

Offeror: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

**Attachment 3**

**Acceptability of the Offer  
N66001-04-R-5014  
Scoring Sheets**

The Government will determine the acceptability of each offer, on a pass or fail basis, by evaluating the consistency of each offeror's promises with the terms and conditions of the RFP. An offer will be considered acceptable when it manifests the offeror's assent, without exception or imposition of condition, to the terms and conditions of this RFP, including attachments and documents incorporated by reference. An offer which takes exception to any of the terms and conditions of this RFP, imposes additional conditions, or omits material information required by this RFP may be considered to be unacceptable (see RFP provision L-317 paragraph 1.0 regarding discussions and correction of deficiencies).

Scoring Procedure: Each offer will be judged against the criteria listed in the source selection plan and the solicitation.

Scoring Criteria: Use the following checklist to determine acceptability. Failure to answer "Yes" to all checklist requirements may render an offer unacceptable.

- Yes/No            Offeror includes fully completed Standard Form 33,
- Yes/No            Offer includes fully completed RFP Section B
- Yes/No            Offer includes fully completed RFP Section K
- Yes/No            Offer does not take exception to any RFP terms and conditions
- Yes/No            Offer does not impose any additional conditions to RFP

The offeror is:

ACCEPTABLE

UNACCEPTABLE

Offeror: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

**Acceptability of the Offer:**

- Yes/No      Offeror includes fully completed Standard Form 33
- Yes/No      Offer includes fully completed RFP Section B
- Yes/No      Offer includes fully completed RFP Section K
- Yes/No      Offer does not take exception to any RFP terms and conditions
- Yes/No      Offer does not impose any additional conditions to RFP

*If answers to any of the above requirements are "No", identify and document deficiency:*

*Score: Acceptable / Unacceptable*

**ATTACHMENT 5  
KEY PERSONNEL QUALIFICATIONS**

The contractor shall provide personnel who are fully qualified and competent to perform the full range of tasks as described in the Statement of Work. The desired education/qualifications of designated key personnel under this contract are stated below.

**PROJECT MANAGER**

**Education:**

- Bachelor's degree in Engineering, Physics or Math.
- Master's degree in Engineering, Physics, Mathematics, or Master's in Business Administration.

**Experience:**

- Ten years of increasingly more complex and authoritative positions with responsibility for major project management.
- Ten years of progressive professional experience in the management of large-scale hardware and software development efforts for real-time systems, with five of those years as a Department Level Manager.
- Engineering design, system engineering, software IV&V, ICD development, concept formulation, research, test and evaluation, navigation signal integrity, data processing, and system implementation. Knowledge of Navigation and Air C4ISR technology areas.

**Demonstrated Abilities:**

- Ability to originate, design and develop specialized concepts related to specific program requirements.
- Ability to apply intensive and diversified knowledge of engineering and management principles for application to specific system/component requirements.
- Ability to make decisions independently on engineering or analytical problems and methods of support of the entire technical staff supporting the contract.
- Ability to provide input to Government project engineers for the consideration and implementation of solutions to resolve important questions, both technical and contractual, as appropriate.
- Ability to plan and coordinate tasking and personnel assignments to achieve designated goals efficiently and economically.

**SENIOR PRINCIPAL ENGINEER**

**Education:**

- Bachelor's degree in Electrical Engineering, Aeronautical Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, Physics, or Mathematics.
- Master's degree in Engineering, Physics, or Mathematics.

**Experience:**

- Ten years of systems engineer experience in Navigation systems and equipment, analyzing requirements, performing engineering duties, analysis and documentation.
- Five years architecture design, development, test of navigation or communication systems into aircraft or shipboard platforms
- Experience in test and evaluation of navigation systems involving multiplatform applications.
- Experience in planning, developing, and coordinating a large hardware/software engineering program or a number of smaller hardware/software programs.
- Experience with, and a thorough working knowledge of, hardware/software development methodology, and evaluating program requirements and design analysis in order to determine the technical feasibility and cost of program/documentation changes; e.g., ECPs/SCNs.
- A thorough knowledge of Navigation and Air/Shipboard C4ISR technology areas.

