

Request for Project Proposals



Solicitation Number: MTEC 20-04-BlastModel

“Blast Exposure Model for Career Artillery Personnel Exposed to Repetitive Low-Intensity Blast”

Issued by:
Advanced Technology International (ATI),
MTEC Consortium Manager (CM)
315 Sigma Drive
Summerville, SC 29486
for the
Medical Technology Enterprise Consortium (MTEC)

Request Issue Date: January 29, 2020

***Proposal Due Date: February 28, 2020
Noon Eastern Time***

White Papers Are NOT Required

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-20-04-BlastModel
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

Table of Contents

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| 1 | Executive Summary..... | 3 |
| 1.1 | The Medical Technology Enterprise Consortium..... | 3 |
| 1.2 | Purpose..... | 3 |
| 2 | Administrative Overview | 4 |
| 2.1 | Request for Proposals | 4 |
| 2.2 | Proposers Conference | 4 |
| 2.3 | Funding Availability, Period of Performance, and Type of Funding Instrument Issued .. | 4 |
| 2.4 | MTEC Member Teaming..... | 5 |
| 2.5 | Proprietary Information | 6 |
| 2.6 | Offeror Eligibility | 6 |
| 2.7 | Inclusion of Nontraditional Defense Contractors, Nonprofit Research Institutions, or Small Businesses | 6 |
| 2.8 | Nontraditional Defense Contractor Definition | 7 |
| 2.9 | Cost Sharing Definition..... | 7 |
| 2.10 | MTEC Assessment Fee..... | 8 |
| 2.11 | Intellectual Property | 9 |
| 2.12 | Data Rights | 9 |
| 2.13 | Expected Award Date..... | 10 |
| 2.14 | Anticipated Proposal Selection Notification | 10 |
| 3 | Proposal | 10 |
| 3.1 | Proposal..... | 10 |
| 3.2 | Proposal Submission | 10 |
| 3.3 | Submission Format..... | 11 |
| 4 | Proposal Preparation Instructions | 11 |
| 4.1 | General Instructions..... | 11 |
| 4.2 | Technical Requirements..... | 12 |
| 4.3 | Preparation of the Proposal | 13 |
| 4.4 | Cost Proposal..... | 14 |
| 4.5 | Proposal Preparation Costs..... | 15 |
| 4.6 | Restrictions on Human Subjects, Cadavers, and Laboratory Animal Use..... | 15 |
| 4.7 | Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) | 15 |
| 5 | Selection..... | 15 |
| 5.1 | Proposal Evaluation Process | 17 |
| 5.2 | Evaluation Factors | 17 |
| 5.3 | Evaluation Factor 1. Technical Approach and Feasibility..... | 18 |
| 5.4 | Evaluation Factor 2. Cost/Price | 18 |
| 5.5 | Best Value..... | 20 |
| 5.6 | Definition of General Terms Used in Evaluations: | 20 |
| 6 | Points-of-Contact | 20 |
| 7 | Acronyms/Abbreviations | 21 |

1 Executive Summary

1.1 The Medical Technology Enterprise Consortium

The Medical Technology Enterprise Consortium (MTEC) is an enterprise partnership in collaboration with industry and academia to facilitate research and development activities, in cooperation with the U.S. Army Medical Research and Development Command (USAMRDC) and other Government agencies in the biomedical sciences (including but not limited to drugs, biologics, vaccines, medical software and medical devices) to protect, treat and optimize the health and performance of U.S. military personnel. MTEC is a nonprofit corporation with the following principal objectives:

- (a) biomedical research and prototyping;
- (b) exploration of private sector technology opportunities;
- (c) technology transfer; and
- (d) deployment of intellectual property (IP) and follow-on production.

MTEC is openly recruiting members to join a broad and diverse biomedical consortium that includes representatives from large businesses, small businesses, contract research organizations, “nontraditional” defense contractors, academic research institutions, and not-for-profit organizations; for more information on the MTEC mission, see the Proposal Preparation Guide (PPG) and MTEC website.

MTEC operates under an Other Transaction Agreement (OTA) for prototypes with USAMRDC. As defined in the OTA Guide dated November 2018, a prototype project addresses a proof of concept, model, reverse engineering to address obsolescence, pilot, novel application of commercial technologies for defense purposes, agile development activity, creation, design, development, demonstration of technical or operational utility, or combinations of the foregoing. A process, including a business process, may be the subject of a prototype project. Although assistance terms are generally not appropriate in OT agreements, ancillary work efforts that are necessary for completion of the prototype project, such as test site training or limited logistics support, may be included in prototype projects. A prototype may be physical, virtual, or conceptual in nature. A prototype project may be fully funded by DoD, jointly funded by multiple federal agencies, cost-shared, funded in whole or part by third parties, or involve a mutual commitment of resources other than an exchange of funds.

1.2 Purpose

This solicitation, issued by the MTEC Consortium Manager (CM), Advanced Technology International (ATI), represents a Request for Project Proposals (RPP) for MTEC support of the Department of Defense (DoD), Naval Medical Research Center. Military relevance is a critical component of the Proposal submission. The Operational and Undersea Medicine Directorate will provide strategic oversight for the award(s) supported by this RPP.

The primary deliverable of this project will be a model for potential brain and systemic physiological changes that occur after repetitive exposure to low-intensity blast overpressure events in career experienced military artillery personnel.

*Note: Pending successful completion of this effort, the Government may issue a non-competitive follow-on production contract or transaction pursuant to 10 USC 2371b section f.

2 Administrative Overview

2.1 Request for Proposals

Each MTEC research project proposal submitted must contain both a Technical and Cost Proposal Volume as described in Section 3 of this request and shall be submitted in accordance with the mandatory format provided in the MTEC PPG, which is available on the Members-Only MTEC website at www.mtec-sc.org. ***White papers are not required for this RPP.*** The Government reserves the right to award Proposals received from this RPP on a follow-on Other Transaction Agreement for prototype projects or other stand-alone OTAs as necessary to meet mission requirements.

2.2 Proposers Conference

MTEC will host a Proposers Conference that will be conducted via webinar within the first two weeks after the release of the RPP. Further instructions will be forthcoming via email.

2.3 Funding Availability, Period of Performance, and Type of Funding Instrument Issued

The U.S. DoD anticipates the total project funding for the three (3) year effort to be \$2.1 Million Defense Health Program (DHP) Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation (RDT&E) funds. Award funding is expected to be structured incrementally and based upon completion of Milestones and Deliverables.

