

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT			1. CONTRACT ID CODE J	PAGE OF PAGES 1 22
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0001	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 06-Jun-2016	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY W6QK ACC-APG NATICK CONTRACTING DIVISION BLDG 1 GENERAL GREENE AVENUE NATICK MA 01760-5011	CODE W911QY	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6) See Item 6		
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code)		X	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. W911QY-16-R-0004	
		X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 06-May-2016	
			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 purpose of this amendment is to: 1. Update Section C.1.3 Contract Outline and Sequence of Events. 2. Update Section C.3.2 First Article Test Units (CLIN 1002). 3. Update Section M.3.5.2 Subfactor 2 - Technical Data. 4. Update Section M.3.9.6.3.				
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 _____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)		16C. DATE SIGNED 06-Jun-2016

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

SECTION C - DESCRIPTIONS AND SPECIFICATIONS

The following have been modified:

STATEMENT OF WORK

C. DESCRIPTIONS AND SPECIFICATIONS for BATTLEFIELD KITCHEN**C.1. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS**

C.1.1. Scope: This Statement of Work (SOW) describes the work to be performed by the Contractor in conjunction with the design, fabrication, test, and delivery of the Battlefield Kitchen (BK).

C.1.2. Technical: The BK is being developed as a replacement to the Mobile Kitchen Trailer. It will be a mobile kitchen towed by the Light Medium Tactical Vehicle (LMTV) and larger vehicles with cross country travel capability. It will have the capability to prepare meals for and feed 300 people, three meals per day. The kitchen will be height reducible to 8 feet for transportation on military aircraft. The system must also have provisions for transportation by helicopter sling load, rail, and ship. All cooking appliances on the BK will be fuel fired (JP-8) with minimal electric power to operate controls, blowers, pumps, etc., and as such, all of the BK electrical power needs will be supplied by a military standard 3kW Generator that is transported within the BK envelope. A key feature of the BK will be that the appliances are dismountable for operation in ground based shelters/buildings. All of the cooking equipment on the BK platform must be man-portable in accordance with MIL-STD-1472. To facilitate operation in closed shelters, the BK ventilation system must be reconfigurable to function when the BK appliances are dismounted and operated in a ground based shelter.

C.1.3. Contract Outline and Sequence of Events: The Contractor will be provided with data and hardware resulting from the developmental work accomplished to date by the Government. This will include solid models, drawings, test reports, prototype burners, appliances, M1061A1 Trailer and generator. See Section H for specifics of GFE and GFI. This provides the contractor with the preliminary system designs, but ultimately, the Contractor shall be responsible for designing and fabricating BK systems that meet all of the requirements of this contract and the component Performance Purchase Descriptions (PPDs). It is the intention of the government to use the technical data obtained under this contract to procure identical or nearly identical Battlefield Kitchens on subsequent (follow on) full and open competitive contracts.

C.1.3.1. For the purposes of this contract, the BK System will be defined as all the parts and pieces that make up a fully functional BK with all Components of the End Item (COEI) and Basic Issue Items (BII). The BK System will include three subsystems: The BK platform, Modular Appliances, and the Modular Burners. The BK platform will therefore be the BK without appliances or burners. It is the intention of the Government to be able to procure separately the three subsystems from the TDP deliverable under this effort in future actions.

C.1.3.2. This overall developmental effort will consist of two phases. The first phase will be the completion of the design of the three sub-systems and all three subsystems will be interchangeable even if provided by different manufacturers: 1) Modular Burner, 2) Modular Appliances, and 3) The BK platform. After successful completion of the Critical Design Review (C.4.4.2.) the Contractor will be given approval to proceed with fabrication of the prototypes. Once Government approval is granted, the Contractor shall proceed to fabricate and test the quantity of Developmental Prototype BK Systems as specified in the Delivery Order.

C.1.3.3. The Contractor shall design and fabricate a minimum of three developmental prototypes (CLIN 0012); additional developmental prototypes, if ordered, will be ordered under CLIN 0013, at quantities and prices specified

in the delivery order. The contractor shall complete the BK developmental prototype systems and deliver them to the Government for evaluation in the Production Prove-Out Test. The Production Prove-Out Test (PPT) will be a Government run test at a Government facility to determine the conformance of the BK and subsystems to the requirements of the applicable PPD's and this Contract. After Government testing, the test prototypes shall be returned to the Contractor. Deficiencies identified during the PPT shall be corrected by the Contractor. After refurbishment of the test prototypes, the Contractor shall deliver the three BK systems to the Government. The prototypes will then be evaluated in Government administered Limited User Test. Feedback from the PPT, and LUT will be used to finalize the design of the BK System and complete the developmental portion of this contract.

C.1.3.4. Initial production approval will be based on the successful completion of the developmental testing and incorporation of necessary design changes to correct remaining deficiencies. The next step will be the fabrication of First Article Test (FAT) Units. These units will be subjected to Contractor performed FAT and Government performed Initial Operational Test (IOT) in that order. The successful completion of these two tests will support the decision for Full Rate Production.

C.1.3.5. During each Government performed test, the Contractor shall provide support in the form of spare and repair parts as well as on-site technical support as required.

C.1.4. Contractor Responsibilities: The Contractor shall furnish all personnel, labor, engineering, services, materials, supplies, and facilities necessary to design, develop, manufacture, and test the BK system and provide all support hardware and software as indicated in this Statement of Work (SOW). The work and services to be performed by the Contractor are detailed in this SOW and will be authorized by issuance of delivery orders. The Contractor shall not initiate any work that is not authorized by a delivery order or modification without written direction by the Contracting Officer.

C.1.5. Program Management: The Contractor shall designate an individual as the Contractor's Program Manager (PM). The PM shall serve as the primary Point of Contact (POC) between the Government and Contractor, and shall be responsible for the coordination of all Contractor activities related to the contract. The PM shall have the authority to commit the Contractor to specific courses of action and accept direction from the Contracting Officer. The PM shall be responsible for coordinating all meetings between the Government and the Contractor. The PM shall be responsible for bringing to the Contracting Officer's attention any conflicts in the Contractor's interpretation of the contract requirements (first by telephone and followed in writing) or problems that could adversely affect the Contractor's ability to meet the stated quality, cost, or production/delivery schedule.

C.1.6. Master Program Schedule: The Contractor shall develop and maintain a detailed Master Program Schedule in Microsoft Project (using the Gantt chart format) that outlines all of the tasks required to execute the program. A baseline schedule shall be established during the contract preparation phase and tracked from contract award. The schedule shall show in detail the path the contractor will follow to meet the required delivery dates of all items awarded on the contract. The schedule shall provide a comprehensive list of all program related events (i.e. design reviews, engineering, design, integration, fabrication, First Article Testing, Production, CDRL deliverables, etc.). The schedule shall track all tasks, baseline and actual schedule progress, and include percentages complete. The Contractor is expected to keep the Master Program Schedule up to date and track program progress using the schedule. Updates to the schedule shall be supplied to the Government as changes occur or as requested. The contractor shall submit the up to date Master Program Schedule along with weekly teleconference meeting minutes (Section 0).

C.1.7. Configuration Management: The Contractor shall implement and maintain an internal configuration management program for the BK throughout the life of the contract. EIA649, 'National Consensus Standard for Configuration Management', may be used as a guide for the Contractor's configuration management program. Copies of this document may be purchased at <http://www.sae.org/>.

C.1.8. Physical Configuration Baseline (PCBL): The Contractor shall create and control the PCBL using the change control and engineering release processes. The PCBL, which shall be in the Contractor's own format, is the product performance requirement for replacement assemblies and spare/repair parts, engineering drawings, parts

lists, process specifications and computer software configuration items. The PCBL shall support interchangeability and interoperability to a replaceable part level.

C.1.9. Configuration Control: The Contractor shall use configuration control to manage all proposed changes after the Physical Configuration is baselined (See C.1.8 and C.2.19). Configuration control shall be used to document the impact of proposed changes and to update configuration documentation. Following acceptance of the system, the Contractor shall not alter the design in form, fit, or function without prior approval from the Contracting Officer.

