			
Business Category	\$ Cost All Contracts	% of SB Participation	Cost Total SubK
Contract Total Price	\$43.00		
SB	\$10.34	24.00%	\$10.34 of \$43.00
SDB	\$2.86	6.65%	\$2.86 of \$43.00
WOSB	\$1.55	3.60%	\$1.55 of \$43.00
HUBZone SB	\$1.08	2.50%	\$1.08 of \$43.00
VOSB	\$1.55	3.60%	\$1.55 of \$43.00
SDVOSB	\$1.46	3.40%	\$1.46 of \$43.00

(7) Guidance for filling in the above "Small Business Participation" Table:

- (a) Include first-tier Subcontractors only. Note that members of a joint venture may be considered the Offeror or the first tier Subcontractors, depending on the legal form of the joint venture as defined in its agreement document.
- (b) If the Offeror is a U.S. small business concern, detail the extent of the Offeror participation as a U.S. small business concern in the same manner as subcontracts to first tier U.S. small business concerns.
- (c) Percentages should be rounded to the nearest hundredth of a percent.

Additional Guidance for particular Business Categories:

- For "Contract Total Price": Include the Offeror's proposed Total Contract Price on this line.
- For SB: Include U.S. small business concerns from all categories (i.e., SB, SDB, WOSB, HUBZone SB, VOSB, and SDVOSB and in the dollars and percentage on this line. The SDB, WOSB, HUBZone SB, VOSB and SDVOSB are subcategories of SB and the dollars in each of these may not add to match the total dollars in the SB line due to the following: In some cases the same dollars may be reported in more than one block (i.e., a \$10,000 subcontract to a Woman-Owned Small Business that is also a Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business should be entered on four rows: \$10,000 under SB, \$10,000 under WOSB, \$10,000 under VOSB and \$10,000 under SDVOSB). Be sure that the dollars are counted in the SB line only once and not four times (e.g. \$40,000 representing the same firm participating at \$10,000 in differing categories). Note that the SB percentage is not simply a total of the percentages of each SB subcategory and must be calculated separately as shown in the chart.
- For HUBZone SB: Include only "SBA certified" HubZone SBs. Note that this is different from some of the state HUB certifications.

- (8) Small Business List: All Offerors shall provide the names and CAGE codes of small business concerns (including the Offeror if a small business concern) who would participate in accomplishing the proposed contract; the small business classification of each U.S. small business concern (i.e., SB, SDB, WOSB, HUBZone SB, VOSB OSB and SDVOSB); a short description of the specific services to be provided by each small business concern; and the estimated total dollars for each service or product.
- (a) This data shall be provided in a table format in accordance with the following example:

Name of SB Concern	CAGE Code	Location	SB Class	Description of Supplies or Services	Total \$ (in Millions)
ABC Co.	123XX	City, U.S.A	SB	Wire	\$0.50
DEF Co.	XX123	City, U.S.A	SB	Plating	\$0.75
GHI, Inc.	DD123	City, U.S.A	SB, WOSB, VOSB	Circuit Cards	\$1.20

<p style="text-align: center;">CONTINUATION SHEET</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Reference No. of Document Being Continued W15QKN-22-R-0057 PIIN/SIIN MOD/AMD 0001</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Page 17 of 28</p>
--	---	---

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

(b) If a small business does not have a CAGE code, insert the word "None" in the table above. Note that during the evaluation, the Government may request that the Offeror submit a letter from the small business affirming the information provided in your proposal.

(c) For SB Classifications(s), list all SB classifications that apply to each concern in the table above.

(9) If the Offeror IS NOT a U.S. small business concern and must submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan under the RFP in accordance with FAR 52.219-9, the Small Business Subcontracting Plan shall be consistent with the Offeror's Small Business Participation proposal information provided (recognizing that the Small Business Subcontracting Plan percentages will be different in that the percentage calculation denominator is total subcontracting amount as opposed to this Small Business Participation Factor where the percentage calculation denominator is the Offeror's proposed Total Contract Price).

(10) Compliance with FAR 52.219-9.

(a) Offerors which are both: (a) other than U.S. small business concerns (as defined by the NAICS code applicable to the RFP), and (b) have had prior contracts requiring the submission of a Small Business Subcontracting Plan in accordance with FAR 52.219-9 are to:

Provide a description of their performance in complying with the requirements of FAR 52.219-9, including documentation of both their goals and their accomplishment of the goals established under subcontracting plans of prior contracts performed over the past 12months (from date of RFP issuance). This documentation shall include Individual Subcontracting Reports (ISRs / DD Form 294s) which list both goals and accomplishments against individual or master plans. If over the last 12months from the date of RFP release, the Offeror reported accomplishments against commercial or comprehensive subcontracting plans in lieu of individual or master plans, the Offeror shall submit the plans to document the goals and the Summary Subcontract Reports (SSRs / DD Form 295s) to document the accomplishments. (Note: if the Offeror has not performed a contract over the past t12 months, which included FAR 52.219-9, the Offeror shall so state).

(b) Offerors which have had prior contracts requiring a Small Business Subcontracting Plan IAW FAR 52.219-9 and provide the information requested above shall not respond to paragraph 11 below.

