

Medical Technology Enterprise Consortium (MTEC)

Request for Project Proposals



Medical Technology
Enterprise Consortium SM

**Amendment No. 02 to Solicitation Number: MTEC-16-02-Brain
Machine Interface**

**Brain Machine Interface Prototype Development for Vision
Restoration**

Issued by:

Advanced Technology International,
dba SCRA Applied R&D
MTEC Consortium ManagerF
315 Sigma Drive
Summerville, SC 29486
for the
Medical Technology Enterprise Consortium (MTEC)

Request Issue Date: June 6, 2016

~~Proposal Due Date: August 22, 2016~~
~~12:00PM Eastern Daylight Time~~

Amendment No. 02 Proposal Due Date:
September 2, 2016
6:00PM Eastern Daylight Time

White papers Not Required

1. Amendment No. 02 changes the proposal due date to September 2, 2016 at 6:00PM Eastern Daylight Time.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
1.1 Purpose.....	3
1.2 Request for Project Proposals.....	3
1.3 Funding Availability and Type of Funding Instrument Issued	4
1.4 Proprietary Information.....	5
1.5 Offeror Eligibility	5
1.6 Inclusion of Nontraditional Defense Contractors	5
1.7 Cost Sharing	5
1.8 Intellectual Property.....	5
1.9 Expected Award Date	6
1.10 Anticipated Proposal Selection Notification	6
2 Full Proposal	6
2.1 Full Proposals	6
2.2 Proposal Submission	6
2.2.1 Submission Format.....	6
3 Proposal Preparation Instructions	7
3.1 General Instructions	7
3.2 Technical Proposal and Statement of Work	7
3.2.1 Technology Objectives	7
3.2.2 Military Relevance:	10
3.2.3 Commercialization Plan and Regulatory Pathway	10
3.3 Cost Proposal.....	10
3.4 Proposal Preparation Cost	11
4 Selection	11
4.1 Proposal Source Selection.....	11
4.2 Evaluation Process	11
4.2.1 Factor 1. Nontraditional Defense Contractor/Cost Sharing.....	12
4.2.2 Factor 2: Technical Benefit.....	13
4.2.3 Factor 3: Potential for Transition and Commercialization	14
4.2.4 Factor 4: Cost Evaluation Factors	14
4.3 Best Value.....	15
5 Points of Contact.....	16

Executive Summary

1.1 Purpose

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 Materiel Command (USAMRMC) and other Government agencies in the biomedical sciences (including but not limited to drugs, biologics, vaccines, medical software and medical devices) to protect, treat and optimize the health and performance of U.S. military personnel. MTEC is a nonprofit corporation with the following principal objectives:

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

This solicitation, issued by the MTEC Consortium Manager (CM), Advanced Technology International, dba SCRA Applied R&D, represents a Request for Project Proposals (RPP) for MTEC's support of the Clinical and Rehabilitative Medicine Research Program (CRM RP) technology objectives. Strategic oversight for the award(s) supported by this RPP will be provided by CRM RP.

Military relevance is a critical component of proposal submission. The CRM RP focuses on innovations to reconstruct, rehabilitate, and provide definitive care for injured Service members. The ultimate goal is to return the Service members to duty and restore their quality of life. Innovations developed from CRM RP-supported research efforts are expected to improve restorative treatments and rehabilitative care to maximize function for return to duty (RTD) or civilian life. The CRM RP interest is in medical technologies (drugs, biologics, and devices) and treatment/rehabilitation strategies (methods, guidelines, standards, and information) that will significantly improve the medical care provided to our wounded Service members within the Department of Defense (DoD) health care system. Implementation of these technologies and strategies should improve: the rate of RTD of Service members, the time to RTD, clinical outcome measures, quality of life, as well as reduce the hospital stay lengths, clinical workload (patient encounters, treatments, etc.), and initial and long-term costs associated with restorative and rehabilitative or acute care. The CRM RP focuses on the following research areas: neuromusculoskeletal injury (including amputees), sensory systems (including hearing, balance, tinnitus, and vision), acute and chronic pain, and regenerative medicine.

