AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT

1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES
J	1 of 7

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NUMBER	3. EFFECTIVE DATE	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQUISITION NUMBER	5. PROJECT NUMBER *(If applicable)*
0001	16 Sep 2026		

6. ISSUED BY CODE H92257

MARSOC H92257
400 RR (BLDG), RIFLE RANGE ROAD, CAMP LEJEUNE ATTN G4 CONTRACT
SNEADS FERRY, NC 28460-0101
UNITED STATES
Samuel Williams, Email: samuel.williams1@socom.mil Telephone: 9104400773

7. ADMINISTERED BY *(If other than Item 6)* CODE

SCD: PAS:

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR *(Number, street, county, State and ZIP Code)*

CODE | FACILITY CODE

(X)

[X] 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NUMBER
H9225726RE036

9B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 11)*
14 Sep 2026

[ ] 10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NUMBER

10B. DATED *(SEE ITEM 13)*

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

[X] The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers [ ] is extended. [X] is not extended.

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:
(a) By completing items 8 and 15, and returning 1 copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or electronic communication which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by letter or electronic communication, provided each letter or electronic communication makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA *(If required)*
See Section G - Contract Administration Data

13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NUMBER AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

CHECK ONE	
[ ]	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: *(Specify authority)* THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NUMBER IN ITEM 10A.
[ ]	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES *(such as changes in paying office, appropriation data, etc.)* SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).
[ ]	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
[ ]	D. OTHER *(Specify type of modification and authority)*

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor [ ] is not [ ] is required to sign this document and return ______ copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (*Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)*

The purpose of this amendment is to remove the DD254 and FCL requirements. Section L & M have been updated accordingly.

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER *(Type or print)*		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER *(Type or print)*	
		Samuel Williams	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	16C. DATE SIGNED
(Signature of person authorized to sign)		*(Signature of Contracting Officer)*	16 Sep 2026

SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

List of Attachments

Header Miscellaneous Text (Modified):

1. MARSOC SOMTS PWS_14Sep2026

2. Pricing Template_14Sep2026

3. Question and Answer Template_14Sep2026

4. Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan_14Sep2026

5. OCI Disclosure Form_14Sep2026

Instructions, Conditions, & Notices to Offerors or Quoters

Header Miscellaneous Text (Modified):

SECTION L - PROPOSAL PREPARATION AND SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

1.0 General Instructions & Administrative Information
This is a competitive, best-value tradeoff acquisition conducted in accordancewith FAR Part 12 and FAR Part 13.5 (Simplified Procedures for CertainCommercial Products and Commercial Services). The Government intends to award aSingle Award Indefinite-Delivery/Indefinite-Quantity (IDIQ) contract resultingfrom this solicitation. Task orders issued under this IDIQ will beFirm-Fixed-Price (FFP). The Government reserves the right not to award acontract depending on the quality of the proposals submitted and theavailability of funds.

Administrative Item Details & Instructions

- Primary Contracting Points of Contact (POC): All questions must be submitted via email to: SSgt Hanna Tilley (hanna.l.tilley.mil@socom.mil) and Samuel Williams, CIV (samuel.williams1@socom.mil).
- Submission Email: Fully completed proposals must be submitted via email to the POCs above.
- Questions Deadline: 10:00 AM Eastern Standard Time (EST) on September 25, 2026. All questions must be submitted in writing. Responses will be published via an RFP amendment.
- Proposal Submission Deadline: 10:00 AM Eastern Standard Time (EST) on October 16, 2026. Late proposals may not be evaluated IAW FAR 52.212-1(f).
- Proposal Validity Period: Offerors must agree to hold proposed prices firm for a minimum of 180 calendar days from the solicitation closing date.
- System for Award Management (SAM): Offerors must be actively registered in SAM.gov under NAICS code 611699 prior to award.

1.1 Use Of Artificial Intelligence (AI) Tools In ProposalEvaluation

- 1.1.1 Use of AI tools in Support of Evaluations: The Government may employ AI as a tool to assist in the analysis and review of offeror proposals. AI tools may be used to support tasks such as summarizing proposal content, identifying compliance with solicitation requirements, and highlighting areas of potential strength, weakness, or risk.
- 1.1.2 Maintaining Inherently Governmental Functions: Notwithstanding the use of AI tools to support the evaluation process, all final evaluation judgments and award decisions will be made exclusively by duly appointed Government personnel. The Government retains sole responsibility for all inherently governmental functions and will not delegate decision-making authority to any AI tool.
- 1.1.3 Offeror Confidentiality and Data Protection: The AI tools utilized by the Government will be employed in a manner consistent with applicable regulations that govern the protection of proprietary and procurement-sensitive information. The AI tool will be an output-only system. Any generated report data is not saved. No proposal data will be transmitted to or processed by external, non-Government systems without appropriate safeguards and authorizations in place.

