

|   |                                    |   |                                |
|---|------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 2. Amendment/Modification No.<br><br>0001 | 3. Effective Date<br><br>2004MAY17 | 4. Requisition/Purchase Req No.<br><br>SEE SCHEDULE | 5. Project No. (If applicable) |
|---|------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|

|   |      |        |   |      |  |
|---|------|--------|---|------|--|
| 6. Issued By<br><br>TACOM-ROCK ISLAND<br>AMSTA-LC-CSC-C<br>ANN HAMERLINCK (309)782-3946<br>ROCK ISLAND IL 61299-7630<br><br>EMAIL: HAMERLINCKA@RIA.ARMY.MIL | Code | W52H09 | 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.<br><br>W52H09-04-R-0160 |  | 9B. Dated (See Item 11)<br><br>2004MAY05 |  |  |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/>            | 10A. Modification Of Contract/Order No.                   |  | 10B. Dated (See Item 13)                 |  |  |

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

**CONTINUATION SHEET****Reference No. of Document Being Continued****Page 2 of 8**

PIIN/SIIN W52H09-04-R-0160

MOD/AMD 0001

**Name of Offeror or Contractor:**

## SECTION A - SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

THE PURPOSE OF THIS AMENDMENT IS TO CORRECT AN ADMISTRATIVE ERROR. THE DD FORM 254 AS ATTACHMENT 002 IN THE SOLICITATION WAS INADVERTENTLY LEFT OFF AND REPLACED WITH THE DD FORM 1423'S. THE ATTACHMENT 002 SHOULD READ AS ATTACHMENT 009 TITLED DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE CONTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION SPECIFICATION (DD FORM 254).

THE FIRST FIVE LINES ON PAGE 67 OF 71 OF THE SOLICITATION ARE HEREBY DELETED AS SHOWN ON PAGES 4 THRU 8 OF THIS AMENDMENT.

THIS SOLICITATION WILL NOT BE EXTENDED.

ALL OTHER TERMS AND CONDITIONS REMAIN UNCHANGED.

\*\*\* END OF NARRATIVE A 003 \*\*\*

**CONTINUATION SHEET**

**Reference No. of Document Being Continued**

**Page 3 of 8**

**PIIN/SIIN** W52H09-04-R-0160

**MOD/AMD** 0001

**Name of Offeror or Contractor:**

SECTION J - LIST OF ATTACHMENTS

| <u>List of</u><br><u>Addenda</u> | <u>Title</u>  | <u>Date</u> | <u>Number</u><br><u>of Pages</u> | <u>Transmitted By</u> |
|----------------------------------|---|-------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Attachment 009                   | DEPART OF DEFENSE CONTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>SPECIFICATION (DD FORM 254) | 18-FEB-2004 | 2PG                              |                       |

|                           |  |                    |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|
| <b>CONTINUATION SHEET</b> | <b>Reference No. of Document Being Continued</b> | <b>Page 4 of 8</b> |
|                           | PIIN/SIIN W52H09-04-R-0160                       | MOD/AMD 0001       |

**Name of Offeror or Contractor:**

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

SECTION M  
EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD OF M25  
STABILIZED BINOCULAR CONTRACT

M.1 BASIS FOR AWARD: Award will be based on the Governments assessment of which proposal(s) offer the best value based on the evaluation criteria stated below. However, any proposal which is unrealistic in terms of technical or schedule commitments or unrealistically high or low in cost, may be deemed reflective of an inherent lack of technical competence or indicative of a failure to comprehend the complexity and risks of the governments requirements and may be grounds for rejection of the proposal. Similarly, any significant inconsistency between proposed performance and cost, if unexplained, may be grounds for rejection of the proposal. Proposals that fail to meet the established criteria for the bid samples and technical proposals Go / No Go will not be evaluated any further and will not be considered for award. Only those proposals that are determined a Go in the bid samples and technical Proposal areas will be further evaluated in the Past Performance, Small Business Participation, and Price factors. The Government reserves the right to award the contract to other than the lowest priced offer. The offeror shall not hold the Government liable for damage to bid samples that occurs as part of the evaluation.

