

W56HZV-11-R-0412

Fuel Tank Fire Suppression Kits For Heavy Tactical Vehicles

QUESTIONS

New questions added will be highlighted in yellow

1. We understand that it is allowable to take photos and/or video of the HTV assets. Are we able to use our own cameras/video equipment or do we have to use government equipment? Also, do the photos/video need to be approved by TACOM prior to release?

1A. Potential offerors will use their own cameras and video equipment. Government photo equipment will not be available for use. Any photos/videos taken during the course of this vehicle display are for the purpose of developing a proposal only. No photos shall be released without prior approval by the PCO and the TACOM Security Office.

2. Is it possible to bring FTFS kits and/or FTFS components to verify fit?

2A. Potential Offerors may bring kits and/or FTFS components to verify fit.

3. Attachment 0003 of solicitation W56HZV-11-R-0412 states in the very last sentence that updates to the program will be posted on the FTFS Website. Is this a special website or is this referring to the TACOM ProcNet website?

3A. All updates to the solicitation will be posted to the TACOM PROCNET Website, there is no dedicated website for this solicitation.

4. Will we need to provide a visit request to the Field Logistics Readiness Center prior to our scheduled visit?

4A. A visit request to FLRC is not required for accessing the vehicle display, all visit requests shall be directed to Francesca Quasarano at francesca.quasarano.civ@mail.mil.

5. Are subcontractors allowed to visit the Vehicle Display with the prime contractor?

5A. Yes, subcontractors are allowed to visit the Vehicle Display with the prime contractor. Please be aware that all companies (whether subcontractor or prime) are only allowed a total of two eight hour viewings per Attachment 0003. Therefore, if a subcontractor attends a total of two 8 hour viewings with a prime or multiple primes, they are not permitted to attend additional viewings, whether as a subcontractor for another prime, or as a prime themselves. Two eight hour

Disclaimer: If any answer to a question listed in this document conflicts with solicitation W56HZV-11-R-0412, the solicitation shall take precedence.

visits per company is the maximum time frame allowed. Only one company will be scheduled at a time and they may bring up to 8 individuals, whether prime or subcontractor personnel.

6. Could the government clarify paragraphs A.4 and C.2.1.2? Is the government expecting the fuel cap/spout and end caps of each fuel tank cited in the RFP to be covered?

6A. The Government is expecting a solution to meet the needs of the RFP. It is at the discretion of the offeror as to the specific hardware design of the proposed solution.

7. Can you clarify section A.6? Does this paragraph mean that an entity other than TACOM, such as the DLA, may call for kit amounts specified in the RFP, or does it mean that another entity may call for amounts above and beyond those specified in the RFP?

7A. Section A.6 specifies the minimum and maximum quantities the Government will acquire under the contract in accordance with FAR 16.504(4)(ii). Please note, pursuant to Clause 52.216-22 the Government will only guarantee the total three year minimum quantity of each CLIN.

8. Can the agency clarify what appears to be a discrepancy between kits amounts listed on pages 21-23 of the RFP and those presented in A.6.1? Pages 21-23 of the RFP seem to indicate that a maximum of 800 could be ordered, whereas A.6.1 seems to indicate the max is 400 (M1074 A0 and A1 PLS).

8A. The maximum number for KIT D should be 400, a revision (Amendment 0001) will include CLIN 0041AA (page 20) to show an estimated quantity of 100, CLIN 0042AA (page 21) to show an estimated quantity of 150 and CLIN 0043AA (page 22) to show an estimated quantity of 150.

9. There appears to be a similar issue on pages 29-31. A.6.1 indicates a max of 650, but pages 29-31 sum to 630.

9A. The maximum number for KIT G should be 630, a revision (Amendment 0001) will include a change in the chart in A.6.1 to show a maximum of 630 for KIT G.

Disclaimer: If any answer to a question listed in this document conflicts with solicitation W56HZV-11-R-0412, the solicitation shall take precedence.

