**Section L - Instructions, Conditions, & Notices to Offerors or Quoters**

### 1.1 GENERAL INFORMATION

**IMPORTANT**: In order to be considered for contract award under this procurement, the Offeror shall possess a Defense Security Service SECRET facility clearance, SECRET personnel clearances and SECRET safeguarding capability at the time the proposal is submitted. The Offeror must have access to, or maintain a dedicated SECRET Test Facility. The physical construction of any SECRET facility must comply with DoD 5205.07-M Vol 3.

The Government may visit the Offeror's facility, and any subcontractor's facilities, at any time upon request during proposal evaluation. Failure to grant the Government access for a facility visit may result in the proposal being found unacceptable.
The Offeror (and any subcontractors performing SECRET-level work) shall not be:

- Under foreign ownership or control
- Under a special security agreement
- Restricted in access to Compartmented Information, Cryptographic Materials or Systems, Restricted Data, or Formerly Restricted Data.

Any proposal that includes redlines, conditions of offer, or any other deviation from the solicitation requirements may be rejected by the Government.

Each Offeror is required to submit a complete and detailed proposal that clearly demonstrates an understanding of, and compliance with, all of the solicitation requirements. Proposals shall contain only material directly relevant to this acquisition. Offerors shall submit all information required by this solicitation, including any documents, exhibits, and other attachments referenced in Section J. Proposals shall encompass all the Contract Line Items (CLINs) identified in Section B of this solicitation. **FAILURE TO FOLLOW THE INSTRUCTIONS OR CONFORM TO ALL REQUIREMENTS OUTLINED IN THIS SOLICITATION MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF THE OFFEROR'S PROPOSAL.**

Proposals submitted in response to the solicitation must contain a comprehensive and detailed description of all relevant aspects of the proposed effort. Offerors shall not assume that previously submitted data or prior experience presumed to be known to the Government (e.g., previous projects performed for the Government; data or services previously submitted or performed for the Government) will be considered as part of the proposal. Only information explicitly included in the Offeror's proposal will be evaluated.

General statements such as, "the Offeror understands," "the Offeror can or will comply with the requirements," "standard procedures will be used," "well-known techniques will be used," or statements which merely paraphrase the solicitation in whole or in part do not constitute compliance with the requirements for proposal content as such the Government may find the proposal to be unacceptable. Discussions of each topic in the proposal shall exhibit continuity and logical progression.

The Government may use automated or AI-enabled tools to assist in the administrative processing of proposals, including document ingestion, compliance checks, and organization of proposal materials. These tools will not independently evaluate, score, or rate any portion of an offeror's proposal. All evaluation

findings and ratings will be made exclusively by Government personnel.

**For proposal purposes, the estimated date of Award is noted in L-211-H001. The Government reserves the right to award sooner or later if necessary. The start and end dates will be updated accordingly upon Award.**

### 1.2 GOVERNMENT-WIDE POINT OF ENTRY (GPE)

This solicitation will be made available only through the Government Point of Entry System for Award Management (SAM) website at https://sam.gov. From time to time, the Government may post additional information to the SAM website relating to this solicitation (e.g. responses to questions, solicitation amendments, etc.). It is the responsibility of prospective Offerors to monitor the SAM.gov website for any such information.

### 1.3 COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE GOVERNMENT

Unless otherwise specified, the Naval Sea Systems Command Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO) and Contract Specialists are the sole Government points of contact for this acquisition.

Ms. Roxie Thomas
Procuring Contracting Officer
roxie.p.thomas.civ@us.navy.mil

Mr. Isaac Paultz
Primary Contract Specialist
isaac.c.pautz.civ@us.navy.mil

Ms. Liz Bonilla-Sotomayor
Secondary Contract Specialist
liz.c.bonilla-sotomayor.civ@us.navy.mil

### 1.4 AVAILABILITY OF ATTACHMENTS AND OFFEROR'S LIBRARY

The Government will make available to Offerors an Offeror's Library containing information to assist in the preparation of a proposal. The Offeror's Library will also contain certain solicitation attachments that cannot be posted to the GPE. Documents in the Offeror's Library may contain classified data and/or technical data whose export is restricted by the Arms Export Control Act (Title, U.S.C. Section 2751 et seq. or Executive Order 12470).

#### 1.4.1 Access Prerequisites and Required Documentation

To request access to the Offeror's Library, the Offeror must first submit the following three (3) documents via email to ALL Government Points of Contact identified in Section L.1.3:

1. A completed DD Form 254 (Attachment J-1)
2. A completed and duly executed Terms of Use Agreement (TOUA) (Attachment J-12)
3. A completed Information Center Account Activation form (Attachment L-10)

The subject line of the email should read:
*"Company Name - N00024-26-R-5246 (ECDIS) Offeror's Library Set Access Request"*

In the body of the email, the Offeror shall confirm the name and email address of the designated company representative(s) identified on Attachment L-10 who is authorized to receive account credentials and access to the Offeror's Library Set materials.

Personnel Limits: Access is strictly limited to a maximum of two (2) individuals per Offeror, and a separate Information Center Account Activation form must be completed and submitted for each individual.

### 1.4.2 Authentication Credentials (CAC and ECA Requirements)

Access to the secure Offeror's Library portal is protected by DoD Public Key Infrastructure (PKI) and requires two-factor identity authentication. Each designated individual requesting account access must possess either an active DoD Common Access Card (CAC) or an approved External Certificate Authority (ECA) Certificate.

1. Mandatory Credential Reporting on Attachment L-10:
   - Offerors must accurately populate all required credential identification data on Attachment L-10 (Information Center Account Activation Form) for each representative.
   - If the representative holds an active DoD Common Access Card (CAC), the Offeror must provide the individual's DoD Identification Number / Electronic Data Interchange Personal Identifier (EDIPI) and card expiration date as requested on Attachment L-10.
   - If the representative does not possess a DoD CAC, the representative must obtain an approved ECA certificate prior to account activation, and the Offeror must record the ECA Certificate Issuer (CA), Certificate Serial Number, Subject Distinguished Name (DN), and Certificate Expiration Date on Attachment L-10.
2. Account Provisioning Restriction:
   - The Government will not issue username/password combinations alone for library entry. Account provisioning will fail if valid CAC or ECA identity credentials cannot be verified against the submitted Attachment L-10.

### 1.4.3 Instructions for Obtaining a DoD ECA Certificate

Prospective Offerors whose designated representatives do not already possess an active DoD CAC must obtain a DoD-approved Medium Assurance (or Medium Token/Hardware Assurance) digital certificate through the DoD External Certificate Authority (ECA) Program.

- Official DoD ECA Program Information: Detailed program information, vendor guidance, and certificate policies are maintained on the DoD Cyber Exchange External Certificate Authority (ECA) Program.

Approved ECA Certificate Authorities (CAs)
DoD-approved ECA certificates must be purchased directly from one of the authorized commercial providers:

- WidePoint (formerly Operational Research Consultants / ORC):
  - Website: https://eca.orc.com
  - Contact: ecahelp@orc.com | (800) 816-5548
- IdenTrust, Inc.:
  - Website: https://www.identrust.com/certificates/eca
  - Contact: helpdesk@identrust.com | (888) 882-1104

Step-by-Step Acquisition Process

**NOTE:** The following instructions provide general guidance for obtaining an External Certificate Authority (ECA) certificate. It is the sole responsibility of the Offeror to follow the most current procedures and requirements as published on the official DoD Cyber Exchange website or by their selected certificate vendor. The Government assumes no liability for the accuracy or currency of the steps outlined below and will not be liable for any delays or costs incurred by the Offeror during the ECA acquisition process.

1. **Application Submission:** The applicant accesses the approved ECA vendor portal, selects the appropriate certificate type (e.g., ECA Medium Assurance Identity and Encryption certificate pair or Medium Token Assurance), and completes the online application.

2. **Identity Verification & Proofing:** The applicant must complete identity verification. Depending on the assurance level selected, this requires:

    - Completing identity verification paperwork;

    - Having the forms notarized by a certified Notary Public or validated in-person before an authorized Trusted Agent / Registration Authority; and
    - Verifying company authorization and organizational affiliation.

3. **Submission of Documentation:** Notarized verification packets, corporate documentation, and identity validation forms must be mailed or securely transmitted to the vendor per vendor-specific instructions.

4. **Certificate Retrieval & Hardware Provisioning:** Once the vendor verifies identity and processes payment, retrieval credentials (activation PINs/passwords) are provided. If a hardware-based token (FIPS 140-2 Cryptographic USB token or Smart Card) is required, the vendor will ship the physical device, after which the certificate is installed and tested.

Timeline & Lead Time

- Standard Processing Window: The process to obtain an ECA certificate typically **takes between three (3) to ten (10) business days** (approximately 1 to 2 weeks), accounting for identity verification, notarization, physical document mailing, vendor review, and token delivery.

- Planning Caution: Offerors are strongly cautioned that expedited processing cannot be guaranteed. Offerors without existing CAC or ECA credentials must initiate certificate procurement immediately upon solicitation release to avoid missing the library access deadline.

Associated Costs:

- All costs and fees associated with acquiring and maintaining ECA certificates and necessary hardware (tokens, smart cards, readers) are the sole financial responsibility of the Offeror and will not be reimbursed by the Government.

- Current commercial vendor pricing typically ranges as follows (subject to vendor changes):
    - Digital Certificate (1-Year to 3-Year validity): Approximately $150 to $270 per year per user for Medium or Medium Token Assurance identity/encryption certificate pairs.

### 1.4.4 Verification and Access Provisioning

Upon receipt, the Government will review and verify the duly executed TOUA and the DD Form 254. Following successful verification, the Government will process the Information Center Account Activation form (Attachment L-10), grant access to the Offeror's Library Set, and notify the Offeror via email that access has been provisioned. If the Government identifies any deficiencies or issues with the submitted DD Form 254 or TOUA that prohibit or delay access, the Government will notify the Offeror with details of the specific concerns to be resolved.

Throughout the procurement, any updates or additional Offeror's Library materials will be provided to the same company representative(s).

### 1.4.5 Prime Contractor Responsibility and Subcontractor Restrictions

Access to the Offeror's Library will be provided only to the Prime Offeror. The Government will not grant access to subcontractors, prospective subcontractors, suppliers, or any other non-prime entities.

The Prime Offeror is solely responsible for executing a TOUA with each subcontractor before sharing any solicitation documents, data, or materials obtained from the Offeror's Library.

The Prime Offeror must ensure that all technical and controlled data provided to subcontractors is handled, stored, protected, and distributed in full compliance with the TOUA, the DD Form 254, NISPOM (32 CFR Part 117), DFARS 252.204-7008/7012, and all applicable solicitation terms.

### 1.4.6 Deadline for Access Requests

The deadline to request access to the controlled solicitation documents and Offeror's Library shall be **21 OCTOBER 2026**.

Requests for access received after this deadline may not be considered, and the Government will not extend the proposal due date as a result of an Offeror's failure to timely obtain required credentials (CAC or ECA) or timely submit a compliant request for access to the Offeror's Library.

## 1.4 SUBMISSION OF QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS

Offerors shall submit written questions and comments related to this solicitation using the Offeror's Question Submittal Form (Attachment L-1). For ease of Government review and to minimize response time, Offerors shall submit this form in the original file format. Do not convert the form to Portable Document Format (PDF). To ensure the Government understands the context of the question, Offerors shall detail the applicable document name, document date or version, page, paragraph, clause or other specific citation to which the question applies. Information contained in the Government's responses to bidder's question shall not supersede any information contained in the solicitation (including amendments). In the event of a discrepancy between a response to a bidder's question and the content of the solicitation, the solicitation shall take precedence.

**Offerors shall not submit comments, questions, or inquiries to any Government representative other than the Contracting Officer and Contract Specialists identified in Section L 1.3.**

Offerors may submit questions or request clarification of any aspect of this solicitation. It is the Offeror's responsibility to bring to the attention of the Contracting Officer at the earliest possible time, but prior to the

closing date, any ambiguities, discrepancies, inconsistencies, or conflicts between the SOW or PWS (as applicable) and other solicitation documents attached hereto or incorporated by reference. Each question should identify solicitation number, document, page number, paragraph number or other identifier relating to the question. Questions without this information may not be answered. Acknowledgment of questions received will not be made

Offeror's questions and associated responses will not be posted publicly. The Government will post Offeror's questions and responses to the Offeror's Library and/or directly to those Offerors who have an executed TOUA and meet the security requirements detailed herein.

In the event that a prospective Offeror wishes to submit a comment or question that the prospective Offeror believes addresses a subject that is specific or proprietary to the Offeror, then the Offeror shall mark the question accordingly on the submission form and provide justification to support its claim. If the Government concurs with this identification, the Government will respond only to that potential Offeror. If the Government does not concur with this identification, it will inform the submitting Offeror and will not provide any further response. The Offeror may resubmit the question without the proprietary marking.

Offerors shall submit, in accordance with this section, any questions or suggestions related to the terms and conditions of this solicitation prior to the deadline for questions. Only written questions will receive a response.

The **deadline for receipt of questions is 4 NOVEMBER 2026**. Any questions received after this date may not be answered prior to the deadline for the receipt of proposals.

Failure of the Government to answer questions received after the date stated in the original solicitation release **will not constitute** a reason to extend the due date of the proposal.

#### 1.4.1 UNCLASSIFIED QUESTIONS

Submit written unclassified questions related to this solicitation via email to the PCO and Contract Specialist identified in Section L 1.2 above. Reference "N00024-26-R-5246 Question from [name of Offeror]" (without quotes or brackets) in the subject line of the message using Attachment L-1.

If an Offeror considers its question to be proprietary in nature, Reference "N00024-26-R-5246 *PROPRIETARY* Question from [name of Offeror]" (without quotes or brackets) in the subject line of the message using Attachment L-1.

### 1.5 SOLICITATION SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

This solicitation is unclassified, although some information provided in conjunction with this solicitation may be classified. The Government does not anticipate a need for Offerors to submit classified material in any proposal volume. All employees of the Offeror working on the classified portions of its proposal shall have active security clearances at the appropriate classification level. Offerors must provide a completed DD Form 254 (Attachment J-1) in order to gain access to and handle classified materials. Offerors must meet all clearance requirements detailed in the DD Form 254 (Attachment J-1) by the time of contract award. All classified material must be handled in accordance with the 32 CFR Part 117 in the National Industrial Security Program Operating Manual (NISPOM) (DoD 5220-22-M) and Industrial Security Regulation (DoD 5220.22-

R). **OFFERORS SHALL NOT PLACE ANY CLASSIFIED INFORMATION IN ANY PORTION OF ITS PROPOSAL**.

