

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-25-02-EXMED
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

Request for Project Proposals



Solicitation Number: MTEC-25-02-EXMED

“Development of an Expeditionary Medical (EXMED) mobile Command, Control, Communications, and Computers IT (C4IT) solution for integration into Expeditionary Fast Transport (T-EPF) Flight II”

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: November 1, 2024

Full Proposal Due Date: November 25, 2024
Noon Eastern Time

White Papers are NOT Required.

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-25-02-EXMED
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

Table of Contents

1	Executive Summary.....	4
1.1	The 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.....	5
2.3	Acquisition Approach.....	6
2.4	Proposers Conference.....	6
2.5	Proprietary Information.....	7
2.6	MTEC Member Teaming.....	7
2.7	Offeror Eligibility.....	8
2.8	Cost Sharing Definition.....	8
2.9	MTEC Assessment Fee.....	8
2.10	Intellectual Property and Data Rights.....	8
2.11	Expected Award Date.....	9
2.12	Anticipated Selection Notification.....	9
3	Technical Requirements.....	9
3.1	Background.....	9
3.2	Objective.....	11
3.3	Solution Requirements.....	11
3.3.1	Design.....	11
3.3.2	Functionality and Features.....	15
3.3.3	Structure.....	15
3.3.4	Authorization(s) and Approval(s).....	17
3.3.5	Test and Evaluation.....	17
3.3.6	Installation and Delivery.....	18
3.3.7	Production and Sustainment.....	18
3.3.8	Deliverables.....	18
3.4	Potential Follow-on Tasks.....	19
4	Proposal Preparation.....	20
4.1.	General Instructions.....	20
4.2.	Instructions for the Preparation & Submission of the Proposal.....	20
4.3.	Full Proposal Preparation Costs.....	23
4.4.	Freedom of Information Act.....	23
4.5.	Telecommunications and Video Surveillance.....	23
5	Selection.....	23
5.1	Preliminary Screening.....	23
5.2	Proposal Evaluation.....	23
5.2.1	Factor 1 – Technical Approach and Strategy.....	24
5.2.2	Factor 2 – Schedule.....	24
5.2.3	Factor 3 – Technical and Management Team and Resources.....	24
5.2.4	Factor 4 – Cost /Price.....	24
5.2.5	Adjectival Merit Ratings.....	25

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-25-02-EXMED
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

5.3	Cost/Price Evaluation by the Consortium Manager	26
5.3.1	Government Access to Information.....	27
5.3.2	Best Value.....	28
5.4	Definition of General Terms Used in Evaluations	28
6	Points-of-Contact	28
7	Acronyms/Abbreviations.....	28
8	Technical Proposal Template	32
	Addendum 1 – Biographical Sketch.....	38

1 Executive Summary

1.1 The Medical Technology Enterprise Consortium

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

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 awarded under the authority of 10 USC § 4022. As defined in the OTA Guide dated July 2023, 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. Proposed prototype projects should not be exploratory in nature and do require a foundation of preliminary data. For more information on the prototype definition, please see the Proposal Preparation Guide (PPG) located on the MTEC Members Only Site: <https://private.mtec-sc.org/>

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 in support of the Defense Health Agency (DHA) and Program Executive Office, Unmanned and Small Combatants (PEO USC) Expeditionary Missions (EXM) (PMS 408). Military relevance is a critical component of the proposal submission. The proposal(s) selected for funding as a result of this RPP will be awarded under the authority of 10 U.S.C. § 4022. Strategic oversight will be provided by PMS 408.

This RPP is focused on development of expeditionary medical (EXMED) command and control (C2), communications, and computer (C4) information technology (IT), or C4IT, prototypes with approval to connect (ATC) to Consolidated Afloat Networks and Enterprise Services (CANES) Network Management System (NMS) and authorization to operate (ATO) on an Expeditionary Fast Transport (EPF) Flight (FLT) II that integrates and interfaces with Joint Operational Medicine Information Systems (JOMIS) solutions.

Specifically, the government is looking to further the development of uninterrupted and secure health care delivery (HCD) within medical units and throughout the continuum, from en route care (ERC) provided during patient movement (PM) to Role 3 (hospital) care. This effort aims to develop two EXMED C4IT prototypes that enable interoperability across all medical and associated administrative (e.g., medical C2 or MEDC2, medical logistics or MEDLOG) functions, securely connecting medical and support endpoints (e.g., laptops, mobile x-rays, patient

monitoring devices, printers) to each other (local network) and to the DOD health enterprise (e.g., JOMIS).

2 Administrative Overview

2.1 Request for Project Proposals (RPP)

MTEC is utilizing a single-staged approach for this RPP. Each proposal submitted must contain both a Technical and Cost Proposal Volume as described in Section 4 of this RPP. The Technical Proposal must be in accordance with the mandatory format provided in Section 8 of this RPP; the Cost Proposal Volume must be in accordance with the requirements provided in the MTEC PPG, which is available on the MTEC Members-Only website (<https://private.mtec-sc.org/>). Proposals that fail to follow the mandatory requirements may be eliminated from the competition during the CM's preliminary screening stage (see Section 5 for more details on the Selection process). **White papers are NOT required for this RPP.** The Government will evaluate Proposals submitted and will select the proposal(s) that best meets their current priorities using criteria in Section 5 of this RPP.

Offerors who submit proposals in response to this RPP should submit by the date on the cover page of this RPP. Proposals may not be considered under this RPP unless received on or before the due date specified on the cover page.

The Government reserves the right to award Full Proposals received from this RPP on a follow-on prototype OTA or other stand-alone OTAs as necessary to meet mission requirements.

*Note that the terms "Full Proposal" and "Proposal" are used interchangeably throughout this RPP.

2.2 Funding Availability and Period of Performance

The U.S. Government (USG) currently has up to **\$2.693 million (M)** for this program, excluding the incentive fee detailed below. Dependent on the results and deliverables under any resultant award(s), the USG may, non-competitively, award additional dollars and/or allow for additional time for scope increases and/or follow-on efforts with appropriate modification of the award.

The Period of Performance (PoP) is not to exceed 18 months; however faster timelines are highly encouraged. To incentivize an accelerated timeline for the completion of the project, an incentive fee of 5% of the awarded cost will be granted should the selected performer be able to achieve all primary deliverables listed in Section 3.3.8 of this RPP by early January 2026 (subject to change and approval by the government). A second incentive fee of 5% of the awarded cost will be granted should the selected performer be able to achieve all secondary deliverables listed in Section 3.3.8 of this RPP within the PoP (subject to change and approval by the government).

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).

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-25-02-EXMED
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

It is expected that the Government will make a **single award** to a qualified Offeror in FY25 to accomplish the scope of work. Note, however, that the Government reserves the right to make final evaluation and award decisions based upon, among other factors, programmatic relevancy and overall best value solutions determined to be in the Government's best interest. Therefore, if a single Proposal is unable to sufficiently address the entire scope of this RPP's technical requirements (outlined in Section 3 of this RPP), several Offerors may be asked to work together in a collaborative manner. However, if an optimal team is not identified, then MTEC may make multiple, individual awards to Offeror(s) to accomplish subset(s) of the key tasks.

2.3 Acquisition Approach

Full proposals will be required in response to this RPP thus reflecting a single stage acquisition approach. MTEC membership is required for the submission of a full proposal. The due date for Proposals is found on the cover page of this RPP. Proposals may not be considered under this RPP unless the Proposal was received on or before the due date specified on the cover page. The Government will evaluate Proposals submitted and will select those that best meet their current technology priorities using the criteria in Section 5 of this RPP.

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. § 4022 section f.

The Government-selected prototype project(s) awarded as a result of this solicitation will be funded under the OTA for prototype projects 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 (RPA) issued under the member's Base Agreement. The MTEC Base Agreement can be found on the MTEC website and Members-Only website at www.mtec-sc.org.

At the time of the submission, if Offerors have not yet executed a Base Agreement, then Offerors must certify on the cover page of their Proposal that, if selected for award, they will abide by the terms and conditions of the latest version of the MTEC Base Agreement. If the Offeror already has executed a MTEC Base Agreement with the MTEC CM, then the Offeror must state on the cover page of its Proposal that, if selected for award, it anticipates the proposed effort will be funded under its executed MTEC Base Agreement.

2.4 Proposers Conference

MTEC intends to host a Proposers Conference that will be conducted via virtual webinar on **Thursday, November 7th at 2:00 PM EST**. The intent of the Proposers Conference is to provide an administrative overview of this RPP process to award and present further insight into the Technical Requirements outlined in Section 3 of this RPP. To register for this conference, please

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-25-02-EXMED
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

use the following link: https://ati.zoomgov.com/webinar/register/WN_d02aRs8YTNS0WG-JpJ6DEQ.

