

<b>AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT</b>			1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES 1   25
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0013	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 26-Sep-2005	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. W81W3G-0A76-0001		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY USAED - BALTIMORE 10 SOUTH HOWARD STREET BALTIMORE MD 21201	CODE W912DR	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6) <b>See Item 6</b>		
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code)		X	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. W912DR-05-R-0001	
		X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 28-Jun-2005	
			10A. MOD. OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
			10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
CODE	FACILITY CODE			
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offer <input type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is not extended. Offer must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning _____ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.				
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)				
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.				
A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.				
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(B).				
C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:				
D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)				
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.				
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.) The solicitation for the Public-Private A-76 Competition for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Information Management/Information Technology is hereby amended per the attached Summary of Changes. As a result of this amendment, the proposal due date of 21 October 2005 at 4:00pm is not changed. It is anticipated that this will be the final technical amendment for this solicitation.				
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.				
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)		
		TEL: _____ EMAIL: _____		
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		16C. DATE SIGNED
_____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)		BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)		26-Sep-2005

## SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

## SUMMARY OF CHANGES

## SECTION SF 30 - BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

The following have been added by full text:

AMENDMENT 0013 INFORMATION

SUMMARY OF CHANGES:

The following changes are included in this amendment.

- A conformed RFP through this Amendment 0013 is hereby attached for ease of reference. Every effort has been made to highlight all changes in BOLD print which have been indicated on the previous amendments.
- Comments/Questions and responses from the Website, dated 16, 21, and 26 September 2005 are attached.
- **Question** received via email: What is the proposed date for the Oral Presentations?  
**Answer:** It is anticipated that Oral Presentations will be held one week after receipt of proposals (i.e., week of 31 October 2005).
- A new Section B is attached to add the following information: **The cost reimbursable portion of the phase-in period (\$120,000,000) will be subject to a fixed fee proposed by the offeror that may not exceed 2%. The Agency Tender Official is excluded from proposing on this fixed fee. The fee amount, if proposed by the offeror shall be reflected on the cost schedule and shall be applied to the established not to exceed amount (\$120,000,000) for the cost portion of the contract phase-in period.**
- FAR Clause 52.216-8, Fixed Fee, is added by reference to Section I. This clause only applies to line item 0001B of the bid schedule.
- The Equivalent Hire information for FAR Clause 52.222-42, issued in Amendment 0008, dated 01 September 2005 is hereby updated to correct the hourly rates (based on Pay Banding) for the Engineering Research & Development Center (ERDC) affected employees only. The remainder of the rates issued in Amendment 0008 are current.
- Section J - A revised Award Fee Plan, dated 15 September 2005 is attached to this amendment. Award Fee Plan was revised to incentivize the prime contractor to maximize participation of small businesses as either subcontractors or members of teaming arrangements. Therefore, (1) the introduction has been modified to add the wording for the Small Business Utilization factor, (2) the Award Fee Evaluation Criteria Weighting factor in Attachment 2 of the Plan was revised to increase Small Business Utilization from 10% to 15% and make other adjustments accordingly in the criteria, (3) revise the definition of the criteria for the Small Business Utilization factor, and (4) Update Attachment 4 example to include the change in criteria.
- Section L - FAR Provision 52.216-1, Type of Contract, is amended to add the wording that Cost Reimbursable Plus Fixed Fee applies to line item 0001B.

- Section M, Basis for Selection of Successful Offeror or Agency Tender, (a) is revised as well as Factors to be Evaluated (3) Past Performance and (5) Utilization of Small Business. Paragraph as indicated below. The changes are in **BOLD** print. A new Section M is attached.

(a) **Lowest Priced Technically Acceptable Source Selection:** The agency shall conduct a lowest price technically acceptable source selection in accordance with FAR 15.101-2 and OMB Circular A-76. The evaluation criteria contained herein (see Factors to be Evaluated) shall be used to make that determination. The successful offeror's/tenders proposal must be found "technically acceptable" on **all** factors and subfactors to remain in the competition. **Any proposal/tender that is determined to be technically unacceptable will not be evaluated in COMPARE. To ensure that that MEO is rated fairly against private industry, the agency tender as well as proposals submitted by private sector offerors will be evaluated in accordance with the requirements of the FAR and OMB Circular No. A-76 (Revised May 29, 2003). Attachment B, paragraph 3.a(4) of the circular specifically states that the MEO is not required to include in its proposal, among other things, past performance information, subcontracting plan goal, and participation of small disadvantaged business. Since this information will not be included in the agency tender, these areas will not receive any rating, to include a rating of "neutral."** For purposes of evaluation, factors and subfactors designated for assessment, with the exception of cost, will be assigned adjectival ratings as listed and defined below:

(3) **Past Performance** - Does the offeror's relevant past performance history indicate a pattern of conformance to contract requirements and demonstrate satisfactory performance of contracts of similar size, scope, and complexity and related operations for work specified in the solicitation? Does the offeror's significant subcontractor(s) (\$2,000,000 or more), if any, provide relevant past performance history on contracts of similar size, scope and complexity and related operations for work specified in the solicitation? Does the offeror demonstrate cost control experience under contracts similar in size, scope and complexity to that contemplated by this solicitation? **Does the offeror indicate and show evidence that they have met or exceeded the small business goals on past contracts?**

(5) **Utilization of Small Business** – **Has the offeror submitted a Small Business Subcontracting Plan that meets the requirements of FAR 52.219-9, Alt II, and received a rating of 71% or higher when evaluated against Appendix DD of the Army FAR Supplement?** Does the offeror's proposed small business subcontract plan meet the requirements of the solicitation by providing a goal of at least 25% of the total contract value? Did the offeror propose a percentage goal for the each of the small business **subcategories?**

**SECTION B – SUPPLIES OR SERVICES AND PRICE/COSTS**  
**26 September 2005 – Amendment 0013**

**Introduction**

CLIN 0001 is the 12 month Phase-in period.

