

**MINUTEMAN MINIMUM ESSENTIAL EMERGENCY  
COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK (MEECN) PROGRAM (MMP)  
UPGRADE SYSTEM DESIGN DEVELOPMENT CONTRACT**

**SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

**ATTACHMENT 9**

**27 JUNE 2007**

<b>1.0 SOURCE SELECTION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.1 BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.2 NUMBER OF CONTRACTS TO BE AWARDED .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.3 REJECTION OF UNREALISTIC OFFERS.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.4 CORRECTION POTENTIAL OF PROPOSALS.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1.5 COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE FROM USE OF GFP .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2.0 EVALUATION FACTORS.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.1 EVALUATION FACTORS AND SUBFACTORS AND THEIR RELATIVE ORDER OF IMPORTANCE .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.2 IMPORTANCE OF COST/PRICE .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.3 FACTOR AND SUBFACTOR RATING .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2.4 MISSION CAPABILITY FACTOR.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2.4.1 Subfactor 1: System Performance .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>2.4.2 Subfactor 2: Integrated Program Management and System Engineering Processes .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2.5 PROPOSAL RISK FACTOR.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>2.5.1 Subfactor 1: System Performance .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>2.5.2 Subfactor 2: Program Management and Systems Engineering Integrated Processes.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>2.6 PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>2.7 PRICE FACTOR .....</b>	<b>12</b>

## **SECTION M**

### **EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD**

#### **1.0 SOURCE SELECTION**

##### **1.1 BASIS FOR CONTRACT AWARD**

The Government will select the best overall offer (based upon an integrated assessment of Mission Capability, Past Performance, Proposal Risk, and Price. This is a best value source selection conducted in accordance with Air Force Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (AFFARS) 5315.3 and the AFMC supplement (AFMCFARS) thereto. Contract may be awarded to the Offeror who is deemed responsible in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR), as supplemented, whose proposal conforms to the solicitation's requirements (to include all stated terms, conditions, representations, certifications, and all other information required by Section L of this solicitation) and is judged, based on the evaluation factors and subfactors, to represent the best value to the Government. The Government seeks to award to the Offeror who gives the Air Force the greatest confidence that it will best meet or exceed the requirements affordably. To arrive at a source selection decision, the Source Selection Authority (SSA) will integrate the source selection team's evaluations of the evaluation factors and subfactors (described below). While the Government source selection evaluation team and the SSA will strive for maximum objectivity, the source selection process, by its nature, is subjective and, therefore, professional judgment is implicit throughout the entire process.

##### **1.2 NUMBER OF CONTRACTS TO BE AWARDED**

The Government intends to award one contract for the System Design Development phase of the Minuteman Minimum Essential Emergency Communications Network (MEECN) Program (MMP) Upgrade. The Government reserves the right to award one or no contracts based on the quality of the proposals.

##### **1.3 REJECTION OF UNREALISTIC OFFERS**

The Government may reject any proposal that is evaluated to be unrealistic in terms of program commitments, including contract terms and conditions, or unrealistically high or low in cost when compared to Government estimates, such that the proposal is deemed to reflect an inherent lack of competence or failure to comprehend the complexity and risks of the program.

##### **1.4 CORRECTION POTENTIAL OF PROPOSALS**

The Government will consider, throughout the evaluation, the "correction potential" of any deficiency or proposal inadequacy. The judgment of such "correction potential" is within the sole discretion of the Government. If an aspect of an Offeror's proposal not meeting the Government's requirements is not considered correctable, the Offeror may be eliminated from the competitive range.

##### **1.5 COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE FROM USE OF GFP**

The Government will eliminate any competitive advantage resulting from an Offeror's proposed use of Government-furnished property (GFP).

## **2.0 EVALUATION FACTORS**

### **2.1 EVALUATION FACTORS AND SUBFACTORS AND THEIR RELATIVE ORDER OF IMPORTANCE**

Award will be made to the Offeror proposing the combination most advantageous to the Government based upon an integrated assessment of the evaluation factors described below. The Mission Capability, Proposal Risk and Past Performance evaluation factors are equal in importance, and each is more important than the Price Factor. Within the Mission Capability and Proposal Risk factors, the subfactors are equal in order of importance.

