

Request for Project Proposals



Solicitation Number: MTEC-21-05-Cross-cutting
“Comprehensive Cross-Cutting Prevention Opportunity to Decrease Harmful Behaviors and Increase Service Member Readiness and Performance”

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 12, 2021
Amendment No. 01 Issue Date: January 20, 2021

White Paper Due Date: February 11, 2021
Noon Eastern Time

Amendment No. 01 revises the page limits in Section 4.2.

White Papers are Required

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	2
1 Executive Summary.....	4
1.1. Medical Technology Enterprise Consortium	4
1.2. Purpose	4
2 Administrative Overview	5
2.1. Request for Project Proposals (RPP).....	5
2.2. Funding Availability and Period of Performance	6
2.3. Acquisition Approach	6
2.4. Proposers Conference	7
2.5. Proprietary Information	8
2.6. MTEC Member Teaming.....	8
2.7. Offeror Eligibility	9
2.8. Cost Sharing Definition.....	9
2.9. Cost Share Requirements.....	9
2.10. MTEC Assessment Fee.....	9
2.11. Intellectual Property and Data Rights	10
2.12. Expected Award Date	10
2.13. White Paper Selection Notification.....	10
3 Technical Requirements	11
3.1. Background.....	11
3.2. Focus Areas of Interest.....	13
3.3. Additional Points of Consideration:	16
3.4. Potential Follow-on Tasks	16
3.5. References.....	16
3.6. Restrictions on Animal and Human Subjects	19
3.7. Guidance related to DOD-affiliated personnel for research.....	19
4 White Paper Preparation	21
4.1. General Instructions.....	21
4.2. Instructions for the Preparation & Submission of the Stage 1 White Paper	21
4.3. Stage 2 Full Proposal (for Only Those Offerors Recommended for Stage 2).....	22
4.4. White Paper and Full Proposal Preparation Costs	24
4.5. Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)	24
4.6. Telecommunications and Video Surveillance	24
5 Selection.....	25
5.1. Preliminary Screening	25
5.2. White Paper (Stage 1) Evaluation:	26
5.3. Full Proposal (Stage 2) Evaluation (for Only Those Offerors Recommended for Stage 2) 27	
5.4. Definitions of General Terms Used in Evaluations:.....	30
6 Points-of-Contact	30
7 Acronyms/Abbreviations	30

Request for Project Proposal MTEC-21-05-Cross-cutting
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

8	White Paper Template	33
	Attachment A – Cost Share	36
	Attachment B – Statutory Requirements for the Appropriate Use of Other Transaction Authority	37
	Attachment C – Intellectual Property and Data Rights.....	38
	Attachment D – Statement of Work Template.....	40
	Attachment E – Warranties and Representations Template.....	45
	Attachment F – Current & Pending Support Template	50
	Attachment G – Focus Areas of Interest: Supplemental Information	52
	Attachment H – BIDS Instructions	61

1 Executive Summary

1.1. 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 Department of Defense (DOD) 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) engage in 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 MTEC website at <https://mtec-sc.org/>.

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 the 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. Proposed prototype projects should not be exploratory in nature and do require a foundation of preliminary data.

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) USAMRDC Military Operational Medicine Research Program (MOMRP)/Joint Program Committee-5 (JPC-5). Proposals selected for award as a result of this RPP will be awarded under the authority of 10 U.S.C. § 2371b. The award(s) will be managed by

the Congressionally Directed Medical Research Program (CDMRP), with oversight from the Government Sponsor, JPC-5.

This Request for Project Proposals (RPP) is focused on optimizing health promotion via prevention initiatives for the military that provide education and skills, protective environments, and healthy climates and relationships in efforts to prevent various forms of violent, abusive, or harmful acts. This RPP aims to address the following cross-cutting prevention focus areas of interest:

- **FOCUS AREA #1: Community Based Participatory Research (CBPR)** - Use CBPR/participatory action research to enhance the military community relevance of research and to develop, assess, and sustain cross-cutting prevention that is culturally grounded in the military community(-ies).
- **FOCUS AREA #2: Measurement and Assessment** - Novel methodologies to efficiently identify and/or collect short-, medium-, and long-term indicators of effectiveness of cross-cutting prevention programming.
- **FOCUS AREA #3: Effective Primary Prevention Programming** - Develop and/or adapt and test primary prevention (addressing individual, relationship, team, leader, community, and/or systems-level aspects) programming for the military context.

The DOD has several gaps that need to be filled in order to have an effective evidence-based cross-cutting prevention capability (see Section 3 for more detail). The DOD's ability to execute the National Defense Strategy is undermined by violent, abusive, or harmful acts completed by and against the military community. Reductions in prevalence of suicide, sexual violence, harassment, domestic abuse, alcohol and substance use, and psychological health issues are vital to the readiness of the Force. Solutions resulting from awards made as part of this RPP will provide the DOD with effective and efficient methods to implement and deliver prevention activities to maximize impact at local and organizational levels. It will also increase the resources for initiatives that have priceless impacts on these mission degrading problems. Proposed work must be relevant to active duty Service Members and/or military beneficiaries, and ultimately impact the greater needs of the American public.

2 Administrative Overview

2.1 Request for Project Proposals (RPP)

MTEC is utilizing a two-staged approach for this RPP. In Stage 1, current MTEC members are invited to submit White Papers using the mandatory format contained in this RPP (Section 8). The Government will evaluate White Papers submitted and will select White Papers that best meet their current technology priorities using the criteria in Section 5 of this RPP. Offerors whose proposed solution is selected for further consideration based on White Paper evaluation will be invited to submit a proposal in Stage 2. Notification letters will contain specific Stage 2 proposal submission requirements.

2.2. Funding Availability and Period of Performance

The U.S. Government (USG) currently has available a total of approximately \$11.3 million (M) for anticipated awards to be made during FY2021. The estimated total available funding per Focus Area is as follows (subject to realignment dependent on quality of submissions):

- 1) FOCUS AREA #1: Community Based Participatory Research ~ \$4.7M
- 2) FOCUS AREA #2: Measurement and Assessment ~ \$1.9M
- 3) FOCUS AREA #3: Effective Primary Prevention Programming ~ \$4.7M

The maximum request for Government funding for each White Paper should not exceed \$2.5 M for projects proposing in response to Focus Areas 1, \$750,000 for Focus Area #2, and \$2.5 M for Focus Area #3. [Note: If a single white paper addresses more than one focus area, then the maxima are additive.] Award and funding from the Government is expected to be limited to the funding specified above and is contingent upon the availability of federal funds for this program. Awards resulting from this RPP are expected to be made in Fiscal Year 2021 under the authority of 10 U.S.C. § 2371b.

Cost sharing, including cash and in kind (e.g., personnel or product) contributions are strongly encouraged, have no limit, and are in addition to the Government funding to be provided under the resultant award(s).

MTEC anticipates that multiple awards (approximately 6 awards) will be made to qualified Offerors to accomplish the statement of work. It is possible that a single Offeror could receive an award for more than one Focus Area.

Award funding will be structured incrementally and based upon completion of Milestones and Deliverables.

The anticipated Period of Performance is expected to be up to 36 months for all focus areas.

Dependent on the results and deliverables under any resultant award(s), the USG may apply additional dollars and/or allow for additional time for follow-on efforts with appropriate modification of the award. See Section 3.4. for additional details.

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 White Papers received in response to this RPP is contingent upon the availability of federal funds for this program.

2.3. Acquisition Approach

MTEC recognizes that considerable effort is required to prepare a competitive proposal to MTEC.

Request for Project Proposal MTEC-21-05-Cross-cutting
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

The two-stage approach for this RPP is intended to streamline the initial proposal preparation time and effort for MTEC members. Based on the Government's evaluation of White Papers in Stage 1, select Offerors will be invited to participate in Stage 2 and will be required to submit a full proposal for more detailed evaluation.

The due date for White Papers is found on the cover page of this RPP. White Papers may not be considered under this RPP unless the White Paper was received on or before the due date specified on the cover page.

Stage 1: White Papers submitted under this RPP shall follow the MTEC White Paper Template provided in Section 8.

Stage 2: Offerors whose solutions are selected for further consideration based on White Paper evaluation will be invited to submit a proposal in Stage 2. Notification letters will contain specific Stage 2 proposal submission requirements. An example of the proposal submission requirements is (subject to change):

- **Technical Proposal** according to the format provided in the Proposal Preparation Guidelines (PPG) available on the MTEC members-only website.
- Detailed **Statement of Work (SOW)** according to the format provided in the notification letter.
- **Cost Proposal** according to the format provided in the PPG.

Pending successful completion of the total effort, the Government may issue a non-competitive follow-on production contract or transaction pursuant to 10 U.S.C. § 2371b section f.

The Government-selected prototype project(s) awarded as a result of this solicitation will be funded under the Other Transaction Agreement for prototype projects (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 (if not yet executed). The same provisions will govern this Base Agreement as the OTA for prototype projects between the Government and MTEC. Subsequently, any proposal that is selected for award will be funded through a Research Project Award issued under the member's Base Agreement. A sample of the MTEC Base Agreement can be found on the MTEC website at www.mtec-sc.org.

2.4. Proposers Conference

MTEC will host a Proposers Conference that will be conducted via webinar within two (2) weeks after the release of the RPP. The intent of the Proposers Conference is to provide an administrative overview of this RPP process to award and present further insight into the specific areas of interest outlined in Section 3. Further instructions will be forthcoming via email. Offerors are advised to check the MTEC website periodically during the proposal preparation period for any clarifications found in Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) responses.

2.5. Proprietary Information

The MTEC CM will oversee submission of proposals and analyze cost proposals submitted in response to this RPP. The MTEC CM shall take the necessary steps to protect all proprietary proposal 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 foundations that award grants for research and operate in research areas that are aligned with those of MTEC. These private foundations may be interested in reviewing proposals within their program areas, allowing for opportunities to attract supplemental funding sources. Therefore, on your White Paper Cover Page, please indicate your willingness to allow MTEC Officers and Directors access to your Technical Proposal for the purposes of engaging in outreach activities with these private foundations. MTEC Officers and Directors who are granted proposal access have signed Nondisclosure Agreements (NDAs) and Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) statements. Additionally, all Technical Evaluation Panel participants, which may include contractor support personnel serving as nongovernmental advisors, will agree to and sign a Federal Employee Participation Agreement or a Nondisclosure/Nonuse Agreement, as applicable.

2.6. 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.

2.7. Offeror Eligibility

Offerors must be MTEC Members in good standing. Offerors submitting White Papers as the prime contractor must be MTEC members of good standing by February 6, 2021. To join MTEC, please visit <http://mtec-sc.org/how-to-join/>.

2.8. Cost Sharing Definition

Cost sharing is defined as the resources expended by the award recipients on the proposed statement of work (SOW). *Cost sharing above the statutory minimum is not required in order to be eligible to receive an award under this RPP.* 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 an in-kind contribution (see Attachment A for definitions); 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.).

2.9. Cost Share Requirements

In order to be compliant with 10 U.S.C. §2371b, Research Projects selected for funding under this RPP are required to meet at least one of the conditions specified in Attachment B (“Statutory Requirements for the Appropriate Use of Other Transaction Authority”). Beyond that, cost sharing is encouraged if possible, as it leads to stronger leveraging of Government-contractor collaboration. For more information regarding cost share, please see Attachment A.

Proposals that fail to meet the mandatory statutory conditions with regard to the appropriate use of Other Transaction authority, as detailed in Attachment B, will not be evaluated and will be determined ineligible for award.

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 awarded. 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.

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. Awardees must select one of the two methods:

(1) 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.

(2) 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.

2.11. Intellectual Property and Data Rights

Intellectual Property (IP) rights for MTEC Research Project Awards are defined in the terms of an awardee's Base Agreement and resultant Task Orders. 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.

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

Note that as part of the Stage 2 of the RPP proposal (submission of a full proposal), Offerors shall complete and submit Attachment C with the signature of responsible party for the proposing Prime Offeror.

2.12. Expected Award Date

Offerors should plan on the period of performance beginning September 30, 2021 (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.

2.13. White Paper Selection Notification

As the basis of selections is completed, the Government will forward their selections to MTEC CM to notify Offerors. Proposers will be notified by email from the MTEC CM of the results of the evaluation. Those successful will move forward to the next phase of the process while those not selected will gain evaluation rationale for non-selection.

