



The Digital Manufacturing Institute

MxD REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL TECHNICAL SUMMARY & PROGRAM OVERVIEW

MxD-20-01: CMMC READINESS ASSESSMENT

Revision 3.0 Release Date: July 15, 2020

Contact: Romina Lara
Project Manager
MxD
projects@mxdusa.org

MxD
1415 North Cherry Ave
Chicago, IL 60642

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Record of Change.....	3
II.	Project Overview.....	3
III.	Introduction.....	3
IV.	Purpose	4
V.	Technical Summary	6
	Problem Statement	6
	Critical objectives and requirements	7
	RFP Scope of Work	8
VI.	Program Requirements.....	12
	Collaboration.....	12
	Program Management	12
	Travel Requirements.....	13
	Period of Performance Requirements	14
	Funding Requirements.....	14
VII.	Eligibility.....	14
	MxD Membership.....	14
	Notification of Participation by Foreign Firms & Non-U.S. Citizens.....	15
VIII.	Technical & Cost Proposal Evaluation	15
	Evaluation Process	15
	Evaluation Criteria.....	16
IX.	Project Awards.....	17
	Contract	17
	Final Technical Proposal & Cost Proposal Revisions	17

I. RECORD OF CHANGE

Revision	Date	Sections	Description
2.0	10 June, 2020	II: Project Overview	Extended Proposal Due Date
Revision	Date	Sections	Description
3.0	15 July, 2020	II: Project Overview	Extended Proposal Due Date

II. PROJECT OVERVIEW

Deadline for Submitting Interest in Teaming	5 pm CT – 7th May 2020
Proposals Due	5 pm CT – 30 th July 2020
Anticipated MxD Funding	\$100,000 - \$150,000
Period of Performance	6 months

III. INTRODUCTION

MxD: The Digital Manufacturing Institute is where innovative manufacturers go to forge their futures. In partnership with the Department of Defense, MxD (also referred to as the Institute) equips U.S. factories with the digital tools and expertise they need to begin building every part better than the last. As a result, our members increase their productivity and win more business.

MxD has invested approximately \$90 million in more than 60 applied research and development projects in areas including design; product development; systems engineering; future factories; agile, resilient supply chains; and cybersecurity.

MxD operates from a nearly 100,000-square-foot innovation center near downtown Chicago. Its factory floor features some of the most advanced manufacturing equipment in the world, which partners can use for experimentation and training on everything from augmented reality to advanced simulation techniques.

MxD Request for Proposals (RFP) are issued to address research and development needs in digital design and manufacturing technology that are aligned with the technical objectives of MxD and directly support the Institute's vision of developing digital manufacturing systems that make every part better than the last.

This RFP contains the following elements:

1. Request for Proposal Technical Summary & Program Overview: a description of a specific technology objective and technical and program requirements
2. Proposal Preparation Kit (PPK referenced as the Kit): includes a PPK overview document and attached proposal templates and references. The PPK Overview provides background and guidance for the preparation of required forms and instructions needed to submit to a MxD Request for Proposal. The PPK Overview offers detailed instructions on how to respond to this RFP and provides attachments with the required

proposal templates. It is intended to provide the basic information necessary for assembling complete and compliant proposals and to help explain those areas that usually generate the most questions from Offerors.

NOTE: MxD recommends Offerors review the Request for Proposal Technical Summary & Program Overview prior to the PPK.

The RFP is available on the MxD website at <http://mxdusa.org>. Notices announcing MxD competitions and due dates will also be posted on the MxD website. Amendments to a MxD RFP may be used to extend due dates, clarify procedural requirements or modify technical requirements. An updated RFP may be issued, and the previous RFP will be rescinded. Offerors should carefully monitor the MxD website after an original posting of an RFP, up to the time of the Technical Proposal and Cost Proposal submission date. Any revisions, amendments or updates will appear in the same section of the website as the original solicitation. It is the responsibility of the Offeror to monitor the MxD RFP updates and ensure their proposal meets the solicitation requirements. MxD welcomes any comments or suggestions for improving the contents of this guide. Please address them to projects@mxdusa.org.