#### Factor 1: Mission Capability

##### Subfactor 1: System Performance

- System Architecture and Design Approach
- Capability Demonstration

##### Subfactor 2: Integrated Program Management and Systems Engineering Processes

- Program Management Approach
- Systems Engineering Approach
- Software and Firmware Engineering Approach

#### Factor 2: Proposal Risk

##### Subfactor 1: System Performance

##### Subfactor 2: Integrated Program Management and Systems Engineering Processes

#### Factor 3: Past Performance

#### Factor 4: Price

All proposals will be evaluated as to the extent of participation of Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB) firms. Offerors will provide targets for SDB participation, expressed as dollars and percentages of total contract value, in each of the applicable and authorized Standard Industrial Code (SIC) Major Groups as well as a total target for SDB participation as joint venture partners, team members, or subcontractors. The authorized SIC Major Groups are 10, 12 - 17, 22 - 31 34, 36 - 42, 44, 46 - 65, 67, 70, 73, 75, 76, 80, 82, 87, and 89. These targets will be incorporated into and become a part of the contract. The successful Offeror will be required to provide reports on SDB subcontractor participation in accordance with FAR clause 52.219-25 in Section I of the contract.

If the Offeror is other than a small business, the Offeror's Small Business Subcontracting Plan submitted in accordance with FAR 52.219-9 and Section L paragraph 5.3.5.1 shall also be evaluated to determine the extent to which the Offeror identifies and commits to the participation of Small Businesses (SB), Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU), and Minority Institutions (MI) whether as joint venture members, teaming arrangement, or subcontractor. Failure to submit such a plan will render the Offeror ineligible for award.

### **2.2 IMPORTANCE OF COST/PRICE**

In accordance with FAR 15.304(e), the evaluation factors other than cost or price, when combined, are significantly more important than cost or price; however, cost/price will

contribute substantially to the selection decision. Within cost /price, Cost Plus CLINs will be more important than Firm Fixed Price CLINs.

### **2.3 FACTOR AND SUBFACTOR RATING**

A color rating, as described in AFFARS 5315.305 Mandatory Procedures (MP 5315.305), paragraph 5.5.1, will be assigned to each subfactor under the Mission Capability factor. The color rating depicts how well the Offeror's proposal meets the Mission Capability subfactor requirements in accordance with the stated explanation, within the subfactor, of how the subfactor will be evaluated. The Mission Capability subfactors are described in paragraph 2.4 below. Subfactor ratings for Mission Capability will not be rolled up to a factor level rating.

A Proposal Risk rating will be assigned to each of the Mission Capability subfactors as described in AFFARS MP 5315.305, paragraph 5.5.2. Proposal risk represents the risks identified with an Offeror's proposed approach as it relates to the Mission Capability subfactor. The Proposal Risk subfactors are described in paragraph 2.5 below. Subfactor ratings for Proposal Risk will not be rolled up to a factor level rating.

A Performance Confidence Assessment will be assigned to the Past Performance factor in accordance with AFFARS MP 5315.305, paragraph 5.5.3.2. Performance confidence represents the Government's assessment of the probability of an Offeror successfully performing as proposed and is derived from an evaluation of the Offeror's present and past work record.

Price will be evaluated as described in paragraph 2.7 below.

When the integrated assessment of all aspects of the evaluation is accomplished, the color ratings, proposal risk ratings, performance confidence assessment, and evaluated price will be considered in the order of priority listed in paragraph 2.1 above. Offerors are required to meet all solicitation requirements such as terms and conditions, representations and certification, and technical requirements, in addition to those identified as Factors and Subfactors. During discussions, Offeror responses to Evaluation Notices (ENs), and, if necessary, a Final Proposal Revision (FPR) will be considered in making the best value decision. Any of these considerations can influence the SSA's decision.

The Government will evaluate Volumes II and V of the Offeror's proposal using AFFARS 5315.305.

### **2.4 MISSION CAPABILITY FACTOR**

The Offeror's written proposal, discussions, and subcontracting plan will be used to evaluate the Mission Capability Factor. In general, the evaluation will assess: the Offeror's understanding of requirements, if the proposed approach is sound, if the proposed approach is within budget constraints in Section L, and if the proposed approach is consistent with their proposed Integrated Management Plan (IMP), Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) and proposed integrated processes.

In arriving at a best value decision, the Government reserves the right to give positive consideration for performance in excess of system performance requirements as described in the Government Statement of Work (SOW), Technical Requirements Document (TRD), Telecommunications Security Requirements Document (TSRD), and Unified Infosec Criteria (UIC).

