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M-1.0 GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR AWARD AND OFFEROR RESPONSIBILITY

Pursuant to FAR 52.215-1 (Alt 1), the Government intends to award this contract to a single awardee after conducting discussions with Offerors whose proposals have been determined to be within the competitive range. The competitive range for this procurement is established to be those offerors whose proposal submission initially appears complete and includes information required by Section L of this Solicitation. Therefore, it is anticipated that discussions will be conducted soon after proposal receipt.

The Government will evaluate each Offeror’s understanding of the Government’s requirements and ability to perform the work on the basis of its proposal and the evaluation criteria. It is the Offeror’s responsibility to provide information and evidence that clearly demonstrates its ability to satisfactorily perform the contract requirements in accordance with the factors listed in Section M. All information submitted as part of the proposal will be used to evaluate the Offeror’s capability to perform and its understanding of the contract requirements. The Government also reserves the right to change any of the terms and conditions of this RFP by amendment at any time prior to contract award and to allow Offerors to revise their offers accordingly as authorized by FAR 15.306.

The Government plans to award one contract based on a best value analysis. The Government reserves the right to not award a contract depending upon the quality of proposal received and the availability of funds.

In accordance with DoD 5220.22-M, “National Industry Security Program Operating Manual,” dated February 28, 2006, Offerors shall be required to have access to classified information and thus companies under foreign ownership, control or influence (FOCI) will be excluded from contract award. A company is considered under FOCI whenever a foreign interest has the power, direct or indirect, whether or not exercised, and whether or not exercisable through the ownership of the U.S. company’s securities, by contractual arrangement or other means, to direct or decide matters affecting the management of operations of that company in a manner which may result in unauthorized access to classified information or may adversely affect the performance of classified contracts.

Responsibility lies with the Offerors at time of proposal submission to ensure that its subcontractor(s) that require access to classified information are not restricted from participating in this acquisition due to FOCI or an OCI clause reference in any Federal Government contract.

M-1.1 CLAUSES INCORPORATED BY FULL TEXT

52.217-5 EVALUATION OF OPTIONS (JUL 1990)

Except when it is determined in accordance with FAR 17.206(b) not to be in the Government's best interests, the Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).
M-2.0 BASIS OF AWARD

This is a best-value competitive source selection conducted in accordance with FAR 15, as supplemented by the Defense FAR Supplement (DFARS) 215. To be eligible for award, the Offeror must be deemed responsible in accordance with FAR 9.1; have an accounting system adequate for determining costs applicable to the contract in accordance with FAR 16.301-3(a)(3), FAR 16.403-1(c) and FAR 9.104-1(e); meet all requirements of the solicitation, including delivery schedule requirements and Limitations on Subcontracting; conform to all required terms and conditions; and include applicable required certifications. Offerors must propose to provide all contract line items in order to be eligible for award.

Alternate proposals are not allowed. Proposals with contingent terms and conditions may be deemed non-responsive and could result in the rejection of an Offeror’s proposal. The Government may reject any proposal that is evaluated to be unrealistic, including contract terms and conditions, unrealistically high or low in cost/price, in excess of funding limits (see M-5.3), or deemed to reflect a lack of understanding/competence or failure to comprehend the complexity and risks of all stated requirements.

The Government will consider, throughout the evaluation, the correction potential of any deficiency. The judgment of such “correction potential” is within the sole discretion of the Government. If any aspect of an Offeror’s proposal not meeting the Government's requirements is not considered correctable, the Offeror may be eliminated from the competitive range, if applicable. The Government will use this information to support competitive range and contract award decisions, as applicable.

Offerors should note that in this solicitation “initial” capability refers to the Offeror’s capability to meet or exceed the threshold requirements.

Offerors should also note that the Cost Addendum requested (see Section L-3.4.7) is for the Government’s information only and shall not be considered in the best value source selection.

M-2.1 Competitive, Best-Value Source Selection

Attention is directed to FAR 52.215-1, which provides that the contract will be awarded to that responsible Offeror whose proposal represents the best value after evaluation in accordance with the factors and sub-factors in the solicitation. “Factors” shall include all of those evaluation factors and sub-factors which are described in Section M.