Any questions regarding this solicitation must be provided to projects@mxdusa.org. The questions will be sent to the appropriate MxD and/or Government POC, and answers will be published on the MxD website, if appropriate. Questions submitted within one week prior to a deadline may not be answered.

IV. PURPOSE

MxD will periodically solicit proposals for applied research and technology development to meet the goals outlined in its Strategic Investment Plan (SIP) or complementary goals specified by key external stakeholders that align with MxD's core mission. The process by which this achieved is through an RFP.

An RFP is initiated when MxD desires new and creative solutions to problems and/or advances in knowledge, understanding and technology for digital manufacturing and design. The purpose of an RFP is to solicit proposals for projects in technology areas that are of interest to MxD membership and external stakeholders such as the U.S. Government. MxD will initiate and coordinate development of the RFP topics by engaging Technology Advisory Committee (TAC) members, MxD's Technical Call participants, Department of Defense (DOD) affiliates, and other relevant stakeholders. Once the RFP topics are developed and approved the MxD RFP will be posted to the MxD website and represents the official notification to Offerors of a request to submit the required documents.



mxdusa.org
@mxdinnovates
info@mxdusa.org

1415 N. Cherry Avenue
Chicago, IL 60642
(312) 281-6900

REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL TECHNICAL SUMMARY





V. TECHNICAL SUMMARY

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Cybercriminals have targeted and continue to target the Defense Industrial Base (DIB) and the supply chain of the Department of Defense (DoD). The DIB sector consists of over 300,000 companies that support and contribute towards the research, engineering, development, production and operators of DoD systems, networks, and services. The growing loss of intellectual property and certain unclassified information from the DoD supply chain can undercut U.S. technical advantages and innovation as well as significantly increase risk to national security.

To help address the concerns of cybersecurity for all manufacturers, the DoD issued compliant requirements such as DFARS 252.204-7012, NIST SP 800-171, the NIST Cybersecure Framework, and NIST SP 800-53. These requirements provided manufacturers with the opportunity to self-assess and improve their cybersecurity posture within their organization. However, the self-assessment process is challenging as a verification mechanism and is difficult to enforce to validate their efforts. In order to verify manufacturers are implementing these requirements, the DoD announced in mid-2019 a new cybersecurity compliance requirement ([Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification](#) aka the CMMC) that will make it mandatory and require outside certification for manufacturers to meet the appropriate level of cybersecurity hygiene. The CMMC prescribes five levels of cybersecurity maturity controls, ranging from a level 1 with 17 controls to a level 5 with 171 controls. Each level of CMMC maturity has increasing expectations, however, not all levels have yet been clearly defined. The specific parameters around what it takes to meet each level will be outlined and rolled out for organizations to understand what CMMC level they need to strive for and maintain. The CMMC efforts builds upon the existing regulation of DFARS 252.204-7012.

MxD and its industry partners previously funded in collaboration with the Critical Infrastructure Resilience Institute (CIRI) at the University of Illinois and Heartland Science and Technology Group the development of a cloud-based application ([Cybersecure Dashboard](#) aka the Dashboard) under Project 15-01-02 (final project report will be provided in the Proposal Preparation Kit) that allows manufacturers to access a set of detailed instructions and policy documents referencing the resources needed to implement and manage the required cybersecurity controls. To ensure the Dashboard is up to date with DoD's recent compliance requirement, the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) has funded Heartland Science and Technology Group to augment the Dashboard with the inclusion of the CMMC. One of the many features being developed is the ability to allow users to self-assess their current cybersecurity posture which can then in turn be used by qualified third-party assessors for CMMC accreditation.

MxD believes it is essential to begin investing in the evaluation and performance of the CMMC assessment process using the Dashboard. Manufacturers and their supply chain will need to perform a self-assessment, the results and performance from this assessment will need to be evaluated by the team which will be partially composed of experienced assessors along with other individuals. The observations and information collected during the performance of a CMMC assessment will be submitted to MxD in order to provide feedback to the CMMC Governing Body for the refinement of the CMMC program.