C.1.10. Engineering Change Proposal (ECP): An ECP shall be prepared for proposed changes. At a minimum, the ECP shall include the following:

C.1.10.1. Date Prepared

C.1.10.2. ECP Number

C.1.10.3. Justification and Priority Code

C.1.10.4. System Designation (i.e. Cage Code, nomenclature, model, P/N)

C.1.10.5. Name of Part (or Lowest Assembly) Affected

C.1.10.6. Baselines Affected

C.1.10.7. Title of Change

C.1.10.8. Description of Change

C.1.10.9. Need for Change

C.1.10.10. Effect on Interfaces (i.e. Integrated Logistics Support (ILS), Interchangeability and Interoperability)

C.1.10.11. Total Costs/Savings

C.1.10.12. Retrofit Information (if applicable)

C.1.10.13. Technical data describing the change to include any changes or additions to the drawings and EDFP.

C.1.10.14. Applicable testing performed and evaluation of the test results.

C.1.10.15. Applicable updates to TM and training

C.1.11. Warranty Performance: The Contractor shall provide a warranty covering workmanship, materials, design, and compliance with the Physical Configuration Baseline and this SOW.

C.1.12. Contractor Test Authorization: The contractor is authorized to receive DoD test rates at a Major Range Test Facility Base (MRTFB).

C.1.13. Pre-Planned Product Improvement (P3I): The Government anticipates that technological advancements will be made during the contract performance period. Therefore, the Contractor shall incorporate these improvements when directed by the Contracting Officer as technology matures. Improvements may include, but are not limited to, burner improvements, ventilation, manufacturing, weight reduction, material improvements to extend useful life of system, application of alternative fuel or alternative power technologies, refrigeration technologies or refrigerants, appliance heat exchanger technologies or materials and use of waste heat for various kitchen functions.

C.2. DEVELOPMENTAL PHASE TASKS

C.2.1. Reliability: The Battlefield Kitchen (BK) shall demonstrate a minimum reliability of at least 430 hours Mean Time Between Hardware Essential Function Failure (MTBHEFF) and a Mean Time Between Hardware System Abort (MTBHSA) of at least 730 hours. The contractor shall furnish information (e.g. test data, modeling and simulation data, accelerated life test data, reliability enhancement test data, RAM model based predictions etc.) to demonstrate the BK will meet or exceed the reliability requirement prior to commencement of Government testing. For the purposes of demonstration of these requirements, testing will be conducted (as applicable) consistent with Attachment A-1 Operational Mode Summary and Mission Profile (OMSMP). Also, demonstration of these requirements in testing shall include all components of the system with the exception of the Government furnished generator. A hardware essential function failure is defined as any contractor furnished (or modified) equipment failure that results in the loss of a mission essential function as defined in Attachment A-2 Failure Definition and Scoring Criteria (FDSC). Examples of essential function failures (EFF) include, but are not limited to, events which causes the inability of the BK to perform a cooking method, or provide ventilation, lighting, power generation or mobility functions. A hardware system abort is any hardware EFF or combination of hardware EFFs that prevent

the BK from producing a scheduled hot meal. Detailed descriptions and explanations of failure categorization are found in the attached FDSC.

C.2.1.1. The Contractor shall develop, implement, and maintain a comprehensive Reliability, Availability and Maintainability (RAM) Management Program. The RAM management program shall establish a process to achieve the RAM requirements in the BK Purchase Description. The Contractor shall develop a RAM model using appropriate design tools and processes such as: Reliability Block Diagram, Fault Tree Analysis (FTA), Failure Modes and Effects Analysis (FMEA), Design Verification Plan & Report (DVP&Rs), Reliability Centered Maintenance (RCM) concepts, and Accelerated Life Cycle Testing (ALT). Throughout the period of contract performance, the Contractor shall update the RAM model whenever new failure modes are identified or when RAM predictions are impacted by design or manufacturing changes. The RAM model shall reflect the lowest identifiable elements and how elements relate to each other. The RAM model shall be used to identify critical items in the system design and identify additional design or testing activities required to achieve the RAM requirements. The RAM model shall be presented at design reviews with supporting reliability data (test data, modeling and simulation data, accelerated life test data, reliability enhancement test data etc.) to demonstrate that the BK will meet or exceed the reliability requirement prior to commencement of Government testing. The Contractor shall ensure products obtained from vendors meet RAM requirements. The Contractor shall monitor system design to identify, assess, and implement failure analysis and corrective actions and to ensure compliance with RAM requirements.

C.2.2. Safety Assessment Report (SAR) & Health Hazard Analysis Report (HHAR) (CLIN 0001):

C.2.2.1. Safety Assessment Report (SAR): The contractor shall conduct a Safety Assessment of the Battlefield Kitchen in accordance with CDRL B001. The SAR is a comprehensive evaluation of the safety risks to the operator, user, and maintainer and equipment prior to test or operation of the system. The Safety Assessment shall identify, analyze and document all safety features of the system design and potential hazards that may be present and specific procedural controls that should be followed to prevent or minimize hazard exposure.

C.2.2.2. Health Hazard Analysis Report (HHAR): A Health Hazard Assessment Report (HHAR) shall be delivered as an appendix or attachment to the SAR IAW CDRL B001. The HHAR shall demonstrate that the prototype is safe to use, maintain and test/evaluate.

C.2.3. Hazardous Material Management Plan (HMMP) (CLIN 0002): The Contractor shall prepare and deliver a HMMP in accordance with CDRL B002.

C.2.4. Design Modular Burner (CLIN 0003): The Contractor shall design the modular burner to meet the requirements of the Attachment B-2, Performance Purchase Description for Modular Burner, PPD FSE-001.

C.2.5. Fabrication of Modular Burners (CLIN 0004): The contractor shall not proceed with this task without approval of the contracting officer. Approval shall be based on the acceptance of the design presented in the Critical Design Review (C.4.2.2). The contractor shall fabricate Modular Burners in accordance with the approved design in quantities sufficient to meet the delivery requirements of the developmental Battlefield Kitchen Systems, C.2.13 CLIN 0012 only. The Modular Burners required for C.2.13.1, CLIN 0013 shall be fabricated and priced as part of CLIN 0013.

C.2.6. Contractor Developmental Test Plan and Test Performance for Modular Burner (CLIN 0005): The Contractor shall develop and provide a Contractors Developmental Test Plan for the modular burner in accordance with CDRL B003 and Attachment B-2, PPD FSE-001 Modular Burner. The Contractor shall be responsible for coordinating, scheduling, and performing Contractor Developmental Testing utilizing the appropriate facilities, equipment, and procedures.

C.2.7. Contractor Developmental Test Report for Modular Burner (CLIN 0006): The Contractor shall prepare and submit a Contractors Developmental Test Report for the Modular Burner in accordance with CDRL B004.

C.2.8. Design Modular Appliance Suite (CLIN 0007): The Contractor shall design the components of the modular appliance suite to meet the requirements of Attachment B-1 Performance Purchase Description, FSE-002. Only those components required for the BK shall be addressed.

C.2.9. Fabricate Modular Appliance suite (CLIN 0008): The contractor shall not proceed with this task without approval of the contracting officer. Approval shall be based on the acceptance of the design presented in the Critical Design Review (C.4.2.2). The contractor shall fabricate modular appliances suites in accordance with the approved design in quantities sufficient to meet the requirements of Delivery of the developmental Battlefield Kitchen Systems, C.2.13, CLIN 0012 only. The Modular Appliance Suite required for C.2.13.1, CLIN 0013, shall be fabricated and priced as part of CLIN 0013.

C.2.10. Contractor Developmental Test Plan and Test Performance for Modular Appliance Suite (CLIN 0009): The Contractor shall develop and provide a Contractors Developmental Test Plan for the Modular Appliances in accordance with CDRL B003 and Attachment B-1, PPD FSE-002 Modular Appliances. The Contractor shall be responsible for coordinating, scheduling, and performing Contractor Developmental Testing utilizing the appropriate facilities, equipment, and procedures.

C.2.11. Contractor Developmental Test Report for Modular Appliance Suite (CLIN 0010): The Contractor shall prepare and submit a Contractors Developmental Test Report for the Modular Appliances in accordance with CDRL B004.

C.2.12. Design Battlefield Kitchen Platform (CLIN 0011): The Contractor shall design the Battlefield Kitchen developmental platform to meet the requirements of the Attachment B-3, PPD FSE-003 BK System.

C.2.13. Fabricate and Deliver Battlefield Kitchen Systems (CLIN 0012 and 0013): The Contractor shall fabricate and deliver complete Developmental Battlefield Kitchen Systems to the Government (CLIN 0012). The Contractor shall fabricate and deliver additional Complete Developmental BK Systems (CLIN 0013) to the Government in accordance with quantities specified in the delivery order. The Developmental Prototype BK System shall contain all COEI and BII required to provide the BK System with complete functionality. The BK System as delivered shall be fully functional and meet all requirements of the contract. All Contractor testing shall be successfully completed in accordance with the approved Contractor Test Plan. These Systems will be subjected to Government Testing. Each BK System shall integrate the Modular Burners and Modular Appliances designed and fabricated under C.2.5 and C.2.9.