SubCLIN 0001A is the first 6 months to be Firm Fixed Price. This shall include the preparation of the final transition plan to support SubCLIN 0001B; this plan shall be delivered to the Contracting Officer on the first day of the fifth month of the phase-in period.

SubCLIN 0001B is the second 6 months to be Cost Reimbursable with an estimated stated not to exceed value of \$120,000,000. The \$120,000,000 amount may not be modified and will be the same value for all offerors for purposes of cost evaluation. **The cost reimbursable portion of the phase-in period (\$120,000,000) will be subject to a fixed-fee proposed by the offeror that may not exceed 2%. The Agency Tender Official is excluded from proposing on this fixed fee. The fee amount, if proposed by the offeror shall be reflected on the cost schedule and shall be applied to the established not to exceed amount (\$120,000,000) for the cost portion of the contract phase-in period.**

CLIN 0002 Is the Firm Fixed Price to develop a report Implementation of the Contractor Manpower.

CLIN 0003 Is the Firm Fixed Price of all requirements described in the PWS that are not included in other separate CLINs.

Note: All services in a through w, below are excluded from the bid and may be executed on a Cost Reimbursable basis or a Fixed Price modification as determined by the Contracting Officer.

- a) *C.5.1.3 Consulting Services*
- b) *C.5.1.6.8 MACOM Design Activity (MDA)*
- c) *C.5.1.8.4. Emergency Operations.*
- d) *C.5.2.1.2. Automated Information System (AIS) and Custom Software Applications.*
- e) *C.5.2.10. IMIT Unique Requirements*
- f) *C.5.3. Communications.* Only the work associated with the word “install”.
- g) *C.5.3.2.1. Management.* Only the work associated with the word “install”.
- h) *C.5.3.2.4.2. Voice Services (Emergency).*
- i) *C.5.3.2.4.6. PBX and Keyed Systems.* Only the work associated with the word “install”.
- j) *C.5.3.3.2.5. Emergency Services.* Only the following sentence “The SP shall participate in national and natural emergency operations.”
- k) *C.5.3.5.2.1 Radio and Microwave Towers.* Only the work associated with the words “install and uninstall”.
- l) *C.5.7.2.1. Audiovisual Services.* Only the work associated with the words “conferences, workshops, meetings, and training classes” and the pre-event surveys associated with this work.
- m) *C.5.7.2.2. Emergency Operations Support.*
- n) *C.5.7.2.3. Audiovisual Facility Design and Installation.*
- o) *C.5.7.3.1. Photographic Services.* Only the work associated with " special events, high-speed, emergency operations, field location, portrait, official military service records, scientific, aerial, hydraulic modeling, research and development"
- p) *C.5.7.3.2. Videography Services.* Only the work associated with " special events, high-speed, emergency operations, field location, scientific, aerial, hydraulic modeling, research and development "
- q) *C.5.7.3.3 Video Production Services:*
- r) *C.5.7.4.1. Graphic Displays –* Only the work associated with “visitor center level exhibits”.
- s) *C.5.7.4.2 Multimedia Products.*
- t) *C.5.7.4.4 Media Conversions.*
- u) *C.5.7.4.5 3-D Computer Animation Projects.*

- v) *C.5.7.4.6 Technical Illustration and Drafting Service.*
- w) *C.5.7.5 Management of Exhibits.*

CLIN0004 Is the Firm Fixed Price associated with the Management of the Government Furnished equipment as defined in section C.3 (and listed in TE-3 of the PWS) and the following reimbursable items

- a. C.3.3.Circuits and wireless. The invoiced cost of the monthly recurring costs for voice and data carrier usage.
- b. C.5.5.2.3 **Official Mail Preparation.** Postage only.
- c. C.5.6.1. Printing Services and Support. Payment of the invoice of the actual printing only
- d. C.5.6.4. Copier Program Management. Invoice supported cost of the paper to support Copy Program only.

CLIN 0005 Is the Firm Fixed Price associated with the Service Provider Furnished Property as defined in section C-4 of the PWS

**Bid Schedule**

0001 Phase-In Period total 12 months

0001A First 6 months Fixed Price \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
10 March 2006 – 09 September 2006

0001B Second 6 months Cost Reimbursable \$ 120,000,000.00  
10 September 2006 – 09 March 2007

NTE 2% of line item 0001B \_\_\_\_\_

0002 Labor to perform services for the  
Implementation of the Contractor Manpower  
Reporting as Described in Section G, Reporting  
of Contracting Manpower Data Elements. These  
services will be for the length of the Contract  
performance period, to include the phase-in period.  
**THE AGENCY TENDER IS EXCLUDED FROM  
COMPLETING THIS LINE ITEM.**

0001A. Phase-In and Base Period \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
10 March 2006 – 09 March 2008

0001B. Option Period 0001 \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
10 March 2008 – 09 March 2009

0001C. Option Period 0002 \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
10 March 2009 – 09 March 2010

0001D. Option Period 0003 \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
10 March 2010 – 09 March 2011

0001E. Option Period 0004 \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
10 March 2011 – 09 March 2012

0003 Contract Performance. Perform all services in support of the mission in accordance with the Solicitation, with the exception of the items listed in a. – w. above and in CLINs 0001, 0002, 0004 and 0005. This CLIN 0003 is to be offered as a Firm Fixed Price.

- |   |          |
|---|----------|
| 0003A Base Period<br>10 March 2007 – 09 March 2008        | \$ _____ |
| 0003B Option Period 0001<br>10 March 2008 – 09 March 2009 | \$ _____ |
| 0003C Option Period 0002<br>10 March 2009 – 09 March 2010 | \$ _____ |
| 0003D Option Period 0003<br>10 March 2010 – 09 March 2011 | \$ _____ |
| 0003E Option Period 0004<br>10 March 2011 – 09 March 2012 | \$ _____ |
- 0004 The following Firm Fixed Price for the Management of the Government Furnished equipment as defined in section C.3 (and listed in TE-3 of the PWS) and the following reimbursable items
- a. C.3.3.Circuits and wireless. The monthly recurring costs for voice and data carrier usage.
  - b. C.5.5.2.3 **Official Mail Preparation**. Postage only.
  - c. C.5.6.1. Printing Services and Support. Payment of the invoice of the actual printing only
  - d. C.5.6.4. Copier Program Management. Paper to Support Copy Program Only.