### 1.6 AWARD WITHOUT DISCUSSIONS

Pursuant to the provision under this section entitled FAR 52.215-1, "Instructions to Offerors – Competitive Acquisition," the Government intends to award a single contract on the basis of a proposal submission without conducting discussions with Offerors, but reserves the right to conduct discussions per FAR 15.306 "Exchanges with Offerors After Receipt of Proposals" if determined by the Contracting Officer to be necessary. Each Offeror shall submit only **one** proposal. **No alternate proposals will be accepted, and the submission of multiple proposals will result in rejection of the proposal.** Therefore, each Offeror's proposal submission shall contain the Offeror's best terms from a price and technical standpoint. However, the Government may contact any, all, or a limited number of Offerors with questions concerning their proposals as permitted under FAR Part 15. Upon the conclusion of discussions, if they occur, the Government will request Final Proposal Revisions (FPRs) from all Offerors still within the competitive range.

### 1.7 PROTECTING CONTROLLED UNCLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Pursuant to DFARS 252.204-7008(c)(1), prospective Offerors are advised proper safeguarding of Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI) is considered a special standard of responsibility for this solicitation. See FAR subpart 9.1. Failure to properly safeguard and mark Controlled Unclassified Information in a prospective Offeror's proposal in accordance with applicable regulation and policy (to include Executive Order 13556, the Defense Acquisition Regulations Supplement and DoD Instruction 5200.48) may preclude the Contracting Officer from being able to provide the required affirmative determination of responsibility. If the Contracting Officer is unable to affirmatively determine the prospective Offeror to be responsible, the prospective Offeror will be ineligible for award.

## 2.0 GENERAL PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS

The completion and submission to the Government of an offer shall indicate the Offeror's unconditional acceptance of the terms and conditions in the solicitation.

Offerors shall take care to submit a legible, neat, orderly, concise and comprehensive proposal. Elaborate brochures or artwork, expensive paper or bindings, or expensive visual or presentation aids beyond those sufficient to present a complete and comprehensive proposal are unnecessary. Clarity is essential. The use of brochures shall be minimized and if used will count against page limits.

### 2.1 PROPOSAL STRUCTURE, FORMAT, AND PAGE COUNTS

Offerors shall structure proposal submittals such that the required content is organized as follows:

| VOLUME | TITLE/DESCRIPTION | PAGE LIMIT |
|---|---|---|
| I | Technical Approach | 50 |
| II | Management Approach | 25 |
| III | Past Performance | See Note 1 |
| IV | Cost/Price Proposal | None |
| V | Standard Form (SF) | None |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | 30/SF33/Completed RFP | |

Note 1: The total page limit for this volume will vary depending on the number of subcontractors for which the Offeror must provide past performance information. The past performance narrative for the Offeror shall not exceed five (5) pages in length. The past performance narrative for applicable subcontractors (see Section L 3.3) shall not exceed two (2) pages in length for each subcontractor. Therefore, the page limit for this volume shall be $(5 + 2x)$, where $x$ represents the number of applicable subcontractors. For further details, see the instructions for Volume III.

Paragraph 3 of this section identifies specific items that will be exempt from the page count limitations set forth above. In addition, the following proposal content **will be exempt** from the page count limitations:

- Cover letter
- Table of contents
- Title pages
- Index pages
- Tabs
- Glossary
- Attachment J-5 Small Business Subcontracting Plan
- Attachment J-6 DFARS 252.227-7017 Data Rights Assertions List (Hardware)
- Attachment J-7 DFARS 252.227-7017 Data Rights Assertions List (Software)
- Attachment J-8 DFARS 252.227-7028 Data Rights Assertions List
- Attachment J- 9 Commercial Technical Data (TD), Commercial Computer Software (CS), or Commercial Computer Software Documentation (CSD) – Government Use Restrictions
- Attachment J-10 Note B – Table 2 (Navy ECDIS AN/SYN-1 Hardware Peripherals) Pricing
- Attachment J-12 Terms of Use Agreement
- Attachment L-2 Proposal Cross Reference Matrix
- Attachment L-3 Integrated Master Schedule (Submitted by Offeror)
- Attachment L-5 Basis of Estimate (BOE) (Submitted by Offeror)
- Attachment L-6 Contract-wide Staffing Plan (Submitted by Offeror)
- Attachment L-7 Software Development Plan (SDP) (Submitted by Offeror)
- Attachment L-8 Contractor Award Announcement Information

The Government may consider any failure on the part of an Offeror to comply with these instructions to be an indication of how the Contractor will comply with contract requirements during contract performance. Therefore, the Government encourages Offerors to contact the PCO and Contract Specialist via the Bidder's Question Process outlined in Section L.1.4.

### 2.2 LABELING & ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS (PIEE)

Each proposal volume shall be submitted electronically through the PIEE Solicitation Module. Each volume shall be placed in its own top-level folder, with clearly labeled subfolders for all required elements, attachments, and supporting documents identified in this section.

The first page of each proposal volume shall display the information required by FAR 52.215-1(c)(2) and shall also contain the volume number, volume title, security classification level of the volume and serial/copy number. If an Offeror wishes to restrict the disclosure or use of its proposals, the Offeror shall use the legend permitted by FAR 52.215-1(e) and prominently indicate the specific pages and paragraphs that contain proprietary information. Each page of an Offeror's proposal shall be labeled with the Offeror's name,

solicitation number and date corresponding to the date of the proposal, and CUI designation.

All information relating to contract cost or pricing data shall be included **only** in the Cost/Price Proposal Volume. **UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES SHALL OFFERORS INCLUDE CONTRACT COST AND PRICING DATA IN VOLUMES I, II, and III.** In the event that cost and pricing data are included in Volumes I, II, and III that data will be excluded from the evaluation.

### 2.3 PAGE SIZE AND FORMAT

The narrative material in each proposal shall be single-spaced, formatted to 8.5x11 inch paper with one-inch margins in Times New Roman 12-point font. Text within tables, diagrams, pictorial charts, or graphic material may use no smaller than 8-point font in Times New Roman or Arial typeface.

Any revisions to Offerors' proposals (if required) shall be submitted in two (2) forms: (1) a final clean revised document; and (2) a redlined document outlining the Offeror's changes. The Contracting Officer reserves the right to provide any additional instructions regarding revisions to Offerors' proposals via letter.

Every section, figure, and table shall be numbered; paragraphs within sections do not need to be numbered.

Foldout sheets may be used for charts and graphs where necessary to depict organization, layout, or implementation schedules. Foldouts shall be uncomplicated to preserve clarity. Extensive written text or tabular data, beyond that reasonably required for clarity, shall not be included in the material presented on the foldout sheet. Foldout pages shall fold entirely within the volume and shall not exceed 11 × 17 inches. Each non-blank side of a foldout page will count as two (2) pages for page count purposes. Foldouts for the entire proposal are limited to a total of 25 foldout sheets. Foldout sheets contained in the Cost/Price Proposal (Volume IV) do not count towards the 25-sheet foldout limit.

### 2.4 PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

**Proposals in response to this solicitation shall be submitted to the Government no later than the time specified in Block 9 of the SF 33 (13 January 2027)**. Offerors are advised that, due to ongoing **mission requirements**, the Government has **no intention of extending the proposal due date**. All submissions shall be provided by the date and time specified in Block 9 to ensure consideration for award. "Local time" shall refer to the time zone for Washington, DC.

Offerors are instructed to submit their proposal electronically via the Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE) application located at https://piee.eb.mil. Mail (hard copies and CDs) offers, telegraphic offers, or facsimile offers will not be considered. Late proposals **WILL NOT** be considered. Partial proposals or attachments **WILL NOT** be considered. Offerors are advised to consult FAR 15.208 related to timely receipt of proposals.

Offerors intending to submit a proposal in response to this solicitation are advised to ensure a representative of their organization registers at the PIEE website within five (5) working days of solicitation release, and that the Proposal Manager role in the Solicitation Module is approved for the Offeror's representative. A vendor registration guide for obtaining access to the PIEE Solicitation Module is posted to the Defense Pricing, Contracting, and Acquisition Policy website at: https://dodprocurementtoolbox.com/site-pages/solicitation-module.

Proposals sent through proprietary or third-party File Transfer Protocol (FTP) sites will not be accepted.

For instructions on how to post an offer, please refer to the Posting Offer demo: https://pieetraining.eb.mil/wbt/sol/Posting_Offer.pdf.

Upon submission, the Offeror should receive a system notification of successful proposal submission from PIEE. **Offerors are strongly encouraged to confirm receipt of the proposal materials with the Contracting Officer or Contract Specialist prior to the proposal submission due date and time.** The inability of an Offeror to confirm receipt does not relieve the Offeror of its responsibility to submit its proposal by the due date and time.

Offerors shall address their package with the RFP number and Offeror's company name. The Offeror is responsible for ensuring it drops off its proposals and generates a drop-off time prior to the proposal submission date and time. In the event of a dispute of proposal time submission, the submittal date and time documented in PIEE shall serve as the official time that the proposal was submitted to the Government. Late proposal submissions will be handled in accordance with FAR 52.215-1.

Proposals must be submitted as individual and clearly labelled to which Volume the file is in relation to: Volume I Technical, Volume II Management Approach, etc. A separate file shall be submitted for each Factor. Do not compress files (e.g., .zip, .rar, .7z) as the PIEE portal does not support these file formats.

All files uploaded must be scanned to ensure that there are no computer viruses within the file. The files shall be in a format that is compatible with and capable of being opened in the most current Microsoft Office Suite or Adobe Acrobat. The proposal shall have separate files. All spreadsheets shall be in Microsoft Excel format such that each mathematical equation is obvious and traceable. No fields or documents shall be password protected. If files are compressed, the necessary decompression program must be included. All Microsoft Excel files shall be completely readable and editable such that the Government may readily ascertain the validity of the pricing or other data contained therein with no locked cells.

All viewgraphs shall be submitted in Microsoft PowerPoint format. All text and proposal narrative shall be submitted in Microsoft Word format. All schedules shall be submitted in Microsoft Project format. Offerors shall not embed sound or video files into the electronic files. All data and tables shall be submitted in a printable format.

Offerors' proposals submitted via the PIEE Solicitation Module shall not contain CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.

### 2.5 MAJOR SUBCONTRACTOR PROPOSALS

For the purposes of this solicitation, major subcontractors are defined as any subcontractor proposed to perform 20% or more of the total hours under CLINs x009, x010, and x014. However, where otherwise minor subcontractors cumulatively perform more than 60% or more of the total hours under x009, x010, and x014 CLINs, all subcontractors performing under cost-reimbursable arrangements are considered major subcontractors and must propose as such.

Major subcontractors may submit proposals or supporting information directly to the Government. Major subcontractors **shall not** submit proposals by mail, courier, or sealed envelope. All major subcontractors must follow the same submission requirements described in Section L.2.4 for the Prime Offeror and must submit their proposals electronically via the Procurement Integrated Enterprise Environment (PIEE) Solicitation Module.

Major subcontractors shall ensure their PIEE submission is clearly addressed with the RFP number, subcontractor's company name, and the Prime Offeror's company name with whom they are supporting.

Major subcontractors are responsible for submitting their proposals in PIEE by the due date and time listed in Block 9 of the SF 33. The Prime Offeror is responsible for coordinating with its major subcontractors and ensuring all required submissions are completed on time. If any major subcontractor fails to submit its proposal by the deadline, the entire proposal, including the Prime's, may be deemed unacceptable.

Prime Offerors shall identify in Volume IV – Price Proposal any major subcontractor that will submit its proposal separately in PIEE. All subcontractors that do not meet the definition of major subcontractor are minor subcontractors.

## 3.0 PROPOSAL CONTENT REQUIREMENTS

Offerors shall provide the information requested in the following paragraphs in the volumes indicated. Each volume shall be written as a stand-alone to the greatest extent possible, minimizing the amount of cross-references to the other volume. However, cross-referencing within a proposal volume is permitted where its use would conserve space without impairing clarity. If additional information is provided in other volumes or sections, Offerors shall provide clear references to the location in the proposal where the information may be found. Any information required for each Proposal Evaluation Factor, that is not included in its designated volume, will be assumed to have been omitted from the proposal.

An Offeror's proposal shall be sufficiently detailed to enable Government evaluation members to make a thorough evaluation against specific factors established in Section M, and to arrive at a sound determination as to whether or not the prospective Offeror will be able to perform in accordance with the stated requirements. Discussions of each topic in the proposal shall exhibit continuity and logical progression. Data shall be organized to enable Government personnel to thoroughly evaluate the proposal. A concise, legible, neat, orderly and comprehensive proposal is required. The Government does not assume the duty to search for data to cure problems it finds in proposals. Failure to conform to all requirements of this solicitation may form the basis for rejection of the proposal.

The Offeror shall complete the Proposal Cross Reference Matrix, Attachment L-2, mapping the specific sections of the Offeror's proposal to the corresponding subsections of this solicitation, specifically Sections L and M. A cross-reference to the Evaluation Criteria of Section M is for informational purposes only and should not be relied upon as evidence that such Criteria have, in fact, been satisfied. This Attachment will not count toward the proposal page count limits set forth in the RFP. The Offeror may expand upon the Proposal Cross Reference Matrix Attachment L-2 if needed.

### 1.1 VOLUME 1: FACTOR 1 – TECHNICAL APPROACH

**Do not include cost or price information in this volume.** The information contained in this volume shall

enable Government personnel to thoroughly evaluate and arrive at a sound determination of whether or not the proposal meets the requirements of the solicitation. To this end, this volume shall be specific, detailed, and complete enough to demonstrate clearly and fully that the Offeror understands the objectives and has a thorough understanding of the solicitation requirements for accomplishing the efforts under this solicitation and the technologies involved. Proposals may include block diagrams, flow diagrams, sketches, drawings, schematics, and interface descriptions required to describe the Offeror's proposed concept. The technical section must be sufficient to show how the Offeror proposes to comply with the Government's requirements and must include a full explanation of the methodology and procedures to be followed. The Offeror must also identify and evaluate any risks associated with the Offeror's proposed approach and propose mitigation steps to minimize the Government's risk in accepting the Offeror's proposed solution.

The Offeror shall clearly state any and all assumptions made in developing the proposed solution. Attachments J-2 and J-3 provide a complete list of all Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) and Government Furnished Information (GFI) that the Government intends to provide under this contract. The Offeror shall not assume the use of any GFE or GFI not listed in Attachments J-2 and J-3.

