Amendment #1

to RFP-NIH-NIAID-DAIT-BAA-05-10

" Modeling Immunity for BioDefense "

Amendment to Solicitation No.:	NIH-NIAID-DAIT-BAA-05-10
Amendment No.:	1
Amendment Date:	October 5, 2004
RFP Issue Date:	August 20, 2004
Proposal Due Date:	November 24, 2004 (unchanged)
Issued By:	Carl A. Newman Contracting Officer DHHS/NIH/NIAID Contract Management Program 6700-B Rockledge Drive Room 3214, MSC 7612 Bethesda, Maryland 20892-7612
Point of Contact:	Robert J. Singman, Contract Specialist 301-451-2607 rsingman@niaid.nih.gov
Name and Address of Offeror:	To All Offerors

The hour and date for receipt of the offeror **HAS NOT BEEN EXTENDED**. Offerors shall acknowledge receipt of this amendment by noting, on the face page of the original technical and business proposal, that the offer has been prepared in accordance with the original solicitation and all its amendments. Failure of the offeror to submit this acknowledgement may result in the rejection of your offer.

Purpose of Amendment: I) To transmit to all offerors the response to questions that have been submitted concerning the solicitation; and II) To revise Section M of the BAA RFP.

I. The following answers are being provided to questions that we have received:

(Note: the responses to these questions do not change or otherwise affect this requirement except as indicated in ITEM II of this Amendment.)

Question 1. We are a foreign offeror can we submit a proposal under this request for proposal?

Answer: Yes. Foreign sources may submit a proposal to this solicitation. Any combination of participants that can meet the requirements stated in the RFP will be considered. You are encouraged to put together the best team possible.

The RFP on page four (4) states the following: "This BAA is open to all domestic and foreign sources; subcontracts to domestic and foreign institutions are acceptable."

Question 2. Can a government agency that is conducting animal studies and collecting data be included as a proposal team member?

Answer: Yes. A Government agency may be included as a proposal team member. Any combination of participants that can meet the requirements stated in the RFP will be considered. You are encouraged to assemble the best team possible.

Question 3. This Government agency will require funding to conduct additional animal studies to validate models. How do we include their funding requirements within our technical and cost proposals?

Answer: The Government agency will be listed as any other subcontractor in your proposal. You should include in your cost proposal everything that is necessary to complete the statement of work. If the NIAID decides to award a contract to your organization, a prime contract will be issued less the cost of the subcontract to the other Government agency. This Government agency will be awarded a contract via an interagency agreement.

Question 4. I am unable to find a copy of the report of the NIAID expert panel convened on June 10-11, 2003 that is mentioned on page 5 of the BAA.

Answer: The link to the Mathematical Modeling Meeting Summary is http://www.niaid.nih.gov/research/mm_summary.pdf It's available on the NIAID website under the Division of Allergy, Immunology and Transplantation (DAIT).

II. The following changes are hereby made to the solicitation:

Section M has been revised. In addition, Small Disadvantaged Business Participation evaluation criteria are added. All other provisions of this solicitation are unchanged.

SECTION M - EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

SECTION M – EVALUATION FACTORS FOR AWARD

1. GENERAL

Selection of an offeror for contract award will be based on an evaluation of proposals against three (3) factors. The factors in the order of importance are: technical, cost, and Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB) participation. Although technical factors are of paramount consideration in the award of the contract, cost/price, and SDB participation are also important to the overall contract award decision. The technical evaluation criteria are significantly more important than SDB participation and cost or price. In any case, the Government reserves the right to make an award(s) to that offeror whose proposal provides the best overall value to the Government.

All technical proposals will undergo evaluation by a peer review group also known as a Scientific Review Group (SRG).

The final state of the evaluation is the establishment of an Order of Merit Ranking in which all competing proposals

are ranked on the basis of their respective relevance and scientific merit evaluations. Final selection of awards will depend upon the availability of funds, scientific priority, and program balance that the NIAID determines to exist at the time of award selection.

The estimated cost of an offer must be reasonable for the tasks to be performed, and, in accordance with FAR 15.305, will be subject to a cost realism analysis by the Government.

Offerors must demonstrate in their proposals that they have the necessary expertise and capabilities for conducting the research as requested by this solicitation. Each proposal must document the feasibility of successful implementation of the requirements of the BAA.

