

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT1. Contract ID Code
Fixed-Price Economic Price Adjustment

Page 1 Of 6

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 2. Amendment/Modification No. 0005 | 3. Effective Date 2004AUG26 | 4. Requisition/Purchase Req No. SEE SCHEDULE | 5. Project No. (If applicable) |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|

| | |
|---|---|
| 6. Issued By Code W52P1J HQ AFSC AMSFS-CCA-R MITZI WAGNER (309)782-4657 ROCK ISLAND, IL 61299-6000 BLDG 350 & 390 EMAIL: WAGNERM@AFSC.ARMY.MIL | 7. Administered By (If other than Item 6) Code |
|---|---|

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|
| 8. Name And Address Of Contractor (No., Street, City, County, State and Zip Code) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | 9A. Amendment Of Solicitation No. W52P1J-04-R-0180 |
| | | 9B. Dated (See Item 11) 2004JUL16 |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | 10A. Modification Of Contract/Order No. |
| | | 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 date specified in the solicitation or as amended by one of the following methods:
 (a) By completing items 8 and 15, and returning 2 signed copies of the amendments; (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 ONLY APPLIES TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS
It Modifies The Contract/Order No. As Described In Item 14.

| | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | A. This Change Order is Issued Pursuant To: The Contract/Order No. In Item 10A. | The Changes Set Forth In Item 14 Are Made In |
| <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. This Supplemental Agreement Is Entered Into Pursuant To Authority Of: | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | D. Other (Specify type of modification and authority) | |

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor is not, 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.)

SEE SECOND PAGE FOR DESCRIPTION

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 (Signature of person authorized to sign) | 15C. Date Signed | 16B. United States Of America By _____ /SIGNED/ (Signature of Contracting Officer) | 16C. Date Signed |

NSN 7540-01-152-8070
PREVIOUS EDITIONS UNUSABLE

30-105-02

STANDARD FORM 30 (REV. 10-83)
Prescribed by GSA FAR (48 CFR) 53.243

| | | |
|---------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| CONTINUATION SHEET | Reference No. of Document Being Continued PIIN/SIIN W52P1J-04-R-0180 MOD/AMD 0005 | Page 2 of 6 |
|---------------------------|---|---------------------------|

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

SECTION A - SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

1. The purpose of this amendment is to make the following clarification.

This is applicable to Clin 0003 (M14B4 Spiral Wrap Cartridge Case):

Reference specification MIL-C-48423A, paragraph 6.1 - The PCO will approve a "process control lot" test prior to submission of FAT. If a contractor chooses to take that option, the contractor must state this in their proposal. Contractor must also specify the number of rounds to be pre-tested in accordance with the specification. Additional government testing costs will then be calculated into the evaluation process.

2. Revised Section M (revision of price evaluation, para 3(c)) is enclosed.

3. The closing date remains unchanged.

4. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

*** END OF NARRATIVE A 006 ***

| | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|
| CONTINUATION SHEET | Reference No. of Document Being Continued | Page 3 of 6 |
| | PIIN/SIIN W52P1J-04-R-0180 | MOD/AMD 0005 |

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

For Local Clauses See: <http://www.afsc.army.mil/ac/aais/ioc/clauses/index.htm>

| <u>Status</u> | <u>Regulatory Cite</u> | <u>Title</u> | <u>Date</u> |
|---------------|------------------------|---|-------------|
| M-1 CHANGED | 15.204-5(C) | SECTION M, EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD | OCT/1997 |

1. Award will be based upon the following evaluation factors:

- a. Capability/Facilities Plan (Go/No Go)
- b. Past Performance (to include On-Time Delivery and Quality)
- c. Price
- d. Small Business Utilization

Overall Weighting:

Price and Past Performance are equal, and are significantly more important than Small Business Utilization. Capability/Facilities are not weighted as it is rated either acceptable (Go) or unacceptable (No Go). Any contractor receiving a No Go/Unacceptable rating will not be considered for award.

All evaluation factors (excluding Capabilities/Facilities, which is a Go/No Go) other than price are, when combined, slightly more important than price.