Management shall be defined as all Labor, material, supplies associated with the receiving, accounting, disposition of the above equipment items and operations. The Service Provider shall propose in this section the cost to manage this equipment and these work items. In addition the Service Provider shall be responsible to finance government operations by paying all costs associated with the above list of items. After payment the Service Provider may request reimbursement (on an agreed time schedule) for the non-management costs only. For equipment items described in C.3 the cost that may be requested for reimbursement is limited to the invoice price of the equipment item. For item a. C.3.3 the only cost allowable for reimbursement will be the invoiced monthly recurring usage cost from the voice and/or data carrier. For item b. C.5.5. the only cost allowable for reimbursement will be the metered postage cost. For item c. C.5.6.1 the only cost allowable for reimbursement will be the invoiced cost of printing. For item d. C.5.6.4 the only cost allowable for reimbursement will be the invoiced cost of paper used for copies in copy machines.

- |   |          |
|---|----------|
| 0004A Base Period<br>10 March 2007 – 09 March 2008          | \$ _____ |
| 0004B Option Period 0001<br>10 March 2008 – 09 March 2009   | \$ _____ |
| 0004C . Option Period 0002<br>10 March 2009 – 09 March 2010 | \$ _____ |
| 0004D Option Period 0003<br>10 March 2010 – 09 March 2011   | \$ _____ |
| 0004E Option Period 0004<br>10 March 2011 – 09 March 2012   | \$ _____ |

0005 Execution of the Service Provider Furnished Property as defined in section C-4 of the PWS. SP shall provide all material, facilities, supplies, equipment and administrative operations associated with these items to support their mission in accordance with section C.4 of the PWS. This Item is Firm Fixed Price.

0005A Base Period \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
10 March 2007 - 09 March 2008

0005B Option Period 0001 \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
10 March 2008 - 09 March 2009

0005C Option Period 0002 \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
10 March 2009 - 09 March 2010

0005D Option Period 0003 \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
10 March 2010 - 09 March 2011

0005E Option Period 0004 \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
10 March 2011 - 09 March 2012

0006 Award Fee

**THE AGENCY TENDER IS EXCLUDED FROM  
COMPLETING THIS LINE ITEM.**

0006A Base Period Award Fee \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
10 March 2007 - 09 March 2008

0006B Option Period 0001 Award Fee \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
10 March 2008 - 09 March 2009

0006C Option Period 0002 Award Fee \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
10 March 2009- 09 March 2010

0006D Option Period 0003 Award Fee \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
10 March 2010 - 09 March 2011

0006E Option Period 0004 Award Fee \$ \_\_\_\_\_  
10 March 2011 - 09 March 2012

**Total**

**Total All items 0001 through 0006 \$ \_\_\_\_\_**

**FAR Clause 52.222-42****Rates For Equivalent Hire - Amendment****0013 – ERDC Only**

<b>Location</b>	<b>Classifications</b>	<b>Occ/ Spec. Series</b>	<b>Auth Grade Rank</b>	<b>Strength</b>	<b>Rate</b>
ERDC	Administrative Support Ass't	00303	2	1	\$16.52
ERDC	Administrative Support Ass't	00303	7	1	\$20.73
ERDC	Telecommunications Specialist	00391	3	1	\$28.58
ERDC	Telecommunications Specialist	00391	11	1	\$26.64
ERDC	Communication/Telecommunication/Clerk	00394	3	1	\$15.91
ERDC	Electronics Technician	00856	3	1	\$25.39
ERDC	Computer Scientist	01550	4	1	\$35.73
ERDC	Information Technology (IT) Specialist	02210	3	1	\$29.05
ERDC	IT Specialist	02210	3	1	\$34.14
ERDC	IT Specialist	02210	3	1	\$34.14
ERDC	IT Specialist	02210	12	1	\$32.29
ERDC	IT Specialist	02210	12	1	\$32.29
ERDC	Forms Programs Manager	00343	3	1	\$30.23
ERDC	Computer Engineer	00854	4	1	\$53.02
ERDC	Computer Scientist	01550	3	1	\$24.50
ERDC	Computer Scientist	01550	4	1	\$39.05
ERDC	Computer Scientist	01550	4	1	\$39.05
ERDC	Computer Scientist	01550	4	1	\$39.05
ERDC	Computer Scientist	01550	4	1	\$39.05
ERDC	Computer Scientist	01550	4	1	\$39.05
ERDC	Computer Scientist	01550	4	1	\$39.05
ERDC	Computer Scientist	01550	4	1	\$39.05
ERDC	Computer Scientist	01550	4	1	\$39.05
ERDC	Computer Scientist	01550	4	1	\$39.05
ERDC	Computer Scientist	01550	4	1	\$39.05
ERDC	Computer Scientist	01550	4	1	\$39.05
ERDC	Computer Scientist	01550	5	1	\$54.50
ERDC	IT Specialist	02210	3	1	\$29.05
ERDC	IT Specialist	02210	3	1	\$29.05
ERDC	IT Specialist	02210	3	1	\$29.05
ERDC	IT Specialist	02210	3	1	\$29.05
ERDC	IT Specialist	02210	3	1	\$29.05
ERDC	IT Specialist	02210	3	1	\$29.05
ERDC	IT Specialist	02210	3	1	\$29.05
ERDC	IT Specialist	02210	3	1	\$29.05
ERDC	IT Specialist	02210	3	1	\$29.05
ERDC	IT Specialist	02210	3	1	\$29.05
ERDC	IT Specialist	02210	4	1	\$22.10
ERDC	IT Specialist	02210	9	1	\$27.17
ERDC	IT Specialist	02210	11	1	\$30.69
ERDC	IT Specialist	02210	11	1	\$30.69
ERDC	IT Specialist	02210	12	1	\$32.20
ERDC	IT Specialist	02210	12	1	\$32.20
ERDC	IT Specialist	02210	12	1	\$32.20
ERDC	Computer Services Specialist	01550	4	1	\$37.08
ERDC	Computer Services Specialist	01550	4	1	\$37.08
ERDC	IT Specialist	02210	4	1	\$37.08
ERDC	IT Specialist	02210	4	1	\$37.08