C.2.13.1. Fabricate and Deliver Battlefield Kitchen Systems (CLIN 0013) The Contractor shall fabricate and deliver additional Complete Developmental BK Systems (CLIN 0013) in the quantity specified in the delivery order. It is anticipated that this order (if executed) will result in a maximum of 2 additional prototypes. These additional prototypes shall be replications of the prototypes delivered under CLIN 0012. Any changes, to include improvements, shall only be made with the prior approval of the Government. The Modular Burners and Appliances necessary to meet this requirement shall be separate from CLIN 0004 and CLIN 0008 and shall be included in the price of CLIN 0013.

C.2.13.2. Generator: The Generator for the developmental prototype shall be the 3kW TQG or the 3 kW STEP Generator if available and will be provided to the Contractor as GFE.

C.2.13.3. Trailer: The trailer used for the developmental prototype shall be the M1061A1 Trailer, NSN 2330-01-207-3533. A sample of this trailer will be provided as GFE. This sample can be used for design purposes only (to include modification if necessary); however, new trailers shall be utilized by the Contractor for the Developmental Prototypes. The Contractor shall be responsible for the purchase of all trailers used for fabrication of prototypes and production units. Previous manufacturers of this trailer have been:

D&S Manufacturing : 301 E Main St Black River Falls, WI 54616, (715) 284-5376
Schutt Industries: 185 Industrial Ave, Clintonville, WI 54929, (715) 823-8025
Utility Tool and Body: P.O. Box 360 Clintonville, WI 54929, (715)-823-3167

C.2.14. Contractor Developmental Test Plan and Test Performance for Battlefield Kitchen System (CLIN 0014): The Contractor shall develop and provide a Contractors Developmental Test Plan for the Battlefield Kitchen System in accordance with CDRL B003 and Attachment B-3, PPD FSE-003. The Contractor shall be responsible for coordinating, scheduling, and performing Contractor Developmental Testing utilizing the appropriate facilities, equipment, and procedures.

C.2.15. Contractor Developmental Test Report for Battlefield Kitchen System (CLIN 0015): The Contractor shall prepare and submit a Contractors Developmental Test Report for the Battlefield Kitchen System in accordance with CDRL B004.

C.2.16. System Support Package Hardware (CLIN 0016): The Contractor shall deliver a complete set of the hardware items contained on the System Support Package List (CDRL B005). Hardware components from the kit shall be used during the Production Prove-out Test, Logistics Demonstration, Limited User Test, and IOT as required replacements for failed components. The kit shall be refurbished after each test to replace used components. Changes to component design will also warrant a replacement of that component in the system support package. Adjustments to the System Support Package List shall also warrant the equivalent adjustment to the System Support Package. Upon completion of the developmental phase of this contract, the Contractor shall replace any shortages in the System Support Package and the Government shall retain the System Support Package Hardware.

C.2.17. Contractor Test Support for Government Developmental Testing (CLIN 0017): The Contractor shall provide support during Government tests, specifically, the Production Prove-out Test (PPT), Limited User Test (LUT), and Logistics Demo (LD).

C.2.17.1. PPT Support: PPT Support shall include initial preparation of equipment for test, providing training to test personnel, on call support for maintenance and repairs, as well as addressing other technical issues as needed for the duration of government testing.

C.2.17.2. LUT Support: The Contractor shall provide LUT support on a daily basis for up to 10 days to include but not limited to training operators and maintainers, tools, and the appropriate engineering, technical, and logistics support personnel. During the conduct of the LUT, the Contractor shall provide all required on-site technical, engineering, and logistics support, to include on-site mark up of any BK CDRL deliverable as changes occur. The Contractor shall repair any BK failures or system technical problems that occur during the conduct of the event.

C.2.17.3. Log Demo (LD) Support: The Contractor shall provide Log Demo support on a daily basis for up to 10 days to include but not limited to training operators and maintainers, tools, and the appropriate engineering, technical, and logistics support personnel. During the conduct of the Log Demo, the Contractor shall provide all required on-site technical, engineering, and logistics support, to include on-site mark up of any BK CDRL deliverable as changes occur. The Contractor shall repair any BK failures or system technical problems that occur during the conduct of the event.

C.2.18. Post Test Actions: Post Test Actions: During the development phase, the Contractor shall correct any and all design deficiencies identified during Government testing of BK systems and refurbish hardware if required for retest or subsequently scheduled test. Developmental testing will include Production Prove-out Test, Limited User Test, and Logistics Demonstration. For Government administered testing, the Contractor shall be responsible for shipping the item(s) to the test site. After testing, the Government shall be responsible for shipping the items to the Contractors facility if refurbishment of hardware is required. If refurbishment is not required and Government testing is complete, the Government shall take possession of the BK prototypes. If mutually agreed upon, One BK prototype may be returned to the Contractors facility at Government expense after completion of all developmental testing and remain at the Contractors facility until the completion of C.3.2. Fabrication of First Article Test units (CLIN 1002). After completion of C.3.2, the Contractor shall be responsible for shipping all developmental prototype items to the Government.

C.2.18.1. Non Design Related Repairs (CLIN 0018): Damage to the BK prototypes that may affect the BKs performance but not considered a design deficiency or incurred through no fault of the Contractor (e.g. accidents or

misuse) may require repair by the Contractor prior to delivery to the Government for subsequent testing. These repairs will be optional and priced at the time of requirement.

C.2.19. LRIP Approval: The Contractor shall not proceed to production without written approval from the Government. Upon successful completion of developmental tasks and acceptable resolution of all outstanding design issues, and a successful Production Readiness Review the Government will approve the Contractor to proceed with LRIP. This will mark the end of the Developmental phase of the BK and the beginning of Production. At this point the Physical Configuration Baseline will be frozen and any subsequent changes shall require an ECP submitted to and approved by the Government (C.1.10.).

C.3. PRODUCTION PHASE

C.3.1. First Article Test Plan (CLIN 1001): The Contractor shall develop and provide a First Article Test Plan in accordance with CDRL B008. The First Article Test Plan shall outline the testing required to demonstrate that the production units meet the stated performance requirements. The Contractor shall be responsible for coordinating and scheduling all First Article Testing utilizing the appropriate facilities, equipment, and procedures. The First Article Test Plan shall include a comprehensive First Article Test schedule that outlines the location, dates, duration, and identifies all testing resources required.

C.3.2. First Article Test Units (CLIN 1002): The Contractor shall fabricate First Article Test Units in accordance with the finalized frozen configuration. These units shall be evaluated in the First Article Test in accordance with the First Article Test Plan developed under C.2.19. (CLIN 1001). The First Article units shall be completely representative of production units including, but not limited to, design, manufacturing processes, sources of supply, and quality assurance processes. Production of First Article units shall include all the non-recurring tasks associated with design and initiation of production. Non-recurring tasks to initiate BK production shall include developing manufacturing processes and instructions; developing quality assurance processes and documents; establishing viable suppliers; set up of equipment, tools, and fixtures; qualification of welders; personnel training; and all other tasks required to establish a production line that delivers compliant systems. Prior to delivery of the First Article Units to the Government, the Contractor shall be required, at no extra cost to the Government, to replace or repair to original condition any units or subcomponents that sustained any damage or were otherwise noncompliant during First Article Test. Normal wear and tear resulting from the testing shall be acceptable, however, damage resulting from material deficiencies or inadequate design must be corrected on the First Article Test unit by the Contractor at his/her own expense. Changes to the FAT units resulting from material deficiencies or inadequate design shall be incorporated into the design through the ECP process to include updating the FAT units. The First Article units will be accepted by the Government after First Article Test and IOT (See Section 3.2.2 results) demonstrate that the First Article Test systems comply with the requirements and after the Government has accepted the First Article Test Report.

