

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT1. Contract ID Code
Cost Plus Incentive Fee | Page 1 Of 14
(Cost Based)

2. Amendment/Modification No. 0005 | 3. Effective Date 2014APR29 | 4. Requisition/Purchase Req No. SEE SCHEDULE | 5. Project No. (If applicable)

6. Issued By Code W56HZV | 7. Administered By (If other than Item 6) Code
U.S. ARMY CONTRACTING COMMAND
ERIC HAYDAMACK
WARREN, MICHIGAN 48397-5000
HTTP://CONTRACTING.TACOM.ARMY.MIL
EMAIL: ERIC.HAYDAMACK@US.ARMY.MIL8. Name And Address Of Contractor (No., Street, City, County, State and Zip Code) | 9A. Amendment Of Solicitation No. W56HZV-13-R-0022
 9B. Dated (See Item 11) 2013NOV26
 10A. Modification Of Contract/Order No.
 10B. Dated (See Item 13)
Code Facility Code**11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS** The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers is extended, is not extended.Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended by one of the following methods:
(a) By completing items 8 and 15, and returning 2 signed copies of the amendments; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. Accounting And Appropriation Data (If required)

**13. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS
It Modifies The Contract/Order No. As Described In Item 14.** A. This Change Order is Issued Pursuant To: The Changes Set Forth In Item 14 Are Made In The Contract/Order No. In Item 10A.
 B. The Above Numbered Contract/Order Is Modified To Reflect The Administrative Changes (such as changes in paying office, appropriation data, etc.) Set Forth In Item 14, Pursuant To The Authority of FAR 43.103(b).
 C. This Supplemental Agreement Is Entered Into Pursuant To Authority Of:
 D. Other (Specify type of modification and authority)E. IMPORTANT: Contractor is not, is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the Issuing Office.

14. Description Of Amendment/Modification (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)

SEE SECOND PAGE FOR DESCRIPTION

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. Name And Title Of Signer (Type or print) | 16A. Name And Title Of Contracting Officer (Type or print)
15B. Contractor/Offeror | 15C. Date Signed | 16B. United States Of America | 16C. Date Signed
By _____ / SIGNED / _____
(Signature of person authorized to sign) | (Signature of Contracting Officer)

NSN 7540-01-152-8070

30-105-02

STANDARD FORM 30 (REV. 10-83)

PREVIOUS EDITIONS UNUSABLE

Prescribed by GSA FAR (48 CFR) 53.243

CONTINUATION SHEET	Reference No. of Document Being Continued PIIN/SIIN W56HZV-13-R-0022 MOD/AMD 0005	Page 2 of 14
---------------------------	---	----------------------------

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

SECTION A - SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Buyer Name: ERIC HAYDAMACK
Buyer Office Symbol/Telephone Number: CCTA-AHL-D/(586)282-3053
Type of Contract: Cost Plus Incentive Fee (Cost Based)
Kind of Contract: Research and Development Contracts

*** End of Narrative A0000 ***

Amendment 0005 to Solicitation W56HZV-13-R-0022 is to incorporate the following changes:

1. SECTION J - LIST OF ATTACHMENTS, has been amended as follows:

a. In Exhibit A (Contract Data Requirements List (CDRL)), the following change has been incorporated:

i. The link to submit CDRLs to the PM ABCT IDE has been changed in the header of each page as follows:

FROM: <https://kcp.tacom.army.mil/sites/HBCTide/cdrl/SitePages/Canvas.aspx>
TO: <https://ext.kcp.tacom.army.mil/sites/HBCTIDE/CDRL/SitePages/VendorUpload.aspx>

ii. In Section J, the date listed for Exhibit A has been updated as follows:

FROM: 13 March 2014
TO: 23 April 2014

b. In Attachment 0061 (AMPV Integrated Master Schedule), the LRIP schedule has been updated to reflect change in schedule resulting from the proposal due date extension.

i. The date listed within Attachment 0061, and in Section J, has been updated as follows:

FROM: 13 February 2014
TO: 22 April 2014

2. SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

a. The Attachment 0051 reference in Section M.4.1.1 has been removed. This section is revised as follows:

FROM: For SubFactor (1) System Design Maturity, the Government will assess the risk that, based on the extent and credibility of the System Design Maturity data provided (Attachment 0051) for all five AMPV variants, the Offeror will timely deliver EMD test vehicles which will successfully complete EMD testing. This assessment will be based on the proposal information submitted in response to Section L.4.1.1.1.

TO: For SubFactor (1) System Design Maturity, the Government will assess the risk that, based on the extent and credibility of the System Design Maturity data provided for all five AMPV variants, the Offeror will timely deliver EMD test vehicles which will successfully complete EMD testing. This assessment will be based on the proposal information submitted in response to Section L.4.1.1.1.

b. The Attachment 0072 reference in Section M.4.1.2 has been removed. This section is revised as follows:

FROM: For SubFactor (2) Manufacturing, the Government will assess the risk that, based on (1) the extent and credibility of the Manufacturing Maturity data (Attachment 0072) provided for the AMPV FoVs and (2) the thoroughness and credibility of the Attachment 0060 provided Manufacturing Approaches to be employed by the offeror, the Offeror will timely and successfully deliver both (a) EMD test vehicles, and (b) LRIP production vehicles.