ERDC	IT Specialist	02210	4	1	\$37.08
ERDC	IT Specialist	02210	12	1	\$32.29
ERDC	IT Specialist Illustrative	00301	4	1	\$43.79
ERDC	Technician	01020	9	1	\$28.71
ERDC	AudioVisual Clerk AudioVisual Specialist	01071	2	1	\$23.04
ERDC	Specialist	01071	11	1	\$29.87
ERDC	Writing & Editing Ass't	01082	2	1	\$22.39
ERDC	Writing & Editing Ass't	01082	2	1	\$22.39
ERDC	Writing & Editing Ass't	01082	3	1	\$37.73
ERDC	Writing & Editing Ass't	01082	3	1	\$37.73
ERDC	Writing & Editing Ass't	01082	3	1	\$37.73
ERDC	Writing & Editing Ass't	01082	3	1	\$37.73
ERDC	Writing & Editing Ass't	01082	3	1	\$37.73
ERDC	Writing & Editing Ass't	01082	3	1	\$37.73
ERDC	Writing & Editing Ass't	01082	3	1	\$37.73
ERDC	Writing & Editing Ass't	01082	3	1	\$37.73
ERDC	Technical Writing & Editing	01083	12	1	\$36.76
ERDC	Technical Writing & Editing	01083	12	1	\$36.76
ERDC	Technical Writing & Editing	01083	12	1	\$36.76
ERDC	Visual Information (VI) Specialist	01084	2	1	\$26.44
ERDC	VI Specialist	01084	2	1	\$26.44
ERDC	VI Specialist	01084	2	1	\$26.44
ERDC	VI Specialist	01084	2	1	\$26.44
ERDC	VI Specialist	01084	2	1	\$26.44
ERDC	VI Specialist	01084	2	1	\$26.44
ERDC	VI Specialist	01084	2	1	\$26.44
ERDC	VI Specialist	01084	2	1	\$26.44
ERDC	VI Specialist	01084	2	1	\$26.44
ERDC	VI Specialist	01084	2	1	\$26.44
ERDC	VI Specialist	01084	3	1	\$28.83
ERDC	VI Specialist	01084	3	1	\$28.83
ERDC	VI Specialist	01084	9	1	\$24.02
ERDC	Editorial Ass't	01087	2	1	\$32.16
ERDC	Forms Program Manager	00343	2	1	\$23.38
ERDC	Forms Program Manager	00343	2	1	\$23.38
ERDC	Forms Program Manager	00343	2	1	\$23.38
ERDC	Forms Program Manager	00343	9	1	\$28.25
ERDC	Equipment Operator	00350	4	1	\$15.35
ERDC	Administrative support Ass't	00303	1	1	\$8.78
ERDC	Administrative support Ass't	00303	3	1	\$18.63

**AWARD FEE PLAN**  
**W912DR-05-R-0001**  
**15 September 2005**

## **1.0 Introduction**

This Award Fee Plan establishes an incentive system by which the service provider can earn additional profit for exceptional performance under the IMIT Support Services contract. This plan defines the criteria used to determine the amount of award fee points earned based on the assessments of the specified performance criteria. The contracting officer shall provide for any award fees earned by the contractor through unilateral contract modification. The award fee only applies to CLIN 0006.

IMIT is a complex grouping of services that continually requires balancing competing resources of time, cost, and quality. Successful performance results from the service provider effectively managing its resources to accommodate these competing demands. The USACE intends to use the award fee to focus the service provider's attention on specific IMIT performance priorities. In support of this objective the award fee criteria is divided into **four (4)** general areas: Customer Support, Performance Effectiveness, **Small Business Utilization**, and USACE Mission Support. Each area is defined in general terms with associated general criteria. The USACE Award Fee Determining Official (AFDO) may add specific target areas of interests within each general category prior to the start of any award fee period.

## **2.0 ORGANIZATION AND RESPONSIBILITIES**

**2.1. Award Fee Review Board (AFRB):** The AFRB and the Fee Determining Official (FDO) constitute the award fee organizational body. The AFRB consists of a Chairperson, the Contracting Officer, a Recorder, Performance Monitors, and if necessary, other functional area participants or advisor members. Attachment 1 identifies these members. AFRB members review the performance monitor's evaluations of the service provider's performance, consider all information from pertinent sources, and arrive at an earned award fee point recommendation to be presented to the FDO. The AFRB will also recommend any changes to the award fee plan.

**2.2. Fee Determining Official (FDO):** The FDO approves the award fee plan and any significant changes to it. The FDO reviews the recommendation(s) of the AFRB, considers all pertinent data, and determines the award fee for each evaluation period. The FDO forwards the award fee determination to the contracting officer.

**2.3. Award Fee Review Board (AFRB) Chairperson:** The Chairperson chairs the AFRB meetings. The AFRB Chairperson briefs the FDO on the service provider's overall performance, the recommended award fee points for the period under review, and recommendations on award fee plan changes. The briefings will also include any data indicating the service provider's weaknesses, areas for corrective action, and examples of

exemplary performance. The chairperson ensures the performance review is thorough and covers all areas required to support the award fee recommendations.

**2.4. Contracting Officer:** The contracting officer is the liaison between service provider and government personnel. The contracting officer reviews the award fee recommendation prior to the FDO decision. The purpose of this review is to ensure "alignment" between the recommended award fee and the service provider's performance as documented in monthly contracting officer's representative (COR) reports. Disagreements, if any, will be resolved within the AFRB before the chairperson briefs the FDO. The contracting officer will ensure the contract file contains documentation substantiating the Award Fee Decision and will modify the contract, if necessary, to reflect the determination.