The Government will select for award the most advantageous proposal representing the best value to the Government based upon an integrated assessment of Non-Price factors (Technical, Management, and Past Performance) and the Price factor. A best value analysis will not be performed for any Offeror whose proposal is found to be unacceptable and will therefore be ineligible for award.
M-2.2 Factor and Sub-Factor Weighting

The Government intends to award one contract to the responsive and responsible Offeror whose proposal represents the best value to the Government based on consideration of the factors specified in Paragraph M-3.0 of this solicitation. In making its best value determination, the Government will consider the relative importance of the non-price factors as set forth below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 1 (F1): Technical</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor TS1: Architecture and Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor TS2: Software Architecture and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor TS3: Technology Maturity/Manufacturing Readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 2 (F2): Management</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor MS1: Program Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor MS2: Schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-factor MS3: Small Business Participation &amp; Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Factor 3 (F3): Past Performance</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table M-2-1  Non-Price Evaluation Factors/Sub-factors

The overall relative importance of the non-price evaluation factors is as follows:

The Technical Factor is more important than the Management Factor. The Management Factor is more important than the Past Performance Factor.

The overall relative importance of the sub-factors under the Technical and Management Factors is as follows:

Within the Technical Factor, the Architecture and Design Sub-Factor is more important than the Software Architecture and Development or Technology Maturity/Manufacturing Readiness Sub-Factors. The Software Architecture and Development and Technology Maturity/Manufacturing Readiness Sub-factors are approximately equal in importance.

Within the Management Factor, the Program Management Sub-factor is more important than the Schedule Sub-factor. Each of these Sub-factors is significantly more important than the Small Business Participation and Commitment Sub-factor.

All evaluation factors other than price, when combined, are significantly more important than price. Even though price is a substantial factor in source selection, this competition may result in an award to a higher-rated, higher-priced Offeror. However, the significance of Price as an evaluation factor will increase with the degree of equality in overall merit of competing proposals in meeting solicitation requirements. Therefore, a price realism analysis will be conducted in order to measure the Offeror’s understanding of the requirements and/or assess the risk inherent in an Offeror’s proposal. Unrealistically low prices proposed initially or subsequently may be grounds for eliminating a proposal from competition either on the basis that the Offeror does not understand the requirement or the Offeror has submitted an unrealistic proposal.
M-3.0 EVALUATION OF FACTORS AND SUB-FACTORS

M-3.1 Factor and Sub-Factor Evaluation

The SSA will select the Offeror whose proposal is considered the best value to the Government based solely on the evaluation of the factors and sub-factors specified in M-4.0.

M-3.2 Technical and Management Factor Rating Information

Each Technical and Management sub-factor will be assigned one of the color ratings described in Table M-3-1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BLUE</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Proposal meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths far outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is low.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURPLE</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YELLOW</td>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RED</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Proposal does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies. The proposal is unawardable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table M-3-1  Technical and Management Sub-Factor Ratings

M-3.3 Evaluation Definitions Applicable to Technical and Management Factors

The following definitions in Tables 3-2 and 3-3 are applicable to the terms specified in the color rating descriptions applicable to the Technical and Management evaluation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significant Strength</td>
<td>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 contract performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strengths

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 contract performance.

Uncertainties

Uncertainty is a doubt regarding whether an aspect of a proposal meets a material performance or capability requirement.

Weaknesses

A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Significant Weaknesses

A flaw in the proposal that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

Deficiencies

A material failure of a proposal to meet a Government requirement or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Has little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and normal Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Can potentially cause some disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome difficulties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Is likely to cause significant disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Is unlikely to overcome any difficulties, even with special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Government assessment of risk is manifested by the identification of weakness(es), considers the potential for disruption of schedule, increased cost, degradation of performance, and the need for increased Government oversight, or the likelihood of unsuccessful contract performance.