TO: For SubFactor (2) Manufacturing, the Government will assess the risk that, based on (1) the extent and credibility of the Manufacturing Maturity data provided for the AMPV FoVs and (2) the thoroughness and credibility of the Attachment 0060 provided Manufacturing Approaches to be employed by the offeror, the Offeror will timely and successfully deliver both (a) EMD test vehicles, and (b) LRIP production vehicles.

c. The Attachment 0052 reference in Section M.4.4.1 has been removed. This section is revised as follows:

FROM: The Government will assess the risk that, based on the extent and credibility of the RAM data provided (Attachment 0052) for the AMPV FoVs, the Offeror will timely deliver EMD test vehicles which will successfully

CONTINUATION SHEET**Reference No. of Document Being Continued****Page 3 of 14****PIIN/SIIN** W56HZV-13-R-0022**MOD/AMD** 0005**Name of Offeror or Contractor:**

complete EMD RAM testing. This assessment will be based on the proposal information submitted in response to RFP Paragraph L.4.4.1.

TO: The Government will assess the risk that, based on the extent and credibility of the RAM data provided for the AMPV FoVs, the Offeror will timely deliver EMD test vehicles which will successfully complete EMD RAM testing. This assessment will be based on the proposal information submitted in response to RFP Paragraph L.4.4.1.

*** END OF NARRATIVE A0006 ***

CONTINUATION SHEET**Reference No. of Document Being Continued****Page 4 of 14**

PIIN/SIIN W56HZV-13-R-0022

MOD/AMD 0005

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

SECTION J - LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

<u>List of</u> <u>Addenda</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Number</u> <u>of Pages</u>	<u>Transmitted By</u>
Exhibit A	CONTRACT DATA REQUIREMENTS LIST (CDRL)	23-APR-2014	179	
Attachment 0061	AMPV INTEGRATED MASTER SCHEDULE	22-APR-2014	003	

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

M.1 Basis of Award

M.1.1 It is the Government's intent to award one contract for the combined AMPV EMD and LRIP efforts. The Government will select for award the proposal which represents the best value to the Government as described below.

There are five evaluation Factors:

- (a) Design & Build
- (b) Performance
- (c) Cost/Price
- (d) O&S(Operation & Support)
- (e) Small Business Participation

The relative order of importance of these Factors, and SubFactors where applicable, are described in section M.4 below.

M.1.1.2 Selection of the proposal which is most advantageous and represents the best value to the Government will be determined on a Source Selection trade-off basis from Offeror proposals which are otherwise eligible for award.

M.1.1.3 To be eligible for award, Offeror proposals shall:

- (a) Establish that the Offeror possesses a Secret Facility Clearance as verified through the Defense Security Service (see Section M.1.3);
- (b) Be Affordable (see Section M.3.2);
- (c) Be determined responsible (see Section M.3.1.4);
- (d) Be rated no less than Acceptable under (i) each SubFactor within the Design & Build Factor (see Section M.4.1) and (ii) the RAM SubFactor in the O&S Factor, (see Section M.4.4.1);
- (e) Not be assessed as High Risk for any of the following P-Spec (Attachments 0001 and 0082) requirements within the Performance Factor:
 - PSPEC-1941 Integrate Equipment into General Purpose Variant
 - PSPEC-1676 Integrate Equipment into Mortar Carrier Variant
 - PSPEC-1677 Integrate Equipment into Medical Evacuation Variant
 - PSPEC-1678 Integrate Equipment into Medical Treatment Variant
 - PSPEC-1675 Integrate Equipment into Mission Command Variant
 - PSPEC-1275 Sand Desert Terrain Speed (GP, MCMd, ME, MC)
 - PSPEC-1446 Sand Desert Terrain Speed (MT)
 - PSPEC-670 Dry Hilly Terrain Speed (GP, MCMd, ME, MC)
 - PSPEC-1449 Dry Hilly Terrain Speed (MT)
 - PSPEC-1277 Wet Hilly Terrain Speed (GP, MCMd, ME, MC)
 - PSPEC-1450 Wet Hilly Terrain Speed (MT)
 - C-PSPEC-37 Protect Occupant from Underbody IED Detonation
 - C-PSPEC-41 Protect Vehicle from Underbody IED Detonation;
- (f) Include no Deficiencies (per FAR Part 15.001); and
- (g) Not exceed a 25% price premium limit. The price premium limit will be established through application of a 25% price premium factor to the Cost/Price Factor proposal of the Offeror with the lowest total evaluated Cost/Price, who is otherwise eligible for award as described above. The low Offeror's Total Evaluated Cost/Price will be used as the denominator to calculate the price premium percentage limit. Proposals of Offerors whose total evaluated Cost/Price exceeds the price premium limit, including any fractions above 25%, will be ineligible for award regardless of any comparative discriminators (strengths, weaknesses, risks) under the non-Cost/Price Factors.

For example:

1. Offeror A has the lowest total evaluated Cost/Price (\$3,000,000) of an Offeror who is otherwise eligible for award IAW M.1.1.3 (a-g).
2. Based on Offeror A's total evaluated Cost/Price, the Cost/Price premium limit would be \$750,000 (25% X \$3,000,000 = \$750,000).