Offerors are advised to check the MTEC website periodically during the proposal preparation period for any clarifications found in Frequently Asked Questions 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.

MTEC Officers and Directors who are granted proposal access have signed Nondisclosure Agreements (NDAs) and Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) statements. Additionally, these MTEC Officers and Staff represent organizations that currently are not MTEC members, and therefore their parent organizations are not eligible to submit Proposals or receive any research project funding through MTEC.

Also, as part of MTEC's mission to incorporate philanthropic donations, MTEC frequently makes contact with private entities (e.g., foundations, investor groups, organizations, individuals) that award grants or otherwise co-fund research, and/or operates in research areas that are aligned with those of MTEC. These private entities may be interested in reviewing certain Proposals within their program areas, allowing opportunities to attract supplemental funding sources. Therefore, on your Proposal Cover Page, please indicate your willingness to allow MTEC Officers and Directors access to your Proposal for the purposes of engaging in outreach activities with these private entities.

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. The following resources may help interested Offerors provide a more complete team for this requested scope of work:

- **MTEC M-Corps** is a network of subject matter experts and service providers to help MTEC members address the business, technical, and regulatory challenges associated with medical product development. Please visit <https://www.mtec-sc.org/m-corps/> for details on current partners
- **MTEC Database Collaboration Tool** to help identify potential teaming partners among other MTEC members. It can be accessed via the "MTEC Profiles Site" tab on the [MTEC members-only website](https://private.mtec-sc.org/) (<https://private.mtec-sc.org/>).

2.7 Offeror Eligibility

Offerors must be MTEC members in good standing to be eligible to submit a Proposal. Offerors submitting Proposals as **the prime performer must be MTEC members of good standing at least 3 days prior to submission of the Proposals**. Subcontractors (including all lower tier subawardees) do not need to be MTEC members. To join MTEC, please visit <http://mtec-sc.org/how-to-join/>. Should you have any questions regarding MTEC membership, please reach out to the points of contact listed within this RPP.

2.8 Cost Sharing Definition

Cost sharing is defined as the non-Federal 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*. In order to be compliant with 10 U.S.C. §4022, Research Projects selected for funding under this RPP are required to meet at least one of the conditions specified in **Section 3 of the PPG**. Proposals that fail to meet the mandatory statutory conditions with regard to the appropriate use of Other Transaction authority, as detailed in **Section 3 of the PPG**, will not be evaluated and will be determined ineligible for award. Additionally, **Section 7.4 of the PPG** contains information on cost share definitions and directions for inclusion.

2.9 MTEC Assessment Fee

Per Section 3.4 of the Consortium Member Agreement (CMA), each recipient of an RPA under the MTEC OTA shall pay MTEC an amount equal to 2% of the total funded value of each research project awarded. Such deposits shall be due no later than 90-days after the RPA is executed. The MTEC Assessment Fee is not allowable as a direct charge to any resulting award or any other contract. Therefore, Offerors shall not include this Assessment Fee as part of their proposed direct costs. Members who have not paid the assessment fee within 90 days of the due date are not “Members in good standing”.

2.10 Intellectual Property and Data Rights

Baseline IP and Data Rights for MTEC RPAs are defined in the terms of an awardee’s Base Agreement and, if applicable, specifically negotiated terms are finalized in any resultant RPA. MTEC reserves the right to assist in the negotiation of IP, royalties, licensing, future development, etc., between the Government and the individual performers prior to final award decision and during the entire award period.

The Offeror shall comply with the terms and conditions contained in their Base Agreement regarding IP and Data Rights, as modified by the specifically negotiated IP and Data rights terms herein. Specifically, the Awardee shall grant to and/or obtain for the Government all Government Purpose Rights to Category A and Category B Data (as defined in the MTEC Base Agreement) **including all documents, software, and materials developed under this award and those developed prior to award by the Awardee or other entity, which are needed for full functionality and/or maintenance of the project deliverables. Data for which Government Purpose Rights shall be granted also includes all source code, algorithms, libraries, and**

additional files required to compile and run the software developed under this award. The documents, software, and materials developed under this award, as well as those developed prior to award as mentioned in the preceding sentence (including but not limited to libraries needed for full functionality and/or maintenance of the project deliverables), shall be provided to the Government with Government Purpose Rights. Any Commercial Computer Software and/or Data needed for the full functionality and maintenance of the project deliverables must be delivered with a commercial license granting to the Government rights equivalent to the Government Purpose Rights described herein. The documents, software, and materials produced under the Award shall not be sold back to a different Government entity as the Government is receiving Government Purpose Rights therein. All documents, materials, and software supplied to the Government under this Award shall be conveyable to other government entities and third parties within the limitations of a Government Purpose Rights license as mentioned above, with no notice to, or authorization from, the Offeror needed. This right does not abrogate any other Government rights. For purposes of this section (i.e. Section 2.10 of the RPP.), the terms “developed” and “government purpose” shall have the same definition as utilized in DFARS 252.227-7014.

See Attachment 6 of the PPG for more detail. Note that as part of each proposal submission, Offerors **shall** complete and submit Attachment 6 of the PPG (Intellectual Property and Data Rights) as an appendix to the Proposal with the Signature of the responsible party for the proposing Prime Offeror.

For more information, the CM has published a resource for Offerors entitled, “Understanding Intellectual Property and Data Rights” on the MTEC members-only website.

2.11 Expected Award Date

Offerors should plan on the PoP to begin in January of 2025 (subject to change). The Government reserves the right to change the proposed PoP start date through negotiations via the CM and prior to issuing an RPA.

2.12 Anticipated Selection Notification

As the basis of selections is completed, the Government will forward its selections to the MTEC CM to notify Offerors. All Offerors will be notified by email from the MTEC CM of the results of the evaluation. Those successful proposals will move forward with the award process.

Offerors are hereby notified that once a Proposal has been submitted, neither the Government nor the MTEC CM will discuss evaluation/status until after the Offeror receives the formal notification with the results of this evaluation.

3 Technical Requirements

3.1 Background

No current capabilities fully bridge the gaps between EXMED units (e.g., expeditionary medical units or EMUs), brick-and-mortar medical facilities, and other healthcare providers, such as

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-25-02-EXMED
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

emergency medical service (EMS) providers. Although standards exist to facilitate data interchange, there are limited solutions that offer robust communications and computer IT packages to implement standards at all levels of care, across military and civilian healthcare organizations.

Currently, many EXMED units present paper charts or verbal reports when transferring care. These methods of information exchange lead to errors, reducing timeliness and quality of care. Even within EXMED units, medical functionality is not fully interoperable; for example, information from diagnostic equipment must be manually captured in electronic health records (EHR). Further, administrative and public health functions are often disconnected from EXMED care providers, limiting visibility of logistics needs (e.g., supply) and safety considerations (e.g., disease vectors). Agile and interoperable solutions are required to improve healthcare provision both on the battlefield and at home.

Mobile and rugged C4IT solutions and medical applications are required to ensure uninterrupted and secure HCD within medical units and throughout the continuum, from ERC provided during PM to hospital care. Solutions must enable interoperability across all medical and administrative functions (MEDLOG, MEDC2) and domains, securely connecting medical and support endpoints (e.g., laptops) to each other and the enterprise.

C4IT solutions must achieve interoperability by implementing joint/industry communications and health IT standards (e.g., United States Core Data for Interoperability [USCDI]) and meeting cybersecurity requirements (e.g., National Institute of Standards and Technology [NIST] Risk Management Framework [RMF] as implemented by the DOD, i.e., DODI 8510.01¹ and related). EXMED C4IT solutions must be physically resilient, scalable, secure, and extensible. Solutions must survive and operate with limited degradation in various environmental conditions endured by EXMED units (e.g., conditions stipulated in required operational capabilities and projected operational environments instructions, e.g., OPNAVINST 3501.411²), including but not limited to climatic extremes (e.g., rain, temperature extremes, coastal/ocean environments), degraded/denied external communications, and in the face of threats such as cyber-attacks, electromagnetic (EM) attack/effects, and other effects of operating in chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear (CBRN) environments. Scalability is required to ensure the solution can be tailored to meet the mobility and capacity needs of various medical units. Extensibility is critical to ensuring solutions can incorporate new functionality and additional interfaces as civilian and DOD medical technology improves. For example, C4IT must connect to various civilian health information and DOD networks (e.g., CANES, Nonclassified Internet Protocol Router Network [NIPRNET], Medical Community of Interest [MEDCOI]). Resiliency, automation, and interoperability require an innovative application of networking, communications, artificial

¹ DOD CIO, "DODI 8510.01, Risk Management Framework for DOD Systems," 19 July 2022. Available online at: <https://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/dodi/851001p.pdf>

² "OPNAVINST 3501.411, Required Operational Capabilities and Projected Operational Environment for the Role 2 Enhanced Expeditionary Medical Unit," Available online at: <https://www.secnav.navy.mil/doni/Directives/03000%20Naval%20Operations%20and%20Readiness/03-500%20Training%20and%20Readiness%20Services/3501.411.pdf>.