10. Can the government please clarify E.3 (a)? This indicates that 63 kits are required for testing. The rest of the RFP indicates 49 total kits for testing (such as E.2.1.1).

10A. The contractor shall provide 49 FTFS kits to support both First Article Inspection (FAI) and First Article Test (FAT) in accordance with RFP Section E.2.1.1. An amendment (Amendment 0001) to the solicitation will be processed to reflect 49 FTFS Kits in Section E-3, Clause 52.209-4000 - Notice Regarding First Article Test Sample.

11. If the cells in attachment 0001 are password protected, can the password be provided? Can the agency clarify how it would prefer the offeror use and populate the price sheet?

11A. The offeror shall populate ONLY the cells in light green which are not password protected. Please refer to the Worksheet Instructions in Attachment 0001.

12. Will an offeror be penalized if it does not own any classified testing data on its product and can only provide information of program office within the government that do own the data (L.3.1.3)?

12A. RFP Section L.3.1.3 references instructions for Classified Proposal Submission. Proposal must contain information to describe the proposed technical solution. Guidance for proposal submission is detailed in Sections L.1.5 and L.1.8, proposal cannot reference a separate entity (Government or Private) that has access to information.

13. Can the agency clarify what may be a discrepancy between the narrative in E.2.1.1, Table 2, and paragraph (ii) on page 53 in terms of what amounts of test kits are going to Yuma versus Aberdeen?

13. E.2.1.1 - Paragraph contradicts Table 2 in regards to Qty for ballistic testing and Qty for System Level and Automotive testing. Based on the rest of the solicitation assume Table is accurate and 4 kits are to be shipped to APG and 2 kits are to be shipped to YPG.

13A. The correct quantity and location for FAT units is detailed in Clause 52.242-4457; 4 kits are to be shipped to Aberdeen and 2 kits are to be shipped to Yuma. An amendment to the solicitation (Amendment 0001) will be processed to revise Section E.2.1.1.

Disclaimer: If any answer to a question listed in this document conflicts with solicitation W56HZV-11-R-0412, the solicitation shall take precedence.

14. C.2.3.4 The FTFS Kit shall provide fuel tank coverage on all sides necessary to meet the performance requirements as specified in this SOW.

Does this mean that Companies that have shown experience for meeting this performance requirement will be trusted to design a system with adequate coverage or is there a specific number or percentage of coverage that the government will use to determine "necessary to meet performance requirements"?

14A. No specific number or percentage of coverage will be used by the Government to determine if an offeror's proposal meets the performance requirements specified in Section C of the solicitation.

15. L.3.2.2.1 The offeror shall identify no more than four (4) of the most recent and relevant contract actions which include performance of work which is recent and relevant to the requirements in the scope of work specified below.

L.3.2.2.2 Recent contract actions include contracts, task orders, or work directives performed within three years of the date of issuance of this RFP.

If a contract action is more than 3 years prior to the date of issuance of this RFP but highly relevant to the requirements in the scope of work specified below can it be provided if the technical approach is the same as proposed? I argue that a technical approach that has been used and proven to work for a longer period of time demonstrates the merit of the technical approach to a higher degree of certainty.

15A. Section L.3.2.2.2 requires offerors to submit recent contract actions that are performed within three years of the date of issuance of this RFP.

16. L.5.1.6 In accordance with Far Clause 52.219-14, the prime offeror shall perform work of at least 50 percent of the cost of manufacturing the supplies, not including the cost of materials. Offers in response to this RFP shall show the percent of the cost of manufacturing to be performed by the prime offeror, less the cost of material. The definition of cost of manufacturing and cost of material is located in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 13, Section 125.6.

What is the governments method to ensure adherence of this requirement?

16A. Section L.5.1.6 states that in accordance with Far Clause 52.219-14, the prime offeror shall perform work of at least 50 percent of the cost of manufacturing the supplies, not including the cost of materials. Offers in response to this RFP shall show the percent of the cost of manufacturing to be performed by the prime offeror, less the cost of material. The definition of cost of manufacturing and cost of material is located in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Title 13, Section 125.6. Also, Section L.6.6.1 states that

Disclaimer: If any answer to a question listed in this document conflicts with solicitation W56HZV-11-R-0412, the solicitation shall take precedence.