3 Technical Requirements

3.1. Background

U.S. military personnel and their families face many challenges that contribute to decreasing the readiness and resiliency of the force. The goal of this MTEC funding opportunity is to support proposals focused on preventive interventions designed to have an impact on multiple outcomes including:

- Suicide ideation and behaviors and non-suicidal self-directed injury
- Sexual violence (sexual harassment and assault)
- Harassment (e.g., gender and racial discrimination, retaliation)
- Domestic abuse (intimate partner violence)
- Alcohol and substance use, misuse, and disorders
- Psychological health issues

Currently, prevention initiatives targeting suicide, sexual violence, harassment, domestic abuse, alcohol and substance use, and psychological health issues, remain a top priority for the DOD (NDAA, 2020; DODI, 6400.09). In 2020, the DOD published a DOD Instruction entitled “DOD POLICY ON INTEGRATED PRIMARY PREVENTION OF SELF-DIRECTED HARM AND PROHIBITED ABUSE OR HARM” (DODI 6400.09; see Attachment G of the RPP, Supplemental Information) establishing and integrating policies and responsibilities to mitigate self-directed harm and prohibit abusive or harmful acts using a career-cycle perspective to promote enduring force readiness. It instructs DOD components to leverage existing capabilities, where possible, to establish a DOD-wide prevention system that facilitates data-informed actions to integrate primary prevention activities to reduce risk for self-directed harm and prohibit abusive or harmful acts. Finally, it instructs DOD components to focus prevention efforts on research-based programs, policies, and practices.

Recent research highlights the interconnected relationships between common risk and protective factors and harmful behaviors (Hawkins et al., 2016; Wilkins et al., 2018; Biglan et al., 2004; see <https://vetoviolenace.cdc.gov/apps/connecting-the-dots/node/5>), providing increasing evidence for the use of cross-cutting approaches to target shared risk and protective factors. Research demonstrates that prevention interventions focusing on shared risk and protective factors can simultaneously prevent multiple harmful behaviors and impact a broad array of outcomes (Wilkins et al., 2018; Reider, Robertson, & Sims, 2014; O’Connell et al., 2009; Bailey, 2009; Sandler et al., 2011). Some programs have found unanticipated positive effects on outcomes not specifically targeted by the intervention (Wilkins et al., 2018; Reider, Robertson, & Sims, 2014; Wolchik et al., 2002; Botvin & Kantor, 2000; Wyman et al., 2010). Furthermore, growing evidence suggests that those at increased risk can benefit the most from prevention interventions (Wilkins et al., 2018; Reider, Robertson, & Sims, 2014). Based on these findings, prevention approaches that address common risk and protective factors show promise for effectively decreasing risk for multiple harmful behaviors.

Related to this new emphasis on addressing common risk and protective factors, recent research has revealed the benefits of focusing on the promotion of well-being and prosocial behaviors (Walsh et al., 2018; Osatuke et al., 2013; Feldblum & Lipnic, 2016; National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2018; Roehling & Huang, 2017). In the military, emphasis on promotion of prosocial behaviors has emerged. The Navy describes these types of behaviors as “signature behaviors” (see Attachment G of the RPP, Supplemental Information). Signature behaviors aim to improve well-being, connectedness, trust, and resilience through reinforcement of behaviors that reflect Navy core values and Warfighting ethos, such as treating others with respect and holding oneself and others accountable for their actions, can engender an environment that supports and encourages healthy norms and communities. Unfortunately, much less is known about protective factors than about risk factors for self-directed harm and prohibited abusive or harmful acts, highlighting the need for additional research in this area.

Critical gaps in research remain and must be addressed to improve the application of cross-cutting prevention within a military context. Research is needed to identify which programs and strategies have the strongest cross-cutting impacts on short-, intermediate-, and long-term outcomes associated with prevention of deleterious outcomes. Although there is evidence for prevention effects on a broad array of behaviors for children and youth, violence prevention and psychological health (Shea & Shern, 2011; CDC, 2015) more research is needed to build a body of prevention evidence for adults and for military contexts. In addition, it is critical to take into account the unique life events, military career cycle, and organizational structure of the military. Examples include deployments, permanent changes of station (PCS), and the impact of combat, including combat-related traumatic brain injuries (TBI), psychosocial health, behaviors, relationships, and influence of teams and leaders.

Preventive intervention approaches at multiple levels of social ecology (i.e., individual, relationship, community, and society; Bronfenbrenner, 1992) are critical to having a population-level impact on harmful behaviors. Therefore, the DOD seeks comprehensive prevention approaches that address multiple levels of the social ecological model. Such approaches use multiple, synergistic strategies across social ecology to promote healthy behaviors and prevent unhealthy and unsafe behaviors, as well as to increase protective factors and reduce risk factors associated with experiencing or engaging in violent, harmful, or abusive behaviors.

There is a critical need for effective solutions for current and future Service Members and their families impacted by harmful behaviors and psychological health issues. The recent success of some prevention interventions in the general population provide promising evidence for cross-cutting prevention approaches. Therefore, this MTEC opportunity focuses on theory-based research to support program development, program efficacy/effectiveness testing (excluding program evaluation for the purposes of enhancing or managing programs), and implementation of military primary prevention approaches that have cross-cutting impacts on multiple outcomes of interest including but not limited to: suicide, sexual violence, harassment, domestic abuse,

alcohol and substance use, and psychological health issues. The primary goal is to adapt or create cross-cutting interventions that address risk and protective factors and behaviors across the social ecology in order to prevent a range of harmful behaviors in a military population and promote health and readiness.

Populations of Interest for this RPP

Applications should focus on:

- Active duty, National Guard, Reserves, Military Service Academy Service Members, and/or Reserve Officers' Training Corps
- Transitioning Service Members (i.e., Service Members preparing to enter or exit military service and Reserve/National Guard Service Members transitioning into or out of Active duty service/orders)
- Any dependents of the aforementioned

Populations not of interest for this RPP

- Retired or Veteran status personnel

3.2. Focus Areas of Interest

The MTEC mechanism allows for and encourages collaboration between the Government sponsors/stakeholders as well as between awardees to accelerate development of solutions and maximize the benefit to Service Members and their Families. Offerors should be prepared to work collaboratively with other applicants or Government sponsors and subject matter experts to ensure application of projects to a military environment. Awardees will interact with Department of Defense and Service level offices (e.g., stakeholders, customers, end-users, and/or DOD partners). Awardees should be prepared to leverage metrics and outcomes identified by stakeholders across Military Services, to avoid duplication or trying to retrofit a metrics solution for systems that do not 'talk' to each other.

Given the cross-cutting objective of this MTEC RPP, Offerors must address at least one of the following focus areas, but are strongly encouraged to consider addressing more than one focus area. Please refer to Attachment G of this RPP for Supplemental Information related to the Focus Areas.

FOCUS AREA #1 Community Based Participatory Research (CBPR) - Use CBPR/participatory action research to enhance the military community relevance of research and to develop, assess, and sustain cross-cutting prevention that is culturally grounded in the military community(-ies).

CBPR is defined as scientific inquiry conducted in a community with researchers and community members as partners (for more details on CBPR, see Attachment G of the RPP, Supplemental Information). Community-partnered approaches to research offer the potential to generate better-informed hypotheses, develop more effective interventions, and enhance the translation

of the research results into practice. Specifically involving members of local military communities in cross-cutting prevention research may improve the quality, impact, and applicability of the research to the military. Offerors are encouraged to:

- Identify cross-cutting risk and protective factors of greatest importance and relevance to military community members across multiple levels of social ecology model with a focus on community-level risk and protective factors;
- Investigate how military communities and civilian communities interact to influence the behavioral health, help-seeking behaviors, and access to services by Service Members and their families, including intimate partners;
- Collaborate with leadership (e.g., Commanders and Senior Leaders) to develop programs and implementation strategies that garner leadership buy-in and empowerment, and enhance structural, cultural and environmental relevance, and norms setting that promotes a culture of help-seeking, de-stigmatizes the receipt of behavioral health services, and enables participation in prevention programs;
- Collaborate with leadership (e.g., Senior Enlisted Advisors, Commanders, Command Triads) to develop culturally responsive programs or interventions that have positive valence, promote norms for respect, and reduce multiple forms of workplace mistreatment;
- Define the leadership behaviors required to develop, strengthen, or foster climates of mutual respect, identify contextual factors that promote or inhibit the demonstration of these behaviors;
- Identify and assess strategies to improve the community climate, environments, policies, resources and programs in order to address the community-identified priorities; and
- Identify and assess strategies to improve program utilization and access.

FOCUS AREA #2 Measurement and Assessment: Novel methodologies to efficiently identify and/or collect short-, medium-, and long-term indicators of effectiveness of cross-cutting prevention programming.

Common measurement is important across programs with diverse prevention objectives to better identify which promising programs have the best cross-cutting outcomes. Furthermore, cross-cutting prevention research is challenged by the need to potentially measure multiple outcomes, leading to multiple statistical tests and decreased study power. Development of an integrated cross-cutting measurement strategy and identification and validation of cross-cutting prevention outcome metrics can improve the science of cross-cutting prevention, while providing military-relevant measures and methods for evaluating program effectiveness.

Proposed projects should advance the measurement and methodology for cross-cutting prevention research, including but not limited to:

- Develop and test an efficient, low-burden (monetary and/or time) solution for assessing cross-cutting prevention effort effectiveness that can be seamlessly integrated into workflow/efforts (e.g., a very brief set of common data elements (CDEs)/questions,

leverage existing already collected data sources, and/or enhance existing records/data collected) and provide information to inform a feedback loop for continuous quality improvement;

- Develop and test tailored or timed interventions that might be initiated at key transitions such as when Service Members arrive at new units or deploy;
- Develop and validate streamlined CDEs for research into cross-cutting prevention, including measures at all levels of social ecology and with an emphasis on specifying military-specific risk and protective factors;
- Develop and validate new measures or measurement models for measuring impact across multiple behavioral health outcomes, e.g. development and validation of a prevention index and/or psychometric testing of novel measures and measurement models. As appropriate, the index measure(s) should leverage already collected data sources;
- Identify and validate common upstream risk and protective factors relevant to prevention of multiple behavioral outcomes; and
- Leverage existing data to develop and test analytic methods, strategies, or tools for assessing cross-cutting outcomes.

FOCUS AREA #3 Effective Primary Prevention Programming: Develop and/or adapt and test primary prevention (addressing individual, relationship, team, leader, community, and/or systems-level aspects) programming for the military context.

To advance cross-cutting prevention we must identify programs with the strongest cross-cutting impacts. This may require developing and testing new prevention programs and models that are developed with cross-cutting outcomes in mind, or alternately adapting and/or testing existing programs from one field of prevention for efficacy and effectiveness in positively impacting other key outcomes. For example, proposed studies may:

- Develop and/or adapt and test comprehensive cross-cutting prevention programs for use in the military to address factors across multiple levels of social ecology, including interdependence of factors across levels;
- Investigate appropriate and critical periods/periods of transition/time points for effective prevention program implementation;
- Pilot implementation of community models for implementing multiple strategies simultaneously or sequentially from the DODI 6400.09 & evaluate cross-cutting effectiveness;
- Develop, test, and improve interventions for use in the military that address developmental and social determinants of health (e.g., poverty; prevention of adverse childhood experiences among military children; housing, food and financial security especially during transition to civilian life);
- Develop and test workplace civility interventions that focus on the promotion of norms for mutual respect and the reduction of multiple forms of related negative behaviors (i.e., incivility, sexual harassment, and sexual assault); and

- Consider the use of sociometric research to tailor cross-cutting prevention programs to the needs of a population and/or individuals fitting certain characteristics measured via peer-nominations or self-nominations.

3.3. Additional Points of Consideration:

Offerors are expected to address or include the following points of consideration in their white papers as applicable:

- Prevention interventions and approaches that are within the military's legal and operational control;
- Measurement of cross-cutting impacts on multiple outcomes of interest including but not limited to suicide, sexual violence, harassment, domestic abuse, alcohol and substance use, and psychological health issues AND positive outcomes or signature behaviors (a minimum set of CDEs may be provided to include upon award);
- Consent to share de-identified data (but still retaining demographics such as whether the participant is a Service Member, family member, branch of service, Active Duty, Reserve component, National Guard) in order to facilitate future secondary data analyses (e.g., common data elements/metrics, pooling data sets) and consent language to facilitate passive longer-term follow-up;
- Consideration of how the proposed solution will integrate existing policies and programs;
- Discussion of potential actionable steps related to the proposed study's findings including more than just publications and dissemination of results;
- Data analysis plans, and identification/specification of a data analysis team; and
- Affirmation of written crisis procedures for staff to follow when/if participants experience distress or adverse events in conjunction with the research.

3.4. Potential Follow-on Tasks

There is potential for award of one or more follow-on tasks based on the success of any resultant Research Project Awards (subject to change depending upon Government review of work completed). Note that any potential follow on work is expected to be awarded non-competitively to resultant project awardees. Such follow-on work may include (but is not limited to) the following:

- Developing, testing and further refining prototypes and prototype methods for disseminating and implementing prototypes.