The Technical Approach Volume shall address the following elements:

- Element 1: Software Engineering Support Approach
- Element 2: Hardware Engineering Support Approach
- Element 3: Integration Approach
- Element 4: Staffing Plan Approach

### 1.2 ELEMENT 1: SOFTWARE ENGINEERING SUPPORT APPROACH TECHNICAL SOLUTION

The Offeror shall provide a clear and comprehensive description of its software engineering approach—encompassing sustainment, development, and design—and detail the methodology for accomplishing all requirements defined in Section C. This section must include a full explanation of the proposed procedures, a Software Development Plan (SDP) rationale justifying the approach for a multi-platform environment, and an evaluation of associated risks with corresponding mitigation steps. The rationale shall address, at a minimum, Open Architecture (OA), Commonality of Hardware/Software/Firmware and Interfaces, Cybersecurity, and prospective Critical Program Information (CPI) with current protection rationale. Additionally, the Offeror shall describe its approach to providing the Government early and continuous insight into the process, its reuse philosophy to reduce costs and schedules, and its strategy for minimizing inter-component dependencies to improve maintainability and reduce integration risk.

The Offeror shall identify all technical data and software to be delivered and shall submit any assertions of restrictions on the Government's rights in accordance with DFARS 252.227-7017. For each assertion, the Offeror shall:

- Identify the specific data or software to which the assertion applies;
- State the rights category being asserted; and
- Indicate whether the Offeror is willing to provide greater rights (e.g., GPR or Unlimited Rights) and the associated price for the Government to obtain those rights.

The Offeror shall describe how its proposed technical approach ensures compliance with these data-rights requirements and supports the Government's ability to maintain, modify, and sustain Navy ECDIS software

throughout the program lifecycle.

The Offeror shall describe its corporate capability and previous experience in providing complex engineering services, including software design, development, sustainment, detailed technical documentation, and troubleshooting for Navy ECDIS or systems of similar complexity. This demonstration must highlight the specific capabilities and resources used to support testing efforts necessary for Navy ECDIS interfaces. To substantiate software reliability claims, the Offeror shall provide historical metrics as evidence of build stability prior to delivery on previous projects of similar scope.

The Offeror shall demonstrate its ability to manage development, integration, and sustainment across diverse and multiple platforms and interfaces. This description must detail the Offeror's approach to maintaining the configurability and adaptability of software architecture and algorithms while ensuring consistent performance and backward compatibility with all existing variants of Navy ECDIS hardware. The Offeror shall provide specific details on its methodology for sustaining, managing, and controlling a single-source baseline that accommodates multiple integration requirements and simultaneous baselines across all versions of the system.

The Offeror shall provide a software build plan detailing how each build will be planned, developed, integrated, tested, and delivered. The plan shall explain the objectives and content of each build, including features, fixes, and technical-debt items, while defining the planned build schedule and cadence. It shall further detail the development and integration workflow, the automated testing processes and tools utilized prior to integration, and the methods for collecting and analyzing data from pre-integration testing. Finally, the plan must define clear entry and exit criteria for build acceptance and identify all documentation and artifacts that will accompany each delivered build.

The Offeror shall provide a plan for long-term software sustainment and the reduction of life-cycle maintenance costs, including the specific process used to resolve Software Trouble Reports (STRs) within the single-source library. This description must include how STRs are triaged, assigned, tracked, and closed, as well as how fixes are verified and documented. The Offeror shall also explain how STR data is analyzed and applied to improve the quality and stability of future builds.

### 1.3 ELEMENT 2: HARDWARE ENGINEERING SUPPORT APPROACH TECHNICAL SOLUTION

The Offeror shall provide a comprehensive Hardware Engineering, Manufacturing, and Sustainment Plan that covers the entire lifecycle from design and development to production and long-term sustainment. The Technical Proposal must be specific and complete, clearly demonstrating a thorough comprehension of the solicitation requirements and the capability to perform them in accordance with Section C. The Offeror shall describe its overall hardware production and sustainment approach, illustrating the intended method for accomplishing each requirement. Additionally, the Offeror must discuss its relevant corporate experience in performing engineering, integrated manufacturing, and hardware production work of comparable size and complexity to Navy ECDIS, providing this information only as needed to support the proposed technical approach.

The Offeror shall describe its approach to manufacturing engineering and integrated production planning, detailing how it will plan, control, and execute a fully integrated manufacturing effort to meet specified performance requirements. This section must include a manufacturing plan and work flowchart demonstrating throughput and major process activities from contract award through the shipment of the first item,

encompassing inspection, component-level testing, and acceptance testing in compliance with SOW Section 5.2.1. The Offeror shall detail its production line readiness, manufacturing technologies intended for use, and its capability to achieve production schedule goals. Furthermore, the Offeror must describe its process for managing changes or deviations to the Government-provided Technical Data Package (TDP), specifically explaining how Engineering Change Proposals (ECPs) will be evaluated, implemented, and controlled in accordance with SOW Section 3.9.1.3

The Offeror shall detail its material acquisition and control system, explaining how it tracks material orders, monitors delivery status, and utilizes automated features within its management information systems to communicate and resolve identified delays. In accordance with Section F, the Offeror must provide a detailed production schedule for the first delivery of each item—excluded from the page count—showing the timeline in weeks for long lead material procurement, item production, manufacturing acceptance testing, and a Production Readiness Review (PRR) prior to the first production items. The Offeror shall also identify associated schedule and manufacturing risks. For any manufacturing technologies or tasks carrying a medium to high risk of successful completion, the Offeror must provide a detailed risk description, an evaluation of likelihood and consequence regarding cost, schedule, and performance, mitigation steps, contingency plans, and root cause analysis methodologies. The Offeror shall describe the project management control tools used to manage this schedule performance.

The Offeror shall describe its quality management and acceptance test approach to ensure all delivered production systems are of high quality, free of defects, fully operational, and compliant with the Prime Item Development Specification (PIDS). This description must verify the Offeror's test capabilities and clearly explain how the proposed quality management approach meets the requirements of ANSI/ASQC/ISO Q9001:2000 for ensuring the production quality of all delivered systems.

### 1.4 ELEMENT 3: INTEGRATION TECHNICAL SOLUTION APPROACH

The Offeror shall submit a full Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) as Attachment L-3, created in Microsoft Project (.mpp) format, which will be excluded from the page count. Assuming a notional contract award date of 24 Sept 2027, the IMS must be consistent with and traceable to all other proposal parts, meeting the requirements of Section C, paragraph 3.2.3. The schedule shall clearly define the critical path and include all meetings, reviews, and Contract Data Requirements List (CDRL) deliverables required by the SOW. At a minimum, the IMS shall detail at least three subtask levels under each primary task, displaying predecessor and successor mapping. Additionally, the Offeror shall identify any areas of schedule risk within the IMS and provide corresponding mitigation plans.

The Offeror shall describe a non-generic, Navy ECDIS-specific Systems Engineering (SE) and System of Systems (SoS) approach that manages multiple requirement sets, interfaces, and warfare areas. This description must explain how performance and interface requirements are allocated to a balanced system design and flowed down to hardware and software engineering teams. The approach shall demonstrate how the Offeror will manage new or evolving requirements at the SoS level—including coordination with sensor and contact suppliers—and communicate effectively with multiple platform organizations. Furthermore, the Offeror must explain its System Security Engineering (SSE) process for designing a system protected against external threats and vulnerabilities. The Offeror shall demonstrate its operational understanding of Navy ECDIS Program Integrated Product Team (IPT) and Working Group (WG) requirements by detailing how its SE process will dictate role allocation, team selection, and necessary personnel qualifications.

The Offeror shall detail its plan and relevant experience using Computer-Aided Systems Engineering (CASE) or interfacing automated tools to execute a structured SE process. The Offeror must explicitly describe how it will provide the Government with continuous insight and oversight through early design disclosure and direct access to contractor tools, documents, and databases. To support these SE efforts, the Offeror shall explain any planned virtualization of the Navy ECDIS system. Concurrently, the Offeror must demonstrate its ability to manage multiple simultaneous software builds within a single-source library, describing the specific tools and processes utilized to optimize, standardize, and control software development across all system variants.

The Offeror shall provide a Configuration Management Program Plan (CMP) demonstrating its understanding of acquisition CM requirements and detailing its experience successfully initiating programs compliant with SOW Section 3.9.1.1. The proposal shall describe how the implemented CM Program will effectively manage baseline configurations, track design changes, and seamlessly execute the Engineering Change Proposal (ECP) process.

The Offeror shall detail its approach and previous experience regarding the testing of manufactured and Commercial Off-the-Shelf (COTS) products of similar complexity, particularly electronic components. The testing methodology must ensure all submitted items are fully operable, function properly, and meet the specification requirements of the provided or Government-approved revised Technical Data Package (TDP). This approach must comprehensively align with SOW requirements for First Article Testing (Section 5.1.2), Manufacturing Acceptance Testing (Section 5.3.5.2), and Final Acceptance Testing (Section 5.3.5.3).

### 1.5 ELEMENT 4: STAFFING PLAN APPROACH TECHNICAL SOLUTION

The Offeror shall submit a comprehensive Technical and Staffing Proposal that provides sufficient detail to allow the Government to evaluate the proposal in accordance with the evaluation criteria established in Section M. The proposal must be clear, concise, and directly address the execution of the requirements outlined in Section C (Performance Work Statement / Statement of Work).

The Offeror shall submit a detailed Staffing Plan, Attachment L-6, that explicitly demonstrates the Offeror’s ability to successfully meet all requirements of Section C. The Staffing Plan shall describe the Offeror’s methodology for structuring and managing personnel, including how the proposed approach achieves an optimal balance between overall team size, management span of control, and technical support capability. The plan must detail how the Offeror will maintain a fully integrated approach across all task areas to ensure seamless execution.

Within the Staffing Plan, the Offeror must provide a detailed personnel roster that identifies the proportion of proposed named individuals versus unnamed (e.g., "To Be Hired") personnel. The proposal should clearly identify specific personnel who are committed to the effort, distinguishing them from generic labor categories or positions that require future recruiting.

For all Level-of-Effort (LOE) CLINs, the Offeror shall provide a **master labor mix** that includes labor categories, hours, distribution of effort, and the rationale supporting the proposed mix. If the Offeror proposes any deviations from the Government-recommended LOE labor mix, the proposal must explicitly identify and isolate these deviations. The Offeror must clearly identify the deviation and provide a comprehensive narrative analyzing the associated risks and benefits. The Offeror must fully justify why the proposed labor mix and

labor hours are appropriate to accomplish the mission requirements.

The Offeror shall propose a labor mix for all engineering services as described in Section L, paragraph 3.5.1. The response shall include detailed job descriptions that outline the skills, abilities, and levels of experience for all proposed personnel. Additionally, the Offeror shall describe its corporate availability of qualified personnel to ensure the continuous provision of Engineering Services throughout the contract period, detailing a specific plan to recruit and ramp up staffing if necessary.

The Offeror must also include a comprehensive assessment of implementation risks associated with their proposed staffing and technical approach. The proposal must identify potential risks to successful execution, including transition or initial staffing hurdles, and present detailed, actionable mitigation strategies to address and overcome them.

Finally, the Offeror shall clearly articulate the continuity of relevant corporate experience within their proposed workforce. The proposal must identify the extent to which personnel proposed for this contract contributed to the Offeror's previous relevant experience and highlight proposed individuals who have previously supported the hardware and software development efforts of similar size and complexity. The Offeror shall describe these individuals' prior contributions and their planned roles on any resultant contract

### 1.5.1 RECOMMENDED ENGINEERING SERVICES LABOR MIX

Offerors have the latitude to propose the labor mix they believe is best to accomplish the requirements identified within the SOW in a high quality, efficient, and cost-effective manner. Nevertheless, the Government has provided the below labor mix estimate for the engineering services CLINs to serve as a reference for prospective Offerors to better understand the overall distribution of skills throughout this effort. This estimate is based on historical requirements; as such, this estimate will be considered in evaluating proposals.

The Offeror may propose deviations from the estimate recommended labor mixes provided in Table L-2. Any deviations shall be fully explained in the Offeror's proposed Staffing Plan (Attachment L-6). For each instance where the proposed labor mix differs from the Table L-2 estimates, the Offeror shall provide clear rationale describing how and why the proposed labor mix supports a high quality, efficient, and cost-effective solution. Additionally, the Offeror shall include a crosswalk that identifies and explains all deviations at the individual labor category level between the Government recommended labor mix and the Offeror's proposed labor mix. If the Offeror does not clearly justify its deviations, the Government may, for evaluation purposes, adjust the proposed labor mix to align with the recommended labor mix in Table L-2.

For each of the LOE Engineering Services CLINs x009 and x010, the Government strongly recommends Offerors provide the following labor mix:

Table L-2 – Recommended Labor Mix

| Labor Category | | CLIN x009 Labor Mix (SW) | CLIN x010 Labor Mix (HW) | CLIN x014 Labor Mix (Repairs) | CLIN x009 Labor Hours (SW) | CLIN x010 Labor Hours (HW) | CLIN x014 Labor Hours (Repairs) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Program Management | Senior Level | 1.3% | 2% | 2% | 1,040 | 635 | 100 |
| | Mid-Level | 5% | 5% | 5% | 4,000 | 1,588 | 250 |
| | Junior Level | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Administrative | Senior Level | 6.3% | 6.1% | 0% | 5,040 | 1,936 | 0 |
| | Mid-Level | 0% | 0% | 3.1% | 0 | 0 | 155 |
| | Junior Level | 0% | 0% | 3% | 0 | 0 | 150 |
| Engineering | Senior Level | 37.5% | 32% | 16% | 30,000 | 10,160 | 800 |
| | Mid-Level | 22% | 22% | 16% | 17,600 | 6,985 | 800 |
| | Junior Level | 22% | 22% | 22% | 17,600 | 6,985 | 1,100 |
| Engineering Support | Senior Level | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Mid-Level | 3% | 3% | 3% | 2,400 | 953 | 150 |
| | Junior Level | 2.9% | 2.9% | 2.9% | 2,320 | 920 | 145 |
| Production Management & Administration | Senior Level | 0% | 2% | 2% | 0 | 635 | 100 |
| | Mid-Level | 0% | 1% | 10% | 0 | 318 | 500 |
| | Junior Level | 0% | 2% | 15% | 0 | 635 | 750 |
| **Total** | | **100%** | **100%** | **100%** | **80,000** | **31,750** | **5,000** |

**Government Defined Labor Categories**

The Government defined labor categories are as follows:

1. **Program Management, Engineering** (Senior, Mid-level, and Junior)

   **Senior:** a high school degree, or a GED, and more than twenty (20) years of relevant experience, a bachelor's degree in a relevant field and fifteen (15) years of relevant experience, OR a master's degree in a relevant field and ten (10) years of relevant experience.
   **Mid-level:** a high school degree, or a GED, and ten (10) years of relevant experience, OR a bachelor's degree in a relevant field and five (5) years of relevant experience, OR a master's in a relevant field.
   **Junior:** a high school degree, or a GED, and three (3) years of relevant experience, OR a bachelor's degree in a relevant field, OR a master's degree in a relevant field.