Offerors shall, consistent with their proposed Prices and Technical Factor solution, provide supporting information and analysis establishing the offeror's conformance with RFP Clause Limitations on Subcontracting (FAR 52.219-14). Specifically, the offeror shall establish that, as the prime contractor, it will perform at least 50 percent of the cost of manufacturing the supplies, not including the cost of materials.

17. L.3.2.1 For the offeror's technical solution, if more than one adaptation for the fuel tank configurations is proposed, the offeror shall provide all the required information for each proposed solution as part of the technical proposal.

What is "all the required information" as mentioned above? Is this Bill of Materials, Top Level Drawings, Weights, ect.? If there is other information that is required can you please provide.

17A. Offerors must submit information that validates the technical solution and adaptations to that solution, if proposed, to meet the performance specification referenced in C.3, in accordance with L.3.2.1.

18. We have classified info to support past testing. Can we simply include DTC project numbers and test report numbers within our proposal or do you prefer that we send the classified info?

18A. Proposal must contain both unclassified and classified information that demonstrates the Offeror meets performance specification requirements. Specific instructions on mailing classified information is provided in solicitation Section L.3.1.3.

19. Pg 80, L.1.4.1 - States (1:00pm Local time, Warren, MI, 27AUG2012). Assume this is a typo, please confirm date in SF33 and in L.1.3 is the correct time and day.

19A. A revision to the solicitation (Amendment 001) will change the due date and time of proposals to 1:00pm Local time, Warren, MI, 22OCT2012.

20. L.5.1.1 The offeror shall fill in proposed prices for all CLINs directly in Attachment 0001, FTFS Pricing Attachment, in accordance with the instructions detailed in the attachment. Prices shall NOT be inserted in Section B. The CDRLs at CLIN 0091 shall not be separately priced.

Disclaimer: If any answer to a question listed in this document conflicts with solicitation W56HZV-11-R-0412, the solicitation shall take precedence.

Is think this is a typo. Shouldn't prices be included in Section B (pages 8-33) for each of the CLINs?

20A. This is not a typo, prices shall be inserted into Attachment 0001 and NOT in Section B in accordance with L.5.1.1.

21. L.5.1.5 Offerors shall provide the following pricing information to support the proposed prices: any offered discounts, established catalog pricing, price lists, or other verifiable and established records that are regularly maintained by the vendor and are published or otherwise available for customer inspection. Offerors shall also provide information on sales of similar equipment to other customers, including Government entities. This information shall include model or part number sold, customer, date of sale, unit price, quantity, and a comparison of any technical differences (and associated cost impacts) between such model and the units offered in response to this solicitation. Also include copies of invoices for these other sales.

We believe that price reasonableness can be obtained by providing the items listed in Section L.5.1.5, through the competitive bid process of this solicitation, as well as the evaluation of past contract awards for similar items and therefore request that Attachment 0001 be modified as an alternative for those offerors who are unable to supply the items provided under L.5.1.5. or removed as a requirement in response to the Solicitation W56HZV-11-R-0412.

21A. An amendment to the solicitation (Amendment 0001) revises the language in Section L.5.1.5 to state "L.5.1.5 Offerors shall provide any of the following pricing information used in the development of the proposed prices: offered discounts, established catalog pricing, price lists, or other verifiable and established records that are regularly maintained by the vendor and are published or otherwise available for customer inspection. Offerors shall also provide information on sales of similar equipment to other customers, including Government entities, if such sales exist. This information shall include model or part number sold, customer, date of sale, unit price, quantity, and a comparison of any technical differences (and associated cost impacts) between such model and the units offered in response to this solicitation. Also include copies of invoices for these other sales".

22. What is the basis of the 74 lbs limit on the individual section size? Other tactical vehicle platforms have established a sectional upper bounds of 100 lbs. Is this based on feedback from the field?