#### **2.4.1 Subfactor 1: System Performance**

The Government will evaluate the soundness of the Offeror's approach for ensuring that the proposed MMP Upgrade architecture, design, and implementation will meet or exceed the system's functional, performance, environmental and compliance requirements as conforms to the SOW, TRD, TSRD, and UIC. The evaluation will focus on the following areas:

##### **2.4.1.1 System Architecture and Design Approach**

The Government will evaluate the completeness, soundness, maturity, and achievability within cost and schedule of the proposed MMP Upgrade design including the extent to which the Government SOO, TRD, TSRD, and UIC and necessary functionality are traceable throughout the architecture and design. The Government's evaluation will also include:

- a. The technical soundness, maturity, achievability and certification risks of the Offeror's proposed cryptographic solution for MMP Upgrade and the level of coordination with the Government completed for that solution to ensure that the proposed design and associated management plans, schedules, staffing plans, and documentation minimize or eliminate risks in certification by the NSA.
- b. The technical soundness, maturity, and achievability of the proposed overall MMP Upgrade design including the terminal, terminal operator control (TOC).
- c. The Offeror's approach to integrating into the ICBM Weapon System and interoperating with MILSATCOM systems and the ICBM Weapon System.
- d. The technical soundness of the design approach and risk mitigation strategy associated with the interface between the MMP Upgrade terminal and the Higher Authority Communications/Rapid Message Processing Element (HAC/RMPE) including the modifications to the HAC/RMPE planned for the MMP Upgrade program.
- e. The Offeror's proposed approach to ensure successful upgrading of the originally fielded MMP Upgrade system hardware and software to provide MMP-VT, MMP-ET, UFO-E, Backward Compatibility, MILSTAR constellation communications capability, and AEHF constellation communications capability with minimal impact to the fielded system.
- f. The level of completion, accuracy, and technical soundness of the Offeror's preliminary design as represented in the Preliminary Design Review (PDR) package I including any proposed updates.

##### **2.4.1.2 Capability Demonstration**

The results of the Capability Demonstration (Section L, paragraph 4.1.2) will be used in the evaluation of design approach including reused and modified products, operational suitability, and ability to satisfy all requirements and key performance characteristics of the MMP Upgrade.

This evaluation will include the completeness, accuracy, and relevance of the cross reference information showing which Government requirements and functions were demonstrated or partially demonstrated during the Capability Demonstration. The level to which the Capability Demonstration achieves the minimum goals for the demonstration will also be evaluated.

#### **2.4.2 Subfactor 2: Integrated Program Management and System Engineering Processes**

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's integrated program management (PM) and system engineering (SE) processes to assure inclusions of all tasks as well as proper management of the effort required to complete a system design, including qualification, certification, integration, fielding, and support of the MMP Upgrade in accordance with the Request for Proposal (RFP). The Government will evaluate the Offeror's selection of organizational process to be applied as well as their approach to and effectiveness of integrating the 526 ICBM Systems Wing Weapon System and IPIC processes and the tailoring of their standard organizational processes specifically for the MMP Upgrade program, audit results for any SCAMPI appraisals, the effectiveness of corrective actions implemented for issues discovered during the Government conducted Process In Execution Review (PIER), plans for executing process proficiency commensurate with CMMI SW/SE/IPPD/SS Level 3, and plans for transition to CMMI V1.2. The evaluation will also include:

##### **2.4.2.1 Program Management Approach**

The Government will evaluate the methods and tools the Offeror uses to manage the program. The evaluation will include the Offeror's approach to integrated program management including Integrated Product Teaming (IPT), the extent of planned Government team involvement in IPTs and other activities, the proposed metrics program, the proposed Risk and Opportunity Management Program (ROMP), and the level of visibility into all aspects of Contractor program management provided to the Government. The proposed approach and risks associated with all certifications and accreditations for the MMP Upgrade program will be evaluated. The comprehensiveness and effectiveness of the measures and metrics proposed as well as the means of collecting, reporting, and managing the program with the proposed measures and metrics will be evaluated. The Offeror's approach to transition planning across the entire contract scope will also be evaluated.