The Period of Performance (POP) is not to exceed three years.

As of the release date of this RPP, future year Defense Appropriations Bills have not been passed and there is no guarantee that any additional funds will be made available to support this program. The funding estimated for this RPP is approximate and subject to realignment. Funding of proposals received in response to this RPP is contingent upon the availability of federal funds for this program. Award funding will be structured incrementally and based upon completion of milestones.

It is expected that MTEC will make one award to a qualified team to accomplish all tasks. If a single proposal is unable to sufficiently address the entire scope of this RPP's technical requirements (outlined in Section 4.2), several Offerors may be asked to work together in a

collaborative manner. However, if an optimal team is not identified, then MTEC may make multiple, individual awards to Offeror(s) to accomplish subset(s) of the key tasks.

The Government-selected Research Project Awards will be funded under the Other Transaction Agreement (OTA) Number W81XWH-15-9-0001 with MTEC administered by the CM, ATI. The CM will negotiate and execute a Base Agreement with MTEC members. The same provisions will govern this Base Agreement as the OTA for prototype projects between the USG and MTEC. Subsequently, any proposal that is selected for award will be funded through a Research Project Award issued under the Base Agreement. A sample of the MTEC Base Agreement can be found on the MTEC website and Members-Only website at www.mtec-sc.org.

At the time of the submission, if Offerors have not yet executed a Base Agreement, then Offerors must certify on the cover page of their Proposal that, if selected for award, they will abide by the terms and conditions of the latest version of the MTEC Base Agreement. If the Offeror already has executed an MTEC Base Agreement with the MTEC CM, then the Offeror must state on the cover page of its Proposal that, if selected for award, it anticipates the proposed effort will be funded under its executed MTEC Base Agreement. Offerors are advised to check the MTEC website periodically during the proposal preparation period for any changes to the MTEC Base Agreement terms and conditions as well as clarifications found in Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) responses.

2.4 MTEC Member Teaming

While teaming is not required for this effort, Offerors are encouraged to consider teaming during the proposal preparation period (prior to proposal submission) if they cannot address the full scope of technical requirements of the RPP or otherwise believe a team may be beneficial to the Government.

MTEC members are encouraged to use the MTEC Database Collaboration Tool. The purpose of the tool is to help MTEC member organizations identify potential teaming partners by providing a quick and easy way to search the membership for specific technology capabilities, collaboration interest, core business areas/focus, R&D highlights/projects, and technical expertise. The Primary Point of Contact for each member organization is provided access to the collaboration database tool to make edits and populate their organization's profile. There are two sections as part of the profile relevant to teaming:

- "Collaboration Interests" - Select the type of teaming opportunities your organization would be interested in. This information is crucial when organizations need to search the membership for specific capabilities/expertise that other members are willing to offer.
- "Solicitation Collaboration Interests" - Input specific active solicitations that you are interested in teaming on. This information will help organizations interested in a specific funding opportunities identify others that are interested to partner in regards to the same funding opportunity. Contact information for each organization is provided as part of the member profile in the collaboration database tool to foster follow-up conversations between members as needed.

The Collaboration Database Tool can be accessed via the “MTEC Profiles Site” tab on the MTEC members-only website.

2.5 Proprietary Information

The MTEC CM will oversee submission of Proposals submitted in response to this RPP. The MTEC CM shall take the necessary steps to protect all proprietary information and shall not use such proprietary information for purposes other than the evaluation of an Offeror’s Proposal and the subsequent agreement administration if the Proposal is selected for award. In accordance with the PPG, please mark all Confidential or Proprietary Information as such. An Offeror’s submission of a Proposal under this RPP indicates concurrence with the aforementioned CM responsibilities.

Also, as part of MTEC’s mission to incorporate philanthropic donations, MTEC frequently makes contact with private entities (e.g., foundations, investor groups, organizations, individuals) that award grants or otherwise co-fund research, and/or operates in research areas that are aligned with those of MTEC. These private entities may be interested in reviewing certain Proposals within their program areas, allowing opportunities to attract supplemental funding sources. On your Proposal Cover Page, please indicate your willingness to allow MTEC Officers and Directors access to your Proposal for the purposes of engaging in outreach activities with these private organizations. MTEC Officers and Directors granted Proposal access have signed Non-disclosure Agreements (NDAs) and Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) statements. Additionally, these MTEC Officers and Staff represent organizations that currently are not MTEC members, and therefore their parent organizations are not eligible to submit Proposals or receive any research project funding through MTEC. Additionally, all Technical Evaluation Panel participants will agree to, and sign a nonproprietary information and conflict of interest document.

2.6 Offeror Eligibility

Offerors must be MTEC Members in good standing.

2.7 Inclusion of Nontraditional Defense Contractors, Nonprofit Research Institutions, or Small Businesses

Proposals that fail to meet the mandatory statutory conditions with regard to the appropriate use of Other Transaction authority, as listed below, will not be evaluated and will determined ineligible for award. Please see the MTEC PPG and RPP (Section 5) for additional details.

Mandatory statutory conditions (the Offeror shall assert that at least one of the one of the following conditions is met):

- (1) There is at least one nontraditional defense contractor or nonprofit research institution participating to a significant extent in the prototype project.
- (2) All significant participants in the transaction other than the Federal Government are small businesses (including small businesses participating in a program described under section 9

of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638)) or nontraditional defense contractors.

(3) At least one third of the total cost of the prototype project is to be paid out of funds provided by sources other than the Federal Government.

The Offeror shall submit Warranties and Representations (see Attachment 2 of the PPG) specifying the critical technologies being offered and/or the significant extent of participation of the nontraditional defense contractor, small business or nonprofit research institution. The nontraditional defense contractor can be an individual so long as he/she has a DUNS Number and meets the requirements in the Warranties and Representations. The significance of the nontraditional defense contractor's, small business' or nonprofit research institution's participation shall be explained in detail in the signed Warranties and Representations. Inadequate detail can cause delay in award.