3.5. References

- Ahmed, S. M., & Palermo, A. G. S. (2010). Community engagement in research: frameworks for education and peer review. *American journal of public health*, 100(8), 1380-1387.
- Arthur, M. W., Hawkins, J. D., Brown, E. C., Briney, J. S., Oesterle, S., & Abbott, R. D. (2010). Implementation of the Communities That Care prevention system by coalitions in the Community Youth Development Study. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 38(2), 245-258.
- Bailey, J. A. (2009). Addressing common risk and protective factors can prevent a wide range of adolescent risk behaviors.

Request for Project Proposal MTEC-21-05-Cross-cutting
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

- Basile, K. C., DeGue, S., Jones, K., Freire, K., Dills, J., Smith, S. G., & Raiford, J. L. (2016). STOP SV: A technical package to prevent sexual violence.
- Biglan, A. (Ed.). (2004). *Helping adolescents at risk: Prevention of multiple problem behaviors*. Guilford Press.
- Botvin, G. J., & Kantor, L. W. (2000). Preventing alcohol and tobacco use through life skills training: theory, methods, and empirical findings. *Alcohol Research & Health*, 24(4), 250.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1992). *Ecological systems theory*. Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2019). Picture of America: Prevention. Retrieved May, 8.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2020). "The Social-Ecological Model: A Framework for Prevention." www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/publichealthissue/social-ecologicalmodel.html
- Cillessen, A. H., & Marks, P. E. (2017). Methodological choices in peer nomination research. *New directions for child and adolescent development*, 2017(157), 21-44.
- DeVoe ER, Ross AM, Paris R. (2012). Build it together and they will come: The case for community-based participatory research with military populations. *Advances in Social Work*.13(1):149-165.
- DOD Instruction 6400.09, "DOD Policy on Integrated Primary Prevention of Self-Directed Harm and Prohibited Abuse or Harm," September 11, 2020.
- Faridi Z, Grunbaum JA, Gray BS, Franks A, Simoes E. (2007). Community-based participatory research: necessary next steps. *Preventing chronic disease*. 4(3).
- Feldblum, C. R., & Lipnic, V. A. (2016). *Select Task Force on the Study of Harassment in the Workplace*. Washington, DC: U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.
- Glass, T. A., & McAtee, M. J. (2006). Behavioral science at the crossroads in public health: extending horizons, envisioning the future. *Social science & medicine*, 62(7), 1650-1671.
- Hawe, P. (2017). The contribution of social ecological thinking to community psychology: Origins, practice, and research.
- Hawkins, J. D., Jenson, J. M., Catalano, R., Fraser, M. W., Botvin, G. J., Shapiro, V., ... & Rotheram-Borus, M. J. (2016). Unleashing the power of prevention. *American Journal of Medical Research*, 3(1), 39.
- Haynes EN. (2015). Community-based participatory research: An overview for application in Department of Defense/Veterans Affairs research. *Airborne hazards related to deployment*. 239-244.
- Hernandez LM, Rosenstock L, Gebbie K. (2003). *Who will keep the public healthy?: educating public health professionals for the 21st century*. National Academies Press.
- Institute of Medicine. *Reducing Risks for Mental Disorders: Frontiers for Preventive Intervention Research*. In: Mrazek PJ, Haggerty RJ, editors. Committee on Prevention of Mental Disorders, Division of Biobehavioral Sciences and Mental Disorders. Washington, DC: National Academy Press; 1994.
- Israel BA, Schulz AJ, Parker EA, Becker AB. (1998). Review of community-based research: assessing partnership approaches to improve public health. *Annual review of public health*. 19(1):173-202.

Request for Project Proposal MTEC-21-05-Cross-cutting
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

- Jagosh, J., Macaulay, A. C., Pluye, P., Salsberg, J., Bush, P. L., Henderson, J. I. M., ... & Seifer, S. D. (2012). Uncovering the benefits of participatory research: implications of a realist review for health research and practice. *The Milbank Quarterly*, *90*(2), 311-346.
- Kelly, J. G. (1966). Ecological constraints on mental health services. *American Psychologist*, *21*(6), 535.
- Kelly, J. G. (1969). Towards an ecological conception of preventive interventions.
- Minkler M, Wallerstein N. (2011). Community-based participatory research for health: From process to outcomes. John Wiley & Sons.
- National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine 2019. Fostering Healthy Mental, Emotional, and Behavioral Development in Children and Youth: A National Agenda. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. <https://doi.org/10.17226/25201>.
- National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020
- O'Connell, M. E., Boat, T., & Warner, K. E. (2009). *Preventing mental, emotional, and behavioral disorders among young people: Progress and possibilities* (Vol. 7). Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Osatuke, K., Leiter, M., Belton, L., Dyrenforth, S., and Ramsel, D. (2013). Civility, Respect, and Engagement in the Workplace (CREW): Nationwide organizational development intervention at the Department of Veterans Affairs. *Journal of Management Policies and Practices* *1*(2), 25-34.
- Reider, E. E., Robertson, E. B., & Sims, B. E. (2014). Does early intervention prevent health-risking sexual behaviors related to HIV/AIDS?. *Prevention Science*, *15*(1), 1-5.
- Robertson, E. B., Sims, B. E., & Reider, E. E. (2016). Drug abuse prevention through early childhood intervention. *The handbook of drugs and society*, 525-554.
- Roehling, M. V., & Huang, J. (2017). Sexual harassment training effectiveness: An interdisciplinary review and call for research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *39*, 134–150.
- Sandler, I. N., Schoenfelder, E. N., Wolchik, S. A., & MacKinnon, D. P. (2011). Long-term impact of prevention programs to promote effective parenting: Lasting effects but uncertain processes. *Annual review of psychology*, *62*, 299-329.
- Shea, P., & Shern, D. (2011). Primary prevention in behavioral health: Investing in our nation's future. Alexandria: National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors (NASMHPD).
- Stone, D. M., Holland, K. M., Bartholow, B. N., Crosby, A. E., Davis, S. P., & Wilkins, N. (2017). Preventing suicide: A technical package of policy, programs, and practice.
- Syme SL, Smedley BD. (2000). Promoting health: Intervention strategies from social and behavioral research. National Academies Press.
- Trickett, E. J., Beehler, S., Deutsch, C., Green, L. W., Hawe, P., McLeroy, K., ... & Trimble, J. E. (2011). Advancing the science of community-level interventions. *American journal of public health*, *101*(8), 1410-1419.
- Viswanathan M, Ammerman A, Eng E, et al. Community-based participatory research: assessing the evidence. Evidence report/technology assessment. 2004;99:1-8.

- U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2015). CDC Injury Center: Research Priorities. <https://www.cdc.gov/injury/pdfs/researchpriorities/cdc-injury-research-priorities.pdf>. Accessed June 5, 2020.
- Viswanathan, M., Ammerman, A., Eng, E., Garlehner, G., Lohr, K. N., Griffith, D., ... & Webb, L. (2004). Community-based participatory research: Assessing the evidence: Summary. In *AHRQ evidence report summaries*. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US).
- Wallerstein, N. B., & Duran, B. (2006). Using community-based participatory research to address health disparities. *Health promotion practice*, 7(3), 312-323.
- Walsh, B.M., Lee, J., Jensen, J.M., McGonagle, A.K., & Samnani, A. (2018). Positive leader behaviors and workplace incivility: The mediating role of perceived norms for respect. *Journal of Business Psychology* (33): 495-508.
- Wilkins, N., Myers, M. L., Kuehl, M. T., Bauman, M. A., & Hertz, M. M. (2018). Connecting the dots: state health department approaches to addressing shared risk and protective factors across multiple forms of violence. *Journal of public health management and practice: JPHMP*, 24(Suppl 1 INJURY AND VIOLENCE PREVENTION), S32.
- Wolchik, S. A., Sandler, I. N., Millsap, R. E., Plummer, B. A., Greene, S. M., Anderson, E. R., ... & Haine, R. A. (2002). Six-year follow-up of preventive interventions for children of divorce: A randomized controlled trial. *Jama*, 288(15), 1874-1881.
- Wyman, P. A., Brown, C. H., LoMurray, M., Schmeelk-Cone, K., Petrova, M., Yu, Q., ... & Wang, W. (2010). An outcome evaluation of the Sources of Strength suicide prevention program delivered by adolescent peer leaders in high schools. *American journal of public health*, 100(9), 1653-1661.
- Wyman, P. A. (2014). Developmental approach to prevent adolescent suicides: Research pathways to effective upstream preventive interventions. *American journal of preventive medicine*, 47(3), S251-S256.

3.6. Restrictions on Animal and Human Subjects

White Papers and proposals must comply with restrictions and reporting requirements for the use of animal and human subjects, to include research involving the secondary use of human biospecimens and/or human data. The Awardee shall ensure local Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) and Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals, continuing review (in the intervals specified by the local IACUC and IRB, but at a minimum, annually), and approval by the U.S. Army Medical Research and Development Command Animal Care and Use and Review Office (ACURO) and the USAMRDC Human Research Protections Office (HRPO). Offerors shall include IACUC, ACURO, IRB and HRPO review and approval in the SOW/Milestones Table submitted with the Stage 2 full proposal (if invited), as applicable.

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

3.7. Guidance related to DOD-affiliated personnel for research

Compensation to DOD-affiliated personnel for participation:

Please note that compensation to DOD-affiliated personnel for participation in research while on duty is prohibited with some exceptions. For more details, see Department of Defense Instruction 3216.02, Protection of Human Subjects and Adherence to Ethical Standards in DOD-Conducted and 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>

Guidance for research studies targeting DOD personnel for survey research:

Protocols that target DOD personnel for research in which the primary data collection tool is a survey require additional administrative review per DODI 1100.13. Investigators will need to coordinate with the USAMRDC, Human Research Protection Office (HRPO), to identify current submission requirements.

Guidance for research studies targeting military families and children:

- (1) In accordance with Department of Defense Instruction (DODI) 1402.5 and Army Directive 2014-23, Child Care National Agency Check and Inquiries (CNACI) background investigations are required for all individuals who have regular contact with military dependents under 18 years of age. All individuals who regularly interact with children under 18 years of age in Army sponsored and sanctioned programs are required to undergo specific initial background checks and periodic re-verifications. Investigators who propose work involving contact with military dependents under 18 years of age should plan for the additional time and funds required for such investigations.
- (2) Per Department of Defense Education Activity (DODEA) Administrative Instruction 2071.3, DODEA approval is required for research studies involving DODEA school personnel, school facilities, students, sponsors, and/or data. Investigators proposing to conduct any research activities involving DODEA schools should plan for the additional time (~3-6 months) and effort required to obtain approval from DODEA to conduct such activities. Procedures and requirements for the review and approval of a research study request can be found at <http://www.dodea.edu/datacenter/research/requests.cfm>.
- (3) Research studies that address Army Family Advocacy Program (FAP) concerns will need to be coordinated with the Family Advocacy Research Subcommittee (FARS) per Army Regulation 608-18.

Guidance for research studies involving US Army Special Operations Command (USASOC):

Per USASOC policy 24-18, studies involving USASOC Soldiers as human subjects require additional review by the USASOC Research Advisory Committee (RAC) and Human Subjects Research Board (HSRB).

4 White Paper Preparation

4.1. General Instructions

White Papers should be submitted by the date and time specified on the cover page using BIDS: <https://ati2.acqcenter.com/ATI2/Portal.nsf/Start?ReadForm>. Include the MTEC Solicitation Number (**MTEC-21-05-Cross-cutting**) on each white paper submitted. See RPP Attachment H for further information regarding BIDS registration and submission.

Do not submit any classified information in the White Paper or proposal submission.

The White Paper format provided in this MTEC RPP is mandatory and shall reference this RPP number (**MTEC-21-05-Cross-cutting**). Note that Cost Proposals are only required for Stage 2 and are not part of the initial White Paper submission. Offerors are encouraged to contact the Points-of-Contact (POCs) identified herein up until the White Paper submission date/time to clarify requirements.

All eligible Offerors may submit White Papers 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 DOD Agreements Officer, is legally authorized to contractually bind MTEC into any resultant awards.

4.2. Instructions for the Preparation & Submission of the Stage 1 White Paper

Offerors submitting White Papers in response to this RPP should prepare all documents in accordance with the following instructions:

Offerors should 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 must 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 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. If the Offeror receives errors and fails to upload the full submission prior to the submission deadline, the submission may not be accepted. It is the Offeror's responsibility to ensure a timely and complete submission.**

Required Submission Documents (1): Submitted via BIDS

- **White Paper: One PDF document 5MB or lower.**

The White Paper page limit is:

- If the White Paper addresses only **ONE focus area**, then it is limited to **five pages plus a cover page (6 pages total)**.
- If the White Paper addresses **two focus areas**, then it is limited to **seven pages plus a cover page (8 pages total)**.
- If the White Paper addresses all **three focus areas**, then it is limited to **nine pages plus a cover page (10 pages total)**.