2. EVALUATION PLAN:

a. Each offeror will first be evaluated as Acceptable (Go) or Unacceptable (No Go) against the specified evaluation criteria for Capability/Facilities Plan. Only offers with an acceptable (Go) Capability/Facilities Plan will be further evaluated against the specified evaluation criteria for price, recent, relevant past performance (on-time delivery and quality) and Small Business Utilization. The evaluator will make a qualitative assessment by assigning an adjectival rating of Excellent, Good, Fair, Unsatisfactory, or Neutral for past performance and Excellent, Good, Adequate or Marginal, for small business utilization. Price will not be assigned an adjectival rating. Any areas of the offer requiring clarification will be referred to the Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO) for resolution.

b. Proposals pertaining to Capability/Facilities, Price and Small Business Utilization shall be evaluated only on their content. Assumptions, preconceived ideas, and personal knowledge or opinions for these factors, not supported by material provided in the proposal, will not be considered or used as a basis for evaluation. However, the Government's evaluation of Past Performance may include data/information from sources other than those provided with the offeror's proposal. Upon receipt of offers, pertinent sections of each proposal shall be forwarded, and the appropriate evaluator will prepare a written summary of the evaluation of each factor/sub-factor. The summary will cite the offeror's strengths, weaknesses, significant weaknesses and deficiencies. These are defined as follows:

Deficiency - A material failure of a proposal to meet the Government's requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level without immediate corrective action.

Strength - A specific aspect or attribute of an offeror's proposal, which exceeds the minimum requirements of the RFP and/or enhances the probability of program success. A "significant strength" in the proposal appreciably enhances the probability of success.

Weakness - A flaw in the proposal that increase the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Significant Weakness - A flaw in the proposal that appreciably increases the risk to the level that the proposal may be determined technically unacceptable.

c. With regard to the initiation of discussions with offerors, receipt of price competitive proposals is anticipated. Accordingly, conduct of formal discussion is not anticipated. Discussions with offerors relative to their offered price and/or their "best value" evaluations will not be mandatory.

3. EVALUATION FACTORS/PROCESS:

- a. Capability/Facility (Essential Processes and Procedures) (Go/No Go): Offerors will be evaluated on the adequacy of existing

CONTINUATION SHEET**Reference No. of Document Being Continued****Page 4 of 6**

PIIN/SIIN W52P1J-04-R-0180

MOD/AMD 0005

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

equipment, facilities, and capabilities. The offeror must demonstrate that it has or will have in place the equipment, facilities and capabilities necessary to manufacture according to the Technical Data Requirements. If any shortfalls in equipment, facilities and/or capabilities exist, the remedy will be evaluated. Evaluation will be made of processes and capacity of the following:

M14 Brass -

- 1) Multiple press and anneal operations
- 2) Annealing furnace
- 3) Machining and tapering equipment
- 4) Mouth anneal equipment
- 5) Inspection equipment
- 6) Critical skills such as engineers, press operators, heat treat operators, CNC machinists

M14B1 Steel -

- 1) Spheroidizing furnace capability
- 2) 7 press operations
- 3) Annealing furnace
- 4) Salt pot heat treat w/quench
- 5) Zinc plater
- 6) Machining and tapering equipment
- 7) Ultrasonic (UT) inspection equipment
- 8) Critical skills such as engineers, press operators, heat treat operators, CNC machinists

M14B4 Spiral Wrap -

- 1) Wrapping of the helix
- 2) Crimping of the base
- 3) Placement of the locking ring

b. Recent/Relevant Past Performance to include On-Time Delivery and Quality:

1) On-Time Delivery: Information provided by the offeror on its recent, relevant contracts will be evaluated. The offeror will be rated based on its record of on-time delivery. The delivery schedule will be compared to the actual deliveries to determine whether deliveries were made on time. If necessary, the offeror will be given an opportunity to present its reasons why it did not meet its original delivery schedule. Other sources, available to the Government other than the contractor's proposal, will be used to gather and evaluate the predetermined factors. Sources such as, but not limited to, contracting and pre-award offices at the other major supporting commands will be used to gather information.