CONTINUATION SHEET**Reference No. of Document Being Continued**

Page 6 of 14

PIIN/SIIN W56HZV-13-R-0022

MOD/AMD 0005

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

3. Under this scenario, examples of eligibility for award would be as follows:

	Total Evaluated Cost/Price	Price Premium Relative to Offeror A	Eligible for Award under M.1.1.3 (g)
Offeror A	\$3,000,000	N/A	Yes
Offeror B	\$3,500,000	16.7% (\$500,000)	Yes
Offeror C	\$3,750,000	25.0 (\$750,000)	Yes
Offeror D	\$3,750,100	25.003% (\$600,100)	No
Offeror E	\$3,800,000	26.7% (\$800,000)	No

M.1.1.3.1 Proposals which are eligible for award in accordance with Section M.1.1.3 will be subject to the Source Selection Trade-off process, considering both the evaluation Factors and their relative order of importance as cited in Section M.4, to identify the proposal which represents the best value and is most advantageous to the Government. The Government will weigh the evaluated proposals (other than the Cost/Price Factor) against the total evaluated cost/price to the Government. As part of the best value determination, the relative strengths, weaknesses, and risks of each proposal shall be considered in selecting the offer that is most advantageous and represents the best overall value to the Government. The Government may choose not to award a contract where it concludes that no proposal exists with a reasonable probability of achieving program requirements complying with contract terms and conditions.

M.1.2 Importance of Cost/Price

Award will be made to the Offeror whose proposal (1) is otherwise eligible for award under M.1.1.3, and (2) represents the best value to the Government. This may not be the Offeror with the lowest evaluated cost/price. However, the closer Offerors evaluations are to each other in those Factors other than the Cost/Price Factor, the more important cost/price becomes in the decision. Notwithstanding the relative order of importance of the five evaluation Factors stated herein, cost/price may be controlling when:

- (a) proposals are otherwise considered approximately equal in non-cost/price factors; or
- (b) an otherwise superior proposal is unaffordable; or
- (c) the advantages of a higher rated, higher cost/price proposal are not considered to be worth the cost/price premium; or
- (d) an Offerors total evaluated cost/price is more than 25% higher than the lowest total evaluated cost/price of an offeror who is otherwise eligible for award (see Section M.1.1.3).

M.1.3 Requirement for Facility Clearance (SECRET)

Portions of the information on this program will be classified as SECRET. To be considered for award, Offerors and subcontractors (whoever will handle SECRET material) must have a SECRET Facility Clearance (FCL). All FCL information will be verified through the Defense Security Service for all Offerors and their subcontractors. Offerors without a SECRET FCL will neither be able to discuss or access key aspects of the program that are classified nor will they be able to pass such information on to their subcontractor.

M.1.4 Export Controlled Information

This solicitation contains Export Controlled information in Controlled Unclassified Attachments and within the Classified Annexes to this solicitation. It is the responsibility of the Offeror, not the Government, to obtain the necessary export licenses to share any such information with subcontractors or to obtain access to the files themselves. The failure or inability of an Offeror to obtain the appropriate license or agreement will not be considered as a mitigating factor in the evaluation process.

M.2 Rejection of Offers

The Government may reject any proposal if in the Governments best interest. Examples include, but are not limited to, the following proposal conditions:

- (a) Merely offers to perform work according to the solicitation terms or fails to present more than a statement indicating its capability to comply with the solicitation terms without support and elaboration as specified in Section L of this solicitation; or
- (b) Is unbalanced as to price. An unbalanced offer is one which is based on pricing significantly higher or lower for one given period versus another period or the price of one or more contract line items is significantly over or understated. There must be a direct relationship between the effort expended and its price for each CLIN and incrementally funded period; or
- (c) Fails to meaningfully respond to the proposal preparation instructions that are specified in Section L of this solicitation; or
- (d) Is unaffordable for either EMD or LRIP; or
- (e) Proposes exceptions to the attachments, exhibits, enclosures, or other solicitation terms and conditions.

Name of Offeror or Contractor:**M.3 Evaluation and Source Selection Process****M.3.1 Evaluation Process**

Selection of the successful Offeror shall be made following an assessment of each proposal, based on the response to the information called for in Section L of this solicitation and against the solicitation requirements and the evaluation criteria described in Section M. Proposals will be evaluated as specified herein, to include narrative support for the evaluation conclusions under each Factor and SubFactor. The Government reserves the right to reject offers in accordance with solicitation provision Rejection of Offers above.

M.3.1.1 Source Selection Authority

The Source Selection Authority (SSA) is the official designated to direct the source selection process and select the Offeror for contract award. A Source Selection Advisory Council (SSAC) will provide a written comparative analysis of the proposals and an award recommendation for the SSA prior to the selection decision.

M.3.1.2 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 an 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. All proposals shall be subject to evaluation by a team of Government personnel.

M.3.1.3 Award with Discussions

This solicitation includes FAR Provision 52.215-1 Instructions to Offerors - Competitive Acquisition (ALT I) in Section L, which advises the Government intends to conduct discussions with Offerors in the Competitive Range. Discussions will be conducted in accordance with FAR Part 15.306. Since written and oral discussions are limited prior to any competitive range determination (FAR Part 15.306 (c)), it is vitally important that Offerors initial proposals are complete and comprehensive.

M.3.1.4 Determination of Responsibility

Per FAR Part 9.103, a contract will be placed only with the Offeror that the Contracting Officer determines to be responsible. That is, the contractor who satisfactorily demonstrates the capability to perform the necessary tasks and delivery of the required items on time. Prospective Offeror(s), in order to qualify as sources for this acquisition, must be able to demonstrate that they meet standards of responsibility set forth in FAR Part 9.104. In addition, the Government may assess the Offeror's financial and management capabilities to meet the solicitation requirements. The Government reserves the right to conduct a Pre-Award Survey on any or all Offeror(s) or their subcontractors to aid the Contracting Officer in the evaluation of each Offeror's proposal and ensure that a selected Offeror is responsible. Additional requirements of responsibility for this contract are the necessary Defense Security Service (DSS) Facility Clearance. No award can be made to an Offeror who has been determined to be not responsible by the Contracting Officer. To make sure that you meet the responsibility criteria at FAR Part 9.104, the Government may:

(a) arrange a visit to your plant and perform a necessary Pre-Award Survey, or

(b) request an Offeror provide financial, technical, production, or managerial background information. If the requested information is not submitted within seven calendar days from the date of the receipt of the request, or if an Offeror refuses the Government access to its facility, the Government may determine the Offeror non-responsible. If the Government visits the Offeror's facility, please ensure that current data relevant to the proposal is available for Government personnel to review.