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-25-02-EXMED
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

intelligence, data storage and management, and other technologies and approaches that facilitate realizing smart hospital benefits in a distributed and expeditionary environment.

3.2 Objective

The objective of this effort is to develop a secure expeditionary and interoperable IT and hardware package to enable HCD, MEDC2, MEDLOG, and patient movement in austere and contested environments, including connected and disconnected operations afloat (on EPF FLT II ships) and ashore. By the end of the PoP or sooner, performers are expected to develop and deliver **two** identical C4IT prototypes (meeting or exceeding the required specifications detailed herein). Each prototype shall be able to deploy and operate independently of other C4IT solutions to support receiving EXMED units, e.g., C4IT 1 for EMU 1 and C4IT 2 for EMU 2. Prototypes shall be authorized to operate on EPF FLT II ships, approved to connect to JOMIS solutions through EPF FLT II networks, and accepted by the USG based on successful test and evaluation (T&E). The deliverables shall include two prototypes as well as all products developed during and for requirements analysis, design, development, T&E, installation, operations, RMF and related processes. Products include, but are not limited to, documents, drawings, and models.

3.3 Solution Requirements

The USG is seeking a solution capable of satisfying the following requirements related to Design; Functionality and Features; Structure; Authorization(s) and Approval(s); Test and Evaluation; Installation and Delivery; Production and Sustainment; and Deliverables. Additional information and guidance documents may be provided upon award to enhance the proposed solution.

3.3.1 Design

The technical solution shall include design of two identical mobile and rugged EXMED C4IT solutions for deployment with EMUs on EPF FLT II ships. The prototypes shall be safe, usable, scalable, extensible, survivable (resilient), multimodal (operate in all expected domains, including afloat and ashore operations), and interoperable. Design shall be conducted consistent with guidance provided by the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Research, Development & Acquisition (ASN (RD&A)) and Department of the Navy (DON) Chief Information Officer (CIO)³ as well as engineering best practices, including but not limited to the employment of a model-based systems engineering approach that facilitates engineering (e.g., enables automation, reduces rework, minimizes inconsistencies). Offerors are expected to work iteratively in coordination with the Government to refine and implement prototype designs as to best ensure the prototypes capability in meeting all requirements listed below.

3.3.1.1 Scalability

The design shall enable each prototype to scale in support of EMU operations (see OPNAVINST 3501.411 EMU ROC POE² and related). Each prototype shall disaggregate into smaller units of useful capability that allow initial operations and aggregate to scale up to full operations.

³ "ASN (RD&A)/DON CIO Joint Memorandum for Distribution, Department of the Navy Enterprise Service Designation for Naval Integrated Modeling Environment," Available online at: <https://www.doncio.navy.mil/ContentView.aspx?id=16127>.

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-25-02-EXMED
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

Likewise, the prototypes shall be designed to scale down to support small teams operating within Forward Deployable Preventative Medical Units (FDPMU). Design shall enable scaling up to support field hospitals (hundreds of personnel).

3.3.1.2 Extensibility

The design shall:

- 1) Allow modifications to integrate new/alternative endpoints
- 2) Allow modifications to employ new/alternative information exchange mechanisms to ensure interoperability with latest DOD enterprise information systems (IS), including administrative (i.e., non-health) IS.
- 3) Enable future integration/interface with enterprise and theater sustainment, including MEDLOG, solutions, such as:
 - a) Maintenance and Material Management (3-M) System
 - b) Relational Supply (RSupply)
 - c) Naval Operational Supply System (NOSS)
 - d) Defense Medical Logistics Standard Support (DMLSS)
 - e) LogiCole
- 4) Enable future integration/interface SECRET Internet Protocol Router Network (SIPRNET)
 - a) This requires the prototypes to meet multiple impact levels (IL) up to IL6 (or cloud/hybrid cloud solutions) or comparable (for other solutions). See related requirements regarding cybersecurity, cyber survivability, and RMF.
- 5) Enable future integration/interface TRANSCOM (U.S. Transportation Command) Regulating and Command & Control Evacuation System (TRAC2ES) and/or Medical Common Operating Picture (MedCOP)
- 6) Enable future integration/interface Defense Readiness Reporting System - Strategic (DRRS-S)/ - Navy (DRRS-N)

See additional considerations (Section 3.3.1.6 of this RPP).

3.3.1.3 Survivability (Resilience)

The prototypes shall operate in and survive the same conditions as the EMU (see the OPNAVINST 3501.411 EMU ROC POE²). The prototypes shall survive the same threat environment, including non-kinetic and limited kinetic threats (e.g., cyber, EM, and CBRN). All components of the prototypes that constitute facility equipment (i.e., equipment required to provide shelter, climate-control, and related capabilities; this equipment typically does not operate in climate-controlled environments), civil engineering support equipment, civil engineering end item, and materials handling equipment, including but not limited to the shipping containers (Section 3.3.3.1 of this RPP), shall operate in temperatures ranging from -10°F (-23.3°C) to 125°F (51.7°C) as well as in varying humidity and other conditions of basic, hot-humid (tropical), hot-dry (desert), and coastal and ocean environments. Other components of the prototypes (those expected to operate in climate-controlled spaces) shall operate with little to no degradation in temperatures between 60°F (15.6°C) and 85°F (29.4°C) and humidity between 15% and 80%. The prototypes shall include options to secure multimodal equipment for operations (e.g., straps, anchor points, integrated stabilizing devices). The prototypes shall operate with little to no degradation in salt

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-25-02-EXMED
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

fog. The prototypes shall operate at sea state ≥ 2 as experienced on EPF FLT II ships. The prototypes, packaged for transportation, shall survive storage and transportation in climatic extremes ranging from severe cold weather to hot-humid (tropical) to hot-dry (desert) and coastal and ocean environments (see MIL-STD-810^{4, 5} and related). The prototypes shall be designed to enable recovery from CBRN exposure to the maximum extent feasible within the constraints of other attributes specified herein (i.e., consistent with EMU operations). The prototypes shall operate in the intended EM environments without causing or experiencing critical failures (i.e., degradation of equipment that is non-recoverable). The prototypes shall be designed to ensure emission control (EMCON) requirements can be met. EMCON requirements include, but are not limited to, the ability to disable and enable transmitters and receivers quickly. The prototypes shall meet cyber survivability attributes required to authorize the solution for operations and provide an enduring capability in the projected operational environment, minimally including access control, system partitioning (logical and physical), attack surface minimization, baseline management and monitoring, and system recovery.

3.3.1.4 Usability and Safety

The design shall meet or incorporate applicable human systems integration (HSI) constraints in MIL-STD-1472H⁴ (or superseding), balancing capability with usability. Design shall include usable and discernible interfaces (e.g., clear indicators). User interfaces shall be simplified to reduce training requirements. Design shall limit the need for specialty tools to operate and maintain the prototypes. Components shall be capable of being maintained and operated by individuals per the OPNAVINST 3501.411 EMU ROC POE² and related manpower and other constructs. The prototypes shall meet applicable safety regulations as established in Navy and related guidance, including but not limited to NAVSEAINST 9310.1C⁶ (or superseding).

3.3.1.5 Interoperability

The prototypes shall be designed to interoperate with Joint forces and capabilities. The prototypes shall produce and consume data that is compatible with the data produced and consumed by other Naval Expeditionary Health Service Support (NEHSS) and joint Health Service Support (HSS) capabilities, including authoritative repositories (see JOMIS requirements, Section 3.3.1.5.1 of this RPP). The prototypes shall be compatible with Navy (ideally joint force) infrastructure, including but not limited to power services. See platform compatibility and ship integration requirements, Section 3.3.1.5.3 of this RPP).

3.3.1.5.1 JOMIS Interface and Integration

⁴ MIL-STDs and similar products are available on ASSIST (<https://quicksearch.dla.mil/qsSearch.aspx>) and EverySpec.com. DOD issuances are available on the DOD Issuances site (<https://www.esd.whs.mil/DD/DoD-Issuances/>). Department of Navy issuances are available on the DONI site (<https://www.secnav.navy.mil/doni/default.aspx>).

⁵ "MIL-STD-810, Department of Defense Test Method Standard: Environmental Engineering Considerations and Laboratory Tests," Available online at: https://quicksearch.dla.mil/qsDocDetails.aspx?ident_number=35978.