22A. The 74 lbs requirement, as detailed in C.2.3.3, is in accordance with MIL-STD-1472.

Disclaimer: If any answer to a question listed in this document conflicts with solicitation W56HZV-11-R-0412, the solicitation shall take precedence.

23. Is it still possible to attend the FTFS Vehicle Display Event even though it's past the specified time in the solicitation?

23A. *No, the solicitation requirements in A.7 and Attachment 0003 specify that requests for participation shall be received within 10 days from solicitation release, which was 06 September 2012. The final day to request was Monday, 17 September 2012.*

24. Our fuel tank fire suppression technology has been tested internally and by the Navy. We have internal reports and results available, but only preliminary results from the Navy. Are our internal test reports sufficient to meet the test requirements for this solicitation?

24A. *Offerors technical proposal shall address Section L.3.2.1 as detailed in solicitation Amendment 0001; "...The offeror shall also provide substantiating data in the form of either validated test information from a third party, or in the form of other substantiating data to document compliance with each of the performance requirements in accordance with Section C.3. If validated test information from a third party is unavailable, the contractor may provide other substantiating data in the form of commercial literature, modeling or simulation data, top drawings, sketches, parts lists, specifications, internal test reports, brochures, historical information, analytical support, supporting rationale or design documentation. In addition, the offeror shall provide a written explanation of how the substantiating data correlates with the proposed solution detailed in its technical proposal. The offeror is expected to provide substantiating data for only the technical solution being offered, and further, is expected to provide confirmation that the substantiating data contained in the proposal is for the offered technical solution".*

Offers will be evaluated in accordance with Section M.5.1; "...Regarding substantiating data, validated test information from a third party which establishes conformance to all the specification parameters of RFP Section C.3 will represent a lower technical risk rating. Substantiating data submitted within a proposal containing limited or no validated test information from a third party will represent a higher technical risk rating.

25. Has the stair bracket been repositioned on the passenger side fuel tank of the HET1070A0?

25A. No, the stair bracket has not been repositioned on the passenger side fuel tank of the HET1070A0.

26. Has the muffler been repositioned on the HET1070A0?

26A. In order to accommodate additional armor for the HETA0, the muffler was repositioned on the HET1070A0 vehicle at the vehicle display. Proposals from offerors shall not accommodate design changes for additional HET1070A0 vehicle armor.

27. Is the stair bracket position the same on the HET1070A0 and the HET1070A1?

27A. Yes, the stair bracket position is the same on both the HET1070A0 and HET1070A1.

28. Are there several positions of the tank bracket on the passenger side fuel tank of the HET1070A0?

28A. No, in order to accommodate additional armor for the HET1070A0, the tank bracket on the passenger side fuel tank was repositioned on the HET1070A0 vehicle at the vehicle display. Proposals from offerors are shall not accommodate design changes for additional HET1070A0 vehicle armor.

29. On the PLS1075 A1, the tool box under the fuel tank is repositioned on the left side under the tank, but it used to be in the center. Does this change from truck to truck, variant to variant?

29A. The stowage box under the auxiliary fuel tank is in a different position on the PLS M1075A1 than it was on the PLS M1075A0. The tool box on the A1 is located on the left side under the tank. The tool box on the A0 is located in the center under the tank.

30. In 12A the government states that the proposal cannot reference a separate entity (Government or Private) that has access to classified documents. What if the government entity that has access to and owns the classified reports a vendor needs to reference is the HTV Office? Can offeror request the classified documents from the HTV office that relate too this effort during this solicitation and if so what is the procedure? Since the HTV Office is not a separate entity can offerors then merely reference classified documents in PM HTV Office's possession instead of providing hard copies of the reports relevant to this effort?

Disclaimer: If any answer to a question listed in this document conflicts with solicitation W56HZV-11-R-0412, the solicitation shall take precedence.

