Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority (BARDA)

Rapid Response Partnership Vehicle (RRPV)

DRAFT

Request for Project Proposals (RPP)

Solicitation Number: RRPV 26-05-NVP

"New Vaccine Platforms"

Draft Issue Date: 21 August 2026

Questions & Feedback Due: 4 September 2026 by 12pm ET

Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority (BARDA)
Contracts Management & Acquisition (CMA)
400 7th Street, SW, Washington, DC 20024
MedicalCountermeasures.gov

1. Executive Summary

1.1 Rapid Response Partnership Vehicle Consortium

The Rapid Response Partnership Vehicle (RRPV) Consortium is an enterprise partnership in collaboration with industry and academia to facilitate research and development activities, in cooperation with the Center for the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority (BARDA), Administration for Strategic Preparedness and Response, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

The RRPV will help fortify national health security by developing medical countermeasure products prior to and during a pandemic or public health emergency. The RRPV will focus on the acceleration of products and technology development, regulatory approval, commercialization, and sustainment to address pandemic influenza, emerging infectious diseases, and other biological threats.

Advanced Technology International (ATI) has been awarded an Other Transaction Agreement (OTA) by BARDA to serve as the Consortium Management Firm (CMF) for the RRPV.

RRPV is openly recruiting members to join a broad and diverse biomedical consortium that includes representatives from all organizations who work within stated technical focus areas. For more information on the RRPV mission, refer to the RRPV website at RRPV.org. For entities interested in joining the RRPV Consortium and responding to this solicitation, please visit http://www.rrpv.org/how-to-join.

1.2 Background

Biological threats, including emerging infectious diseases (EIDs), continue to pose a significant and evolving threat to national health security. As known pathogens cause more frequent outbreaks and new pathogens emerge, there is inherent uncertainty in predicting which threat may drive the next public health emergency. National health security preparedness in the face of an increasingly complex threat landscape that includes future, unknown threats is enabled by advancing platform technologies that have demonstrated flexibility and can be adapted to multiple different infectious disease threats.

To address this challenge, BARDA leverages product development for known priority threats to advance flexible capabilities, including platform technologies, to enable preparedness and response for newly emerging health security threats.

For the purposes of this RPP, a vaccine platform technology refers to a well-understood, reliable technology that is incorporated into or used by an existing vaccine and is essential to its structure or function. It can be adapted to multiple candidate vaccines that share key features, enabling standardized methods for developing or manufacturing such vaccines. This streamlines the creation and production of more than one vaccine by using the same core technological process.

Advancing vaccine platforms that are safe, effective across multiple infectious disease threats, and enable streamlined development and manufacturing will help ensure the U.S. MCM portfolio is optimally positioned to respond efficiently and effectively to national health security incidents.

1.3 Purpose

The purpose of this RPP is to identify new vaccine platforms for the BARDA MCM portfolio and advance them through an initial manufacturing and nonclinical capability demonstration to identify technologies that are (1) safe; (2) effective across multiple infectious disease threats from different pathogen families; and (3) support development and manufacturing that would enable an effective response during an

emerging national health security incident. Initial work will demonstrate the desired capabilities across two EID targets selected from the provided subset of Public Health Emergency Medical Countermeasures Enterprise (PHEMCE) priority biological threats. A subsequent objective is to advance the most promising platforms technologies into a clinical capability demonstration.

2. Administrative Overview

2.1 RPP Approach

A multistage approach will be employed to streamline the process for preparation, submission, evaluation, and notification. A down selection will occur between Stage 1 (Abstract) and Stage 2 (full technical and cost proposal by invitation only).

Submission to Stage 1 does not guarantee the opportunity to submit a full technical and cost proposal under Stage 2. Submission of a Stage 2 full technical and cost proposal does not guarantee an award. Each stage of this RPP process is competitive. Offerors will be invited to submit a Stage 2 full technical and cost proposal via email from the RRPV Consortium Management Firm (CMF) following the results of the Stage 1 evaluation. Invitation to negotiations at any stage does not guarantee an award. Submissions that are not selected to proceed beyond Stage 1 or Stage 2, including the basket (see section 5.5/5.6 below) will receive notification, but may not receive feedback on their submission.

The solicitation stages are as follows:

Stage 1 – Abstract. In Stage 1 Offerors will submit an Abstract and quad chart that must follow the required templates and page limits (section 3.5 and Attachment 1). Abstracts that do not meet the mandatory eligibility criteria (section 2.6) will not be evaluated. Offerors invited for a Stage 2 full technical and cost proposal will be provided feedback, particularly focusing on needed clarifications to be addressed in the Stage 2 submission. Offerors not invited for Stage 2 will be notified via email but may not receive feedback.

