

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0001	3. EFFECTIVE DATE SEE BLOCK 16C	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REG. NO. N/A	5. PROJECT NO. (if applicable) N.A.
6. ISSUED BY OFFICE OF NAVAL RESEARCH ONR 254 (703) 588-2837 E-Mail Richard.pollack@navy.mil 875 North Randolph St. Arlington VA 22203-1995	CODE N00014	7. ADMINISTERED BY (if other than item 6) N/A	SCD-C

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)  Prospective Offerors	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. N00014-14-R-0004 <input type="checkbox"/> 9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO. - <input type="checkbox"/> 10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)
CODE	FACILITY CODE

**11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS**

The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers  is extended  is not extended.

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and data specified in the solicitation or as amended, by on of the following methods: (a) By completing items 8 and 15, and returning 1 copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of the 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 data 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 ITEM 14.**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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.
<input type="checkbox"/>	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation data, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).
<input type="checkbox"/>	C. SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF: AUTHORITY FOR OTHER THAN FULL AND OPEN COMPETITION:
<input type="checkbox"/>	D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor  is not,  is required to sign this document and return 2 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 to the above referenced solicitation is to: amend Section L, ONR Clause No. 179, General Instructions for Submission of Technical and Cost Proposals, Paragraph "I"; address questions from prospective offerors, and; provide a more legible copy of the Award Fee Evaluation Criteria Chart that is part of Attachment No. 3, NSAM Award Fee Plan. Accordingly, the solicitation is amended as follows:

See page 2.

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)
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
15C. DATE SIGNED	16C. DATE SIGNED
(Signature of person authorized to sign)	BY (Signature of Contracting Officer)

1. Section L, ONR Clause 0179, General Instructions for Submissions of Technical and Cost Proposals, Paragraph "1" is changed to read:

(1) Proposal Identification/Mailing. Offerors should assign their own identifying number to its proposal. The proposal should be packaged for delivery so as to permit safe and timely arrival at destination. The proposal package must be sent to the address shown below and marked as follows:

**RFP No. N00014-14-R-0004**

**Closing Date: (As specified in Block 9 on Page 1 of the RFP)**

**Attn: Brian Kehoe  
Code 254, 12th Floor (W1252B)  
Office of Naval Research  
875 North Randolph Street,  
Arlington, VA 22203-1995**

2. The following are responses to questions submitted by prospective offerors:

Q1. Solicitation Page 39; Section ONR 0179(E)(3) states "Each page shall be counted except the following: Cover pages, page separators/tabs, glossaries, table of contents/indexes, past performance questionnaires and resumes." However, Solicitation Page 42; Section ONR 0180(B), Executive Summary, states "The Executive Summary should not exceed five (5) pages. (Not included in 50 limit page count)". Clarification is hereby requested regarding whether or not the Executive Summary pages are included in the 50 page limit.

**A1. The Executive summary is not included in 50 page limit.**

Q2. Solicitation Page 43; Section ONR 0180(C)(1)(g), Center Business Operations: This section states that "Favorable and unfavorable cost and/or schedule variances that exceed +/- 20% shall be identified and reported along with proposed corrective actions." However, Statement of Work Page 6; Section 2.3.1, COE Performance Management states "Favorable and unfavorable cost and/or schedule variances that exceed +/- 10% shall be identified and reported along with proposed corrective actions." Clarification is hereby requested regarding the threshold for identifying and reporting cost/schedule variances.

**A2. +/- 10% is the threshold.**

Q3. Solicitation Page 47; Section ONR 0181(B), Cost Proposal Element: Clarification is hereby requested regarding whether the cost proposal assumption of "A typical Navy ManTech project load of 15 projects of an average duration of 12 months each" indicates a total of 15 projects for the 5-year performance period or an average workload of 15 projects, in varying states of execution, at any point during the 5-year performance period.

**A3. The intent was an average workload of 15 projects, in varying states of execution, at any point during the 5-year performance period**