##### **2.4.2.2 Systems Engineering Approach**

The Government will evaluate the technical soundness, maturity, appropriateness, and achievability of the proposed approach to reused and modified products (hardware, software, and firmware) from sources outside the MMP Upgrade Program. This evaluation includes the completeness, applicability, and executability of the proposed reuse plans, methods of managing program dependencies, schedules, and tailored organizational processes. It will include an evaluation of the risks associated with the planned reuse approach. This evaluation will also include the approach for assessing, acquiring, integrating, documenting, certifying, and testing the reused and modified products as well as vulnerability and IA analyses and the soundness of alternative strategies to be implemented if planned reuse and modified products is no longer viable. The evaluation will further focus on:

- a. The soundness of the Offeror's overall system engineering approach, including the selection, appropriateness, and usefulness, of Technical Performance Measures (TPMs), Technical Performance Indicators (TPIs), leading indicators, and other measures of technical maturity and robust development.
- b. The Offeror's approach to hardware engineering and development as well as the association of TPMs and TPIs with development and integration activities.

#### **2.4.2.3 Software and Firmware Engineering Approach**

The Government will evaluate the proposed approach to software engineering including linkage to systems engineering, standard software development methodologies and coding standards, measurement and metrics, approach for delivering zero-defects software, and Very High Speed Integrated Circuit (VHSIC) Hardware Description Language (VHDL) architecture and development methods. The evaluation will include the Offeror's selection and use of software TPMs, TPIs, leading indicators, and other measures of technical maturity and robust development. The evaluation will further focus on:

- a. The Offeror's approach to identifying, managing, and minimizing the risks associated with the development of software and firmware as well as the reuse or modification of software or firmware products. The evaluation will consider the use of common versus dissimilar hardware platforms and operating environments as well as the extent of a fully functional and integrated reuse solution (e.g., full crypto suite).
- b. The comprehensiveness and soundness of the Offeror's software and firmware build plans as well as the association of TPMs and TPIs with those build plans and integration activities.
- c. The technical soundness of the Offeror's estimating methodologies as well as the accuracy of complexity and sizing estimates, including new, reused, and modified code, required for the MMP Upgrade program. The level of confidence provided in the accuracy of the estimates as well as their consideration of all factors that may impact these estimates over time will be evaluated. The effectiveness and timely insight provided by proposed software metrics as well as methods of collection, management, and reporting.
- d. The technical soundness and risks associated with the Offeror's approach for developing, qualifying, and certifying high assurance and secure software, VHDL, firmware, and systems including the sufficiency of coding standards and vulnerability analyses.
- e. The completeness and technical soundness of the Offerors plan for SCA compliance and waveform porting.
- f. The approach to identify sources, support systems, devices, and other tools to help ensure that the fielded MMP Upgrade will have all data in a data management system (crypto keys, images) to smoothly and seamlessly transition to a different communications plan, a new satellite, or a new satellite in a different constellation through the operational lifetime of the MMP Upgrade terminal. The extent of inclusion of mixed constellations, split homing of terminals, and viable contingency switches will be evaluated.



#### **2.4.2.4 Integrated Master Plan (IMP)**

The Government will evaluate the comprehensiveness, accuracy, and utility of the Offeror's IMP and all required/associated plans as well as the utility of the proposed IMP to be used as a day to day management tool that is aligned with the proposed Contract Statement of Work (CSOW), Contract Work Breakdown Structure (CWBS), and IMS. The linkage of events and accomplishments to the Earned Value Management System (EVMS) as well as the sufficiency and completeness of defined events including entrance and exit criteria will be evaluated.

#### **2.4.2.5 Integrated Master Schedule (IMS)**

The Government will evaluate the comprehensiveness, accuracy, reasonableness, and utility of the Offeror's IMS and the utility of the IMS to be used as a day to day management tool that is aligned with the proposed CSOW, CWBS and IMP.

#### **2.4.2.6 CDRL and WBS Tailoring**

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed tailoring of the program CDRL for its level of appropriateness and ability to provide all data necessary for oversight, certification, integration, operation, sustainment, and management of the MMP Upgrade terminal and associated HAC/RMPE interfaces. The Government will also evaluate the completeness and accuracy of the proposed CWBS including the level of insight provided into all tasks managed on the program.

#### **2.4.2.7 Contract Statement of Work (CSOW)**

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposed tailoring of the CSOW for completeness and appropriateness in covering the full scope of work required to execute the MMP Upgrade program.

#### **2.4.2.8 Risk and Opportunity Management Program**

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's Risk and Opportunity Management Program (ROMP) including the methods for maintaining accuracy and currency, approach to identify, assess, manage, monitor, collect metrics on, and report all risks and opportunities associated with the MMP Upgrade program. The completeness and effectiveness of the risk mitigation strategies and trigger points linked in the IMS will also be evaluated. The Government will evaluate risks in program execution as a result of program management, systems engineering, and process implementation including the impacts the MMP Upgrade has on the ICBM Weapon System, MILSTAR system, and HAC/RMPE as well as impacts of other programs upon which the MMP Upgrade is dependent.