(c) If the reporting entity listed on a subcontracting report is different from the name of the proposing Prime, provide an explanation of the legal relationship between the other entity and the proposing Prime and a description of how the other entity's small business accomplishments reported are applicable to the current proposal. This explanation should include Business Name, CAGE Code and DUNS number of the other entity and the proposing prime.

(11) Approach to meeting FAR 52.219-8. Offerors which are either U.S. small business concerns, or other than U.S. small business concerns (as defined by the NAICS code applicable to the RFP) having had no prior contracts requiring a Small Business Subcontracting Plan in accordance with FAR 52.219-9 shall substantiate their proposed approach to meeting the requirement of FAR 52.219-8. Substantiation may include providing:

- a. A description of the Offeror's performance, over the past 12months (from date of solicitation issuance), in complying with the requirements of FAR 52.219-8 (Note: if the Offeror has not performed a contract over the past 12 months (from date of solicitation issuance), which included FAR 52.219-8, the Offeror shall so state);
- b. A description and available documentation of any methods or techniques used to promote small business participation;
- c. Any listings of U.S. small business concerns who are Subcontracting candidates;
- d. Internal procedures used to monitor small business participation during contract performance; and / or
- e. Any other information substantiating that the Offeror will satisfy the requirements of FAR 52.219-8.

L.3.10 VOLUME VII Solicitations, Offer and Award Documents and Certifications / Representations.

Certifications and Representations Each Offeror shall complete (fill-in and signatures) the solicitation sections indicated below using the file (without modification to the file) provided with the RFP. An authorized official of the firm shall sign the SF 33 and all certifications requiring original signature. A PDF file shall be created to capture the signatures for submission.

- Section A SF 33, Solicitation, Offer and Award
- Section G Contract Administration Data
- Section K Representations, Certification and Other Statements of Offerors
- Small Business Subcontracting Plan shall be submitted in accordance with FAR 52.219-9.

Solicitations, Offer and Award Documents and Certifications / Representations shall not be addressed separately from that submitted in VOLUME VII Solicitations, Offer and Award Documents and Certifications / Representations.

CONTINUATION SHEET	Reference No. of Document Being Continued W15QKN-22-R-0057 PIIN/SIIN MOD/AMD 0001	Page 18 of 28
Name of Offeror or Contractor:		

<p style="text-align: center;">CONTINUATION SHEET</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Reference No. of Document Being Continued W15QKN-22-R-0057</p> <p> PIIN/SIIN MOD/AMD 0001 </p>	<p style="text-align: right;">Page 19 of 28</p>
--	---	--

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD
M. BASIS FOR AWARD

M.1 The Government intends to make multiple awards as a result of this RFP. The Government will select for award the proposals that are most advantageous and represents the best value to the Government, with the Source Selection Authority (SSA) giving the appropriate consideration to the six evaluation Factors: Go / No-Go: Licensing, Management, Technical, Price, Past Performance and Small Business Participation. The Government will weigh the relative benefits of each proposal and awards will be made based on an integrated assessment of the results of the evaluation. In making the integrated assessment of the evaluation results, the SSA will give due consideration to all of the Factors and Subfactors and their relative order of importance. Prior to evaluating the Management, Technical, Price, Past Performance and Small Business Participation Factors, the Government intends to review the Offerors Go / No-Go: Licensing. If the Offeror receives a No-Go determination for Licensing, the Offerors proposal will not be evaluated further and the Offeror will not be eligible for award. For evaluation purposes, Management is more important than Technical, Technical is more important than Price. Price is significantly more important than Past Performance. Past Performance is significantly more important than Small Business Participation. All non-Price Factors, when combined, are significantly more important than Price. Price will be evaluated, but will not be rated with a color or adjectival rating. The Government reserves the right to make an award to other than the lowest priced Offeror, or to other than the Offeror with the highest non-Price factor ratings if the SSA determines that to do so would result in the best value to the Government.

M.2 In order to be eligible for contract award, a final rating of no less than Acceptable must be achieved for the Management Factor and Technical Factor. A final Past Performance rating of Limited or No Confidence will make the proposal ineligible for contract award. Additionally, an Offeror that is not a small business must have an acceptable Small Business Subcontracting Plan to receive an award in accordance with FAR 19.702(a). Offerors that receive a final rating of Unacceptable at any Factor / Subfactor level are ineligible for contract award.

M.2.1 Once the evaluations are complete and awards have been made for the IDIQ contracts, then the awardee for Delivery Order 0001 will be determined based upon a competitive evaluation of the rating received for Management Subfactor 4, Delivery Order 0001, and the Total Evaluated Price proposed for Delivery Order 0001. This first Delivery Order award will follow the Best Value Tradeoff source selection approach, using only the Management Subfactor 4 and the Price for Delivery Order 0001. For evaluation purposes, the Management Subfactor 4 rating is more important than Price.

M.2.2 The Government intends to award a contract(s) without discussions (except for clarification as described in FAR 15.306(a)), as permitted by FAR 15.306(a)(3) and FAR 52.215-1. However, the Government reserves the right to conduct discussions to permit Offerors to revise their proposals.