C.3.3. First Article Test: The Contractor shall be responsible for all actions necessary to complete the First Article Test including transportation of equipment and test items to and from test sites. The Contractor shall administer and perform a First Article Test in accordance with the Attachments B-1, B-2, B-3, and the Government approved test plan (CLIN 1001). First Article Test is designed to verify the conformance of BK Production Units to this Statement of Work and the requirements and verifications of the PPDs contained in Attachment B. The Contractor shall conduct all of the verifications specified in Section 4 of the PPDs for the BK System, Appliances, and Burner. The Contractor shall provide all technical support to the First Article Test, to include repairing any damage or problems that occur during testing and having personnel and parts available to service systems as required. Failed components shall be replaced by the Contractor at no additional charge to the Government. The Contractor shall perform all maintenance and repairs during testing at no additional cost to the Government. Maintenance shall be conducted in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Contractor supplied technical publications and technical manuals. During First Article Test, the Contractor's personnel shall perform all unit and direct support level maintenance as required.

C.3.3.1. The Contractor may utilize all FAT units as needed to complete all verifications within the required schedule. The Contractor shall be responsible for coordinating and scheduling all First Article Testing and for the utilization of the appropriate facilities, equipment, personnel, and procedures. The Contractor may use Government

test facilities, on a non-interference basis, for performance of some or all of the required First Article Test. If utilized, the Contractor shall provide reimbursement directly to the Government testing activity (e.g., Aberdeen Test Center) for all direct and indirect costs incurred related to the test conduct. Throughout First Article Test conduct, the Government requires immediate and electronic access (e.g., VISION Digital Library at Aberdeen Test Center or other means) to test related information, including the test plans, test schedule, test results, and each Test Incident Report (TIR). The Government has the right to attend any portion or all of the First Article Test. The Contractor, at no additional cost to the Government, shall correct all issues to include non-conformances to requirements or specifications that are identified as a result of the conduct of the First Article Test. If adequately demonstrated in prior testing, the Government reserves the right to waive portions of the First Article Test. Any testing waived by the Government shall result in a direct reduction in the First Article Test cost. The Contractor shall report on the First Article Test results, analyze any failures, repair any damage, provide corrective action for failures, submit ECPs as part of the configuration control as required, and retain one First Article unit as manufacturing samples during execution of BK production. The Contractor shall restore the First Article unit to original condition plus correct nonconformances identified in testing, and deliver these units last on the contract, unless otherwise directed by the Government. Prior to final delivery of the FAT units, the contractor shall incorporate any and all approved Engineering Changes to the units. The remainder of the First Article Units shall be delivered to the Government to participate in the IOT (See C.3.2.1).

C.3.3.2. Initial Operational Test. The Initial Operational Test (IOT) is a Government administered test performed after completion of the Contractor administered FAT. The IOT for the BK shall be performed using the FAT units that have been delivered to the Government under C.3.2 (CLIN 1002). After completion of the First Article Test and refurbishment of the FAT unit in accordance with C.3.2, two of the FAT units shall be shipped to the Government for the performance of the Government administered Initial Operational Test (IOT).

C.3.4. First Article Test Report (CLIN 1003): The Contractor is required to develop and submit a comprehensive First Article Test Report for all of the tests that were conducted during the First Article Test in accordance with CDRL B009.

C.3.5. Contractor Test Support for Initial Operational Testing (IOT) (CLIN 1004): The Contractor is responsible to provide IOT support on a daily basis for up to 10 days to include but not limited to training operators and maintainers, tools, and the appropriate engineering, technical, and logistics support personnel. During the conduct of the IOT, the Contractor shall provide all required on-site technical, engineering, and logistics support. The Contractor shall be responsible for repair of any BK failures or system technical problems that occur during the conduct of the event.

C.3.6. BK Production Units (CLINs 1005, 2001, 3001, 4001, and 5001): The Contractor shall fabricate BK production units conforming to all the requirements of this contract and to the latest configuration of the BK and the BK subsystems. Contractor developed technical manuals are a required component of the BK and no delivery of BK production shall be accepted without the required, acceptable technical manuals.

C.3.7. BK Authorized Stockage List Kits (CLINs 1006, 2002, 3002, 4002, and 5002): The Contractor shall provide a complete BK ASL kit with each BK fielded. The ASL kit will be comprised of the items on the Authorized Stockage List (ASL). The ASL will consist of select items from the Provisioning Parts List. The purpose of the ASL kit will be to supplement the BK System with spare parts most likely to require replacement during the first year of deployment. The ASL will be determined within 30 days after the completion of the Production Prove-out Test. The ASL will be generated by the Government with Contractor Input.

C.3.8. Shipping (CLINs 0087, 1007, 2003, 3003, 4003, and 5003): The contractor shall ship BK components as required for the developmental and production phases of this effort. Shipping shall include: Shipping of complete systems and support system and components to test sites, shipping complete systems and ASL to fielding sites, and other shipping as required. CLIN 0087 shall be used to cover all shipping charges during the developmental phase. CLINS 1007, 2003, 3003, 4003, and 5003 shall be used to cover shipping charges during option years 1 through 5 respectively.

C.3.9. Contractor Support of Fielding (CLINs 1008, 2004, 3004, 4004, and 5004): The contractor shall provide support to correct issues due to manufacturing or shortages with the Battlefield Kitchens or ASL at the time of fielding. Support will be in the form of providing replacement components, and at the Government's discretion, installing those components, for items found defective or missing during government deprocessing.

C.3.10. Long Term Storage of BK Systems (CLINs 1009, 2005, 3005, 4005, and 5005): These CLINs will be ordered if storage duration of BK goes beyond the 90 calendar days furnished under CLINs 1005, 2001, 3001, 4001 or 5001. The Contractor shall provide storage capacity for up to 200 Government accepted BK at an indoor and secure storage location. Long Term Storage shall include storage plus all other activities associated with storage including, but not limited to, material handling, recordkeeping, security, cleaning, and refurbishing. The contractor shall be fully liable for any damage to, degradation of, or loss of BK during storage and storage activities. BK are required to be stored in an inside location, with the unauthorized access to systems prohibited. BK shall enter and exit Contractor storage on a First In - First Out basis, with a minimal amount of material handling activities occurring during the storage period. The Government will notify the Contractor that BK are required at a fielding location, which shall initiate the process of removing the required number of systems from storage. All BKs shall be inspected and cleaned and refurbished as needed to obtain like-new condition prior to being shipped to the Government. The Contractor shall maintain a system log by serial number that includes, but is not limited to, date accepted by Government, date of entry into storage, date of removal from storage, fielding destination, and details of all activities completed on the system during the Contractor storage period. Any nonconformance of a production unit removed from long term storage shall be corrected by the contractor at no additional cost to the Government utilizing Contractor personnel and Contractor supplies equipment and materials. The unit of measure for long-term storage is "Each" where "Each" is defined as the total price to store one BK for one month. If ordered, payment for long-term storage will be based on the total inventory in storage at the end of each month. *FOR EXAMPLE ONLY*, if the CLIN price is \$100 and the contractor maintains twenty-five (25) systems in long-term storage on the last day of the month, the total price for the CLIN (for that month) would be \$2,500. If, in the next month, ten systems are shipped, while five more are added to long-term storage, the end-of-month inventory would be twenty (20) systems, and the contractor would be entitled to an additional \$2,000 under the long-term storage CLIN.

C.3.11. Per Unit Production Cost Breakdown Report (CLINs 1010, 2006, 3006, 4006, and 5006): At the end of each production year the Contractor shall submit documentation detailing the actual production costs of the BK in accordance with CDRL C002.

C.3.12. Modular Appliances and Accessories (CLINs 1011, 2007, 3007, 4007, and 5007): The contractor shall fabricate and deliver modular appliances and accessories as per delivery order in accordance with CLIN 1011, 2007, 3007, 4007, and 5007.

Modular Burner
Modular Oven with Burner
Modular Griddle with Burner
Modular Cook top with Burner
Modular Steamer with Burner
Modular Tilt Skillet with Burner
Modular Refrigerator
Modular Hand Wash Sink
Components for dismounted operation

C.3.13. Initial Spares per Proposed Spare Parts List (CLIN 1012): The Contractor shall deliver to the Government a kit of initial spares for all items on the Proposed Spare Parts List (See C.6.1). The quantity of each required spare part shall be sufficient to maintain 100 BKs for two years.

C.4. MEETINGS and REVIEWS:

C.4.1. Post Award Conference: The Contractor shall coordinate, schedule, and conduct a Post Award Conference with the Government within 21 calendar days of Contract award. The purpose of the Conference shall be discussion of project orientation, transfer of background information, to provide a mutual understanding of the technical

requirements/contractual requirements and the Quality Assurance provisions of the Contract. The Government can address any questions or issues with regards to technical matters. The Contractor shall describe to the Government the management of all aspects of the program. The Contractor shall ensure that all personnel and subcontractors that are required for an adequate discussion of the contract effort are in attendance. Scheduling of the Post Award Conference shall not change the delivery schedule of the contract. The Contractor shall be prepared to:

C.4.1.1. Conduct a review of the system requirements to ensure that they have been completely and properly identified and that there is a mutual understanding of the system requirements between the Government and the Contractor.