2. **Production Management & Administration**, **Engineering Support** (Senior, Mid-level, and Junior)
   **Senior:** a high school degree and at least fifteen (15) years of relevant experience, a bachelor's degree in a relevant field and at least five (5) years of relevant experience, or a master's degree or higher in a relevant field and at least three (3) years of relevant experience.
   **Mid-level:** a high school degree and at least at least five (5) years of relevant experience, or an associate's degree in a relevant field and at least two (2) years of relevant, or a master's degree in a relevant field.
   **Junior:** a high school degree and at least three (3) years of relevant experience or, an associate's

degree in a relevant field and at least one (1) year of relevant experience, or a bachelor's degree in a relevant field.

3. **Administrative** (Senior, Mid-level, and Junior)
**Senior:** a high school degree and at least fifteen (15) years of relevant experience, a bachelor's degree

or higher and at least eight (8) years of relevant experience.
**Mid-level:** a high school degree and at least at least ten (10) years of relevant experience, or an associate's degree in a relevant field and at least two (5) years of relevant experience, or a bachelor's degree and at least five (5) years of relevant experience.
**Junior:** a high school degree and at least three (3) years of relevant experience or, an associate's degree in a relevant field and at least one (1) year of relevant experience, or a bachelor's degree in a relevant field

**NOTE:** The Offeror shall provide a mapping of any company-specific labor categories it, or one of its Subcontractors, proposes in the Staffing Plan to these Government labor categories. This mapping shall include a description, similar in detail to the Government labor categories, of the requirements/qualifications associated with each company-specific labor category contained in the Offeror's Staffing Plan, including company-specific labor categories proposed by subcontractors. Mapping shall be incorporated in the Labor Category Mapping tab in the Staffing Plan.

### 1.6 VOLUME II: FACTOR 2 – MANAGEMENT APPROACH

**Do not include cost or price information in this volume.** The Offeror shall describe their approach and ability to effectively manage all the efforts required by this solicitation for the entire period of performance by providing descriptive narratives to explain the processes, resources and controls that will be implemented to plan, execute, monitor and manage the efforts required by this RFP. The narrative shall be organized into four distinct elements as detailed below:

#### 1.6.1 ELEMENT 1: MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Offeror shall describe the proposed management plan, how it will be implemented, and key features of the management proposal to plan, execute, manage, and support the proposed system. The approach shall describe how the Offeror plans to manage the scope of the contract; and how the Offeror plans to use existing corporate plans, policies, procedures, and proposed organization structure (i.e. Organization Chart) to manage the overall contract work including subcontractors and multiple Technical Instructions. The submission shall incorporate a comprehensive Program Management Plan (PMP) prepared in accordance with CDRL A003, along with corporate policies and governing procedures for scope management, cybersecurity integration, configuration management, and quality oversight. Offerors shall demonstrate their capability to implement and utilize secure online collaborative team environments and automated data exchange mechanisms to facilitate timely deliverable tracking, information sharing, and coordination between the Government and designated contractors. Additionally, the Offeror shall present a metrics-based management framework establishing quantifiable Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) to track planned versus actual schedule, cost, and technical performance across all Contract Line Item Numbers (CLINs).

#### 1.6.2 ELEMENT 2: MANAGEMENT PROCESS:

The Offeror shall describe its management processes relative to cost control, operational efficiencies, and schedule development and maintenance, including its processes for developing, maintaining, and updating the Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) required by CDRL A004. The Offeror shall detail the processes it uses to monitor, track, and control costs, including its demonstrated experience capturing Management Reserve (budget) on Level of Effort (LOE) projects and how Management Reserve is allocated, managed, and applied throughout the period of performance. The Offeror shall detail its processes for increasing efficiency and eliminating duplication of effort across all tasks. Furthermore, the Offeror shall describe its comprehensive

approach to risk identification, prioritization, mitigation, and reporting in accordance with CDRL A010; its methods and procedures for planning and conducting required program meetings, reviews, and technical exchanges; its processes for Government Furnished Property (GFP) accountability, tracking, and reporting; and its Quality Assurance Program Plan (QAPP) in accordance with CDRL A011 and applicable quality standards.

#### 1.6.3 ELEMENT 3: SUBCONTRACTOR MANAGEMENT:

The Offeror shall describe their methods used to monitor and report on all aspects of the subcontractor(s) performance (technical, schedule, and cost). The Offeror shall identify by name and provide a description of the qualifications and experience of the proposed subcontractors as related to the requirement(s) to be performed. The Offeror shall discuss selection processes, contingency plans, management interactions, and risk mitigation in the event of subcontractor turnover during the period of performance.

#### 1.6.4 ELEMENT 4: SMALL BUSINESS:

The Offeror's Small Business Participation Approach shall describe how small business concerns will be utilized to fulfill the contract requirements, including specific scope, complexity and technical areas assigned to each firm. The Offeror shall identify each proposed small business and explain the basis for selection, detailing the tasks, deliverables, or functional areas each subcontractor will perform. The narrative should align with the information provided in the Offeror's Small Business Subcontracting Plan, which may be used to substantiate proposed participation levels and commitments. The submission shall demonstrate meaningful participation by showing how the assigned work contributes to the overall program success and supports the subcontractor's technical capability development. The Offeror shall also state its commitment level to the proposed Small Businesses, including the percentage and dollar value of the total proposed effort allocated to these firms.

For Small Businesses proposing as Prime Contractors, information relative to the overall breakout to subcontracting partners is required under this section.

### 1.7 VOLUME III: FACTOR 3 – PAST PERFORMANCE

**Do not include cost or price information in this volume**. In the Past Performance Volume, the Offeror shall demonstrate through its past performance on efforts of similar size, scope, and complexity that the Offeror will be able to perform the requirements outlined in this solicitation. If possible, the Offeror should provide at least three recent and relevant prior contract efforts. The Offeror shall clearly describe how each prior contract effort is recent and relevant in terms of period of performance, similarity of product/service/support to this solicitation, complexity, dollar value, contract type, and extent of subcontracting/teaming.

The Offeror shall provide information that depicts its depth of past performance and qualifications under contracts that have helped to establish its management and technical capability for the scope of work and variety of skill categories and manning levels proposed to perform work consistent with the size and scope of this requirement. The Offeror shall place particular emphasis on both recent (within five years of the proposal submission date) and relevant current Navy efforts.

The Offeror shall provide a past performance narrative not to exceed five (5) pages in length that addresses the following topics:

- Producing software as well as experience with hardware/software integration.
- Providing sustainment of software or similar mission critical software for surface and subsurface baselines and emergent requirements.
- Ability to produce, maintain, and test interfaces that integrate with ECDIS with surface and submarine combat systems, and mission planning systems, sensor systems, and other shipboard systems and interfaces including radar, navigation, track sources (radar, Automatic Identification System (AIS), Electro-Optic/Infrared (EO/IR)), as well as network-based data exchange and data transfer abilities.
- Approach to DEVSECOPS and how virtualization may benefit the effort.
- Capacity to deliver up to 10 Navy ECDIS software builds annually through the AGILE software process.
- Manufacturing and testing electrical components and electronic circuit card assemblies.
- Production of a hardware suite, which will properly accommodate the Navy ECDIS Software or similar software system.
- Capability to build an ECDIS or similar maritime navigation system at a sustained annual production rate and with the ability to scale production to support increased quantities when required.
- Experience sourcing hardware, negotiating pricing, driving down lead times, correcting issues, and conducting acceptance testing of commercial off the shelf (COTS) items and/or hardware items manufactured to a Government approved TDP specification.
- Preferred approach to systems integration of ECDIS Software and the associated hardware.
- Test evaluation of an integrated product will require at a minimum a Secret facility clearance at the time of contract award.
- Ability to meet Capability Maturity Model Integration (CMMI) Level 3 requirements.
- Ability to meet Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification (CMMC) Level 1 processes.
- As required by DFARS 215.305(a)(2)(A), the Offeror shall provide information on its past performance demonstrating compliance with the requirements of FAR 52.219-8 and FAR 52.219-9.

Additionally, the Offeror must also submit past performance information associated with at least one (1) recent and relevant contract effort for each proposed major subcontractor. The information submitted for each subcontractor shall not exceed two (2) pages in length.

NOTE: As part of the past performance evaluation the Government reserves the right to obtain information from any and all sources, including Contract Performance Assessment Report System (CPARS) ratings, and sources outside the Government, regardless of whether they have been provided by the Offeror as references and from the points of contact identified by the Offeror in its proposal.

The past performance factor will be evaluated as either “Acceptable”, “Neutral”, or “Unacceptable” as described in Section M.

### 1.8 VOLUME IV: FACTOR 4 - COST/PRICE PROPOSAL

In this procurement, the Government will perform a cost realism analysis of each Offeror’s proposed costs for LOE Cost CLINs x009, x010, and x014. The burden of cost credibility rests with the Offeror to demonstrate the realism of its proposed costs; as such, the Offeror must submit substantiating data for every major cost element it proposes (e.g., direct labor rates and hours, material, fringe rate, overhead rate, G&A rate, subcontract costs, etc.) for CLINs x009, x010, and x014.

While the Government reserves the right to rely on other relevant, reliable data in its cost realism analysis of each Offeror’s proposed costs, each Offeror must submit sufficient substantiating data to demonstrate the

realism of each of its proposed major cost elements. If an Offeror fails to provide any of the specifically requested substantiating cost information, the Government may find the Offeror ineligible for award. Moreover, providing insufficient information to substantiate the realism of an Offeror's proposed costs may result in an upward cost adjustment, an assessment of increased proposal risk, and/or a determination that the Offeror is ineligible for award.

The Offeror's proposal should represent its best efforts to respond to the solicitation. The burden of proof as to cost/price credibility rests with the Offeror. Unrealistically low prices may indicate an ina999bility to understand requirements and a high-risk approach to contract performance. Moreover, inconsistencies between cost and pricing information submitted by the prime and cost and pricing information submitted by a subcontractor may indicate a performance or cost risk based on unclear subcontracting agreements or a lack of communication amongst an Offeror's team. Accordingly, the Government may consider such inconsistencies in evaluating an Offeror's ability to perform and the cost risk of its approach.

Volume IV should not discuss the Offeror's proposed technical approach, except as necessary to demonstrate cost realism. If an Offeror discusses its proposed technical approach in Volume IV, it should provide cross-references to the full discussion of the applicable portion of the Offeror's technical approach in the non-cost volume(s).

Each Offeror is required to submit the Cost/Price Proposal separate from the other volumes. Electronic copies of the Cost/Price Volume shall be submitted on separate media, using MS Word or MS Excel. Electronic copies of text and tables must be capable of being edited (not embedded pictures or screenshots) within MS Word or MS Excel.

Offerors are not required to submit certified cost or pricing data. However, after receipt of proposals, it may be determined that adequate price competition does not exist and that certified cost or price data are required. If it is determined that adequate price competition does not exist, Offerors may be required to provide certified current, complete and accurate cost and pricing data within 30 calendar days after receipt of the Contracting Officer's request. In this event, a Certificate of Current Cost or Pricing Data will be required immediately after agreement on cost/price is reached. Submission of certified cost or pricing data is not considered "discussions" under FAR Part 15.

**NOTE**: The Government will not conduct either price realism or cost realism on any FFP CLINs 0001, 0002, x003, x004, x005, x006, x007, x008, x012, or 9800. Where such CLINs are included in the calculation of the Total Evaluated Price (TEP), the Government will use the proposed price for FFP CLINS, after applying the appropriate stepladder quantities (if applicable). Offerors do not need to provide any cost or pricing information for these CLINs besides the information required to complete the SF 33/Section B. Nevertheless, the Government will review the pricing under these CLINs for material balance.

### 1.8.1 TOTAL COST/PRICE BUILD UP

The Offeror shall provide a completed Total Cost/Price Build Up spreadsheet (Attachment L-4). This spreadsheet must have all formulas visible and editable, and the spreadsheet's calculations must comply with the Offeror's proposed accounting and billing practices. If the proposed accounting and billing practices differ in any way from the Offeror's current or approved practices, the Offeror must clearly note these changes in the Cost Narrative (discussed below).

Electronic copies of these tables shall be submitted in MS Excel format and shall have the ability to be edited (hours, rates, etc.) such that the spreadsheet will immediately and automatically calculate the impact of the change(s) to the Total Price via links and formulas native to MS Excel (not an embedded picture within MS Excel).

It is imperative that all electronic pricing spreadsheets submitted under this volume contain functioning, visible, spreadsheet formulas. The Offeror shall ensure that the completed Total Cost/Price Build Up (Attachment L-4) satisfies the following requirements:

- No macros
- No hidden or locked sheets
- Visible and editable formulas
- Editable cells (i.e., not locked)
- All calculation formulas involving rates linked to consolidated rates sheet
- Visibility and traceability into calculation for each cost element
- Traceability of proposed costs to specific CLINs
- Traceability of proposed company labor categories to Government skill mix categories

The Offeror shall ensure that all pricing spreadsheets are properly linked and summarized, and capable of being searched, reproduced, and manipulated. All cells containing derived data shall be presented together with the formulas used to derive the data present and functional. Further, all submitted MS excel files shall be linked to allow for adjustments during cost analysis. Spreadsheet cells may not be linked to cells in other workbooks (i.e., separate files). Failure to comply with this requirement may render the proposal unacceptable.

The Offeror's Cost/Price Build Up workbook (Attachment L-4) shall provide the full cost build-up details for all cost-reimbursement LOE CLINs (x009, x010 and x014). The Offeror shall calculate the hourly cost and fee rate and round to the nearest whole penny for the purposes of re-calculating the final cost/fee. For fixed-price CLINs (0001, 0002, x003, x004, x005, x006, x007, x008, and x012), the workbook shall include entries for each such line item at the total price level for the line item (i.e., without a detailed cost breakdown). Similarly, where the solicitation directs Offerors to propose a required Government estimated value (CLINs x011, x015 and 9800), the Offeror does not need to provide further breakdown of these proposed costs but shall provide details on any adders.