The White Paper must be in 11 point (or larger) type font, single-spaced, single-sided, on 8.5 inches x 11 inches paper. Smaller font may be used in figures and tables, but must be clearly legible. Margins on all sides (top, bottom, left, and right) should be at least 1 inch. The MTEC staff will share white papers with various potential public and private sector sponsors. ***Please do not include confidential or proprietary information.*** White Papers exceeding the page limits specified above may not be accepted.

4.3. Stage 2 Full Proposal (for Only Those Offerors Recommended for Stage 2)

MTEC members who are invited to participate in Stage 2 will be required to submit the following information.

Required Submission Documents (8): Submit via BIDS (5MB or lower)

- **Technical Proposal as one word or PDF document.**
- **Statement of Work (SOW)/Milestone Payment Schedule (MPS) as one Word (.docx or .doc)**
- **Section I: Cost Proposal Narrative as one Word or PDF document.**
- **Section II: Cost Proposal Formats as one Excel or PDF document.**
- **Royalty or Additional Research Project Award Assessment as one signed Word or PDF document.**
- **Warranties and Representations for all proposals as one Word or PDF document.**
- **Current and Pending Support as one Word or PDF document.**
- **Data Rights as one signed Word or PDF document.**

The following information provides additional information related to each of the required documents for the full proposal submission. 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. Each document will be uploaded to BIDS separately (see Attachment H of RPP for BIDS instructions).

- **Technical Proposal:** The Technical Proposal format provided in the MTEC PPG is mandatory. Proposals shall reference this RPP number (MTEC-21-05-Cross-cutting). If your proposal addresses more than one focus area, please ensure that your technical

Request for Project Proposal MTEC-21-05-Cross-cutting
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

proposal clearly delineates your approach separated by focus area. Refer to section 6.2 of the PPG for instruction regarding the preparation of the Technical Proposal (also referred to as Volume 1).

- **Statement of Work (SOW)/Milestone Payment Schedule (MPS) (template provided in Attachment D):** The Offeror is required to provide a detailed SOW/Milestone Payment Schedule using the format provided herein (Attachment D). 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. [Note: Although the SOW/MPS is already included as Appendix B of the Technical Proposal (Volume 1), it must be uploaded into the BIDS system again as a separate file in either the *.docx or *.doc format.]
- **Cost Proposal:** The Cost Proposal should clearly delineate your costs separated by focus area (if applicable), where possible. Each cost proposal 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. The Cost Proposal shall be submitted in two separate sections Section I: Cost Proposal Narrative (see Attachment 1 of the PPG) is required. Separately, Section II: Cost Proposal Formats. Refer to section 7 of the PPG for instruction regarding the preparation of the Cost Proposal (also referred to as Volume 2).] **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.
- **Warranties and Representations (template provided in Attachment E):** one Word (.docx or .doc) or PDF file that contains all Warranties and Representations is required for each proposal. Refer to Attachment E for the template.
- **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. [Note: As per section 7.1 of the PPG, you must indicate your choice of either the MTEC Additional Research Project Award Assessment Fee or the Royalty Payment Agreement as part of Section I of the Cost Proposal (Cost Proposal Narrative). For more information regarding the Royalty Payment Agreement or Additional Research Project Award Assessment, refer to Section 8.8 of the PPG.]
- **Current and Pending Support (template provided in Attachment F):** For all current and pending research support (to include Government and non-government), include the

Request for Project Proposal MTEC-21-05-Cross-cutting
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

award number and title, funding agency and requiring activity's names, period of performance (dates of funding), level of funding (total direct costs only), role and level of effort, 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 Assertions (template provided in Attachment C)**
 - 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 would 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.
 - If this is not the intent, then you should discuss any restricted data rights associated with any proposed deliverables. If applicable, complete the table within the Attachment for any items to be furnished to the Government with restrictions. An example is provided.
 - Note: This document is no longer required as part of the Technical Proposal (Volume 1) and will be uploaded as a separate attachment into the BIDS system.

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. White Paper and Full Proposal Preparation Costs

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

4.5. 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.

4.6. Telecommunications and Video Surveillance

Per requirements from the Acting Principal Director of Defense Pricing and Contracting dated 13 August 2020, the provision at FAR 52.204-24, "Representation Regarding Certain Telecommunications and Video Surveillance Services or Equipment" is incorporated in this solicitation. If selected for award, the Offeror(s) must complete and provide the representation as required by the provision to the CM.

5 Selection

5.1. Preliminary Screening

The CM will conduct a preliminary screening of submitted White Papers to ensure compliance with the RPP requirements. As part of the preliminary screening process, White Papers 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 information or eliminate proposals that do not meet these requirements from further consideration. One of the primary reasons for non-compliance or elimination during the initial screening is the lack of significant nontraditional defense contractor participation, nonprofit research institution participation, or cost share (see Attachment B). Proposal Compliance with the statutory requirements regarding the appropriate use of Other Transaction Authority (as detailed within Attachment B) will be determination based upon the ratings 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 White Paper has at least one Nontraditional Defense Contractor or Nonprofit Research Institute 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 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 White Paper 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

5.2. White Paper (Stage 1) Evaluation:

The CM will distribute all White Papers that pass the preliminary screening (described above) to the Government for evaluation. The Government will evaluate White Papers submitted under this RPP using the following equally important criteria:

1. Programmatic Relevance
2. Technical Feasibility
3. Project Team

Factor 1 – Programmatic Relevance: The Offeror’s white paper will be assessed for its alignment of the proposed prototype with the RPP’s focus area(s) of interest described in Section 3. The following information will be considered as part of this factor:

- The Problem: Offeror shall demonstrate an understanding of the problem space described in the RPP.
- Alignment to RPP: Whether the proposed work supports the objectives of the sponsoring Government Office.
- Military Impact: How well the research will address the cross-cutting prevention issues relevant to Service Members and/or their dependents.

Factor 2 – Technical Feasibility: The Offeror’s white paper will be assessed for relevancy, thoroughness, and completeness of the proposed approach (e.g., the technical merit). The following information will be considered as part of this factor:

- a) Feasibility: Feasibility of the proposed solution and its alignment with the RPP’s topic area, including access to human subject population if applicable;
- b) Study Design: The Offeror’s study design to include the strategies and concepts for research design as they relate to the objectives; and
- c) Budget: The Offeror’s estimated budget.

Factor 3 – Project Team: The Offeror’s white paper will be assessed for how the background and expertise of the personnel and organizations are appropriate to execute the proposed research. The following information will be considered as part of this factor:

- a) Strength of Team: Strength of the organization/team, considering the qualifications of the personnel, facilities, equipment, supplies, services, and subcontractors, and project management plan proposed to complete the work.
- b) Financial Stability: How well the funding strategy described will advance the technology to the next level of development and/or delivery to the military or civilian market.
- c) Schedule: The degree to which the Offeror demonstrates a realistic, achievable performance schedule with a plan to address potential risks that could delay or otherwise impact performance.

Table 2 explains the adjectival merit ratings that will be used for the evaluation factors.

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.

Upon review and evaluation of the White Papers, Offerors who are favorably evaluated will be invited to participate in Stage 2 for further consideration. Offerors whose White Papers were not favorably evaluated will be provided feedback on the evaluation. Note that Offerors should receive an overall rating of at least “Acceptable” or higher in order to be considered for Stage 2; however, the Government reserves the right to make final evaluation decisions based upon programmatic relevancy and overall best value solutions determined to be in the Government’s best interest.

The RPP review and award process may involve the use of contractor subject-matter-experts serving as nongovernmental advisors. All members of the technical evaluation panel, to include contractor SMEs, will agree to and sign a Federal Employee Participation Agreement or a Nondisclosure/Nonuse Agreement, as appropriate, to protect information contained in the RPP as outlined in Section 2.5.

5.3. Full Proposal (Stage 2) Evaluation (for Only Those Offerors Recommended for Stage 2)

To the maximum extent practicable the evaluation criteria found here are anticipated for all (Stage 2) Full Proposal submissions (subject to change).

Request for Project Proposal MTEC-21-05-Cross-cutting
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

The CM will conduct a preliminary screening of received proposals to ensure compliance with the Stage 2 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 information or eliminate proposals that do not meet these requirements from further consideration.

Full proposals that pass the preliminary compliance screening will be evaluated by the Government technical evaluation panel who will make recommendations to a Source Selection Authority.

To ensure both scientific excellence and programmatic relevance, the USAMRDC may use a two-tier review process. The first tier is peer review, the evaluation of applications against established criteria to determine technical merit. The second tier is programmatic review, a comparison-based process in which applications with high scientific and technical merit are further evaluated for programmatic relevance.

Evaluation 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 against the technical evaluation factors detailed below and assign adjectival ratings to the non-cost/price factor(s) consistent with those defined in Table 1 (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 CM will evaluate the cost proposals for those Offerors recommended for award, as detailed below, for cost reasonableness.

Evaluation Factors

1. Technical Approach and Research Strategy
2. Potential for Transition/Implementation
3. Cost/Price

Technical Approach and Potential for Transition/Implementation will be evaluated with equal importance; however, when combined are significantly more important than cost/price.

Factor 1 – Technical Approach and Research Strategy: The Offeror's full proposal will be assessed for:

- a) How well the specific aims and proposed methodology support the technical objectives and the development of the prototype.
- b) An approach which effectively demonstrates the Offeror's understanding of the overall requirement and inclusion of complete and clear processes to execute the effort.

Request for Project Proposal MTEC-21-05-Cross-cutting
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

- c) How well the submission defines a prototype that meets the requirements set forth in this RPP. Whether the prototype is based on promising preliminary data, sound scientific rationale, and demonstrated proof-of-concept.

Factor 2 - Potential for Transition/Implementation: The Offeror’s full proposal will be assessed for:

- a) How well the Offeror demonstrates the potential for the prototype to integrate into current or future cross-cutting prevention initiatives.
- b) How well the Offeror demonstrates potential advancement into the next phase of desired research, development, testing, and/or implementation.
- c) An achievable approach to regulatory approval (if applicable).

Factor 3 – Cost Reasonableness: Assessment of the cost of the project to determine: i) whether the project cost is within the available funding limits, and ii) the ability and/or likelihood of the offeror to successfully execute the proposed project within the financial resources proposed. The proposed cost will be based on the following ratings: Sufficient, Insufficient or Excessive. See the definitions of these ratings in Table 2 below.

With the exception of “Cost Reasonableness,” the Stage 2 evaluation factors will be rated based upon the adjectival merit ratings detailed in Table 2. See Table 3 for the definitions of the “Cost Reasonableness” factor ratings.

Table 2 - “Cost Reasonableness” Factor Ratings Definitions	
RATING	DESCRIPTION
SUFFICIENT	The estimate is within the available funding limits and considered appropriate to successfully complete the proposed project
INSUFFICIENT	The estimate is lower than what is considered appropriate to successfully complete the proposed project.
EXCESSIVE	The estimate is higher than what is considered appropriate to successfully complete the proposed project and may be outside of the available funding limits.

Please also refer to Section 5.4 for definitions of general terms used in technical evaluations.

Best Value

The Government will conduct the source selection based on the evaluation criteria and ratings contained within this RPP. The overall award decision will be based upon a Best Value determination and the final award selection(s) will be made to the most advantageous offer(s) by considering and comparing factors in addition to cost or price. Based on the results of the Stage 2 Technical Evaluation, the Government reserves the right to negotiate and request changes to any or all

parts of the proposal to include the SOW. Offerors will have the opportunity to concur with the requested changes and revise cost proposals as necessary.

5.4. Definitions 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 White Paper, the Government and the MTEC CM will not discuss evaluation/status until the source selection process is complete.

7 Acronyms/Abbreviations

ACURO	Animal Care and Use Review Office, USAMRDC
ATI	Advanced Technology International
BRFSS	Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System
CAS	Cost accounting standards
CBPR	Community Based Participatory Research

Request for Project Proposal MTEC-21-05-Cross-cutting
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

CDEs	Common data elements
CDMRP	Congressionally Directed Medical Research Program
CM	Consortium Manager
CMA	Consortium Member Agreement
C-SSRS	Columbia-Suicide Severity Rating Scale
DEOCS	Defense Organizational Climate Survey
DOD	Department of Defense
DODSER	DOD Suicide Event Report
DUNS	Data Universal Numbering System
F&A	Facilities and Administrative Costs
FAQ	Frequently Asked Questions
FDA	Food and Drug Administration
FOC	Full Operating Capability
FOIA	Freedom of Information Act
FY	Fiscal Year
G&A	General and Administrative Expenses
HCUP	Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project
HRPO	Human Research Protection Office
IACUC	Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee
IP	Intellectual Property (e.g., patents, copyrights, licensing, etc.)
IRB	Institutional Review Board
IR&D	Independent Research and Development
JPC-5	Joint Program Committee-5
KRL	Knowledge readiness level
M	Million
MOMRP	Military Operational Medicine Research Program
MPS	Milestone Payment Schedule
MSCR	Military Suicide Research Consortium
MTEC	Medical Technology Enterprise Consortium
NDA	Nondisclosure Agreement
NDC	Nontraditional Defense Contractor
NRI	Nonprofit Research Institution
NSDUH	National Survey on Drug Use and Health
NVDRS	National Violent Death Reporting System
NVSS	National Vital Statistics System
OCI	Organizational Conflict of Interest
ODC	Other Direct Costs
OTA	Other Transaction Agreement
PAR	Participatory Action Research
PCS	Permanent changes of station
PMA	Pre-market Approval
POC	Point-of-Contact

Request for Project Proposal MTEC-21-05-Cross-cutting
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

POP	Period of Performance
PPG	Proposal Preparation Guide
Q&A	Questions and Answers
ROM	Rough Order of Magnitude
RPP	Request for Project Proposals
RSSC	Research, Surveys, and Statistics Center
SEM	Social-ecological model
SOW	Statement of Work
TBI	Traumatic brain injuries
TRL	Technology readiness level
USAMRDC	U.S. Army Medical Research and Development Command
USG	U.S. Government
WGR	Workplace and Gender Relations Surveys

8 White Paper Template

See the following page for the mandatory White Paper Template.