M.2 EVALUATION SEQUENCE RELATIVE ORDER OF IMPORTANCE: The Evaluation Sequence contains eight Go / No Go criteria. The bid samples, (or recent Government source inspected production M25s, see L.2), must meet all eight of the criteria in order for the proposal to be further considered. If the bid sample fails any of the Go / No Go criteria the proposal will be considered unacceptable and no further evaluation will be performed. After passing the Go / No Go criteria, the price factors and non-price factors of each proposal will be evaluated however, the closer the offerors evaluations are in the non-price factors, the more significant the factor of price becomes in the decision. Past Performance is more important than Small Business Participation. Past Performance and Small Business Participation combined are more important than Price. Notwithstanding the fact that the price factor is not the most important consideration it may be controlling when: 1. two or more proposals are otherwise considered equal; 2. an otherwise superior proposal is unaffordable; 3. the advantages of a higher rated, higher price proposal are not considered to be worth the cost premium.

M.2.1 BID SAMPLE EVALUATION. If bid samples are required (see L.2) they will be evaluated as follows, otherwise the evaluation will continue with the Technical Evaluation, M.2.2. The bid samples will be evaluated for compliance with the following requirements. All three bid samples must meet all of the elements in order for the proposal to be further considered. If the bid sample fails any of these Go / No Go elements the proposal will be considered unacceptable and no further evaluation will be performed.

M.2.1.1 Binocular. The bid sample optic must consist of two parallel telescopes, each with its own objective and eyepiece, Paragraph 3.1 of the Purchase Description (AR-PD-121).

M.2.1.2 Internally Image Stabilized. The bid sample binocular must have an internal means of image stabilization, Paragraph 3.1 of the Purchase Description.

M.2.1.3 Weight. The bid sample stabilized binoculars weight must be equal to or less than 2.5 Kg (5.5 lbs), as defined by the Purchase Description (3.2.1.1).

M.2.1.4 Size. The bid sample stabilized binoculars size must be equal to or less than 12 inches long, 8 inches wide, and 4 inches high as defined by the Purchase Description (3.2.1.2).

M.2.1.5 Bid Sample Resolution. The bid sample stabilized binoculars resolution must be 4.3 arc seconds (per line pair) or better in the caged mode and 6.0 arc seconds (per line pair) or better in the stabilized mode, paragraph 3.7.10 of the Purchase Description (AR-PD-121).

M.2.1.6 Night Vision Capability. The bid sample stabilized binocular must be provided with 2 night vision eyepieces that meet the requirements of sec. 3.3.6 of the Purchase Description.

M.2.1.7 Drop. The bid sample stabilized binocular will be subjected to and must survive drop testing per the requirements in paragraph 3.8.3 of the Purchase Description (AR-PD-121).

M.2.1.8 Watertightness. The bid sample stabilized binocular will be subjected to and must survive immersion testing per the requirements in paragraph 3.8.7 of the Purchase Description (AR-PD-121).

M.2.2 TECHNICAL EVALUATION. The Technical Proposal Evaluation will only be conducted on offerors meeting all of the above Bid Sample Evaluation requirements.

This area will be evaluated on the ability of the offeror to meet the specific requirements of the SOW and the Purchase Description as detailed below. This area will be evaluated from the offeror's written description of capabilities (L.3), and at the Governments discretion, from results of bid sample (or existing Government source inspected production) examination and/or other literature provided. Where the current configuration does not meet the requirement, a thorough explanation of proposed modifications which are needed to enable it to meet the requirements in time for delivery of test and production hardware must be provided. Apparent

|                           |  |                    |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|
| <b>CONTINUATION SHEET</b> | <b>Reference No. of Document Being Continued</b> | <b>Page 5 of 8</b> |
|                           | PIIN/SIIN W52H09-04-R-0160                       | MOD/AMD 0001       |

**Name of Offeror or Contractor:**

inconsistencies between the claimed current capabilities and the bid sample or other literature will be investigated.

All elements within the Technical Evaluation section will be rated on a Go/No Go basis. An offerors proposal must demonstrate that it will meet all elements and provide a thorough explanation of modifications to be made, work break down structures, and time frames in order to be further considered. If the written proposal fails to demonstrate that it will meet any of the requirements listed below the proposal will be assigned a No Go rating and the offeror will no longer be considered for award.