C.4.1.2. Make available to Government representatives the documentation for production planning, manufacturing methods and controls, material and manpower resource allocation, production engineering, quality control and assurance program, production management organization, and management of major subcontractors.

C.4.1.3. Review the overall plan, tasks, and schedule required to execute the BK program within the schedule constraints set forth by the Contract/Government.

C.4.1.4. Document the Post Award Conference meeting minutes and distribute the minutes via e-mail to all Post Award Conference attendees no later than 1 week from the end of the Post Award Conference.

C.4.1.5. Conduct a tour of all facilities associated with the BK effort.

C.4.2. Design Review Meetings and Information Packages (CLIN 0019): The contractor shall conduct a minimum of two design reviews (Preliminary and Critical) on each component of the BK System (appliances, burner, and BK platform) with the Government. Additional reviews shall be scheduled as needed. The design review schedule shall be proposed by the contractor and mutually agreed upon by Government. The contractor shall propose design review dates that support its Program Master Schedule (See C.1.6.) for meeting delivery dates of the contract. A minimum of 14 calendar days after each review shall be given to the Government for providing comments and concerns regarding the design. Government concerns and comments shall be resolved as part of the Contractor's Design Review Information Packages (CLIN 0019) and shall be submitted to the Government in accordance with CDRL B006.

C.4.2.1. Preliminary Design Review (PDR): The purpose of the Preliminary Design Review is to ensure that the design and basic system architecture are sufficiently complete to demonstrate a technical confidence that the performance requirements will be satisfied within cost and schedule goals. At the time of the Preliminary Design Review, the contractor shall have identified at least the system functions and major component functions needed to meet the requirements of the PPDs and have applied performance requirements to each function. The contractor shall also present details of its findings thus far on the effectiveness of component and subcomponent hardware and software items in meeting the functional and performance requirements. The presentation format and content will be of the Contractors choosing, but must be sufficient to support the purpose of the PDR. The intent is for separate PDRs for the Burner, Appliances, and BK platform; however, the Contractor or Government may recommend combining the PDRs. A combination PDR will be a mutual decision.

C.4.2.2. Critical Design Review (CDR): The purpose of the Critical Design Review is to confirm that the system design is stable and is expected to meet system performance requirements, confirms the system is on track to achieve cost goals as evidenced by the detailed design documentation, and establishes the system's initial product baseline. A successful Critical Design Review will provide the Contractor authority to proceed with developmental component and/or system fabrication. The presentation format and content will be of the Contractors choosing, but must be sufficient to support the purpose of the CDR. The intent is for separate CDRs for the Burner, Appliances, and BK platform; however, the Contractor or Government may recommend combining the CDRs. A combination CDR will be a mutual decision.

C.4.3. Production Readiness Reviews (PRR): Two production readiness reviews shall be conducted. The first shall be conducted 30 days prior to initiation of fabrication of the First Article Test Units. The purpose of this review will be to verify that all lessons learned to date have been incorporated into the design of the BK and that the

Contractor is ready to begin fabrication of the First Article Units. The second Production Readiness Review shall be conducted after all changes made to correct deficiencies uncovered during FAT and IOT have been incorporated and after Government acceptance of FAT Report. The Contractor shall coordinate the scheduling of the PRR with the Government. The Contractor shall provide a minimum of 21 days advance notice for scheduling. The purpose of this review shall be to verify that the lessons learned from First Article Test have been incorporated into the design and technical data, update quality assurance processes, and to demonstrate the Contractor's readiness to produce the BK. The review will focus on First Article Test results, resolution of any required changes, readiness of the logistics deliverables, Quality Assurance processes, and any additional equipment procurement that is required. The exact date, location, and administrative arrangements for this meeting shall be made through communication between the Contractor and the Government. The presentation format and content will be of the Contractors choosing, but must be sufficient to support the purpose of the PRR.

C.4.4. In-Process Reviews: In-Process Reviews (IPR) shall be conducted as a part of program status monitoring and control. Technical Publication, Provisioning, Training, technical/engineering, quality assurance, and other necessary IPRs shall be conducted to clarify requirements, assure conformance to contract requirements, provide guidance, review deliverable status, and to help ensure deliverables are prepared in a manner that will satisfy contractual requirements. The Contractor may request an IPR when Government assistance or clarification is desired. The Government may require IPRs irrespective of the program schedule and shall notify the Contractor of a Government required IPR at least 10 calendar days prior to the event. Discrepancies and/or deficiencies identified as the result of an IPR shall be corrected by the Contractor prior to the next IPR. The schedule for IPRs will be flexible and occur on an as needed basis as program issues dictate.

C.4.5. Weekly Teleconference Meetings and Minutes (CLIN 0020): A Weekly Teleconference Meeting shall be conducted by the BK Integrated Product Team (IPT) of Government and Contractor personnel to address technical progress, cost, schedule, contractual, and other programmatic issues or concerns. The Contractor shall provide a weekly email agenda to the designated Contracting Officer's Representative and Contracting Officer at least one day prior to the conduct of scheduled weekly meetings and submit updated minutes and action items to the Government within 48 hours of the conclusion of the meeting. The updates shall include, but are not limited to, issues involving design, development, fabrication, testing, cost, funding, quality control, production, task tracking, and scheduling. Updates shall identify any programmatic problems that may have arisen and shall identify proposed solutions. The minutes shall include the discussion from the Weekly Teleconference Meeting between the Government, the Contractor, and any relevant subcontractor personnel. The Contractor shall submit minutes to the weekly meeting in accordance with CDRL B007

C.5. Technical Data Package and License Agreement for Modular Burner, Modular Appliances, and BK Platform (CLINs 0021, 0022, 0023, 0024, 0025, and 0026):

C.5.1. Technical Data Package (CLINs 0021, 0023 and 0025): The contractor shall provide a complete production level TDP IAW MIL-STD-31000 and CDRL C001. The TDP shall include detailed design data for all BK components including commercial items and modified commercial items (see DFARS 227.7102-1(a)(2)). In addition to the delivery schedule in CDRL C001, the Contractor shall provide an updated TDP at the start of production, the first month of each option year, and during the last month of production of BK on this contract. At the time of each submission, the TDP shall reflect the most current version of the BK platform, modular appliances, and appliance burner with all changes to the system since the last submittal incorporated.

C.5.2. License Agreement (CLINs 0022, 0024 and 0026): If the offeror prices the optional license agreement CLINS and the Government issues a Delivery Order for them, the contractor shall deliver a paid up, royalty free license that covers all of the items in the TDP as prescribed by Military Standard MIL-STD-31000. The License shall be adequate for Government Purpose License Rights (GPLR) to support a competitive reproduction and manufacture of the system and spare/repair parts by a competent manufacturing source. The License Agreement shall cover the product and the manufacture thereof so as to permit manufacturing and use of the product by or on behalf of the U.S. Government for a U.S. Government Purpose. Note, this may also include product formulation, composition, and/or manufacturing information/licensing rights from third parties. It is expected that this proposed License Agreement will enable future competitive procurement from technically competent manufacturers after the conclusion of this contract and any exercised options.

C.6. INTEGRATED LOGISTICS SUPPORT:

C.6.1. The Contractor shall prepare and deliver Provisioning Data in accordance with the provisioning statement of work, see Attachment C-1.

C.6.2. The Contractor shall prepare and deliver Failure Modes Effect Criticality Analysis (FMECA) Data in accordance with the FMECA statement of work, Attachment, C-2.

C.6.3. The Contractor shall prepare and deliver the Technical Manual and National Maintenance Work Requirement (NMWR) in accordance with the 13&P and NMWR statement of work, see Attachment C-3, C-8, and C-9

C.6.4. The Contractor shall prepare and deliver training materials in accordance with the training statement of work, Attachment C-4

C.6.5. The Contractor shall prepare and deliver an interactive DVD in accordance with the IMI DVD statement of work, see Attachment C-5

C.6.6. The Contractor shall prepare and deliver Packaging Data in accordance with the packaging statement of work, see Attachment C-6

C.6.7. The Contractor shall prepare and deliver a Care of Supply in Storage (COSIS) plan in accordance with the COSIS statement of work, see Attachment C-7.