Table M-3-2 Evaluation Definitions

M-4.0 FACTORS AND SUB-FACTORS

M-4.1 Technical Factor (Factor 1)

M-4.1.1 Technical Sub-factor 1 (TS-1): Architecture and Design

M-4.1.1.1 System Architecture

The Government will assess how, under CLIN 0001, the Offeror’s proposed architecture results in a producible design which accommodates the Future Growth sensitivity and Objective raid size capacity levels as defined in the LRDR Element Specification without requiring structural modifications. The Government will assess the initial LRDR capability offered for CLIN 0001. The Government will also evaluate how well the Offeror’s approach addresses the Threat Scenarios sample problem.
The Government will assess the performance of the Objective Capability offered (base CLIN 0001 plus option CLINs 1000 & 1200) against the Objective raid scenario.

Initial LRDR capability that is offered for CLIN 0001 that has merit (such as enhanced battle space coverage and/or flexibility to participate in future BMDS flight tests) may be assigned a strength or a significant strength. The Government may assign a strength or a significant strength for capacity and performance of the initial CLIN 0001 capability against the Objective raid as set forth in the LRDR Element Specification. The Government may also assign a strength or a significant strength for the extent to which the initial CLIN 0001 capability exceeds the Threshold radar sensitivity up to the Objective radar sensitivity as set forth in the LRDR Element Specification.

Proposals for CLIN 0001 will not be eligible for award unless they satisfy the following conditions:

- radar sensitivity and raid size capacity meets the Threshold levels
- LRDR architecture and design accommodate the Future Growth sensitivity and Objective raid capacity levels as set forth in the LRDR Element Specification.

M-4.1.1.2 Hardware Architecture, Design and Development

The Government will evaluate how well the LRDR hardware design realizes the proposed architecture and provides a fielded system that is capable, resource efficient, producible, reliable and supportable which at least meets the requirements in the LRDR Element Specification (ES) and this solicitation.

M-4.1.1.3 Reliability, Availability, Maintainability and Testability (RAM-T)

The Government will evaluate how the LRDR design (hardware and software) at least meets all LRDR Reliability, Availability, Maintainability and Testability (RAM-T) requirements as defined in the LRDR Element Specification. The Government will also assess the Offeror’s approach to logistics and the proposed content of the logistics demonstrations. The Government will evaluate how well the Offeror’s approach addressed the RAM-T sample problem.

M-4.1.1.4 Technical Data and Computer Software Rights

The Government will evaluate the extent to which proprietary or otherwise limited or restricted components, subsystems, devices, interfaces, and software within the system architecture are used. The Government will evaluate the Offeror’s intellectual property and technical data rights assertions including: DFARS 252.227-7017 Technical Data Rights List (Attachment J-09); DFARS 252.227-7028 Technical Data Rights List (Attachment J-09); Supplemental Information—Noncommercial Technical Data, Noncommercial Computer Software, Noncommercial Computer Software Documentation (Attachment J-09); Commercial Technical Data, Commercial Computer Software, and Commercial Computer Software Documentation—Government Use Restrictions in the Commercial Restrictions List (Attachment J-09); as well as other information required in Section L pertaining to use of proprietary or otherwise limited or restricted information.
Evaluation will include both the hardware and software concept design. In the event an Offeror proposes to deliver any commercial or noncommercial Technical Data/Computer Software/Computer Software Documentation (TD/CS/CSD) with less than GPR, the Government will evaluate the impact on the Government’s ability to use, modify, release, or disclose such TD, CS, or CSD. Use of proprietary algorithms, designs, processes, or interfaces will be evaluated based on the extent to which they affect the Government’s overall goal and ability to acquire and support the LRDR design. Justification and rationale for all intellectual property and technical data rights assertions will be evaluated. Any proposal which asserts less than GPRs at any system/subsystem interface or other interface (e.g., including, but not limited to, mechanical, electrical and thermal) may result in the assignment of a weakness or significant weakness.

M-4.1.2 Technical Sub-factor 2 (TS-2): Software Architecture and Development

The Government will evaluate how the proposed Software Architecture and Development at least meets the technical and compliance requirements of the LRDR Element Specification, the Statement of Work, and the terms and conditions of this solicitation. The Government will also evaluate the suitability and results of radar algorithms and related products submitted as substantiation of the Offeror’s performance claims for acquisition, track, discrimination, hit assessment and raid handling.