CRITICAL OBJECTIVES AND REQUIREMENTS

As previously stated, the CMMC module is being implemented in the Dashboard. Some of the key features that are being developed include a new CMMC portal, scoring mechanisms that will include a self-assessed score and an accredited score, reporting capabilities, and the visibility of a supply chain's cybersecurity posture. The following objectives and requirements are necessary to evaluate the assessment process and to perform multiple CMMC assessments.

Study & Evaluate Effectiveness of novel CMMC readiness assessment process:

The evaluation shall be executed by performing assessments of a select group composed of a prime and their supply chain. An assessor or qualified individuals with experience performing security audits/assessments need to evaluate the self-assessments of medium/large DoD contractors and at least 5 suppliers in their supply chain. Optionally, prime(s) with divisions or business units are encouraged to participate to enable assessments and roll up of results across units for an Enterprise view.

Objectives:

- Documented outcomes/learnings to create awareness of best practices, implementation roadblocks, and resource requirements to MxD membership and other interested parties.
- Capture key outcomes from assessments which will be used to provide outcomes as feedback to the CMMC Governing Body for the refinements to the CMMC program, where appropriate
- Create a better understanding of the impact of CMMC assessment on the supply chain based on observed/defined manufacturer profiles. Profiles will capture such information as the size, complexity and nature of the information available to the assessed manufacturers.
- Develop flowcharts to capture detailed activities/steps in completing CMMC assessments will help define, standardize, and identify critical areas of the assessment process that may need improvement. This can be used by manufacturers to understand, prepare and plan for an assessment.

The project team is expected to be composed of the following:

- Large or medium sized manufacturer(s) who is the prime
- Sub-contractors in the prime supply chain currently contracting or aspiring to contract with the Defense Industrial Base (DIB)
- An assessor with experience in completing cybersecurity compliance assessments
- An optional observer who will document and conduct interviews as necessary to gather lessons learned and other key content for analysis of related processes, during and/or at the completion of the assessments



Through these objectives, the project principally seeks to address the following use cases:

CMMC User Categorization	Description	Example
Prime Contractor	DoD Contractor	As a DoD Prime contractor with multiple divisions, I would like to determine the readiness of my supply chain for compliance with CMMC.
Supplier Contractor	Supplier	As a DIB supplier, I would like to understand the effort involved in performing a CMMC assessment.

RFP SCOPE OF WORK

The above objectives must be completed within the following project constraints:

Period of Performance: 6 months

Anticipated MxD Funding: \$100,000 - \$150,000

During the period of performance, the evaluation and performance of a CMMC readiness assessment, key steps and activities involved must be documented. The team is expected to develop a framework for determining resources required to complete a CMMC assessment as well as developing detailed process flow maps. The team should also plan to document best practices and identify assessment roadblocks for the CMMC.

Tasks:

Project team:

- Conduct interviews and/or observations to capture and document the assessment processes in flowcharts and other documents that will include: *key learnings, identifying bottlenecks, omitted steps, double data entry, and best practices.*
- Develop a resource plan: identify resources such as people, skillsets, time, and cost (total cost) required to complete an assessment.
- Create and document high level description of the manufacturer profiles including size, complexity, product types and other organizational attributes.

Assessor(s)/Assessment organization:

- Conduct six (6) assessments across prime and five (5) suppliers using the Dashboard's CMMC assessment capabilities including new supply chain features. (*Access to the Dashboard will be provided as needed to team members by CIRI/Heartland*)
- Oversee the quality of the assessment process and reporting.
- Provide framework for assessment consistent with industry recognized audit standards of evidence and related practices.

Primes and sub-contractors:

- Perform self-assessments and collect supporting artifacts as evidence for assessment conclusions. May require expert assistance from service provider(s) or other technical resources who may be part of the core project team.



- Contribute key learnings, inclusive of pain points, bottlenecks and best practices documentation through participation in interviews and/or other methods of observation that may be led by appropriate project team member.
- Participate in the validation/verification reviews to be performed by assessors.

