

UNCLASSIFIED

Item	Question	Answer
1	CLINS 0001AA, 0006AA, 52.242-4022: Clarify the delivery schedule for kits/vehicles.	The delivery schedule is contained within Section B and Attachment 0086. Attachment 0084 identifies the kit configurations for each vehicle. The Government intends to change Clause 52.242-4022 in the Final RFP.
2	Why was price realism removed for FFP CLINs?	Price realism was removed on the FFP CLINs as it was determined not to meet the requirements of FAR 15.404-1(d)(3).
3	Tab "SOW to CLIN Crosswalk" - The SOW to CLIN Crosswalk provided in Attachment 0060 indicates several tasks that are System Engineering related (i.e. C.2.1.1.6.12 Interface Control Documents and Models) are to be bid against CLINs XX01-16 which includes Vehicle CLINs XX01-XX04. Costs bid against these CLINs would therefore be included in the FoV AUMC calculation. These System Engineering type costs seem inconsistent with the costs detailed in RFP paragraph M.3.2.2 that are to be included in the AUMC calculation. Is it the government's intent that these non-manufacturing related costs be included in the AUMC calculation?	Yes. The functions in C.2.1.1.6.12 are part of the Average Unit Manufacturing Cost (AUMC) as defined in Section M.3.2.2 and are therefore cross walked to CLINs xx01-16.
4	C.2.4.2.1.2: PDFOV-2909 / PDFOV-8761 - How does the Government intend to evaluate the MMBHMF and MMBEFF requirements? In EMD, two different methods were used to calculate MMBHMF: (a) AMSAA AMPM model (which used only first occurrence B-modes, A-modes, Fix Effectiveness Factors (FEFs) and cumulative RAM mileage at the time of each failure) or (b) An Assessed Point Estimate in which Fix Effectiveness Factors for each B-mode were applied to the accumulated HMFs and then divided into the total accumulated RAM miles.	MMBHMF and MMBEFF will be evaluated based on the demonstrated value observed during RQT in accordance with C.2.4.2.1.2. The Government intends to change Section C.2.4.2.1.2 in the Final RFP.
5	C.2.4.2.1.2: PDFOV-2909 / PDFOV-8761 - Does the statement of meeting the PD requirements after each testing segment signify that the offeror needs to be at or above the proposed level at all RQT decision points?	Yes.
6	C.2.4.2.1.2: PDFOV-2909 / PDFOV-876 - If the proposed value is to be achieved at the end of RQT, will minimum threshold limits or confidence intervals be defined for each RQT decision point? If so are they intended to reflect performance improvement?	MMBHMF and MMBEFF will be evaluated based on the demonstrated value observed during RQT in accordance with C.2.4.2.1.2 for the RQT decision points. The Government intends to change Section C.2.4.2.1.2 in the Final RFP.
7	C.2.4.2.1.2: PDFOV-2909 / PDFOV-8761 - Will the USG allow for engineering modifications during RQT and are CAP periods anticipated in between RQT segments?	The RFP does not include CAP periods for RQT. Engineering Change Proposals will be allowed in accordance with C.2.1.1.5.7 prior to purchasing a TDP and C.2.6.10 if the TDP option is exercised.
8	C.2.4.2.1.2: PDFOV-2909 / PDFOV-8761 - Assuming successful RQT, will the government direct retrofit of any other LRIP test vehicles or production vehicles with identified corrective actions via the Gov funded ECP process? If there are contractor initiated changes implemented to successfully pass RQT, is there a requirement to retrofit?	The Government will determine the retrofit range for Government directed ECPs at the time they are negotiated. The Government intends to update the Final RFP to clarify that ECPs initiated by the Contractor to meet Purchase Description requirements (Attachment 0001), or to correct failures, or deficiencies shall be retrofitted by the contractor to all vehicles produced.
9	C.2.4.2.1.2: Is compliance measured by proposed performance against this requirement or by threshold in PD?	As stated in M.4.2.5, if the Contractor proposed above the threshold requirements, "For the selected Offeror, the levels of performance proposed by the Offeror will be

