



<b>CONTINUATION SHEET</b>	<b>Reference No. of Document Being Continued</b> <b>PIIN/SIIN</b> W56HZV-04-R-S019 <b>MOD/AMD</b> 0001	<b>Page</b> 2 <b>of</b> 4
---------------------------	---	---------------------------

**Name of Offeror or Contractor:**

SECTION A - SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. THE PURPOSE OF THIS AMENDMENT 0001 TO W56HZV-04-R-S019 IS TO MAKE A CHANGE TO THE CLAUSE TITLE M.1 SOURCE SELECTION PROCESS.
2. DELETE THE VERBIAGE AFTER "ADVANTAGEOUS PROPOSAL, (i.e., best value)..."
3. THEREFORE, THE FOURTH PARAGRAPH IS CHANGED TO:

Under Phase II of the evaluation process, those proposals found acceptable under the Phase I evaluation, will be evaluated using a trade off process to determine which proposal provides the most advantageous proposal.

4. REVISED M.1 SOURCE SELECTION PROCESS IS INCORPORATED BY THIS AMENDMENT.
5. ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF THE SOLICITATION REMAIN UNCHANGED AND IN FULL FORCE AND EFFECT.
6. THE DATE AND CLOSING TIME REMAINS UNCHANGED AT 9:00 AM EST, 12 MAY 2004.

\*\*\* END OF NARRATIVE A 002 \*\*\*

SECTION M

M.1 Source Selection Process

Source Selection Authority. The Source Selection Authority (SSA) is the official designated to direct the source selection process and select the offeror for the contract award.

Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB). An SSEB has been established by the Government to evaluate proposals in response to this solicitation. The SSEB is comprised of technically qualified individuals who have been selected to conduct this evaluation in accordance with the evaluation criteria listed for this solicitation. Careful, full, and impartial consideration will be given to all proposals received pursuant to this solicitation.

Two-step Evaluation Process. The evaluation of proposals in response to this solicitation is structured in two phases. Phase I is an evaluation of the offerors technical proposal. This evaluation will be on an acceptable/not acceptable basis. Any offerors proposal assessed as not acceptable in Phase I will no longer be considered for award.

Under Phase II of the evaluation process, those proposals found acceptable under the Phase I evaluation, will be evaluated using a trade off process to determine which proposal provides the most advantageous proposal.

The Government intends to award a contract without discussions, but reserves the right to hold discussions, if necessary. Where award will be made without discussions, exchanges with offerors are limited to Clarifications as defined in FAR 15.306(a). Therefore, the offerors initial proposal should contain the offerors best terms from a technical, delivery and price standpoint.

The anticipated award date is late May 2004.

a. Phase I Evaluation.

Phase I will be an acceptable/not acceptable evaluation of the Technical proposal meeting the contract specification (Attachment 1). The determination of acceptable will be based on an evaluation of the technical proposal against the following definition:

An "Acceptable" Technical proposal is a proposal where there is essentially no doubt, based on the offeror's proposal, that the offered supplies will meet each of the specification requirements. This assessment will be performed using the information contained in the Technical Information Questionnaire, as well other information supplied by the offeror to support conformance of the supplies to each specification requirement.(e.g. commercial literature, vendor data, narrative descriptions of conformation to specification requirements, test data, etc).

NOTE: Technical performance beyond the minimum acceptable, as defined above, will not be given extra evaluation credit.

**Name of Offeror or Contractor:**

Under the Technical Area evaluation, the Government will also assess the Offerors proposal to have a dealer available to support the hardware being delivered. This will be done on an acceptable/not acceptable basis, and will be based upon the information provided by the Offeror. To be acceptable, the Offerors submitted information must demonstrate the availability of a dealer meeting the requirement stated in the RFP/Contract Work Statement.

## b. Phase II Evaluation.

Phase II of the evaluation is a best value process utilizing source selection trade-off procedures, to select the most advantageous offer from among those Phase I proposals assessed as acceptable. Under Phase II, the SSA will weigh the merits in the Delivery Area and the Small Business Participation Area against the evaluated price to the Government to determine which proposal, in the SSAs judgment, represents the best value. The Technical Area proposal will not be considered in the Phase II best value award decision. As part of the trade-off determination of best value, the relative advantages, disadvantages, and risks of each proposal will be considered.

The Delivery Area is significantly more important than the Price Area. The Price Area is significantly more important than the Small Business Participation Area. The Delivery Area and the Small Business Area combined are significantly more important than the Price Area.

c. Delivery Area. The Delivery Area will assess the extent to which contract hardware deliveries satisfy the solicitation's objective delivery schedule for the guaranteed minimum quantity of IDIQ contract deliverables (the guaranteed minimum quantity is identified in the Schedule Section of the RFP). For the purpose of this RFP, the objective delivery date for the guaranteed minimum IDIQ quantity is 30 June 2004. The Delivery Area evaluation will be performed using the information provided in the Delivery Questionnaire and any other validation information gathered by the Government.