Evaluation Period:		Award Fee Qualitative Ratings					Score:		
COE	Project Title:	Project #:	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent		
			578	71-76	78-80	81-88	81 - 100	X 0 15 0	
Award Fee Score Weights:									
<b>A. TECHNICAL / PROGRAMMATIC</b>									
1. Progress Toward Technical Goals / Metrics	0.30 0.15								
<p><b>Basis for Scoring:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Is progress toward achieving the technical goals as expected?</li> </ul>		<p>- Technical progress does not meet expectations. Recovery plan may or may not be in place. Significant risk that technical goals will not be achieved. Little possibility of technical success of project.</p>		<p>- Technical progress generally meets expectations but there are concerns that are justified and approved recovery plan is in place. Minor overall risk to technical success of project.</p>		<p>- Technical progress meets project expectations or is acceptable with only minor concerns. Project expected to be successful.</p>		<p>- Technical progress meets project expectations and there are no concerns. Project expected to be successful.</p>	
<b>Justification:</b>									
2. Quality of Work	0.15								
<p><b>Basis for Scoring:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Is work of a quality consistent with technical requirements and industry norms?</li> <li>- Are deliverables complete, accurate, and in compliance with requirements?</li> </ul>		<p>- Work is not complete or frequently incomplete, inaccurate, and/or either minimally compliant or non-compliant with industry norms and technical requirements.</p> <p>- Deliverables are of poor quality (i.e., not complete, accurate, and in compliance with requirements).</p> <p>- Little or no improvement from previous period.</p>		<p>- Work is complete, generally accurate, and in compliance with minimum industry norms and technical requirements but some improvements may be desired.</p> <p>- Some problems with quality of deliverables (i.e., completeness, accuracy, compliance to requirements).</p> <p>- Consideration may be given to improvement (or lack thereof) from previous periods.</p>		<p>- Work is of a high caliber of thoroughness and/or accuracy. Meets or exceeds industry norms and technical requirements.</p> <p>- Deliverables are generally complete, accurate, and in compliance with requirements.</p>		<p>- Work is of the highest caliber for both thoroughness and accuracy. Exceeds industry norms and technical requirements. Little or no possibility for improvement.</p> <p>- All deliverables are complete, accurate, and in compliance with requirements. Little or no possibility of improvement.</p>	
<b>Justification:</b>									
<b>B. PROJECT MANAGEMENT</b>									
1. Adherence to Schedule	0.30 0.10								
<p><b>Basis for Scoring:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Is technical progress on schedule?</li> <li>- Are deliverables on schedule?</li> </ul>		<p>- Project is significantly behind schedule. Plan to recover schedule slippage is nonexistent or not acceptable.</p> <p>- Deliverables rarely on schedule.</p> <p>- Little or no improvement from previous period.</p>		<p>- Technical progress of project generally on schedule. Schedule slippages, if any, have adequate justification.</p> <p>- Deliverables generally on schedule, and delays, if any, have not significantly impacted project performance.</p> <p>- Consideration may be given to improvement (or lack thereof) from previous periods.</p>		<p>- Technical progress of project is on or ahead of schedule for most tasks.</p> <p>- Delays, if any, are minor, have adequate justification, and do not impact project performance.</p> <p>- Deliverables are on schedule for most tasks.</p> <p>- Consideration may be given to improvement from previous periods.</p>		<p>- Technical progress of project is on or ahead of schedule for all tasks.</p> <p>- Deliverables are on or ahead of schedule for most tasks.</p> <p>- Little or no possibility of improvement.</p>	
<b>Justification:</b>									

Navy ManTech Program  
Award Fee Evaluation Criteria

Award Fee Qualitative Ratings				
Unacceptable	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good	Excellent
570	71-75	76-80	81-90	91 - 100
<p><b>2. Adherence to Spend Plan</b> Basis for Scoring: - Is Contractor demonstrating cost control? - Are the monthly and cumulative expenditures on schedule and consistent with technical progress?</p>	<p>- Contractor attempting to control costs, but monthly and/or cumulative expenditures vary by 10% to 15% from the approved plan (unless a greater deviation is considered to be in the best interest of the Government). A higher score in this range is reasonable if a revised spend plan has been received and is acceptable.</p> <p>- Consideration may be given to improvement (or lack thereof) from previous periods and/or the reasonableness of any justification provided.</p>	<p>- Contractor controls costs and spend plan remains generally accurate and consistent with technical progress on both a monthly and a cumulative basis, with cumulative expenditures varying by no more than 10% from the approved plan (unless a greater deviation is considered to be in the best interest of the Government).</p> <p>- Consideration may be given to improvements from previous periods.</p>	<p>- Contractor controls costs and spend plan remains accurate and generally consistent with technical progress on both a monthly and a cumulative basis, with cumulative expenditures varying by no more than 5% from the approved plan (unless a greater deviation is considered to be in the best interest of the Government).</p> <p>- Little or no possibility for improvement.</p>	<p>Score: <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 0.10 <input type="checkbox"/> 0</p>
<p><b>3. Timeliness and Appropriateness of Invoices</b> Basis for Scoring: - Are invoices submitted on time? - Are invoices complete, accurate, and consistent with technical progress?</p>	<p>- Invoices frequently or consistently not on time. - Invoices are frequently or consistently incomplete, and/or do not accurately reflect actual project performance. - Little or no improvement from previous periods.</p>	<p>- Most invoices provided on time. - Invoices are usually complete, contain very few or no errors, and accurately reflect work performed in invoicing period.</p>	<p>- Invoices are usually complete, contain very few or no errors, and accurately reflect work performed in invoicing period.</p>	<p>Score: <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 0.10 <input type="checkbox"/> 0</p>
<p><b>C. TECHNOLOGY TRANSITION</b> 1. Transition / Implementation Coordination and Planning Basis for Scoring: - Is Technology Transition Plan (TTP) complete and current? - Is the Contractor actively coordinating with the primary industry partner and any required approval authorities (i.e., technical warrant holders, system program office, etc.) to ensure transition / implementation? Note: The evaluator should consider the type of project and percentage completion of its planned period of performance for example, the TTP is most important in the early phases of a project whereas active coordination with industry and the approval authorities for transition and implementation is most important during the later phases. - Partial implementation during the project as a strong positive and a basis for a High rating - The project's Risk Assessment Rating.</p>	<p>- TTP not complete and/or not current. - Transition activities not coordinated. Key industry and approval authority personnel not actively involved. - Project did not or will not transition. If fully recent start, project will not transition / implement without significant improvement in Contractor coordination with industry and approval authorities.</p>	<p>- TTP generally complete and current. Any deficiencies are minor. Consideration should be given to reasonable attempts to obtain appropriate signatures. - Transition activities with industry and approval authorities well-coordinated. - Project proceeding towards transition / implementation.</p>	<p>- TTP complete and current. Consideration should be given to reasonable attempts to obtain appropriate signatures. - Transition activities with industry and approval authorities well-coordinated. - Project proceeding towards transition / implementation.</p>	<p>Score: <input type="checkbox"/> 0 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 0.25 <input type="checkbox"/> 0</p>

