

## APPENDIX C



**DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE**  
HQ WARNER ROBINS AIR LOGISTICS CENTER (AFMC)  
ROBINS AIR FORCE BASE GEORGIA

MEMORANDUM FOR (See Distribution List Below)

*Current Date*

FROM: WR-ALC/PKXE  
215 Page Rd Suite 231  
Robins AFB, GA 31098-1662

SUBJECT: Request for Order Proposal (RFOP) FA8530-11-R-\_\_\_\_\_

1. A proposal is requested for the (*supplies, repair, services, etc.*) described in the attached (*Statement of Work, Performance Work Specification, etc.*). It is determined that the most appropriate type order for this effort is (*firm fixed price, time and materials, cost plus fixed fee, etc.*). The funding profile for this requirement is \_\_\_\_\_. (*Include this sentence only if the funding profile is releasable.*)

2. Each page containing proprietary information should be so marked. Proposal submissions are requested electronically (if requesting hard copy state here). Page size shall be 8.5 x 11 inches, not including foldouts. Pages may be single spaced, font size no less than 12 point Times New Roman. Use at least 1-inch margins on the top and bottom and ¾ inch side margins. Pages shall be numbered sequentially by attachment. Tables, charts, graphs and figures shall be legible. The text on these shall be no smaller than 10 point Times New Roman and the page size shall not exceed 8.5 x 14 inches (legal). To ensure receipt of a complete proposal submission, you are requested to provide a table of contents as a cover sheet (or in the cover email) clearly indicating the title of the email attachments and the number of pages per attachment. A Safety Plan is required from each offeror and must be approved by the 78 ABW Safety Office. The proposal should include the following sections: Section I - completed RFOP schedule and clauses; Section II – Technical Submission; Section III – Cost / Price Submission; and Section IV – Past Performance Submission (*if applicable*). Please include in your submission the signed RFOP with any attachments and the signed Performance Plan.

a) Section I submission shall be the completed RFOP schedule and clauses. *An estimated amount for the travel line item must be provided. However, that amount will not be included when evaluating the total price proposed. (Include these statements when a travel CLIN is included in an otherwise fixed price requirement.)*

b) Section II submission shall include a brief technical proposal (limited to 10 pages total) (*Number of pages is based on the number of evaluation factors – the more pages to evaluate the longer the evaluation*) identifying the offeror's proposed approach to the specific requirement. Section II will be

evaluated in accordance with the factors listed below. Each evaluation factor should be addressed separately in your proposal.

***INSERT EVALUATION FACTORS PROVIDED BY THE CUSTOMER  
SAMPLE EVALUATION CRITERIA CAN BE FOUND IN APPENDIX D***

c) Section III submission shall include the information required by **Clause H-901(f) and (g) of the basic SbAST contract**. If minimal information is required, such as in the case of a fixed price proposal, that information can be included in Section I or your cover letter. The cover letter shall state where the Section III information is located. Your cover letter shall also include a statement as to whether you have used the rates in the Rate Tables incorporated in the basic SbAST contract or you have proposed lower rates.

*(The following needs to be input if evaluating Cost Reimbursable (CR) labor rates)  
For All CR labor rates, detailed cost information must be submitted for the elements of cost for the Prime and all Subcontractors. NOTE: Detailed cost information (build up of the labor rates) is required for all proposed CR rates. A cost realism analysis will be performed on all proposed prime contractor or subcontractor CR labor rates.*

3. In accordance with Clause H-901, award of this competitive D/TO will be made to the Contractor whose proposal is the most advantageous to the Government based on an integrated assessment of evaluation criteria which address technical/management and cost/price, **(where technical/management is more important than cost/price, cost/price is more important than technical/management.)** *(The following may be added if technical/management is more important than cost/price, **However, cost/price will contribute substantially to the best value award decision**).* For this order the Government will not perform a new past performance evaluation as the Government completed the evaluation of past performance on the basic SbAST contract, and that evaluation included work that was very similar to what is required for this requirement. The Government determined that all SbAST Primes currently have acceptable past performance relevant to this acquisition. The Government intends to award without negotiations. However; in the event that there needs to be clarification/revision to your proposal the government will issue discrepancy notices. The Government will not establish a formal “opening” or “closing” of negotiations and will not request final proposal revisions. Since final proposal revisions will not be requested, each offeror is put on notice that all submittals will be considered as the final offer. An offer may be determined not eligible for award if all required documentation is not submitted at the time of proposal.

4. The technical proposal evaluation factors will be evaluated as follows: A technical rating and risk rating will be assigned (see attachment 1 for definitions). Proposal risk assesses the risk associated with the offerors’ proposed approach as it relates to accomplishing the requirements as specified.