**Demonstrated Abilities:**

- Ability to effectively communicate verbally and in formal reports with higher authorities.
- Capable of working independently and directing the work of other engineers.
- Ability to monitor, review and approve work performed by assigned project staff and maintain effective liaison with Government and other contracting personnel.
- Ability to perform technical engineering studies in specialty fields and support areas, develop test and evaluation documentation, develop Simulation Systems.
- Ability to estimate manpower requirements and the successful scheduling and completion of these hardware/software programs.
- Ability to prepare program plans and milestones, and assist in analyzing and solving any problems which will effect those milestones.

SENIOR NAVIGATION ENGINEER/ANALYST

**Education:**

- Bachelor's degree in Engineering, Physics, Mathematics or Computer Science.
- Master's degree in Engineering, Physics, Mathematics or Computer Science.

**Experience:**

- Five years of experience with navigation systems to include hardware/software analysis, aircraft integration, ICD's, jamming, SA/A-S.
- Experience in all phases of software analysis, development and support, as part of two or more major software programs.
- Experience with, and a thorough working knowledge of, software development methodology.
- Experience in algorithm and model development.
- Experience in navigation signal integrity, M-Code, SAASM
- In-depth knowledge of Navigation and Air C4ISR systems , advanced technology and system design in software engineering, real time software support, and a working knowledge of higher order languages such as FORTRAN C++, and Ada.
- Computer experience including a hands-on working knowledge of Operating Systems, Processors, Case Tools, and Personal Computers (PC's).

**Demonstrated Abilities:**

- Capable of participating in the analysis, definition, design, development, and writing of requirements and specifications, determining technical feasibility, assisting in cost estimate preparation, planning, and software development and maintenance.
- Capable of developing and /or evaluating procedures, algorithms, techniques, models, and technologies related to navigation and air C4ISR systems called for in this solicitation's Statement of Work.

**SENIOR SOFTWARE ENGINEER**

**Education:**

- Bachelor's degree in Engineering, Physics, math, or Computer Science.

**Experience:**

- Ten or more years of software engineering experience in the design, development, implementation, test, integration, and deployment of complex software systems. At least five years of experience in direct support of government related projects.
- Ten or more years in engineering in Navigation systems and equipment, analyzing requirements, performing engineering duties, analysis and documentation.
- Design and implementation of interfaces to navigation users' and sensors, including Global Positioning System and inertial navigation systems.
- Detailed understanding of navigation coordinates systems and related coordinate conversion algorithms.
- Design and implementation of navigation algorithms, including correlation, blending, smoothing, and integration of navigation data.
- Experience using GPS navigation simulators.
- Ability to plan, develop, coordinate large navigation software engineering program or a number of smaller navigation software programs.
- Demonstrated knowledge of software and documentation in accordance with MIL and DOD standards.
- Ability to evaluate program requirements and design analysis in order to determine the technical feasibility and cost of program/documentation changes.
- Implementation of project configuration management procedures and tools.
- Experience using software engineering and formal design methodologies in the development of real-time systems, including the implementation of processes and procedures necessary to achieve various levels of the Software Engineering Institute (SEI) Capability Maturity Model (CMM).
- Implementation of processes and procedures necessary to achieve various SEI CMM levels.

ENGINEER/ANALYST

**Education:**

- Bachelor's degree in Electrical/Electronic Engineering, Aeronautical Engineering, Physics, math, or Computer Science.

**Experience:**

- Experience in planning, scheduling and coordinating all phases of system development and support, as part of two or more major programs.
- Experience with, and a thorough working knowledge of, system development methodology.
- In-depth knowledge of Navigation and C4ISR systems, advanced technology and systems engineering.
- Experience in ICD's, testing, test plans, ECP's, aircraft/shipboard integration.
- Computer experience including a hands-on working knowledge of Operating Systems, Processors, Case Tools, and Personal Computers (PCs).

**Demonstrated Abilities:**

- Capable of providing technical direction for tasks performed under the contract, and able to provide technical expertise in the specific areas of hardware/software support called for in this Statement of Work.
- Ability to coordinate the efforts for and participate in technical working group meetings, design reviews, etc.