⁶ NAVSEAINST 9310.1C, "Naval Lithium Battery Safety Program", 12 August 2015. Available online at: <https://nps.edu/documents/111291366/111353818/NAVSEAINST+9310+1C+08.12.15.pdf/1b39f12a-d05c-9925-3c29-0e0ce5a45358?t=1643064781899>

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-25-02-EXMED
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

Joint interoperability is enabled by JOMIS connectivity. The prototypes shall interface with JOMIS capabilities, including solutions requiring client applications and browser-enabled access. The prototypes shall connect to the MEDCOI and NIPRNET, via Navy (EPF FLT II) networks/communication infrastructure, to enable access to JOMIS services. The prototypes shall interface and integrate with Theater Medical Information Program-Maritime (TMIP-M) per interface control documents (and related JOMIS specifications and guidance). The prototypes shall enable interface/integration with the following JOMIS capabilities, per JOMIS specifications and guidance, as these capabilities replace existing capabilities (e.g., TMIP).

- 1) Operational Medicine Data Service (OMDS)
- 2) Operational Medicine Care Delivery Platform (OpMed CDP)
 - a) Including Battlefield Assisted Trauma Distributed Observation Kit (BATDOK)
- 3) MHS (Military Health System) GENESIS-Theater (MHSG-T)
- 4) Theater Blood Mobile (TBLD-M)

3.3.1.5.2 Other Services

The prototypes shall enable access to various web-browser-based services, including but not limited to DynaMedex and UpToDate.

3.3.1.5.3 Platform Compatibility and Ship Integration

The prototypes shall meet the requirements of the EPF FLT II regarding size, weight, heat, cooling, and power as defined in the EPF FLT II performance specification (PSPEC) (or superseding documents) and related documents (interface control documents). Design products shall include all size, weight, heat, cooling, power, and other information to facilitate the development of a load plan for deploying to and operating from EPF FLT II ships. The hardened containers shall include interfaces (e.g., cables) compatible with the panels in the mission bay of EPF FLT II ships. The hardened containers shall connect to EPF FLT II panels for power and data. The prototypes shall be designed to minimize the amount of power required for operations. The Offeror(s) should consider adapters, power conditioning, uninterruptible power supplies, and other devices to maximize compatibility with EPF FLT II ships while also enabling future compatibility. The design shall minimize cooling requirements, weight, operational size (footprint when configured for operations), and size when packaged for transportation. All components in transit cases, excluding the hardened containers, shall fit through EPF FLT II hatches, doors, and elevators (i.e., internal openings). The hardened containers shall meet the size constraints stipulated in Section 3.3.3.1 of this RPP.

3.3.1.6 Additional Considerations

The design shall be modular, scalable, and extensible. The design shall maximize innovative approaches, extensibility, and interoperability. Offerors should consider the following:

- 1) In addition to implementing standards/specifications to interoperate with JOMIS, C4IT design should enable exchange consistent with standards developed by organizations like Digital Imaging and Communications in Medicine (DICOM), Health Level Seven International (HL7), and National Council for Prescription Drug Programs (NCPDP)
- 2) Design should enable employment technologies like machine learning and data lakes to collect and process unstructured data and structured data of various formats

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-25-02-EXMED
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

- 3) Design should include creative approaches to enable rapid integration of new endpoints; endpoints may be vastly different in purpose and construct
- 4) Design should enable integration with and operation from other afloat platforms as well as operations ashore.

3.3.2 Functionality and Features

The prototypes shall provide the following functionality and features:

- 1) Security (physical and logical, including but not limited to secure data exchange, processing, and storage); see Section of 3.3.1.3 of this RPP for more information on survivability, including cyber survivability
- 2) Enterprise operations (enable EMU operations when connected; see interoperability, Section 3.3.1.5 of this RPP)
- 3) Standalone operations (enable EMU operations when disconnected or with limited connectivity)
- 4) Wired connectivity (including connectivity to endpoints)
- 5) Wireless connectivity (including connectivity to endpoints)
- 6) Related network services (e.g., monitoring, management, optimization)
- 7) Implementation of standards and protocols (see interoperability, Section 3.3.1.5 of this RPP, and additional considerations, Section 3.3.1.6 of this RPP)

3.3.3 Structure

The prototypes shall be capable of deploying and operating independently of each other in order to support multiple EXMED units (e.g., EMUs) simultaneously. The prototypes shall be composed of components that maximize transportability of the overall system and mobility/portability of individual components. The prototypes shall include hardened containers or comparable (Section 3.3.3.1 of this RPP), network components (i.e., all components required to meet functionality, connectivity, and other requirements herein), mobile network enclosures, endpoints (Section 3.3.3.3 of this RPP), transit cases (Section 3.3.3.4 of this RPP), and related components (including but not limited to consumable and accessories, Section 3.3.3.4 of this RPP) to enable HCD, MEDC2, MEDLOG, and patient movement in austere and contested environments.

3.3.3.1 Hardened Containers

Each prototype shall include a standard 10-foot shipping container (i.e., a container with external dimensions no more than 10 feet in length by 8.5 feet in height by 8 feet in width) or comparable transportation mechanism. All components of a single prototype, when packed for transportation (see transit case requirements, Section 3.3.3.4 of this RPP), shall fit inside the prototype's 10-foot container (with the exception of the hardened container itself). The containers shall meet the American Bureau of Shipping (ABS) rules and regulations, including the portable industrial module (PIM) certification requirements per Rules for Survey After Construction (Part 7)⁷ or superseding. See Section 3.3.4 of this RPP for more information on

⁷ "Rules for Survey After Construction (Part 7)." Available online at:
<https://ww2.eagle.org/content/dam/eagle/rules-and-guides/current/generic/generics-2024/00-part-7-jul24.pdf>

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-25-02-EXMED
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

certifications. See Section 3.3.1.3 of this RPP for more information on survivability and Section 3.3.1.5.3 of this RPP for more information on EPF FLT II interoperability.

3.3.3.2 Network Enclosures

Each prototype shall include a network enclosure. Each network enclosure shall be sufficient to house all network components of a single prototype. The network enclosures shall protect the network components in transit and during operations. The network enclosures shall be mobile and enable transportation of network components to and from various compartments on EPF FLT II ships. The network enclosures shall enable network components to operate from various compartments on EPF FLT II ships.

3.3.3.3 Endpoints

To enable HCD, MEDC2, MEDLOG, and patient movement functions, each prototype shall include end-user devices or endpoints. Each prototype shall include the following endpoints in the specified quantities:

- 1) 21 rugged laptops, each equipped with a common access card (CAC) reader, headset, and mouse
- 2) 28 tablets that enable two-handed (ideally one-handed) operation and are compatible with JOMIS solutions, each equipped with a detachable keyboard and protective case
- 3) 6 BATDOK-compatible mobile devices that enable one-handed operation, each equipped with a protective case
- 4) 5 multifunction printers that scan, print, and copy
- 5) 5 label printers that are approved for medical use/operations
- 6) 6 barcode scanners that are compatible with JOMIS solutions (e.g., BATDOK)
- 7) 3 wristband printers that are approved for medical use/operations
- 8) 200 Near-field communication (NFC) cards that are compatible with JOMIS solutions
- 9) 1 large screen display with mount for patient tracking and C2 operations
- 10) 7 DVD/CD writers
- 11) 7 memory card readers
- 12) 1 shredder approved for use by the DOD

The delivered solution shall include the total quantity of endpoints required for both prototypes (i.e., 42 total rugged laptops procured, 21 laptops for each prototype, etc.). The endpoints for both prototypes shall be consistent (e.g., the same make and model of rugged laptop is selected for both prototypes) to facilitate compatibility, cybersecurity, and configuration management.

To the maximum extent, endpoints shall be mobile and easy to operate, ideally with one hand. See MIL-STD-1472⁸ (and related) for more information regarding usability (including component sizes and weights). The Offeror(s) shall select devices that are supportable and, as applicable, approved for use in medical applications and with JOMIS solutions (see 3.3.1.5 of this RPP).

⁸ "MIL-STD-1472, Department of Defense Design Criteria Standard: Human Engineering," Available online at: https://quicksearch.dla.mil/qsDocDetails.aspx?ident_number=36903.

3.3.3.4 Consumables, Accessories, and Transit Cases

The prototypes shall include transit cases to protect endpoints, consumables, accessories, and other components not otherwise protected and transported in the network enclosures. All components of a single prototype (excluding the hardened container), packaged for transportation in transit cases, shall fit in a single hardened container (i.e., that prototype's container).

Each prototype shall include consumables (printer cartridges, paper, etc.) and accessories (power adapters, data cables, etc.) of all components to enable full operation for no less than 30 days.

3.3.4 Authorization(s) and Approval(s)

Prior to T&E of the prototypes and prototype delivery, the prototypes shall be authorized to operate on EPF FLT II ships, including the EPF 14 and EPF 15. Prior to final acceptance testing and prototype delivery, the prototypes shall be approved to connect to EPF networks, including CANES NMS variants used on EPF FLT II ships.