Technical Expert(s):

As part of the core-team or contracted resource(s) engaged by the manufacturer to manage assets in the manufacturer's environment. These resources are expected to:

- Assist with information/data gathering for evidence for self-assessment and subsequent validation exercises.
- Provide expert knowledge about manufacturers environment and architecture.
- Assist assessors and project team with key information about the operating environment at each of the manufacturers to be included in the study (where appropriate).

CIRI/Hartland Technology Solutions: Though not official member(s) of the project team, the following support activities will be performed by Heartland Technology Solutions

- Provision accounts and assist with onboarding users on the project team(s) unto the application.
- Provide orientation/training on how to access and use/navigate the application.
- Provide ongoing support as necessary for project team to complete assessments and required reports.
- Provide key learnings from the assessments that can be used for enhancements to related processes.

Teams are expected to provide a detailed description of the assessment methodology, practices and other key factors that distinguish the work to be performed to complete the listed activities and objectives for the assessment and related studies. A quality management process to assure the quality of the deliverables is a requirement that should be addressed in team responses. Teams should also include in their proposals, ideas for the most effective and efficient medium for disseminating select artifacts from the assessments and study to MxD's membership and other stakeholders.

During the period of performance, the team will produce deliverables that will be shared with the MxD membership in accordance with the Membership Agreement. The recommended deliverables are listed below in Table 1, but the team is encouraged to include additional deliverables or provide value-added changes to the recommended set of deliverables.

IMPORTANT: If proposing changes to the deliverables, the team must provide the reasoning and detail any assumptions to provide context for the changes. The proposed set of deliverables must align with MxD's focus on achieving deployable outcomes and enabling the transition of the research.



Table 1. Reporting Deliverables

Deliverable	Description
CMMC Assessment Report	A detailed report with the findings, conclusions and ratings/certification level for each of the assessed manufacturers
Best Practice Report	White paper on best practices and assessment flow charts
Accessibility Barrier Report	Report on assessment roadblocks
Resource Report	Report on resource requirements and manufacturer profiles
Assessment flowcharts	Flowcharts depicting the steps and activities required to complete/perform CMMC assessments

The team is expected to develop a transition plan, which is detailed in Table 2 in Section VI. MxD is focused on supporting the transition of project outcomes to its membership in the form of evaluation reports. The accuracy, reliability, professionalism, and quality of these reports is vital as they will be provided to the CMMC-AB (Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification – Accreditation Board) for the refinement of the CMMC program.



mxdusa.org
@mxdinnovates
info@mxdusa.org

1415 N. Cherry Avenue
Chicago, IL 60642
(312) 281-6900

PROGRAM OVERVIEW



VI. PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

COLLABORATION

Participation in this program requires collaboration with a team of organizations with diverse capabilities. Competitive teams should include representation from the manufacturing base (specifically DoD and supply chain manufacturers), academia interested in DoD contracting, and potential 3rd party CMMC assessors.

Each team must include participation by a MxD Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3 Manufacturing Member to drive use case and operational requirements.

Teams are highly encouraged to seek participation from a small/medium manufacturer (SMM) or a manufacturer within the leading manufacturer's supply chain.

Teams are encouraged to have participation from academic institutions interested in DoD contracting. They should support the team in the development of new algorithms or technologies, building out fundamentals that can inform the decisions of the team.

Where applicable, the proposing team is suggested to collaborate with a standards organization to better inform their draft standards and to help popularize their work to increase the potential for endorsement in the future.

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

MxD will be responsible for managing the project to ensure their team will meet all the technical objectives and requirements proposed within the project's period of performance and budget. The MxD Project Engineer will coordinate with Principal Investigators (PIs) of every participant to manage the program following MxD's project processes. The Director of Cybersecurity, in coordination with the project's MxD Project Engineer, will monitor technical and cost performance of the associated Enterprise Award Agreement. Project teams will submit the reports listed below to their identified Project Engineer to fulfill their reporting requirements. These reports will be internally accessed by the MxD Director of Cybersecurity, the Government, the Project Engineer and other authorized MxD staff members in the course of their official duties. Technology advancements will be summarized at least annually in order to support reporting to the Executive Committee, Technical Advisory Committee, MxD Members, and the Government, when applicable.