Stage 2 – By invitation only – full technical and cost proposal. Successful Stage 1 Offerors will receive an invitation letter from the CMF to submit a full technical and cost proposal. Required documents for Stage 2 will be noted in the invitation, but are anticipated to include a technical proposal, a cost proposal narrative, a full cost proposal, and statement of work. Further instructions will be provided to successful Stage 1 Offerors in the invitation letter.

2.2 Order of Precedence

Each proposal selected for award under this RPP will be executed as a Project Award under the RRPV Base Agreement 75A50123D00005. The same provisions will govern this Base Agreement as the OTA between the U.S. Government (USG) and ATI ("RRPV Base") unless otherwise noted in the Project Award.

2.3 Period of Performance and Funding

2.3.1 Period of Performance

The period of performance for Performers should be commensurate with the amount of work proposed. BARDA anticipates the full program Period of Performance to be up to ten (10) years from the date of award. Specific dates will be negotiated prior to award of the project agreement.

2.3.2 Funding

The total USG funding amount anticipated to be available for the initial manufacturing and nonclinical demonstration across the two selected EID threats is approximately $160M. The USG anticipates making up to approximately six (6) awards for this initial demonstration. Funding within this initial phase may be adjusted based on the Performer's demonstrated progress and program priorities.

Based on program priorities, the USG may provide additional funds to advance select Performers for follow-on clinical demonstration.

Funding and estimated number of awards is subject to change and dependent on proposal received, BARDA priorities, and availability of Federal funds for this program.

2.4 Expected Award Date

Offerors should plan on the period of performance beginning during FY27. The government reserves the right to change the notional period of performance start date through negotiations via the RRPV CMF and prior to project award.

2.5 Proprietary Information

The RRPV CMF will oversee submission of abstracts, quad charts, proposals, and other materials submitted in response to this RPP. The RRPV CMF shall take the necessary steps to protect all proprietary information and shall not use such proprietary information for purposes other than proposal evaluation and agreement administration. Please mark all Confidential or Proprietary Information as such. An Offeror's submission of a response under this RPP indicates concurrence with the aforementioned CMF responsibilities.

2.6 Mandatory Eligibility Criteria

To be eligible for consideration Offerors must be RRPV members when their Abstract is submitted. Prospective Offerors may join the consortium at www.rrpv.org/how-to-join.

Offerors must meet the following additional mandatory eligibility criteria:

- Technology scope
    - In scope: protein-based or non-nucleic acid-based vector vaccine platform technologies
    - Out of scope:
        - Nucleic acid-based vaccine platforms
        - Whole virus inactivated or attenuated approaches
        - Peptide-based approaches
        - Technologies where the platform element is focused solely on delivery devices or physical administration methods
- Technology maturity: demonstrated Phase 1 cGMP manufacturing for the platform technology, either as
    - The full technical solution (i.e., full vaccine platform solution); or
    - Each platform capability must have independently demonstrated Phase 1 cGMP manufacturing (Capability A and Capability B as defined in Section 2.7)

2.7 Eligible Offerors

This RPP is open to Offerors comprised of either (1) a single organization with a full technology solution or (2) a two-part team that together comprise a full technology solution as specifically described below.

Eligible Offerors must meet all noted mandatory eligibility criteria. Eligible Offers may be categorized as:

1. Single organization with a full technology solution, comprised of an antigen expression capability and a vaccine carrier/formulation capability. For example: for a protein-based platform this may include [antigen] + [carrier, inclusive of carrier system and adjuvant]; for an eligible vector-based approach the antigen expression and carrier may be a single system.

2. Two organization team that together have a full technology solution. Teams should be comprised of two organizations that each contribute one of the defined elements that constitute a full technology solution, specifically:

    - Capability A – antigen expression technology.
    - Capability B – vaccine carrier technology (e.g., formulation/adjuvant)

    Offerors comprised of a two-organization team must identify one teaming partner (Capability A or B) as the prime Offeror for response to the RPP and any notional future award. Abstract (Stage 1) and full technical and cost proposal (Stage 2) reviews will assess the experience and capability of the team as whole, but will also assess the experience and capability of the prime Offeror to serve as the lead of a development program.

    At RPP Stage 1 (Abstract), team-based Offerors must submit a one-page teaming arrangement (see Attachment 1). At Stage 2 (by invitation only, full technical and cost proposal) a more in-depth teaming arrangement will be required that will include confirmation that all necessary partnership and intellectual property agreements are in place at the time of submission.

    Any additional support outside the specific two-organization teaming arrangement (Capability A+B) that is necessary to meet technical requirements should be proposed as typical subcontractor, or other collaborative relationship; for example, contract research organization (CRO), contract development and manufacturing organization (CDMO), etc.