M.2.2.1 Laser Eye Protection and Optical Characteristics. The offerors description of the technical approach ensures that each of the specific requirements in section 3.7 of the Purchase Description (AR-PD-121) will be met.

M.2.2.2 Stabilization. The offerors description of the technical approach ensures that each of the specific requirements in section 3.6 of the Purchase Description (AR-PD-121) will be met.

M.2.2.3 Environmental. The offerors description of the technical approach ensures that each of the specific requirements in section 3.8 of the Purchase Description (AR-PD-121) will be met.

M.2.2.4 Physical Characteristics. The offerors description of the technical approach ensures that each of the specific requirements in section 3.2 of the Purchase Description (AR-PD-121) will be met.

M.2.2.5 Design and Construction. The offerors description of the technical approach ensures that each of the specific requirements in section 3.3 of the Purchase Description (AR-PD-121) will be met.

M.2.2.6 Components. The offerors description of the technical approach ensures that each of the specific requirements in section 3.4 of the Purchase Description (AR-PD-121) will be met.

M.2.2.7 Power Requirements. The offerors description of the technical approach ensures that each of the specific requirements in section 3.5 of the Purchase Description (AR-PD-121) will be met.

M.2.2.8 Reliability/Supportability. The offerors description of the technical approach ensures that each of the specific requirements in section 3.9 of the Purchase Description (AR-PD-121) will be met. The device is conservative of logistics resources. There is at most a small impact on the existing U.S. Army structure. There is no need for: new Military Occupational Specialties to operate or maintain the M25; new support equipment; nor new facilities. There is small usage of expendable or shelf life items. There is a small training burden; low safety risk; adequate, contractor format manuals and technical drawings; acceptable, commercial packaging for parts and end-items; and parts, supplies and tools standardized with existing U.S. Army assets.

M.2.2.9 Quality Assurance. The offerors description of the technical approach ensures that the requirements in section 4 of the Purchase Description (AR-PD-121) and section C.3.3 of the Statement of Work will be met.

M.2.3 PAST PERFORMANCE. Past performance information is evaluated as a predictor of future contract performance. Using past performance information for each offeror, the Government will assess the probability that the instant requirement will be successfully completed in accordance with contract terms.

In evaluating performance history, the Government may review the offeror's current and prior performance record of complying with all aspects of its contractual agreement: conformance to technical requirements; timeliness of deliveries/performance and quality of performance. In conducting the past performance evaluation, the Government may use information obtained from other sources. The Government may consider the currency, degree of relevance, source and context of the past performance information it evaluates as well as general trends in performance, and demonstrated corrective actions. A significant achievement, problem/problem resolution or lack of relevant data in any element can become an important consideration in the selection process. A negative finding in any element may result in an overall high-risk rating. The Government may also consider past performance information regarding predecessor companies, key personnel, other corporate entities or subcontractors where such information is relevant to this acquisition.

Offerors' past performance will be rated as follows:

Very Low Risk: Based on the offeror's past performance, very little doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Low Risk: Based on the offeror's past performance, little doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Moderate Risk: Based on the offeror's past performance, some doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

High Risk: Based on the offeror's past performance, significant doubt exists that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.

Unknown Risk: The offeror had little or no recent/relevant past performance upon which to base a meaningful performance risk

|                           |  |                    |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|
| <b>CONTINUATION SHEET</b> | <b>Reference No. of Document Being Continued</b> | <b>Page 6 of 8</b> |
|                           | PIIN/SIIN W52H09-04-R-0160                       | MOD/AMD 0001       |

**Name of Offeror or Contractor:**

prediction.

The Government is not required to interview all points of contact identified by offerors. It is the responsibility of the offeror to provide complete past performance information and thorough explanations as required by Section L. The Government is not obliged to make another request for the required information.

M.2.4 PRICE. The Government reserves the right to award based on a better value to the Government rather than lowest price and hence may award to other than the lowest priced offeror.