Per the DoD OT Guide, rationale to justify a *significant extent* includes:

1. Supplying a new key technology, product or process
2. Supplying a novel application or approach to an existing technology, product or process
3. Providing a material increase in the performance, efficiency, quality or versatility of a key technology, product or process
4. Accomplishing a significant amount of the prototype project
5. Causing a material reduction in the cost or schedule of the prototype project
6. Provide for a material increase in performance of the prototype project

2.8 Nontraditional Defense Contractor Definition

A nontraditional defense contractor is a business unit that has not, for a period of **at least one year prior to the issue date of the Request for Project Proposals**, entered into or performed on any contract or subcontract that is subject to full coverage under the cost accounting standards (CAS) prescribed pursuant to section 26 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 422) and the regulations implementing such section.

2.9 Cost Sharing Definition

Cost sharing is defined as the resources expended by the award recipients on the proposed statement of work (SOW). If cost sharing is proposed, then the Offeror shall state the amount that is being proposed and whether the cost sharing is a cash contribution or in-kind contribution; provide a description of each cost share item proposed; the proposed dollar amount for each cost share item proposed; and the valuation technique used (e.g., vendor quote, historical cost, labor hours and labor rates, number of trips, etc.). Cost sharing above the statutory minimum is

encouraged if possible, as it leads to stronger leveraging of Government-contractor collaboration.

Cash Contribution

Cash Contribution means the Consortium and/or the Research Project Awardee (or Awardees' lower tier subawards) financial resources expended to perform a Research Project. The cash contribution may be derived from the Consortium's or Research Project Awardee (or Awardees' subawards) funds or outside sources or from nonfederal contract or grant revenues or from profit or fee on a federal procurement contract.

An Offeror's own source of funds may include corporate retained earnings, current or prospective Independent Research and Development (IR&D) funds or any other indirect cost pool allocation. New or concurrent IR&D funds may be utilized as a cash contribution provided those funds identified by the Offeror will be spent on performance of the Statement of Work (SOW) of a Research Project or specific tasks identified within the SOW of a Research Project.

Cash contributions include the funds the Offeror will spend for labor (including benefits and direct overhead), materials, new equipment (prorated if appropriate), awardees' subaward efforts expended on the SOW of a Research Project, and restocking the parts and material consumed.

In-Kind Contribution

In Kind Contribution means the Offeror's non-financial resources expended by the Consortium Members to perform a Research Project such as wear-and-tear on in-place capital assets like machinery or the prorated value of space used for performance of the Research Project, and the reasonable fair market value (appropriately prorated) of equipment, materials, IP, and other property used in the performance of the SOW of the Research Project.

Prior IR&D funds will not be considered as part of the Consortium Member's cash or In-Kind contributions, except when using the same procedures as those that authorize Pre-Award Costs, nor will fees be considered on a Consortium Member's cost sharing portion.

See the MTEC PPG for additional details. If the offer contains multiple team members, this information shall be provided for each team member providing cost share.

2.10 MTEC Assessment Fee

Per Section 3.4 of the Consortium Member Agreement (CMA), each recipient of a Research Project Award under the MTEC OTA shall pay MTEC an amount equal to 1% of the total funded value of each research project award. Such deposits shall be due no later than 90 days after the research project award is executed. Awardees are not allowed to use MTEC funding to pay for their assessment fees.

2.11 Intellectual Property

Intellectual Property (IP) rights for MTEC Research Project Awards will be defined in the terms of an awardee's Base Agreement and resultant Research Project Awards. MTEC reserves the right to assist in the negotiation of IP, royalties, licensing, future development, etc., between the government and the individual performers during the entire award period.

Additionally, MTEC has established two methods of payment to be made to MTEC surrounding the licensing/commercialization of Intellectual Property developed with funding received from MTEC Research Project Awards:

Royalty Payment Agreements

Government-funded research projects awarded through MTEC will be subject to a 10% royalty on all Net Revenues received by the Research Project Award recipient resulting from the licensing/commercialization of the technology, capped at 200% of the Government funding provided.

Additional Research Project Award Assessment

In lieu of providing the royalty payment agreement described above, members receiving Research Project Awards may elect to pay an additional assessment of 2% above the standard assessment percentage described in Section 3.4 of the CMA. This additional assessment applies to all research project awards, whether the award is Government funded or privately funded.

2.12 Data Rights

The Offeror shall comply with the terms and conditions defined in the Base Agreement regarding Data Rights. **It is anticipated that anything delivered under this proposed effort will be delivered to the Government with Government purpose data rights or unlimited data rights unless otherwise asserted in the proposal and agreed to by the Government.** Rights in technical data in each Research Project Award shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of MTEC Base Agreement.

If applicable, the Offeror shall complete the below table for any items to be furnished to the Government with restrictions and include this table as Attachment C of the proposal submission. An example is provided.

| Technical Data or Computer Software to be Furnished with Restrictions | Basis for Assertion | Asserted Rights Category | Name of Organization Asserting Restrictions | Milestone # Affected |
|---|---------------------|--------------------------|---|----------------------|
|---|---------------------|--------------------------|---|----------------------|

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-20-04-BlastModel
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

| | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|---------------------------|------------------|------------------------|
| Software XYZ | Previously developed software funded exclusively at private expense | Restricted | Organization XYZ | Milestones 1, 3, and 6 |
| Technical Data Description | Previously developed exclusively at private expense | Limited | Organization XYZ | Milestone 2 |
| Technical Data Description | Previously developed with mixed funding | Government Purpose Rights | Organization XYZ | Milestone 2 |

2.13 Expected Award Date

Offeror should plan on the period of performance beginning July 1, 2020 (subject to change). The Government reserves the right to change the proposed period of performance start date through negotiations via the CM and prior to issuing a Research Project Award.

2.14 Anticipated Proposal Selection Notification

As the basis of selections is completed, the Government will forward their selections to MTEC CM to notify Offerors.

3 Proposal

3.1 Proposal

Proposals in response to this RPP, must be received by the date on the cover page of this RPP. Proposals received after the time and date specified may not be evaluated.

The MTEC PPG is specifically designed to assist Offerors in understanding the proposal preparation process. The proposal format outlined in the PPG is mandatory. MTEC will post any general questions received and corresponding answers (without including questioners' proprietary data) on the Members-Only MTEC website. The Government will evaluate Proposals submitted and will select Proposals that best meet their current technology priorities using the criteria in PPG Section 5.

3.2 Proposal Submission

Instructions on how to submit are included in the RPP version that is posted on the MTEC Members Only Site.