C.7. ANTI-TERRORISM (AT) AND OPERATIONS SECURITY (OPSEC)

C.7.1. AT Level 1 Training: All contractor employees, to include subcontractor employees, requiring access to Army installations, facilities and controlled access areas shall complete AT Level I awareness training within 30 calendar days after contract start date or effective date of incorporation of this requirement into the contract, whichever is applicable. The contractor shall submit certificates of completion for each affected contractor employee and subcontractor employee to the COR or to the contracting officer, if a COR is not assigned, within 30 calendar days after completion of training by all employees and subcontractor personnel. AT level I awareness training is available at the following website: <http://jko.jten.mil>.

C.7.2. iWATCH Training: This standard language is for contractor employees with an area of performance within an Army controlled installation, facility or area. The contractor and all associated subcontractors shall brief all employees on the local iWATCH program (training standards provided by the requiring activity ATO). This local developed training will be used to inform employees of the types of behavior to watch for and instruct employees to report suspicious activity to the CO. This training shall be completed within 30 calendar days of contract award and within 30 calendar days of new employees commencing performance with the results reported to the COR NLT 30 calendar days after contract award.

C.7.3. Access and general protection/security policy and procedures. Contractor and all associated subcontractors employees shall provide all information required for background checks to meet installation access requirements to be accomplished by installation Provost Marshal Office, Director of Emergency Services or Security Office. Contractor workforce must comply with all personal identity verification requirements (FAR clause 52.204-9, Personal Identity Verification of Contractor Personnel) as directed by DoD, HQDA and/or local policy. In addition to the changes otherwise authorized by the changes clause of this contract, should the Force Protection Condition (FPCON) at any individual facility or installation change, the Government may require changes in contractor security matters or processes.

C.7.4. Access to DoD facility or installation. Contractor and all associated subcontractor employees shall comply with adjudication standards and processes using the National Crime Information Center Interstate Identification Index (NCICIII) and Terrorist Screening Database (TSDB) (Army Directive 2014-05/AR 190-13), applicable installation, facility and area commander installation/facility access and local security policies and procedures

(provided by government representative), or, at OCONUS locations, in accordance with status of forces agreements and other theater regulations.

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

The following have been modified:

SECTION M

M.1. BASIS FOR AWARD

The award will be made based on the best overall (i.e., best value) proposal that is determined to be the most beneficial to the Government, with appropriate consideration given to the four (4) evaluation factors: Technical, Management, Past Performance and Contract Price. The Technical factor is more important than the Management factor, which is more important than the Cost/Price factor, which is more important than the Past Performance factor. To receive consideration for award, a rating of no less than "Acceptable" must be achieved for the Technical and Management factors (to include all subfactors). A Contract may be awarded to the Offeror who is deemed responsible in accordance with the FAR (See FAR 9.104, which describes the standards prospective contractors, must meet to be determined "responsible"), as supplemented, whose proposal is responsive in that it 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 Army the greatest confidence that it will best meet, or exceed, the requirements of this solicitation. This may result in an award to a higher rated, higher priced Offeror, where the decision is consistent with the evaluation factors, and the Source Selection Authority (SSA) reasonably determines the best value in accordance with business judgments and tradeoffs. The SSA will base the source selection decision on an integrated assessment of proposals against the Technical Capability and Cost/Price Factors in the source selection criteria in the solicitation (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.

The tradeoff process is selected as appropriate for this acquisition. Award may be made to other than the lowest priced Offerors or other than the highest technically rated Offerors. In determining the best value to the Government, the Technical and Management Evaluation Criteria, when combined, are more important than the evaluated price. The Government is more concerned with obtaining a proposal with superior technical merit than making a selection at the lowest evaluated price. Thus, the closer or more similar in merit that the Offerors' technical proposals are evaluated to be, the more likely the evaluated price may be the determining factor in selection for award. However, the Government will not make an award at a price premium that it considers disproportionate to the benefits associated with the higher technical merit. In determining the best value to the Government, the Government need not quantify the tradeoffs that led to the best value decisions.

M.1.1. Number of Contracts to be Awarded: The Government intends to award one contract for the Battlefield Kitchen design, development and production effort however, the Government reserves the right to not award a contract in the event that no proposals are considered to be in the best interest of the Government.

M.1.2. Reporting: A narrative discussion of the evaluation of each proposal in terms of the evaluation criteria and proposed strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses and deficiencies will be provided to the Contracting Officer. Each Factor will be rated by consensus and incorporated into a report. If consensus is not obtainable, a minority report prepared and signed by the dissenting evaluator(s) and included in the report.

M.1.3. Ratings: To receive consideration for award offerors shall demonstrate a complete understanding of the requirements of the solicitation. An Adjectival Rating of no less than "Acceptable" must be achieved for the

Technical & Management Factors (to include all subfactors). An evaluation rating of "Unacceptable" at the Subfactor level will cause the entire Factor to be rated as "Unacceptable," and an evaluation of "Unacceptable" at the Factor level will cause the entire Proposal to be rated as "Unacceptable." Offerors are cautioned that award may not necessarily be made to the lowest-priced offeror.

M.1.4. Competitive Range: If the Contracting Officer decides that discussions with offerors are needed, a competitive range determination will be made. The competitive range will be comprised of all of the most highly rated proposals, unless the range is further reduced for purposes of efficiency. The Contracting Officer will notify Offerors promptly in writing when their proposals are excluded from the competitive range or otherwise eliminated from the competition. That notice shall state the basis for the determination and that a proposal revision will not be considered. The Contracting Officer will use this report to assist in the competitive range determination.

M.1.5. Discussions: Offerors are advised that the Government intends to conduct discussions but reserves the right to award based on the initial proposal submissions without discussions therefore, the offeror's initial proposal shall contain the offeror's best terms. Upon establishment of the competitive range, and to the extent deemed necessary at the sole discretion of the Contracting Officer, written discussion items may be issued to remaining Offerors, using control numbers, to further investigate any weaknesses, deficiencies, or other subjects identified by the technical panel as germane to the evaluation process. Discussion items may be issued relating to any matter that requires written revisions to a proposal for which a binding agreement is required/desired.

M.1.6. 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) by assessing the equivalent value (see FAR 45.201) of those resources as part of the offered price.

M.2. FACTORS AND SUBFACTORS TO BE EVALUATED:

The following evaluation factors and subfactors will be used to evaluate each proposal: Award will be made to the offeror whose proposal is most advantageous to the Government based upon an integrated assessment of the evaluation factors and subfactors described below.

M.2.1. Factor I – The Technical factor is further divided into the following subfactors:

- a. Subfactor 1 Developmental Design of Modular Appliances, Modular Burner and Battlefield Kitchen Platform.
- b. Subfactor 2 Technical Data.
- c. Subfactor 3 ILS Functions and Configuration Management.

Subfactor 1 and 2 are of equal importance and are more important than subfactor 3.

M.2.2. Factor II –Management

Evaluation of the offeror's proposal shall address each requirement of the RFP. A detailed explanation of the criteria for the evaluation is set forth in the "Evaluation Approach", Section M.3. During evaluations of each proposal, the Government will assign an adjectival rating and write a narrative evaluation reflecting the identified findings for this factor.

M.2.3. Factor III – Past Performance: Each offeror's past performance will be reviewed to determine relevancy and confidence assessment.

M.2.4. Factor IV – Contract Price Proposal: The resulting award will be a Firm Fixed Price (FFP) contract type. Price reasonableness will be utilized in the evaluation of each offeror's price proposal IAW section M.3.3.9. of this solicitation.

M.3. EVALUATION APPROACH:

M.3.1. All proposals in response to this RFP shall be subject to evaluation by a panel of Government Subject Matter Experts and based on an independent comprehensive review and assessment of each proposal against all source selection criteria. Proposals will be rated in accordance with the process described in this section. The process will rate the offerors ability to perform the work in accordance with all aspects of requirements outlined in this solicitation and the reasonableness of the Contract Price Section.

M.3.2 Proposal Rating: The technical panel will provide a detailed evaluation and assign a combined technical/risk rating for the Technical and Management Factors. The Past Performance Factor will receive only a confidence rating. The Contract Price Proposal Factor will be evaluated by the Contracting Officer and/or Price Analyst in accordance with the evaluation criteria established in the RFP.

M.3.3. Relative Importance of Factors and Subfactors:

M.3.3.1. Factors: The Technical factor is more important than the Management factor, which is more important than the Cost/Price factor, which is more important than the Past Performance factor.