**2.5. AFRB Recorder:** The AFRB recorder is responsible for coordinating the administrative actions required by the performance monitors, the AFRB and the FDO. The recorder will also schedule and notify the AFRB members of the interim and end-of-period evaluation meetings.

**2.6. Performance Monitors:** Performance monitors are the quality assurance personnel that will evaluate and document the contractor's performance. They will maintain written records of their evaluations so a fair and accurate evaluation is obtained. Interim and end-of-period evaluation reports will be prepared and briefed to the AFRB.

### 3.0 AWARD FEE PROCESS

**3.1. Available Award Fee Point Amount:** The earned award fee points will be based on the service provider's performance during the evaluation period. There are 100 points available for each evaluation period. Up to ten additional points can be earned for each evaluation period based on process improvements identified by the service provider and accepted by the government.

**3.2. Evaluation Periods:** The evaluation period is 6 months. The first evaluation period will begin on the effective date of the base year performance in the contract and extend for 6 months. All subsequent award fee evaluation periods will be for the same 6-month period. After the Base Year Period the FDO may elect to change each award fee period to 12-month periods.

**3.3. Interim Evaluations:** During the Base Year Period interim evaluations will occur at the midpoint of each evaluation period. The AFRB recorder will notify each AFRB member and the performance monitors 21 calendar days before the interim period is complete. Performance monitors will submit their evaluation reports to the contracting officer not later than 10 calendar days after the end of the interim period. The contracting officer will review the evaluation reports for completeness and forward them to the AFRB chairperson. The AFRB will convene at the time; date and place established by the chairperson and will review available information to assess the service provider's strengths and weaknesses for the interim period. The contracting officer will provide the service provider with the interim evaluation assessment, including areas of strength and weakness.

**3.4. End-of-Period Evaluations:** End-of-period evaluations will occur at the end of each evaluation period. The AFRB recorder will notify each AFRB member and performance monitor 21 calendar days before the end of the evaluation period. Performance monitors will submit their evaluation reports to the contracting officer not later than 10 calendar days after the evaluation period ends. The contracting officer will review the evaluation reports for completeness and forward them to the AFRB chairperson. The AFRB will convene at the time, date and place established by the chairperson and will consider the information submitted by the following sources before making a recommendation to the FDO:

- (1) Performance monitor's evaluation reports;
- (2) Assessments or inputs from the contracting office representative, other functional area participants or advisor members; and
- (3) Service Provider's self-assessment.

The service provider's self-assessment must be submitted not later than 10 calendar days after the evaluation period ends. The self-assessment shall be no more than a total 15 pages in length. After receiving the performance monitors' evaluations and reviewing all available information, each voting member shall assess a rating and point total for each of the evaluation criteria. The evaluation criteria are outlined in Attachment 2. The total number of points assessed for each criterion will be divided by the number of voting AFRB members to determine the average. The average for each criterion will then be adjusted according to its weighted percentage of the total, identified in Attachment 2. The sum of these totals will then equate to the final number of award fee points that will be recommended to the FDO for consideration. The recommendation of the AFRB shall be briefed to the FDO within 30 calendar days after the end of the evaluation period. The FDO will make a determination of the earned award fee points within 45 calendar days after the end of the evaluation period. The contracting officer will notify the service provider in writing of the FDO's determination, and if necessary, issue a unilateral modification to provide the award fee in accordance with this plan.

**3.5. Evaluation Criteria:** The evaluation criteria, their associated percentage of the total maximum number of points, and a summarization example for the basis of each rating factor is presented in Attachment 2.

**3.5. Conversion Table:** The correlation of rating to range of award points and to award fee is detailed in Attachment 3.

**3.7. Points & Percentage Calculation:** An example of the award fee points and percentage calculation is provided in Attachment 4.

#### 4.0 AWARD FEE PLAN CHANGE PROCEDURES

The FDO has unilateral authority to make changes to this plan prior to the beginning of any new evaluation period that will become effective in the next evaluation period. Any change that will affect a current evaluation period must be agreed to bilaterally. Changes to this plan must be incorporated by contract modification.

#### 5.0 ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Award Fee Organization

Attachment 2: Evaluation Criteria

Attachment 3: Award Fee Conversion Table

Attachment 4: Award Fee Points & Percentage Calculation Example

Attachment 1

#### AWARD FEE ORGANIZATION

##### 1. Fee Determining Official:

TBD

##### 2. Award Fee Review Board:

###### a. Chairperson:

TBD

(Votes only in cases of a tie.)

###### b. Award Fee Review Board Members:

Voting Members:

TBD

Non-Voting Members:

Performance Monitors

Recorder

Staff Judge Advocate Representative

Other Functional Advisory Personnel (as determined necessary)

##### 3. All voting members of the Award Fee Organization are government employees.

Attachment 2

**EVALUATION CRITERIA**

The evaluation criteria and their respective weightings toward the possible 100 evaluation points are as follows:

<u>Evaluation Criteria</u>	<u>Weighting Factors</u>
<b>Customer Satisfaction . . . . .</b>	<b>33%</b>
<b>Performance Effectiveness . . . . .</b>	<b>33%</b>
<b>Small Business Utilization.....</b>	<b>15%</b>
<b>USACE Mission Support.....</b>	<b>19%</b>

An additional 10 points may be earned through process improvements:

Process Improvements . . . . . Up to 10 points

Total maximum score is 110 points. Total award point scores from 100 to 110 will earn the contractor 100% of the award fee for the evaluation period. See Attachment 3, Award Fee Conversion Table.

**1. Customer Satisfaction:** The government will evaluate the service provider's customer satisfaction survey system and resultant customer survey analysis. The service provider's process of measuring customer satisfaction should be distinguish between the levels of satisfaction, with the mid level rating set to correspond to the level of acceptable/satisfactory service as measured by user expectations. A total rating should be able to be calculated monthly by taking the average of the ratings for each service area's customer satisfaction and a community-wide customer satisfaction. An annual customer satisfaction rating would be the average of the monthly ratings for 6 months. The "User Expectations" baseline will be established with the survey accomplished during the Phase-In period.