For evaluation purposes, the Government has weighted the ranges based on the likelihood that if an order is placed, it will be placed in that particular range. The offeror will be evaluated based on the proposal's total evaluation price to the Government and on reasonableness. The price evaluation will consist of the following:

M.2.4.1 An evaluation price for each year will be calculated by multiplying the sum of the offered unit prices (including warranty cost), by their respective weights and maximum quantities for each range and adding them together.

M.2.4.2 The First Article Test (L.5.1); Confirmatory Test and Governments Internal Confirmatory Test Estimate of \$75,000.00 (L.5.2); and Setup (implementation) of Depot Level Maintenance Support (L.5.4) and Spare Parts/Accessories (L.5.5) costs will be added to the combined Production Weighted Total Prices as part of the Total Evaluated Price, if appropriate. Confirmatory Test Costs will most likely not be appropriate for a recent supplier of M25s.

M.2.4.3 Depot Level Maintenance Support and Spare Parts costs and delivery times will be evaluated for reasonableness.

M.2.4.4 A total evaluation price will be determined by adding the adjusted totals of all years; FAT, Confirmatory Test Support, Internal Confirmatory Test Estimate, and Setup (implementation) of Depot Level Maintenance Support and Spare Parts/Accessories, costs (as appropriate).

M.2.4.5 If a FAT and/or Confirmatory test is required, or any non-Production Quantities CLINs are exercised the associated costs may be added to the delivery order price, when issued; and amortized into the unit price.

M.2.4.6 Spare parts prices will be evaluated for reasonableness in comparison with the offered production CLIN unit price(s), and to determine that they are not materially imbalanced.

M.2.4.7 Total maintenance costs as outlined in C.3.2.4 will be evaluated for reasonableness.

M.2.5 SMALL BUSINESS PARTICIPATION.

The Government will evaluate the extent to which offerors identify, and commit to utilizing SBs, VOSBs, SDVOSBs, HUBZone SBs, SDBs, WOSBs, and HBCU/MIs in the performance of the contract; such utilization may be as the prime contractor or subcontractor, or as a member of a joint venture or teaming arrangement. The Government will also evaluate the extent of the offeror's past compliance with FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns, and FAR52.219-9, and Small Business Subcontracting Plan. Evaluation will consider the following:

a. The extent to which the proposal specifically identifies SBs, VOSBs, SDVOSBs, HUBZone SBs, SDBs, WOSBs, and HBCUs/MIs; identifying the specific components to be produced or services to be performed by them and the estimated total dollars of such work for all years.

b. The items/services to be furnished by SBs, VOSBs, SDVOSBs, HUBZone SBs, SDBs, WOSBs, and HBCUs/MIs;

c. The extent of participation of such concerns in terms of the value of the total contract amount; and

d. An assessment of the risk, based upon performance, of the offeror actually achieving the involvement of small business concerns as proposed. Such assessment will include:

- For all offerors, an evaluation of performance over the past three calendar years in complying with the requirements of FAR 52.219-8, Utilization of Small Business Concerns;

- For offerors who are large business as defined by the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Code applicable to this solicitation, an additional evaluation of past performance over the last three calendar years in complying with the requirements of FAR 52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan. Where a large business has not held a contract that included 52.219-9, its prior performance will be evaluated against 52.219-8 only.

e. The extent of substantive evidence indicating the level of past compliance with the requirements of FAR 52.219-8 and FAR 52.219-9.

|                           |  |                    |
|---------------------------|--|--------------------|
| <b>CONTINUATION SHEET</b> | <b>Reference No. of Document Being Continued</b> | <b>Page 7 of 8</b> |
|                           | PIIN/SIIN W52H09-04-R-0160                       | MOD/AMD 0001       |

**Name of Offeror or Contractor:**

Adjectival Ratings

The element of Small Business Participation will be evaluated in accordance with the following. Apply the adjectival rating for the definition that most closely meets the evaluation conclusion.