MTEC membership is required for the submission of a Proposal. Offerors must be MTEC Members in good standing. Offerors submitting Proposals as the prime contractor must be MTEC members of good standing by **February 25, 2020**.

Do not submit any classified information in the proposal submission.

3.3 Submission Format

Offerors shall submit files in Microsoft Office formats or Adobe Acrobat (PDF – portable document format) as indicated below. ZIP files and other application formats are not acceptable. All files must be print-capable and without a password required. Filenames shall contain the appropriate filename extension (.docx, .doc, .pptx, .ppt, .xlsx, .xls or .pdf). Filenames should not contain special characters. Apple users must ensure the entire filename and path are free of spaces and special characters.

MTEC will email receipt confirmations to Offerors upon receipt of submission. Offerors may submit in advance of the deadline. **Neither MTEC nor ATI will make allowances/exceptions for submission problems encountered by the Offeror using system-to-system interfaces with MTEC's submission form. It is the Offeror's responsibility to ensure a timely and complete submission.**

4 Proposal Preparation Instructions

4.1 General Instructions

The Technical Proposal and Cost Proposal shall be submitted in two separate volumes, and shall remain valid for 180 days unless otherwise specified by the Offeror in the proposal. The Proposal format provided in this MTEC RPP is mandatory and shall reference this RPP number (MTEC-20-04-BlastModel). Offerors are encouraged to contact the POC identified herein up until the proposal submission date/time to clarify requirements. Offerors shall propose a Milestone Payment Schedule (MPS), which shall include all significant event/accomplishments that are intended to be accomplished as part of the project, a planned completion date (based on months post award), the expected research funding expended towards completing that milestone, and any cost share, if applicable. See the example in Attachment A: Statement of Work (SOW) within this RPP.

The Milestones and associated accomplishments proposed should, in general, be commensurate in number to the size and duration of the project. A milestone is not necessarily a physical deliverable; it is typically a significant R&D event. Quarterly and final technical reports may be considered deliverables, but they are not milestones. Please include quarterly and final technical reports as part of the Milestone Payment Schedule, without an associated cost.

All eligible Offerors may submit proposals for evaluation according to the criteria set forth herein. Offerors are advised that only ATI as the MTEC's CM, with the approval of the Government

Agreements Officer, is legally authorized to contractually bind or otherwise commit funding for selected Research Project Awards as result of this RPP.

4.2 Technical Requirements

Program Background:

Blast overpressure dynamics emanating from military artillery pieces is unique from other military weapon systems that may have the potential to exhibit long-term neurological effects. This project focuses on the development of a prototype model system for repetitive blast exposure for artillery weaponry. This model will provide a tool to operators and system planners to assess potential long-term neurological effects of low-intensity blast exposure specific to military artillery communities. The model will also enable the assessment of relationships between the numbers of repetitive low-intensity blast exposure from artillery weapons with specific neurological outcome measures.

Project Deliverable:

The primary deliverable of this project will be a model for potential brain and systemic physiological changes that occur after repetitive exposure to low-intensity blast overpressure events in career experienced military artillery personnel.

Solution Requirements:

Previous studies show converging evidence of model systems for neurophysiological effects from cumulative exposure to repetitive blasts in breacher populations. This prototype effort is intended to expand these findings by examining a cohort of experienced artillery personnel who may incur cumulative effects of repeated low-level blast exposure associated with military artillery weaponry.

Proposed projects shall 1) conduct a human study to determine the neurophysiological effects of repetitive low-level exposure to overpressure associated with artillery weaponry in military personnel assigned to artillery units, and 2) use these data sets to develop a model for potential brain and systemic physiological changes that occur after repetitive exposure to low-intensity blast overpressure events.

The Offeror shall:

- Establish a multi-institutional regulatory framework for a human subject's research protocol to permit the assessment of 30 experienced career artillery service members and 30 matched controls recruited from operational units. Submit an approved institutional human subject's protocol for second level DoD review and approval by the USAMRDC Human Research Protection Office (HRPO).

- Conduct comprehensive neurological assessments of military operational participants recruited from operational units. Assessments shall include a participant history utilizing a demographic and head injury questionnaire, neuropsychological testing tests of memory, attention, and general cognitive function, neuroimaging utilizing magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and shall include T1 and T2-weighted imaging, fluid attenuation inversion recovery (FLAIR) imaging, susceptibility weighted imaging (SWI), diffusion tensor imaging (DTI), perfusion weighted imaging, functional connectivity, and task-based functional MRI, assessment of fluid biomarkers, and tests of postural/stability, auditory, and vestibular function in a total of 30 experienced career artillery service members and well-matched controls will be recruited through established contacts with military units.
- Apply state-of-the-art feature engineering/extraction approaches to structure data across the datasets to generate a model for potential brain and systemic physiological changes that occur after repetitive exposure to low-intensity blast overpressure events in career experienced military artillery personnel. Using complex analytical techniques the investigators will test the hypothesis that participation in artillery service member activity results in structural, functional, and physiological neurological alterations compared with controls. The primary outcome deliverable will be a model for potential brain and systemic physiological changes that occur after repetitive exposure to low-intensity blast overpressure events in career experienced military artillery personnel.

Allowable costs include subject matter expertise, consultation to develop a regulatory strategy, model development, and clinical trial support.

Performers will be required to obtain approvals by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) and the USAMRDC HRPO in accordance with DoD and institutional regulations for human subjects protection. Therefore, all proposals shall account for requirements related to obtaining these approvals to include IRB and HRPO review and approval in the SOW/Milestones Payment Schedule (Attachment A).

4.3 Preparation of the Proposal

The Technical Proposal format provided in the MTEC PPG is mandatory. Proposals shall reference this RPP number (MTEC-20-04-BlastModel). The Technical Proposal and Cost Proposal must be submitted in two separate volumes, and shall remain valid for 180 days unless otherwise specified by the Offeror in the proposal. Offerors are encouraged to contact MTEC with any questions so that all aspects are clearly understood by both parties. The full proposal should include the following:

- **Technical Proposal submission:** one signed Technical Proposal (.pdf, .doc or .docx).
- **Statement of Work/Milestone Payment Schedule:** one Word (.docx or .doc). The Offeror is required to provide a detailed SOW/Milestone Payment Schedule using the format

provided herein (Attachment A). The Government reserves the right to negotiate and revise any or all parts of SOW/Milestone Payment Schedule. Offerors will have the opportunity to concur with revised SOW/Milestone Payment Schedule as necessary.