Unsatisfactory: The service provider has demonstrated a level of performance that is deficient in significant areas and received a total customer satisfaction rating below the customer's expected acceptable level. The service provider's customer satisfaction survey system and resultant analysis reports are inadequate. Immediate improvement is required.

Satisfactory: The service provider has performed in a manner that conforms to the requirements. The customer survey process being utilized is providing reliable results. Areas of good performance usually offset areas of deficiency and the service provider has received a "satisfactory" total customer satisfaction rating.

Good: The service provider has performed in a manner that meets or exceeds requirements. Areas of deficiency are few and are offset by areas of good or excellent performance. The service provider provides uninterrupted and adequate support with minimal disruption. A total customer satisfaction rating is above the satisfactory level.

Excellent: The service provider's performance clearly exceeds requirements. Deficiencies are very few and low in importance and are offset by excellent performance in other areas. The service provider actively provides follow up seeking process improvements that will increase mission support, readiness and overall customer satisfaction. Customer satisfaction is well above the good level.

Superior: The service provider's performance is truly superior and customer satisfaction clearly exceeds the excellent level with ratings at the upper limits.

**2. Performance Effectiveness**: The government will evaluate how well the service provider is meeting the identified outcomes and performance standards of the contract and quality of service. In addition, the government will assess the service provider's overall management approach and responsiveness.

Unsatisfactory: Performance of contract is inadequate and inconsistent; requiring attention and constant surveillance to ensure the mission is not affected. Fails to adapt to changing program and schedule requirements resulting in significant adverse impact. Fails to proactively manage workload and take initiative to resolve problems before the government points them out. Areas of deficiency tend to be recurring. The standard of performance is not met.

Satisfactory: Support is adequate with minimal disruption. Performance conforms to the requirements of the contract. The contractor is responsive to changing program and schedule requirements. Although there are deficiencies these are worked with a proactive management approach and are usually offset by areas of good performance.

Good: Performance consistently meets the standards and outcomes of the contract. There are established programs and processes that identify and prevent deficiencies resulting in a quality of service at or above the minimum standard required. Minor discrepancies are offset by excellent performance in other areas. The contractor has a sound teaming approach with subcontractors to include organizational relationships and responsibilities.

Excellent: Performance is consistently at or above the standards and outcomes of the contract. Support is uninterrupted and discrepancies are resolved in an effective and timely manner. Effective performance metrics have been established, are tracked, and reported on time. Very little performance surveillance is required because of the contractor's own quality control plan. There are not recurring problems.

Superior: Performance is truly superior. Proactive management is used to identify and anticipate problems prior to any adverse impacts. Program effectively and efficiently safeguards

government property, personnel and the environment. Line of communication are well defined, clearly understood, and always facilitate rapid exchanges of information.

**3. Small Business Utilization:** The government will evaluate the service provider's utilization of small business and the service provider's small business opportunity for substantial small business participation in the execution of the contract.

Unsatisfactory: Service provider fails to provide at least 25% of contract value to small business during rated period. Fails to proactively manage recovery plan. The standard of performance is not met.

Satisfactory: Service provider executes sufficient small business participation to meet **overall small business and small business sub-category** goals during rated period or has aggressively managed plan to achieve goals and taken steps to overcome obstacles to meeting **them**.

Good: Service provider performance consistently meets the small business participation goals and effectively monitors and manages the subcontracts and/or teaming arrangements to ensure the growth of small business opportunity. The service provider actively works with the government to grow the base for small business participation and has in place a strategy to increase participation of **small business and small business sub-categories** beyond the goals **established in the approved subcontracting plan**.

Excellent: Service provider performance this rating period executed 30% of the total contract value with small business **and meets or exceeds most sub-category goals**. Service provider effectively manages small business utilization program and aggressively seeks to grow the base of potential small business contractors. Service provider has in place a strategy that provides small business opportunities in excess of 30% of total contract value **with commensurate success in exceeding small business sub-category goals**.

Superior: Performance is superior. Small business participation goal meets or exceeds 40% during the rated period with evidence that the small business utilization plan will sustain that level of performance due to the diligence and commitment of the service provider. **Small sub-category goals are met or exceeded in all categories**.

**4. USACE Mission Support:** The government will assess the service provider's overall performance and responsiveness to supporting the overall USACE Mission.

Unsatisfactory: Performance of contract is inadequate and inconsistent; requiring attention and constant surveillance to ensure the mission is not affected. Fails to adapt to changing program and schedule requirements resulting in significant adverse impact. Fails to proactively manage workload and take initiative to resolve problems before the government points them out. Areas of deficiency tend to be recurring. The standard of performance is not met.

Satisfactory: Support is adequate with minimal disruption. Performance meets necessary USACE mission requirements. The contractor is responsive to changing program and schedule

requirements. Although there are deficiencies these are worked with a proactive management approach and are usually offset by areas of good performance.

Good: Performance consistently meets the standards and outcomes of the contract. Minor discrepancies are offset by excellent performance in other areas. The service provider has a sound teaming approach with subcontractors to include organizational relationships and responsibilities.

Excellent: Performance is consistently at or above the standards and facilitates USACE employees effectively meeting its missions. There are not recurring problems.

Superior: Performance is truly superior. Proactive management is used to identify and anticipate problems prior to any adverse impacts to IMIT affect on USACE mission.

4. **Process Improvements**: The service provider may earn up to an additional 10 points per evaluation period for process improvements/recommendations that result in tangible or intangible benefits to the government. Here the service provider initiates an approach for continuous process improvement relating to improved quality, reduced costs, timeliness, etc.