2.8 Teaming Event

To enable teaming, RRPV will host a teaming event open to organizations with Capability A or Capability B technologies that meet the minimum eligibility criteria. An online portal will be opened on the RRPV website where organizations can self-declare for Capability A or Capability B and provide a brief technology description. Organizations that align with criteria will be invited to participate in the teaming event. Participants do not need to be RRPV members at the time of the teaming event to participate. Additional information and details will be made available on the RRPV website.

2.9 Cost Sharing

Cost sharing is defined as the resources expended by the Project Awardee on the proposed Statement of Work (SOW). Cost sharing, while not required, is encouraged, if possible, as it leads to stronger leveraging of Government-Performer collaboration.

2.10 Intellectual Property and Data Rights

Intellectual Property (IP) rights for RRPV Project Awards will be defined in the terms of a Project Awardee's Base Agreement. The RRPV CMF reserves the right to assist in the negotiation of IP, royalties, licensing, future development, etc., between the Government and the Project Awardees during the entire award period.

The Offeror shall comply with the terms and conditions defined in the RRPV Base Agreement regarding Data Rights**. It is anticipated that anything delivered under this proposed effort would be delivered to the Government with unlimited data rights as defined in the RRPV Base Agreement unless otherwise specified in Attachment 1, Abstract and Quad Chart, and agreed to by the Government.** All proposed data rights are subject to Government review and approval. Rights in technical data agreed to by the Government will be incorporated into the Project Award.

3 Submissions

3.1 Question and Answer Period

Key dates related to this RPP are provided below. Please submit questions to Ms. Kathy Garee (rrpv-contracts@ati.org).

Date	Event	Method
21 August 2026	Draft RPP Released	RRPV Website
4 Sep 2026 12pm Eastern	Questions & Feedback Due to RRPV	Email to rrpv-contracts@ati.org
28 Sep 2026 (tentative)	(TBD) Proposers Conference & Teaming Event	RRPV Website

3.2 General Instructions

The formats provided in this RRPV RPP are mandatory and shall reference this RPP number. ***At the time of the submission, Offerors must certify on the cover page of their Abstract that, if selected for award, they will abide by the terms and conditions of the latest version of the RRPV Base Agreement*.** Offerors may request a current copy of the RRPV Base Agreement terms and conditions by emailing RRPV-contracts@ati.org. Base Agreements are typically not executed until Offeror is selected for award.

Offerors are encouraged to contact the Point of Contact (see Section 6), identified herein up until the submission date/time to clarify requirements.

Abstracts shall reference this RPP number. The Abstract and Quad Chart is mandatory and shall remain valid for 180 days unless otherwise specified by the Offeror in the submission. Offerors are encouraged to contact the RRPV CMF with any questions so that all aspects are clearly understood by both parties.

All eligible Offerors shall submit Abstracts and Quad Chart for evaluation according to the criteria set forth in this RPP. Offerors are advised that only ATI, as the RRPV's CMF, with the approval of the Other Transaction Agreements Officer, is legally authorized to contractually bind or otherwise commit funding for selected Project Awards as result of this RPP.

3.3 Abstract and Quad Chart Submission

Abstracts and Quad Charts shall be submitted by the date and time specified on the cover page to the BARDA Digital Resource (BDR) portal website at https://rrpv.hhs.gov/. Abstracts received after the date and time specified may not be evaluated.

Offerors will be required to register for a BDR portal account before a response can be submitted. A BDR account can be requested by contacting ATI at RRPV@ati.org. The account request process is simple but may take several days for approval and access. Upon confirmation of a BDR portal account, the Offeror will login using the prescribed two-factor authentication method.

Offerors are strongly encouraged to access the BDR Portal well in advance of the submission due date to verify their ability to log in, confirm account validity, and ensure full access to the submission system. Failure to submit on time for any reason (e.g., due to late registration in BDR portal) will result in the submission not being considered for award. Offerors will be provided an automated confirmation of successful submission.

Do not submit any classified information in the Abstract or Quad Chart submission.

3.4 Preparation Cost

The cost of preparing Abstracts, Quad Charts, and/or Proposals in response to this RPP is not considered a direct charge to any resulting award or any other contract.

3.5 Submission Format

Stage 1 submissions shall consist of a written Abstract of no more than five (5) pages, and 1-page Quad Chart, in accordance with the template and formatting instructions in Attachment 1. Submissions exceeding the page limits or not adhering to the prescribed format may be rejected without further review.

4 Technical Requirements

4.1 Introduction

The Offeror shall clearly state how they intend to meet and, if possible, exceed the technical requirements. Responses must include quantitative, data-driven justification and clearly describe how prior platform development enables efficiency, scalability, and reuse.

4.2 Scope

Overall objective. This RPP is focused on identifying new vaccine platform technologies that are safe; effective across multiple infectious disease threats; and support efficient development and manufacturing timelines. The technical approach will focus on a series of capability demonstrations to assess: (1) platform manufacturing; (2) nonclinical safety, immunogenicity, and efficacy; and (3) clinical safety and immunogenicity.