Cover Page (1 page)

Title of White Paper

Focus Area

- Indicate which focus area this white paper is responding to [check **all that apply**]:
 - Focus Area #1 – Community Based Participatory Research (CBPR)
 - Focus Area #2 – Measurement and Assessment
 - Focus Area #3 – Effective Primary Prevention Programming

Principal Investigator and Institution

Statement that “This White Paper is submitted pursuant to the RPP MTEC-21-05-Cross-cutting”

Dates of submission and signature of official authorized to obligate the institution contractually

Nontraditional Defense Contractor or Nonprofit Research Institution % - (See Attachment B)

Willingness to allow MTEC Officers access to your White Paper for the purposes of engaging in outreach activities with private sector entities: Indicate YES or NO

[As part of MTEC’s mission to incorporate philanthropic donations, MTEC frequently makes contact with private sector entities (e.g., foundations, organizations, individuals) that award grants or otherwise co-fund research, and/or operate in research areas that are aligned with those of MTEC. Additional private entities may be interested in reviewing certain White Papers within their program areas, allowing opportunities to attract supplemental funding sources. Please indicate your willingness to allow MTEC access to your White Paper for the purposes of engaging in outreach activities with these private sector entities. MTEC staff has signed Nondisclosure Agreements (NDAs) and Organizational Conflict of Interest statements.]

White Paper (5 pages)

Title: [Insert descriptive title of project]

Principal Investigator: [Insert name, organization, email address, phone number]

Approach: [Briefly describe your approach to solving the problem. Include relevant background/preliminary data about your approach. Describe the existing or proposed solution. Indicate the technology or knowledge readiness level (TRL/KRL) at the time of submission and at end of the PoP. Full definitions of TRLs can be found [here](#). More information regarding KRLs can

be found [here](#). Note: References are included within the page limit. There is no required format for the inclusion of references.]

Objectives: [Specify the objectives of the proposed effort.]

Technical Strategy: [Outline the proposed methodology **by focus area if responding to more than one** in sufficient detail to show a clear course of action that addresses the technical requirements described in this RPP.]

Anticipated Outcomes: [Provide a description of the anticipated outcomes from the proposed work. List milestones and deliverables from the proposed work. Also provide a high-level summary of potential follow-on tasks beyond the initial PoP, if applicable.]

Technical Maturity and Transition/Implementation Strategy: [Provide a brief description and justification of the maturity of the proposed solution, anticipated regulatory pathway (if applicable) and transition/implementation plans. Include information about Intellectual Property/Data Rights Assertions.]

Schedule: [Provide an overview of the timing of initiation, duration, and completion of project activities over the course of the PoP.]

Personnel: [Briefly state the qualifications of the Principal Investigator, key personnel, and organizations that will perform the SOW.]

Non-traditional defense contract, nonprofit research institution, or 1/3 cost sharing: [Describe the plan to include significant participation of a non-traditional defense contractor, nonprofit research institution, or the ability to meet 1/3 cost sharing requirement.]

Period of Performance: [Indicate the total proposed PoP.]

Cost Share: [It is anticipated that Government funds would provide incentive for industry funding to join the project. While not a requirement, Offerors are **strongly encouraged** to discuss the ability to bring leveraged funding/cost share to complete the project goals.]

Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) Pricing: [The Offeror must provide an estimate based on the technical approach proposed in the White Paper. The following ROM pricing shall be included in the White Paper. **(NOTE: If invited to Stage 2, it is preferred that the total cost to the Government proposed in the ROM not substantially deviate from the proposed cost presented in the Stage 2 full proposal (unless otherwise directed by the Government) as this may result in an unacceptable rating.) Use the example table format and template below to provide the ROM pricing.** The labor, travel, material costs, other direct costs, and indirect costs, information should be entered for Offeror (project prime) only. Subcontractors and/or consultants should be

Request for Project Proposal MTEC-21-05-Cross-cutting
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

included only in the “Subcontractor” section of the table. If selected for award, a full cost proposal will be requested.

Labor	<i>\$200,000.00</i>
Subcontractors	<i>\$100,000.00</i>
Consultants	<i>\$20,000.00</i>
Material/Equipment	<i>\$150,000.00</i>
Other Direct Costs	<i>00</i>
Travel	<i>0,000.00</i>
Indirect costs	<i>\$96,400.00</i>
Total	<i>\$578,400.00</i>
Fee (Not applicable if cost share is proposed)	<i>\$0.00</i>
Total Cost (plus Fee)	<i>\$578,400.00</i>
Cost Share (if cost share is proposed then fee is unallowable)	<i>\$580,000.00</i>
Total Project Cost	<i>\$1,158,400.00</i>

***Offerors are reminded to refer to the Selection Criteria under Section 5 of the RPP to ensure that all required information is provided.**

Attachment A – Cost Share

Cost Sharing includes any costs a reasonable person would incur to carry out (necessary to) proposed projects' statements of work (SOW) not directly paid for by the Government. There are two types of cost sharing: Cash Contribution and In-Kind Contribution. If a proposal includes cost share then it cannot include fee. Cost Share may be proposed only on cost type agreements. Prior Independent Research and Development 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.

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 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. Prior IR&D funds will not be considered as part of the Offeror's cash.

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.

Attachment B – Statutory Requirements for the Appropriate Use of Other Transaction Authority

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. 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.

Significant Extent Requirements

All Offerors shall submit Warranties and Representations (See Attachment E) specifying the critical technologies being offered and/or the **significant extent** of participation of the nontraditional defense contractor and/or nonprofit research institution. The significance of the nontraditional defense contractor's and/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

Conditions for use of Prototype OT Authority

Proposals that do not include one of the following will not be eligible for award:

- (A) At least one nontraditional defense contractor or nonprofit research institution participating to a significant extent in the prototype project; or
- (B) 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; or
- (C) 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.

This requirement is a statutory element of the Other Transaction Authority and will be regarded as a pass/fail criterion during the Compliance Screening in order to ensure compliance with 10 U.S.C. §2371b.

Attachment C – Intellectual Property and Data Rights

For Information Only - Stage 2 Requirement

Definitions

- **Intellectual Property (IP) Rights** for MTEC Research Project Awards will be defined in the terms of an awardee’s Base Agreement, unless specifically negotiated at the RPA level. MTEC Base Agreements are issued by the MTEC CM to MTEC members receiving Research Project Awards. Base Agreements include the applicable flow down terms and conditions from the Government’s Other Transaction Agreement with MTEC, including the IP terms and conditions.
- **Data Rights:** It is anticipated that anything delivered under a Research Project Award would be delivered to the Government with **Government with Government purpose data rights or unlimited data rights unless otherwise asserted in the proposal and agreed to by the Government**. If this is not the intent, **then the White Paper should discuss data rights associated with each item**, and possible approaches for the Government to gain unlimited data rights as referenced in the Base Agreement. Rights in technical data in each Research Project Award shall be determined in accordance with the provisions of MTEC Base Agreement.

Directions to the Offeror

If applicable, complete the below table for any items to be furnished to the Government with restrictions. An example is provided. If the Offeror does not assert data rights on any items, a negative response is required by checking the applicable box below.

Failure to complete this attachment in its entirety (including a failure to provide the required signature) may result in removal from the competition and the proposal determined to be ineligible for award

If the Offeror intends to provide technical data or computer software which existed prior to or was produced outside of the proposed effort, to which the Offeror wishes to maintain additional rights, these rights should be asserted through the completion of the table below.

Note that this assertion is subject to negotiation prior to award.

If Offeror WILL be asserting data rights for the proposed effort, check this box and complete the table below, adding rows as necessary.

Request for Project Proposal MTEC-21-05-Cross-cutting
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

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 Description Data	Previously developed exclusively at private expense	Limited	Organization XYZ	Milestone 2
Technical Description Data	Previously developed with mixed funding	Government Purpose Rights	Organization XYZ	Milestone 2

If the Offeror will NOT be asserting data rights for the proposed effort, check this box.

Signature of responsible party for the proposing Prime Offeror

DATE

Attachment D – Statement of Work Template

For Information Only - Stage 2 Requirement

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.

Proposal Number:

Organization:

Title:

ACURO and/or HRPO approval needed:

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. 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.

Request for Project Proposal MTEC-21-05-Cross-cutting
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

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 Bimonthly Reports (submitted every other month) which include both Technical Status and Business Status Reports (due the 25th of the respective month), Final Technical Report, and Final Business Status Report. Reports shall have no funding associated with them.

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

Request for Project Proposal MTEC-21-05-Cross-cutting
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

2	N/A	Bimonthly Report 1 (November - 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	3/14/2020	\$210,757	\$187,457	\$398,214
6	N/A	Bimonthly Reports 2 (January - February, Technical and Business Reports)	3/25/2020	\$ -		\$ -
7	4	Toxicity Studies	4/1/2020	\$63,227		\$63,227
8	5	FDA authorization trial	4/1/2020	\$84,303		\$84,303
9	6	Research staff trained	4/15/2020	\$ -		\$ -
10	7	Data Management system completed	4/30/2020	\$ -		\$ -
11	8	1 st subject screened, randomized and enrolled in study	5/15/2020	\$150,000	\$187,457	\$337,457
12	N/A	Bimonthly Report 3 (March - April, Technical and Business Reports)	5/25/2020	\$ -		\$ -
13	9	Completion of dip molding apparatus	6/1/2020	\$157,829	\$187,457	\$ 345,286
14	10	Assess potential toxicology	6/1/2020	\$157,829		\$157,829
15	11	Complete 50% patient enrollment	6/15/2020	\$350,000	\$187,457	\$537,457
16	12	Electronic Report Forms Developed	6/15/2020	\$315,658	\$187,457	\$503,115
17	13	Complete 75% patient enrollment	7/1/2020	\$157,829	\$93,728	\$251,55

Request for Project Proposal MTEC-21-05-Cross-cutting
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

18	N/A	Bimonthly Report 4 (May - June, Technical and Business Reports)	7/25/2020	\$ -		\$ -
19	14	Complete 100% patient enrollment	8/1/2020	\$157,829	\$93,728	\$251,557
20	15	Report results from data analysis	8/5/2020	\$157,829		\$157,829
21	N/A	Final Reports (<u>Prior to the POP End</u>)	8/31/2020	\$ -		\$ -
			Total	\$2,025,240	\$1,124,741	\$3,149,981

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.
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 Research Project Award.
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.
8. Allow at least 3 to 4 months for ACURO regulatory review and approval processes for animal studies.
9. Allow at least 2 to 3 months for HRPO regulatory review and approval processes.

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

Reporting

Bimonthly Reports – The MTEC research project awardee shall prepare a Bimonthly 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)

Request for Project Proposal MTEC-21-05-Cross-cutting
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

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 E – Warranties and Representations Template

For Information Only - Stage 2 Requirement

Section 815 of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2018, authorizes Department of Defense organizations to carry out prototype projects that are directly relevant to enhancing the mission effectiveness of military personnel and the supporting platforms, systems, components, or materials proposed to be acquired or developed by the Department of Defense, or to improvement of platforms, systems, components, or materials in use by the armed forces. The law also requires at least one of the following:

(A) There is at least one nontraditional defense contractor or nonprofit research institution participating to a significant extent in the prototype project.

(B) 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.

(C) 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.

A. Prime Contractor: The prime contractor must complete the following table.

1. Legal Name:		2. DUNS #:	
3. Point of Contact: Name, Title, Phone #, Email			
4. Prime Contractor is a nontraditional (Y/N)?			
5. Prime Contractor is a nonprofit research institution (Y/N)?			
6. Prime Contractor will provide at least one third of the total cost of the prototype project out of funds provided by sources other than the Federal Government (Y/N)?			
7. Prime Contractor is a small business (Y/N)?			