### **2.5 PROPOSAL RISK FACTOR**

Proposal Risk will be evaluated at the Mission Capability subfactor level. The proposal risk assessment focuses on the risks and weaknesses associated with an Offeror's proposed approach and includes an assessment of the potential for disruption of schedule, increased cost, degradation of performance, and the need for increased Government oversight, as well as the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance. For each identified risk, the assessment also addresses the Offeror's proposal for mitigating the risk and why that approach is or is not

manageable. Each mission capability subfactor will receive one of the proposal risk ratings defined at AFFARS 5315.305 Mandatory Procedures (MP 5315.305), paragraph 5.5.2.

### **2.5.1 Subfactor 1: System Performance**

This evaluation focuses on risks and weaknesses associated with the Offeror's proposed approach and includes an assessment of the potential for disruption of schedule, increased cost, degradation of performance, and the need for increased Government oversight, as well as the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance.

### **2.5.2 Subfactor 2: Program Management and Systems Engineering Integrated Processes**

To evaluate the risks associated with the Offeror's or Offeror's team's program management and system engineering process maturity/capability and improvement, the Government will use information provided by the Offerors that describes the program management and system engineering processes, practices, procedures, and standards that they intend to apply to the MMP Upgrade at the development locations proposed. The mapping of processes, practices, procedures and standards to the IMP and IMS will also be used to evaluate system engineering process risks. Evaluation of proposed processes, process maturity, and process improvement will be used to assess the risks associated with the Offeror's ability and commitment to perform.

## **2.6 PAST PERFORMANCE FACTOR**

Under the Past Performance factor, the Performance Confidence Assessment represents the evaluation of an Offeror's and associated key or major subcontractors', inter-divisional transfers, teaming partners' and joint venture partners' present and past work record to assess the Government's confidence in the Offeror's probability of successfully performing as proposed. The assessment will include the contractor's past performance in interacting with the proposed subcontractors as well as interaction between subcontractors themselves. The Government will evaluate the Offeror's demonstrated record of contract compliance in supplying products and services that meet users' needs, including cost and schedule. The Government will assess only contract efforts considered to be very relevant, relevant or somewhat relevant for the prime and relevant for subcontractors, inter-divisional transfers, and partners in the determination of the confidence rating.

MMP Upgrade Initial Design and Development (IDD) contract will be deemed very relevant for purposes of the past performance evaluation. All other contracts will be evaluated using the information below.

The relevancy of the Prime contractor's contracts, which must have been performed within the past five (5) years (the Government will consider only work performed beginning at a point five years prior to the RFP release date, up to the award date), will be assessed based on the following criteria:

- a. Past contracts in the development, integration or production of MILSATCOM systems, that involve COMSEC and TRANSEC of classified information.

- b. Past contracts with a requirement to develop high assurance software and complete Information Assurance and National Security Agency certifications and accreditations, and to support the Department of Defense Information Technology Security Certification and Accreditation Process and/or Defense Information Assurance Certification and Accreditation Process.
- c. Past contracts with significant product (i.e., software, hardware, and firmware) reuse from other sources.
- d. Past management of contracts valued over \$50 million to include: design, development or production.

In order for an effort to be considered Very Relevant, it must meet all criteria listed above. To be considered Relevant, it must meet three out of four criteria above. To be considered somewhat relevant it must meet two out of four criteria above.

Subcontractors, inter-divisional transfers, and partners will be assessed as either relevant or not relevant; in order to be considered Relevant, the effort must have been performed at the same division/location, within the past five (5) years, and must have been the same type effort proposed for the MMP Upgrade program.

More recent and relevant performance will have a greater impact on the Performance Confidence Assessment than less recent or relevant effort. A strong record of relevant past performance may be considered more advantageous to the Government than a "Neutral/Unknown Confidence" rating. Likewise, a more relevant past performance record may receive a higher confidence rating and be considered more favorably than a less relevant record of favorable performance.

Past performance information may be obtained through the Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting Systems (CPARS), similar systems of other Government departments and agencies, questionnaires tailored to the circumstances of this acquisition, Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) channels, interviews with program managers and contracting officers, and other sources known to the Government, including commercial sources.

Offerors are to note that, in conducting this assessment, the Government reserves the right to use both data provided by the Offeror and data obtained from other sources.