ADJECTIVAL / DEFINITION AND CRITERIA

Excellent

Proposal includes a substantial portion of the work, in terms of dollar value (more than 20%) to be performed in Small Business (SB), Vetern-Owned Small Business (VOSB), HUBZone Small Business (HUBZone SB), Small Disadvantaged Business(SDB), Women-Owned Small Business (WOSB), and Historically Black Colleges and University/Minority Institution (HBCU/MI) sector by the prime (if so qualified) and/or as subcontractors or team members. Offeror has substantive evidence suggesting prior achievement of subcontracting plans or policy goals. Based on the proposal and past performance history, the offeror's proposed goals and/or actions are substantial and are considered very realistic (very low risk). There is significant substantive evidence indicating past compliance with the requirements of FAR 52.219-8 and FAR 52.219-9.

Good

Proposal includes a significant portion of the work in terms of dollar value (more than 15%) to be performed in the Small Business (SB), Vetern-Owned Small Business (VOSB), Service-Disabled Vetern-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB), HUBZone Small Business (HUBZone SB), Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB), Women-Owned Small Business (WOSB), and Historically Black Colleges and University/Minority Institution (HBCU/MI) sector by the prime (if so qualified) and/or as subcontractors or team members. Offeror has evidence suggesting prior achievement of most subcontracting plan or policy goals. Based on the offeror's proposal and past performance history, the offeror's proposed goals and/or actions are significant and are considered realistic (low risk). There is substantive evidence indicating past compliance with the requirements of FAR 52.219-8 and FAR 52.219-9.

Adequate

Proposal includes a reasonable portion of the work in terms of dollar value (more than 10%) to be performed in the Small Business (SB), Veteran-Owned Small Business (VOSB), Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB), HUBZone Small Business (HUBZone SB), Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB), Women-Owned Small Business (WOSB), and Historically Black Colleges and University/Minority Institution (HBCU/MI) sector by the prime (if so qualified) and/or as subcontractors or team members. Offeror has evidence suggesting prior achievement of some subcontracting plan or policy goals. Based on the offeror's proposal and past performance history, the offeror's proposed goals and/or actions are adequate and could be met if the offeror focuses attention on them (moderate risk). There is reasonable substantive evidence indicating past compliance with the requirements of FAR 52.219-8 and FAR 52.219-9.

Marginal

Proposal includes a minimal portion of the work in terms of dollar value (less than 10%) to be performed in the Small Business (SB), Veteran-Owned Small Business (VOSB), Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business (SDVOSB), HUBZone Small Business (HUBZone SB), Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB), Women-Owned Small Business (WOSB), and Historically Black Colleges and University/Minority Institution (HBCU/MI) sector by the prime (if so qualified) and/or as subcontractors or team members. Based on the offeror's proposal and/or past performance history, there is little likelihood that more than a minimal portion of the work will be performed in this sector. (High Risk) There is minimal substantive evidence indicating past compliance with the requirements of FAR 52.219-8 and FAR 52.219-9.

Poor

Offeror demonstrates little or no commitment to using SBs, VOSBs, SDVOSBs, HUBZone SBs, SDBs, WOSB and HBCU/MIs. There is no evidence that the offeror met his prior goals and/or shows no serious commitment and did not provide adequate justification for not doing so. Based on the proposal and/or past performance history, there is negligible likelihood that anything other than a token portion of the work will be performed in this sector. (Very High Risk) There is little or no substantive evidence indicating past compliance with the requirements of FAR 52.219-8 and 52.219-9.

Neutral

Foreign firm (offeror) has held no past Government contract(s) subject to FAR 52.219-8 and 52.219-9. Foreign firm (offeror) indicates no opportunity for using SBs, SDBs, HUBZone SBs, SDBs, WOSBs and HBCU/MIs as all contract work will be performed completely outside the United States or no meaningful subcontract opportunities exist.

\*Offerors are required to address two areas in their SB Participation response: (1) "Proposed" SB usage in performance of the potential contract, and (2) "Past" usage of SBs in contract performance. The Government will evaluate both areas to develop one overall rating.

---

**CONTINUATION SHEET****Reference No. of Document Being Continued****Page 8 of 8****PIIN/SIIN** W52H09-04-R-0160**MOD/AMD** 0001

---

**Name of Offeror or Contractor:**

---

\*\*\* END OF NARRATIVE M 001 \*\*\*