- **Cost Proposal submission:** one Word (.docx or .doc) or PDF file for Section I: Cost Proposal Narrative (see Attachment 1 of the PPG) required. Separately, Section II: Cost Proposal Formats either in Excel (.xlsx or .xls) or PDF format is required.
- **Warranties and Representations:** one Word (.docx or .doc) or PDF file that contains all Warranties and Representations is required.
- **Royalty Payment Agreement or Additional Research Project Award Assessment:** Each Offeror will select either the MTEC Additional Research Project Award Assessment Fee or the Royalty Payment Agreement (available on the MTEC members only website), **not both**, and submit a signed copy with the proposal.
- **Current and Pending Support (no page limit) – See Attachment B**
 - For all current and pending research support (to include government and non-government), include the award number and title, funding agency and requiring activity's names, period of performance (dates of funding), level of funding (total direct costs only), brief description of the project's goals, and list of specific aims. If applicable, identify where the proposed project overlaps with other existing and pending research projects. Clearly state if there is no overlap.
 - If there is no current and/or pending support, enter "None."
- **Data Rights – Provide as Attachment C to Full Proposal**
 - Please reference RPP Section 2.12

Evaluation: The Government will evaluate and determine which proposal(s) to award based on criteria described in **Section 5, "Selection,"** of this RPP. The Government reserves the right to negotiate with Offerors.

4.4 Cost Proposal

Offerors are encouraged to use their own cost formats such that the necessary detail is provided. MTEC will make cost proposal formats available on the Members-Only MTEC website. The Cost Proposal formats provided in the MTEC PPG are **NOT** mandatory. Refer to the MTEC PPG for additional details.

Each cost should include direct costs and other necessary components as applicable, for example, fringe, General & Administrative Expense (G&A), Facilities & Administrative (F&A), Other Direct Costs (ODC), etc. Offerors shall provide a breakdown of material and ODC costs as applicable.

Please note that compensation to Federal personnel (civil servants or Service members) participating as human subjects (when “On-Duty”), whether or not the research is Federally funded, is **unallowable** (with the exception of some blood draws) in accordance with Department of Defense Instruction number 3216.02 (SUBJECT: Protection of Human Subjects and Adherence to Ethical Standards in DoD-Supported Research). You may access a full version of the DODI by accessing the following link:
<https://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/dodi/321602p.pdf>

4.5 Proposal Preparation Costs

The cost of preparing Proposals in response to this RPP is not considered a direct charge to any resulting award or any other contract.

4.6 Restrictions on Human Subjects, Cadavers, and Laboratory Animal Use

Proposals must comply with important restrictions and reporting requirements for the use of human subjects, to include research involving the secondary use of human biospecimens and/or human data, human cadavers, or laboratory animals. For a complete description of these mandatory requirements and restrictions and others, Offerors must refer to the accompanying MTEC PPG, “Additional Requirements.”

These restrictions include mandatory government review and reporting processes that will impact the Offeror’s schedule.

For example, the clinical studies under this RPP shall not begin until the USAMRDC Office of Research Protections (ORP) provides authorization that the research may proceed. The USAMRDC ORP will issue written approval to begin research under separate notification. Written approval to proceed from the USAMRDC ORP is also required for any Research Project Awardee (or lower tier subawards) that will use funds from this award to conduct research involving human subjects. Offerors must allow at least 30 days in their schedule for the ORP review and authorization process.

4.7 Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)

To request protection from FOIA disclosure as allowed by 10 U.S.C. §2371(i), Offerors shall mark business plans and technical information with a legend identifying the documents as being submitted on a confidential basis. For more information, please refer to Section 6.1.1 of the MTEC PPG.

5 Selection

The CM will conduct a preliminary screening of submitted proposals to ensure compliance with the RPP requirements. As part of the preliminary screening process, proposals that do not meet the requirements of the RPP may be eliminated from the competition or additional information may be requested by the CM. The Government reserves the right to request additional

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-20-04-BlastModel
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

information or eliminate proposals that do not meet these requirements from further consideration. One of the primary reasons for elimination from further consideration is the lack of significant nontraditional defense contractor participation, nonprofit research institution participation, all small business participation, or cost share (see RPP Section 2.7). The Cost Sharing/Nontraditional Contractor determination will be made as shown in Table 1:

| TABLE 1- COST SHARING/NONTRADITIONAL CONTRACTOR ASSESSMENTS | |
|---|---|
| RATING | DESCRIPTION |
| PASS | <p>Offeror proposing an MTEC research project meets at least ONE of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Offeror is a Nontraditional Defense Contractor or Nonprofit Research Institution• Offeror's proposal has at least one Nontraditional Defense Contractor or Nonprofit Research Institution participating to a significant extent• All significant participants in the transaction other than the Federal Government are small businesses or nontraditional defense contractors• Offeror provides at least one third of the total project cost as acceptable cost share |
| FAIL | <p>Offeror proposing an MTEC research project does NOT meet any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Offeror is a Nontraditional Defense Contractor or Nonprofit Research Institution• Offeror's proposal has at least one Nontraditional Defense Contractor or Nonprofit Research Institution participating to a significant extent• All significant participants in the transaction other than the Federal Government are small businesses or nontraditional defense contractors• Offeror provides at least one third of the total project cost as acceptable cost share |

Following the preliminary screening, the Government sponsor will perform proposal source selection. This will be conducted using the evaluation factors detailed below. The Government will conduct an evaluation of all qualified proposals. The Source Selection Authority may:

1. *Select the proposal (or some portion of the proposal) for award*
2. *Place the proposal in the Basket if funding currently is unavailable; or*

3. *Reject the proposal (will not be considered for award and will not be placed in the Basket)*

5.1 Proposal Evaluation Process

Qualified applications will be evaluated by a panel of subject matter experts (SMEs) who will make recommendations to a Source Selection Authority.

This process may involve the use of contractors as SME consultants or reviewers. Where appropriate, the USG will employ non-disclosure-agreements to protect information contained in the RPP as outlined in Section 2.4.

Evaluation of proposals will be based on an independent, comprehensive review and assessment of the work proposed against stated source selection criteria and evaluation factors.. The Government will evaluate each proposal against the evaluation factors detailed below and assigned adjectival ratings to the non-cost/price factor(s) consistent with those defined in Table 2 (General Merit Ratings Assessments). The Offeror shall clearly state how it intends to meet and, if possible, exceed the RPP requirements. Mere acknowledgement or restatement of a RPP requirement is not acceptable.