For the purposes of this RPP:

- A vaccine platform technology refers to a well-understood, reliable technology that is incorporated into or used by an existing vaccine and is essential to its structure or function. It can be adapted to multiple candidate vaccines that share key features, enabling standardized

methods for developing or manufacturing such vaccines. This streamlines the creation and production of more than one vaccine by using the same core technological process.

- New vaccine platforms refer to differentiated technologies that expand and complement the current BARDA portfolio, with particular interest in approaches that introduce novel mechanisms of action or manufacturability advantages (e.g., improved speed). Priority will be given to modalities that are not already the focus of a substantial BARDA development program(s).

The platform capability demonstration is planned to occur across at least two (2) EID targets from the provided list (Table 1). For the purposes of this RPP, target options are categorized based on the fusion protein class; Offerors may select any two (2) EID threat targets regardless of fusion protein class as EID-1 and EID-2.

Table 1. Target EID threat options for platform capability demonstration

Threat type	Options
Class I glycoprotein virus	Lassa virus; Nipah virus[1]
Class II envelope protein virus	Chikungunya virus; West Nile virus

Within and across capability demonstrations, platforms will be advanced as informed by program priorities, available funding, and the individual capability demonstration outcomes against pre-defined criteria.

Initial work will focus on the platform manufacturing and nonclinical capability demonstration for the two selected EID targets.

- EID-1. A key objective for EID-1 work is to evaluate the platform's ability to efficiently initiate and execute development and manufacturing for a new, emerging threat. Accordingly, EID-1 must be a target for which the Offeror has not previously conducted platform-specific development activities.
- EID-2. A key objective for EID-2 work is to demonstrate the flexibility of the platform across infectious disease threats from different pathogen families. The second EID target may be one for which the Offeror has previously conducted platform-specific development activities.

If advanced, subsequent work includes the clinical demonstration for at least one target. Additional work may include other targets as defined under Project Tasks.

Technical Requirements. The staged capability demonstration (CD) described below must be proposed for each threat target. A parallel objective for CD-1 (manufacturing) and CD-2 (nonclinical) demonstrations is to complete all critical path activities to enable filing of a Phase 1 clinical trial IND with the U.S. FDA. All necessary regulatory activities, engagements, and submissions to enable this goal should be included in the proposed technical approach. Offerors should consider the U.S. FDA Platform Technology Designation

[1] A Nipah virus vaccine should ideally provide protection with a single dose; any Offeror proposing to target Nipah virus should have a strong technical justification for how the platform has demonstrated the potential to offer single dose protection against a high consequence, high mortality threat.

Program for Drug Development guidance (May 2024) from a conceptual perspective and identify efficiencies that could potentially be leveraged from prior platform development efforts for the proposed work under this RPP.

Capability demonstration:

- Capability Demonstration 1 (CD-1) – manufacturing demonstration. Conduct all necessary process development; chemistry, manufacturing, and controls (CMC) development; and development runs through to production of clinical trial material to enable a Phase 1 trial. Work should leverage any available efficiencies provided by prior manufacturing process development for the platform technology.

- Capability Demonstration 2 (CD-2) – nonclinical demonstration.
    - Conduct all nonclinical activities on the critical path to support submission of a Phase 1 IND with the U.S. FDA. This may include, but is not limited to, necessary nonclinical safety studies (e.g., toxicology; biodistribution; etc.) and demonstration of immunogenicity and efficacy. Work should leverage any available efficiencies provided by prior nonclinical development for the platform technology.
    - Develop a detailed clinical and regulatory plan that includes the Phase 1 clinical trial to be executed in CD-3.

- Capability Demonstration 3 (CD-3) – clinical demonstration (Phase 1).
    - Planning and execution of a Phase 1 clinical trial under a U.S. FDA IND.
    - Conduct trial readiness and execution activities, including but not limited to:
        - Conduct Site Readiness activities
        - IRB approval confirmed and if applicable sIRB
        - Confirm that materials and supplies are sourced and onsite
        - Execute Phase 1 clinical trial
        - Conduct study Close-out at sites
        - Conduct sample analysis for primary and secondary endpoints
        - Perform database lock
        - Perform data analysis
        - Produce Clinical Study Report
        - Perform any required IRB/IND reporting
        - Provide Investigational Brochure
    - Conduct immunogenicity assays
    - Conduct safety and immunogenicity analysis
    - Produce Clinical Study Report

- Capability Demonstration 4 (CD-3) – clinical demonstration (Phase 2).
    - Manufacturing of cGMP clinical trial material
    - Planning and execution of a safety and immunogenicity Phase 2 clinical trial under a U.S. FDA IND.
    - Conduct trial readiness and execution activities, including but not limited to:
        - Conduct Site Readiness activities
        - IRB approval confirmed and if applicable sIRB