Offeror: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

**Attachment 8  
Oral Presentations - Sample Task  
Scoring Sheets**

**Scoring Procedure:** Each offeror's response to the sample task will be evaluated by the TEB immediately after the conclusion of each oral presentation. The TEB chair will be responsible for distributing and collecting score sheets from the TEB members. Each presentation will be scored (0-85) by each member of the TEB. Reviewers will generate a score for each of the 3 criteria of this section. The individual criteria scores will be averaged to obtain a final reviewer score for the section.

**Scoring Criteria:** The oral presentation of each offeror will be evaluated against the following Subfactors:

1. Task Rationale/Approach. (45 points)

Subfactors equal:

- A. To what extent does the offeror present a logical approach/solution to the problem.
- B. To what extent does the offeror present a realistic milestone plan.
- C. To what extent is the offeror's approach feasible.
- D. To what extent is the offerors' approach complete.

2. Task Description - Does the offeror understand the requirement. (20 points)

3. Task Clarity - Does the offeror's response provide sufficient level of clarity and detail. (20 points)

Offeror: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

**Task Rationale/Approach (45 pts)**

- \* Logical approach to problem 0-3 \_\_\_\_\_
- \* Realistic Milestone Plan 0-3 \_\_\_\_\_
- \* Feasibility of Approach 0-3 \_\_\_\_\_
- \* Completeness 0-3 \_\_\_\_\_

Subtotal \_\_\_\_\_

(Subtotal \* 45/12 = a = \_\_\_\_\_)

**Task Description (20 pts)**

- \* Does offeror understand the requirement. 0-3 \_\_\_\_\_

Subtotal \_\_\_\_\_

(Subtotal \* 20/3 = b = \_\_\_\_\_)

**Task Clarity (20 pts)**

- \* Does the offeror's response provide sufficient level of clarity and detail. 0-3 \_\_\_\_\_

Subtotal \_\_\_\_\_

(Subtotal \* 20/3 = c = \_\_\_\_\_)

Total = a+b+c = \_\_\_\_\_

**Key**

- 0 = no understanding/wholly inadequate approach
- 1 = some understanding/questionable approach
- 2 = full understanding/adequate approach
- 3 = superior understanding/excellent approach

Offeror: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

*Strengths:*

*Weaknesses:*

*Risk:*

*Comments:*



Offeror: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

**Attachment 10**

**PAST PERFORMANCE  
N66001-04-R-5014  
SCORING SHEETS**

Past performance is a measure of the degree to which an offeror has satisfied customers in the past. The evaluation will be based upon the ability of the offeror to demonstrate, particularly within the last five years, their successful past performance, relating to the programs and skills required in the Statement of Work. In the case of an offeror with no past performance, or where information on past performance is not available, the factor of past performance will receive a neutral rating.

The Government's assessment of past performance will be subjective, and based mainly on offeror reputations with customers and others. Reviewers must consider and evaluate their own experience with offerors. Reviewers will assign scores based on the Reference Information Sheets submitted by offerors, information available to the Government from other sources, and responses to Past Performance Questionnaires.

**Scoring Procedure:** Reviewers will generate a score for each of the criteria of this section for each offeror. The individual criteria scores will be combined to obtain a final reviewer score for the section. Individual reviewer scores for each offeror will be averaged to obtain a final summary score for each offeror.

**Scoring Criteria:** The Government will evaluate the performance data provided by offerors, and obtained from other sources, against the following criteria/subfactors. Subfactors (a), (b), (c) and (d) are equally important. The total possible points for the Past Performance factor is **10 points**.

Subfactors equal:

- (a) Record of conforming to specifications and to standards of good workmanship/customer service. **(10 Points)**
- (b) Record of containing and forecasting costs on any previously performed cost reimbursable contracts. **(10 points)**
- (c) Adherence to contract schedules, including timely completion of technical and administrative tasks and delivery of data deliverables. **(10 Points)**
- (d) Record of complying with the requirements of the clause at FAR 52.219-8 "Utilization of Small Business Concerns" and FAR 52.219-9 "Small Business Subcontracting Plans" on any previously performed Federal agency contracts. (FAR 52.219-9 is not applicable to small business offerors who will be automatically receive the maximum credit for this subfactor.) **(10 points)**

The following definitions/ratings shall be used for each of the four criteria:

- 0-5 (POOR) Past performance record is not relevant to the program and skills required in the SOW. Entirely unfavorable past performance. Offeror has consistently not satisfied previous customers. Offeror has a poor record of adhering to contract schedules; always late in completing technical and administrative task and data delivery. Has consistently failed to comply with FAR 52.219-8 and FAR 52-219-9.
- 6 (FAIR) Past performance record split between favorable and unfavorable in relevance to the program and skills required in the SOW. Offeror has occasionally satisfied, and occasionally not satisfied, previous customers. Offeror has a fair record of adhering to contract schedules and completion of technical and administrative tasks including data deliverables; has a fair record of compliance with FAR 52.219-8 and FAR 52.219-9. Offerors with past performance record split between favorable and unfavorable will be assigned a neutral rating in this range.

**Offeror:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Reviewer:** \_\_\_\_\_

7-8 (GOOD) Past performance record more favorable than unfavorable in relevance to the program and skills required in the SOW. Offeror has generally satisfied previous customers. Offeror has generally adhered to contract schedules and has been timely in the completion of technical and administrative tasks, including data deliverables; and has a good record of compliance with FAR 52.219-8 and FAR 52.219-9.

9-10 (EXCELLENT) Past performance record entirely favorable in relevance to the program and skills required in the SOW. Offeror has consistently, without exception, satisfied previous customers to a high degree. Offeror has consistently adhered to contract schedules and consistently completed technical and administrative tasks, including delivery of data in a timely manner; has an excellent record of complying with FAR 52.219-8 and FAR 52.219-9.

**Past Performance:**

*Ratings:*

\_\_\_\_\_ a. Record of conforming to specifications and to standards of good workmanship/customer service.

\_\_\_\_\_ b. Record of containing and forecasting costs on any previously performed cost reimbursable contracts.

\_\_\_\_\_ c. Adherence to contract schedules, including timely completion of technical and administrative tasks and delivery of data deliverables

\_\_\_\_\_ d. Record of compliance with the requirements of the clauses at FAR 52.219-8 "Utilization of Small Business Concerns" and FAR 52.219-9 "Small Business Subcontracting Plans" on any previously performed Federal agency contracts. (FAR 52.219-9 is not applicable to small business offerors who will automatically receive the maximum credit for this specific subfactor.)

**Final Past Performance Score = (a + b + c + d)\*10/40 = \_\_\_\_\_ Points**

*Strengths:*

**Offeror:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Reviewer:** \_\_\_\_\_

*Weaknesses:*

*Risk:*

*Comments:*

*Overall Rating:*

Offeror: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

Attachment 12

**PARTICIPATION OF SUBCONTRACTORS  
N66001-04-R-5014  
SCORING SHEET**

The Government will determine the extent to which the offeror identifies and commits to the utilization of small business (SB), HUBzone small business (HUBZone), small disadvantaged business (SDB), woman-owned small business (WOSB), historically black college or university and minority institution (HBCU/MI), and service disabled veteran-owned small business (SDVOSB) performance under the contract, whether as a joint venture, teaming arrangement, or subcontractor.

The Government will evaluate the proposed participation of subcontractors against the following criteria/sub-factors of the assigned point value:

- (a) Identification of specific large business, SB, HUBZone small business, SDB, WOSB, HBCU/MI, and SDVOSB subcontract participation in contract performance. **(2 Points)**
- (b) Extent of commitment to use such firms; **(2 Points)**
- (c) Extent of participation of SB, HUBZone small business, SDB, HBCU/MI, WOSB, and SDVOSB firms in terms of the value of the total acquisition. The extent of prime contractor participation will be evaluated for SB, HUBZone small business, SDB, HBCU/MI, WOSB, and SDVOSB firms. The extent of large business participation whether as a prime contractor or a subcontractor will not be evaluated. **(1 Points)**

Scoring Procedure: The negotiator will examine the offeror's Subcontracting Information Sheet (attachment 9) submitted with its offer, as well as the documentation (letters of commitment, etc.) provided to score each criteria. The individual criteria scores will be combined to obtain a final reviewer score for the section. NOTE: Offerors are instructed to provide evidence of a binding, written agreement/letter of commitment for each proposed subcontractor. Offerors are also instructed to correlate proposed subcontractor costs directly with the offeror's Volume II cost proposal. Small Business participation scoring will be maximized to the extent a binding written agreement/letter of commitment is submitted and proposed subcontractor costs correlate directly with the offeror's Volume II cost proposal. See Subcontractor Information Sheet, Attachment 11. The total possible points for the Participation of Subcontractors factor is **5 points**.