The evaluation factors and evaluation criteria are described below.

5.2 Evaluation Factors

1. Technical Approach and Feasibility
2. Cost/Price

Evaluation factors are listed in descending order of importance.

Table 2 explains the adjectival merit ratings that will be used for the Technical Approach and Feasibility Factor.

| TABLE 2- GENERAL MERIT RATING ASSESSMENTS | |
|---|---|
| RATING | DESCRIPTION |
| 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 performance is high. |
| UNACCEPTABLE | Proposal does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies. Proposal is not awardable. |

5.3 Evaluation Factor 1. Technical Approach and Feasibility

The Technical Approach and Feasibility factor will be evaluated using the merit rating as shown in Table 2.

The Offeror's proposed solution will be assessed for the likelihood of successfully achieving the requirements of the technology of interest as defined in Section 4.2 above. The likelihood of success will be determined by considering the soundness and clarity of the technical approach. Additional consideration will be given to the degree to which any preliminary existing data supports the proposed project plan and the suitability of the proposed statistical plan. The SOW should provide a succinct approach for achieving the project's objectives. The SOW will be evaluated based on the degree to which the rationale, objectives, and specific aims support the proposed research. The effort will be assessed for the extent to which the solution is technologically innovative and how the proposed deliverable advances the solution's maturity. Military relevance is a critical component of proposal submission. This relevance includes the health care needs of military Service members, Veterans, and/or other Military Health System beneficiaries and the extent to which the proposal offers a joint Service solution. A description of the project team's expertise, key personnel, and corporate experience shall demonstrate an ability to execute the SOW.

5.4 Evaluation Factor 2. Cost/Price

The Cost/Price area will receive a narrative rating to determine whether costs are realistic, reasonable, and complete.

If a proposal is selected for award, the MTEC CM will evaluate the estimated cost proposed by the Offeror for performing all requirements outlined in this RPP and the MTEC PPG. Evaluation will include analysis of the proposed cost together with all supporting information. The Offeror's cost and rationale will be evaluated for realism, reasonableness, and completeness. The MTEC CM will review the original cost proposal and the Offeror's response to a Proposal Update Letter, if applicable. The MTEC CM will request additional information or clarification as necessary. The MTEC CM will assess the reasonableness and completeness of the cost estimates and then provide a formal assessment to the Government. The Government will review this assessment and make the final determination that the negotiated project value is fair and reasonable.

Proposals will be evaluated using the understanding of cost realism, reasonableness, and completeness as outlined below:

a) Realism. Proposals will be evaluated to determine if Costs are realistic for the work to be performed, reflect a clear understanding of the requirements, and are consistent with the various elements of the Offeror's schedule proposal.

Estimates are “realistic” when they are neither excessive nor insufficient for the effort to be accomplished. Estimates must also be realistic for each task of the proposed project when compared to the total proposed cost. For more information on cost realism, please refer to the MTEC PPG.

The MTEC CM will make a determination by directly comparing proposed costs with comparable current and historical data, evaluator experience, available estimates, etc. Proposed estimates will be compared with the corresponding technical proposals for consistency.

b) Reasonableness. The Offeror’s cost proposal will be evaluated to determine if it is reasonable. For a price to be reasonable, it must represent a price to the Government that a prudent person would pay in the conduct of competitive business. Normally, price reasonableness is established through cost and price analysis.

To be considered reasonable, the Offeror’s cost estimate should be developed from applicable historic cost data. The Offeror should show that sound, rational judgment was used in deriving and applying cost methodologies. Appropriate narrative explanation and justification should be provided for critical cost elements. The overall estimate should be presented in a coherent, organized, and systematic manner.

Costs provided shall be clearly attributable to activities or materials as described by the Offeror. Costs should be broken down using the Cost Proposal Formats that are located on the Members-Only MTEC website.

c) Completeness. The MTEC CM will evaluate whether the proposal clearly and thoroughly documents the rationale supporting the proposed cost and is compliant with the requirements of the solicitation.

The proposal should clearly and thoroughly document the cost/price information supporting the proposed cost in sufficient detail and depth. The MTEC CM will evaluate whether the Offeror’s cost proposal is complete with respect to the work proposed. The MTEC CM will consider substantiation of proposed cost (i.e., supporting data and estimating rationale) for all elements.

Rate and pricing information is required to properly perform the cost analysis of the proposal. If the Offeror is unwilling to provide this information in a timely manner, then the proposal cannot be properly evaluated, and cannot be selected for award.

5.5 Best Value

The Government will conduct the source selection based on the evaluation criteria and ratings listed above. The overall award decision will be based upon a Best Value determination by considering and comparing factors in addition to cost or price. Based on the results of the Technical Approach and Feasibility Evaluation, the Government reserves the right to negotiate and request changes to any or all parts of the SOW. Offerors will have the opportunity to concur with the requested changes, proposed further changes and revise cost proposals, as necessary.

5.6 Definition of General Terms Used in Evaluations:

Strength - An aspect of an Offeror's proposal that has merit or exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be advantageous to the Government during award performance.

Weakness - A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful award performance.

Significant Strength - An aspect of an Offeror's proposal that has appreciable merit or appreciably exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that will be appreciably advantageous to the Government during award performance.

Significant Weakness - A flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful award performance.

Deficiency - A material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful award performance to an unacceptable level.

6 Points-of-Contact

For inquiries, please direct your correspondence to the following contacts:

- Questions concerning contractual, cost or pricing related to this RPP should be directed to the MTEC Contracts Administrator, mtec-contracts@ati.org
- Technical and membership questions should be directed to the MTEC Director of Research, Dr. Lauren Palestrini, Ph.D., lauren.palestrini@officer.mtec-sc.org
- All other questions should be directed to the MTEC Director of Program Operations, Ms. Kathy Zolman, kathy.zolman@ati.org

Once an Offeror has submitted a Proposal the Government and the MTEC CM will not discuss evaluation/status until the source selection process is complete.