        - Confirm that materials and supplies are sourced and onsite
        - Execute Phase 1 clinical trial
        - Conduct study Close-out at sites
        - Conduct sample analysis for primary and secondary endpoints
        - Perform database lock
        - Perform data analysis
        - Produce Clinical Study Report
        - Perform any required IRB/IND reporting
        - Provide Investigational Brochure
    - Conduct immunogenicity assays
    - Conduct safety and immunogenicity analysis
    - Produce Clinical Study Report

Project Tasks. The staged capability demonstration should be proposed as structured below. Offerors must propose two EID threats to target from the provided list (Table 1). EID selections must be technically justified based on the capabilities and limitations of the platform technology. Justification should address feasibility across nonclinical, manufacturing, and clinical domains, including the ability to elicit a protective immune response, and suitability of the expression system for the target antigen. Protection should be achievable with no more than two doses[1]; regimens requiring three or more doses will not be favorably evaluated.

Required work breakdown structure:

1. **(Base) Target 1 (EID-1)**. A key objective for this initial EID-1 work is to evaluate the platform's ability to enable timely and effective development and manufacturing for a new, emerging threat. Accordingly, the selected EID-1 target must be one for which the Offeror has not previously conducted platform-specific development activities (see Table 1 for options).
    a. CD-1 – manufacturing demonstration
    b. CD-2 – nonclinical demonstration

2. **(Option) Target 2 (EID-2)**. A key objective for EID-2 work is to demonstrate the flexibility of the platform across infectious disease threats from different pathogen families and further demonstrate the transferability of the manufacturing approach. The second EID target may be one for which the Offeror has previously conducted platform-specific development activities (see Table 1 for options).
    a. CD-1 – manufacturing demonstration
    b. CD-2 – nonclinical demonstration

3. **(Option) Target 3 (TBD influenza virus)**. Work must focus on a to-be-determined influenza virus target. The specific target will be determined in discussion between BARDA and Offeror post-award and prior to execution of any options. For purposes of developing the technical and cost proposal, Offerors should assume work will focus on a pandemic influenza target.
    a. CD-1 – manufacturing demonstration

b. CD-2 – nonclinical demonstration
c.

4. **(Option) Target 4 (TBD high-consequence threat)**. Work must focus on a to-be-determined infectious disease target and will be informed by the BARDA CBRN Vaccine Program mission, which is to strengthen domestic preparedness for priority and "next threat" biological threats by advancing flexible and sustainable vaccine technologies[2, 3, 4]. The specific target will be determined in discussion between BARDA and Offeror post award and prior to execution of any options. For purposes of developing the technical and cost proposal, Offerors should assume work will focus on a BSL-4 threat.
    a. CD-1 – manufacturing demonstration
    b. CD-2 – nonclinical demonstration

5. **(Option) Capability Demonstration 3 (CD-3) – clinical demonstration (Phase 1)**. Up to four (4) options for Phase 1 clinical demonstration as described (see Technical Requirements) as aligned to Targets 1-4.

6. **(Option) Capability Demonstration 4 (CD-4) – clinical demonstration (Phase 2)**. Up to two (2) options for Phase 1 clinical demonstration as described (see Technical Requirements) as aligned to Targets 1-4.

5 Proposal Selection/Evaluation

5.1 Gain-of-Function Research

In accordance with Executive Order 14292 "Improving the Safety and Security of Biological Research," BARDA does not support gain-of-function research or research involving the manipulation of pathogens that may result in a gain of function.

For purposes of this RPP, gain-of-function research is defined as scientific research on an infectious agent or toxin that has the potential to cause disease by enhancing its pathogenicity or increasing its transmissibility.

Covered research activities include those that could result in significant societal consequences and that seek or achieve one or more of the following outcomes:

- Enhancing the harmful consequences of an agent or toxin
- Disrupting beneficial immunological responses or reducing the effectiveness of immunizations
- Conferring resistance to clinically or agriculturally useful prophylactic or therapeutic interventions, or enabling evasion of detection methodologies
- Increasing the stability, transmissibility, or dissemination potential of an agent or toxin
- Altering the host range or tropism of an agent or toxin
- Enhancing the susceptibility of a human population to an agent or toxin
- Generating or reconstituting an eradicated or extinct agent or toxin

[2] https://medicalcountermeasures.gov/barda/cbrn/vaccines
[3] https://aspr.hhs.gov/PHEMCE/Pages/Priority-Threats.aspx
[4] https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/39882823/

Abstracts and Proposals will be evaluated by BARDA for the appropriate use of strains in proposed studies, in addition to all other evaluation factors. Proposals that include gain-of-function research will be considered unacceptable and will not be eligible for award.