If the prime contractor has answered “Y” to question 4, 5, or 6, skip Section B and proceed to Section C.

B. Subcontractor(s)/Vendor(s): If the prime contractor is a **traditional** defense contractor and proposes the use of one or more nontraditional defense contractors or nonprofit research institutions, the following information is required **for each** participating nontraditional defense contractor or nonprofit research institution.

8. Legal Name:		9. DUNS #:	
10. Dollar Value to be Awarded to Subcontractor:			
11. Point of Contact: (Name, Title, Phone #, Email)		12. Task/Phase:	
13. Subcontractor/Vendor is a nontraditional (Y/N)?			
14. Subcontractor/Vendor is a nonprofit research institution (Y/N)?			
15. Subcontractor/Vendor is a small business (Y/N)?			
16. Significant Contribution:			

Request for Project Proposal MTEC-21-05-Cross-cutting
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

<input type="checkbox"/>	A - The significant contribution involves developing, demonstrating or providing a key technology. <i>Please describe what the key technology is; why it is key to the medical technology community, and what makes it key.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	B - The significant contribution involves developing, demonstrating or providing a new technology that is not readily available. <i>Please describe what the new part or material is and why it is not readily available.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	C - The significant contribution involves use of skilled personnel (such as modeling & simulation experience, medical technology design experience, etc.), facilities and/or equipment that are within the capabilities of the designated nontraditional and required to successfully complete the program. <i>Please describe the personnel, facilities and/or equipment involved in the proposed program and why they are required to successfully complete the program.</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	D - The use of this designated subcontractor/vendor will cause a material reduction in the cost or schedule. <i>Please describe the specific cost or schedule impact to be realized</i>
<input type="checkbox"/>	E - The use of this designated subcontractor/vendor will increase medical technology performance. <i>Please describe what the performance increase will be attained by the use of this designated nontraditional defense contractor</i>
1 In addition to the above please provide the following information:	
Q1	What additional capability beyond those described in A through E above does this subcontractor/vendor have that is necessary for this specific effort?
A1	
Q2	In which task/phase(s) of the effort will the subcontractor/vendor be used?
A2	
Q3	What is the total estimated cost associated with the subcontractor/vendor included in the proposal? <i>Note: While cost is an indicator for the level of nontraditional defense contractor participation, there is no particular cost threshold required.</i>
A3	

C. Signature

Signature of authorized representative of proposing Prime Contractor

Date

Warranties and Representations Instructions

Section A must be completed for the Prime Contractor.

1. Insert prime contractor's legal name.
2. Insert prime contractor's DUNS #.
3. Insert the Point of Contact (Name, Title, Phone #, Email) for the prime contractor.
4. Indicate Yes (Y) or No (N) if the prime contractor is a nontraditional defense contractor (Note: A nontraditional defense contractor means an entity that is not currently performing and has not performed, for at least the one-year period preceding the issue date of the solicitation, any contract or subcontract for the Department of Defense that is subject to full coverage under the cost accounting standards prescribed pursuant to Section 1502 of Title 41 and the regulations implementing such section.).
5. Indicate Yes (Y) or No (N) if the prime contractor is a nonprofit research institution.
6. Indicate Yes (Y) or No (N) if the prime contractor will provide at least one third of the total cost of the prototype project out of funds provided by sources other than the Federal Government (i.e. will the project contain at least 1/3 cost share).
7. Indicate Yes (Y) or No (N) if the prime contractor is a small business (including small businesses participating in a program described under section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638)).

Section B must be completed if the Prime Contractor is **traditional** and has proposed nontraditional defense contractors, nonprofit research institutions, or small businesses. Copy, paste, and complete the table found in Section B **for each** participating nontraditional defense contractor, nonprofit research institutions, or small business.

8. Insert subcontractor/vendor's legal name.
9. Insert subcontractor/vendor's DUNS #.
10. Insert the dollar value (cost and fee) to be awarded to the subcontractor/vendor.
11. Insert the Point of Contact (Name, Title, Phone #, Email) for the subcontractor/vendor.
12. Indicate in which specific task/phase(s) of the effort will the subcontractor/vendor be used.
13. Indicate Yes (Y) or No (N) if the subcontractor/vendor is a nontraditional defense contractor (Note: A nontraditional defense contractor means an entity that is not currently performing and has not performed, for at least the one-year period preceding the issue date of the solicitation, any contract or subcontract for the Department of Defense that is subject to full coverage under the cost accounting standards prescribed pursuant to Section 1502 of Title 41 and the regulations implementing such section.).
14. Indicate Yes (Y) or No (N) if the subcontractor/vendor is a nonprofit research institution.
15. Indicate Yes (Y) or No (N) if the subcontractor/vendor is a small business (including small businesses participating in a program described under section 9 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 638)).
16. Explain the subcontractor/vendor's Significant Contribution to the project by answering the questions below.

Request for Project Proposal MTEC-21-05-Cross-cutting
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

- A - The significant contribution involves developing, demonstrating or providing a key technology. ***Please describe what the key technology is; why it is key to the medical technology community, and what makes it key.***
- B - The significant contribution involves developing, demonstrating or providing a new technology that is not readily available. ***Please describe what the new part or material is and why it is not readily available.***
- C - The significant contribution involves use of skilled personnel (such as modeling & simulation experience, medical technology design experience, etc.), facilities and/or equipment that are within the capabilities of the designated nontraditional and required to successfully complete the program. ***Please describe the personnel, facilities and/or equipment involved in the proposed program and why they are required to successfully complete the program.***
- D - The use of this designated subcontractor/vendor will cause a material reduction in the cost or schedule. ***Please describe the specific cost or schedule impact to be realized.***
- E - The use of this designated subcontractor/vendor will increase medical technology performance. ***Please describe what the performance increase will be attained by the use of this designated nontraditional defense contractor.***
- Q1 - What additional capability beyond those described in A through E above does this subcontractor/vendor have that is necessary for this specific effort?
- Q2 - In which task/phase(s) of the effort will the subcontractor/vendor be used?
- Q3 - What is the total estimated cost associated with the subcontractor/vendor included in the proposal? Note: While cost is an indicator for the level of nontraditional defense contractor participation, there is no particular cost threshold required.

Section C must be signed by an authorized representative of the prime contractor.

General Guidance

- Nontraditional defense contractors can be at the prime level, team members, subcontractors, lower tier vendors, or "intra-company" business units, provided that the business unit makes a significant contribution to the prototype project.
- All nontraditional defense contractors must have a DUNS number.
- A foreign business can be considered a nontraditional if it has a DUNS number and can comply with the terms and conditions of the MTEC Base Agreement.

Attachment F – Current & Pending Support Template

For Information Only - Stage 2 Requirement

Include the requested information for each person who will contribute significantly to the proposed research project

Current

Award Number:

Title:

Funding Agency/Requiring Activity:

Dates of Funding:

Total Awarded Costs:

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

Level of Effort:

Brief summary of the scope of work:

Award Number:

Title:

Funding Agency/Requiring Activity:

Dates of Funding:

Total Awarded Costs:

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

Level of Effort:

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.)*

Level of Effort:

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.)*

Level of Effort:

Request for Project Proposal MTEC-21-05-Cross-cutting
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

Brief summary of the scope of work:

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

Attachment G – Focus Areas of Interest: Supplemental Information

I. Public Health Approach to Prevention

The public health approach to prevention defines prevention based on when the activity takes place and who is targeted. The terms primary, secondary and tertiary are used in cases when the focus is on when the prevention activity occurs, while universal, targeted, and indicated are used when the focus is on who is targeted with the prevention activity. There are three levels of prevention based on when the prevention effort occurs (CDC, 2019; Institute of Medicine, 1994) (all three levels of prevention are acceptable forms of prevention for this RFP):

- *Primary Prevention.* Approaches that take place before a negative event, harmful behavior, or psychological health issue has occurred to prevent the initial event and all ensuing negative events.
- *Secondary Prevention.* Immediate responses after a negative event, harmful behavior, or psychological health issue arises to ultimately address the early identification of issues and the short-term consequences of those negative events.
- *Tertiary Prevention.* Long-term responses after a negative event, harmful behavior, or psychological health issue arises to address the lasting consequences.

This public health approach also distinguishes between prevention strategies based upon the group for whom the intervention is intended. Using this type of differentiation, interventions can again be divided into three categories (CDC, 2019; Institute of Medicine, 1994; National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2019) (all three types of interventions are acceptable forms of intervention for this RFP):

- *Universal Interventions.* Approaches that are aimed at groups or the general population regardless of individual risk
- *Selective Interventions.* Approaches that are aimed at those who are thought to have a heightened risk
- *Indicated Interventions.* Approaches that are aimed at those who have already experienced a negative event, harmful behavior, or psychological health issue

II. DODI 6400.09: Section 4: Elements of Integrated Primary Prevention

4.1. OVERVIEW.

Integrated primary prevention, as outlined in Section 3, will include a focus on the individual, interpersonal, and organizational elements in this section through a holistic approach to address risk and protective factors for self-directed harm and prohibited abusive or harmful acts, leveraging, where possible and appropriate, existing prevention efforts.

4.2. SKILL DEVELOPMENT.

DOD integrated primary prevention policies and programs will foster healthy behaviors, life skills, and stress management early on and will reinforce these behaviors and skills using appropriate educational strategies to maintain proficiency throughout one's military career or civilian employment cycle by developing the skills for:

- a. Healthy relationships (e.g., respectful professional and personal relationships, appropriate boundary setting).
- b. Responsible alcohol use (e.g., social resistance skills).
- c. Healthy coping (e.g., problem-solving skills).
- d. Emotional intelligence (e.g., managing strong emotions in a non-destructive manner, identifying and addressing bias, exhibiting empathy).
- e. Effective communication (e.g., conflict management, assertive communication of sexual boundaries and consent, bystander intervention).
- f. Resilience (e.g., mindfulness).
- g. Other capabilities as determined by the DOD Component head concerned.

4.3. PROTECTIVE ENVIRONMENTS AND HEALTHY CLIMATES.

DOD integrated primary prevention policies and programs will establish and maintain protective environments and healthy climates, which will include:

- a. Preventing the full spectrum of prohibited behaviors by consistently applying policies such as those contained in DODIs 1350.02, 1438.06, 1010.04, 1020.03, 1020.04, 6490.16, and 6495.02 and DODDs 1020.02E, and 1440.1 and implementing the programs established by these policies that promote a healthy and professional workplace.
- b. Promoting an understanding of lethal means (e.g., firearms, medications, household poisons) safety among the military community.
- c. Promoting awareness of availability of confidential chaplain counseling to discuss or disclose self-directed harm and prohibited abusive or harmful acts, in accordance with the regulations of the Military Department and Service concerned.

4.4. SUBSTANCE USE.

DOD integrated primary prevention policies and programs will prevent substance misuse and abuse by:

- a. Working with community partners on responsible alcohol use, including:
 1. Responsible sales practices.
 2. Prohibiting distribution to minors.
 3. Effective bystander intervention among alcohol servers, where possible.
- b. Implementing alcohol policies that decrease the likelihood of overconsumption.
- c. Implementing policies that support early intervention for alcohol treatment that do not impact operational readiness.
- d. Enforcing substance abuse prevention policies as outlined in DODIs 1010.01, 1010.04, 1010.09, and 1010.16.
- e. Promoting and disseminating research-based tools and resources aimed to prevent substance misuse and support positive behavior changes to reduce self-directed harm and prohibited abusive or harmful acts.

4.5. MILITARY DEPENDENT SUPPORT.

DOD integrated primary prevention policies and programs will facilitate command support for Service Members and military dependents in accordance with DODI 1342.22, which will include:

- a. Mitigating the risk of child abuse and neglect in military families through home visitations to promote effective parenting skill development and increased awareness of child social and emotional developmental stages, in accordance with DODI 6400.05. Reserve component members may receive support in accordance with applicable memorandums of understanding (MOUs) or memorandums of agreement (MOAs) with established community partners.
- b. Preventing domestic abuse through command and peer support for Service Members and their spouses or intimate partners to proactively seek help for unhealthy relationships before the onset of a crisis, such as through the Family Advocacy Program (FAP), in accordance with DODI 6400.01. Reserve component members may receive support through applicable MOUs or MOAs established with community partners.
- c. Military parent engagement with DOD and community resources providing developmentally attuned strategies for parents to teach their children about healthy relationships and peer interactions. Eligible reserve component members may receive support applicable MOUs or MOAs established with community partners.
- d. Encouraging Service Members and their spouses or intimate partners to participate in recommended clinical treatment and non-clinical services or interventions to develop safe and healthy parenting practices and to learn skills for maintaining healthy, non-violent relationships with their spouse, intimate partner, or children.
- e. Promoting safety for military families through home safety checks by command and other appropriate professionals for assessment of access to lethal means.
- f. Collaboration with community organizations, as appropriate, on prevention outreach.