As a result of an analysis of those risks and strengths identified, each Offeror will receive an integrated Performance Confidence Assessment, which is the rating for the Past Performance factor. Although the past performance evaluation focuses on performance that is relevant to the Mission Capability subfactors, the resulting Performance Confidence Assessment is made at the factor level and represents an overall evaluation of contractor performance. In addition to evaluating the extent to which the Offeror's performance meets mission requirements, the assessment will consider things such as the Offeror's history of forecasting and controlling costs, adhering to schedules (including the administrative aspects of performance), reasonable and cooperative behavior and commitment to customer satisfaction, and generally, the contractor's business-like concern for the interest of the customer.

Where relevant performance record indicates performance problems, the Government will consider the number and severity of the problems and the appropriateness and effectiveness of any corrective actions taken (not just planned or promised). The Government may review more recent contracts or performance evaluations to ensure corrective actions have been implemented and to evaluate their effectiveness.

Each Offeror will receive one of the ratings described in AFFARS 5315.305 Mandatory Procedures (MP 5315, paragraph 5.5.3.2 for the Past Performance factor.

Offerors without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance and, as a result, will receive a "Neutral/Unknown Confidence" rating for the Past Performance factor.

## **2.7 PRICE FACTOR**

The Government will evaluate the Offeror's Cost/Price proposal for cost realism and reasonableness using one or more of the techniques defined in FAR 15.404.

### **2.7.1 Cost realism Analysis**

The proposals will be evaluated at the Government Estimate of Most Probable Cost (GEMPC) as determined by the Cost/Price Realism Assessment (CPRA) of each Offeror's proposed approach. This will include an evaluation of the extent to which proposed costs indicate a clear understanding of solicitation requirements and reflect a sound approach to satisfying those requirements. The CPRA will consider technical/management risk identified during the evaluation of the proposal and associated costs. For cost-type CLINs, cost information supporting a cost judged to be unrealistically low, and technical/management risk associated with the proposal will be quantified by the Government evaluators and included in the GEMPC/CPRA for each Offeror. When the Government evaluates an offer as unrealistically low or high compared to the Offeror's anticipated costs of performance and the Offeror fails to explain these estimated costs, the Government will consider, under the applicable Proposal Risk subfactor, the Offeror's lack of understanding of the technical requirements of the corresponding Mission Capability subfactor. The Government may perform a price realism evaluation of fixed-price CLINS; however, while the results of this price realism evaluation may be used in performance risk assessments and responsibility determinations, it will not be used to adjust offered prices. The CPRA will also include a Government determination of proposal cost risk as high, medium, or low, as defined in Table 2 of the AFFARS Mandatory Source Selection Procedures.

### **2.7.2 Total Evaluated Cost/Price**

The total evaluated cost/price for award purposes will be the sum of all priced Contract Line Items (CLINS) as described below. The proposed estimated costs shall not be the controlling factor for source selection purposes. Proposals will be evaluated as follows:

- a. Cost Plus Award Fee (CPAF) CLIN prices will be evaluated at the GEMPC plus the proposed award fee pool amount.
- b. Cost Plus Fixed Fee (CPFF) CLIN prices will be evaluated at the GEMPC plus the proposed fixed fee amount.
- c. Firm Fixed Price (FFP) CLIN prices will be evaluated at the government's specified Best Estimated Quantities (BEQs). Remaining tubular prices for variable quantity items will be evaluated to ensure realism, reasonableness, and balance (i.e., not overstated or understated for any given quantity).
- d. Time & Materials (T&M) CLIN prices will be used by the Government for evaluation purposes.

Information other than cost or pricing data will be evaluated for the purposes of determining cost realism and the best value.

## **Acronyms**

AFFARS	Air Force Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement
CLIN	Contract Line Item
CPARS	Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting Systems
DCMA	Defense Contract Management Agency
EAM	Emergency Action Message
EN	Evaluation Notices
FAR	Federal Acquisition Regulation
FFP	Firm Fixed Price
FPR	Final Proposal Revision
GFP	Government-furnished property
HBCU	Historically Black Colleges and Universities
IMP	Integrated Management Plan
IMS	Integrated Master Schedule
MEECN	Minimum Essential Emergency Communications Network
MI	Minority Institutions
MMP	Minuteman MEECN Program
RFP	Request for Proposal
SB	Small Business
SDB	Small or Disadvantaged Business
SDD	System Design Development
SIC	Standard Industrial Code
SSA	Source Selection Authority
TPM	Technical Performance Measures
TRD	Technical Requirements Document