5.2 Evaluation

Evaluation at Stage 1 (Abstract) and Stage 2 (full technical and cost proposal) will be based on strong technical justification from prior and ongoing development efforts with the platform. Evaluation will consider the priority characteristics noted below along with any other noted priorities and requirements throughout this RPP. Evaluation of proposals at the Abstract (Stage 1) and by-invitation-only full technical and cost proposal (Stage 2) stages will consider not just the proposed work, but the strength of the technical justification that supports proposed work and priority criteria.

Platform priority characteristics include the following attributes, each of which is independently important and is not intended to be weighed against one another:

- Platform has favorable safety profile
- Platform is effective across multiple infectious disease threats
    - Protection achieved with a maximum of two-doses[1]
    - Alternative delivery methods (i.e., non-intramuscular) will be considered, but the platform technology should be capable of producing robust systemic immunogenicity
- Platform is adaptable and demonstrates efficient development and manufacturing for new targets
    - Platform technologies that minimize the need for re-optimization or re-development when addressing a new target are preferred; i.e., the degree to which prior candidate manufacturing process development, analytical methods, control strategy, etc. can be leveraged for a new target.
    - Platforms with ability to generate and release cGMP drug substance and final drug product following target identification with an efficient response timeline while meeting key safety and quality attributes.

5.3 Compliance Screening

The RRPV CMF will conduct a preliminary screening of submitted Abstracts to ensure compliance with the RPP requirements. As part of the preliminary screening process, submissions that do not meet the requirements of the RPP may be eliminated from the competition or additional information may be requested by the RRPV CMF. The Government reserves the right to request additional information, perform a pre-award audit, or eliminate from further consideration Abstracts that do not meet these requirements.

5.4 Evaluation Process

Following the preliminary screening, the Government sponsor will perform source selection using the evaluation factors detailed below. The Government will conduct an evaluation of all qualified Proposals.

Qualified Proposals will be evaluated by a panel of subject matter experts (SMEs) who will make recommendations to a Source Selection Authority.

This process may involve the use of contractors as SME consultants or reviewers. Where appropriate, the USG will employ non-disclosure agreements to protect information contained in the RPP. An Offeror's

submission of an Abstract and/or Proposal under this RPP indicates concurrence with the aforementioned use of contractors and SMEs.

5.4.1. Stage 1 and 2:

Following the preliminary screening by the CMF for compliance with the RPP requirements, BARDA will perform an evaluation of all eligible Stage 1 Abstracts. Only selected offerors will move on to Stage 2.

Stage 1 (Abstract). Abstracts that do not meet the minimum mandatory criteria (Section 2.6) will not be evaluated. A primary evaluation will be conducted to determine which proposed solutions best meet the evaluation criteria, technical requirements, and priority characteristics by a panel of subject matter experts (SMEs). Feedback may be provided to Offerors invited to submit a full technical and cost proposal under Stage 2.

Stage 2 (full technical and cost proposal) - Invitation Only. Submission of a Stage 2 full technical and cost proposal will be by invitation only. A panel of subject matter experts (SMEs) will evaluate qualified full technical and cost proposals to make recommendations to a Source Selection Authority.

Evaluation of Stage 1 Abstracts and Stage 2 full technical and cost proposals will be based on an independent, comprehensive review and assessment of the work proposed. The Government will evaluate the abstracts and full technical and cost proposals against the evaluation factors detailed below and assign one of the following adjectival ratings in order to determine the best value to the Government.

- Outstanding
- Good
- Acceptable
- Marginal
- Unacceptable

Stage 1 Abstract and Stage 2 full technical and cost proposal evaluation factors are as follows:

- Evaluation Factor 1 – Technical Approach: This factor evaluates the relevancy, thoroughness, completeness, and feasibility of the proposed approach and the feasibility of proposed schedule.

- Evaluation Factor 2 – Relevant Experience: This factor evaluates the offeror's demonstrated organizational experience, as well as the technical and management experience of the proposed team to perform the proposed work. The Government may also consider information in Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), and the Federal Awardee Performance and Integrity Information System (FAPIIS) or similar systems.

- Evaluation Factor 3 – Cost Reasonableness: Assessment of the cost of the project to determine i) whether the project cost is within the available funding limits, and ii) the ability and/or likelihood of the offeror to successfully execute the proposed project within the financial resources proposed.