1.2 Request for Project Proposals

This MTEC RPP is focused on the clinical, prototyping, and manufacturing needs to develop a brain machine interface that addresses capability gaps for vision restoration.

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

1.3 Funding Availability and Type of Funding Instrument Issued

Total funding for awards made from this Funding Opportunity for Fiscal Year 2016 is \$2.0M. Awards will be funded based on Milestone completion. The Government intends to award three - Phase 1 awards at \$332K each (direct and indirect costs). The Government intends to award one Phase 2 award at \$1.0M (direct and indirect costs). The Offeror must include both Phase 1 and Phase 2 study plans and define specific Milestones for the end of Phase 1 and Phase 2. The Government will make a Phase 2 award based on progress towards completion of Phase 1. The Period of Performance (POP) for Phase 1 is not to exceed 12 months. Progress Reports are due to the Government quarterly. The Final Report is due at the end of month 12 for Phase 2 selection. The POP for Phase 2 is not to exceed 24 months. Quarterly Progress Reports and a Final Progress Report are required for Phase 2. As of the release date of this RPP, future year Defense Appropriations Bills have not been passed and there is no guarantee that any additional funds will be made available to support this program. The funding estimated for this RPP is approximate and subject to realignment. Funding of proposals received in response to this RPP is contingent upon the availability of federal funds for this program. MTEC reserves the right to reduce the second year award, if the Offeror's technology after the first year excels only in a limited number of the requirements/goals/tasks listed in the announcement. MTEC reserves the right to encourage two or three of the first year awardees to collaborate in the second year award to maximize performance across the greatest number of the requirements/goals/tasks listed in the announcement, and may allocate the second year funds in accordance with participation in such a collaboration.

The Government-selected Research Project Awards will be funded under the Other Transaction Agreement Number W81XWH-15-9-0001 (or subsequent OTAs in support of MTEC) with MTEC administered by the CM, SCRA Applied R&D. The CM will negotiate and execute a Base Agreement with MTEC members. This Base Agreement will be governed by the same provisions as the OTA between the Government and MTEC. Subsequently, any proposal that is selected for award will be funded through a Research Project Award issued under the Base Agreement. A sample of the MTEC Base Agreement can be found on the Members Only portion of the MTEC website at www.mtec-sc.org. **At the time of the submission, if Offerors have not yet executed a Base Agreement, then Offerors must certify on the cover page of their proposals that, if selected for award, they will abide by the terms and conditions of the latest**

version of the MTEC Base Agreement. If the Offeror already has executed an MTEC Base Agreement with the MTEC CM, then the Offeror must state on the cover page of its proposals that, if selected for award, it anticipates the proposed effort will be funded under its executed MTEC Base Agreement No. 20XX-XXX.

Offerors are advised to check the MTEC website periodically during the proposal preparation period for any changes to the MTEC Base Agreement terms and conditions.

1.4 Proprietary Information

The MTEC CM will oversee submission of proposals and analyze cost proposals submitted in response to this RPP. The 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. 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. On your proposal Cover Page, please indicate your willingness to allow MTEC Officers access to your Technical Proposal for the purposes of engaging in outreach activities with these private foundations. MTEC Officers granted proposal access have signed Nondisclosure Agreements (NDAs) and Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) statements. Additionally, these MTEC Officers represent organizations that currently are not MTEC members, and therefore their parent organizations are not eligible to submit research project proposals, nor receive any research project funding through MTEC.

1.5 Offeror Eligibility

Offerors must be MTEC Members in good standing.

1.6 Inclusion of Nontraditional Defense Contractors

Proposals that do not include Nontraditional Defense Contractor participation to a significant extent, or do not propose at least one third acceptable cost sharing, will not be eligible for award. Please see the MTEC PPG for additional details.