7 Acronyms/Abbreviations

| | |
|---------|--|
| ATI | Advanced Technology International |
| CAS | Contract Accounting System |
| CM | Consortium Manager |
| CMA | Consortium Member Agreement |
| DHP | Defense Health Program |
| DoD | Department of Defense |
| DTI | Diffusion tensor imaging |
| FAQ | Frequently Asked Questions |
| F&A | Facilities and Administrative Costs |
| FLAIR | Fluid attenuation inversion recovery |
| FY | Fiscal Year |
| G&A | General and Administrative Expenses |
| HRPO | Human Research Protection Office |
| IP | Intellectual Property (e.g., patents, copyrights, licensing, etc.) |
| IRB | Institutional Review Board |
| IR&D | Independent Research and Development |
| M | Millions |
| MRI | Magnetic resonance imaging |
| MTEC | Medical Technology Enterprise Consortium |
| NDA | Nondisclosure Agreement |
| OCI | Organizational Conflict of Interest |
| ODC | Other Direct Costs |
| ORP | Office of Research Protections, USAMRDC |
| POC | Point-of-Contact |
| PoP | Period of Performance |
| PPG | Proposal Preparation Guide |
| R&D | Research and Development |
| RDT&E | Research, Development, Test and Evaluation |
| RPP | Request for Project Proposals |
| SME | Subject Matter Expert |
| SOW | Statement of Work |
| SWI | Susceptibility weighted imaging |
| USAMRDC | U.S. Army Medical Research and Development Command |
| USG | U.S. Government |

Attachment A: Statement of Work (SOW)

The SOW developed by the Lead MTEC member organization and included in the proposal (also submitted as a separate document) is intended to be incorporated into a binding agreement if the proposal is selected for award. If no SOW is submitted with the proposal, there may be no award. The proposed SOW shall contain a summary description of the technical methodology as well as the task description, but not in so much detail as to make the contract inflexible. DO NOT INCLUDE ANY PROPRIETARY INFORMATION OR COMPANY-SENSITIVE INFORMATION IN THE SOW TEXT. The following is the required format for the SOW.

Statement of Work

Submitted under Request for Project Proposal (*Insert current Request No.*)

(Proposed Project Title)

Introduction/Background (*To be provided initially by the Offeror at the time of proposal submission. Submitted information is subject to change through negotiation if the Government selects the proposal for funding.*)

Scope/Project Objective (*To be provided initially by the Offeror at the time of proposal submission. Submitted information is subject to change through negotiation if the Government selects the proposal for funding.*)

This section includes a statement of what the project covers. This should include the technology area to be investigated, the objectives/goals, and major milestones for the effort.

Requirements (*To be provided initially by the Offeror at the time of proposal submission to be finalized by the Government based on negotiation of Scope/Project Objective*).

State the technology objective in the first paragraph and follow with delineated tasks required to meet the overall project goals. The work effort should be segregated into major phases, then tasks and identified in separately numbered paragraphs (similar to the numbered breakdown of these paragraphs). Early phases in which the performance definition is known shall be detailed by subtask with defined work to be performed. Planned incrementally funded phases will require broader, more flexible tasks that are priced up front, and adjusted as required during execution and/or requested by the Government to obtain a technical solution. Tasks will need to track with established adjustable cost or fixed price milestones for payment schedule. Each major task included in the SOW should be priced separately in the cost proposal. Subtasks need not be priced separately in the cost proposal.

Deliverables *(To be provided initially by the Offeror at the time of proposal submission. Submitted information is subject to change through negotiation if the Government selects the proposal for funding.)*

Results of the technical effort are contractually binding and shall be identified herein. Offerors are advised to read the Base Agreement carefully. Any and all hardware/software to be provided to the Government as a result of this project shall be identified. Deliverables should be submitted in PDF or MS Office format. It must be clear what information will be included in a deliverable either through a descriptive title or elaborating text.

Milestone Payment Schedule *(To be provided initially by the Offeror at the time of proposal submission. Submitted information is subject to change through negotiation if the Government selects the proposal for funding. The milestone schedule included should be in editable format (i.e., not a picture))*

The Milestone Payment Schedule should include all milestone deliverables that are intended to be delivered as part of the project, a planned submission date, the monetary value for that deliverable and any cost share, if applicable. For fixed price agreements, when each milestone is submitted, the MTEC member will submit an invoice for the exact amount listed on the milestone payment schedule. For cost reimbursable agreements, the MTEC member is required to assign a monetary value to each milestone. In this case, however, invoice totals are based on cost incurred and will not have to match exactly to the amounts listed on the milestone payment schedule.

The milestones and associated deliverables proposed should, in general:

- be commensurate in number to the size and duration of the project (i.e., a \$5M multi-year project may have 20, while a \$700K shorter term project may have only 6);
- not be structured such that multiple deliverables that might be submitted separately are included under a single milestone;
- be of sufficient monetary value to warrant generation of a deliverable and any associated invoices;
- include at a minimum Quarterly Reports which include both Technical Status and Business Status Reports (due the 25th of Apr, Jul, Oct, Jan), Annual Technical Report, Final Technical Report, and Final Business Status Report. Reports shall have no funding associated with them.

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-20-04-BlastModel
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

| MTEC Milestone Payment Schedule Example | | | | | | |
|--|--------------------|--|-----------------|-------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| MTEC Milestone Number | Task Number | Significant Event/ Accomplishments | Due Date | Government Funds | Cost Share | Total Funding |
| 1 | N/A | Project Kickoff | 12/1/2019 | \$20,000 | | \$20,000 |
| 2 | N/A | Quarterly Report 1 (October - December, Technical and Business Reports) | 1/25/2020 | \$ - | | \$ - |
| 3 | 1 | Protocol Synopsis | 2/28/2020 | \$21,075 | | \$21,075 |
| 4 | 2 | Submission for HRPO Approval | 2/28/2020 | \$21,075 | | \$21,075 |
| 5 | 3 | Submission of Investigational New Drug application to the US FDA | 4/30/2020 | \$210,757 | \$187,457 | \$398,214 |
| 6 | N/A | Quarterly Reports 2 (January - March, Technical and Business Reports) | 4/25/2020 | \$ - | | \$ - |
| 7 | N/A | Quarterly Report 3 (April - June, Technical and Business Reports) | 7/25/2020 | \$ - | | \$ - |
| 8 | 4 | Toxicity Studies | 10/1/2020 | \$63,227 | | \$63,227 |
| 9 | N/A | Annual Report 1 | 10/25/2020 | \$ - | | \$ - |
| 10 | 5 | FDA authorization trial | 11/30/2020 | \$84,303 | | \$84,303 |
| 11 | 6 | Research staff trained | 11/30/2020 | \$ - | | \$ - |
| 12 | 7 | Data Management system completed | 11/30/2020 | \$ - | | \$ - |
| 13 | 8 | 1 st subject screened, randomized and enrolled in study | 1/1/2021 | \$150,000 | \$187,457 | \$337,457 |
| 14 | N/A | Quarterly Report 4 (October - December, Technical and Business Reports) | 1/25/2021 | \$ - | | \$ - |
| 15 | 9 | Completion of dip molding apparatus | 3/1/2021 | \$ 157,829 | \$ 187,457 | \$ 345,286 |