5.5 Cost/Price Evaluation

Successful Stage 1 Offerors will be invited to submit full technical and cost proposals. Full technical and cost proposal templates and instructions will be provided to successful Stage 1 Offerors at time of

notification. If a successful Stage 2 Offeror is selected for award, the RRPV CMF will evaluate the estimated cost proposed by the Offeror for performing all requirements outlined in this RPP. Evaluation will include analysis of the proposed cost together with all supporting information. The RRPV CMF will request additional information or clarification as necessary. The RRPV CMF will assess the reasonableness and completeness of the cost estimates and then provide a formal assessment to the Government. The Government will review this assessment and make the final determination that the project value is fair and reasonable, subject to final Government negotiations.

Stage 2 Cost Proposals will be evaluated using the understanding of cost realism, reasonableness and completeness as outlined below:

a) Realism. Proposals will be evaluated to determine if Costs are realistic for the work to be performed, reflect a clear understanding of the requirements, and are consistent with the various elements of the Offeror's schedule proposal.

Estimates are "realistic" when they are neither excessive nor insufficient for the effort to be accomplished. Estimates must also be realistic for each phase of the proposed project when compared to the total proposed cost.

The RRPV CMF will make a determination by directly comparing proposed costs with comparable current and historical data, evaluator experience, available estimates, etc. Proposed estimates will be compared with the corresponding technical proposals for consistency.

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

To be considered reasonable, the Offeror's cost estimate should be developed from applicable historic cost data. The Offeror should show that sound, rational judgment was used in deriving and applying cost methodologies. Appropriate narrative explanation and justification should be provided for critical cost elements. The overall estimate should be presented in a coherent, organized and systematic manner.

Costs provided shall be clearly attributable to activities or materials as described by the Offeror. Costs should be broken down in the Cost Proposal Format. An optional template is located on the Members-Only RRPV website.

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

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

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

5.6 Best Value

The Government will conduct the source selection based on the evaluation criteria and ratings listed above. The overall award decision will be based upon a Best Value determination by considering and comparing factors in addition to cost or price. Funding recommendations depend on various factors and programmatic relevance. Based on the evaluation of the Technical Approach, Relevant Experience, and Cost/Price, the Government reserves the right to negotiate and request changes to any or all parts of the SOW. Offerors will have the opportunity to concur with the requested changes, propose further changes and revise cost proposals, as necessary.

5.5 Evaluation Results

Following the evaluation of the Stage 2 proposals, the Source Selection Authority may recommend the following for the CMF's consideration:

1. Select the proposal (or some portion of the proposal) for award;
2. Place the proposal in the Basket; or
3. Reject the proposal (will not be considered for award and will not be placed in the Basket)

The Government does not guarantee a minimum or maximum number of awards resulting from this solicitation.

5.7 Basket Provision

The electronic "Basket" is an innovative acquisition tool. Stage 2 full technical and cost proposals rated as Acceptable through Outstanding, but not immediately selected for award, may be placed in the Basket for 2 years and eligible for award during that time. Proposals rated as below Acceptable will not be placed in the Basket and will not be eligible for future award. If awarding from the Basket, the Government reserves the right to award whichever proposal best meets its needs.

6 Points of Contact

Questions related to this RPP should be directed to Ms. Kathy Garee (rrpv-contracts@ati.org).

All technical questions must be submitted by 12pm ET on 04 September 2026, to allow for Government response. The Government will respond to questions at its discretion. All questions and responses will be posted to the RRPV Solicitation webpage https://www.rrpv.org/opportunities/. Questions received after the stated deadline are not guaranteed a response.

Once an Offeror has submitted a submission under this RPP, the Government and the RRPV CMF will not discuss evaluation/status until the evaluation results have been provided to the Offerors.

ATTACHMENT 1 – ABSTRACT TEMPLATE

General Instructions

The Abstract must address the technical requirements described in the RPP in sufficient detail to permit evaluation from a technical perspective in accordance with the evaluation factors set forth in the RPP. Offerors are strongly encouraged to use pictures and graphics to succinctly represent proposed ideas, organization, etc.

The Abstract shall be limited to 5 pages (6 pages if Teaming, is applicable) and Quad Chart limited to 1 page; however, the Cover Page and the Data Rights Assertions are not included in the page count. Pages in excess of this limitation may not be considered**.** Offerors are advised that the number of pages should be commensurate with the degree of complexity of the proposed effort.

The following formatting requirements apply:

- 12-point font (or larger), single-spaced, single-sided, 8.5 by 11 inches
- Smaller type may be used in figures and tables, but must be 8-point font (or larger)
- Margins on all sides (top, bottom, left, and right) should be at least 1-inch
- Submit files in Microsoft Word, Adobe Acrobat (PDF – portable and searchable document format) formats. ZIP files and other application formats are not acceptable. All files must be print-capable and without a password required. Filenames shall contain the appropriate filename extension (.docx.pdf). Filenames should not contain special characters. IOS users must ensure the entire filename and path are free of spaces and special characters. Movie and sound file attachments or other additional files, will not be accepted.