Scoring Criteria:

a. & b. Identification of specific SB, HUBZone small business, SDB, HBCU/MI, WOSB, and SDVOSB subcontract participation in contract performance; extent of commitment to use such firms. Reviewers will evaluate the information provided by offerors for paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Subcontracting Information Sheet.

Utilize the following criteria:

- 0 (Poor)            The offeror has provided the information requested by the Subcontracting Information Sheet, paragraph 1, for none of their subcontractors (as identified and cross-referenced in their cost proposal). The offeror has provided documentation demonstrating definitive and enforceable commitments with none of their subcontractors.
- 2 (Fair)            The offeror has provided the information requested by the Subcontracting Information Sheet, paragraph 1, for less than half of their subcontractors (as identified and cross-referenced in their cost proposal). The offeror has provided documentation demonstrating definitive and enforceable commitments with less than half of their subcontractors.

Offeror: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

- 3 (Good) The offeror has provided the information requested by the Subcontracting Information Sheet, paragraph 1, for most of their subcontractors (as identified and cross-referenced in their cost proposal). The offeror has provided documentation demonstrating definitive and enforceable commitments with most of their subcontractors.
- 4 (Excellent) The offeror has provided the information requested by the Subcontracting information Sheet, paragraph 1, for all of their subcontractors (as identified and cross-referenced in their cost proposal). The offeror has provided documentation demonstrating definitive and enforceable commitments with all of their subcontractors.

c. Extent of participation of small business, HUBZone small business, SDB, HBCU/MI, WOSB, and SDVOSB firms in terms of the value of the total acquisition. Reviewers will evaluate the information provided by offerors for paragraph 3 of the Subcontracting Information Sheet, against the following table. The extent of prime contractor participation will be evaluated for small business, HUBZone small business, small disadvantaged business, WOSB, and SDVOSB firms. The extent of large business participation, whether as a prime contractor or subcontractor, will not be evaluated.

Type of Business	Low Range	Medium Range	High Range
Large	N/A	N/A	N/A
Small	Less than 19%	19% - < 30%	30% or more
HUBZone Small	Less than 1.1%	1.1% - < 3%	3% or more
SDB	Less than 2%	2% - < 5%	5% or more
HBCU/MI	Less than 1%	1% - < 3%	3% or more
WOSB	Less than 2%	2% - < 5%	5% or more
SDVOSB	Less than 1.1%	1.1% - < 3%	3% or more

Utilize the following criteria.

- 0-.25 (Poor) The extent of participation of target firms in terms of the total acquisition mostly falls within the low range.
- .26-.50 (Fair) The extent of participation of target firms in terms of the total acquisition mostly falls within the low to medium ranges.
- .51-.75 (Good) The extent of participation of target firms in terms of the total acquisition mostly falls within the medium to high ranges.
- .76-1.0 (Excellent) The extent of participation of target firms in terms of the total acquisition mostly falls in the high range.

**Participation of Subcontractors:**

*Ratings:*

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. & b. Identification of specific small business, HUBZone small business, small disadvantaged business, HBCU/MI, WOSB and SDVOSB subcontract participation in contract performance; extent of commitment to use such firms. Reviewers will evaluate the information provided by offerors for paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Subcontracting Information Sheet.
- \_\_\_\_\_ c. Extent of participation of small business, HUBZone small business, small disadvantaged business, HBCU/MI, WOSB and SDVOSB firms in terms of the value of the total acquisition. Reviewers will evaluate the information provided by offerors for paragraph 3 of the Subcontracting Information Sheet, against the following table. The extent of prime contractor participation will be evaluated for small business, HUBZone small business, small disadvantaged business, WOSB and SDVOSB firms. The extent of large business participation, whether as a prime contractor or subcontractor, will not be evaluated.

**Offeror:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Reviewer:** \_\_\_\_\_

Score for Subcontractor Participation = a&b+c score =

Points

*Strengths:*

*Weaknesses:*

*Risk:*

*Comments:*

*Final Reviewer Rating:*