Both the hours and skill mix priced in the Total Cost/Price Build Up spreadsheet must be consistent with the Offeror's proposed BOE (Submitted as Attachment L-5) and Contract-wide Staffing Plan (Submitted as Attachment L-6) and be directly matrixed to the Government provided labor categories. Lack of consistency or traceability between the BOEs, the Total Cost/Price Build Up spreadsheet, the Contract-wide Staffing Plan, and/or any other portion of the Offeror's proposal may result in the Government adjusting the Offeror's proposed costs and/or identifying increased performance risk (cost and/or technical) with the Offeror's proposal.

**MAJOR SUBCONTRACTOR NOTE:** Each of the Offeror's major subcontractors (defined in Section L 2.5 must also provide a completed Total Cost/Price Buildup Spreadsheet (Attachment L-4) for the scope of their subcontract efforts under the cost-reimbursement CLINs (x009, x010, x011, x014, and x015). These subcontractors may submit this information directly to the Government. Failure to have a subcontractor submit its data by the proposal due date and time shall render the entire proposal, including the prime's proposal, non-

responsive, which would make the proposal unawardable.

Minor subcontractor top-line hours and proposed costs must appear in the Prime Offeror's Total Cost/Price Buildup Spreadsheet, Attachment L-4, and subcontractor calculations. The hours listed there must correspond to the hours included in the Prime Offeror's Staffing Plan. Minor subcontractors, however, are not required to submit cost data per the format in the Total Cost/Price Buildup Spreadsheet for their proposed costs nor provide substantiating cost realism data. Nevertheless, any minor subcontractor proposing uncompensated overtime must comply with FAR 52.222-2.

NOTE: From a U.S. Government proposal evaluation perspective, discrepancies between the prime contractor's proposed subcontractor costs or hours and the subcontractors' supporting data or analysis may indicate poor communication between the prime and its subcontractors. Any material mismatch between the Offeror's proposal and the information submitted by subcontractors, particularly as it relates to the subcontractor's allocation of costs or hours, may demonstrate an increased risk of unsuccessful contract performance, which may factor into the Government's evaluation of the Offeror's non-cost/price factors. As such, the Offeror should ensure that, within reasonable rounding errors, the supporting data and analysis their subcontractors provide the Government corresponds to the proposed subcontractor costs or hours.

### 1.8.2 CLIN-SPECIFIC DETAILS:

CLINs 0001, 0002, x003, x004, x005, x006, x007, x008, x012, and 9800 are FFP CLINs. The Offeror shall include Facilities Capital Cost of Money (FCCM) within the proposed price. For the purpose of this solicitation, offerors will assume a maximum quantity of fifty (50) units of any one-part number per ordering period for CLIN series X012.

The Offeror shall propose a Unit Price for each (including stepladders as specified in Section B Note A) of the following Firm Fixed Price CLINS x003, x004, x005, x007, x008, and x012. Offeror's stepladder pricing shall be proposed in the "Stepladder Pricing Table" located in Section B Note A and shall follow the stepladder pricing guidelines therein.

The Offeror shall propose the Unit Price for all Navy ECDIS AN/SYN-1 Hardware Peripheral items CLIN x006 listed in Attachment J-10. Offerors shall enter all stand-alone and integrated pricing for the Base Year and all Option Years in Attachment J-10.

CLINs x009, x010, and x014 are CPFF LOE type CLINs.

CLINs x011 and x015 are Cost Only type CLINs.

CLIN 9900 is Not Separately Priced

### 1.8.3 GOVERNMENT ESTIMATE FOR COST-ONLY OTHER DIRECT COST (ODC)

CLINs x011 and x015 are cost-only (no fee shall be applied). For evaluation purposes, the Offeror shall use the Government Cost Estimate (GCE) provided in the table below as the final fully burdened costs for this CLIN series. The Offeror shall not alter the GCE amounts. The Offeror shall only apply applicable indirect

rates in accordance with its disclosed accounting practices to produce the fully burdened cost to populate Section B of its proposal.

| CLIN | Government Cost Estimate |
|---|---|
| 0011 | $100k |
| 1011 | $100k |
| 2011 | $100k |
| 3011 | $100k |
| 4011 | $100k |
| 0015 | $50k |
| 1015 | $50k |
| 2015 | $50k |
| 3015 | $50k |
| 4015 | $50k |

### 1.8.4 PROPOSED PRICING FOR PIO SPARES ORDERS

CLIN 9800 (PIO) is FFP. For evaluation purposes, the Offeror shall use the GCE provided in the table below as the final fully burdened costs for this CLIN. The Offeror shall not alter the GCE amounts. The Offeror shall only apply applicable indirect rates in accordance with its disclosed accounting practices to produce the fully burdened cost to populate Section B of its proposal.

The proposed profit rate **shall not exceed 6%.** The proposed profit rate will be incorporated into the resulting award and will be applicable to all orders under CLIN 9800.

| CLIN | Government Cost Estimate |
|---|---|
| 9800 | $500k |

### 1.8.5 SUBSTANTIATING COST NARRATIVE AND COST INFORMATION

Offerors shall use this section to substantiate the cost realism of the Total Cost/Price Build Up Spreadsheet (Attachment L-4) for CLINs x009, x010, and x014. This Section shall not replicate the information in the BOEs but must be consistent with the BOEs and shall provide mapping from the "Substantiating Cost Narrative and Cost Information" to the BOEs.

In its cost realism analysis, the Government desires to use the most relevant, reliable data available to capture the probable cost for each major cost element. Since each Offeror bears the burden of demonstrating the realism of its proposed costs, each Offeror must substantiate its proposed costs, as presented in its Total Cost/Price Build Up Spreadsheet Attachment L-4), with relevant, reliable data that demonstrates the realism of each proposed major cost element. The Government has already determined that certain types of information are necessary for its review, so Offerors must provide substantially all of the following information to be eligible for award:

#### 1.8.5.1 RATES:

To substantiate their proposed rates, Offerors shall, at a minimum, submit the following data for the Offeror, any Offeror's subsidiary business units, and major cost reimbursement subcontractors:

a. The current, company-wide highest, lowest, and average hourly direct labor rate actuals for all proposed labor categories. Offerors should describe whether this data includes the impact of uncompensated overtime; if so, Offerors should provide historical data to substantiate any uncompensated overtime claims and provide rates that do not include the impact of uncompensated overtime.

b. Uncompensated Overtime Supporting Documentation: If any Offeror or any subcontractors (major or minor) propose uncompensated overtime, each must comply with FAR 52.222-2. Moreover, if any Offeror or major subcontractor proposes uncompensated overtime or direct labor rates decremented for the impact of uncompensated overtime, it must substantiate the cost reductions associated with its proposed use of uncompensated effort. This substantiation must include a description of the formulas applied to calculate the decremented rate (and/or decrement factor) and some form of historical data to demonstrate that the proposed level of uncompensated overtime is realistic. Such historical data might include the company's historical average annual level of uncompensated overtime from preceding years and/or historical data demonstrating that the company's proposed decremented rates are equal to or greater than historical actual incurred decremented direct labor rates for corresponding labor categories from preceding years, after adjusting them for annual escalation. In accordance with FAR 52.237-10 Identification of Uncompensated Overtime, if uncompensated time is included in the offer or any of the supporting cost data, the uncompensated time should be clearly identified with an explanation as to why it is needed.

c. A list of all Forward Pricing Rate Agreements (FPRA) or Forward Pricing Rate Recommendation (FPRR) that apply to any of the proposed major cost elements or a statement that none apply to the proposal. The Offeror shall include the contact information for the DCMA office that executed the agreement or provided FPRR. Offerors shall provide a current copy of any rate agreement, proposal, or recommendation contained on this list. *NOTE: Offerors shall not rely on any Forward Pricing Rate Proposal to provide any form of cost realism substantiation. Additionally, Provisional Billing Rates (PBRs) are for billing purposes only and should not be used for cost /price proposals. Offerors are cautioned not to rely on these submissions (FPRPs & PBRs), which lack meaningful Government review, as sufficient to demonstrate the realism of its proposed rates.*

d. Five years of actual, incurred rates, associated base volumes, and projected-to-actual data for each proposed indirect and G&A rate. Offerors should indicate the beginning and end dates for the fiscal year applicable to these rates. NOTE: If an Offeror does not have five years' worth of actual, incurred data, it must provide the required information dating from the origin of the company. Offerors and cost-reimbursable subcontractors that offer to contractually cap their indirect rates are not required to provide this information, but the rate cap will be used to calculate the Offeror's Total Evaluated Cost/Price if no other data substantiates a lower indirect rate is realistic. The Government will unilaterally incorporate any proposed rate caps (prime or subcontractor) into the resulting contract at award.

e. Subcontractor Costs: Each major subcontractor shall provide all of the information required of the prime contractor under Section L 3.6.3 of this solicitation (i.e., a complete Attachment L-4, a

corresponding Cost Analysis Narrative, and all necessary Substantiating Cost Information) for those portions of the work subcontracted to them. That said, major subcontractors need not submit a separate Section B pricing; instead, the subcontractor costs should match the corresponding subcontract costs in the Offeror's Total Cost/Price Build Up Spreadsheet. The detailed information of subcontractors may be submitted separately to the Government if the subcontractor does not wish to provide this data to the prime Offeror. Subcontractors must submit their information directly to the Government as described in Section L 2.4.

#### 1.8.5.2 CBOM COSTS:

To support the realism of its proposed material purchases, the Offeror shall provide relevant quotes, recent purchase history, and/or similar substantiating data for each item on the CBOM, with at least 80% of the total proposed material costs supported with applicable quotes or relevant purchase orders. At a minimum, quotes shall include the type of quote (e.g. fixed price, cost reimbursement, etc.) and the Offeror should ensure quotes are recent and specific to this requirement. With respect to prior purchase history, the Offeror should ensure that the history is recent and shall specifically address any impact changes in order quantity will have on unit pricing.

Additionally, Offerors shall specifically address where they propose to purchase more than the required material because of limits on minimum purchase quantities or to receive volume-pricing discounts. Offerors shall expressly describe whether they intend to charge the Government for these additional materials and whether they intend to retain them or deliver them to the Government during performance.

#### 1.8.5.3 ASSUMPTIONS:

In developing its cost estimates for CPFF CLINs only (CLINs x009, x010, and x014) only, Offerors and their subcontractors shall use the following assumptions, which require no additional justification by the Offeror:

(a) Offerors shall assume that less than 10% of the total annual hours will be performed at the Government site and at least 90% of the total annual hours will be performed at Contractor site or subcontracted sites. Offerors shall propose rates according to this breakout.
(b) Escalation: For all cost-reimbursement CLINs, Offerors shall, at a minimum, propose the escalation rates provided in the table below:

| Contract Year | Minimum Direct Labor Escalation Rate |
|---|---|
| Base | 1.33% |
| Option Year 1 | 1.18% |
| Option Year 2 | 1.15% |
| Option Year 3 | 1.45% |
| Option Year 4 | 1.81% |

These escalation rates are derived from IHS Global Insight escalation data for NAICS 334511 and represent the minimum acceptable escalation assumptions for cost realism purposes.

If the Offeror has a current, Government-approved Forward Pricing Rate Agreement (FPRA), the Offeror shall base its proposal on the rates established in that agreement. In such cases, the FPRA rates supersede the minimum escalation rates identified in this section.

The Government will adjust any Offerors' proposed costs that fail to apply these assumptions. Additionally, the Government may identify additional cost or technical risk based on the Offeror's failure to fully understand the impact of these assumptions on their proposed approach.

The above list of substantiating information is necessary for the Government's cost realism analysis but is not a complete list of the data that may be required to demonstrate the realism of the Offeror's proposed rates. Therefore, the agency encourages Offerors to provide additional substantiating information as necessary to demonstrate the cost realism of their proposed costs. Nevertheless, as with any substantiating data, merely providing the substantiating data, without sufficient analysis and explanation of the relevance and reliability of that data in the Cost Analysis Narrative, will not demonstrate cost realism. As discussed in Section L 3.6.1, the Cost Analysis Narrative must clearly explain the reliability of all of the substantiating cost information provided and its relevance to the Offeror's cost analysis. Providing substantiating information, without demonstrating its relevance, may indicate that the Offeror lacks an understanding of the costs involved in performing the solicitation's requirements, which would indicate performance risk.

#### 1.8.5.4 GENERALLY APPLICABLE NOTES

The Substantiating Cost Narrative should identify any other assumptions that the Offeror must make in this analysis to reach its conclusions and justify why these assumptions are reasonable. Unreasonable assumptions or baseless assertions may indicate that the Offeror's proposal lacks cost credibility, cost realism, and/or an understanding of the solicitation requirements. This may result in an upward cost adjustment, an assessment of proposal risk, and/or a determination that the Offeror is ineligible for award.

From a U.S. Government proposal evaluation perspective, fixed-price type subcontracts pose less risk of incorrectly capturing the ultimate cost of the services to the Government than cost-reimbursable contracts. Therefore, the Offeror's Substantiating Cost Narrative need only perform price analysis on the fixed- price cost elements of its proposal to demonstrate that the fixed price elements are fair and reasonable. FAR 15.404-1(b) provides a general discussion of price analysis.

It is the Offeror's sole responsibility to demonstrate the realism and traceability of its supporting documentation to its proposed costs. Any inconsistency between the proposed system, the analysis supporting that design, or the proposed efforts may indicate a lack of understanding of the requirements and/or increased proposal risk. Offerors bear all risk of submitting proposal language that is ambiguous, vague, or lacks traceability between the various portions of the Offeror's proposal.

Each of the Offeror's major subcontractors must also provide a Substantiating Cost Narrative and Cost Information substantiating its Total Cost/Price Build Up (Attachment L-4) for the scope of their subcontract effort under the cost-reimbursement CLINs. These subcontractors may submit this information directly to the Government. Failure to have a subcontractor submit its data by the proposal due date shall render the entire proposal, including the prime's proposal, non-responsive, which would make the proposal unawardable.