2.0 Proposal Format and Page Constraints
Proposals shall be submitted electronically across four (4) distinct volumes asoutlined below. Email submissions must conform to standard military networklimitations.

- Email Attachment Size Limit: Individual emails (including attachments) shall not exceed 10 MB. It is the offeror's responsibility to request and obtain electronic receipt confirmations.
- Page Layout: 8.5" x 11" pages, 1-inch margins all-around, with a font size of no less than 10 pitch (or 11-point Calibri/Times New Roman for proportional fonts).
- Exclusions: Cover sheets, glossaries, table of contents (TOC), and dividers do not count toward volume page limits.

Volume	Title	Page Limit	Evaluation Type

Volume I	Qualifying Criteria	Maximum 3 Pages (excluding fill-ins/DD254 plan)	Pass / Fail (Go / No-Go)
Volume II	Factor I: Technical	Maximum 15 Pages (excluding resumes)	Adjectival Rating
Volume III	Factor II: Past Performance	Maximum 5 Pages	Confidence Assessment
Volume IV	Factor III: Price	No Page Limit	Price Reasonableness

3.0 Volume I: Qualifying Criteria (Pass/Fail Gate)

Offerors shall submit a Volume I narrative not exceeding five (5) pages (unless specifically exempted below). Volume I must include:

1. Administrative & Contact Information: Corporate name, CAGE code, UEI, TIN, and primary POC details.
2. Terms & Conditions Statement: Explicit statement agreeing to all solicitation terms and conditions without exception.
3. Fill-In Clauses & Certifications: Completed solicitation representations and certifications. *(Exempt from page count)*.
4. SPRS & NIST SP 800-171 Validation: Verification of a current, active NIST SP 800-171 DoD Assessment posted in the Supplier Performance Risk System (SPRS) (IAW DFARS 252.204-7019/7020) and compliance with DFARS 252.204-7012. *(Exempt from page count)*.
5. Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI) Safeguarding Plan: Offerors shall provide a concise operational plan detailing how the contractor will safeguard, store, mark, and transmit CUI (e.g., student training rosters, medical records/performance data, and tactical scenario materials) generated or accessed during performance. The plan must demonstrate compliance with:
    - DoDI 5200.48 (*Controlled Unclassified Information*).
    - Secure storage and transmission protocols (e.g., encrypted email, FIPS 140-2/3 validated storage).
    - Immediate destruction/sanitization of transient training data upon course completion.
    - *Note: A DoD Facility Security Clearance (FCL) and DD Form 254 are NOT required for this contract, as performance is strictly unclassified up to CUI.*

4.0 Volume II: Factor I: Technical

Offerors shall provide a detailed narrative detailing their technical capabilities to accomplish the work described in Attachment 1 - Statement of Work (SOW). General statements that the Offeror understands the requirement and shall comply will be considered inadequate. Do not merely rephrase the Government's requirements.

- Subfactor 1A: Key Personnel Minimums (Pass/Fail Gate): Provide resumes for the Program Lead, Primary Instructor, Lane Instructor, Exercise Manager, SME - Ultrasound, and SME - Airway/Ventilator Support. Resumes must clearly demonstrate the personnel meet the minimum experience, certification, and clearance thresholds established in the PWS. (Resumes do not count toward page limits).
- Subfactor 1B: Corporate Experience: Provide a narrative detailing the Prime Contractor's institutional experience within the last five (5) years in successfully delivering turnkey, complex Special Operations medical training. Detail the corporation's specific experience managing concurrent live cadaveric labs, tactical off-road driving tracks, and multi-faceted logistics support (lodging/catering) within North Carolina or similar operational environments.
- Subfactor 1C: Turnkey Operational Execution: Provide a narrative on how the courses will be conducted, Training Facilities to be utilized, Training Materials, handling of Sensitive Items and CUI (inclduing physical safeguarding of student performance evaluations and scenario injects in garrison and field environmnets), and logistics management (Lodging and Catering Services), and any other relevant elements necessary to execute the requirements.