M.3.3.2. Technical Subfactors: Subfactor 1 and 2 are of equal importance and are slightly more important than subfactor 3.

M.3.4. The overarching evaluation approach for all factors and subfactors is as follows:

M.3.4.1. Adequacy of Response. The proposal will be evaluated to determine whether the offeror's methods and approach have adequately and completely considered, defined, and satisfied the requirements specified in the RFP. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which each requirement has been addressed in the proposal in accordance with the proposal submission section of the RFP.

M.3.4.2. Feasibility of Approach. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the proposed approach is workable and the end results achievable. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which successful performance is contingent upon proven devices and techniques. The proposal will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the offeror is expected to be able to successfully complete the proposed tasks and technical requirements within the required schedule.

M.3.5. FACTOR I TECHNICAL - The offerors proposal will be evaluated for adequacy of response and feasibility of approach with regard to the Offeror's technical capability. Marginal levels of overall details in the Factors and Subfactors could indicate a lack of understanding concerning the requirements and may result in the entire proposal receiving an unfavorable rating and/or being eliminated from the competitive range. The Technical factor is divided into the following subfactors:

M.3.5.1. Subfactor 1 –Ability to develop and manufacture a complete BK System that meets the requirements of this solicitation. Subfactor 1 will be evaluated for adequacy of response and feasibility of approach with regard to the Offeror's proposed:

Modular Burner: The plan to design, fabricate, test, and manufacture a burner that meets the requirements of the PPD FSE-001 will be evaluated for adequacy of response and feasibility of approach. The evaluation will focus on determining the proposers understanding of the project requirements and the ability to meet those requirements both in the development and production phases of this effort.

Modular Appliances: The plan to design, fabricate, test, and manufacture the modular appliances that meet the requirements of PPD, FSE-002 will be evaluated for adequacy of response and feasibility of approach. The evaluation will focus on determining the proposers understanding of the project requirements and the ability to meet those requirements both in the development and production phases of this effort.

Kitchen Platform: The plan to design, fabricate, test, and manufacture the Battlefield Kitchen Platform that meets the requirements of PPD FSE-003 will be evaluated for completeness and effectiveness. The evaluation will focus

determining the proposers understanding of the project requirements and the ability to meet those requirements both in the development and production phases of this contract.

M.3.5.2. Subfactor 2 - Technical Data: The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposal for adequacy of response and feasibility of approach in regard to the Offeror's proposed: Contract Data Requirements Lists (CDRLs) and the Statements of Work (SOW), using Military Standard MIL-STD-31000.

M.3.5.2.1. GPR Adjustment: The GPR Adjustment will be the result of the evaluation in accordance with M.3.5.2 of information submitted in response to section L.10.2.2. The adjustment will be proportional to the anticipated future savings based on the degree to which the offerors proposed data rights fully support future full and open competitive acquisitions. The resulting GPR adjustment will be subtracted from the offerors Evaluated Contract Price as part of the Total Evaluated Price calculation. The adjustment will be based on a combination of the utility for future competitive acquisitions of the TDP and the cost of the GPR.

M.3.5.2.2. GPR Adjustment Formula: The GPR Adjustment, in FY16\$, will be calculated in accordance with the formula:

$$A = (B \times C) + (B - P)$$

Where:

A = GPR adjustment

B = Baseline government savings

C = Competitive utility multiplier

P = GPR Price

M.3.5.2.3. Proposed GPR Price: The Offerors proposed GPR price will be evaluated as part of the Evaluated Contract Price calculated under M.3.9.

M.3.5.2.4. Government Baseline Savings: The Governments baseline savings (B) is \$3,109,600.00 in FY16\$. This baseline savings represents the savings the Government expects to yield if the Offerors proposed TDP and GPR fully support future full and open competitive acquisitions. The baseline savings is calculated based on anticipated costs for any necessary redesign, recreation of technical data, and re-testing of equipment. In the event the formula in M.3.5.2.2 yields a negative number, there will be no adjustment to the Total Evaluated Price.

M.3.5.2.5. Competitive Utility Multiplier: The competitive utility multiplier represents an assessment of the quality of the proposed TDP in terms of the degree to which it provides complete information for future competitive procurement (i.e., Competitive Utility), and will be applied based on the evaluation of the TDP in total. The Government will not perform a risk assessment as part of the Competitive Utility Multiplier evaluation. The evaluation will take into account the quantity of components which the Offeror identifies as OEM Source Controlled, the specific components which the Offeror proposes to be OEM Source Controlled and the impact of those components to competitive utility and future competitive procurements. In general, Source Controlled components are considered less advantageous to the Government and competitive rights components (Government Purpose or Unlimited Rights) are considered more advantageous to the Government. Proposing a TDP with significant quantities of OEM Source Controlled components generally will result in a lower competitive utility multiplier due to the additional reverse engineering and/or qualification testing necessary to attain secondary sources to support competition. There are four possible competitive utility multipliers: 0, 1/3, 2/3, and 1. Descriptions of each multiplier are as follows:

M.3.5.2.5.1. 0 Multiplier: Represents a proposed TDP that has significantly degraded to no competitive utility due to the following criteria:

* The proposed TDP features significant quantities of OEM Source Controlled components which would require significant reverse engineering and/or qualification testing for secondary sources to permit future competition.

M.3.5.2.5.2. 1/3 Multiplier: Represents a proposed TDP that has moderately degraded competitive utility due to the following criteria:

* The proposed TDP features moderate quantities of OEM Source Controlled components which would require moderate reverse engineering and/or qualification testing for secondary sources to permit future competition when purchased.

M.3.5.2.5.3. 2/3 Multiplier: Represents a proposed TDP that has slightly degraded competitive utility due to the following criteria:

* The proposed TDP features limited quantities of OEM Source Controlled components which would require limited reverse engineering and/or qualification testing for secondary sources to permit future competition when purchased.

M.3.5.2.5.4. 1 Multiplier: Represents a proposed TDP that has full competitive utility due to the following criteria:

* The proposed TDP features no OEM Source Controlled components, which as a result would not require any reverse engineering and/or qualification testing for secondary sources, and thus would immediately permit future competition when purchased.

M.3.5.2.6. Declining to Propose Data Rights: An Offeror declining to propose an option for the Government to acquire rights in technical data greater than the rights to which the Government is already entitled, i.e., declining to provide an option to give the Government full rights to support competition, will not receive a GPR adjustment. In accordance with 10 USC 2320 and DFARS 227.7103-1 Offerors are not required, either as a condition of being responsive to a solicitation or as a condition for award, to sell or otherwise relinquish to the Government any rights in technical data related to items, components or processes developed exclusively at private expense. An Offeror that does not propose to sell or otherwise relinquish any rights in technical data related to items, components or process developed exclusively at private expense will still be considered responsive.

M.3.5.3. Subfactor 3 – Integrated Logistics Support (ILS) Functions and Configuration Management. Subfactor 3 will be evaluated for adequacy of response and feasibility of approach in regard to the Offeror's proposed:

Ability to perform the ILS functions and the functions necessary for Configuration Management in accordance with the Contract Data Requirements List (CDRL) and the requirements of the solicitation.

M.3.6. FACTOR II MANAGEMENT - The Government will evaluate the Offeror's proposal for adequacy of response and feasibility of approach in regard to the Offeror's proposed Management capabilities. Marginal levels of overall details in this Factor could indicate a lack of understanding concerning the requirements and may result in the entire proposal receiving an unfavorable rating and/or being eliminated from the competitive range.

M.3.7. TECHNICAL AND MANAGEMENT FACTOR RATINGS: The Technical and Management factor Ratings, excerpted below focus on the strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses, deficiencies, risks and uncertainties of the offeror's proposal. The color rating depicts how well the offeror's proposal meets the factor and subfactor requirements.

M.3.7.1. The adjective descriptor, as defined below, will be assigned by the evaluators and represents their assessment of how well the offerors proposal meets the stated evaluation criteria for each factor/subfactor.

Combined Technical/Risk Ratings	
Adjectival Rating	Definition
Outstanding	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths far outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is very low.
Good	Proposal meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal contains strengths which outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is low.

Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths and weaknesses are offsetting or will have little or no impact on contract performance. Risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Marginal	Proposal does not clearly meet requirements and has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. The proposal has one or more weaknesses which are not offset by strengths. Risk of unsuccessful contract performance is high.
Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies. Proposal is un-awardable.