## 1.9 VOLUME V –SF 33/COMPLETED CONTRACT

### 1.9.1 COVER LETTER

Volume V of the proposal shall be accompanied by a cover letter prepared on the company's letterhead stationery and shall state the following:

1) The proposal is valid for 365 days following the due date for receipt of proposals
2) Offeror's Cage Code and DUNS Number
3) All enclosures transmitted with the proposal submission
4) The approved security clearance and clearance level of storage capability for the Offeror's facility
5) Address and point of contact for the Offeror's cognizant security office
6) Name of the Offeror's security representative
7) Address(es) of the location(s) at which the Offeror intends to perform the proposed effort including subcontractor facilities
8) Name, telephone number, and electronic mail address of the Offeror's assigned DCAA Auditor (if assigned);
9) Name, telephone number, and electronic mail address of the Offeror's assigned DCMA Administrative Contracting Officer (if assigned);
10) Table of Contents and Glossary
11) A table providing the company name, address, DUNS, CAGE code, and point of contact for any Major Subcontractors included in the proposal

In addition, the letter must contain the following certification regarding the classified and other restricted information made available to the Offeror for the purpose of responding to this solicitation:

> I, [*insert signatory's name, title, company*], hereby certify that within 120 days of receipt of notification that [*company*] has been excluded from the competitive range or has not been selected for award of this contract, [company] will destroy any and all copies, notes, or other materials produced using the classified or other restricted information provided in connection with solicitation N00024-26-R-5246.

The Government will evaluate the cover letter to confirm that it contains the required information.

If the Offeror wishes to restrict the disclosure or use of its proposal, use the legend permitted by FAR 52.215-1(e). The Offeror's cover letter shall be placed at the beginning of Volume V after the title page.

### 1.9.2 SF 33 SOLICITATION, OFFER, AND AWARD

The SF 33(s) must be completed entirely by the Offeror. Common mistakes include: (1) failing to complete all of blocks 12-18 on the first page, (2) failing to list pricing for all Contract Line Items (CLINs) and stepladder quantities in Section B, and (3) failing to fully complete Section K. The Offeror shall provide a completed SF 33 and a copy of the solicitation (and attachments) with all contractor fill-ins complete. The Offeror's completed Section B shall include all proposed costs and fees.

Changes to any portion of the SF 33 not specifically requiring the input of information by the Offeror are prohibited. Red-lines, strikethroughs, additions, deletions, or any other changes not specifically required will be considered conditional agreement with solicitation terms, conditions, and provisions. An Offeror's proposal which changes any portion of the SF 33 not specifically requiring the input of information by the Offeror may be rejected, and the Offeror furnishing the proposal may be determined ineligible for award.

### 1.9.3 SOLICITATION SECTION A

The solicitation SF 33 will be used to award a contract resulting from this solicitation. The Offeror shall complete Blocks 12 through 18 of the SF 33. The Offeror shall submit an executed SF 33 bearing the original signature of a representative who is authorized to contractually bind the company submitting the offer. The Offeror shall also submit a signed copy of the SF 30 cover page for each amendment to the solicitation. As with the SF 33, the representative who signs the SF 30 cover page(s) must be authorized to contractually bind the company submitting the offer. Block 12 shall be completed to align with the solicitation validity period (365 days following the proposal due date) required by Section L 3.9.1 of this solicitation.

### 1.9.4 SOLICITATION SECTIONS B THROUGH I

The Offeror shall submit Sections B through I with all appropriate information completed as required by the solicitation

### 1.9.5 SOLICITATION SECTION J

The Offeror shall provide the following completed exhibits and attachments, which will be incorporated into the contract at award:

- Exhibit A , Contract Data Requirements List (CDRL), DD Form 1423
- Supplement A1, Technical Data Package (TDP) Option Selection Worksheet
- Attachment J-1 DD Form 254
- Attachment J-4 Spares Price List
- Attachment J-5 Small Business Subcontracting Plan (formatted IAW FAR 52.219 requirements)
- Attachment J-6 DFARS 252.227-7017 Data Rights Assertions List (Hardware)
- Attachment J-7 DFARS 252.227-7017 Data Rights Assertions List (Software)
- Attachment J-8 DFARS 252.227-7028 Data Rights Assertions List
- Attachment J-9 Commercial Technical Data (TD), Commercial Computer Software (CS), or Commercial
  Computer Software Documentation (CSD) – Government Use Restrictions
- Attachment J-10 Note B Table 2A-2D
- Attachment J-12 Terms of Use Agreement

### 1.9.6 SOLICITATION SECTION K

The Offeror shall complete and submit applicable provisions under the Representation, Certifications and Other Statements of Offerors section of the solicitation. Offerors shall mark items that are not applicable with "N/A."

If the Offeror's Representations, Certifications, and Other Statements of Offerors are available, active, and valid in the System for Award Management (SAM) (https://www.sam.gov); the Offeror may reference them in the Cover Letter and decline to complete the portions of Section K of the SF 33 which are already present in SAM. The Offeror bears the burden of: (1) ensuring all information referenced in SAM is current accurate, and complete; and (2) ensuring any necessary information not present in SAM is provided within the Offeror's proposal.

### 1.9.7 SECTION L ATTACHMENTS

The Offeror shall utilize the following Section L attachments in the preparation of their proposal. Offerors must complete and submit, or develop and provide, each attachment as indicated in the table below:

- L-1 Question Submittal Form (Completed by Offeror If Applicable)
- L-2 Proposal Cross Reference Matrix (Completed by Offeror)
- L-3 Integrated Master Schedule (Provided by Offeror)
- L-4 Total Cost/Price Build Up spreadsheet (Completed by Offeror)
- L-5 Basis of Estimate (Provided by Offeror)
- L-6 Contract-wide Staffing Plan (Provided by Offeror)
- L-7 Software Development Plan (Provided by Offeror)
- L-8 Contractor Award Announcement Information (Completed by Offeror)
- L-9 Sections L and M
- L-10 Infocenter Account Request Form (Completed by Offeror)
- L-11 TOUA Master Copy Log for Solicitation N00024-26-R-5246

### 1.9.8 PRESS RELEASE INFORMATION

The Offeror shall complete Attachment L-7 and return a copy with the offer. The information provided in the form will be used to prepare a press release for a contract award per DFARS 205.303, if applicable.

## 1.10 SUBMISSION OF OFFER

The proper completion and submission to the Government of the SF 33 Solicitation Set/Completed Contract shall constitute an offer and indicate the Offeror's unconditional assent to the terms and conditions in this solicitation and in any attachments hereto. Any objection to any of the terms and conditions of this solicitation may constitute a deficiency, which may make the offer unacceptable. Offerors are notified that the Government's acceptance of an offer does not imply acceptance of the pricing rationale or assumptions.

## 1.11 CONTRACT UPDATES REQUIRED TO SUPPORT AWARD

Prior to award, the Government will update the completed contract to generate a document suitable for contract award. These updates will include assigning the contract number and reformatting the contract document for entry into the Government contract-writing system, which may result in repagination of the document. The Government will pre-populate the contract pricing for Section B stepladder option line items using the highest stepladder quantity and unit price (the actual quantity and price for each line item will be established at the time of option exercise based on the terms and conditions of the contract). The Offeror agrees that the Government may incorporate these updates, as well as the others noted in this solicitation, unilaterally prior to award

**Section M - Evaluation Factors for Award**

**1.0 GENERAL**

All proposals will be evaluated for compliance with the terms, conditions and requirements set forth in this solicitation. The proposal must demonstrate to the Government that the Offeror will satisfy all requirements for each evaluation factor. The Government will evaluate each factor on a stand-alone basis; however, proposal information provided for one factor may be used to assist the Government in evaluating other factors. The Government will reject as non-compliant any proposal that takes exception to the terms and conditions in the solicitation.

**IMPORTANT:** All security requirements will be evaluated in accordance with Attachment J-1. In order to be considered for contract award under this procurement, the Offeror shall possess a Defense Security Service **SECRET** facility clearance with **SECRET** personnel clearances and **SECRET** safeguarding capability, all issued by the United States Government, at the time of proposal submission. In addition to these requirements, the Offeror must have access to or maintain a dedicated **SECRET** Test Facility. The Government reserves the right to visit the Offeror and any subcontractor's facility upon request. **SECRET** facility physical construction must meet the requirements as defined in DoD 5205.07-M Vol 3.

The Offeror (and any subcontractors performing SECRET-level work) shall not be:

- Under foreign ownership or control
- Under a special security agreement
- Restricted in access to Compartmented Information, Cryptographic Materials or Systems, Restricted Data, or Formerly Restricted Data.

The Government will evaluate each Offeror's understanding of the requirements described in this solicitation and ability to perform the work on the basis of its proposal and the solicitation evaluation criteria. It is the Offeror's responsibility to provide information and evidence that clearly demonstrates its ability to satisfactorily perform the contract requirements in accordance with the factors outlined herein. All information submitted as part of the proposal will be used to evaluate the Offeror's capability to perform and understanding of the contract requirements.

The Government reserves the right to change any of the terms and conditions of this solicitation by amendment at any time prior to contract award and to allow Offerors to revise their offers as authorized by FAR 15.307.

The Government plans to award a single contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible Offeror whose proposal offers the best value to the Government. The Government reserves the right to award no contracts at all depending upon the quality of proposals received and the availability of funds.

Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements, including terms and conditions and representations and certifications (Section K) and to provide all information required by Section L of this solicitation. Failure to comply with all of the solicitation requirements may result in the removal of the Offeror from consideration for award.

Offerors are advised that technical proposals may be evaluated without consideration of any proposed subcontractor which is deemed to have an organizational or personal conflict of interest.

The Government reserves the right to eliminate from the competition any proposal determined to be unacceptable. To be acceptable, the offer must manifest the Offeror's assent, without exception, to the terms and conditions of the Request for Proposal (RFP), including attachments. **An "Unsatisfactory" or "Unacceptable" rating for any factor may result in the entire proposal being found unacceptable**.

## 2.0 EVALUATION FACTORS AND RELATIVE ORDER OF IMPORTANCE

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposal in accordance with the following factors:

| Evaluation Factor | Proposal Content | Evaluation Method | Section M References |
|---|---|---|---|
| Factor 1 | Volume I - Technical Approach | Adjectival | M 3.0 |
| Factor 2 | Volume II - Management Approach | Adjectival | M 4.0 |
| Factor 3 | Volume III - Past Performance | Acceptable/Unacceptable | M 5.0 |
| Factor 4 | Volume IV - Cost/Price Proposal | Total Evaluated Cost/Price (TEC/P) | M 6.0 |

**Relative Order of Importance:**

- Factor 1 (Technical Approach) is more important than Factor 2 (Management Approach). Factor 3 (Past Performance) will be rated on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis.

- Factors 1 and 2, when combined, are significantly more important than Factor 4 (Total Evaluated Cost/Price).

- However, as competing proposals approach equality in the non-cost factors (Factors 1 and 2), the significance of the TEC/P (Factor 4) as an evaluation factor will increase.

- Within Factor 1 and 2, the solicitation specifies a set of elements. Elements serve as a means of organizing the proposal structure and streamlining the evaluation process. Elements are not sub-factors and, as such, the Government will not assign separate ratings to individual elements.

## 3.0 FACTOR 1: TECHNICAL APPROACH

Under Factor 1, the Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed technical approach from all aspects of the proposal submissions as required in Section L to assess the extent to which the Offeror's proposal demonstrates an adequate approach, understanding, capabilities and experience to perform the entirety of the work under this solicitation.

The Government will assign a single adjectival rating to Factor 1. The evaluation will assess the totality of the Offeror's Technical Approach as submitted in Volume I, and will assess the Offeror's demonstrated understanding, methodology, feasibility, and capability to perform **all requirements of Section C**.

The Government's evaluation will consider the Offeror's approach across all four required elements identified in Section L:

(1) Software Engineering Approach

The Government's evaluation will consider, at a minimum:

- The Offeror's software sustainment, development, and design methodology, including its Software Development Plan (SDP) rationale for a multi-platform environment.
- The Offeror's approach to Open Architecture, interface commonality, cybersecurity, CPI protection, and reduction of inter-component dependencies.
- The Offeror's strategy for early and continuous Government insight, reuse philosophy, and single-baseline management across multiple variants.
- The completeness and accuracy of data-rights assertions submitted under DFARS 252.227-7014 (noncommercial computer software) and 252.227-7017 (identification and assertion of restrictions), including the degree to which the Offeror's proposed rights structure reduces Government sustainment risk.
- The Offeror's ability to manage STR triage, tracking, closure, verification, and application of STR analytics to improve future build stability.
- The feasibility and clarity of the Offeror's software build plan, including entry/exit criteria, automated testing, integration workflow, and documentation deliverables.

Offerors providing greater data rights (GPR or Unlimited Rights) or demonstrating ECDIS-specific software experience may be evaluated more favorably for this element. Failure to provide required data rights information may result in an unacceptable rating for Factor 1.

(2) Hardware Engineering Approach

The Government's evaluation will consider, at a minimum:

- The Offeror's hardware engineering, manufacturing, and sustainment plan, including production readiness, throughput, and compliance with Section C hardware requirements.
- The Offeror's approach to manufacturing engineering, production line readiness, long-lead procurement, material control, and TDP change management (including ECP/RFV processes).
- The Offeror's identification of manufacturing risks, likelihood/consequence analysis, and detailed mitigation and contingency planning.
- The Offeror's quality assurance and acceptance test approach, including MAT, FAT, FCA/PCA, and compliance with ANSI/ISO/ASQ 9001.

(3) Integration Approach.

The Government's evaluation will consider, at a minimum:

- The completeness, traceability, and feasibility of the Offeror's Integrated Master Schedule (IMS), including critical path identification and alignment with Section C 3.2.3.
- The Offeror's Systems Engineering (SE) and System-of-Systems (SoS) approach, including requirements allocation, interface management, coordination with external system providers, and SoS-level change management.
- The Offeror's System Security Engineering (SSE) approach for protecting Navy ECDIS against external threats and vulnerabilities.
- The Offeror's use of CASE tools, virtualization, and automated SE processes to provide early Government insight and maintain configuration control.
- The Offeror's ability to manage multiple simultaneous software builds within a single-source library.
- The Offeror's Configuration Management Program Plan (CMP) and demonstrated understanding of CM requirements in Section C 3.9.1.1.

- The Offeror's approach to testing manufactured and COTS components, including compliance with First Article Testing, MAT, and FAT requirements.
- The completeness and accuracy of assertions submitted under DFARS 252.227-7013 Technical Data (noncommercial).

(4) Staffing Plan Approach

The Government's evaluation will consider, at a minimum:

- The completeness and feasibility of the Offeror's Staffing Plan (Attachment L-6) and its ability to support all Section C requirements.
- The Offeror's methodology for team structure, span of control, and integrated execution across software, hardware, and integration domains.
- The Offeror's labor mix rationale, including justification for any deviations from the Government recommended mix in Table L 2.
- The Offeror's identification of named vs. unnamed personnel, continuity of corporate experience, and availability of qualified personnel.
- The Offeror's identification of staffing risks and detailed mitigation strategies.
- The Offeror's proposed hardware engineering labor mix, personnel qualifications, and ability to support required production capacity.