1.7 Cost Sharing

Cost sharing is defined as the resources expended by the award recipients on the proposed statement of work (SOW). If cost sharing is proposed, then the Offeror shall state the amount that is being proposed and whether the cost sharing is a cash contribution or in-kind contribution as discussed in the MTEC PPG. If the offer contains multiple team members, this information shall be provided for each team member

providing cost share. For additional information regarding cost share, please see the Cost Share Guidance document on the MTEC website www.mtec-sc.org.

1.8 Intellectual Property

Intellectual Property (IP) rights for MTEC Research Project Awards will be defined in the terms of an awardee's Base Agreement and resultant Task Orders. MTEC-funded initiatives will be subject to up to a one-point-five percent (1.5%) royalty on gross sales for all Government-funded research project awards. The royalty payments will start when the product enters the market and end when the awardee has repaid an amount not to exceed 200% of the government funding provided. 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 and up to 5 years post completion.

1.9 Expected Award Date

Offeror should plan on the period of performance beginning October, 2016. 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.

1.10 Anticipated Proposal Selection Notification

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

2 Full Proposal

2.1 Full Proposals

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

The MTEC PPG is specifically designed to assist Offerors in understanding the proposal preparation process. The proposal format provided in the MTEC PPG is mandatory. MTEC will post any general questions received and corresponding answers (without attributable proprietary data) on the members only MTEC website.

2.2 Proposal Submission

Offerors must submit proposals via email to mtec-sc@mtec-sc.org.

2.2.1 Submission Format

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.

- **Full technical proposal submission:** one Word (.docx or .doc) or PDF file. Separately, a Word (.docx or .doc) version of the SOW (Appendix B of the proposal) is required.
- **Full cost proposal submission:** one Word (.docx or .doc) or PDF file for Section I: Cost Proposal Narrative required. Separately, Section II: Cost Proposal Formats either in Excel (.xlsx or .xls) or PDF format is required.
- **Warranties and Representations:** If Nontraditional Defense Contractor participation is proposed, Warranties and Representations are required. One Word (.docx or .doc) or PDF file that contains all Warranties and Representations is required.

MTEC will email receipt confirmations to Offerors upon submission of proposals. Offerors may submit proposals in advance of the deadline.

3 Proposal Preparation Instructions

3.1 General Instructions

Technical and cost proposals must be submitted in separate volumes, and shall remain valid for 180 days unless otherwise specified by the Offeror in the proposal. The proposal format provided in the MTEC PPG is mandatory. Proposals shall reference this RPP number (MTEC-16-02-Brain Machine Interface).

Offerors are encouraged to contact the POC identified herein up until the proposal submission date/time to clarify requirements. Offerors are to propose a Milestone Payment Schedule which 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. The Milestones and associated deliverables proposed should, in general, be commensurate in number to the size and duration of the project.

All eligible Offerors may submit proposals for evaluation according to the criteria set forth herein. Offerors are advised that only SCRA Applied R&D as the MTEC's CM, with the approval of the Government Agreements Officer, is legally authorized to contractually bind or otherwise commit funding for selected Research Project Awards as result of this RPP.

3.2 Technical Proposal and Statement of Work

3.2.1 Technology Objectives

The overarching goal of this program, is to provide a prototype visual prosthesis for human testing within 5 years that (1) provides the ability to navigate for ambulation, identify faces and objects critical to daily life, and read large print, and (2) is economically feasible. Applications to MTEC should clearly state how the proposed research provides an innovative solution to a critical problem in the development of a brain machine interface prototype for vision restoration.