M.2.3 Minimum Acceptability: If an Offeror does not meet the Go / No-Go Criteria and receives a No-Go determination, the Offeror will not be evaluated and will not be considered for contract award. If an Offeror takes exception to any of the terms and conditions of the solicitation, the Offeror may not be considered for contract award. All Offerors are urged to ensure that their initial proposals are submitted with the most favorable terms in order to reflect their best possible potential.

M.3.3 FACTORS AND SUBFACTORS TO BE EVALUATED

M.3.3.1 Careful, full, and impartial consideration will be given to all proposals received pursuant to the RFP. A team of Government personnel will evaluate each proposal relative to the Factors and Subfactor. The following evaluation Factors and Subfactor will be used to evaluate each proposal: Award(s) will be made to the Offeror(s) whose proposal is most advantageous to the Government based upon an integrated assessment of the evaluation Factors and Subfactors described below. The Government reserves the right to make award(s) based upon the Price Factor in the event that the Go / No-Go: Licensing, Management, Technical, Price, Past Performance, and Small Business Participation evaluation results of all Offerors proposals are substantially the same. In order to be eligible for contract award, a final rating of no less than Acceptable must be achieved for the Management Factor and Technical Factor. A final Past Performance rating of Limited or No Confidence are ineligible for contract award. Additionally, any other than small business Offeror must have and acceptable Small Business Subcontracting Plan to receive an award in accordance with FAR 19.702(a). Offerors that receive a final rating of Unacceptable at any Factor / Subfactor level and / or within their Past Performance rating are ineligible for award.

M.3.4 Factor 1: The Go / No-Go: Licensing is further divided into the following:

- a. Item 1 U.S. Department of State DDTC Brokering License.
- b. Item 2 Bureau of ATF Type 11 license.

M.3.4.1 Go / No-Go: Both items require a Pass rating to be eligible for award. If the Offeror receives one No-Go determination for Licensing, the Offerors proposal will not be evaluated further and the Offeror will not be eligible for award.

M.3.5 Factor 2: The Management Factor is further divided into the following Subfactors:

- a. Subfactor 1 Program Management Plan
- b. Subfactor 2 Manufacturer Supply List
- c. Subfactor 3 Transportation Plan

<p style="text-align: center;">CONTINUATION SHEET</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Reference No. of Document Being Continued W15QKN-22-R-0057 PIIN/SIIN MOD/AMD 0001</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Page 20 of 28</p>
--	---	---

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

d. Subfactor 4 Delivery Order 0001

Of the four Management Subfactors, Program Management Plan is the most important Subfactor and more important than Manufacturer Supply List. Manufacturer Supply List is more important than Transportation Plan. Transportation Plan is more important than Delivery Order 0001.

A detailed explanation of the criteria for the evaluation is set forth in the Evaluation Approach, Paragraph D of this section. During the evaluation of each proposal, the Government will assign each Subfactor an adjectival rating and write a narrative evaluation reflecting the identified findings. The compilation of these Subfactor adjectival ratings will form the basis of the Management Factor rating.

M.3.6 Factor 3: The Technical Factor is further divided into the following Subfactors:

- a. Subfactor 1 Technical Description
- b. Subfactor 2 Technical Verification

Technical Subfactors are of equal importance.

A detailed explanation of the criteria for the evaluation is set forth in the Evaluation Approach, Paragraph D of this section. During the evaluation of each proposal, the Government will assign each Subfactor an adjectival rating and write a narrative evaluation reflecting the identified findings. The compilation of these Subfactor adjectival ratings will form the basis of the Technical Factor rating.

M.3.7 Factor 4: Price: Price will be evaluated but not rated. There are no Subfactors for the Price Factor. The resulting award(s) will be multiple FFP IDIQ contract(s). Prices proposed in Section J, Attachment 0001 - Price Matrix of the solicitation will be utilized to compute a total evaluated price. Price Reasonableness will be utilized in the evaluation of the FFP effort. If the Government determines that adequate price competition was not obtained and / or if the total evaluated price cannot be deemed fair and reasonable, the Government reserves the right to request cost or pricing data and to evaluate such data utilizing the proposal analysis techniques delineated in FAR 15.404-1 as deemed appropriate.

M.3.8 Factor 5: Past Performance: Each Offerors past performance will be reviewed to determine relevancy and confidence assessment. The Past Performance Factor does not have any Subfactors.

M.3.9 Factor 6: Small Business Participation: Each Offerors level and degree of commitment to utilize small business in execution of the requirement will be evaluated. The Small Business Participation Factor does not have any Subfactors.

M.3.10 EVALUATION APPROACH

M.3.10.1 All proposals shall be evaluated by the Source Selection Team (SST).

M.3.10.2 The overarching evaluation approach for all Factors and Subfactors is as follows:

a. Adequacy of Response. The proposal will be evaluated to determine whether the Offerors methods and approach have adequately and completely considered, defined, and satisfied the requirements specified in the RFP. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which each requirement has been addressed in the proposal in accordance with the proposal submission section of the RFP.

b. Feasibility of Approach. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the proposed approach is workable and the end results achievable. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which successful performance is contingent upon proven devices and techniques. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the Offeror is expected to be able to successfully complete the proposed tasks and technical requirements within the required schedule.