M-4.1.3 Technical Sub-factor 3 (TS-3): Technology Maturity/Manufacturing Readiness

M-4.1.3.1 Technology Maturity

The Government will evaluate the Offeror’s understanding of technological maturity issues and anticipated risks to LRDR performance, delivery and reliability requirements. The Government will also assess the offeror’s metric-based processes and plans to achieve at least a Technology Readiness Level (TRL) of 6 by System PDR for all mission critical, safety critical, and other key components, and the plan to achieve at least a TRL of 7 by System CDR.

M-4.1.3.2 Manufacturing Readiness

The Government will evaluate the Offeror’s manufacturing readiness level claims and its understanding of the manufacturing challenges, anticipated risks and risk mitigations to LRDR performance, delivery and reliability requirements. The Government will assess the Offeror’s metric-based processes and plans to achieve at least a Manufacturing Readiness Level (MRL) of 6 for all mission critical, safety critical, and other key components by System PDR, and plans to achieve at least MRL level 7 by System CDR.

M-4.2 Management Factor (Factor 2)

M-4.2.1 Management Sub-factor 1 (MS-1): Program Management
The Government will evaluate the Offeror’s proposed program management approach for accomplishing the SOW requirements and the terms and conditions of the contract. The Offeror’s management approach will be evaluated to determine the extent to which the Offeror has developed a strategy for the effective and efficient management of contract activities, business operations and program management activities including subcontract management, key personnel, facilities, and System and Specialty Engineering.

M-4.2.2 Management Sub-factor 2 (MS-2): Schedule

The Government will evaluate the effectiveness of the Offeror’s proposed approach for accomplishing the SOW requirements for development of the Integrated Master Schedule. The Government will evaluate the Offeror’s proposed approach and understanding of the entire effort as demonstrated in the proposed Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) and accompanying Schedule Risk Analysis.

M-4.2.3 Management Sub-factor 3 (MS-3): Small Business Participation and Commitment

The Government will evaluate the Offeror’s Small Business Participation and Commitment Plan. As part of the evaluation for this sub-factor the Government will consider each Offeror’s commitment to use small businesses in terms of the type of work to be performed, the extent to which specific companies are named in the proposal; and whether documented commitments are demonstrated in their proposal.

M-4.3 Past Performance (Factor 3)

M-4.3.1 Past Performance Evaluation

The Past Performance evaluation assesses the probability of meeting the solicitation requirements based on an Offeror’s demonstrated record of recent and relevant quality work performance in meeting contract requirements.

For the purposes of evaluating past performance, the following definitions apply:

(a) “Major Subcontractors” is defined as proposed subcontractors that contribute $25 million or more of the effort as proposed by the Prime Offeror for all CLINs combined. Past performance information related to predecessor companies or subcontractors will be considered the same as past performance information of the principal Offeror.

(b) “Recent” is defined as the five (5) year period preceding the date of issuance of this solicitation.

(c) “Relevant” is defined as similar in size, scope, and complexity to LRDR.

The Government may obtain past performance information from various sources known or identified by the Government. The Government may consider past performance information from individual references, or in the aggregate.

M-4.3.2 Past Performance Rating

10
Based on an integrated assessment of recency, relevancy, and quality of work, the Government will assign an overall Past Performance Rating as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>Based on the Offeror’s recent/relevant/quality performance record, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>Based on the Offeror’s recent/relevant/quality performance record, the Government has no reasonable expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>No recent/relevant/quality performance record is available, or the Offeror’s performance record is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table M-4-1 Past Performance Rating Definitions

#### M-4.3.2.1 Recency Assessment

The Government will assess past performance information to determine if it is recent. Past performance information that does not meet the definition of “recent” (M-4.3.1(b)) will be considered “not recent” and will not be evaluated. If any part of performance falls within the “recent” timeframe, the Government may consider the entire performance in its evaluation of past performance.

#### M-4.3.2.2 Relevancy Assessment

The Government will assess past performance information that has been determined to be recent to ascertain its relevancy to the scope of this solicitation. The Government is not bound by the Offeror’s opinion of relevancy.