A critical step towards realization of the overarching goals is the development of an appropriate brain-machine interface. Applications must address the following focus area in vision restoration to be considered:

Specifically, MTEC seeks the prototype development of a device that:

1. Stimulates visual pathways in either the a) the lateral geniculate nucleus (LGN) or b) primary visual cortex.
2. Provides appropriate punctate stimuli with either a) electrical stimulation or b) optical stimulation for photolysis of caged excitatory neurotransmitters, photoswitches, or optogenetics (an optical stimulation delivery device is being sought, NOT the development of caged neurotransmitters, photoswitches or optogenetic tools).
3. Provides density of stimulation for the equivalent of at least 20/40 in the central 2° of visual field.
4. Stimulates neurons normally responsive to the peripheral field providing the equivalent of at least 70° of horizontal visual field for each eye.
5. Proposal must address specific anatomical challenges associated with implantation and communicating with the stimulation device.
6. Proposal must address biocompatibility (i.e., the prosthesis should ideally function for the lifetime of the patient).
7. Components of the device must be demonstrated as a prototype in animal or appropriate *in vitro* models.

MTEC seeks applications from investigators comprising multi-disciplinary teams from a wide spectrum of disciplines including, but not limited to, basic science, engineering, translational research, and clinical research.

The current effort aims to promote highly innovative, groundbreaking research; high-impact research with near-term clinical relevance; multidisciplinary, synergistic research; and translational studies to support the fluid transfer of knowledge from basic principles to a working visual prosthesis prototype. Results of studies conducted through this effort should inform the developmental pathway for a visual prosthesis prototype.

Proposed projects must be based on logical reasoning and sound scientific rationale. Please note that awards are not to be exploratory in nature and require a foundation of preliminary data.

Research involving animal or human subjects is allowed, in accordance with the PPG.

Although seven critical specifications of the visual prosthesis prototype are outlined in the above, we encourage you to submit even if you cannot currently meet all seven specifications. However, it is expected that an Offeror's approach to the visual prosthesis prototype will one day satisfy all seven critical specifications.

3.2.2 Military Relevance

Though advancement in prototyping is the primary objective of this funding opportunity, relevance to the health care needs of Service members, Veterans, and/or other Military Health System beneficiaries is a key feature of this funding opportunity. Provide a brief statement explaining the potential relevance of the proposed work to the military mission, health, medicine, and its impact on Service members, Veterans and their beneficiaries. Many of the military needs are also applicable to the civilian population.

3.2.3 Commercialization Plan and Regulatory Pathway

The successful Offeror will provide a description and justification of the anticipated regulatory pathway and Commercialization Plan. The Commercialization Plan must concisely convey answers to the key questions outlined in the MTEC PPG. The Commercialization Plan should describe the strategy the Offeror will employ to move a technology to the military and civilian market. The Commercialization Plan should provide a roadmap to convey how the Offeror may ultimately generate revenue and profits from the innovation, either from partnering to license and/or co-developing the technology, or continuing to develop internally with additional funds identified in conjunction with MTEC funding. The quality of the analysis within the Commercialization Plan is a critical element of the MTEC proposal review. Assumptions within the plan should be clearly stated, and evidence of validation should be provided. Include an outline of the development plan required to support the planned indication. The Commercialization Plan must concisely convey:

- The business opportunity enabled by the innovation;
- The compelling value proposition for the intended customer;
- The key points of a plan appropriate for the Offeror's stage of development;
- The status of the effort to date;
- The current and the anticipated commercial landscape;
- Pertinent information about intellectual property;
- The planned indication for the product label, if appropriate;
- Transition plan (including potential funding and resources) showing how the product will progress to the next phase of development and/or delivery to the market after the successful completion of this award;
- The vision for the enterprise and how the proposed innovation fits into the future market.

3.3 Cost Proposal

MTEC will make sample cost proposal formats available on the members only MTEC website. Offerors are encouraged to use their own cost formats such that the necessary cost detail is provided. Refer to the MTEC PPG for additional details.