2) Quality: The offeror's recent, relevant record in the area of quality assurance will be evaluated. Evidence of quality awards and/or quality certification presented to the offeror by the US Army can be submitted for consideration. In the event that any indications of problems are discovered during evaluation, the offeror's corrective action(s) and process to improve product quality will be evaluated. If such an evaluation is required, the offeror will be required to submit data explaining corrective actions it has taken to improve its process and/or to solve quality problems. The offeror will be required to disclose information about Request for Waivers (RFWs), Request for Deviations (RFDs), QDRs, First Article Test failures, and/or other product quality or quality program related problems or industrial/commercial equivalent. The submission must be clear and concise when describing the deficiency, stating the corrective action and when it was implemented.

3) Sources available to the Government, other than the contractor's proposal, will be used to gather and evaluate the predetermined factors. Sources such as, but not limited to, contracting and pre-award offices at other major supporting commands may be used to gather information. In addition, the Government has the right to consider information regarding contractor performance up to the date of award.

4) Consistent with FAR 15.305(a)(2)(iv), during evaluation of past performance, an offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for who past performance information is not available will not be evaluated or rated either favorable or unfavorably. Such an evaluation or rating will not adversely impact an offeror's eligibility for award based on past performance.

c. Price: Price will be an evaluation factor, however, it will not be adjectivally scored. Price will be evaluated in accordance with all price related factors specified in the RFP. The Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) requires that contracts only be awarded at prices or costs that are fair and reasonable. If the price/cost is out of realistic range then best value will not be served. In addition, costs for GFE in possession of a contractor will be evaluated based on factors calculated as a result of the provision entitled Evaluation Procedures for use of Government Owned Production and Research Property located in Section M. If applicable, a transportation evaluation factor will be added to each respective bid if F.O.B. Origin prices are requested. Any other Government test cost incurred due to voluntary "process control lot" testing will be calculated into the evaluation process. Prices will be requested for the base year and two option years. The contractor offering the lowest price for the total of all years, including the base year and option years, with addition of the additives previously mentioned in this paragraph will be considered as the low offeror as far as price is concerned.

CONTINUATION SHEET**Reference No. of Document Being Continued**

Page 5 of 6

PIIN/SIIN W52P1J-04-R-0180

MOD/AMD 0005

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

d. Small Business Utilization:

1) The Government will evaluate all offerors (small, large and foreign) proposed utilization of:

- Small Business (SB)
- Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB)
- Women-Owned Small Business (WOSB)
- Veteran-Owned Small Business (VOSB)
- Service Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB)
- Historically Underutilized Business Zone Small Business (HUBZone) hereinafter all to be referred to as SB; and
- Historically Black Colleges and Universities/Minority Institutions (HBCU/MI)

2) For Small Businesses, as identified by the size standard for the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) applicable to this solicitation, the offeror's own participation as a SB or HBCU/MI is to be identified and will be considered in evaluating small business utilization.

3) The Government will evaluate the extent to which an offeror identifies and commits to utilizing SB and HBCU/MI in the performance of the proposed contract as well as how well it has performed in this regard in the past. Such utilization may be as the contractor, subcontractor, or as a member of a joint venture or teaming arrangement. The elements to be evaluated are:

a) Complexity of specific products or services that will be provided by those SB's and HBCU/MI's

b) The extent of Small Business participation in terms of value of the total contract

c) Realism - The Government will evaluate the offeror's actual past performance in achieving the proposed small business utilization on contracts performed within three years prior to the initial solicitation closing date for same or similar items to assess the realism of proposed small business utilization. This evaluation will include an assessment of:

i) The offeror's performance as prescribed by FAR clause 52.219-8, "Utilization of Small Business Concerns". SB's and HBCU/MI's are reminded to include their own performance on their contracts.

ii) For large business offerors, their performance as prescribed by FAR 52.219-9, "Small Business Subcontracting Plan". This includes evaluation of the offeror's actual performance in meeting SB and HBCU/MI subcontracting goals. Large businesses that have not held a contract in the past three years that included FAR 52.219-9, will be evaluated against FAR 52.219-8 only.

iii) Offerors without a record of past performance will not be considered favorably or unfavorably in developing a realism assessment. The fact that the offeror has no past performance will be noted for the Source Selection Authority.