Table 2. Technical Deliverables

Deliverable	Description
Project Immersion Workshop	Face to Face or virtual meetings with manufacturer(s) including stakeholders from key business units to review project transition plan and define pilot requirements.
Transition Plan	Written plan for successful transition of project outcomes after period of performance including technology integration, educational distribution, and potential commercialization.
Monthly Technical and Financial Reports	Monthly report from each Project Participant including the financial and technical status of the Project
Member Technical Reviews	Presentation encompassing all technical advancements made prior to key milestone and presented to the MxD Project Engineer, members of the Technical Advisory Committee, and other interested MxD members.
Presentations at MxD	Presentation and demonstration of developed technology presented in person or virtually with MxD
Annual Patent Reports	Report of inventions and subcontracts
Intellectual Property Reports	Participants must promptly notify the MxD Project Engineer apprised of Project IP created, filing status, claims against the Project IP, and BIP licensed to other Members.
Safety Accident/Incident Report	Participants must report any major accident/incident (including fire) resulting in any one or more of the following situations: one or more fatalities or one or more disabling injuries; damage of Government property exceeding \$10,000; impact to Project planning or production schedules or degradation of the safety of equipment under contract. Such report will also identify potential hazards requiring corrective action.
Draft Final Technical Report	Draft report must include a comprehensive, cumulative, and substantive summary of all technical advancements and significant accomplishments achieved during the project.
Final Technical Report	See above
Project Team Lead Release	Release by Project Team Lead confirming scope of work to be complete
Property Report	List of all MxD funded equipment and planned disposition
Final Patent Report	Report of inventions and subcontracts

TRAVEL REQUIREMENTS

Proposals should include funding for six (6) trips for the duration of the project. Each trip will be for two (2) project team members. MxD recommends the assessor and the project observer who will be responsible for documenting key learnings from the exercise be onsite with the manufacturers. The project kickoff meeting along with the project closeout meeting will be held virtually. For estimation purposes, use Chicago, IL as the destination. Proposals may include additional funding for travel to manufacturers' sites for implementation and evaluation with proper justification. *Due to COVID-19, MxD will monitor current events and adjust any onsite meetings to virtual meetings. Due to high variability of travel costs, please estimate costs to the best of your ability. If downselected, you will have the opportunity to adjust estimates and provide substantiation at that time.



PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE REQUIREMENTS

Proposed projects should be no more than six months in duration. Please note that projects are initiated once an Enterprise Award Agreement is signed, therefore, the project duration must include the subcontracting of all project participants between the Lead Organization and the Project Participants.

FUNDING REQUIREMENTS

MxD anticipates awarding one project for \$100,000-\$150,000, not inclusive of expected cost share, under the MxD-20-01 RFP. Final award amounts will be adjusted accordingly based on Proposals received and subsequent evaluations. This project requires a minimum 1-to-1 Cost Share in aggregate by each Offeror team.

VII. ELIGIBILITY

MxD MEMBERSHIP

All organizations selected to participate on projects must be MxD Members, in accordance with the MxD Membership Agreement, prior to project award. This RFP is open to the public; any organizations regardless of membership status may submit a Technical Proposal and Cost Proposal in response to an RFP. MxD, in its sole discretion, may make the Membership Agreement effective upon project selection and require payment of the membership dues. The Membership Agreement must be fully executed with every participant within 30 days of project selection. Any non-members Offerors are encouraged to review the Membership Agreement prior to submission and to direct questions to the MxD Director of Business Development, Tony Papke (tony.papke@mxdusa.org). For more information on how to become a MxD Member, please visit the MxD Membership page on our website.

Federally Funded Research and Development Centers (FFRDCs) and Government entities (Government/National laboratories, military educational institutions, etc.) are subject to applicable direct competition limitations and cannot propose to RFPs in any capacity unless they address the following conditions:

- FFRDCs or Government entities may not exclusively team on any specific project team.
- FFRDCs must clearly demonstrate that the proposed work is not otherwise available from the private sector and must also provide a letter on letterhead from their sponsoring organization citing the specific authority establishing their eligibility to compete with industry and propose to solicitations utilizing Government funding.
- Government entities must clearly demonstrate that the work is not otherwise available from the private sector and provide written documentation citing the specific statutory authority, as well as, where relevant, contractual authority, establishing their ability to propose to solicitations utilizing government funding.