3.4 Proposal Preparation Cost

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

4 Selection

4.1 Proposal Source Selection

The Government will undertake proposal source selection. The proposal source selection will be conducted in accordance with the evaluation factors detailed below. The Government will conduct an evaluation of all qualified proposals. The Source Selection Authority may:

- a) Select the proposal (or some portion of the proposal) for award
- b) Place the proposal in the Basket if funding currently is unavailable or
- c) Reject the proposal (will not be placed in the Basket)

4.2 Evaluation Process

All applications will be evaluated by a panel of subject matter experts that will make recommendations for funding to the Commanding General, USAMRMC based on (a) criteria described below; and (b) the relevance to the missions of the CRM RP and MTEC. An MTEC Officer may be participating as an observer in the Government's technical evaluation process in order to provide improved feedback to all Offerors during the debriefing process. Offerors submitting the best value proposals that meet the evaluation criteria will be selected for award negotiations.

Factor 1: Nontraditional Defense Contractor/Cost Sharing

Factor 2: Technical Benefit

Factor 3: Potential for Transition and Commercialization

Factor 4: Cost

Nontraditional Defense Contractor/Cost Sharing is more important than Technical Benefit. Technical Benefit is more important than Potential for Transition and Commercialization. Potential for Transition and Commercialization is more important than Cost.

The following adjectival merit ratings will be used for Factors 2 and 3:

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

MTEC Request for Project Proposals 16-02-BRAIN MACHINE INTERFACE
W81XWH-15-9-0001

	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 unawardable.

4.2.1 Factor 1. Nontraditional Defense Contractor/Cost Sharing.

Each Offeror must have at least one Nontraditional Defense Contractor participating to a significant extent in the performance of an awarded Research Project Award or provide cost share of no less than one third of the value of the Research Project Award awarded to the Member Organization. See paragraph 1.6 for specific details on this evaluation criteria.

The following ratings will be used for Nontraditional Defense Contractor/Cost Sharing Evaluation:

Evaluation	Rating
Offeror proposing an MTEC research project meets at least one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offeror is a Nontraditional Defense Contractor • Offeror's proposal has at least one Nontraditional Defense Contractor participating to a significant extent • Offeror provides at least one third of the total project cost as acceptable cost share 	Acceptable
Offeror proposing an MTEC research project meets at least one of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offeror has at least one Nontraditional Defense Contractor participating, but additional detail is required to determine if nontraditional participation is significant • Offeror has proposed cost share, but additional detail is required to determine if cost share is acceptable 	Marginal
Offeror proposing an MTEC research project does not meet any of the following:	Unacceptable

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Offeror is a Nontraditional Defense Contractor• Offeror's proposal has at least one Nontraditional Defense Contractor participating to a significant extent• Offeror provides at least one third of the total project cost as acceptable cost share	
---	--

Proposals receiving a rating of unacceptable will be rejected. Proposals that receive an overall Technical Benefit Factor rating above a “Marginal” but with a Nontraditional Defense Contractor/Cost Sharing rating of “Marginal” may be awarded only if and when nontraditional participation is deemed significant or one third cost share is proposed.

4.2.2 Factor 2: Technical Benefit

The Technical Benefit Merit Rating will be a subjective adjectival rating.

The overall Technical Benefit Merit Rating will be based on an integrated assessment of the criteria described below. Each criterion will receive an adjectival rating of Outstanding, Good, Acceptable, Marginal, or Unacceptable. Based on these adjectival ratings, an overall Technical Benefit Factor Rating will be determined. The Technical Benefit Evaluation criteria are as follows:

1. Ability to address a specific Technology Objective area
2. Management, Schedule, Resources and Personnel

4.2.2.1 Ability to address a specific Technology Objective area

- The Offeror’s proposed solution will be assessed for the likelihood of successfully achieving the requirements of the technology of interest. This likelihood of success will be determined by considering the soundness of the technical approach, including complete and clear processes to execute the effort. Additional consideration will be given to the degree to which any preliminary existing data supports the proposed project plan and objectives, and the suitability of the proposed statistical plan. The proposed road map and SOW should provide a feasible plan for addressing the project’s objectives. The plan will be evaluated for how well the rationale, objectives, and specific aims support the research idea. The proposed effort will be assessed for the extent the solution is a technological breakthrough solution that is an innovative, novel approach, which is a brand new technology that currently is not readily available. The proposed effort’s demonstrated abilities to advance the technology maturity level and projected performance will be assessed. Relevance to the health care needs of military Service members, Veterans, and/or other Military Health System beneficiaries and the extent to which the proposal offers a joint Service solution will be considered.