5.0 Volume III: Factor II: Past Performance

- Quantity & Currency: Submit a minimum of three (3) and a maximum of five (5) recent and relevant contracts or agreements. Recent is defined as work performed within the past five (5) years from the issuance date of this solicitation.
- Relevance: Relevant efforts are those of similar size, scope, and magnitude to the MARSOC Special Operations Medical Training Services requirements.
- Required Data Points: For each reference, include:
    - Contract/Task Order Number and Period of Performance.
    - Total Contract/Task Order Dollar Value.
    - Point of Contact (Name, Phone, Email) for both the Government PM/COR and, if applicable, the Prime Contractor.
    - A concise narrative explaining how the prior work directly maps to the PWS tasks.

6.0 Volume IV: Factor III: Price

- 6.1 IDIQ Ceilings & Magnitude of Effort: Offerors are advised that this IDIQ contract carries an estimated Maximum Overall Ceiling of $4,950,000 across the entire period of performance (Base plus four Option Years and the potential 6-month extension). Furthermore, the anticipated Annual Ceiling is $900,000. Proposed pricing that, when evaluated against the Government's estimated quantities, mathematically exceeds the annual or overall ceilings may be deemed unreasonable and unawardable.

6.2 Pricing Template & Course Iterations:

Offerors shall submit pricing using the Government-provided Excel template. Pricing is based on Firm-Fixed-Price (FFP) per-course iterations for standard classes and fully burdened hourly labor rates for custom classes

-
    - Standard Classes (Priced): Offerors shall propose fully burdened FFP rates for the Two (2) Standard Classes defined in the PWS (CLIN X00101 and CLIN X00102). These rates will be binding for the duration of the IDIQ and will form the basis of the Total Evaluated Price (TEP).
    - Custom Class (Unpriced Course Rate at IDIQ Level - CLIN X00103): The "Custom Class" per-course iterations will NOT be priced in this IDIQ proposal. Pricing for custom classes will be established and negotiated at the individual Task Order level. Offerors shall leave the Custom Class per-course FFP cells blank or marked as "Unpriced" in the template.
    - Fully Burdened Labor Rate Ceiling Table: To establish a binding basis for future Task Order negotiations under CLIN X00103, Offerors MUST submit a Fully Burdened Labor Rate Ceiling Table as part of Volume IV. This table must define the maximum hourly rates (inclusive of base labor, fringe, overhead, G&A, and fee) for all labor categories required to execute Custom Medical Training as defined in the PWS (e.g., Program Director, Program Manager, Instructors, Subject Matter Experts, and Logistics Specialists). The proposed hourly rates shall act as contractually binding ceilings for the life of the IDIQ.

6.3 Basis of Estimate (BOE) & Price Narrative:

Provide a narrative breaking down the price calculation:

1. Standard Classes: Provide a detailed breakdown of the FFP course iteration rates for the Two Standard Classes. Detail the major cost elements (e.g., instructor compensation, facility overhead, logistics/catering, G&A, and fee) that comprise the turnkey price.
2. Custom Class (Labor Ceiling Rates): Provide a narrative justifying the basis of estimate for the proposed hourly ceiling rates in the Fully Burdened Labor Rate Ceiling Table. Include descriptions of escalation rates applied to Option Years 1 through 4.

6.4 Price Evaluation Basis (Unit-Rate Evaluation):

The Government will evaluate price proposals based on the unit prices proposed for each individual course iteration and the maximum hourly rates proposed for the labor categories. There is no mathematically extended Total Evaluated Price (TEP) for this requirement.

-

- 6.4.1 Standard Classes (CLINs X00101 and X00102): Offerors shall propose a binding, flat-rate unit price per-course iteration for each Standard Class across the Base Period and all Option Periods. These single course rates are evaluated directly for reasonableness.

- 6.4.2 Evaluation of FAR 52.217-8 (6-Month Extension): To evaluate the potential 6-month extension period under FAR 52.217-8, the Government will evaluate the unit-course rates at exactly 50% of the proposed Option Year 4 course iteration rates. Offerors shall not propose separate rates for the extension period.