4.6. FINANCIAL READINESS.

DOD integrated primary prevention policies and programs, in accordance with DODI 1342.22, will strengthen financial readiness of:

- a. Service Members and their dependents, by focusing on promoting and encouraging use of DOD, Military Department, and Military Service financial literacy education and financial counseling services to develop knowledge and skills to:
 1. Make informed financial decisions.
 2. Address the effects of financial decisions on personal and professional lives.
 3. Achieve and maintain financial readiness.
- b. DOD civilian personnel, by focusing on promoting and disseminating tools and resources for financial readiness.

4.7. SELECTED PRIMARY PREVENTION.

DOD integrated primary prevention policies and programs will work to reduce the risk for harm by:

- a. Addressing the needs of high-risk groups as identified in Paragraph 3.2.a., including those at risk for re-victimization or who have been affected by multiple self-directed harm and prohibited abusive or harmful acts (e.g., sexual assault survivor at risk for suicide).
- b. Implementing safety measures (e.g., increased leadership supervision) for high risk on-base locations (e.g., barracks) and on social media and other virtual or digital communications, where possible.
- c. Encouraging personnel to seek help early and without stigma, before destructive behaviors escalate and require more intensive intervention.
- d. Providing advocacy, behavioral health, and other methods of recovery care that are victim-centered, trauma-informed, and culturally-competent.
- e. Providing communication strategy training and education for public affairs officers and military leaders across the DOD to support help-seeking efforts and privacy when discussing, responding to, and reporting self-directed harm and prohibited abusive or harmful acts through the media, including social media platforms.

III. Community Based Participatory Research (CBPR) and/or Participatory Action Research (PAR)

CBPR/PAR is defined as scientific inquiry conducted in a community with researchers and community members as partners (Israel, Schulz, Parker, & Becker, 1998). CBPR and PAR are applied approaches that emphasize the application of research methods in the service of creating positive community change (Trickett et al, 2011). Recommendation for employing and guidance on the rigorous conduct of CBPR and PAR are available from the CDC (Faridi, Granbaum, Gray, Franks, & Simoes, 2007), Institute of Medicine (Hernandez, Rosenstock, Gebbie, 2003; Syme & Smedley, 2000), Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (Viswanathan et al. 2004), and National Institutes of Health (Ahmed & Palermo 2010).

Community members (often those most directly affected by the topic being examined such as Service Members and families who would be the recipients of prevention services, providers who would deliver the program, and military leaders who would implement strategies) are full participants in all phases of the research (from conception through study design, implementation, analysis and interpretation, and results dissemination; Jagosh et al., 2012). CBPR/PAR is typically characterized by substantial community input in the development of the grant application. Further, CBPR/PAR is an approach to scientific inquiry and can be combined with a wide range of research designs and methods. As an approach to research, CBPR and PAR have been identified as particularly well suited for addressing persistent health disparities (Wallerstein & Duran, 2006) and challenges related to social and environmental conditions (Israel, Schulz, Parker, & Becker, 1998), focusing on improving the ecological contexts underpinning health (Minkler & Wallerstein, 2011).

Specifically involving members of local military communities in cross-cutting prevention research via CBPR/PAR may improve the quality, impact, and applicability of the research to the military by (DeVoe, Ross, & Paris, 2012; Haynes, 2015):

- focusing the research questions on the issues of greatest importance to military communities;
- increasing the relevance of prevention approaches to the community members and thus the likelihood for success;
- targeting interventions to the identified needs of Service Members, their families, military leadership, and other critical community stakeholders;
- enhance recruitment and retention for studies, as well as our ability to increase accessibility and use of services that are effective for preventing multiple behavioral and health challenges;
- improving the reliability, validity and sensitivity of measures through both increasing the fit of chosen measures to the issues of most relevance to communities, as well as through capturing in-depth feedback during pretesting;
- addressing cultural factors and developing prevention strategies that effectively incorporate military cultural and social norms, practices and values.

IV. Signature Behaviors

Behaviors that are positive, honorable and promote the (Navy's) Core Values, Ethos and Core Attributes while contributing to improved well-being, greater connectedness, increased toughness, trust and resilience (<https://www.cpf.navy.mil/downloads/2020/02/signature-behaviors.pdf>).

These Signature Behaviors are:

- Treat every person with respect.
- Take responsibility for my actions.
- Hold others accountable for their actions.
- Intervene when necessary.
- Be a leader and encourage leadership in others.
- Grow personally and professionally every day.
- Embrace the diversity of ideas, experiences, and backgrounds of individuals.
- Uphold the highest degree of integrity in professional and personal life.
- Exercise discipline in conduct and performance.
- Contribute to team success through actions and attitude.

V. Protective Factors that Stem from Demonstration of Signature Behaviors: Definitions

Connectedness: The feeling of support and willingness to help. Involves the quality and number of connections one has with other people in a social circle of family, friends and acquaintances.

Toughness: The ability to thrive in any condition, psychologically, spiritually, physically and emotionally. It includes using resilience to cope with stress, persevere through challenges and have the courage to seek help when needed.

Trust: The shared, transparent commitment between teams, leaders, peers and subordinates contributing to an authentic environment that promotes learning and recovery

Resilience: The capacity to withstand, recover, grow and adapt in the face of stressors and changing demands.

VI. Social-Ecological Model

The social-ecological model (SEM) explains how the inherent qualities of individuals and their environment interact to influence how they behave (CDC, 2020; Kelly, 1966; Kelly, 1969). Preventative interventions implemented at multiple levels of social ecology (i.e., individual, relationship, community, and societal) are critical to having a population-level impact on preventing cross-cutting harmful behaviors (Basile et al., 2016). Social ecology-based prevention emphasizes the context of human behavior. Of central importance is addressing the opportunities and constraints in social, organizational, and community environments (Glass & McAtee, 2006). Therefore, the DOD seeks to emphasize prevention that aims to modify the ecological context to facilitate positive/desirable behavior, while eliminating harmful behavior and/or psychological health issues.

The SEM is a frame that helps to understand the factors (risk and protective factors) that influence behaviors and how the factors interact. Within the SEM, you have an individual nested within relationships, which are both nested within their community, which are all three nested within the societal context. Thus, there is interrelatedness among the factors that influence behavior. The individual level includes biological and personal history factors as well as attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors. The relationship level includes factors that result from relationships with peers, intimate partners, family members, and community members. Community level factors are those that reside in organizations and systems where individuals live their lives (e.g., where they live, work, play). Societal level factors include the laws, policies, media, and other social forces that influence shared values and social norms, such as the acceptance or rejection of violence. These societal-level factors also influence differing levels of access and opportunities available to groups of people within a society. The SEM is adapted slightly in the military context, which is a “closed environment.” Societal factors do influence everyone, but within the Military there is also a closed system (i.e., organization) that allows for its own community.

The SEM attends not just to the nested ecological levels, but also to the principles of community ecology (cycling of resources, interdependence, adaptation, and succession; Kelly, 1969). Cycling of resources refers to the processes by which resources are transferred from one part of the community to another—for example, prevention programs might consider addressing how interventions add value and resources into the setting. Interdependence refers to how one part of the community have impacts elsewhere —for example, how change in community climate towards substance use may lead to changes in problem drinking and changes in treatment services. Adaptation refers to how community and social processes adapt to fit local systems—for example, how a prevention program adapts to be successfully implemented across diverse

settings. Succession refers to the sequences of changes in communities, such as leadership, personnel, and policy changes—for example, understanding how prevention programs change as the community changes.

The SEM helps explain why so many common risk and protective factors exist among an array of harmful behaviors. Approaches to preventative interventions at multiple levels of social ecology (i.e., individual, relationship, community, and society) are critical to having a population-level impact on harmful behaviors. Prevention in the SEM emphasizes the context of human behavior. Of central importance is addressing the opportunities and constraints in the social and community environment (Glass & McAtee, 2006). Therefore, the DOD seeks to emphasize prevention that aims to modify the ecological context to facilitate positive/desirable behaviors, while reducing risk factors associated with experiencing or engaging in violent, harmful, or abusive behaviors.

Within a social-ecological framework, there is less information on community and societal level factors that *promote* population health compared to individual-level risk factors, especially in the military context. Therefore, the SEM should be a key component in proposals. Prevention approaches and interventions are requested that are aimed at promoting population health, reducing multiple risk factors and/or increasing protective factors, implemented at multiple levels of the SEM to prevent suicidal ideation and behaviors (Wyman, 2014; Stone et al., 2017), multiple forms of violence (Wilkins et al., 2018), and substance abuse or misuse (Botvin & Kantor, 2000; Robertson, Sims, & Reider, 2015; Arthur et al., 2010). Furthermore, proposals are encouraged that attend also to the principles of community ecology (cycling of resources, interdependence, adaptation, and succession; (Cilllessen & Marks, 2017)).

VII. Resources Currently In Use by Stakeholder Offices

Name of Resource	Website
Harassment Prevention Checklist	https://cms1.sapr.mil/sites/default/files/public/docs/policy/toolkit/Commander_Checklist_for_Unrestricted_Reports_20150122.pdf
Defense Organizational Climate Survey (DEOCS 5.0)	https://www.defenseculture.mil/Portals/90/Documents/A2S/GRP-A2S-Sample_DEOCS_Survey-201708.pdf?ver=2020-02-10-125602-450
Workplace and Gender Relations Surveys (WGR)	https://www.dmdc.osd.mil/appj/dwp/dwp_surveys.jsp
Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS)	https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/index.html
Duke Social Support and Stress Scale	https://fmch.duke.edu/sites/cfm.duke.edu/files/cfm/Research/HealthMeasures/DUSOCS.pdf

Request for Project Proposal MTEC-21-05-Cross-cutting
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

Defense Research, Surveys, and Statistics Center (RSSC) Gender Relations Surveys Equal Opportunity Surveys Financial Issues Surveys	https://www.dmdc.osd.mil/appj/dwp/dwp_surveys.jsp
Status of Forces Surveys	https://www.militaryonesource.mil/data-research-and-statistics/survey-findings/2017-status-of-forces-survey/
Military Spouse Survey	https://www.militaryonesource.mil/data-research-and-statistics/survey-findings/2019-spouses-survey/
Youth Risk Behavior Survey	https://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/data/yrb/index.htm
National Vital Statistics System (NVSS)	https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nvss/index.htm
National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH)	https://www.samhsa.gov/data/data-we-collect/nsduh-national-survey-drug-use-and-health
DOD Suicide Event Report (DODSER)	DOD Sponsor required
Brief Resilience Scale	https://www.psytoolkit.org/survey-library/resilience-brs.html
PhenX ToolKit	https://www.phenxtoolkit.org/
AUDIT & AUDIT-C	https://www.drugabuse.gov/sites/default/files/audit.pdf https://www.samhsa.gov/sites/default/files/alcohol_use_facts_and_resources_fact_sheet_2018_data.pdf
WISQARS	https://www.cdc.gov/injury/wisqars/index.html
National Violent Death Reporting System (NVDRS)	https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/datasources/nvdrs/index.html
NEISS-AIP	https://webappa.cdc.gov/sasweb/ncipc/nfirates.html
Military Suicide Research Consortium (MSRC) Common Data Elements	Available through MOMRP
Columbia-Suicide Severity Rating Scale (C-SSRS)	https://suicidepreventionlifeline.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/09/Suicide-Risk-Assessment-C-SSRS-Lifeline-Version-2014.pdf
Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project (HCUP) Databases	https://www.hcup-us.ahrq.gov/databases.jsp

VIII. Relevant Data Reports and/or Reports to Congress

- SAPRO Reports to Congress:
<https://www.sapr.mil/reports>
- FY2019 FAP Report to Congress:
<https://download.militaryonesource.mil/12038/MOS/Reports/FINAL-DoD-FAP-Report-FY2019.pdf>
- Data on incidence of domestic violence homicide-suicides (general population):
<https://vpc.org/press/nearly-eleven-murder-suicides-occur-across-america-each-week-claiming-more-than-1200-lives-annually-new-vpc-study-finds/>
- Data on child fatalities related to domestic violence homicide suicides:
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4699178/>
- Review on child sexual abuse prevention (civilian population):
https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.safestates.org/resource/resmgr/policy/FY_2019_CDC_RTC_on_Child_Sex.pdf
- CDC Connecting the Dots Connection Selector:
<https://vetoviolence.cdc.gov/apps/connecting-the-dots/node/5>
- Veto Violence, Violence Prevention in Practice:
<https://vetoviolence.cdc.gov/apps/violence-prevention-practice/#!/>
- Sexual violence indicators guide and database:
<https://vetoviolence.cdc.gov/apps/sexual-violence-indicators-guide-database/database>

Attachment H – BIDS Instructions

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK. PLEASE SEE THE PRESENTATION BELOW.