4.2.2.2 Management, Schedule, Resources and Personnel

The Offeror’s proposal will be assessed for the aspects that evaluate the **Management, Schedule, Resources and Personnel**. The Offeror’s proposal will be considered for:

- Presentation of a sound management plan that demonstrates an ability to perform the proposed project in an orderly, timely manner.
- Degree to which the project team's expertise, key personnel, and corporate experience demonstrate ability to accomplish the SOW.
- Extent that facilities and resources are sufficiently identified and available to execute the effort as proposed.
- Clearly identified tangible technical benefits resulting from cost share resources above the required statutory requirement.
- Detailed schedule with cost risks, and potential mitigation strategies identified.

4.2.3 Factor 3: Potential for Transition and Commercialization

The Offeror's proposal will be assessed for:

- How well the Offeror provides sufficient evidence that the effort is ready to move into the proposed stage of research, development, or clinical testing.
- How well the project will translate promising, well-founded basic or clinical research findings into clinical applications for military Service members and or their beneficiaries.
- 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.
- How well the proposal identifies intellectual property ownership, describes any appropriate intellectual and material property plan among participating organizations (if applicable), and addresses any impact of intellectual property issues on product development.
- How well the regulatory strategy is described, if applicable.

4.2.4 Factor 4: Cost Evaluation Factors

The Cost area will receive a narrative rating. The Government Technical Evaluators will assess cost realism as part of the source selection process. If a proposal is selected for award, the MTEC CM will review the original cost proposal and the Offeror's response to a Proposal Update Letter (PUL), if applicable. The MTEC CM will request additional information or clarification as necessary. The MTEC CM will assess the reasonableness and completeness of the cost estimates and then provide a formal assessment to the Government. The Government will review this assessment and make the final determination that the negotiated project value is fair and reasonable.

Completeness

The following will be evaluated:

- The degree to which the Offerors have provided all cost information requested in the Proposal Preparation Guide. Rate and pricing information is required to properly perform the cost analysis of the proposal. If the Offeror is unwilling to provide this information in a timely manner, its proposal will be lacking information that is required to properly evaluate the proposal and the proposal cannot be selected for award.

- Substantiation of cost (i.e., supporting data and estimating rationale) for all elements.

Reasonableness

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

Realism

Estimates are "realistic" when they are neither excessive nor insufficient for the effort to be accomplished. Estimates must also be realistic for each task of the proposed project when compared to the total proposed cost. The MTEC CM will make a determination by directly comparing proposed costs with comparable current and historical data, evaluator experience, available estimates, etc. Proposed estimates will be compared with the corresponding technical proposals for consistency.

As part of its cost analysis, the factors of completeness, reasonableness, and realism will be reviewed as discussed below.

4.3 Best Value

The Government will conduct the source selection and MTEC CM will award the projects in Best Value sequence for each Technology Objective. If applicable, the Government will invoke a best value process to evaluate the most advantageous offer by considering and comparing factors in addition to cost or price. Based on the results of the Technical Evaluation, the Government reserves the right to negotiate and revise any or all parts of the SOW. Offerors will have the opportunity to concur with the revised SOW and revise cost proposals as necessary. Projects identified as having sufficient technical merit but lacking sponsorship funds, will be placed in the Basket in accordance with the Basket Provision.

Definitions

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.

5 Points of Contact

Questions concerning contractual, cost or pricing related to this RPP should be directed to the MTEC Program Manager, Polly Graham at SCRA Applied R&D via email to mtec-sc@mtec-sc.org.

Once an Offeror has submitted a proposal, neither the Government nor the MTEC CM will discuss evaluation status until the source selection process is complete.