M.3.2 Availability of Funding and Affordability

M.3.2.1 No proposal, no matter how highly rated under the non-Cost/Price Factors, will be considered for award if unaffordable for either (1) the EMD phase or (2) the LRIP phase. For EMD, this includes affordability based on (a) the total available funding in FY15-FY19 and, (b) available RDT&E funding within each of the FY15-FY19 funding periods, since the contract will be RDT&E incrementally funded. For LRIP, this includes affordability based on (a) the total available Production funding for each option period and, (b) available Production funding within each of the option funding periods is listed in Section M.3.2.4 since the option year CLINs will be funded by fiscal year. Proposals specifying funding in excess of the following will be considered unaffordable and ineligible for award:

M.3.2.2 EMD Phase - The availability of funding for the AMPV EMD Phase is:

FY15: \$ 70 Million

FY16: \$174 Million

FY17: \$114 Million

FY18: \$ 64 Million

FY19: \$ 14 Million

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

The affordability limits established in EMD are inclusive of the exchange credit (if proposed) and exclusive of the performance incentives for CLIN 0001.

M.3.2.3 EMD proposals that require funding in advance of availability may not be considered for award. Fiscal year funding is not often available to the AMPV Product Management Office prior to January of each fiscal year. Offerors should account for this in their execution planning and resourcing.

M.3.2.4 LRIP Phase - The availability of funding for the AMPV LRIP Phase is:

Option 1: \$244 Million

Option 2: \$479 Million

Option 3: \$505 Million

The affordability limits established in LRIP are inclusive of the exchange credit (if proposed) and based on the vehicle quantities identified in Section B, CLIN Narrative B002 for CLINs 0004AA 0006AE. The affordability limit is exclusive of the performance incentive for CLINs 0004AA-0004AE.

M.4 Evaluation Criteria**A. There are five evaluation Factors:**

- (a) Design & Build
- (b) Performance
- (c) Cost/Price
- (d) O&S
- (e) Small Business Participation

Relative Order of Importance. Design & Build and Performance are equal in importance to each other. Design & Build and Performance are, on an individual basis, more important than either Cost/Price or O&S. Cost/Price and O&S are equal in importance to each other. Cost/Price and O&S are, on an individual basis, significantly more important than Small Business Participation. The non-Cost/Price Factors, when combined, are more important than the Cost/Price Factor.

B. Evaluation Consideration of the RFP Paragraph L.4.8 specified System Description and 3D CAD Models

RFP Section L Paragraph L.4.8 (Volume 8) specifies the submission of a System Description and 3D CAD Models. With respect to use of this information in the evaluation of the Design & Build Factor, Performance Factor and RAM SubFactor under the O&S Factor, the Government will review the System Description and 3D CAD Models to assess the Offeror's proposal. Notwithstanding the information contained in Volume 8, offerors are still required to submit the supporting data specified in Section L, for all Factors, by separate stand alone submission. Offerors shall not assume that the System Description and 3D CAD Models submitted will be considered in the evaluation of other Factors and SubFactors. However, the Government reserves the right to utilize this data in other areas of the evaluation at its sole discretion.

C. Substantiating Data in support of the System Design Maturity SubFactor (Attachment 0051) and Manufacturing SubFactor (Attachment 0072) under the Design & Build Factor, and RAM SubFactor (Attachment 0084) under the O&S Factor

The primary purpose of the substantiating data submitted for the above SubFactors is to document and support the achievement and credibility of the Offerors proposed maturity levels. The Government will review the substantiating data to assess the Offerors maturity. Notwithstanding the information contained in Attachments 0051, 0072 and 0084, offerors are required to submit the information and supporting data required for the other factors by separate stand alone submission. Offerors may not assume that substantiating data submitted for the System Design Maturity SubFactor (Attachment 0051), Manufacturing SubFactor (Attachment 0072), and RAM SubFactor (Attachment 0084) will be considered in the evaluation of other Factors or Sub-factors of the proposal. However, the Government reserves the right to utilize the Attachment 0051, 0072 and 0084 substantiating data in other areas of the evaluation at its sole discretion.

D. Evaluation of (1) Design & Build Factor, (2) the Performance Factor and (3) RAM SubFactor under the O&S Factor

In the evaluation of (1) Design & Build Factor, (2) the Performance Factor and (3) RAM SubFactor, the Government will consider substantiating data that is consistent with the proposed design configuration to represent the most credible form of substantiating data. However, the greater the extent to which the Offerors proposed design configuration meaningfully varies from the design configuration to which the data applies, thereby undermining the credibility of the substantiating data, the more the Government may discount the validity of the substantiating data.

M.4.1 Design & Build Factor

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

The Design & Build Factor contains three SubFactors: (1) System Design Maturity, (2) Manufacturing, and (3) Integrated Master Schedule (IMS). SubFactor (1) System Design Maturity is more important than SubFactor (2) Manufacturing. SubFactor (2) Manufacturing is more important than SubFactor (3) IMS.