The Offeror(s) shall execute the RMF for DOD systems per DODI 8510.01⁹ (or superseding) and related DOD, Navy, and DHA guidance to obtain necessary authorizations (e.g., ATO, interim authorization to test [IATT]) to allow T&E and operation of the prototypes on EPFs and in test environments and test facilities. The Offeror(s) shall conduct necessary system integration testing to obtain ATCs the prototypes to EPF networks (e.g., CANES NMS).

All components of the prototypes, including but not limited to the containers (Section 3.3.3.1 of this RPP), shall meet rules and regulations of the American Bureau of Shipping (ABS) and be certified by ABS for safe operations on EPF FLT II ships. Prototype compliance to ABS includes, but is not limited to, cybersecurity, EM interference, and operational safety (e.g., fire safety). See section 3.3.1 of this RPP for additional ship integration information.

3.3.5 Test and Evaluation

The technical solution shall include test planning and test execution. During the PoP, Offerors shall work iteratively with the Government to finalize the test strategy, test plans, and test reports. Test plans shall be aligned with the PSPEC to clearly show traceability from requirements to prototype components as well as test methods and test procedures. Prototype T&E shall cover integration testing, system testing (with interfaces to JOMIS operational), and acceptance testing (e.g., system operational verification test or SOVT). Test execution shall be documented in test reports which capture actual characteristics (e.g., security, interoperability, performance) for comparison to design. Reports shall also include improvements required (e.g., mitigations to deficiencies).

⁹ DOD CIO, "DODI 8510.01, Risk Management Framework for DOD Systems," 19 July 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.esd.whs.mil/Portals/54/Documents/DD/issuances/dodi/851001p.pdf>

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-25-02-EXMED
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

Prior to delivery of the prototypes, all deficiencies associated with requirements specified herein, including but not limited to meeting requirements to obtain authorizations and approvals (Section 3.3.4 of this RPP), shall be mitigated to the satisfaction of the USG.

3.3.6 Installation and Delivery

The technical solution shall include installation plans as well as training materials for the prototypes, including but not limited to installation manuals and operation manuals. The Offeror(s) shall install the prototypes and conduct acceptance testing (Section 3.3.5 of this RPP).

3.3.7 Production and Sustainment

The technical solution shall include production and sustainment plans that document a timeline to support future production and sustainment (Section 3.4 of this RPP), related production and sustainment costs, as well as production risks and potential mitigations. Sustainment planning shall address provision of training in the future.

3.3.8 Deliverables

Primary deliverables required for the successful completion of the period of performance (and for the receipt of the primary incentive fee as described in Section 2.2 of this RPP) shall include:

- **Two** identical prototypes as described herein
- Regular (i.e., monthly) progress reports (with risks, cost and schedule impacts, mitigations)
- Any products required for the design, development, analysis, T&E, installation, operations, RMF and related processes, to include the following:
 - Requirements specifications,
 - Design documents (minimally including equipment lists, equipment specifications, equipment configuration, internal block diagrams, activity diagrams, rack diagrams, networking diagrams, mechanical drawings, electrical drawings),
 - Plans listed herein including implementation plan (addressing project management strategy, including risk, systems engineering, program protection and cybersecurity), test strategy, test plans, installation plan, production and sustainment plan,
 - Security architecture views and artifacts (including but not limited to drawings, spreadsheets, documents, and models) that meet content and formatting requirements to execute the RMF to obtain an ATO),
 - Reports (including test reports, cybersecurity vulnerability assessments),
 - Training materials (installation manuals, operation manuals, and training presentation or comparable products),
 - Related products (such as models and other source files)

Secondary deliverables required for the successful completion of the PoP (and for the receipt of the secondary incentive fee as described in Section 2.2 of this RPP) shall include:

- ABS PIM Certification as described in Section 3.3.3.1 of this RPP
- Obtaining ATO as described in Section 3.3.4 of this RPP

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-25-02-EXMED
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

- Obtaining ATC as described in Section 3.3.4 of this RPP
- Passing acceptance testing (e.g., system operational verification test or SOVT); see Section 3.3.5 of this RPP for additional information about T&E
- A final report with findings and recommendations

All deliverables shall be identified and included within the Offeror's Milestone Payment Schedule. A final and comprehensive schedule of both primary and secondary deliverables shall be negotiated after selection of the performer.

3.4 Potential Follow-on Tasks

Under awards resulting from this RPP, there is the potential for award of one or more non-competitive follow-on tasks based on the success of the project (subject to change depending upon Government review of completed work and successful progression of milestones). Potential follow-on work may be awarded based on the advancement in prototype maturity during the initial (not to exceed 18 month) PoP. Future efforts may include, but are not limited to:

- Optimization of prototypes to ensure suitability in all projected operational environments, including:
 - Enhanced survivability (e.g., integrate network/other redundancies, identify and deploy next-gen hardened enclosures)
 - Optimized performance (e.g., identify and upgrade to state-of-the-art firewalls or networks-in-a-box)
 - Improved mobility (e.g., reduce overall network rack size with networks-in-a-box)
 - Continued mitigation of security vulnerabilities (e.g., apply software/firmware patches)
 - Interoperability with additional host units and platforms
- Modernization of the solution through:
 - Addition of interfaces to new enterprise information systems that facilitate MEDC2, MEDLOG, PM, and HCD
 - Incorporation of new medical devices
 - Continued improvements to the timeliness and accuracy of information collection with automation (e.g., integration of card/QR code printers and readers, advanced voice command, AI-supported form completion)
 - Integration of organic external communications solutions (e.g., satellite communications) to enable connectivity to enterprise solutions without leveraging host infrastructure (e.g., EPF FLT II networks)
- Production of additional systems required to meet full operational capabilities (FOC) stipulated in requirements documents of the EXMED FOS (e.g., 13 EMUs, 8 ashore theater hospitalization system or ATHS which offers role 3, 75 en route care systems or ERCS, 4 FDPUMs).
- Incorporation of functionality required to evolve C4IT beyond an IT package to a full-fledged expeditionary medical data/knowledge management solution that complements JOMIS and other enterprise capabilities.

4 Proposal Preparation

4.1. General Instructions

Proposals should be submitted by the date and time specified on the cover page using Broad agency announcement Information Delivery System (BIDS): <https://submissions2.ati.org/ATI2/Portal.nsf/Start?ReadForm>. See **Attachment 7 of the PPG** for further information regarding BIDS registration and submission. The Offeror shall include MTEC Solicitation Number (**MTEC-25-02-EXMED**) on the submitted proposal.

The MTEC PPG is specifically designed to assist Offerors in understanding the proposal preparation process. The Technical Proposal format outlined in **Section 8 of this RPP** is mandatory and shall reference this RPP number (**MTEC-25-02-EXMED**). Offerors are encouraged to contact the POCs identified herein up until the Proposal submission date/time to clarify requirements (both administrative and technical in nature).

All eligible Offerors may submit Full Proposals for evaluation according to the criteria set forth herein. Offerors are advised that only ATI as the MTEC's CM, with the approval of the DoD Agreements Officer, is legally authorized to contractually bind MTEC into any resultant awards.

4.2. Instructions for the Preparation & Submission of the Proposal

Offerors submitting a Proposal in response to this RPP shall 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, searchable, 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.

An automated BIDS receipt confirmation will be provided by email. 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 (8): Submitted via BIDS (5MB or lower per document)

- **Technical Proposal:** one PDF document (Template Provided in Section 8 of this RPP)
- **Section I: Cost Proposal Narrative:** one Word or PDF document (Refer to Section 7.2 of the PPG)
- **Section II: Cost Proposal Formats:** one Excel or PDF document (Refer to Section 7.3 of the PPG)

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-25-02-EXMED
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

- **Warranties and Representations:** one Word or PDF document (Attachment 3 of the PPG)
- **SOW/MPS:** one Word or PDF document (Attachment 4 of the PPG)
- **Current and Pending Support:** one Word or PDF document (Attachment 5 of the PPG)
- **IP and Data Rights Assertions:** one Word or PDF document (Attachment 6 of the PPG)
- **Biographical Sketches:** one Word or PDF document (Addendum 1 of this RPP) providing a biographical sketch for all key personnel contributing to the proposed work.

What follows provides additional information related to each of the required documents for the full proposal submission. The Technical Proposal and the 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 Proposal should include the following. Each document will be uploaded to BIDS separately (**see Attachment 7 of the PPG for BIDS instructions**).