M.4 The Go / No-Go: Licensing. The Government will evaluate the Offerors Go / No-Go: Licensing information to ensure the Offeror has a complete understanding of the necessary importation process capabilities for the SAWS program. The Government reserves the right to not evaluate the rest of an Offerors proposal if it fails to pass the Go / No-Go criteria. The Go / No-Go: Licensing is divided into the following:

(a) Item 1 U.S. Department of State DDTC Brokering License: This item will evaluate the U.S. Department of State DDTC Brokering License. The Government will evaluate the Offerors DDTC Brokering License to meet the requirements of the RFP.

(b) Item 2 ATF Type 11 License: The Government will evaluate the ATF Type 11 License to meet the requirements of the RFP.

M.5 The Management Factor is divided into the following Subfactors:

M.5.1 Subfactor 1 Program Management Plan: This Subfactor evaluates the Offerors Program Management Plan using the examples in the Table below. The Government will evaluate the Offerors detailed Program Management Plan for each item in the Table below. This Plan will be

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

evaluated on the inclusion and details to effectively manage, meet schedule and monitor performance of the Offerors major / key Subcontractors. Major / key Subcontractors are defined as those that will be providing hardware, or process, or whose subcontract is for more than 25% of the proposed price. The Offeror will provide information to substantiate the following:

KEY POINT #1: The adequacy and completeness of the Offerors proposed detailed IMS, identifying all program tasks required for successful execution (milestones, events and program tasks from receipt of DO, through delivery, highlighting the critical path and closeout of the DO identified with associated manufacturer) to include the tasks and milestones identified in the Government SOW, and General Specifications, including deliverables and data items.

KEY POINT #2: The adequacy and completeness of the description of each of the tasks included in the IMS with references to the tasks and milestones identified in the Government SOW, and General Specifications, including deliverable and data items.

KEY POINT #3: The adequacy of the primes experience and ability to effectively manage major / key Subcontractor in performance and schedule. The Offerors submission of evidence of completion of prior deliveries will be evaluated to ensure accuracy.

***PLEASE NOTE: This Plan is for Evaluation Purposes ONLY.

Item Numbers	Item	Quantity	Destination
0010	7.62x54mm Ball	1,000,000	Mogadishu International Airport, Somalia
0010	7.62x54mm Ball	100,000	Crane Army Ammunition Activity, IN
0357	7.62x54mm Linking Machine	2	Mogadishu International Airport, Somalia
0024	12.7x108mm Ball	250,000	Mogadishu International Airport, Somalia
0024	12.x7108mm Ball	50,000	Crane Army Ammunition Activity, IN
0352	12.7x108mm Ball Linking Machine	2	Mogadishu International Airport, Somalia

M.5.2 Subfactor 2 Manufacturer Supply List: This Subfactor evaluates the Offerors current Manufacturer Supply List. The Government will evaluate the adequacy and completeness of the Offerors current Manufacturer Supply List for each of the items listed in the Section J, Attachment 0001 - Price Matrix. The response will also be evaluated for the adequacy of the proposed Letters of Commitment to support the proposed manufacturers. The Offeror will provide information to substantiate the following areas:

KEY POINT #1: The adequacy of the proposed list to identify the item, quantity, manufacturer locations and supply type (i.e. new production and / or surplus with ammunitions range of years manufactured and service life; as defined in the General Specifications, stock ammunition must be less than five years old for all ammunition, except for small caliber ammunition, which shall be less than ten years old.

KEY POINT #2: The adequacy of the proposed Letters of Commitment, which demonstrate the Offerors ability to supply the requirements of the RFP. The proposal will be evaluated for completeness to include, the name of address of company, item of commitment, length of commitment (with a preference of 270 calendar days from the date the solicitation closes), date received and the signature of the individual from the manufacturer (with a preference for one authorized to bind the company and provide a firm commitment)."

M.5.3 Subfactor 3 Transportation Plan: This Subfactor evaluates the Offerors Transportation Plan using the examples in the Table below. The Government will evaluate the detailed Transportation Plan for the items listed in the table below. The Plan will also be evaluated to demonstrate the Offerors ability to effectively manage, schedule and monitor programmatic performance of the Offerors Subcontractors and Freight Forwarders. The proposal will be evaluated on the information to substantiate the following:

KEY POINT #1: The Offerors Transportation Plan will be evaluated on the inclusion and adequacy of its ability to successfully transport each of the items listed in the Table below. The Offerors Transportation Plan will be evaluated for its level of understanding of the processes required and ability to handle the movement and transportation requirements to the three locations identified, Camp Arifijan, Kuwait, Picatinny Arsenal, NJ and Crane Army Ammunition Activity, IN. The Offerors Transportation Plan will be evaluated for its completeness, comprehensiveness and executability of scheduling milestones of each shipment and terms of local and state permits, approval and /or clearances in the manufacturers country and all foreign states and locality necessary for the movement and into the final country, mode(s) of transportation from original to final delivery point (to include inland transportation) identification of ports, freight forwarder companies with commitment letters, and ROM pricing for transportation costs to meet the requirements of the solicitation.