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-20-04-BlastModel
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

| | | | | | | |
|----|-----|--|--------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 16 | N/A | Quarterly Reports 5 (January - March, Technical and Business Reports) | 4/25/2021 | \$ - | | \$ - |
| 17 | 10 | Assess potential toxicology | 6/1/2021 | \$157,829 | | \$157,829 |
| 18 | N/A | Quarterly Report 6 (April - June, Technical and Business Reports) | 7/25/2021 | \$ - | | \$ - |
| 19 | 11 | Complete 50% patient enrollment | 10/1/2021 | \$350,000 | \$187,457 | \$537,457 |
| 20 | N/A | Annual Report 1 | 10/25/2021 | \$ - | | \$ - |
| 21 | N/A | Quarterly Report 7 (October - December, Technical and Business Reports) | 1/25/2022 | \$ - | | \$ - |
| 22 | 12 | Electronic Report Forms Developed | 3/1/2022 | \$315,658 | \$187,457 | \$503,115 |
| 23 | N/A | Quarterly Reports 8 (January - March, Technical and Business Reports) | 4/25/2022 | \$ - | | \$ - |
| 24 | N/A | Quarterly Report 9 (April - June, Technical and Business Reports) | 7/25/2022 | \$ - | | \$ - |
| 25 | 13 | Complete 100% patient enrollment | 8/1/2022 | \$315,658 | \$187,457 | \$503,115 |
| 26 | N/A | Annual Report 1 | 10/25/2022 | \$ - | | \$ - |
| 27 | 14 | Report results from data analysis | 11/1/2022 | \$157,829 | | \$157,829 |
| 28 | N/A | Final Reports <u>(Prior to the POP End)</u> | 11/30/2022 | \$ - | | \$ - |
| | | | Total | \$2,025,240 | \$1,124,742 | \$3,149,982 |

Please Note:

1. Firm Fixed Price Contracts – Milestone must be complete before invoicing for fixed priced contracts.
2. Cost Reimbursable Contracts – You may invoice for costs incurred against a milestone. Invoicing should be monthly.

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-20-04-BlastModel
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

3. Cannot receive payment for a report (i.e. Quarterly, Annual and Final Reports should not have an assigned Government Funded or Cost Share amount.)
4. Quarterly and Annual Reports include BOTH Technical and Business Reports (separate).
5. Final Report due date must be prior to POP end noted in subcontract.
6. MTEC Milestone Numbers are used for administrative purposes and should be sequential.
7. Task Numbers are used to reference the statement of work if they are different from the MTEC Milestone Number.

Shipping Provisions *(The following information, if applicable to the negotiated SOW, will be finalized by the Government and the MTEC Consortium Manager based on negotiations)*

- The shipping address is:
Classified Shipments:
Outer Packaging
Inner Packaging

Data Rights *(see Section 8.4 of PPG for more information)*

| Technical Data or Computer Software to be Furnished with Restrictions | Basis for Assertion | Asserted Rights Category | Name of Organization Asserting Restrictions | Milestone # Affected |
|---|---|---------------------------|---|------------------------|
| Software XYZ | Previously developed software funded exclusively at private expense | Restricted | Organization XYZ | Milestones 1, 3, and 6 |
| Technical Data Description | Previously developed exclusively at private expense | Limited | Organization XYZ | Milestone 2 |
| Technical Data Description | Previously developed with mixed funding | Government Purpose Rights | Organization XYZ | Milestone 2 |

Reporting *(The following information, if applicable to the negotiated SOW, will be provided by the Government based on negotiation)*

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-20-04-BlastModel
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

| Report Months | Due Date |
|--------------------|------------|
| January – March | 25 April |
| April - June | 25 July |
| July - September | 25 October |
| October - December | 25 January |

- Quarterly Reports – The MTEC research project awardee shall prepare a Quarterly Report, which will include a Technical Status Report and a Business Status Report in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Base Agreement. (Required)
 - Annual Technical Report – The project awardee shall prepare an Annual Technical Report for projects whose periods of performances are greater than one year in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Base Agreement. (Required)
 - Final Technical Report – At the completion of the Research Project Award, the awardee will submit a Final Technical Report, which will provide a comprehensive, cumulative, and substantive summary of the progress and significant accomplishments achieved during the total period of the Project effort in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Base Agreement. (Required)
 - Final Business Status Report – At the completion of the Research Project Award, the awardee will submit a Final Business Status Report, which will provide summarized details of the resource status of the Research Project Award, in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Base Agreement. (Required)
-

Attachment B – Current & Pending Support Template

Current

Award Number:

Title:

Funding Agency/Requiring Activity:

Dates of Funding:

Total Direct Costs:

Role: *(i.e. Principal Investigator, Co-Investigator, etc.)*

Brief summary of the scope of work:

Award Number:

Title:

Funding Agency/Requiring Activity:

Dates of Funding:

Total Direct Costs:

Role: *(i.e. Principal Investigator, Co-Investigator, etc.)*

Brief summary of the scope of work:

[Add additional fields, if needed, to report all current support]

Pending

Title of Proposal:

Funding Agency/Requiring Activity:

Estimated Dates of Funding:

Proposed Total Direct Costs:

Role: *(i.e. Principal Investigator, Co-Investigator, etc.)*

Brief summary of the scope of work:

Title of Proposal:

Funding Agency/Requiring Activity:

Estimated Dates of Funding:

Proposed Total Direct Costs:

Role: *(i.e. Principal Investigator, Co-Investigator, etc.)*

Brief summary of the scope of work:

[Add additional fields, if needed, to report all pending support]