*M.4.1.1 For SubFactor (1) System Design Maturity, the Government will assess the risk that, based on the extent and credibility of the System Design Maturity data provided for all five AMPV variants, the Offeror will timely deliver EMD test vehicles which will successfully complete EMD testing. This assessment will be based on the proposal information submitted in response to Section L.4.1.1.1.

*M.4.1.2 For SubFactor (2) Manufacturing, the Government will assess the risk that, based on (1) the extent and credibility of the Manufacturing Maturity data provided for the AMPV FoVs and (2) the thoroughness and credibility of the Attachment 0060 provided Manufacturing Approaches to be employed by the offeror, the Offeror will timely and successfully deliver both (a) EMD test vehicles, and (b) LRIP production vehicles.

M.4.1.3 For SubFactor (3), Integrated Master Schedule, the Government will assess the risk that, based on the proposal information submitted in response to Section L.4.1.1.2, the Offeror will timely and successfully (a) deliver EMD test assets, (b) deliver the first five LRIP vehicles no later than the dates specified in the Attachment 0061 (AMPV Integrated Master Schedule), and (c) complete both the LRU Qualification and Highly Accelerated Life Test.

M.4.2 Performance Factor

The Performance Factor includes the following three SubFactors: (1) Tier 1, (2) Tier 2, and (3) Tier 3. SubFactor (1) Tier 1 is more important than SubFactor (2) Tier 2. SubFactor (2) Tier 2 is more important than SubFactor (3) Tier 3.

M.4.2.1 For the Performance Factor, and as described in the Attachment 0053 Tier Guidance, the terms Requirement, Threshold and Objective represent the following when used in (a) Attachments 0055 and 0105, (b) RFP Section L&M and (c) the Performance Specification:

M.4.2.1.1 Tier 1: RFP Sections L&M and Attachments 0055 and 0105 refer to Tier 1 Requirements as Threshold performance levels. For the purposes of Tier 1 as defined in the Compliance Matrices (Attachments 0055 and 0105), the term Requirement in the Performance Specification means Threshold performance level.

M.4.2.1.2 Tier 2: RFP Sections L&M and Attachment 0055 refer to Tier 2 Requirements as having both Threshold and Objective performance levels. For the purposes of Tier 2 as defined in the Compliance Matrix (Attachment 0055), the term Requirement in the Performance Specification means the Objective performance level. The Threshold performance levels are identified in Attachment 0055, but not in the Performance Specification.

M.4.2.1.3 Tier 3: RFP Sections L&M and Attachment 0055 refer to Tier 3 Requirements as Objective performance levels. For the purposes of Tier 3 as defined in the Compliance Matrix (Attachment 0055), the term Requirement in the Performance Specification means the Objective performance level. There are no Threshold performance levels in Tier 3.

M.4.2.2 For SubFactor (1) Tier 1, the Government will assess, for each AMPV variants mission role highlighted in Attachment 0132:

(a) The risk that the Offeror's proposal will meet the Tier 1 threshold requirements in Attachments 0055 and 0105. Proposals will be assessed as deficient and ineligible for award where the Offeror does not meet a Tier 1 threshold requirement. In the case of the two Classified Performance Specification (C-PSPEC) Underbody Force Protection/Survivability Requirements cited in M.4.2.2 (b), and to the extent the Offeror proposes to achieve performance above the threshold performance level, the Government will evaluate the risk that the Offeror will meet the proposed level of performance.

(b) The extent to which the Offeror credibly achieves Objective levels of performance for the following two Underbody Force Protection/Survivability requirements:

1) C-PSPEC 60; Paragraph 3.2.1.1.2.4; Protect Occupants From Underbody Improvised Explosive Devices (Detonation) - Objective.

2) C-PSPEC 61; Paragraph 3.2.1.1.2.6; Protect Vehicle From Underbody IED Detonation - Objective.

M.4.2.3 For SubFactor (2) Tier 2, the Government will assess, for each AMPV variants mission role highlighted in Attachment 0132:

(a) The risk that the Offeror's proposal will meet the Tier 2 threshold requirements in Attachment 0055. Proposals will be assessed as deficient and ineligible for award where the Offeror does not meet a Tier 2 threshold requirement. In the case of the objective performance levels cited in Attachment 0055, and to the extent the Offeror proposes to achieve performance above the threshold performance level, the Government will evaluate the risk that the Offeror will meet the proposed level of performance.

(b) The extent to which the Offeror credibly achieves the objective levels of performance for the objectives cited in

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

Attachment 0055.

M.4.2.4 Evaluation of Tier 1 and Tier 2 Objective requirements

For the objective requirements being evaluated under Tier 1 and Tier 2, evaluation credit in the form of a proportional strength may be given for proposed performance above the threshold requirement up to the objective. A strength may result in an increase in the assigned rating for the appropriate Factor and SubFactor. Evaluation credit will not be granted for exceeding the objective performance requirement except to the extent that performance beyond the objective level reduces the risk of achieving the objective performance level.

M.4.2.5 To receive objective performance evaluation credit, the Offerors proposal must demonstrate to the Government that the proposed performance level is achievable at moderate or lower risk. Where the objective performance level is evaluated as having risk higher than moderate risk for achieving proposed performance, no additional evaluation credit shall be given, nor shall such a proposal be considered a proposal strength or to have benefit to the Government.