Item Numbers	Item	Quantity	Destination	Delivery Schedule
--------------	------	----------	-------------	-------------------

CONTINUATION SHEET	Reference No. of Document Being Continued		Page 22 of 28
	PIIN/SIIN	MOD/AMD 0001	

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

0297	40mm HE Frag	20,000	Camp Arifjan, Kuwait	180 calendar days after award or EUC, if required
0010	7.62x54mm Ball	5,000,000	Camp Arifjan, Kuwait	90 calendar days after award or EUC, if required
0010	7.62x54mm Ball	400,000	Crane Army Ammunition Activity, IN	90 calendar days after award or EUC, if required
0357	7.62x54mm Linking Machine	5	Camp Arifjan, Kuwait	180 calendar days after award or EUC, if required
0357	7.62x54mm Linking Machine	1	Picatinny Arsenal, NJ	180 calendar days after award or EUC, if required
0357	7.62x54mm Linking Machine	5	Crane Army Ammunition Activity, IN	180 calendar days after award or EUC, if required
0341	Belt, 7.62x54mm (100 rds)	5000	Camp Arifjan, Kuwait	180 calendar days after award or EUC, if required
0341	Belt, 7.62x54mm (100 rds)	10	Crane Army Ammunition Activity, IN	90 calendar days after award or EUC, if required
0444	Inert 125mm APFSDS	25	Picatinny Arsenal, NJ	90 calendar days after award or EUC, if required
0425	Inert 90mm HESH-TP-T	25	Picatinny Arsenal, NJ	270 calendar days after award or EUC, if required
0432	Inert 30mm HE Frag	25	Picatinny Arsenal, NJ	270 calendar days after award or EUC, if required

M.5.4 Subfactor 4 Delivery Order 0001: This Subfactor evaluates the Offerors Delivery Order 0001 proposal. The Government will evaluate the Offerors proposed response, which includes a detailed IMS, Transportation Plan, Manufacturer Supply List, and Price as defined in the RFP. The Offeror will provide information to substantiate the following areas:

KEY POINT #1: The Offeror will be evaluated on the adequacy of the detailed IMS for its ability to procure / supply the requirements and delivery schedule found in the Table Below and Section J, Attachment 0003 - Delivery Order Proposal Request Form - Delivery Order 0001, as well as description of a thorough analysis to indicate that the IMS is complete, supportable and achievable to include milestones, events and program tasks, from receipt of delivery order through delivery, highlighting the critical path, to include the associated manufacturer. Additionally, the Offerors plan will be evaluated for the adequacy in regards to incorporation and completeness of all the tasks and milestones identified in the Government SOW and General Specifications are adequately addressed, including deliverables and applicable data items.

KEY POINT #2: The Offerors will be evaluated on the adequacy of the detailed Transportation Plan, for its level of understanding of the processes required and ability to handle the movement and transportation requirements in Delivery Order 0001 to include modes(s) transportation from origin to final delivery point (to include inland transportation) and ability to meet the delivery schedule found in the Table Below, as well as Section J, Attachment 0003 Delivery Order Proposal Form - Delivery Order 0001. Identification of port(s) to be utilized, Identification of freight forwarder companies, Transportation costs, Letter(s) of commitment from freight forwarder companies, to include the following: Name and address of the company providing the commitment and Length of commitment for a minimum of 270 days from the date the solicitation closes.

KEY POINT #3: The Offeror will be evaluated on adequacy / completeness of the Manufacturer Supply List for its ability to procure / supply the requirements for Delivery Order 0001 to include, item, quantity, manufacturer and location, date of delivery, supply type new production and / or surplus with ammunitions range of years manufactured and service life in accordance with General Specifications, identification of any required EUC, Letter of Commitment from the manufacturer with length of commitment for a minimum of 270 calendar days from the date the solicitation clauses.

Item Numbers	Item	Quantity	Destination	Delivery Schedule
0005	7.62x39mm Ball	99,840	Blue Grass Army Depot, KY	90 calendar days after award or EUC, if required
0005	7.62x39mm Ball	1,000	Picatinny Arsenal, NJ	90 calendar days after award or EUC, if required

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

0001	5.45x39mm Ball	23,400	Blue Grass Army Depot, KY	90 calendar days after award or EUC, if required
0001	5.45x39mm Ball	1,000	Picatinny Arsenal, NJ	90 calendar days after award or EUC, if required

In accordance with the Army Source Selection Supplement (AS3), Section 3.1, the Army methodology for evaluating Technical Approach and Related Risk is the Combined Technical / Risk Rating, (see Table 1 below). This methodology considers risk, in conjunction with the strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, uncertainties, and deficiencies in determining technical ratings. The definitions of Technical Risk (Table 2) are included for further clarification but should not be evaluated as a separate rating. The Management Factor and Subfactors will receive a color / adjectival rating in accordance with the chart below.

TABLE 1	COMBINED TECHNICAL / RISK RATINGS		
Color	Rating	Description	
Blue	Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low.	
Purple	Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low to moderate.	
Green	Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and risk of risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.	
Yellow	Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and / or risk of unsuccessful performance is high.	
Red	Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation, and thus, contains one or more deficiencies, and / or risk of unsuccessful performance is unacceptable. Proposal is un-awardable.	

TABLE 2	Technical Risk Definitions	
Low	Proposal may contain weaknesses, but they have 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	Proposal may contain weaknesses that could potentially cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Special Contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.	
High	Proposal contains weaknesses that are likely to cause significant disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Special Contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring may not be able to overcome any difficulties.	
Unacceptable	Proposal contains a material failure or a combination of weaknesses that increases the risk of unsuccessful performance to an unacceptable level.	