Government agencies interested in participating in MxD RFPs as part of an Offeror team should notify MxD in advance of Proposal submission. For RFPs utilizing Government funding, special agreements and considerations may need to be implemented to enable participation.



NOTIFICATION OF PARTICIPATION BY FOREIGN FIRMS & NON-U.S. CITIZENS

As required by the Technology Investment Agreement, membership in MxD shall be granted only to U.S. companies, firms, organizations, institutions or other entities organized or existing under the laws of the United States, its territories, or possessions (as defined in Section 120.15 of International Traffic in Arms Regulations, 22 CFR § 120 et. seq. ("ITAR")). All proposed project participation by Non-U.S. Citizens must be disclosed to MxD at least 60 days prior to proposed participation for approval.

Membership & project participation (or participation in projects without membership status) will be granted to any agency or instrumentality of a foreign government; companies, firms, organizations, institutions, or other entities not organized or existing under the laws of the United States (as defined in Section 120.16 of the ITAR); and Non-U.S. Citizens on a case-by-case basis at the sole discretion of the Executive Committee upon approval of the U.S. Government. In such event, all Members will be notified immediately of the foreign entity's role. It is a requirement that work related to the project must be completed inside the U.S.

If a Member is a Corporation with subsidiaries or affiliates, its membership will include its wholly-owned and controlled and majority-owned and controlled U.S. subsidiaries and affiliates who qualify as a U.S. person under Section 120.15 of the ITAR.

VIII. TECHNICAL & COST PROPOSAL EVALUATION

EVALUATION PROCESS

An MxD Evaluation Board (EB) will review and evaluate each submitted Technical Proposal utilizing the evaluation criteria specified in the following section. Cost Proposals will not be provided to the Evaluation Board for the purposes of evaluation. Cost Proposals will be utilized by MxD and the Government during the cost analysis and project approval process.

The EB may consist of recognized experts from industry and academia and key government stakeholder representatives (when appropriate). MxD representatives, such as the Director of Cybersecurity, and respective Project Engineers, may participate in and lead EB meetings. All members of the EB will need to meet strict standards of personal and organizational conflict of interest. The evaluators may be supported by subject matter experts to review and comment upon the proposed work.

Through its deliberations, the EB will determine "selectability" of each submission. Selectability determination incorporates average EB score, judgement of market impact, and budget availability. The EB will identify a list of all proposed Technical Proposals that are "selectable for negotiation" leading to a subagreement award, along with their associated evaluation scores, to the Project Engineer. The Director of Cybersecurity, with the consultation of other MxD representatives, will determine which subset of the proposed Technical Proposals deemed "selectable for negotiation" will be down selected for negotiations. This determination will take into account the EB's recommendation, funding availability, alignment with MxD SIP as well as external stakeholder requirements (when applicable). MxD reserves the right to fund all, some or none of the Technical Proposals received under issued RFPs.



If down selected, MxD will complete a comprehensive cost analysis (including cost reasonableness and cost realism) prior to award. In addition, the Government Agreements office may conduct a cost analysis of all submitted Cost Proposals to approve the Cost Proposals. Approval of the Cost Proposal and Technical Proposal by the Government Agreements office and the DoD Program Manager is required for all MxD projects.

Cost share is required for all MxD projects that are executed through the MxD. Cost sharing or matching relates to the portion of project or program costs supported by the Offeror and not by MxD.

Neither MxD nor the U.S. Government has any responsibility for costs associated with Technical Proposal or Cost Proposal development, submissions, or pre-award negotiations.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

MxD's primary goal is to apply digital manufacturing technologies to solve business problems. To this end, successful proposers must demonstrate an understanding of both the business needs as well as the technology solutions. Proposals should provide a clear explanation of how the solutions address business problems and technical requirements outlined in the RFP, any assumptions, and considerations for deployment of developed solution through a pilot.