Evaluation Factors for Award

Header Miscellaneous Text (Modified):

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

(ADDENDUM TO FAR 52.212-2 EVALUATION-COMMERCIAL PRODUCTSAND COMMERCIAL SERVICES)

1.0 Basis for Award (Best Value Tradeoff)

1.1 Tradeoff Methodology
The Government intends to award a Single Award Indefinite-Delivery/Indefinite-Quantity (IDIQ) contract to the responsible Offeror whose proposal conforms to the solicitation requirements and represents the best overall value to the Government. This is a competitive best-value tradeoff acquisition conducted in accordance with FAR Part 12 and FAR Part 13.5(Simplified Procedures for Certain Commercial Products and Commercial Services). The Government is not utilizing the formal source selection procedures of FAR Part 15 or the DoD Source Selection Procedures. Accordingly, the Government is not obligated to award to the lowest-priced offeror or the highest technically rated offeror. The Government may award to a higher-rated, higher-priced offeror if the Contracting Officer reasonably determines that the technical superiority and/or superior past performance of the higher-priced proposal outweigh the price difference. The Contracting Officer retains the ultimate discretion to determine whether the identifiable benefits of a higher-priced proposal justify the payment of the associated price premium.

1.2 Use Of Evaluative Tools
In accordance with the notice provided in Section L, the Government may use artificial intelligence (AI) or other automated tools to support the evaluation process. These tools serve an assistive function, such as summarizing content or verifying compliance with solicitation requirements. All technical, past performance, and tradeoff award judgments are, and will remain, the exclusive determination of Government personnel.

1.3 Relative Importance of Factors
The Government will evaluate proposals based on three main factors. The relative importance is defined as follows: Factors I and II (the non-cost/price factors), when combined, are significantly more important than Factor III(Price). As competing proposals approach equality in the non-cost/price factors, Price will become a more significant determinant in the award decision. The Government will not make an award at a price premium it considers unreasonable.

1.4 Phased Evaluation Sequence
To ensure an efficient evaluation process, the Government will evaluate proposals in three sequential phases:

- Phase 1: Qualifying Criteria (Pass/Fail Gate). Volume I will be evaluated first on a strict Pass/Fail basis. If a proposal receives a "Fail," no further evaluation will be conducted, the proposal will be eliminated from the competition, and it will not be considered for award.
- Phase 2: Technical Evaluation. Subfactor 1A is evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis. If personnel meet minimums, the proposal proceeds to evaluation of Subfactors 1B and 1C. If a proposal's overall Technical rating is evaluated as "Unacceptable" (Red), the proposal is deemed unawardable. Consequently, the Government will not evaluate the Offeror's Past Performance or Price, and the proposal will be eliminated.
- Phase 3: Past Performance & Price Evaluation. Only proposals that successfully pass Phase 1 and achieve a Factor I (Technical) rating of "Marginal" (Yellow) or higher will advance to the evaluation of Factor II (Past Performance) and Factor III (Price) to determine the final best-value tradeoff.

1.5 Intent to Award Without Exchanges

- Award Without Exchanges: The Government intends to evaluate proposals and award a contract without conducting exchanges with offerors. Therefore, the Offeror's initial proposal should contain the Offeror's best terms from both a technical and pricing standpoint. Offerors should not assume that the Government will conduct communications, clarifications, or negotiations.
- Reservation of Rights (FAR 13.106-2): The Government is utilizing the simplified evaluation procedures of FAR 13.106-2(b) and is not establishing a formal "competitive range" or conducting "discussions" as defined in FAR Part 15. However, the Government reserves the right to conduct clarifications, communications, or negotiations with one, some, or all offerors if the Contracting Officer determines it to be necessary and in the best interest of the Government to facilitate an efficient award.

2.0 Volume I: Qualifying Criteria Evaluation (Pass/Fail)
The Government will evaluate the Qualifying Criteria submitted in Volume I strictly on a Pass/Fail (Go/No-Go) basis.

Rating	Definition

Pass	The proposal meets all Volume I mandatory criteria. Specifically, the Offeror: 1. Unconditionally accepts all solicitation terms and conditions. 2. Demonstrates an active NIST SP 800-171 assessment score in SPRS. 3. Submits an acceptable CUI Safeguarding Plan that complies with DoDI 5200.48 and DFARS 252.204-7012 safeguarding protocols. The proposal advances to Phase 2 (Technical Evaluation).
Fail	The proposal fails to satisfy one or more mandatory criteria, takes exception to terms, lacks a verified SPRS score, or submits an inadequate CUI Safeguarding Plan. The proposal is rated Unacceptable, eliminated from the competition, and will not be evaluated further.