M.6 The Technical Factor is divided into the following Subfactors:

M.6.1 Subfactor 1 Technical Description: The Government will evaluate the Offerors ability to provide sufficient Technical Description to meet the requirements of the RFP.

KEY POINT #1: The Government will evaluate the Offerors ability on the completeness of documented examples of TDPs as defined in the

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

Applicable General Specifications (listed in Key Point #2 below) for the following items:

- Item Number 0279: 82mm Mortar HE (Complete).
- Item Number 0434: Inert 40mm HE Frag.

KEY POINT #2: The Government will evaluate the comprehensiveness of the TDP description with process flow charts, and demonstrated compliance to technical, testing and inspection requirements and verification procedures as defined in the General Specifications listed below:

- General Specification for General Ammunition and Weapon Systems, dated 24 August 2020.
- General Specification for Rocket Propelled & Spin Stabilized Grenade Ammunition, dated 24 August 2020.
- General Specification for Mortar Ammunition, dated 24 August 2020.
- General Specification for Small Caliber Ammunition, dated 24 August 2020.
- General Specification for PdD SAWS Mortar Weapon Systems, dated 24 August 2020.

M.6.2 Subfactor 2 Technical Verification: The Government will evaluate the Offerors Technical Verification to meet the requirements of the RFP.

KEY POINT #1: The Government will evaluate the Offerors proposal on the adequacy and completeness of the documented examples of LATRs as defined in the Applicable General Specifications (listed in Key Point #2 below) for the following items:

- Item Number 0279: 82mm Mortar HE (Complete).
- Item Number 0008: 7.62x39mm AP.

KEY POINT #2: The Government will evaluate the comprehensiveness and adequacy of the LATR description with process flow charts, and demonstrated compliance to technical, testing and inspection requirements and verification procedures as defined in the General Specifications listed below:

- General Specification for Special Ammunition, and Weapon Systems, dated 24 August 2020.
- General Specification for Rocket Propelled & Spin Stabilized Grenade Ammunition, dated 24 August 2020.
- General Specification for Mortar Ammunition, dated 24 August 2020.
- General Specification for Small Caliber Ammunition, dated 24 August 2020.
- General Specification for PdD SAWS Mortar Weapon Systems, dated 24 August 2020.

In accordance with the Army Source Selection Supplement (AS3), Section 3.1, the Army methodology for evaluating Technical Approach and Related Risk is the Combined Technical / Risk Rating, (see Table 3 below). This methodology considers risk, in conjunction with the strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, uncertainties, and deficiencies in determining technical ratings. The definitions of Technical Risk (Table 4) are included for further clarification but should not be evaluated as a separate rating. The Technical Factor and Subfactors will receive a color / adjectival rating in accordance with the chart below.

TABLE 3 COMBINED TECHNICAL / RISK RATINGS			
Color	Rating	Description	
Blue	Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low.	
Purple	Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength, and risk of unsuccessful performance is low to moderate.	
Green	Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and risk of risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.	
Yellow	Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and / or risk of unsuccessful performance is high.	
Red	Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation, and thus, contains one or more deficiencies, and / or risk of unsuccessful performance is unacceptable. Proposal is un-awardable.	

CONTINUATION SHEET	Reference No. of Document Being Continued W15QKN-22-R-0057 PIIN/SIIN	Page 25 of 28 MOD/AMD 0001
Name of Offeror or Contractor:		

TABLE 4 Technical Risk Definitions	
Low	Proposal may contain weaknesses, but they have 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	Proposal may contain weaknesses that could potentially cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Special Contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.
High	Proposal contains weaknesses that are likely to cause significant disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Special Contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring may not be able to overcome any difficulties.
Unacceptable	Proposal contains a material failure or a combination of weaknesses that increases the risk of unsuccessful performance to an unacceptable level.

M.7 Price Factor. Adjectival ratings shall not be used for Offerors Price proposal. The Government will fully evaluate and negotiate all priced Item Numbers and ordering periods for award. The evaluation of all ordering periods will not obligate the Government to place more than the minimum order. The Offerors Price proposal will be evaluated as follows.

a. FFP Evaluation: For prices to be fair and reasonable, it must represent a price to the Government that a prudent person would pay in the conduct of competitive business. Prices proposed in the Section J, Attachment 0001 - Price Matrix, of the RFP will be utilized to compute a total evaluated price. A price reasonableness determination will be made on the total evaluated price, using one or more techniques described in FAR 15.404-1.

(i) If an Offeror proposes the use of Government property in its possession, the total evaluated price will be adjusted to include a rental equivalent factor for each item of such property calculated in accordance with FAR 52.245-9. This adjustment will apply for the use of Government property by the Offeror as well as any Subcontractor thereto. The value of the proposed Government property will be evaluated for cost realism.