4. RATING EVALUATION CRITERIA:

a. Capability/Facilities will be rated as Unacceptable or Acceptable based upon the following performance risks:

Unacceptable (No Go): Substantial doubt exists that the offeror has the essential processes and procedures to ensure that the M14/M14B1/M14B4 Cartridge Case will be manufactured in accordance with applicable technical data. Shortfalls in equipment or facilities are not documented and the plan to remedy is not acceptable (timely, complete, reasonable). It is unlikely that the offeror could meet contract quantities. An unsuccessful rating will be based on technical weaknesses and significant weaknesses that demonstrate an unsuccessful performance.

Acceptable (Go): Little doubt exists that the offeror has the essential processes and procedures in place to ensure that the M14/M14B1/M14B4 Cartridge Case will be manufactured in accordance with applicable technical data. The offeror can demonstrate, to a high degree of confidence, subcontractor on time performance and process control. Shortfalls of equipment are documented and the plan to remedy is acceptable (timely, complete, reasonable). Timely is defined as equipment that will be installed and operational in order to meet the required delivery schedule. An acceptable rating will be based on technical strengths demonstrated by the proposal. Any deficiencies shown must be minor in nature and will not affect the performance of the item.

b. Past Performance, to include on-time delivery, quality and safety, will be rated as Excellent/Low Performance Risk, Good/Moderately Low Performance Risk, Fair/Moderate Performance Risk, Unsatisfactory/High Performance Risk, or Neutral, based upon performance risk. Small Business Utilization will be rated as Excellent, Good, Adequate or Marginal based on performance risk.

Performance risks listed below will be used to determine the offeror's success in performing the solicitation's requirements. Offerors are cautioned that, in conducting the past performance risk assessment, the Government may use information provided by the offeror in its proposal and information obtained from other sources. Since the Government may not interview all of the sources provided by the

| | | |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|
| CONTINUATION SHEET | Reference No. of Document Being Continued | Page 6 of 6 |
| | PIIN/SIIN W52P1J-04-R-0180 | MOD/AMD 0005 |

Name of Offeror or Contractor:

offeror's, it is incumbent upon the offeror to explain the relevance of the data provided.

Past Performance (timeliness of deliveries and quality):

Excellent: Essentially no doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Offeror has recent, relevant past performance and the deliveries are consistently on-time and any history of quality related problems such as QDRs, RFWs, RFDs, First Article Test failures and/or Lot Acceptance Test failures will not effect performance risk.

Good: Little doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. Offeror has recent, relevant past performance and its deliveries are usually on-time and/or has a history of experiencing few quality related problems such as QDRs, RFWs, RFDs, First Article Test failures, and/or Lot Acceptance Test failures which are the fault of the offeror.

Fair: Some doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform in accordance with the quality provisions and/or perform the required effort. Offeror has recent, relevant past performance, however, deliveries frequently are not on-time and/or a history of experiencing some quality related problems such as QDRs, RFWs, RFDs, First Article Test failures and/or Lot Acceptance Test failures which are the fault of the offeror.

Unsatisfactory: There is substantial doubt whether the offeror would comply with the quality requirements and/or perform in accordance with the delivery schedule. Offeror has recent, relevant past performance with the history of experiencing many quality related problems such as QDRs, RFWs, RFDs, First Article Test failures and/or Lot Acceptance Test failures which are the fault of the offeror and/or deliveries are rarely on time.

Neutral: There is no meaningful record of past performance. This rating has neither positive nor negative evaluative significance, and neither rewards nor penalizes firms without relevant performance history.

c. Small Business Utilization:

A rating will be assigned to each offeror's (small, large and foreign) proposal. This rating considers the proposed small business utilization and the likelihood of attaining that participation based on the small business utilization past performance. Offeror's that have no contractual history within three years prior to the initial solicitation closing date, for the same or similar items that require (1) compliance with FAR 52.219-8 or FAR 52.219-9, and (2) using SBs and/or HBCU/MIs will be treated neither favorably nor unfavorably.

NOTE: If an offeror has no Small Business Utilization Past Performance, the proposal will be evaluated on only the elements of complexity of specific products or services that will be provided by those SBs will be given an adjectival rating without regard to past performance, treating this lack of past performance neither favorably nor unfavorably. Such an offeror's rating will, however, note that it had no Small Business Utilization Past Performance. This will allow the Source Selection Authority to make any necessary trade-offs.

(End of Provision)

(MF6012)