Each Proposal is evaluated by a specific set of criteria. Below are the Proposal Evaluation criteria for this RFP:

Proposal Evaluation Criteria	Order of Importance
Transition Plan <i>Transition plan clearly articulates all project results and application into commercial and/or government products, systems and applications; Plan includes detailed descriptions of project results, risks/assumptions/mitigations, all required actions and timing, detailed funding and ROI strategy, key milestones, schedule and go/no-go decision points; Proposed team includes appropriate representation from supply chain, researchers and industrial partners; Transition tasks and partners identified and thoroughly defined, both to MxD members and the broader industry; Solution and strategy to rapidly enable the adoption of the new technologies across the US manufacturing base is presented; Clearly defined IP ownership and innovative licensing strategies designed for rapid adoption of the new technologies; Discussion of future transition and/or commercialization demonstrates a clear understanding of the industry and possible markets for the technology; benefits of technology are clearly defined and substantiated.</i>	1
Requirements Compliance <i>Clearly articulates how the team will meet all the capabilities required by the RFP; Proposed solution clearly addresses problem statement and use cases identified in RFP; Clear identification of assumptions, risks, and mitigations; proposed deliverables align with requirements; program management plan meets requirements in the RFP and is reasonable for the scope of work described in the technical proposal.</i>	2



Methodology <i>Clear and concise work effort scope targeted at problem statement; Proposed effort of direct relevance to RFP; Clear identification of barriers to implementation and explanation of how they will be overcome; Innovative methodology with high - potential for market impact; Significant and impactful use of external resources; Methodology demonstrates scientific and technical merit; SMART metrics and KPIs identified and described and demonstrate clear understanding of proposed work; Provides a maturity level assessment of both current and future state of technology with substantiation of assessed levels; Deliverables are fully described and identified.</i>	3
Team Qualifications <i>Members of proposed team are highly qualified to accomplish project tasks with clear delineation of roles and responsibilities; Solid evidence of commitment by team members, such as letters of commitment from their companies; Team members have unique capabilities that are directly associated with the target technology; Team includes a broad mix of capabilities and experiences to ensure success along with the commitment of top-tier facilities to accomplish all project</i>	4
Cost Factors <i>Proposed cost estimates are reasonable and realistic for the proposed work effort; The minimum cost share proscribed in the RFP has been met or exceeded; Cost share is clearly defined and directly applicable to the performance and success of the project; Cost share value is readily discernable. Cost share from partners is documented with letters of commitment.</i>	5

IX. PROJECT AWARDS

CONTRACT

MxD projects will be funded under the MxD Tech Investment Agreement W15QKN-19-3-0003 between MxD and the Government. All contractual negotiations related to RFPs will be executed by MxD. Funds will be distributed to those offerors selected through the evaluation/selection process utilizing Enterprise Award Agreements (EAAs). EAAs are Cost Reimbursement/Cost Share agreements.

MxD has provided an EAA template within the PPK for Offerors to **review** prior to proposal submission. **The EAA should not be submitted with the proposal.** After receiving a notification of down selection, MxD will request all down selected project participants to officially begin contract review and negotiations. MxD intends to execute EAAs with every Offeror organization individually (i.e. MxD will function as the Project Prime/Lead for contracting and subcontracting matters) and all EAAs will share the same Statement of Work and Intellectual Property Management Plan. Once the EAA is executed the project team can begin working on the project. When applicable, it is the sole responsibility of Offeror organizations to issue sub-awards to any subcontractors and to ensure team members are abiding by the terms and conditions within the EAA.

FINAL TECHNICAL PROPOSAL & COST PROPOSAL REVISIONS

MxD reserves the right to negotiate the cost and scope of the proposed work with the project participants that have been down selected prior to award. MxD will facilitate the creation of a



Statement of Work with all participants including technical scope modifications and program management aspects. All down selected organizations who intend to pursue selection are required to participate in the proposal revision process prior to award. For example, MxD may request that the organizations revise the technical scope to better align to RFP requirements. Neither MxD nor the U.S. Government has any responsibility for costs associated with pre-award negotiations.