## Attachment 3

**AWARD FEE CONVERSION TABLE**

<b>RATING</b>	<b>AWARD POINTS</b>	<b>AWARD FEE PERCENTAGE</b>
<b>Unsatisfactory</b>	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
<b>Satisfactory</b>	0 to 73	0%
<b>Good</b>	74	23%
	75	26%
	76	29%
	77	32%
	78	35%
	79	38%
	80	41%
	81	44%
	82	47%
	83	50%
	84	53%
<b>Excellent</b>	85	56%
	86	59%
	87	62%
	88	65%
	89	68%
	90	71%
	91	74%
	92	77%
	93	80%
<b>Superior</b>	94	83%
	95	86%

	96	89%
	97	92%
	98	95%
	99	98%
	100-110	100%

## Attachment 4

**AWARD FEE POINTS & PERCENTAGE CALCULATION EXAMPLE**

<b><u>CRITERIA</u></b>	<b><u>Average Points Earned</u></b>	<b><u>Weighting Factors</u></b>	<b><u>Weighted Points Earned</u></b>	<b><u>Award Fee Percentage</u></b>
Customer Satisfaction	79	33%	26.07	
Performance Effectiveness	83	33%	27.39	
Small Business Utilization	89	15%	13.35	
USACE Mission Support	93	19%	17.67	
Process Improvements	2		2.00	
Total Points Earned for Evaluation Period			<b>86.48</b> or 86.00	59%

Note: Points of "X.01" through "X.49" will be rounded down to "X".

Points of "X.50" through "X.99" will be rounded up to "X+1".

## Section M – Evaluation Factors for Award

## CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

52.217-5

Evaluation of Options

JUL 1990

SECTION M A76 EVAL FACTORS*Section M***BASIS FOR SELECTION OF SUCCESSFUL OFFER OR AGENCY TENDER**

(a) **Lowest Priced Technically Acceptable Source Selection:** The agency shall conduct a lowest price technically acceptable source selection in accordance with FAR 15.101-2 and OMB Circular A-76. The evaluation criteria contained herein (see Factors to be Evaluated) shall be used to make that determination. The successful offeror's/tenders proposal must be found "technically acceptable" on **all** factors and subfactors to remain in the competition. **Any proposal/tender that is determined to be technically unacceptable will not be evaluated in COMPARE. To ensure that that MEO is rated fairly against private industry, the agency tender as well as proposals submitted by private sector offerors will be evaluated in accordance with the requirements of the FAR and OMB Circular No. A-76 (Revised May 29, 2003). Attachment B, paragraph 3.a(4) of the circular specifically states that the MEO is not required to include in its proposal, among other things, past performance information, subcontracting plan goal, and participation of small disadvantaged business. Since this information will not be included in the agency tender, these areas will not receive any rating, to include a rating of "neutral."** For purposes of evaluation, factors and subfactors designated for assessment, with the exception of cost, will be assigned adjectival ratings as listed and defined below:

"Technically Acceptable" is defined as any proposal which can be awarded "as is" and contains few, if any, minor weaknesses. It meets or exceeds the Government's minimum needs and the Government is confident that the offeror can successfully perform the services.

"Technically Unacceptable" is defined as any proposal that contains major weaknesses which prohibit successful contract performance and/or could only become eligible for award if it were substantially revised. It does not meet the Government's requirements and the Government has no confidence that the offeror can successfully perform the services.

"Neutral" is defined as an offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available. In this case the offeror may not be

evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance. NOTE: This adjectival rating only applies to the Past Performance Factor.

(b) The Government will review the offeror's/tender's proposal to determine, completeness, reasonableness and cost realism.

(c) Offerors are urged to reflect their best possible potential costs, since less than the best potential costs could result in exclusion of the proposal from further consideration. If a material deficiency is perceived by the Contracting Officer, the Contracting Officer shall ensure that the Agency Tender Official, private sector offeror, or the public reimbursable tender official receive a deficiency notice and shall afford the Agency Tender Official, private sector offeror, or the public reimbursable tender official a specific number of days to address the material deficiency and, if necessary, to review and recertify the tender or offer.

(d) Offerors are reminded that unsupported promises to comply with the contractual requirements are not sufficient. Proposals must not merely "parrot" back the contractual requirements, but must provide convincing evidence in support of any conclusion statements relating to promised performance. The offeror's/tender's proposal is presumed to represent its best efforts to respond to the solicitation. Any inconsistency, whether real or apparent, between promised performance and price should be explained in the proposal. Unexplained inconsistencies resulting from the offeror's/tender's lack of understanding of the nature and scope of the work required may be grounds for rejection of the proposal.

#### **EVALUATION CRITERIA**

An evaluation of all offers will be made in accordance with the criteria set forth below. Evaluation criteria consist of factors and sub-factors. A proposal must first be determined to be "technically acceptable" to be considered for award, and then cost becomes the controlling factor among those proposals rated technically acceptable. There will be no ranking or scoring of proposals. Each factor and subfactor will be given a rating of "technically acceptable," "technically unacceptable," or "neutral", with the exception of cost. The individual members of the SSEB will evaluate each proposal in relation to each factor, and then the board will give a consensus rating. Each factor, with the exception of cost, will receive a rating, and then there will be an overall roll-up rating of the proposal as a whole. The overall evaluation of the offeror's/tender's technical capability to perform shall be based on all the evaluation factors stated below.

#### **FACTORS TO BE EVALUATED**

Proposals will be evaluated initially for acceptability. The evaluation factors are: Technical, Management, Past Performance, Experience, and Small Business Utilization. All non-cost factors are of equal importance. A price analysis and cost realism will be conducted on all proposals determined to be technically acceptable.

(1) Technical Factor: Subfactors to be evaluated under Technical include the following. All subfactors are of equal importance.

(a) Phase-In Plan - Does the Phase-In Plan demonstrate a thorough and clear plan for phase-in with a high probability for success? Does the offeror present an adequate plan for recruiting, hiring, training, and retaining the required staffing level, to include key personnel, necessary to provide complete contractual support from Phase-In through expiration of the contract? Does the phase-in plan minimize disruption, adverse personnel impacts, and start-up requirements? Does the phase-in plan address any security limitations? Does the Phase-In Plan include a reasonable approach to conduct the joint inventory and the inventory to baseline performance service quality levels? Has the offeror adequately detailed the role of the Government in conducting the two inventories? Does the Phase-In Plan include a reasonable concept of approach for the second 6-month period for ending Government operations and starting SP operations? Has the offeror adequately detailed the role of the Government in its conceptual approach to ending Government operations and starting SP operations

(b) Does the offeror provide a clear and easily understood staffing plan that provides sufficient detail to determine that the offeror can provide a sufficiently skilled and adequate work force (including any cross-utilization of personnel proposed) to perform all the requirements, including workload surges and after duty hours requirements?