M.3.7.2. The Adjectival descriptors will be supported by narrative write-ups identifying the associated strengths, weaknesses, and deficiencies, as defined below:

M.3.7.3. Strength: An aspect of an offerors' proposal that has merit or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Government during contract performance.

M.3.7.4. Weakness: A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of contract performance. See FAR 15.001.

M.3.7.5. Significant Weakness: A flaw in the proposal that appreciably increases the risk of contract performance. See FAR 15.001.

M.3.7.6. Deficiency: A material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of weaknesses and significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of contract performance to an unacceptable level. See FAR 15.001

M.3.8. FACTOR III PAST PERFORMANCE - The Offerors and subcontractors past performance with Government and industry will be evaluated to assess the relative risks associated with the Offerors likelihood of success in meeting the requirements stated in this solicitation. Specific areas of past performance examined will include demonstrated technical and schedule performance, cost control, general responsiveness to contract requirements, customer satisfaction, customer focus, and references, if applicable. Past performance data, which demonstrates the Offerors ability to produce military technical manuals and ability to train military technicians on maintenance procedures will also be evaluated. Emphasis will be on recent and relevant performance. Additionally, any and all contracts terminated in whole or in part during the past five (5) years, to include those currently in the process of such termination should be identified.

M.3.8.1. The Past Performance Factor shall be assigned a performance relevancy rating and confidence assessment rating: The confidence rating will be based on the relevancy and quality of submitted past performances as defined below.

M.3.8.2. Relevancy: The first aspect of the past performance evaluation will be to assess the offeror's past performance to determine how relevant a recent effort accomplished by the offeror is associated with mobile military field kitchens, appliance manufacture and design, fuel fired burner design and fabrication, other mobile systems of similar complexity to the BK to be acquired through the source selection. Relevancy is not separately rated; however, the following criteria will be used to establish what is relevant which will include similarity of service/support, complexity, dollar value, contract type, and degree of subcontract/teaming. Relevant is defined as those contracts associated with military field kitchens and equipment or other products similar to the effort required by this contract. Relevant contracts are also defined as those encompassing similar scope in the cost; complexity; system engineering; production; and integrated logistics support requirements as this contract requires.

Past Performance Relevancy Ratings	
Rating	Description

Very Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Somewhat Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
Not Relevant	Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

M.3.8.3. Quality Assessment: The quality of the offeror's past performance on those recent efforts that were determined relevant will be assessed to determine how well the contractor performed on the contracts. Documented results from Past Performance Questionnaires, interviews, CPARS, and other sources form the support and basis for this assessment.

M.3.8.3.1. High Quality: Contractor clearly demonstrated a level of performance above expectations.

M.3.8.3.2. Acceptable Quality: Contractor demonstrated an acceptable level of performance.

M.3.8.3.3. Low Quality: Contractor did not demonstrate an acceptable level of performance

M.3.8.4. PAST PERFORMANCE CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENT: Once the Relevancy and Quality of the past performance contracts has been established, the final step is for the team to arrive at a single consensus performance confidence assessment for the offeror, selecting the most appropriate rating from the chart below.

Performance Confidence Assessments	
Rating	Description
Substantial Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent, relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the Offeror shall successfully perform the required effort.
Satisfactory Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent, relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror shall successfully perform the required effort.
Limited Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent, relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the Offeror shall successfully perform the required effort.
No Confidence	Based on the offeror's recent, relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the Offeror shall be able to successfully perform the required effort.
Unknown Confidence (Neutral)	No recent, relevant performance record is available or the Offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned.

M.3.9. FACTOR IV CONTRACT PRICE PROPOSAL - Contract Price will be evaluated in accordance with FAR Part 15.305(a)(1) to ensure that prices are fair and reasonable, based on adequate price competition and a

comparison to the IGCE and will not be given an adjectival or risk rating. The RFP requires firm-fixed-prices contract line items. In the event that reasonableness cannot be determined based on competition and the comparison to the IGCE other than cost and pricing data shall be utilized.

M.3.9.1. Pricing will be evaluated based on a comparison of proposed prices from all offerors received in response to the solicitation as well as a comparison of proposed prices with the Independent Government Cost Estimate. The Government will evaluate all options and has included the provision FAR 52.217-5, Evaluation of Options, in Section M of the solicitation. In accordance with FAR 52.217-5, Evaluation of Options, this does not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

M.3.9.2. Reasonableness: The Government will evaluate the reasonableness of the proposed price based on competition and a comparison with the IGCE. In the event reasonableness cannot be determined then the methodology will be evaluated. For the price to be reasonable in its nature and amount, it should not exceed that which would be incurred by a prudent person in the conduct of a competitive business. Reasonableness takes into account the context of a given source selection, including current market conditions and other factors that affect the ability of an offeror to perform the contract requirements. Reasonableness depends upon a variety of considerations and circumstances, including:

- a. Whether it is the type of cost generally recognized as ordinary and necessary for the conduct of the offeror's business or of the contract performance;
- b. Generally accepted sound business practices, Federal and State laws and regulations, etc.; and
- c. Any significant deviations from the offeror's established practices.

M.3.9.3. Completeness: Price proposals shall be evaluated for completeness by assessing the responsiveness of the proposed price.

M.3.9.4. A price reasonableness approach will be utilized by the Government to determine that the proposed prices offered are fair and reasonable and that a "buy-in" or unbalanced pricing between CLINs or Option Periods is not occurring. The Government may determine that an offer is unacceptable if the prices are significantly unbalanced. Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable total evaluated price, the price of one or more contract line items is significantly over or understated as indicated by the application of cost or price analysis techniques.

M.3.9.5. All proposed prices, including step-ladder prices, will also be evaluated individually to determine reasonableness.

M.3.9.6. Total Evaluated Price (TEP) - The TEP for award purposes will be the sum of the CLINs specified below to include the base period CLINs and all option CLINs as described below except that the Government will eliminate any competitive advantage resulting from an "Offeror's" proposed use of Government-furnished equipment (GFE) as detailed in section H.2. Government Furnished Equipment by assessing the equivalent value (see FAR 45.202) of those resources as part of the offered price.

M.3.9.6.1. The CLINS that are included in the TEP are as follows: 0001-0016, 0021-0086, 1001-1003, 1005, 1006, 1009, 1011, 1012, 2001, 2002, 2005, 2007, 3001, 3002, 3005, 3007, 4001, 4002, 4005, 4007, 5001, 5002, 5005 and 5007.

M.3.9.6.2. For evaluation purposes only the Additional BK Developmental Prototype CLIN 0013 will be evaluated by averaging the unit price for each step-ladder pricing to determine an average unit price. For evaluation purposes only, the average unit price will then be multiplied by 5. This total will be utilized in the total evaluated price calculation.

M.3.9.6.3. For evaluation purposes the total evaluated price will be adjusted as specified in M.3.5.2., based on the utility and cost of the proposed Government Purpose License Rights for CLINS 0022, 0024, and 0026.

M.3.9.6.4. For evaluation purposes only the Production Unit CLINS 1005, 2001, 3001, 4001 and 5001 will be evaluated by averaging the unit price for each step-ladder pricing to determine an average unit price. For evaluation

purposes only, the average unit price will then be multiplied by 80. This total will be utilized in the total evaluated price calculation.

M.3.9.6.5. For evaluation purposes only the ASL Kit CLINS 1006, 2002, 3002, 4002 and 5002 will be evaluated by averaging the unit price for each step-ladder pricing to determine an average unit price. For evaluation purposes only, the average unit price will then be multiplied by 10. This total will be utilized in the total evaluated price calculation.

M.3.8.6.6. For evaluation purposes only the Storage CLINS 1009, 2005, 3005, 4005 and 5005 will be evaluated by averaging the unit price for each step-ladder pricing to determine an average unit price. For evaluation purposes only, the average unit price will then be multiplied by 30. This total will be utilized in the total evaluated price calculation.

M.3.9.6.7. For evaluation purposes only the Modular Appliances and Accessories CLINS 1011, 2007, 3007, 4007 and 5007 will be evaluated by averaging the unit price for each step-ladder pricing to determine an average unit price. For evaluation purposes only, the average unit price will then be multiplied by 25. This calculation will be completed for each modular appliance and accessories. These totals will be utilized in the total evaluated price calculation.

M.3.9.6.8. The CLINS that are excluded from the TEP are as follows: 0017-0020, 0087, 1004, 1007, 1008, 1010, 2003, 2004, 2006, 3003, 3004, 3006, 4003, 4004, 4006, 5003, 5004 and 5006.

(End of Summary of Changes)