The elements **are not** individually weighted and are evaluated as a whole under Factor 1. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's supporting rationale for any statements relating to proposed performance and the ability to meet the delivery schedule. No assumptions will be made by evaluators regarding areas that are not addressed in the Offeror's written proposal.

## 4.0 FACTOR 2: MANAGEMENT APPROACH

The Government will assign a single adjectival rating to Factor 2. The evaluation will assess the totality of the Offeror's Management Approach as submitted in Volume II and will determine the extent to which the Offeror demonstrates a comprehensive, feasible, and integrated management structure capable of executing all requirements of Section C. The Government's evaluation will consider, at a minimum, the Offeror's approach across the four required elements identified in Section L:

(1) Management Plan

The Government's evaluation will consider, at a minimum:

- The Offeror's plan to establish and maintain a fully staffed Program Management Office (PMO) aligned with Section C requirements.
- The clarity and feasibility of the Offeror's Program Management Plan (PMP) in accordance with CDRL A003.
- The Offeror's approach to cybersecurity, configuration management, and quality oversight.
- The effectiveness of the Offeror's metrics-based management framework for monitoring planned versus actual performance across all CLINs.

(2) Management Process

The Government's evaluation will consider, at a minimum:

- The Offeror's approach to cost and schedule including the Offeror's processes for schedule development and maintenance, including the Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) required by CDRL A004.

- The Offeror's approach to risk identification, prioritization, mitigation, and reporting in accordance with CDRL A010.
- The Offeror's methods for conducting required meetings, reviews, and technical exchanges; the Offeror's approach to Government Furnished Property (GFP) accountability and reporting.
- The Offeror's Quality Assurance Program Plan (QAPP) in accordance with CDRL A011 and applicable standards.

(3) Subcontractor Management

The Government's evaluation will consider, at a minimum:

- The Offeror's subcontractor management plan, including selection criteria, surveillance methods, performance metrics, communication protocols, and corrective action processes.
- The Offeror's ability to conduct monthly subcontractor performance reviews and maintain documented oversight records.
- The Offeror's integration of subcontractor risks into the Risk Management Plan and IMS.
- The Offeror's compliance with Government attendance rights at subcontractor meetings as required by Section C.
- The Offeror's approach to managing GFP, security, and export-control requirements across all subcontractor tiers.

(4) Small Business

The Government's evaluation will consider, at a minimum:

- The Offeror's Small Business participation strategy, including the realism, feasibility, and effectiveness of the Offeror's approach to meeting or exceeding small business subcontracting goals.
- The Offeror's identification of meaningful roles for small business concerns.
- The Offeror's methods for ensuring small business participation contributes substantively to contract performance rather than serving as nominal or administrative involvement.

Offerors proposing Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB) participation levels that exceed the Congressionally mandated five percent (5%) goal may be evaluated more favorably, provided the proposed workshare is realistic, traceable to Section C requirements, and supported by credible commitments.

The elements above are not individually weighted and will be evaluated collectively under Factor 2. A deficiency or combination of significant weaknesses in any element may result in an Unacceptable rating. No assumptions will be made by evaluators regarding areas not addressed in the Offeror's written proposal.

## 5.0 FACTOR 3: PAST PERFORMANCE

The Government will evaluate this factor on an acceptable/unacceptable basis. The Government will evaluate whether the Offeror's proposal demonstrates an acceptable approach to meeting the solicitation requirements based on the elements set forth in Section L. The Government will evaluate whether the Offeror meets the past performance criteria outlined in Section L. Failure to meet the past performance criteria will result in an unsatisfactory rating for past performance. The Government reserves the right to not perform a Past Performance evaluation on any Offeror that is assigned an "Unacceptable" or "Marginal" rating under any other factor.

This assessment will be based on a demonstrated record of past performance, taking into consideration the recency and relevancy of the past performance data. The Government shall also evaluate the past performance

of an Offeror's proposed subcontractors. In the investigation of an Offeror's past performance, the Government reserves the right to contact former customers, Government agencies and other private and public sources of information.

In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available or so sparse that no meaningful past performance rating can be reasonably assigned, the Offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance (see FAR 15.305 (a)(2)(iv)). Therefore, the Offeror shall be determined to have unknown past performance. In the context of acceptability/unacceptability, unknown past performance shall be considered acceptable. The evaluation will include information provided by the Offeror demonstrating compliance with the requirements of FAR 52.219-8 and 52.219-9.

## 6.0 FACTOR 4: TOTAL EVALUATED COST/PRICE

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed costs and prices by calculating a Total Evaluated Cost/Price (TEC/P) that the Government will use in making the award determination. The Government will not conduct price realism on any CLINs. Evaluation of the options will not obligate the Government to exercise any option. The Government will determine a Total Evaluated Price to the Government for each offer by adding together the following values:

(1) Total Evaluated Price for FFP CLINs 0001, 0002
(2) Total Evaluated Price from Random Selections under FFP CLINs x003, x004, x005, x006, x007, x008, x012
(3) Total Evaluated Cost for CPIF LOE CLINs x009, x010, x014
(4) Total Cost specified in the solicitation for Cost CLINs x011, x015
(5) Total Price specified in the solicitation for FFP CLIN 9800
NOTE: CLIN x013 is RESERVED and not marked above

**Offerors are advised that the Government may not conduct a cost realism analysis or calculate a TEC/P for an offer that is "Unacceptable" or "Marginal" or is otherwise non-responsive in any non-price factor.**

### 6.1.1 COST-REIMBURSEMENT LOE CLINS (CLINS X009, X010, AND X014)

**6.1.1.1** For the cost-reimbursement CLINs, the Government will perform an analysis of the cost realism and completeness of the cost data and the traceability of the proposed cost to the Offeror's approach under the non-cost factors. Pertinent substantiating cost information, including but not limited to, historical data or DCAA and/or DCMA recommended rates for such costs as direct labor, overhead, G&A, etc., as necessary and appropriate, will be used to arrive at the Government's determination of the probable cost to be incurred in the performance of this contract.

**6.1.1.2** To calculate the evaluated cost for each CLIN (i.e., the probable cost to the Government of the Offeror's proposed approach for that year), the Government intends to use cost estimates supported by relevant cost realism substantiating data, including, but not limited to: 1) historical substantiating data (e.g., recently-paid payroll screenshots and prior-years' actual indirect rates); 2) Forward Pricing Rate Agreements (FPRAs), Forward Rate Pricing Recommendations (FPRRs); 3) and contractual rate caps. If any of the Offeror's proposed costs are considered to be unrealistically low based on all available

relevant substantiating data, the Government will use higher costs supported by relevant substantiating data in calculating the TEC/P. If an Offeror does not submit cost realism substantiating data for a cost element, the Government may accept the rates as proposed but may document increased cost realism risk.

**6.1.1.3** Additionally, Offerors should note that the fundamental purpose of a cost realism analysis is to guard the agency against unsupported claims of cost savings by determining whether the costs as proposed represent what the Government realistically expects to pay for the proposed effort. Therefore, the Government will closely evaluate whether and to what degree each Offeror's proposed costs are unrealistically low. In a competitive environment, the Government will not evaluate whether proposed cost elements are unrealistically high. It is the Offeror's sole responsibility to demonstrate that its proposed costs are realistic because they are substantiated by actual incurred data or are fixed/capped by contract.

**6.1.1.4** Any inconsistencies between proposed technical performance and cost, whether real or apparent, should be explained in the supporting cost data section. The burden of proof for cost credibility rests with the Offeror. Offerors are cautioned that to the extent proposed costs appear unrealistic; the Government may infer either a lack of understanding of the requirements, increased performance or cost risk, or lack of credibility on the part of the Offeror. In addition, proposals which are unrealistic in terms of technical or schedule commitments or unrealistically low in cost may be deemed reflective of an inherent lack of technical competence or indicative of a failure to comprehend the complexity and risks of the proposed work. In sum, the burden of proof for cost credibility and realism rests with the Offeror; therefore, Offerors are cautioned to ensure that its proposed costs are easily traceable to their proposed technical approach and are supported by cost realism substantiating data.

**6.1.1.5.** In Section L 2.5 of this solicitation, the Government defines minor subcontractors; considering the small potential cost impact of variations in minor subcontractor costs, the Government will not conduct a detailed cost realism analysis of any Offeror's minor subcontractor costs. Nevertheless, the Navy will review these proposed costs and hours for consistency with the rest of the Offeror's proposal and may adjust minor subcontractor cost or hours for lack of consistency with the rest of the Offeror's proposal. Similarly, the Government will not conduct a detailed cost realism analysis of any Firm-Fixed Price or T&M subcontractors, as these subcontracting arrangements do not present a meaningful cost risk in performance. The Government will evaluate any proposed Fixed-Price Incentive Fee contractors at ceiling without conducting a detailed cost realism of those subcontract costs.

**6.1.1.6** The Government reserves the right to consider reasonable and realistic substantiating data from any other sources. Such sources include, but are not limited to: historical performance data from NAVSEA contracts, information from DCAA, and information from DCMA. If Offerors are aware of any contradictory cost data, particularly recent audits or performance data that indicate higher costs than their proposed costs, Offerors should explain why the substantiating data they provide is a more realistic estimate of the costs they would incur during performance than the contradictory data. Nevertheless, the Government is under no obligation to identify and use any cost realism data other than that provided by the Offeror, including any it already possesses. Offerors are cautioned that the burden of cost credibility rests with them.

### 6.1.2 FIXED PRICE CLINS (CLINS 0001, 0002, X003, X004, X005, X006, X007, X008, X012 AND 9800)

The Government will not conduct cost or price realism on any Firm Fixed Price CLINs (CLINs 0001, 0002, x003, x004, x005, x006, x007, x008, x012, and 9800). For those items with stepladder quantities - CLINs x003, x004, x005, x007, x008, and x012 - the Government will use a predetermined (but not disclosed to Offerors) quantity within the range of stepladder quantities to evaluate each CLIN and will evaluate that quantity that includes the fully burdened fixed price unit price (unit cost plus profit). The selected predetermined quantity within the range of stepladder quantities may be different between CLINs. The unit price for the predetermined selected stepladder quantity for each CLIN listed in this paragraph will be used in the calculation of the GTEP. The amount used in the calculation of the GTEP will be the Offeror-proposed unit price multiplied by the Government predetermined quantity.

**6.1.2.1** The evaluated price for CLINs 0001 and 0002 will be determined by adding the proposed prices of the CLINs.

**6.1.2.2** CLINs x003, x004, and x005 are comprised of three (3) AN/SYN configurations and CLINs x007 and x008 are comprised of two (2) Navy ECDIS Tech Refresh Hardware SIBS node part numbers (See Note A, Tables 1 - 5). The Government has determined that for CLINs x003, x004, and x005, it is just as likely that any of the three (3) configurations at their respective stepladder quantities will be exercised and for CLINs x007 and x008 the Government has determined it is just as likely that any of the two (2) parts at their respective stepladder quantities will be exercised. Therefore, for purposes of evaluation only, the Government will randomly select an evaluation quantity for each of the three (3) AN/SYN configurations and for each of the two (2) Hardware SIBS node parts. The total evaluation quantity for each AN/SYN configuration will not exceed twenty (20) units for that configuration and the total evaluation factor for Navy ECDIS Tech Refresh Hardware SIBS node part will not exceed five (5).

The Government will use these evaluation quantities to calculate the extended price for each configuration which will then be summed to calculate the extended price for each CLIN for all Offerors. The Government will follow the steps in Section B, Note A (Tables 1- 5) and Section L, to determine the Offeror’s proposed unit price at the random stepladder quantity for each configuration.

The selection of the random quantities is for evaluation purposes only and does not obligate the Government to exercise an option at the selected random quantities or configurations. The evaluated price for these CLINs will be determined by summing the extended CLIN prices at the randomly selected evaluation quantities for each configuration. The randomly selected quantities will not be disclosed to Offerors prior to contract award.

For CLINs x003, x004, x005, x007 and x008, the Government will develop an evaluated price based on the following steps for evaluation purposes only:

Step 1: The Government will randomly select a stepladder quantity for each of the three (3) AN/SYN

configurations and for each of the two (2) Hardware SIBS node parts.

Step 2: The Government will multiply the evaluated quantity (EQ) for each AN/SYN configuration and Hardware SIBS node parts by the unit price associated with it.

Step 3: The Government will sum the total of each of the three (3) AN/SYN configurations and the two (2) Hardware SIBS node parts to obtain the evaluated price for each CLINs X003, X004, X005, X007 and X008.

Example for AN/SYN:

Steps 1 and 2:

Evaluated Quantity (Note A - Table 1, Navy ECDIS AN/SYN – 1 (v1) Hardware) = 4

| Stepladder Quantity | * | Price | = | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | * | $1,500 | = | $0 |
| 2 – 4 | * | $1,400 | = | $5,600 |
| 5 – 8 | * | $1,200 | = | $0 |
| 9 – 12 | * | $1,100 | = | $0 |
| 13+ | * | $1,000 | = | $0 |
| | | | Total: | $5,600 |

Evaluated Quantity (Note A - Table 1, Navy ECDIS AN/SYN – 1 (v2) Hardware) = 1
Stepladder Quantity * Price = Total

| Stepladder Quantity | * | Price | = | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | * | $1,500 | = | $1,500 |
| 2 – 4 | * | $1,400 | = | $0 |
| 5 – 8 | * | $1,200 | = | $0 |
| 9 – 12 | * | $1,100 | = | $0 |
| 13+ | * | $1,000 | = | $0 |
| | | | Total: | $1,500 |

Evaluated Quantity (Note A - Table 1, Navy ECDIS AN/SYN – 1 (v3) Hardware) = 10

| Stepladder Quantity | * | Price | = | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | * | $1,500 | = | $0 |
| 2 – 4 | * | $1,400 | = | $0 |
| 5 – 8 | * | $1,200 | = | $0 |
| 9 – 12 | * | $1,100 | = | $11,000 |
| 13+ | * | $1,000 | = | $0 |
| | | | Total: | $11,000 |

Step 3:
Evaluated Price for AN/SYN: $5,600 + $1,500 + $11,000 = $18,100

**6.1.2.3** CLIN x006 - For each Note B peripheral item listed in Attachment J-10 Tables 2A–2D, Offerors shall propose unit prices for two configurations:

- A stand-alone configuration (Table 2A), and
- An integrated configuration (Tables 2B–2D for V1, V2, or V3).