MTEC BIDS REGISTRATION

MTEC BIDS URL:

[HTTPS://AT12.ACQCENTER.COM](https://at12.acqcenter.com)


BIDS New Registration

Navigate to the MTEC BIDS website and select “New Registration”



The screenshot shows the MTEC BIDS website home page. At the top, there is a purple navigation bar with the text "Welcome, Anonymous" and a "Help Request" link. Below this is the ATI logo (Advanced Technology International) and a "Portal" header. On the left, there is a purple sidebar with "Information" and links for "Privacy Notice" and "Contact Us". The main content area is titled "Consortium Membership" and contains a note about membership requirements, a paragraph about ATI's services, and a link to "ATI's Program Solicitations" website. Below this is a section for "ATI-Managed Consortia" featuring a green banner for "MTEC" with the MTEC logo and text: "MTEC MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY ENTERPRISE CONSORTIUM Medical Technology Enterprise Consortium". Underneath the banner are links for "MTEC BIDS Home" and "Learn More | How to Join". On the right side of the page, there is a "Login/Registration" box with input fields for "User Name:" and "Password:", a "Login" button, and links for "Forgot Your User Name?", "Forgot Your Password?", and "New Registration". The "New Registration" link is circled in red, and a red arrow points from a yellow callout box to it. The callout box contains the text: "Select 'New Registration' from the home screen." Below the "New Registration" link is a "NOTE:" section with text about registering for a RPP account. At the bottom right, there is a "Request Help?" section with a "Request" link and text about requesting help about the site, and a "Contact Help" link with text about requesting website help.

Select “Submitter”



Portal

Welcome, Anonymous Help Request

Select “Submitter”.

Please select the type of account you are registering for:

Government

- Government Requirement Submitter/Evaluator/AOR – Select this in order to submit requirements, evaluate whitepapers and proposals, and/or make an award. Please note you must be approved before you will be able to access the system.

Industry

- Submitter** - Select this in order to submit responses to solicitations.


SECURITY NOTICE: Unauthorized attempts to deny service, upload information, change information, or attempt to access a non-public site from this service are strictly prohibited and may be punishable under Title 18 of the U.S. Code to include the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act of 1986 and the National Information Infrastructure Protection Act.



Copyright © 2020. All Rights Reserved. This website was created by the AcqCenter and is part of the BIDS family.

BIDS New Registration

Complete the registration form. Be sure to select how you want to receive the dual factor verification code (SMS text message is recommended).



Extn.

Fax Number:

* Email Address:

* Email Confirmation:

* Contractor Status:

Cell Number: Enter a cell number in order to be able to receive passcodes via SMS. Enter exactly 10 digits without any punctuation.

Preferred Code Delivery Method: Select your preferred method for receiving two-factor passcodes. If you select SMS, you must enter a cell number. You will still have the selecting either when logging in.

SMS (Text) ←

E-Mail

Website: http://

* Programs Requested: What area do you belong to? Please select all that apply:

MTEC

How to receive dual factor authentication .

Select "Submit Registration" to complete BIDS registration.

BIDS New Registration

BIDS registration is instantaneous. It does not require any verification by the MTEC team. After successfully registering, you can submit proposals to any open MTEC RPP.

- MTEC Membership will be verified once a proposal is received and after the proposal deadline.
- Updates to submitted documents can be made anytime prior to the due date and time.
- MTEC RPP links will be opened, within BIDS, at least two weeks prior to the submission deadline.

Please note: For RPPs that are two stages (i.e. White Paper to Full Proposal) only the account that submitted the stage 1 proposal (the White Paper) will be allowed to submit for stage 2 (the Full Proposal), if selected.


ALL PROPOSALS MUST BE SUBMITTED BEFORE THE SUBMISSION DUE DATE AND TIME. LATE PROPOSALS CAN NOT BE ACCEPTED.

MTEC BIDS PROPOSAL SUBMISSION

MTEC BIDS URL:

[HTTPS://AT12.ACQCENTER.COM](https://at12.acqcenter.com)

Navigate to the MTEC BIDS site and login. After login select the “MTEC BIDS Home” link.




The screenshot shows the MTEC BIDS website interface. At the top, there is a navigation bar with "Welcome, Anonymous" and "Help Request" links. Below this, the "Portal" section is visible. On the left, there is an "Information" sidebar with links for "Privacy Notice" and "Contact Us". The main content area features a "Consortium Membership" section with a note about solicitation requirements and a "Managed Consortia" section. A prominent green box highlights the "MTEC" logo and the "MTEC BIDS Home" link, with a red arrow pointing to it from a yellow callout box. To the right, a "Login/Registration" form is visible, with a red arrow pointing to the "User Name:" input field from another yellow callout box. Below the login form, there are links for "Forgot Your User Name?", "Forgot Your Password?", and "New Registration". A "NOTE" section explains that users must register for a submitter account to respond to RPPs. At the bottom right, there is a "Need Help?" section with links for "Help Request" and "Contact Help".

Login to your BIDS Account.

Then select the “MTEC BIDS Home” link

SECURITY NOTICE: Unauthorized attempts to deny service, upload information, change information, or attempt to access a non-public site from this service are strictly prohibited and may be punishable under Title 18 of the U.S. Code to include the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act of 1986 and the National Information Infrastructure Protection Act.

Select the “Respond to RPP” link under the submitter tools



Once logged in, your username will appear here.

Click the link to respond to an RPP.

RPP information is provided in this section. This includes status updates.

Welcome, MTEC FAQs | Help Request

Portal | MTEC Home | Submissions | Search | Logout

Submitter Tools
Respond to RPP
Submissions
Search
Archives
My Submissions
Account Center
Edit My Account
Change Password
Logout
Information
Privacy Notice
Reference Materials
Portal

RPPs - Open
On January 27, 2020, the RPP (MTEC-20-04-Test) was released. Full Proposals are due by January 27, 2020 at 01:40:00 PM ET. An intent to award solicitation is located on the Members Only portion of the MTEC website: <https://private.mtec-sc.org/>

On January 22, 2020, government feedback was released for initial submissions to the RPP (MTEC-10-16-Test). Those selected to submit a Full Proposal must do so by December 16, 2019 at 01:00:00 PM ET. All information related to this solicitation is located on the Members Only portion of the MTEC website: <https://private.mtec-sc.org/>


Medical Technology Enterprise Consortium
The Medical Technology Enterprise Consortium (MTEC) is a nationally dispersed consortium of traditional and non-traditional defense contractors, small business, for-profit and not-for-profit entities, and academic institutions brought together to accelerate the development of medical solutions that prevent and treat injuries and restore America's military and veterans to full health. The prototyping requirements include technologies that enable or enhance the understanding in the following technical areas:

1. Military Infectious Diseases Research Program (MIDRP)
2. Combat Casualty Care Research Program (CCCRP)
3. Military Operational Medicine Research Program (MOMRP)
4. Clinical and Rehabilitative Medicine Research Program (CRM RP)
5. Medical Simulation and Information Sciences Research Program (MSISRP)


MTEC Membership
solicitation on this site, you must be a member of the MTEC Consortium. To verify your status, please visit: <https://mtec-sc.org/>

standing can submit in response to a solicitation. To verify your status, please visit: <https://mtec-sc.org/>

authorized attempts to deny service, upload information, change information, or engage in any activity prohibited and may be punishable under Title 18 of the U.S. Code, Chapter 115, Section 2385, Fraud and Abuse of Computer.

 **BIDS** Copyright © 2020. All Rights Reserved. This website was created by the AcqCenter and is part of the BIDS family.

Select which RPP you will be responding to.



The screenshot shows the MTEC submission checklist page. At the top, there is a navigation bar with the MTEC logo and the text "Welcome, MTEC" and "FAQs | Help Request". Below this is a secondary navigation bar with "Portal", "MTEC Home", "Submissions", "Search", and "Logout". The main content area is titled "Submission Checklist" and contains a "Cancel" button. Below the title, there is a red heading: "Please check your submittal for the following requirements to ensure compliance with the RPP". Underneath, it says "Select the appropriate RPP:" followed by a radio button selected for "MTEC-20-04-Test". A red arrow points from a yellow callout box to this radio button. A "Continue" button is located below the radio button. At the bottom of the page, there is a "SECURITY NOTICE" and the BIDS logo with the text "Copyright © 2020. All Rights Reserved. This website was created by the AcqCenter and is part of the BIDS family."

Cancel

Submission Checklist

Please check your submittal for the following requirements to ensure compliance with the RPP


Select the appropriate RPP:

MTEC-20-04-Test


Continue

Select which RPP to respond to. If multiple RPPs are open, they will be listed here.

SECURITY NOTICE: Unauthorized attempts to deny service, upload information, change information, or attempt to access a non-public site from this service are strictly prohibited and may be punishable under Title 18 of National Information Infrastructure Protection Act.

 **BIDS** Copyright © 2020. All Rights Reserved. This website was created by the AcqCenter and is part of the BIDS family.

Complete the submission form.



The screenshot shows the MTEC submission form interface. At the top, there is a green navigation bar with the MTEC logo and text: "Welcome, MTEC" and "FAQs | Help Request". Below this is a secondary green bar with navigation links: "Portal | MTEC Home | Submissions | Search | Logout". A "Cancel" button is visible on the left. The main content area displays "New MTEC White Paper for MTEC" and a countdown timer: "Time remaining before submission deadline: 03:31:59". A red note states: "***PLEASE NOTE: Your web session will expire automatically if you are idle for more than 60 minutes.***". A section titled "*Denotes Required Field." contains the "Submission Information" form. This form includes fields for "RPP Number" (MTEC-3-9-2020), "Submitter Contact Info" (MTEC, Evan Kellinger, Project Manager, ATI, (843) 760-4354, Evan.Kellinger@ati.org), "Submission Deadline" (03/09/2020 01:00 PM EDT), "Submission Date", "* Submission Title" (empty text input), "Project Identifier" (NOTE: The Project Identifier is a unique identifier that will be assigned to your submission when it is submitted.), and "* Requirement" (a dropdown menu showing "---Select a Requirement---"). Below this is the "Contact Information" section with fields for "* Tech POC First Name", "* Tech POC Last Name", "* Tech POC Address", "* Tech POC Phone", and "Tech POC Extension". Two callout boxes provide instructions: a yellow box points to the timer with the text "Shows remaining time before submission close.", and a red box points to the requirement dropdown with the text "Select the technical area your submitting to as identified in the RPP."

Proposal Submission BIDS

Complete the submission form by uploading the required documents and click submit.

File Attachments	
Required Files:	White Paper No file uploaded Upload White Paper (Allowed file types: pdf, doc, docx; Size Limit: 5mb)
Agreements	
*Classified Information:	I certify no classified information is contained in the information being submitted. <input type="checkbox"/> Agree
*Submitter Agreement:	I understand The Government intends to use the Consortium Management Firm, ATI, to assist in the processing of Submitter's proposals to this RPP as indicated in the MTEC Base Agreement. The Consortium Management Firm shall take the necessary steps to protect all proprietary proposal information and shall not use such proprietary information for purposes other than the evaluation of a Submitter's proposal and the subsequent contract administration if the proposal is selected for award. A Submitter indicates concurrence with the aforementioned CMF responsibilities. Additionally, the Government (CSP) to assist in the submitted proposals' evaluation. The CSP will be required to submit to the Submitter reflecting the effort they will supply to support this RPP. The Submitter's submission of a proposal with the aforementioned Consortium Management Firm responsibilities and the use of CSP. Finally, the Consortium leadership may be provided, at their request, top-level data and metrics on submissions for their use in monitoring the effectiveness of submission processes and the level of participation by members in the RPP. Information will only be released with Government approval. A Submitter's submission under this RPP indicated concurrence with the aforementioned release of information to the Consortium leadership. <input type="checkbox"/> Agree

Upload documents in this section.

Submit

Once the submission form is completed select submit.

SECURITY NOTICE: Unauthorized attempts to deny service, upload, or delete data on this non-public site from this service are strictly prohibited and may be punishable under Title 18 of the U.S. Code to include the National Information Infrastructure Protection Act.

Proposal Submission BIDS

Once you have successfully submitted a proposal, you will receive a notification with your submission number (ex. MTEC-23-24-Everest-045).

- Submission documents can be modified anytime prior to the due date and time from your BIDS account.
- To make changes to your submission, prior to the due date/time, select the submission link from the home page and navigate to your submission.

Please note: For RPPs that are two stages (i.e. White Paper to Full Proposal) only the account that submitted the stage 1 proposal (the White Paper) will be allowed to submit for stage 2 (the Full Proposal), if selected.

ALL PROPOSALS MUST BE SUBMITTED BEFORE THE SUBMISSION DUE DATE AND TIME. LATE PROPOSALS CAN NOT BE ACCEPTED.