M.4.2.6 If the Government evaluation of the proposal indicates that the achievement of the proposed performance level above the threshold, up to the objective, is likely at moderate risk or lower, the proposed level of performance will be included in any resulting contract. In the event an Offeror does not agree to incorporate the proposed level of performance into the resulting contract, the Offeror will not be credited, in whole or in part, with achievement of performance beyond the threshold.

M.4.2.7 For SubFactor (3) Tier 3, the Government will assess, for each AMPV variant's mission role highlighted in Attachment 0132, the extent to which the Offeror proposes to meet Tier 3 objectives in Attachment 0055. Tier 3 objectives are divided into thirteen groups. Within the thirteen Priority Groups, Basic Vehicle Network (Priority Group 1) is more important than VHMS Increment 1 (Priority Group 2), which is slightly more important than VHMS Increment 2 (Priority Group 3), which is slightly more important than Portable Maintenance Aid (Priority Group 4), which is more important than Advanced Power Management (Priority Group 5). Priority Groups 5-13 are in descending order of importance. In order to receive evaluation credit for any of the thirteen groups, Offerors must propose to meet:

- (a) all objectives in the group at the full objective performance level, and
- (b) the full objective performance level for all variants listed in Attachment 0055.

M.4.2.8 For the objective performance groups being evaluated under Tier 3, extra evaluation credit in the form of strengths may be given for each group where the offeror proposes to meet the full objective performance level for each objective in the group and on all variants listed in Attachment 0055.

M.4.2.8.1 A strength may result in an increase in the assigned rating for the Performance Factor and Tier 3 SubFactor. Where the offeror does not propose to meet the full objective performance level for each objective in the group and on all variants listed in Attachment 0055, no additional evaluation credit shall be given, nor shall such a proposal be considered a proposal strength or to have any benefit to the Government.

M.4.2.8.2 Proposed Objective performance levels for a group, which satisfy M.4.2.7 (a-b) above, will be included in any resulting contract. In the event an Offeror does not agree to incorporate the objective levels of performance into the resulting contract, including each objective in that group and on all variants listed in Attachment 0055, the Offeror will not be credited with achieving any objective performance, nor be given a strength, for that group.

M.4.3 Cost/Price Factor

M.4.3.1 The Offeror's proposal shall be evaluated to determine the Total Evaluated Cost/Price to the Government.

M.4.3.1.1 Total Evaluated Cost/Price - The Government will evaluate Offerors for award by summing the Evaluated Cost to the Government in EMD and the Evaluated Price in LRIP as detailed in Sections M.4.3.1.2(c) and M.4.3.1.3(a) below. The Total Evaluated Cost/Price may differ from the total proposed cost/price. The Total Evaluated Cost/Price, rather than the total proposed cost/price, shall be used in the trade-off evaluation to determine best value. The incentive structure will not be considered in the Evaluated Price for LRIP. Performance Incentive Fee will not be considered in the Evaluated Cost/Price for EMD and LRIP.

M.4.3.1.2 For the CPIF EMD CLIN, the Evaluated Cost will include an assessment of the reasonableness of proposed costs, and a realism assessment. Cost Reasonableness and Cost Realism will be assessed as described below. Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) and Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) may be requested to verify rates and projections.

- (a) Cost Realism: The Government shall evaluate realism by independently reviewing and evaluating the specific elements of the Offeror's proposed cost estimate to determine whether the cost accurately reflects the Offeror's proposed effort to meet program requirements and objectives. The result of the realism evaluation will be a determination of the most probable cost to the Government (which consists of cost and fee) of performance for the Offeror. The most probable cost will be determined by adjusting the Offeror's proposed cost to reflect any additions or reductions to cost elements to realistic levels based on the results of the realism analysis.

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

(b) Cost Reasonableness: The Government shall evaluate the reasonableness of the Offeror's proposed cost, fee, and credit for exchange in vehicles in accordance with the definition in FAR Part 31.201-3. A cost is reasonable if, in its nature and amount, it does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person in the conduct of competitive business.

(c) Evaluated Cost - CPIF CLIN:

1) The Evaluated Cost for the CPIF CLIN will consist of summing:

i. The most probable cost to the Government, consisting of:

a) The evaluated cost based on the cost realism evaluation described in Section M.4.3.1.2(a); and

b) Cost incentive fee, which will be determined by applying the cost incentive fee structure (as set forth in FAR Clause 52.216-10 located in Section I) (70/30 underrun and 30/70 overrun share ratio, a minimum fee percentage of 3%, and a maximum fee percentage of 13%) to the cost based on the cost realism evaluation described above; and

ii. The proposed credit for exchange of vehicles (as defined in Sections H.7.2 and L.4.3.5.8). Note that the credit for the exchange of vehicles will be applied to the most probable cost to the Government as detailed in Section M.4.3.1.2(c)(1)(i) above (after the cost incentive fee has been calculated); and

iii. Use of Existing Government-Owned Property:

a) Rent-free use of existing facilities, special test equipment, and/or special tooling, title to which is in the Government or to which the Government has the right to take title (all of which is herein described as property), including rent-free use by prospective subcontractors, will be a consideration in the evaluation of responses to this solicitation.

b) For purposes of evaluation only, the proposed items for each classification of property, computed as follows, shall be included by the Government in the Evaluated Cost. The proposed items shall be computed by multiplying the acquisition cost of each item of property by the rental rates specified below, and then multiplying the product obtained by the number of months of use proposed. A minimum of one month of use shall be required for purposes of evaluation. Fractional portions of a month shall be counted as a full month. The final items shall be separately set forth by the offeror under the proposed price.

c) Monthly Rental Rates:

(1) For land and land preparation, buildings, building installations, and land installations other than those items specified in (2) below: the prevailing commercial rate.