5. The successful offeror’s technical proposal may be incorporated in whole or in part (or by reference) in any resulting order. Nothing contained in the successful offeror’s technical proposal shall constitute waiver to any other requirement of the contract/order. If after award of an order, it is discovered that changes made during negotiations (if held) were not incorporated into the PWS and/or technical proposal, such changes to the contractor’s documentation shall be considered administrative and shall be made by unilateral modification to the order, at no change in cost or price or other terms and conditions to include changes to the IMS or schedule.

## 6. Cost/Price.

The Offeror's Schedule, Section B, proposed prices will be evaluated for reasonableness and balance. See Paragraphs a) and b) below. Offerors are reminded that, in order to maintain reasonable/balanced pricing, the Government will not accept "Not Separately Price (NSP)", No Charge (NC), \$0, etc., on any line item other than those already designated "NSP" in the Schedule. Offerors are advised to review all data items and ensure that they are proposing to the specific data requirements and level of effort involved. For data items where the quantity of one (1) lot is specified, the quantity of one (1) shall be used. A Total Evaluated Price (TEP) will be calculated in accordance with Paragraph c) below.

a) Reasonableness. The existence of adequate price competition is expected to support a determination of reasonableness. Price analysis techniques may be used to further validate price reasonableness. If adequate price competition is not obtained or if price reasonableness cannot be determined using price analysis of Government obtained information, additional information in accordance with FAR 15.4 may be required to support the proposed price.

b) Balance. Offerors are cautioned against submitting an offer that contains unbalanced pricing. Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable total evaluated price, the price of one or more contract line items including the Basic and Options, is significantly overstated or understated as indicated by the application of proposal analysis techniques. The Government shall analyze offers to determine whether there are unbalanced separately priced line items or sub-line items. Prices submitted will be compared and evaluated to assure that a logical progression exists as related to price and quantity changes within each offeror's response to the pricing structure in the Schedule. Offers that are determined to be unbalanced may be rejected if the lack of balance poses an unacceptable risk to the Government.

c) Total Evaluated Price (TEP). All Unit Prices should be rounded to the nearest whole dollar. The Government will calculate a TEP based on the following:

*(For Other than Firm Fixed Price (FFP) CLINS: Include the following statement)* Each item requires back-up information in accordance with H-901 to include hours, labor categories, and labor rates.

For Firm Fixed Price (FFP) CLINS: Offerors will propose a Unit price for FFP CLINS. Failure to bid all tasks will result in the offer being determined not eligible for award. The Government will multiply the Quantity by the Unit price to calculate the amount. All FFP CLINS (Basic and Options) will be added together to calculate the TEP.

Note: Cost Reimbursable Travel & per diem will not be part of the TEP calculation.

Evaluation of Options shall not obligate the Government to award Options.

7. Proposal submission is due no later than 4:30 pm Eastern Time (*Standard or Daylight, whichever is in effect*) on (**Date**). The estimated award date for this acquisition is (Date). Address your proposal and any questions to the undersigned at (478) XXX-XXXX, e-mail XXXXXX, facsimile (478)-926-4543, and **PCO's Name**, e-mail **PCO's Email**.

NAME  
Contract Specialist

Attachments:

Addressee Distribution List

Evaluation Ratings and Definitions

RFOP

SOW/PWS

*Add or delete as necessary*

DD1423

DD254

FACTS Sheet

Adequacy Checklist (For Follow-On requirements- Mandatory for all actions expected to exceed the threshold for obtaining certified cost or pricing data (FAR 15.403-4(a)(1))

## ***Distribution List***

Advanced Aerospace Engineering Concept  
1925 McKinley Avenue Suite B  
La Verne, CA 91750-5800

Alabama Aircraft Industries Inc Birmingham  
1943 50<sup>th</sup> Street North  
Birmingham, AL 35212-1007

Advanced Modification Solutions Joint Venture  
109 Park Drive  
Warner Robins, GA 31088-5185

Engineering and Software System Solutions, Inc  
550 West C Street Suite 1630  
San Diego, CA 92101-3540

Scientific Research Corporation  
2300 Windy Ridge Parkway Suite 400 SE  
Atlanta, GA 30339-5665

Support Systems Associates, Inc.  
709 South Harbor City Boulevard Suite 350  
Melbourne, FL 32901-1936

## Attachment 1

### Technical Evaluation Ratings and Definitions

Rating	Definition
Exceeds	Exceeds specified performance or capability requirements necessary for contract performance in a way beneficial to the Government
Clearly Meets	Clearly meets performance or capability requirements necessary for contract performance
Does Not Clearly Meet	Does not clearly meet specified performance or capability requirements necessary for contract performance

### Risk Definitions

HIGH	Likely to cause significant disruption of schedule, increase cost, or degradation of performance. Extraordinary contractor emphasis and rigorous Government monitoring may be able to overcome difficulties.
MODERATE	Can potentially cause disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome difficulties.
LOW	Has little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost, or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and normal Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.

\* A plus “+” rating may be used as an option when risk is evaluated to be in the upper boundaries of a technical risk rating, but not enough to merit the next inferior rating.