- **Technical Proposal:** The Technical Proposal shall adhere to the format provided in **Section 8 of this RPP**, which is **mandatory**. The Technical Proposal shall be limited to fourteen (14) pages, **excluding** the *Cover Page*. The Technical Proposal shall be 12-point font (or larger), single-spaced, and 8.5 inches x 11 inches. Smaller type 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. Offerors are strongly encouraged to use pictures and graphics to succinctly represent proposed ideas, organization, data, etc. Proposals shall reference this RPP number (**MTEC-25-02-EXMED**). **Technical Proposals and Appendices exceeding the page limitations and/or the file size specified above may not be accepted.**

APPENDICES (excluded from the page limit, and must be uploaded to BIDS as separate documents)

- **Cost Proposal:** The Cost Proposal (also referred to as Volume 2) 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, Facilities & Administrative, Other Direct Costs, etc. Travel costs should be included with a justification for travel as well as duration and number of personnel. Offerors should consider all aspects of the effort (e.g., T&E, delivery, and installation) when identifying costs (e.g., shipping). 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 and Section II: Cost Proposal Formats. [Refer to Section 7 of the PPG for instruction regarding the preparation of the Cost Proposal.] Cost proposal formats are available on the Members-Only MTEC website; however, these formats are **NOT** mandatory. **Offerors are encouraged to use their own cost formats such that the necessary detail is provided.** Refer to the MTEC PPG for additional details. Refer to Section 5.3 of this RPP for details on how the full Cost Proposals will be evaluated.

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-25-02-EXMED
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

- **Warranties and Representations (template provided in Attachment 3 of the PPG):** Warranties and Representations are required. One Word (.docx or .doc) or PDF file that contains all Warranties and Representations is required.
- **SOW/MPS (Statement of Work/Milestone Payment Schedule) (template provided in Attachment 4 of the PPG):**
 - Provide a draft SOW as a separate Word document or PDF to outline the proposed technical solution and demonstrate how the Offeror(s) proposes to meet the Government objectives. Submitted information is subject to change through negotiation if the Government selects the Proposal for award. The format of the proposed SOW shall be completed in accordance with the template provided in Attachment 4 of the PPG.
 - The Government reserves the right to negotiate and revise any or all parts of the SOW/MPS. Offerors will have the opportunity to concur with revised SOW/MPS as necessary.
- **Current and Pending Support (template provided in Attachment 5 of the PPG):** The Offeror shall provide this information for all key personnel who will contribute significantly to the proposed research project. Specifically, information shall be provided for all current and pending research support (to include Government and non-government), including the award number and title, funding agency and requiring activity's names, PoP (dates of funding), level of funding (total direct costs only), role, 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."
- **IP and Data Rights Assertions (template provided in Attachment 6 of the PPG):**
 - 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 in accordance with Section 2.10 of the RPP 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/milestones. If applicable, complete the table within the referenced attachment for any items to be furnished to the Government with restrictions.
- **Biographical Sketches:** one Word or PDF document (template provided in **Addendum 1 of this RPP**) providing a biographical sketch for all key personnel contributing to the proposed work.

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-25-02-EXMED
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

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.

4.3. Full Proposal Preparation Costs

The cost of preparing Full Proposals in response to this RPP is not considered a direct charge to any resulting award or any other contract. Additionally, the MTEC Assessment Fee (see Section 2.9 of this RPP) is not allowable as a direct charge to any resulting award or any other contract.

4.4. Freedom of Information Act

To request protection from FOIA disclosure as allowed by 10 U.S.C. §4021(i), Offerors shall mark business plans and technical information with a legend identifying the documents as being submitted on a confidential basis. For more information, please refer to Section 6.1.1 of the MTEC PPG.

4.5. Telecommunications and Video Surveillance

As stated in Section 6.1.2 of the MTEC PPG, 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 Proposals to ensure compliance with the RPP requirements. As part of the preliminary screening process, Proposals that do not meet the requirements of the RPP may be eliminated from the competition or additional information may be requested by the CM. Additionally, the Government reserves the right to request additional information or eliminate Proposals that do not meet these requirements from further consideration.

5.2 Proposal Evaluation

The CM will distribute all Proposals that pass the preliminary screening (described above) to the Government for full evaluation. Evaluation of proposals will be based on an independent, comprehensive review and assessment of the work proposed against stated source selection criteria and evaluation factors. The Government will evaluate each Proposal against the evaluation factors detailed below and assign adjectival ratings to the non-cost/price factor(s) consistent with those defined in Table 1 (General Merit Rating 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 overall award decision will be based upon a best value determination by considering the factors listed below.

Evaluation Factors

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-25-02-EXMED
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

1. Technical Approach and Strategy
2. Schedule
3. Technical and Management Team and Resources
4. Cost/Price

All Evaluation Factors will be evaluated with equal importance.

5.2.1 Factor 1 – Technical Approach and Strategy

An Offeror's technical proposal will be assessed for how well the specific aims and proposed methodology support the technical objectives and the development of the prototypes. The technical proposal will be assessed for relevancy, thoroughness, and completeness of the proposed approach (e.g., technical merit). The proposal may also be assessed on how well the Offerors demonstrate their knowledge of RMF. The Government's evaluation of this factor may include the degree to which the following are addressed and demonstrated:

- Clear and appropriate objectives that describe a feasible solution;
- Focused and detailed methodologies to address the requirements outlined in Section 3.3 of this RPP; and,
- Thorough and complete SOW.

5.2.2 Factor 2 – Schedule

The Offeror's proposal will be assessed based on the level of detail and soundness of the plan of actions and milestones (POA&M). The proposal may be assessed on POA&M detail as well as the timeliness and feasibility of the overall schedule. The schedule may be assessed based on its alignment to other sections of the proposal (e.g., technical approach, SOW, cost volumes).

5.2.3 Factor 3 – Technical and Management Team and Resources

This factor will evaluate the strength of the organization/team, including the Offeror's resources, expertise, and experience of proposed personnel. Specifically, this factor may include assessment of the Offeror's experience fielding identified analogous solutions and experience with military medical solutions and projects. As part of this evaluation factor, the Government may also consider the project management plan and the ability for the technical and management team to execute the proposed SOW in an efficient and effective manner. Key personnel will be assessed based on the demonstrated relevant qualifications (i.e., ability to support this effort).

The Offeror's resources (key facilities, equipment, etc.), project management plan, expertise, and experience of personnel may also be considered as part of this factor. Assessment of the Offeror's resources may include the level of security achieved by resources (facilities and equipment) as well as the availability of resources (e.g., labs, networks, development environments) sufficient to meet the requirements herein (e.g., EM testing). The Government may also consider whether the proposal includes strategies to address potential risks that could delay or otherwise impact performance.

5.2.4 Factor 4 – Cost /Price

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-25-02-EXMED
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

The Cost/Price proposal will be evaluated to determine whether costs are realistic, reasonable, and complete, as further detailed under Section 5.3 below. This factor may also be assessed for how clearly the cost proposal aligns with the technical approach and strategy, the schedule, and the team proposed. Please note that the Government technical evaluation panel may provide an additional review for the purposes of informing the CM’s detailed cost analysis, specifically with regards to the cost realism analysis.

The proposed costs will be based on the following ratings: Sufficient, Insufficient, or Excessive. See the definitions of these ratings in Table 2 below.

5.2.5 Adjectival Merit Ratings

Table 1 explains the adjectival merit ratings that will be used for the Evaluation Factors. With the exception of “Cost Reasonableness”, evaluation factors will be described using the following adjectival merit ratings: outstanding, good, acceptable, marginal, unacceptable. Please see Table 2 for the definitions of the “Cost Reasonableness” factor ratings.

TABLE 1 - 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.

TABLE 2 – COST/PRICE RATING ASSESSMENTS	
RATING	DESCRIPTION

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-25-02-EXMED
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

SUFFICIENT	The estimate is 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.

Upon review and evaluation of the Proposals, the Government sponsor will perform proposal source selection. This will be conducted using the evaluation factors detailed above. The Government will conduct an evaluation of all qualified proposals. The Source Selection Authority may:

1. Select the proposal (or some portion of the proposal) for award
2. Place the proposal in the Basket if funding currently is unavailable; or
3. Reject the proposal (will not be placed in the Basket)

In rare cases, the following recommendation may be provided: "Recommendation Undetermined." This is reserved for situations in which additional information/documentation is needed by the Government evaluators before finalizing a recommendation to one of those listed above and is intended to facilitate the release of all evaluator comments within the BIDS System.

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

5.3 Cost/Price Evaluation by the Consortium Manager

After completion of the technical evaluation performed by the Government sponsor, the MTEC CM will evaluate the cost proposed (for only those proposals recommended for award) together with all supporting information for realism (as applicable), reasonableness, and completeness as outlined below. If a proposal is selected for award, the MTEC CM will provide a formal assessment to the Government at which time the Government will make the final determination of whether or not the negotiated project cost is fair and reasonable.

a) **Realism.** Proposals may be evaluated to determine if Costs are realistic for the work to be performed, reflect a clear understanding of the requirements, and are consistent with the various elements of the Offeror's technical approach and SOW.