(c) Does the offeror provide an adequate description of each functional area including the identification of major work processes, process interfaces, and the outputs of these processes? Does the offeror's/tender's technical approach ensure efficient, quality, and timely performance? Does the offeror demonstrate through its risk mitigation plan a thorough knowledge of the critical performance elements it must manage for a high probability of successful performance? Did the offeror submit quality performance standard(s) for each TE-1, Requirements Standard? Did the offeror identify the facilities and sufficiently describe their planned usage to include length of time it plans to occupy multiple facilities? Did the offeror address the task requirements of the WBS/PWS to the third level?

(d) Does the offeror adequately describe how work will be scheduled, to include employment of any automated systems or workloading procedures?

(e) Transformation Plan - Does the proposed Transformation Plan provide a comprehensive description of technical solutions that directly support all of the 13 Target Work Environment (TWE) statements prescribed in the Corps Enterprise Architecture (CeA) (reference Technical Exhibit 22)?

(f) Quality Control - Does the offeror's/tender's Quality Control Plan describe the relationship between his quality control personnel and the proposed organization including reporting requirements? Is the offeror's/tender's Quality Control Plan practical, consistent with quality concepts, and provide for an effective measure of contract performance? Does the plan include feedback mechanisms and corrective action

methods? Does the offeror's/tender's quality control system include effective and timely reporting to the Contracting Officer? Did the offeror provide adequate controls that will ensure a high probability of successful performance?

(g) Phase-Out – Did the offeror provide terms acceptable to the Government for the potential future purchase or lease of contractor titled equipment or facilities?

(2) Management Factor: Subfactors to be evaluated under Management include the following. All subfactors are of equal importance.

(a) Organizational Structure. Does the offeror adequately address interfaces between project management and administration and the functional areas? Does the offeror adequately address interfaces between just the functional areas?

(b) Does the offeror propose adequate management procedures for monitoring and analyzing performance indicators necessary to ensure timely quality work and cost control?

(c) Staffing and Key Personnel: Does the offeror demonstrate sufficient staffing that realistically supports its performance approach? Does the offeror demonstrate sufficient understanding of those positions that would require a Level I or II designation? Does the offeror demonstrate adequate personnel practices to maximize its staff stability? Does the offeror have a history of low employee turnover? Do the resumes submitted for key personnel adequately meet the requirements of the PWS including certification requirements? NOTE: Agency Tender is only required to submit Position Descriptions in lieu of resumes for each of its key positions. However, the Agency Tender Official may submit resumes subject to applicable federal laws. If the Agency Tender is partnering with industry, they shall submit resumes for any industry personnel who are considered key personnel.

(3) Past Performance - Does the offeror's relevant past performance history indicate a pattern of conformance to contract requirements and demonstrate satisfactory performance of contracts of similar size, scope, and complexity and related operations for work specified in the solicitation? Does the offeror's significant subcontractor(s) (\$2,000,000 or more), if any, provide relevant past performance history on contracts of similar size, scope and complexity and related operations for work specified in the solicitation? Does the offeror demonstrate cost control experience under contracts similar in size, scope and complexity to that contemplated by this solicitation? **Does the offeror indicate and show evidence that they have met or exceeded the small business goals on past contracts?**

(4) Experience - Does the offeror's experience, as a prime or major subcontractor demonstrate that they have the relevant experience on a minimum of three projects that were in effect within 36 months of this solicitation date? The projects must be of relevant scope, size and complexity as a prime or as a major subcontractor. Proposed significant subcontractors must also meet this minimum acceptability requirement. "Significant" is defined for these purposes in terms of estimated dollar amount of the subcontract (e.g., \$2,000,000 or more).

(5) Utilization of Small Business – **Has the offeror submitted a Small Business Subcontracting Plan that meets the requirements of FAR 52.219-9, Alt II, and received a rating of 71% or higher when evaluated against Appendix DD of the Army FAR Supplement?** Does the offeror's proposed small business subcontract plan meet the requirements of the solicitation by providing a goal of at least 25% of the total contract value? Did the offeror propose a percentage goal for the each of the small business concerns?

COST FACTOR:

Price will not be evaluated with a rating system other than the computation for the private sector offerors, required under PL 108-287, August 5, 2004, Section 8014 of the Fiscal Year 2005 Department of Defense Appropriations Act (See Section H and Section L.5.1.4). The government will assess price for completeness, reasonableness, and cost realism. Further, proposals will be evaluated by utilizing the OMB mandated COMPARE software for A-76 competitions. An evaluation will be performed on the total proposed price, to include phase-in, basic performance period, and all option years. The price analysis will be an Independent Government review and evaluation of each offerors proposed price for completeness, reasonableness, and cost realism.

Performance Decision: The basis for award is Lowest Price/Technically Acceptable. The offeror's and Agency Tender Official's price will be determined by summing all CLINs to include the NTE price of any Section B CLIN. The performance decision shall be based on the lowest price of all offers and tenders determined to be technically acceptable complying with OMB Circular No. A-76 (May 29, 2003). The Contracting Officer shall sign the Standard Competition Form (SCF) and the Source Selection Authority (SSA) shall certify the SCF in accordance with Attachment C of the OMB Circular No. A-76 (May 29, 2003). The SSA makes the performance decision by certifying the SCF.

SECTION I - CONTRACT CLAUSES

The following have been added by reference:

52.216-8

Fixed Fee

MAR 1997

SECTION L – INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES TO OFFERORS

52.216-1 TYPE OF CONTRACT (APR 1984)

The Government contemplates award of a Firm Fixed Price Plus Award Fee/Cost Reimbursement contract resulting from this solicitation. **Cost Reimbursement Plus Fixed Fee only applies to line item 0001B of the Bid Schedule.**

(End of clause)

(End of Summary of Changes)