(ii) Price Evaluation Preference for HUBZone Small Business Concerns: If a HUBZone certified small business concern submits an offer in response to the solicitation, in accordance with FAR 52.219-4, when applicable and as required by the provision, an adjustment will be made by adding the applicable factor(s) to the price of other offers.

b. Overall / Price Proposal Evaluation: The overall Price proposal will be evaluated for the following:

(i) Compliance: The Price proposal submitted by the Offeror will be evaluated for compliance based upon the submission requirements contained in the Section L Instructions to the Offerors.

(ii) Unbalanced Pricing: The Offerors overall Price proposal will be evaluated for unbalanced pricing as defined in FAR 15.404-1(g). An offer may be rejected if the Contracting Officer determines that the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government (see FAR 15.404-1(g)(1) through FAR 15.404-1(g)(3)).

(iii) Errors: The Offerors Price proposal will be reviewed for errors. The Offeror may be given an opportunity to clarify certain aspects of their proposal at the sole discretion of the Contracting Officer.

(iv) Total Evaluated Price: The Total Evaluated Price consists of summing the weighted evaluated prices, computed from the unit prices proposed in the Section J, Attachment 0001 - Price Matrix, to include the evaluated per unit rental value for Government property in the Offerors (and any Subcontractors) and the price evaluation preferences for HUBZone Small Business Concerns, when applicable.

The weighted evaluated prices will be calculated as follows:

(1) Items with a Single Quantity Range: An average unit price will be calculated utilizing the proposed unit prices for Ordering Periods One through Five for each Item Number, including the evaluated per unit rental value of Government property, rounded to the nearest hundredth (two decimals). The average unit price for Item Numbers with a single quantity range will be assigned a 100% weighted percentage to derive the weighted average unit price. The evaluated quantity for items with a single quantity range will be the maximum quantity in the single quantity range. The evaluated quantity will be multiplied by the weighted average unit price, to derive the evaluated price, rounded to the nearest whole dollar. The evaluated price will be

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

multiplied by a weighted percent applicable to each Item Number in order to derive the weighted evaluated price. The weighted evaluated price will be rounded to the nearest whole dollar.

(2) Items with Multiple Quantity Ranges: An average unit price will be calculated utilizing the proposed unit prices for Ordering Periods One through Five for each quantity range, including the evaluated per unit rental value of Government property, rounded to the nearest hundredth (two decimals). The average unit price for each quantity range will be multiplied by an assigned weighted percentage and summed for all quantity ranges within each Item Number to derive the weighted average unit price for each Item Number, rounding to the nearest hundredth (two decimals). The evaluated quantity for each Item Number will be the maximum quantity in the Item Number. The evaluated quantity will be multiplied by the weighted average unit price to derive the evaluated price for each Item Number, rounded to the nearest whole dollar. The evaluated price for each Item Number will be multiplied by the assigned weighted percentage to derive the weighted evaluated price for each Item Number. The weighted evaluated price will be rounded to the nearest whole dollar.

(3) The total evaluated price for Delivery Order 0001 will be calculated by multiplying the quantity for each Item Number by the proposed unit price on Section J, Attachment 0003 - Delivery Order Proposal Form, to derive the evaluated amount. The total transportation price proposed will be added to each Item Number price. The evaluated totals for each Item Number will then be added together to derive the total evaluated price for Delivery Order 0001.

Note: The proposed unit prices for Delivery Order 0001 can be equal to or lower than the unit prices provided in the Section J, Attachment 0001 - Price Matrix for each Item Number.

M.8 Past Performance Factor. The Government will evaluate the Offerors record of past and current performance to ascertain the probability of successfully performing the required efforts of the SOW.

- a. Evaluation of past performance shall be in accordance with this plan utilizing the forms and questionnaires set forth in Appendix D.
- b. The Government will focus its inquiries on the Offerors (and major Subcontractors) record of performance as it relates to all solicitation requirements, including cost, schedule, performance and management of Subcontractors and compliance with FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns, and FAR 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan. For the purposes of this SSP / Requirement, major Subcontractors are defined as members of an Offerors overall team who are expected to perform twenty five percent (25%) or more of the proposed effort. A significant achievement, problem, or lack of relevant data in any element of the work can become an important consideration in the evaluation process. Therefore, Offerors will be reminded to include the most recent and relevant efforts (within the past three years) in their proposal. Absent any recent and relevant past performance history or when the performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned, the Offeror will be assigned a neutral confidence rating and its proposal will not be evaluated either favorably or unfavorably on past performance. The Government may use data provided by the Offeror in its proposal and data obtained from other sources, including data in Government files or data obtained through interviews with personnel familiar with the Contractor and their current and past performance under Federal, State or Local Government contracts for same or similar services as compared to the NAICS 332993, Small Arms, Ordnance, and Ordnance Accessories Manufacturing.
- c. The Government will evaluate the Offerors submission of all Federal Government contracts for the Prime Offeror and each major Subcontractor in performance or awarded during the past three years, from the issue date of this RFP, which are relevant to the efforts required by this RFP. The Government may consider a wide array of information from a variety of sources, but is not compelled to rely on all of the information available.
- d. The Past Performance Factor considers each Offerors demonstrated recent and relevant record of performance in supplying products and services that meet the contract requirements. There are two aspects to the past performance evaluation: relevancy and performance confidence assessment.
- (i.) RECENCY: The first aspect is to evaluate the recency of the Offerors past performance. Recency is generally expressed as a time period during which past performance references are considered relevant, and is critical to establishing the relevancy of past performance information.
- (ii.) RELEVANCY: The second aspect is to determine how relevant a recent effort accomplished by the Offeror is to the effort to be acquired through the source selection. Relevancy is not separately rated; however, the following criteria (see Table 5) will be used to establish what is relevant which shall include similarity of service / support, complexity, dollar value, contract type, and degree of subcontract / teaming.