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-25-02-EXMED
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

Estimates are “realistic” when they represent what the cost of the project should be for the effort to be accomplished, assuming reasonable economy and efficiency. Estimates must also be realistic for each task of the proposed project when compared to the total proposed cost. For more information on cost realism, please refer to the MTEC PPG.

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

To be considered reasonable, the Offeror’s cost estimate should be based upon verifiable techniques such as estimates developed from applicable and relevant 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.

The MTEC CM will perform an analysis 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.

Costs provided shall be clearly attributable to activities or materials as described by the Offeror. Costs should be broken down using the Cost Proposal Formats that are located on the Members-Only MTEC website. If the MTEC template is not used, the Offeror should submit a format providing for a similar level of detail.

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

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

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

5.3.1 Government Access to Information

After receipt of the cost proposal and after the CM’s completion of the cost analysis summarized above, the government may perform a supplemental cost and/or price analysis of the submitted

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-25-02-EXMED
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

cost proposal. For purposes of this analysis, the Agreements Officer and/or a representative of the Agreements Officer (e.g., Defense Contract Audit Agency, Defense Contract Management Agency, etc.) shall have the right to examine the supporting records and/or request additional information, as needed.

5.3.2 Best Value

The overall award decision will be based upon the Government's 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. The Government reserves the right to negotiate and request changes to any or all parts of the proposal, to include the SOW with the MTEC CM acting on the Government's behalf and/or serving as a liaison.

5.4 Definition of General Terms Used in Evaluations

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.

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 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 Manager, Ms. Taylor Hummell, mtec-contracts@ati.org
- Technical and membership questions should be directed to the MTEC Biomedical Research Associate, Dr. Chuck Hutti, Ph.D., chuck.hutti@ati.org
- All other questions should be directed to the MTEC Program Manager, Mr. Evan Kellinger, mtec-sc@ati.org

7 Acronyms/Abbreviations

3-M Maintenance and Material Management

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-25-02-EXMED
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

ABS	American Bureau of Shipping
ASN (RD&A)	Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Research, Development & Acquisition
ASSIST	Acquisition Streamlining and Standardization Information System
ATC	Approval to Connect
ATHS	Ashore Theater Hospitalization System
ATI	Advanced Technology International
ATO	Authorization to Operate
BATDOK	Battlefield Assisted Trauma Distributed Observation Kit
BIDS	Broad agency announcement Information Delivery System
C2	Command and Control
C4	Command, Control, Communications, and Computers
C4IT	Command, Control, Communications, and Computers Information Technology
CAC	Common Access Card
CANES	Consolidated Afloat Networks and Enterprise Services
CBRN	Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear
CIO	Chief Information Officer
CM	Consortium Manager
CMA	Consortium Member Agreement
DHA	Defense Health Agency
DICOM	Digital Imaging and Communications in Medicine
DMLSS	Defense Medical Logistics Standard Support
DoD	Department of Defense
DODI	Department of Defense Instruction
DON	Department of the Navy
DRRS-N	Defense Readiness Reporting System - Navy
DRRS-S	Defense Readiness Reporting System - Strategic
EHR	Electronic Health Records
EM	Electromagnetic
EMCON	Emission Control
EMS	Emergency Medical Services
EMU	Expeditionary Medical Unit
EPF	Expeditionary Fast Transport (sometimes shown as T-EPF)
ERC	En Route Care
ERCS	En Route Care System
EXM	Expeditionary Missions
EXMED	Expeditionary Medical
FDPMU	Forward Deployable Preventive Medicine Unit
FLT	Flight
FOC	Full Operational Capabilities
FOS	Family of Systems
FY	Fiscal Year
Government	U.S. Government, specifically the DoD
HCD	Health Care Delivery
HL7	Health Level Seven International

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-25-02-EXMED
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

HSI	Human Systems Integration
HSS	Health Service Support
IATT	interim authorization to test
IP	Intellectual Property (e.g., patents, copyrights, licensing, etc.)
IS	Information Systems
ISO	International Organization of Standardization
IT	Information Technology
JOMIS	Joint Operational Medicine Information System
M	Millions
MEDC2	Medical Command and Control
MEDCOI	Medical Community of Interest
MedCOP	Medical Common Operating Picture
MEDLOG	Medical Logistics
MIL-STD	Military Standard
MHS	Military Health System
MHSG-T	MHS GENESIS Theater
MPS	Milestone Payment Schedule
MTEC	Medical Technology Enterprise Consortium
NAVSEAINST	Naval Sea Systems Command Instruction
NCPDP	National Council for Prescription Drug Programs
NDA	Nondisclosure Agreement
NEHSS	Naval Expeditionary Health Service Support
NIPRNET	Nonclassified Internet Protocol Router Network
NIST	National Institute of Standards and Technology
NOSS	Naval Operational Supply System
NMS	Network Management System
OCI	Organizational Conflict of Interest
OMDS	Operational Medicine Data System
OpMed CDP	Operational Medicine Care Delivery Platform
OPNAVINST	Office of the Chief of Naval Operations Instruction
OTA	Other Transaction Agreement
PDF	Portable Document Format
PEO USC	Program Executive Office, Unmanned and Small Combatants
PIM	Portable Industrial Module
PM	Patient Movement
PMS 408	Expeditionary Missions
POA&M	Plan of Actions and Milestones
POC	Point-of-Contact
POE	Projected Operational Environment
PoP	Period of Performance
PPG	Proposal Preparation Guide
PSPEC	Performance Specification
RDT&E	Research, Development, Testing, and Evaluation
RMF	Risk Management Framework

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-25-02-EXMED
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

ROC	Required Operational Capability
RPA	Research Project Award
RPP	Request for Project Proposals
RSupply	Relational Supply
SIPRNET	SECRET Internet Protocol Router Network
SME	Subject Matter Expert
SOVT	System Operational Verification Test
SOW	Statement of Work
T-EPF	Expeditionary Fast Transport (sometimes shown as EPF)
T&E	Test and Evaluation
TBLD-M	Theater Blood Mobile
TMIP	Theater Medical Information Program
TMIP-M	Theater Medical Information Program-Maritime
TRAC2ES	TRANSCOM Regulating and Command & Control Evacuation System
TRANSCOM	U.S. Transportation Command
USAMRDC	U.S. Army Medical Research and Development Command
USCDI	United States Core Data for Interoperability
USG	U.S. Government

8 Technical Proposal Template

Cover Page

[Name of Offeror]

[Address of Offeror]

[Phone Number and Email Address of Offeror]

Unique Entity ID: [UEI]

CAGE code: [CAGE code]

[Title of Proposal]

[Offeror] certifies that, if selected for award, the Offeror will abide by the terms and conditions of the MTEC Base Agreement.

[Offeror] certifies that this Enhanced White Paper is valid for 3 years from the close of the applicable RPP, unless otherwise stated.

[A proprietary data disclosure statement if proprietary data is included. Sample:

This Enhanced White Paper includes data that shall not be disclosed outside the MTEC Consortium Management Firm and the Government and shall not be duplicated, used, or disclosed, in whole or in part, for any purpose other than to evaluate this Enhanced White Paper and negotiate any subsequent award. If, however, an agreement is awarded as a result of, or in connection with, the submission of this data, the MTEC Consortium Management Firm and the Government shall have the right to duplicate, use, or disclose these data to the extent provided in the resulting agreement. This restriction does not limit the MTEC Consortium Management Firm and the Government's right to use the information contained in these data if they are obtained from another source without restriction. The data subject to this restriction is (clearly identify) and contained on pages (insert page numbers).]

Willingness to allow MTEC Officers access to your Solution Brief for the purposes of engaging in outreach activities with private sector entities: **Indicate YES or NO [MTEC frequently makes contact with private sector entities (e.g., foundations, investors, 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 Solution Briefs within their program areas, allowing opportunities to attract supplemental funding sources. Please indicate your willingness to allow MTEC access to your Solution Brief 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.]**

[Title of Proposal]

Programmatic Relevance / Rationale

- Provide the background and the Offeror's understanding of the problem and/or technology gap/process deficiency.
- Describe how the proposed solution meets the needs specified in this RPP, including a brief description of previous related work data that supports the feasibility of proposed work.

Scope Statement

- Define the scope of the effort and clearly state the objectives of the project.