The Government has determined that either configuration is equally likely to be exercised during the Period of Performance. Therefore, for evaluation purposes only, the Government will randomly select one of the two offered configurations for each Note B item.

The price will be added to the evaluated price of the CLIN associated with the selected configuration:

- If the stand-alone configuration is selected → the price is added to CLIN X006.
- If the integrated configuration is selected → the price is added to the corresponding AN/SYN-1 Hardware CLIN:
  - V1 → CLIN X003
  - V2 → CLIN X004
  - V3 → CLIN X005

The evaluated total for each CLIN will be the sum of all prices applicable to that CLIN.

Example Offeror's Proposed Prices:

- Integrated V1 (Table 2B)
  - K7390 = $2,000
  - 426 = $500
- Stand-alone (Table 2A)
  - J7075 = $1,000
- CLIN X003 evaluated price = $5,600

Add to Applicable CLINs

- Integrated items → CLIN X003
  - Evaluated Price CLIN X003 = $5,600 + ($2,000 + $500) = $8,100

- Stand-alone items → CLIN X006
  - Evaluated Price CLIN X006 = $1,000

**6.1.2.4** CLIN x012 The ECDIS-N Systems Spares CLINs are comprised of multiple spreadsheets contained in Attachment J-04 ECDIS-N Systems Spares. Each spreadsheet includes spare parts with stepladder pricing. The Government has determined that it is just as likely that any spare part listed in any spreadsheet may be ordered. Because the Government seeks reasonable and balanced pricing, the Government will randomly select a percentage of spare parts and stepladder quantities for evaluation.

The selection of parts and quantities is for evaluation purposes only and does not obligate the Government to exercise an option at the randomly selected parts or quantities. The evaluated price for the ECDIS-N Systems Spares CLINs will be determined using the following steps.

Evaluation Method

For each spreadsheet in Attachment J-04 ECDIS-N Systems Spares, the Government will develop an evaluated price based on the following steps:

Step 1:
The Government will randomly select twenty percent (20%) of the spare parts listed in the spreadsheet, not to exceed ten (10) unique parts per spreadsheet and not to include duplicative spares.

Step 2:
For each selected part, the Government will randomly select a stepladder quantity from the quantity ranges provided (e.g., Qty 1, Qty 2–5, Qty 6+).

Step 3:
The Government will multiply the evaluated quantity for each selected part by the unit price associated with the selected quantity range.

Step 4:
The Government will sum the extended prices of all selected spare parts within each spreadsheet to calculate an evaluated price for that spreadsheet. The Government will then sum the evaluated prices of all spreadsheets within Attachment J-04 to determine the Total Evaluated Price for the ECDIS-N Systems Spares CLINs

Example

Step 1:
Example Randomizer Output (for evaluation only):

- Item SSD Drive (Hard Drive) 7050-01-735-8391
  - EQ = 1
- Item CIRCUIT CARD ASSEMB 5998-01-681-5664
  - EQ = 4

Step 2:

- Example Offeror's Proposed Prices: SSD Drive (Hard Drive) 7050-01-735-8391 (Qty 1) = $1,000
- Item CIRCUIT CARD ASSEMB 5998-01-681-5664 (Qty 2-5) = $2,000

Step 3 – Calculate Extended Prices:

Item SSD Drive (Hard Drive) 7050-01-735-8391
Evaluated Quantity * Price = Total
1 * $1,000 = $1,000

Item CIRCUIT CARD ASSEMB 5998-01-681-5664
Evaluated Quantity * Price = Total
4 * $2,000 = $8,000

Step 4:
Evaluated Price for Spares: $1,000 + $8,000 = $9,000

**Notes to Offerors**
*· The evaluation is for price comparison only and does not obligate the Government to purchase the selected parts or quantities.*
*· Offerors must provide complete stepladder pricing for all parts in all spreadsheets to ensure evaluation can be performed.*
*· Failure to provide complete pricing may result in an incomplete or unacceptable proposal.*

**6.1.2.5** The evaluated cost for CLINs x011 (ODC) and x015 (Repair Material) will be determined by adding the Government cost estimates and the proposed indirect costs adders. The proposed cost will be adjusted by the Government for cost realism where appropriate.

**6.1.2.6** The evaluated price for CLINs 9800 (PIO) will be determined by adding the Government cost estimate, proposed indirect costs adders, and the proposed fee/profit for the CLINs.

**6.1.2.7** The Government will evaluate the Offeror's cost/price proposal for completeness, materially balanced pricing and reasonableness.

**Completeness**
The Government will review the Offeror's cost/price proposal to verify compliance with Section L and completeness, adequacy and accuracy of all submitted documents. The Government may reject a proposal if determined that it is non-compliant, incomplete, inadequate or inaccurate. Any inconsistency, whether real or apparent, between promised performance and cost or price shall be explained in the proposal. Therefore, any inconsistencies between proposed technical performance and cost, whether real or apparent, should be explained in the supporting cost data section. The burden of proof for cost credibility rests with the Offeror. Offerors are cautioned that to the extent proposed costs appear unrealistic; the Government may infer either a lack of understanding of the requirements, increased cost or performance risk, or lack of credibility on the part of the Offeror.

**Materially Balanced**
The Government may determine a cost/price proposal is unacceptable if the proposed prices, including option prices, are found to be materially unbalanced between stepladder ranges and/or line items. Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable total evaluated cost/price, the price of one or more stepladder prices or line items is significantly overstated or understated as indicated by the application of cost or price analysis techniques. A proposal may be rejected if the Contracting Officer determines that the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government. The Government will not adjust the proposed costs/prices due to unbalanced pricing.

**Reasonableness**
The Government will verify adequate price competition exists in accordance with the procedures identified in FAR 15.403-1(c)(1). Normally, adequate price competition establishes a fair and reasonable price; however. In the event that the Government determines adequate price competition exists and the proposed costs/prices are fair and reasonable, the Government may award a contract

without discussions**.**

NOTE: The Government will not conduct a detailed cost realism analysis of any Offeror's minor subcontractor costs. Nevertheless, the Government will review these proposed costs and hours for consistency with the rest of the Offeror's proposal and may adjust minor subcontractor cost or hours for lack of consistency with the rest of the Offeror's proposal.

**Determination of Contractor Responsibility**
Statements and representations made in the Offeror's proposal may be subject to verification by Government Agencies, and/or through site visit or Pre-Award Surveys. Therefore, as part of this evaluation, the Government may conduct a site visit with any of the Offerors deemed necessary by the Contracting Officer. The Offerors may be required to make their production facilities available for a site visit by the Government as soon as two weeks after the submission of the proposal. The Contracting Officer may contact the Offeror to schedule the visit of up to five (5) Government personnel. **The conducting of a site visit or a Pre-Award Survey shall not constitute discussions or proposal acceptability.**

FAR 9.103 requires that the Contracting Officer make an affirmative determination of responsibility prior to contract award. FAR 9.104-1 states that to be determined responsible, a prospective contractor: 1) has
adequate financial resources to perform the contract, or the ability to obtain them; 2) is able to comply with the required delivery schedule, taking into consideration all existing commercial and governmental
business commitments; 3) has a satisfactory performance record; 4) has a satisfactory record of integrity and business ethics; 5) has the necessary organization, experience, accounting and operational controls, and technical skills, or the ability to obtain them; 6) has the necessary production, construction, and technical equipment and facilities, or the ability to obtain them; and 7) is otherwise qualified and eligible to receive an award under applicable laws and regulations.

**Contract Ceiling Determination Note**
The TEC/P calculated under Factor 4 is used solely for source-selection evaluation purposes and does not represent the contract ceiling. Offerors are advised that the TEC/P shall not be interpreted as the maximum ordering value, funding obligation, or total potential dollar amount of the resulting contract.

The contract ceiling will be established by the Government at the time of award and will be based on:

- The sum of all Firm-Fixed-Price CLINs awarded at their proposed prices;
- The Government's determination of probable cost for cost-reimbursement CLINs, as calculated under Section M 6.1.1;
- The Government's independent assessment of anticipated ordering needs across the Period of Performance; and
- Any additional quantities, ordering flexibility, or programmatic considerations required to support mission execution.

For CLINs containing stepladder pricing, the Government's use of a random evaluation quantity for TEC/P calculation is for evaluation purposes only and does not establish, limit, or imply the contract ceiling. The ceiling will be based on the full range of quantities the Government may order under each

stepladder CLIN, not the single quantity used for TEC/P evaluation.

Accordingly, the contract ceiling may be higher or lower than the TEC/P depending on the Government's anticipated ordering profile, cost-reimbursement probable cost determinations, and program requirements at award. The TEC/P shall not be construed as a commitment by the Government to order any specific quantity or to obligate funds beyond those established in the awarded contract.

| Item | Supplies/Service | Ceiling Price | Notes |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0001 | FIRST ARTICLE UNIT (FAU) | Proposed FFP Total from subCLINs | |
| 0002 | PRODUCTION READINESS REVIEW (PRR) | Proposed FFP Total from subCLINs | |
| x003 | NAVY ECDIS AN/SYN-1(v1) | Proposed Maximum Qty Stepladder Unit Price * Qty 54 | Option |
| x004 | NAVY ECDIS AN/SYN-1(v2) | Proposed Maximum Qty Stepladder Unit Price * Qty 53 | Option |
| x005 | NAVY ECDIS AN/SYN-1(v3) | Proposed Maximum Qty Stepladder Unit Price * Qty 53 | Option |
| x006 | NAVY ECDIS AN/SYN- HARDWARE PERIPHERALS | Summation over the set of all Peripheral Parts: (Proposed Peripheral Unit Price * Qty 5) | Option |
| x007 | NAVY ECDIS S-IBS GEN 5-NODE | Proposed Maximum Qty Stepladder Unit Price * Qty 20 | Option |
| x008 | NAVY ECDIS S-IBS GEN 7 NODE | Proposed Maximum Qty Stepladder Unit Price * Qty 20 | Option |
| x009 | ENGINEERING SUPPORT NAVY ECDIS SOFTWARE | Proposed CPFF Total | Option |
| x010 | ENGINEERING SUPPORT NAVY ECDIS HARDWARE | Proposed CPFF Total | Option |
| x011 | TRAVEL AND OTHER DIRECT COSTS | NTE $500,000 | Option |
| x012 | SPARES | NTE $9,000,000 | Option |
| x014 | HARDWARE REPAIRS | Proposed CPFF Total | Option |
| x015 | REPAIR MATERIALS | NTE $250,000 | Option |
| 9800 | PIO | NTE $500,000 | Option |

## 7.0 BASIS FOR AWARD

The Government intends to award a single contract to the responsive and responsible Offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government based on consideration of the evaluation factors outlined in this solicitation. The best value to the Government is that proposal that meets the requirements of this solicitation

and that is determined to be the most advantageous to the Government, considering all of the evaluation factors. The best value proposal will be selected using a tradeoff process, as defined in FAR 15.101-1, which permits tradeoffs among cost and non-cost factors. Accordingly, the Government may accept other than the lowest cost proposal where the perceived benefits of the higher cost proposal merit the additional cost. Conversely, the Government may select a lower-cost, lower rated proposal if the Government determines that the premium associated with the higher-rated proposal is not justified. The Government may cease evaluation of any proposals that it determines are nonresponsive, unacceptable, or otherwise ineligible for award. In making its best value determination, the Government will consider the relative importance of the factors.

Offerors are notified that, in accordance with FAR clause 52.215-1, the Government intends to make an award on the basis of initial proposals without conducting discussions. Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if needed.

## 8.0 ADJECTIVAL RATING PROCESS

The Government will use the following adjectival ratings/definitions for Factors 1 (Technical Approach) and 2 (Management Approach). The Government will evaluate the significant strengths, strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, and deficiencies associated with these factors.

A proposal need not have all of the attributes of the rating definitions defined below in order to be eligible for the rating adjective specified.

Table M-1: Adjectival Rating Standards

| Color Rating | Adjectival Rating | Description |
|---|---|---|
| Blue | Outstanding | Proposal meets requirements and indicates a exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths far outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is very low. |
| Purple | Good | Proposal meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal contains strengths which outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate. |
| Green | Acceptable | Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths and weaknesses are offsetting or will have little or no impact on contract performance. Risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate. |
| Yellow | Marginal | Proposal does not clearly meet the requirements and has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. The proposal has one or more weaknesses which are not offset by strengths. Risk of unsuccessful performance is high. |
| Red | Unacceptable | Proposal does not meet the requirements and contains one or more deficiencies and is unawardable, and/or risk of performance is unacceptably high. |

Additionally, the Government will use the following risk descriptions in the course of the evaluation to support a combined adjectival/risk rating:

| Table M-2: Technical Risk Rating Standards | |
|---|---|
| Adjectival Rating | Description |
| Low | Proposal may contain weakness(es) which have low potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation of performance. Normal contractor emphasis and normal Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties. |
| Moderate | Proposal contains a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which may have a moderate potential to 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 a significant weakness or combination of weaknesses which is likely to have high potential to cause significant disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will unlikely be able to overcome any difficulties. |
| Unacceptable | Proposal contains a deficiency or a combination of significant weaknesses that causes an unacceptable level of risk of unsuccessful performance. |

**DEFINITIONS OF GENERAL TERMS IN ADJECTIVAL RATINGS STANDARDS**

The Government will apply the following definitions in the evaluation process for factors rated on an adjectival basis:

*Significant Strength* – An aspect of an Offeror's proposal that exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Government during contract performance and appreciably decreases the risk of unsuccessful performance.

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

*Weakness* – A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance (per FAR 15.001).

*Significant Weakness* – A flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance (per FAR 15.001).

*Deficiency* – A material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of

significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level (per FAR 15.001).

### 8.1 ACCEPTABILITY RATING PROCESS

The Government will use the following Acceptable/Unacceptable ratings/definitions for Factor 3 .

#### 8.1.1 FACTOR 3: ACCEPTABILITY RATINGS

In assessing the Past Performance factor, the Government will apply the following definitions of acceptable or unacceptable:

*Acceptable* – Based on the Offeror's performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort, or the Offeror's performance record is unknown.

*Unacceptable* – Based on the Offeror's performance record, the Government does not have a reasonable expectation that the Offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

## 9.0 EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

In the event that the Government rates an Offeror's proposal unacceptable in either Factor 1 or 2, the Government **may** eliminate that Offeror's proposal from further consideration without evaluating the proposal on any other factor.