## d. Small Business Participation Area

This provision applies to every Offeror (U.S. and non-U.S.), regardless of size-status or location of its manufacturing facility or headquarters.

2. The Government will evaluate the extent of small business concern participation in terms of the percentage of total subcontracted dollars which the Offeror credibly proposes to subcontract to U.S. small business concerns (Small Business, Small Disadvantaged Business, Woman-Owned Small Business, Veteran-Owned Small Business, Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business, HUBZone Small Business and/or Historically Black Colleges and Universities/Minority Institutions), Coalition Partner Companies, and Force Contributing Nation Companies in the performance of this contract. See Attachment 6, Small Business Participation Evaluation.

3. The evaluation will include the following:

a. The extent to which the proposal identifies participation of small business concerns. The extent of participation of such concerns shall be evaluated in terms of the percentage of the total subcontract amount.

b. An assessment of the probability that the Offeror will satisfy the requirements of FAR 52.219-8 and FAR 52.219-9 and achieve the levels of Small Business Participation identified in the proposal. This assessment will be based upon both:

1. a proposal risk assessment of the Offeror proposed Small Business Participation Approach and;

2. a performance risk assessment of prior achievements in satisfying commitments and requirements under FAR 52.219-8 and FAR 52.219-9, if applicable.

c. Offerors are advised that they will be evaluated under the Small Business Participation Area based upon the risk and extent of the Offeror credibly achieving the Governments goals for small business concern participation.

The statutory U.S. Government goals for small business participation are:

23% Small Business

5% Small Disadvantaged Business

5% Woman-Owned SB

3% HUBZone SB

3% Service Disabled Veteran-Owned SB

Goals for evaluation include:

1. small business concern participation (including all subcategories of small business concerns) of 10% or more; and

2. U.S. small disadvantaged business concern participation of 2.2% or more.

<b>CONTINUATION SHEET</b>	<b>Reference No. of Document Being Continued</b> <b>PIIN/SIIN</b> W56HZV-04-R-S019 <b>MOD/AMD</b> 0001	<b>Page</b> 4 <b>of</b> 4
---------------------------	---	---------------------------

**Name of Offeror or Contractor:**

---

d. Price Area

1) The Price Area will be assessed based upon total evaluated price to the Government to include an assessment of price reasonableness, realism and affordability to the Government. Realism measures "does the proposal price accurately reflect the offeror's approach in meeting the solicitation requirements and objectives, as well as an expectation that the solicitation requirements and objectives will be met at a price that will not result in a net loss to the offeror?". Reasonableness exists when the offered price does not exceed what would be incurred by a prudent person in the conduct of competitive business. The Government may reject a proposal which is not realistic, or not reasonable, as to price.

2) All vehicles items will be inspection and acceptance FOB Destination.

3) The total evaluated price for each respective CLIN will equal the CLIN Price multiplied by the total estimated quantity for of the two Ordering Periods offered. The Total Evaluated Price equals the sum of the individual Ordering Periods plus the total price of CLIN 2001AA.

3. Affordability. Contract Price can also play a role in the Governments evaluation of the affordability of an Offeror's proposal. An Offeror may not receive an award if its proposal is unaffordable.

4. Per FAR Subpart 9.1, contracts will be placed only with Contractors that the Contracting Officer determines to be responsible (that is, they meet the standards in FAR 9.104). The PCO may request/require a Pre-Award Survey to help ensure that a selected Contractor is responsible.

5. Rejection of Offers. The Government may reject any proposal which:

a. Merely offers to perform work according to the RFP terms or fails to present more than a statement indicating its capability to comply with the RFP terms without support and elaboration, as specified in the solicitation; or

b. Reflects an inherent lack of technical competence or a failure to comprehend the complexity and risks required to perform RFP requirements due to submission of a proposal that is unrealistically high or low in price and/or unrealistic in terms of technical or schedule commitments; or

c. Contains any unexplained, significant inconsistency between the proposed effort and the proposed price, which implies the Offeror has (1) an inherent misunderstanding of the scope of work, or (2) an inability to perform the resultant contract; or

d. An offer that is unbalanced, as to prices. An unbalanced offer is one, which is based on prices significantly high or low for one given ordering period versus another ordering period; or

e. Fails to meaningfully respond to the Proposal Preparation Instructions specified in the solicitation.

\*\*\* END OF NARRATIVE A 003 \*\*\*