To ensure Abstracts receive proper consideration, **the format shown below is mandatory**. If there are any items which are not applicable to a specific Abstract, include the section topic in the Abstract with a short explanation as to why it is not applicable.

- Cover page – 1 page
- Abstract – 5 pages
    - Technical approach – 3 pages.
        - Offerors must note which two EID threats they are proposing for EID-1 and EID-2 (reference Project Tasks in 4.2 Scope) and provide a technical justification that supports selections. Given space limitations of the Abstract, the technical approach overview should focus on Target 1 (EID-1), work to execute CD-1 and CD-2.
            - Executive summary
            - Technical approach overview
            - Regulatory strategy
            - Facilities and personnel qualification
            - Subcontractors

    - Manufacturing process overview and platform elements – 2 pages
        - Provide overview of the platform manufacturing process (e.g., upstream and downstream) from the perspective of initiating development for a new target.
        - Offerors should highlight elements of the manufacturing process that enable utility as a platform (i.e., require no to low optimization for a novel target) versus elements that require redevelopment or moderate to significant optimization for each new target.
        - Offerors should include the timeline for major process milestones (e.g., time to produce bulk drug substance; time to final drug product; time to complete release testing).

- Data Rights Assertions. Not included in page count
- Teaming arrangement – 1 page
    - Is teaming approach document required?
        - Team-based Offerors = required
        - Single organization Offerors = not required
    - Teaming arrangement
        - Will serve as a letter of intent across the teaming partners.
        - Should describe technical competencies as they relate to the proposed vaccine platform technology and technical requirements
- Quad chart – 1 page
    - Proposed Funding - ROM budget estimate required

[Name of Offeror]
[Address of Offeror]
[Phone Number and Email Address of Offeror]

Unique Entity Identifier (UEI) #: [UEI #]
CAGE code: [CAGE code]

RRPV 26-05-NVP

[Title of Abstract]

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

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

[Title of Abstract]

Technical approach.

1. Executive Summary
    - Provide the background and the Offeror's understanding of the problem.
    - Provide a description of the technology/process.
    - Emphasize how the proposed technology/process meets the overall objective specified in this RPP.
2. Technical Approach Overview
    - Note the two EID threats and the technical justification that supports selection for the Offeror's platform. Include any previous studies or preliminary data [non-clinical and/or clinical] that support the feasibility of the proposed technology solution
    - Demonstrate how your proposed solution currently meets the Technical Requirements described in Section 4 for Target 1 (EID-1), CD-1 and CD-2.
3. Briefly describe your regulatory strategy
4. Subcontractors
5. Facilities and Personnel Qualification
    - Describe the qualifications and expertise of the key personnel and organizations associated with the proposed solution.
    - Detail any past performance(s) that demonstrate relevance to the program objective and solution requirements.
    - Identify any key facilities, equipment, and other resources relevant for the solution being proposed.
6. Period of performance/schedule.

Manufacturing process overview and platform elements.

- Provide overview of the platform manufacturing process (e.g., upstream and downstream) from the perspective of initiating development for a new target.
- Offerors must highlight elements of the manufacturing process that enable utility as a platform (i.e., require no to low optimization for a novel target) versus elements that require redevelopment or moderate to significant optimization for each new target.
- Offerors must include the timeline for major process milestones (e.g., time to produce bulk drug substance; time to final drug product; time to complete release testing).

Data Rights Assertions. It is anticipated that anything delivered under this proposed effort would be delivered to the Government with unlimited data rights. If this is not the intent, then you should discuss any restricted data rights associated with any proposed deliverables. If applicable, complete the below table for any items to be furnished to the Government with restrictions. An example is provided. *This section is not part of the page count*.

Technical Data or Computer Software to be Furnished with Restrictions	Basis for Assertion	Asserted Rights	Name of Organization Asserting Restrictions	Deliverables Affected

Teaming Arrangement (if required) 1 page limit

- Requirements detailed in Abstract Template - General Instructions

Quad Chart Template

Your quad chart must contain the following information and be positioned in a landscape view.
Any quad chart submitted that exceeds the one-page limit will not be read or evaluated.

PROJECT TITLE, RRPV 26-05-NVP, TECHNICAL/ADMINISTRATIVE POC (NAME, EMAIL, PHONE), COMPANY NAME & ADDRESS

Abstract Information	**Supporting Content and Project Planning Information**
Objective: Clear, concise (two to three sentences) description of the objectives and methodologies of the effort. Description of effort: A bullet list (2-3) of the primary scientific challenges being addressed	Picture or Graphic that Illustrates the research or concept (e.g., data figures, molecule illustrations or processes)
Benefits of Proposed Technology: Challenges: Maturity of Technology:	Bullet list of the major goals/milestones by: Project Year **Proposed Funding (required)** **(Rough Order of Magnitude Estimate)**