Navy ManTech Program  
Award Fee Evaluation Criteria

Award Fee Qualitative Ratings			
Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Good	Very Good
570	71/76	78-80	81-90
Excellent			91-100
<p><b>2. Secondary Transitions / Implementations &amp; Technology Transfer</b></p> <p><b>Basis for Scoring:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Is transition of the technology to other entities and organizations being actively pursued?</li> <li>- Is the technology being disseminated through workshops, meetings, presentations, or other related activities?</li> <li>- If appropriate, will the technology be commercialized and/or will the workforce be improved?</li> </ul>	<p>- Contractor shows some interest in pursuing additional transitions. Working to identify and define additional transition paths (though perhaps transitions not possible)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Some effort to disseminate technology through workshops, meetings, presentations, or other related activities.</li> <li>- If appropriate, commercialization and/or workforce improvement may be unlikely.</li> </ul>	<p>- Contractor shows interest in pursuing additional transitions. Secondary transitions likely.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Technology being disseminated through workshops, meetings, presentations, and/or other related activities.</li> <li>- If appropriate, likelihood of commercialization and/or workforce improvement.</li> </ul>	<p>- Contractor actively pursuing additional transitions. Strong likelihood of additional transitions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Technology actively being disseminated through workshops, meetings, presentations, and/or other related activities.</li> <li>- If appropriate, strong likelihood of commercialization and/or workforce improvement.</li> </ul>
0.05	71/76	78-80	81-90
Score: X 0.05			
<b>D. CUSTOMER SATISFACTION</b>			
<p><b>1. Customer Satisfaction</b></p> <p><b>Basis for Scoring:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Are customer expectations being met?</li> <li>- Are all customer requests responded to promptly, accurately, and completely?</li> </ul>	<p>- Most customer expectations met and customer generally satisfied.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Customer requests generally responded to promptly, accurately, and completely.</li> <li>- Deficiencies are minor but may require improvement.</li> </ul>	<p>- Customer expectations met.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Customer requests almost always responded to promptly, accurately, and completely.</li> </ul>	<p>- Customer expectations exceeded. Customer very satisfied.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All customer requests responded to promptly, accurately, and completely.</li> </ul>
0.08			
Score: X 0.08			
<b>E. COST SHARE / LEVERAGING</b>			
<p><b>1. Cost Share / Leveraging</b></p> <p><b>Basis for Scoring:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Has the Contractor obtained some cost share?</li> <li>- Has the Contractor pursued and/or taken advantage of leveraging opportunity(ies)?</li> </ul>	<p>- Cost share and/or leveraging opportunities not pursued.</p>	<p>- Cost share and/or leveraging opportunities pursued, as appropriate.</p>	<p>- Secured cost share or demonstrated significant actions in an attempt to obtain cost share and/or identified and pursued significant leveraging opportunities as appropriate.</p>
0.02			
Score: X 0.02			
<b>Total Award Fee Score</b>			
0			
<b>Total Award Fee Percentage (From Award Fee Conversion Chart)</b>			
0%			
<b>Award Fee Pool</b>			
\$0			
<b>Award Fee</b>			
\$0.00			
<b>Approval:</b>			
<b>Date:</b>			