UNCLASSIFIED

		incorporated into the contractually binding Purchase Description as threshold requirements.” Additionally, Section M.4.2.6 states “...for the selected Offeror, each compliance the Offeror identifies in Attachment 0074 (Requirements Compliance Matrix) will be incorporated into the contractually binding Purchase Description as Threshold requirements.”
10	G.2.1 - For System Engineering / Program Management, DRFP #3 incorporates a threshold for the cost allocation between USA and USMC in the Base Year. For Options 1-7, would the USG consider a similar approach or align the SEPM costs proportionally to vehicles by customer?	No. Affordability will be calculated in accordance with Attachment 0070.
11	ATT74, L.4.1, L.4.2.5, M.3, M.4.1.4, M.4.2.6: How will the Government assess technical risk of ATT 0074 without a technical factor evaluation in TEC/P? Where are the evaluation instructions/criteria for the technical evaluation?	Attachment 0074 is part of the Secondary Technical Adjustment proposal. Proposals instructions for Attachment 0074 are contained in L.4.2.5, and its associated evaluation criteria is contained in M.4.2.6. As stated in M.4.2.6, “Proposed performance will not be evaluated for risk under the Secondary Technical Adjustment.” As stated in M.4.1.4 “While risk will not be assessed or evaluated within the Secondary Technical Adjustment, the Offeror’s proposed PD performance under the Secondary Technical Adjustment may be considered in the risk assessment under the Primary Technical Factor evaluation as described in M.4.2.6.”
12	M.4.4/L.4.2.5: “The Offeror must propose to be compliant to requirements PDFOV-3511....PDE-21.” We interpret this to mean that the Offeror need not propose compliance with other requirements. Is that correct? Please clarify in light of M.2, allowing rejection if the proposal “offers a product or service that does not meet all stated material requirements of the solicitation,” or “proposes performance below threshold performance for any Primary Technical Performance Requirement...”	Section M.4.4 is not contained within the Draft RFP. Section M.4.1.3 states “No proposal, no matter how highly rated under the other Factors, will be considered for award if the Offerors proposed level of performance for any of the PD requirement identified in Attachment 0061 (Primary Technical Performance Requirements List) is below the requirements threshold value.” All other PD requirements are tradable with the exception of those identified in M.2(j) and L.4.2.5. If the Offeror proposes exceptions to the attachments, exhibits, enclosures, or other RFP terms and conditions, its proposal may be rejected in accordance with M.2(e).
13	M.3 & M.4.1 - Please clarify the apparent inconsistency between Line 5 of paragraph M.3 and the new paragraph in M.4.1.	Section M.4.1 applies to the Primary Technical Factor only, whereas Section M.3 applies to the entire source selection process. The Small Business Participation Factor is the only factor where strengths and weaknesses may be assessed.
14	M.3 & M.4.1 - How does the Government intend to evaluate risk in the Primary Technical Factor if strengths and weaknesses are not used?	Primary Technical is not a pass/fail assessment. Multiple risk ratings will be used (reference M.4.1 & M.4.1.2). As stated in M.4.1, the Primary Technical risk assessments will “assess the proposal risk that the Offerors JLTV will achieve the Government’s defined threshold performance levels for each PD requirement identified in Attachment 0061 (Primary Technical Performance Requirements List).”
15	M.4.1: Risk assessment will consider proposed performance of JLTV FoV. How do you quantify risk? How does it impact source selection? Is Primary Technical being evaluated on a pass/fail basis? If it is a risk rating, will there be more levels than pass/fail?	As stated in M.4.1, the Primary Technical risk assessments will “assess the proposal risk that the Offerors JLTV will achieve the Governments defined threshold performance levels for each PD requirement identified in Attachment 0061 (Primary Technical Performance Requirements List).” It will be used in the Source Selection in accordance with Section M. Section M.3 states “As part of the best value determination, the relative strengths, weaknesses, and risks of each offerors

UNCLASSIFIED

		<p>proposal will be considered, as specified below, in addition to the other evaluation methods described below, in selecting the offer that is most advantageous and represents the best value to the Government.” The order of importance contained within Section M.1.1 states “Primary Technical is more important than TEC/P. TEC/P is significantly more important than Small Business Participation. As required to be defined by FAR 15.304(e), the non-TEC/P factors, when combined, are significantly more important than the TEC/P Factor.”</p> <p>Primary Technical is not a pass/fail assessment. Multiple risk ratings will be used (reference M.4.1 & M.4.1.2).</p>
16	M.4.1: “Government will not identify ‘strengths’ and ‘weaknesses’ when evaluating proposals.” Please clarify in light of M.3 (“as part of the best value determination, the relative strengths, weaknesses, and risks...”). Is Small Business the only area where strengths and weaknesses will be assessed?	Section M.4.1 applies to the Primary Technical Factor only, whereas Section M.3 applies to the entire source selection process. The Small Business Participation Factor is the only factor where strengths and weaknesses may be assessed.
17	M.4.3 - Will Small Business Participation be evaluated using the combined Technical/Risk methodology (Method 1 of the OSD Source Selection Procedures) and include identification of strengths and weaknesses?	The Small Business Participation Factor will be evaluated in accordance with Section M.4.3.1. Strengths and weaknesses may be assessed as part of the evaluation. The Government will not disclose which methodology from the DoD Source Selection Guide is being used. (reference M.4.3.1(b))
18	M-6 – Why was 52.245-5001 deleted?	Clause 52.245-5001 was not included in the Previous Draft RFPs. Clause M-6 (52.245-4001) from the 08 Oct 2014 Draft RFP was removed in the updated Draft RFP as it was determined to not be applicable.
19	PDFOV-875 /8537 /2907 - PDFOV-2907 could imply that the trailer has separate requirements from each JLTV variant (possibly conflicting with PDFOV-875 and PDFOV-8537) and therefore may need separate RAM requirements defined. Is it the Government’s intent for the trailer to be included in each variant when assessing RAM compliance or does the trailer have separate stand-alone requirements?	The RAM requirements (PDFOV-2904) are specified for the Family of Vehicles which includes the companion trailer in accordance with PDFOV-875 & 8537. The Government will verify compliance for the variants together and the companion trailer separately; however, the same requirements apply across the Family of Vehicles.
20	Removal of the manufacturing readiness factor appears to conflict with DFARS 215.304(c)(iv). How does the government intend to evaluate manufacturing readiness?	The Government does not intend to evaluate Manufacturing Readiness in the Source Selection. DFARS 215.304(c)(iv) implements Section 812 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2011, which requires “ <u>appropriate consideration</u> of the manufacturing readiness and manufacturing readiness processes of potential contractors and subcontractors as a part of the source selection process for major defense acquisition programs.” The Government gave appropriate consideration of Manufacturing Readiness and determined not to include it as an evaluation factor in the Source Selection.