(2) For industrial plant equipment of the types covered by Federal Supply Classification Code Numbers 3405, 3408, 3410, 3411 through 3419 (machine tools), and 3441 through 3449 (secondary metal forming and cutting machines), the following rates shall apply:

Age of Equipment	Monthly Rental Rates
0-2 years	3.00%
Over 2 to 3 years	2.00%
Over 3 to 6 years	1.50%
Over 6 to 10 years	1.00%
Over 10 years	0.75%

(3) For personal property and equipment not covered in (1) and (2) above (including all production equipment not in the Federal Supply Classification Codes set forth above, and including special tooling and special test equipment), the following rates shall apply:

- Two percent (2.00%) per month for electronic test equipment and automotive equipment;
- One percent (1.00%) per month for special tooling and for all other property and equipment.

d) If any item of property is to be used on other work for which use has been authorized during the period such property is requested for use on any contract resulting from this solicitation, the evaluation factors shall be calculated in accordance with the following: the acquisition cost of each item of property shall be multiplied by the rental rates specified for the applicable classification of property set forth above, and the product obtained shall then be multiplied by the number of months of rent-free use requested. The resulting product shall be multiplied by a fraction, the numerator of which is the amount of use of the property proposed under this solicitation, and the denominator of which is the sum of the previously-

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

authorized use of the property during the period of proposed use and the use proposed under this solicitation. The measurement unit for determining the amount of use to be considered in establishing the fraction referred to in the foregoing calculation shall be direct labor hours, sales, hours of use, or any other measurement unit which will result in an equitable apportionment of the factor. The measurement unit used and the amount of respective uses shall be set forth in sufficient detail to support the proration for each item of property.

e) For the purposes of determining the evaluation factors set forth above, the following definitions apply:

(1) The term acquisition cost means the total cost to the Government for an item of property, including the cost of (i) transportation, (ii) installation, (iii) accessories to be used with the item, and (iv) any rebuilding and modernization which has enhanced the original capability of the item;

(2) The age of an item of property shall be based on the year in which it was manufactured, with an annual birthday on 1 January of each year thereafter. On 1 January following the date of manufacture, the item shall be considered one year old; and on each succeeding January 1st, it shall become one year older (thus, an item manufactured on 15 July 1978 would be one year old on 1 January 1979, and over two years old on and after 1 January 1980).

f) Where this solicitation provides that the property is offered for use on an as-is basis, F.O.B. loading dock at present location, the Government shall add to the Evaluated Cost, in addition to the evaluation factors described above, a factor, for purposes of evaluation, which will be composed of the costs to the Government of making such property available at the F.O.B. point, including the costs of disconnection, preparation for shipment, and placement on the loading dock.

M.4.3.1.3 For the FPIS LRIP Option subCLINs, the Evaluated Price for LRIP year one shall include the proposed Ceiling Prices for each FPIS subCLIN. The Evaluated Price for LRIP years two and three shall include the proposed Ceiling Price at the quantity identified in CLIN Narrative B002, which represents the most probable quantity the Government expects to exercise, included in Section B of the RFP. In addition, for each FPIS subCLIN in LRIP year one, the Government will evaluate the reasonableness of the proposed Ceiling Price. For each FPIS subCLIN in LRIP years two and three, the Government will evaluate the reasonableness of the proposed ceiling price at the quantity identified in CLIN narrative B002 included in Section B of the RFP, and the ceiling price per vehicle for each quantity range. As part of this evaluation, the Government will consider the reasonableness of the proposed Ceiling Price in comparison to the proposed Target Cost, using the detailed narrative explaining how the proposed Ceiling Price was developed (as requested in Sections L.4.3.6.2 and L.4.3.6.5 of the RFP). Price reasonableness may also be evaluated by various means as identified in FAR Part 15.404-1(b), such as historical data and experience available from Government sources. A price is reasonable if, in its nature and amount, it does not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person in the conduct of competitive business.

(a) Evaluated Price - FPIS CLINs:

1) The Evaluated Price for the FPIS CLINs will consist of summing:

i. The total proposed Ceiling Price for each subCLIN (0004AA - 0004AH, 0005AA - 0005AE, 0006AA - 0006AE). Note that for the FPIS subCLINs associated with LRIP years two and three, the Ceiling Price will be based on the quantity identified in CLIN narrative B002 included in Section B of the RFP; and

ii. The proposed credit for exchange of vehicles for each subCLIN (0004AA - 0004AE, 0005AA - 0005AE, 0006AA - 0006AE) as defined in Sections H.7.3, H.7.4, H.7.5 and L.4.3.6.3. Note that the credit for the exchange of vehicles will be applied to the proposed price (including profit) detailed in Section M.4.3.1.3(a)(1)(i) above. Also note that for the FPIS subCLINs associated with LRIP years two and three, the Credit for Exchange of Vehicles will be based on the quantity identified in CLIN narrative B002 included in Section B of the RFP; and

iii. Use of Existing Government-Owned Property:

a) Rent-free use of existing facilities, special test equipment, and/or special tooling, title to which is in the Government or to which the Government has the right to take title (all of which is herein described as property), including rent-free use by prospective subcontractors, will be a consideration in the evaluation of responses to this solicitation.

b) For purposes of evaluation only, the proposed items for each classification of property, computed as follows, shall be included by the Government in the Evaluated Cost. The proposed items shall be computed by multiplying the acquisition cost of each item of property by the rental rates specified below, and then multiplying the product obtained by the number of months of use proposed. A minimum of one month of use shall be required for purposes of evaluation. Fractional portions of a month shall be counted as a full month. The final items shall be separately set forth by the offeror under the proposed price.