Technical Approach

The technical proposal shall cover approach and strategy to achieve all requirements herein, as. This proposal should clearly address the requirements described in **section 3.3. of this RPP** including Design; Functionality and Features; Structure; Authorization(s) and Approval(s); Test and Evaluation; Installation and Delivery; Production and Sustainment; and Deliverables. The technical approach and strategy shall include the following:

- The strategy for eliciting and addressing stakeholder feedback throughout the effort, including feedback from the Government as well as SMEs
- The strategy for developing interoperability with JOMIS, EPF FLT II, and capabilities specified in Section 3.3.1.2 of the RPP; designs that enable integration/interface of capabilities in Section 3.3.1.2 into prototypes delivered by or before the PoP are preferred; the strategy shall address the following:
 - a) Obtaining an ATO (or comparable, as described in Section 3.3.4 of this RPP) to operate on an EPF FLT II ship and to interoperate with JOMIS;
 - b) Obtaining an ATC to CANES NMS;
 - c) Interfacing and integrating with JOMIS solutions;
 - d) Integrating with and operating on an EPF FLT II ship;
 - e) Future interface/integration of capabilities in Section 3.3.1.2.
- The approach to maximizing mobility and transportability of the proposed solution.
- The strategy to optimize prototype survivability (including its resilience to non-kinetic, e.g., cyber and EM, and limited kinetic threats as well as operation in climatic extremes and other environment conditions).
- The strategy to optimize design, e.g., functionality, performance, structure, etc. (including network services enabled by built-in infrastructure, support to standalone operations, kind and capacity of endpoints included).
- Proposed cybersecurity strategies (including an Offeror's ability to obtain an ATO or comparable, as described in Section 3.3.4 of this RPP, as well as an ATC).
- The overarching design approach, which shall address the following considerations:
 - a) Survivability (including cyber survivability and cybersecurity), interoperability, mobility and transportability, extensibility, modularity, and scalability;

- b) Innovative technologies or capabilities and innovative applications of technologies or capabilities to address one or more of the above design considerations.
- The overarching project management and engineering approach, which includes planning and follow-on activities; this requirement will be assessed by the following:
 - a) Soundness and thoroughness with which the approach addresses assumptions (e.g., expectation of government furnished equipment or software), dependencies, risks, mitigations, timeline, and design (especially critical design elements) and associates these considerations with cost in the cost volume, schedule (or timeline), and elements of the SOW;
 - b) The detail and soundness of the process by which these considerations will be monitored, addressed, and reported throughout the effort from design to installation and delivery;
 - c) Demonstration of a robust understanding of
 - i) Systems engineering, system security engineering, and related activities to cover the lifecycle of the solution (from requirements analysis to operations and sustainment),
 - ii) Mechanisms to improve execution of these activities (e.g., model-based systems engineering using industry standard and Navy-approved modeling tools such as MagicDraw), and
 - iii) The application of that knowledge to the technical approach for developing the prototypes.

Anticipated Outcomes/Impact

- Provide a description of the anticipated outcomes from the proposed work. List milestones and deliverables from the proposed work. The Offeror's plan of actions and milestones shall clearly describe tasks, task dependencies, task deliverables, task resources (including labor and non-labor), task duration, task start date, task end dates, and location(s) at which task will be performed.
- Describe the impact that the proposed project would have, if successful, in supporting the goal of this effort

Potential Follow-On Work

- Specify the objective of each proposed follow-on task as it relates to **Section 3.4** of the RPP.
- Briefly outline the proposed methodology **by task** to the extent possible to demonstrate a course of action that addresses the technical requirements described in this RPP.
- Indicate the proposed PoP (duration) for the potential follow-on work in total.
- Specify a total cost (including directs and indirects) for each task.

Technical and Management Team

- Describe the qualifications and expertise of the proposed personnel and organizations that will perform the proposed work. It is recommended that the Offeror propose a multidisciplinary team to address the effort holistically, covering systems engineering,

network engineering, software engineering, Navy subject matter expertise, medical subject matter expertise, system security engineering, and mechanical/electrical/comparable engineering. Insights into these fields are likely to be invaluable during prototype development.

- Describe the overall project management plan that clearly defines roles and responsibilities. This plan should include a communication and conflict resolution plan if the proposal involves more than one company/institution/organization.
- Describe the ability of the management team to advance the technology.
- Ensure the team provides multidisciplinary expertise that can holistically address systems engineering, network engineering, software engineering, Navy subject matter expertise, medical subject matter expertise, security engineering, and mechanical/electrical/comparable engineering.

Resources

- Identify any key facilities, equipment and other resources proposed for the effort. Identified facilities, equipment and resources should be available and relevant for the technical solution being proposed.

Transition to the Government

- Describe the software deliverables and computational resources required for data processing and storage envisioned to support the final vision of the proposed solution.
- Describe previous/existing partnerships with industry or the USG/DoD (including any resultant contracts/grants/awards and/or IP).

Schedule

- PoP: Indicate the proposed PoP in months from award.
- Proposed Schedule: Provide a schedule (e.g., Gantt chart) that clearly shows the plans to perform the program tasks in an orderly, timely manner. Provide each major task as a separate line. Do not duplicate the level of detail presented in the Statement of Work. But ensure the schedule and Statement of Work align, i.e., elements in the schedule trace to elements in the SOW.

Risk Identification and Mitigation

- Identify key technical, schedule, and cost risks. Discuss the potential impact of the risks, as well as potential mitigations.
- Consider risks associated with assumptions and dependencies identified elsewhere in the proposal.

APPENDICES (excluded from the page limit, and must be uploaded to BIDS as separate documents)

Appendix 1: Warranties and Representations: (template provided in Attachment 3 of the PPG)

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-25-02-EXMED
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

- Warranties and Representations are required. One Word (.docx or .doc) or PDF file that contains all Warranties and Representations is required.

Appendix 2: Statement of Work (template provided in Attachment 4 of the PPG)

- Provide a draft Statement of Work as a separate Word document or PDF to outline the proposed technical solution and demonstrate how the Offeror proposes to meet the Government objectives. Submitted information is subject to change through negotiation if the Government selects the proposal for award. The format of the proposed Statement of Work shall be completed in accordance with the template provided in the PPG.
- The Government reserves the right to negotiate and revise any or all parts of SOW/Milestone Payment Schedule (MPS). Offerors will have the opportunity to concur with revised SOW/Milestone Payment Schedule as necessary.
- Clearly describe tasks, task dependencies, task deliverables, task resources (including labor and non-labor), task duration, task start date, task end dates, and location(s) at which task will be performed

Appendix 3: Current and Pending Support (template provided in Attachment 5 of the PPG)

- Summarize other sponsored research for each person who will contribute significantly to the proposed prototype project. The information for previous support should include the past five (5) years, unless otherwise specified in the request. If there is no current and/or pending support, enter "None."

Appendix 4: Data Rights Assertions (template provided in Attachment 6 of the PPG)

- The Offeror shall comply with the terms and conditions defined in the Base Agreement regarding Data Rights and those specifically tailored terms listed within Section 2.10 of the RPP unless otherwise asserted by the Offeror and agreed to by the Government.
- If applicable, complete the table within the referenced attachment for any items to be furnished to the Government with restrictions. An example is provided in Attachment 6 of the PPG.

Appendix 5: Cost Proposal Narrative: one Word or PDF document

- See Section 4.3 of this RPP and Section 7 of the PPG for additional details regarding the Cost Proposal Narrative

Appendix 6: Cost Proposal Formats: one Excel or PDF document

- See Section 4.3 of this RPP and Section 7 of the PPG for additional details regarding the Cost Proposal Formats
- The cost proposal shall clearly indicate labor, travel, material costs (including licensing), etc. sufficient to address the requirements herein. The cost proposal shall clearly align with the technical approach and strategy, schedule (see note regarding task resources in 5.2.2), and team proposed (5.2.3). All labor costs shall include a breakdown by personnel (see notes regarding man-hours in 5.2.3).

Request for Project Proposals MTEC-25-02-EXMED
Number W81XWH-15-9-0001

Appendix 7: Biographical Sketches (template provided in Addendum 1 of this RPP).

- Provide a biographical sketch for all key personnel contributing to the proposed work, including all qualifications, including education, current certifications, relevant and current work experience.
- Offerors are limited to a half page per person

Addendum 1 – Biographical Sketch

Biographical Sketch

Provide the following information for each individual included in the Research & Related Senior/Key Person Profile (Expanded) Form			
NAME		POSITION TITLE	
EDUCATION/TRAINING (Begin with Baccalaureate or other initial professional education, such as nursing, and include postdoctoral training)			
INSTITUTION AND LOCATION	DEGREE (IF APPLICABLE)	YEAR(S)	FIELD OF STUDY
<p>RESEARCH AND PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE: Concluding with present position, list in chronological order, previous employment, experience, and honors. Include present membership on any Federal Government public advisory committee. List in chronological order the titles, all authors, and complete references to publications pertinent to this application. List certification names, certifying agency, date obtained, and expiration date for all active certifications pertinent to this application. OFFERORS ARE LIMITED TO A HALF PAGE PER PERSON.</p>			