2. EXTENT OF SMALL DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS PARTICIPATION

SDB participation will not be scored, but the Government's conclusions about overall commitment and realism of the offeror's SDB Participation targets will be used in determining the relative merits of the offeror's proposal and in selecting the offeror whose proposal is considered to offer the best value to the Government.

The extent of the offeror's Small Disadvantaged Business Participation Targets will be evaluated before determination of the Order of Merit Ranking. Evaluation of SDB participation will be assessed based on consideration of the information presented in the offeror's proposal. The Government is seeking to determine whether the offeror has demonstrated a commitment to use SDB concerns for the work that it intends to perform.

Offers will be evaluated on the following sub-factors:

a) Extent to which SDB concerns are specifically identified
b) Extent of participation of SDB concerns in terms of the value of the total acquisition.

3. EVALUATION OF DATA SHARING PLAN

The offeror's plan for the sharing of final research data shall be assessed for appropriateness and adequacy. If your proposal does not include a plan or if the plan in your proposal is considered "unacceptable," you will be afforded the opportunity to further discuss, clarify or modify your data sharing plan during discussions and in your Final Proposal Revision (FPR). If your data sharing plan is still considered "unacceptable" by the Government after discussions, your proposal may not be considered further for award.

4. TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation criteria are used by Technical Evaluation Panel when reviewing the technical proposals. The criteria below are listed in relative order of importance with weights assigned for evaluation purposes.

Evaluation Factors		**Points**
A.	**SCIENTIFIC RATIONALE AND TECHNICAL APPROACH**	**60**

Feasibility and appropriateness of the scientific rationale and technical approach, including:

1) Procedures for development of mathematical models of host immunity and application of those models to understand immune responses to vaccination, immunotherapeutic strategies, or infection with NIAID Category A, B, or C pathogens.
2) For those offerors that focus on immunological research that is not directed specifically at NIAID Category A, B and C Priority Pathogens: clear correlations and explanations for the use of model organisms to directly address a practical approach to inducing, controlling or improving the effectiveness of innate or adaptive immune responses to infection by NIAID Category A, B, or C pathogens or vaccines to prevent infection.

3) Methods to use laboratory experimentation to test and refine the models and adequacy of the methods to apply the models to guide future experimentations and make predictions about host immune functions.
4) Clearly defined milestones and timelines for progress of the research program, including availability of the models to the broader research community.
5) Development of education programs and measures of success of these programs, including the methods for providing participants with a knowledge of the power of applying mathematical principles to biological phenomena in immunology. The main goal of the education program will be to produce the next generation of researchers with multi-disciplinary expertise in mathematical modeling and immunology.
6) Plans for the development of methods and standards for data sharing and communication among the Centers, as well as with the broader research community.
7) Plans to make the predictive mathematical models user-friendly and widely available to the research community, including methods for training researchers to use the models efficiently.
8) Adequacy of plans to address animal welfare and human subjects information, for those Offerors using animals, human tissue/blood samples, or data from clinical trials.

B. OFFEROR'S QUALIFICATIONS AND CAPABILITIES 25

1) Principal Investigator: Documented training, expertise, leadership, commitment and availability with respect to technical and administrative competence to successfully manage a project of comparable size and complexity. It is expected that the Principal Investigator shall have expertise in either immunology or development of mathematical models, as needed to plan and direct the project. **(15 points)**
2) Scientific and Technical Staff: Documented training, experience, expertise, availability, and capability of the technical and support staff to perform their roles in the proposed studies including experience with similar projects. Adequacy of the management and organization of the Immune Modeling Center including the synergy of the multi-disciplinary team of researchers to conduct innovative research to develop novel or improved highly predictive mathematical models that simulate immune function for analysis of host immune responses to NIAID category A-C pathogens. **(10 points)**

C. OFFEROR'S FACILITIES AND RESOURCES 15

Documented availability and adequacy of the Organization (Institution or Business), facilities, equipment, and resources necessary to carry out and meet the goals and objectives of the Immune Modeling Center, including institutional commitment to the Center.

End of Amendment #1 to RFP NIH-NIAID-DAIT-BAA-05-10