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

c) Monthly Rental Rates:

(1) For land and land preparation, buildings, building installations, and land installations other than those items specified in (2) below: the prevailing commercial rate.

(2) For industrial plant equipment of the types covered by Federal Supply Classification Code Numbers 3405, 3408, 3410, 3411 through 3419 (machine tools), and 3441 through 3449 (secondary metal forming and cutting machines), the following rates shall apply:

Age of Equipment	Monthly Rental Rates
0-2 years	3.00%
Over 2 to 3 years	2.00%
Over 3 to 6 years	1.50%
Over 6 to 10 years	1.00%
Over 10 years	0.75%

(3) For personal property and equipment not covered in (1) and (2) above (including all production equipment not in the Federal Supply Classification Codes set forth above, and including special tooling and special test equipment), the following rates shall apply:

- Two percent (2.00%) per month for electronic test equipment and automotive equipment;
- One percent (1.00%) per month for special tooling and for all other property and equipment.

d) If any item of property is to be used on other work for which use has been authorized during the period such property is requested for use on any contract resulting from this solicitation, the evaluation factors shall be calculated in accordance with the following: the acquisition cost of each item of property shall be multiplied by the rental rates specified for the applicable classification of property set forth above, and the product obtained shall then be multiplied by the number of months of rent-free use requested. The resulting product shall be multiplied by a fraction, the numerator of which is the amount of use of the property proposed under this solicitation, and the denominator of which is the sum of the previously-authorized use of the property during the period of proposed use and the use proposed under this solicitation. The measurement unit for determining the amount of use to be considered in establishing the fraction referred to in the foregoing calculation shall be direct labor hours, sales, hours of use, or any other measurement unit which will result in an equitable apportionment of the factor. The measurement unit used and the amount of respective uses shall be set forth in sufficient detail to support the proration for each item of property.

e) For the purposes of determining the evaluation factors set forth above, the following definitions apply:

(1) The term acquisition cost means the total cost to the Government for an item of property, including the cost of (i) transportation, (ii) installation, (iii) accessories to be used with the item, and (iv) any rebuilding and modernization which has enhanced the original capability of the item;

(2) The age of an item of property shall be based on the year in which it was manufactured, with an annual birthday on 1 January of each year thereafter. On 1 January following the date of manufacture, the item shall be considered one year old; and on each succeeding January 1st, it shall become one year older (thus, an item manufactured on 15 July 1978 would be one year old on 1 January 1979, and over two years old on and after 1 January 1980).

f) Where this solicitation provides that the property is offered for use on an as-is basis, F.O.B. loading dock at present location, the Government shall add to the Evaluated Cost, in addition to the evaluation factors described above, a factor, for purposes of evaluation, which will be composed of the costs to the Government of making such property available at the F.O.B. point, including the costs of disconnection, preparation for shipment, and placement on the loading dock.

M.4.3.2 Unbalanced Pricing. Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable total evaluated price, the price of one or more contract line items is significantly over or understated as indicated by the application of cost/price analysis techniques. Offerors are cautioned that a proposal the Government assesses to be unbalanced as to price, may be either rejected or unacceptable for award.

M.4.4 O&S Factor

The O&S Factor contains two SubFactors: (1) Reliability Availability Maintainability (RAM), and (2) Commonality. The RAM SubFactor is more important than the Commonality SubFactor.

*M.4.4.1 RAM SubFactor

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

The Government will assess the risk that, based on the extent and credibility of the RAM data provided for the AMPV FoVs, the Offeror will timely deliver EMD test vehicles which will successfully complete EMD RAM testing. This assessment will be based on the proposal information submitted in response to RFP Paragraph L.4.4.1.

M.4.4.2 Commonality SubFactor

The Government will assess the extent to which each of the items listed in Attachment 0062 are common across all five AMPV FoVs to achieve complete commonality. Only commonality across all five variants will be given evaluation credit as a strength in the Commonality SubFactor evaluation. Proposals will be assessed as progressively more advantageous the greater the extent to which complete commonality is achieved.

M.4.5 Small Business Participation Factor

M.4.5.1 The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed extent of Small Business Participation in the performance of the contract (EMD and LRIP) for the Small Business categories listed in Section M.4.5.2 below.

M.4.5.2 The evaluation will consist of the following:

(a) The extent to which the proposal identifies participation by U.S. small business concerns to achieve the Government's goals for U.S. small businesses (SBs) in the categories listed below and expressed as percentage of Total Contract Amount. The term Total Contract Amount is defined for evaluation purposes as total proposed amount for the Basic EMD CLIN and all of the LRIP Option CLINs.

- 13% for Small Business (SB)
- 1.8% for Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB)
- 1.8% for Woman Owned Small Business (WOSB)
- 1% for Historically Underutilized Business Zone Small Business (HubZone SB)
- 1% for Veteran Owned Small Business (VOSB)
- 1% for Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business (SDVOSB)

(b) An assessment of the proposal risk probability that the Offeror will achieve the levels of Small Business Participation identified in the proposal.

*Revised via Amendment 0005

*** END OF NARRATIVE M0001 ***