In assessing relevancy, the Government may consider all information it receives or obtains, such as contract type and dollar value, program phase, division of company, and major subcontractors, as well as performance information related to efforts the Offeror or major subcontractors performed for other agencies of Federal, State, or local Government, and commercial customers.

A record of more relevant past performance will typically be a stronger predictor of future success and may have more influence on confidence assessment than a favorable record of less relevant past performance.

Based on an assessment of the Offeror’s recent performance history and its relevancy to this solicitation, the Government will assign a Relevancy Rating. The following rating definitions apply:
### Past Performance Relevancy Ratings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Relevant (VR)</td>
<td>Present/past performance effort involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant (R)</td>
<td>Present/past performance effort involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Relevant (SR)</td>
<td>Present/past performance effort involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Relevant (NR)</td>
<td>Present/past performance effort involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Performance Quality Assessment

The Government will conduct an in-depth evaluation of the Offeror’s recent and relevant performance history in order to assess the Offeror’s quality of performance on past contracts. This assessment will not change the existing record or history of the Offeror’s past performance; rather, the evaluation process will review information from customers on how well the Offeror performed on those past contracts.

Based on its evaluation, the Government will assign a Performance Assessment Quality Rating. The following rating definitions apply:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory (S)</td>
<td>Performance met contractual requirements. Performance contained some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the Offeror appeared or were satisfactory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory (U)</td>
<td>Performance did not meet most contractual requirements. Performance contained problem(s) for which the Offeror’s corrective actions did not appear in a timely manner, or were ineffective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable (NA)</td>
<td>Unable to provide an assessment due to lack of information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PRICE FACTOR

The Price Factor will not receive a color rating. The Cost Volume shall be evaluated, but shall not be scored or otherwise combined with other aspects of the proposal evaluation. The Government will evaluate each Offeror’s price proposal using one or more of the techniques described in FAR 15.404 and DFARS 215.404. Information in the proposal and information from other sources such as DCAA, DCMA, and information obtained by the past performance evaluation team may be considered under the cost factor.
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410 M-5.1 Total Evaluated Price
411
412 The Government will evaluate the Offeror’s price proposal to determine a Total Evaluated Price (TEP).
413
414 The Total Evaluated Price (TEP) shall include all CLINs, including the option CLINs. The Cost Addendum requested (see Section L-3.4.8) shall not be included or considered in the Government’s establishment of Total Evaluated Price.
415
416 The Total Evaluated Price is comprised of:
417
418 1. The proposed ceiling price for CLIN’s 0001, 0010, 1000, 1010, 1200 and 1210.
419
420 2. For all cost reimbursement CLINs, the probable cost (reflecting any Government adjustments to proposed cost as a result of cost realism analysis) and associated fee at that probable cost (excluding performance incentives) determined in accordance with applicable RFP fee language.
421
422 3. The maximum potential Performance incentive fees.
423
424 4. The total amount of any additional costs to the Government (see Section M-5.2).
425

M-5.2 Additional Costs to the Government
426
427 The amount of any additional costs to the Government which are necessary to support the Offeror’s unique approach will be considered by the Government when making the best value determination. Items such as increased operating cost resulting from data assertions, government furnished equipment, information, facilities, and any other government property proposed by the Offeror that may be included in this category of cost. Even if the proposed GFP is available on a rent free basis the amount of rent would otherwise be charged in accordance with FAR 52.245-9, Use and Charges, will be considered. However, Additional Costs to the Government does not include the GFP items listed in Section J of this RFP. These items are intended to be available to all Offerors and the use of these items will not be considered a discriminator during selection.

M-5.3 Funding Limitations
443
444 The Government will perform a cost realism analysis of the Target Cost proposed for CLINs 0001, 0010 and the Estimated Cost for CLIN 0030. The results of the cost realism analysis will be used to assess the Target Prices and Estimated cost proposed in each Government Fiscal Year accordingly. Applicable incentive fee and the proposed fixed fee will also be included in the Government’s analysis of funding requirements. Any proposal that is evaluated to require funding at any time during performance in excess of the cumulative funding established in L-3.4.5.2 (for each Government fiscal year) shall be considered ineligible for award.