Table 5 Past Performance Relevancy Definitions		

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

Relevant	Present / past performance effort involved similar scope and	

CONTINUATION SHEET	Reference No. of Document Being Continued W15QKN-22-R-0057 PIIN/SIIN MOD/AMD 0001	Page 27 of 28
--------------------	---	---------------

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

	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.

(iii.) QUALITY ASSESSMENT: Assess the quality of the Offerors past performance on those recent efforts that were determined relevant by determining how well the Contractor performed on the contracts. Documented results from Past Performance Questionnaires, interviews, Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) rating, and other sources form the support and basis for this assessment.

e. PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT: The final step is for the team to arrive at a single consensus performance confidence assessment for the Offeror, selecting the most appropriate rating from the chart below. This rating considers the assessed quality of the relevant / recent efforts gathered. Ensure the rationale for the conclusions reached are included.

TABLE 6 Performance Confidence Assessments	
Rating	Definition
Substantial Confidence	Based on the Offerors recent / relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Satisfactory Confidence	Based on the Offerors recent / relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
Neutral Confidence	No recent / relevant performance record is available or the Offerors performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned. The Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on the Factor of past performance.
Limited Confidence	Based on the Offerors recent / relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
No Confidence	Based on the Offerors recent / relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the Offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

A final Past Performance rating of Limited or No Confidence will make the proposal ineligible for contract award.

M.9 Small Business Participation Factor. The Small Business Participation Factor will receive a color / adjectival rating. The Government will evaluate the extent of first-tier small business participation (in terms of the Offeror's proposed Total Contract Price) which the Offeror credibly proposes to subcontract to U.S. SB concerns (SB, SDB, WOSB, HUBZone SB, VOSB, and SDVOSB) in the performance of the contract. For the purpose of this evaluation, the extent of Offeror (or joint venture partner / teaming arrangement) participation in proposed contract performance, where the Offeror is a U.S. small business concern, for NAICS code 332993.

The evaluation will consist of the following:

a. The extent to which the proposal identifies challenging goals for participation by U.S. small business concerns and the adequacy of the rationale that support those goals (to include, as described above, the participation of the Offeror if it is a U.S. small business concern). The extent of participation of such concerns will be evaluated in terms of the percentage of the Offeror's proposed Total Contract Price.

b. An assessment of the realism, which includes strengths and weaknesses, that the Offeror will achieve the levels of small business participation identified in the proposal. This assessment will be based on an assessment of the Offeror's proposed small business participation approach and the probability that the Offeror will satisfy commitments and requirements, on the resulting SAWS contract, based upon the extent of satisfaction of FAR 52.219-8 and / or FAR 52.219-9 (as applicable) commitments on prior contracts.

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

Color	Rating	Description	
Blue	Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the small business objectives.	
Purple	Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of small business objectives.	
Green	Acceptable	Proposal indicates an adequate approach and understanding of small business objectives.	
Yellow	Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the small business objectives.	
Red	Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet small business objectives.	

M.10 Evaluation and Award of Delivery Order 0001. Once the evaluations are complete and awards have been made for the base IDIQ contracts, then the awardee for Delivery Order 0001 will be determined based on a competitive evaluation of the rating received for Management Subfactor 4, Delivery Order 0001, and the Total Evaluated Price proposed for Delivery Order 0001. This first Delivery Order award will follow the best value tradeoff source selection approach, using only Management Subfactor 4 and the Price for Delivery Order 0001. For evaluation purposes, Subfactor 4 is more important than Price.

M.11 DISCUSSIONS

M.11.1 GENERAL INFORMATION. In accordance with FAR 15.306(d), discussion sessions with each Offeror may be held, although the Government reserves the right to make an award without first entering into discussions. Should discussions take place, all Offerors in the competitive range will be allowed a minimum of seven calendar days to submit Final Proposal Revisions.

M.11.2 DISCUSSION SCHEDULING. If discussions are conducted, the Contracting Officer will schedule the discussion sessions, and each Offeror will be notified of the time and place at least two business days prior to their discussion session. Appropriate security clearances should be provided by the Offerors in sufficient time to process the requests. The Contracting Officer will provide additional instructions with the notification. The discussion sessions will take place via video teleconference or conference call in.

M.12 DETERMINATION OF RESPONSIBILITY

M.12.1 As an element of determining the responsibility of Offerors who are large businesses, the PCO will evaluate the adequacy of the Offerors Small Business Subcontracting Plan in accordance with FAR 19.705.

M.12.2 For small businesses, a Certificate of Competency may be required by the Contracting Officer in accordance with FAR 19.6.

M.12.3 A Pre-award Survey may be required by the Contracting Officer in accordance with FAR 9.106.

M.12.4 For actions over \$10M, a Pre-award Clearance by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP) will be required in accordance with FAR 22.805(a).