3.0 Volume II: Factor I - Technical Evaluation
The Government will evaluate the quality of the technical solution and the associated risk. **Subfactor 1B (Corporate Experience)** will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the Prime Contractor possesses institutional history executing turnkey SOF medical training of similar scope and complexity. Subfactor 1C (Turnkey Operational Execution): The Government will evaluate the feasibility, realism, and risk associated with the Offeror's proposed execution plan, facility locations, sensitive items handling, and logistical support (lodging/ catering) and protocols for safeguarding sensitive resources and Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI) during training execution to ensure compliance with the PWS.

Technical Rating Methodology:

Color Rating	Adjectival Rating	Description
Blue	Outstanding	Proposal indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements and contains multiple strengths (e.g., extensive turnkey SOF corporate experience). Risk of unsuccessful performance is low.
Purple	Good	Proposal indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements and contains at least one strength. Risk of unsuccessful performance is low to moderate.
Green	Acceptable	Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. Risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.
Yellow	Marginal	Proposal has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements, and/or risk of unsuccessful performance is high.
Red	Unacceptable	Proposal does not meet requirements of the solicitation, and thus, contains one or more material failures to meet the requirements. Proposal is unawardable.

4.0 Volume III: Factor II - Past Performance Evaluation

4.1 Past Performance Evaluation Approach
The Past Performance evaluation will assess the Offeror's probability of meeting the solicitation requirements based on their historical record of performance on recent and relevant efforts. The evaluation is a two-step process: determining Relevancy and then determining Performance Confidence.

4.2 Step 1: Relevancy Determination
The Government will evaluate the provided references against the size, scope, and complexity of the current MARSOC SOMTS PWS to determine relevancy using the following definitions:

- Very Relevant: Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
- Relevant: Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
- Somewhat Relevant: Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.
- Not Relevant: Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.

4.3 Step 2: Performance Confidence Assessment
Based on the quality of the recent and relevant past performance, the Government will assign an overall Performance Confidence Assessment rating using the following definitions:

- Substantial Confidence: Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a high expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
- Satisfactory Confidence: Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
- Neutral Confidence: No recent/relevant performance record is available or the offeror's performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned. The offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on the factor of past performance.
- Limited Confidence: Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has a low expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort.
- No Confidence: Based on the offeror's recent/relevant performance record, the Government has no expectation that the offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.

5.0 Volume IV: Factor III - Price Evaluation

5.1 Price Evaluation Approach

Price will be evaluated for completeness, reasonableness, and balance in accordance with FAR 13.106-3(a). Since specific course quantities are unknown at the IDIQ level, the Government will conduct its evaluation strictly on a unit-rate basis (per-course iteration prices for Standard Classes and hourly labor ceiling rates for the Custom Class). Cost realism analysis will not be performed.

Evaluation Metric	Detailed Description & Standard
Completeness	The Government will verify that the Offeror has: 1. Proposed binding, flat-rate Firm-Fixed-Prices for a single iteration of both Standard Classes (CLINs X00101 and X00102) across the Base Period and all four Option Periods. 2. Submitted a completed Fully Burdened Labor Rate Ceiling Table covering all required labor categories for the Custom Class (CLIN X00103). 3. Left the Custom Class per-course FFP cells blank or marked as "Unpriced" in the pricing template.
Price Reasonableness	The proposed unit rates will be evaluated using price analysis techniques under FAR 13.106-3(a): Standard Course Iterations: The single-unit course prices for CLINs X00101 and X00102 will be compared against competing proposals, historical training prices, and the Independent Government Cost Estimate (IGCE) to ensure they are fair and reasonable. Hourly Labor Ceilings (CLIN X00103): The proposed hourly rates for the Custom Class will be compared to commercial market standards and competitive proposals to ensure they represent reasonable maximum ceilings for future task order negotiations.
Unbalanced Pricing	The Government will review the proposed course rates and labor ceilings across all ordering periods to identify any mathematically unbalanced pricing (e.g., extreme front-loading of Base Year rates or disproportionate escalations in Option Years). Proposals with materially unbalanced pricing that poses an unacceptable risk may be rejected.