30A. To satisfy the requirement in section L.3.2.1, and in addition to the answer previously provided to Question #12, offerors shall contact the contract specialist at nancy.e.dulmage.civ@mail.mil to request specific classified data from the Government. Requests must include all necessary information to identify classified data requested; to include test report numbers and test site point of contact information with phone number and e-mail address. Both a Secret Security Clearance and a Facility Clearance verified by G2, are required prior to receiving this data. Reference sections A.2, C.3, H.2, H.3 for required information regarding security clearances.

Please see answer to question #44 below.

31. Section L-16 (a) (1) provides for the situation where the Agency could award a partial waiver of testing. Presumably meaning some proposed kits may best tested while others waived. If that is the case, why is the Agency only allowing for the FAI/FAT to be priced as a "lot", rather than individually? See L.5.1.1.

Testing costs to the government are driven by the amount of individual ballistic shots fired. Would it be more effective for the vendors to price the FAI/FAT by kit (CLIN) in order for the government to better evaluate the economics of each bid, including testing costs that it (the government) may incur?

31A. Based on program risk, the Government reserves the right to waive portions of the FAT/FAI requirement, or the entire FAT/FAI requirement. Based on sections L and M, the Government will only be evaluating the price of the FAT/FAI kits, and not the Government test cost.

32. Is it possible to get a six week extension to the proposal due date? The purpose for the extension is to allow coordination with suitable small business partners who can comply with the small business set aside and other requirements of the offer.

32A. This solicitation is a competitive small business set-aside (SBSA) in accordance with clause 52.219-6. A six week extension will not be granted, although a two week extension will be granted to allow interested offerors time to accumulate the necessary documentation to meet the Ballistic Performance requirement in section L.3.2.1. Solicitation Amendment 0002 extends the due date from 22 October 2012 to 05 November 2012.

33. Section F-6 indicates an IUID requirement for items over \$5,000. Does this requirement refer to an entire kit or a single section of a kit?

Disclaimer: If any answer to a question listed in this document conflicts with solicitation W56HZV-11-R-0412, the solicitation shall take precedence.

If this refers to an entire kit, does the government expect an IUID label only on the crate, or on one section of the kit, or on all sections of the kit?

33A. The requirement for IUID is specified in DFARS 211.274-2 (a) (1) "ALL delivered items for which the Government's unit acquisition cost is \$5,000 or more". The policy for valuation is determined in DFARS 211.274-3 (a) "It is DoD policy that contractors shall be required to identify the Government's unit acquisition cost (as defined in 252.211-7003(a)) for all items delivered, even if none of the criteria for placing a unique item identification mark applies". In this case, this requirement is referencing the unit acquisition cost of individual items within the kit, and not the entire kit.

The requirement for marking IUID is specified in solicitation clause 252.211-7003.

34. Question 11 of the Q&A, attachment 0001, paragraph L.5.1.1, and paragraph L.5.1.5 appear to be at cross purposes:

The instructions in Attachment 0001 only allow for the input into green cells, consisting of entity name and detailed cost data to build to a price (flowing to the tab entitled CLIN Prices). Section L.5.1.5 indicates that cost data is not required as part of price submission. Paragraph L.5.1.1 indicates that Section B is not completed and refers the vendor back to the Attachment 001 spreadsheet, which requires detailed cost data as part of price submission. Why are confidential cost, margin, and overhead data from each vendor required as part of a competitive FFP bid?

34A. Solicitation Amendment 0004 will remove paragraph L.5.1.5 which required offeror's provide pricing information used in the development of the proposed prices. Also, Amendment 0004 will revise Attachment 0001 to remove the configuration tabs which contain the requirement for detailed cost data. The Government reserves the right, if necessary, to request additional information to aid in its evaluation of price reasonableness in accordance with L.5.2.

35. Can a vendor submit its price data on its own spreadsheet similar to the tab entitled "CLIN prices" in Attachment 0001?

35A. No, offerors shall use the revised Attachment 0001 provided in Amendment 0004 to submit pricing data.

36. Can the Agency clarify how exactly vendors should reconcile question 11 of the Q&A, attachment 0001, paragraph L.5.1.1, and paragraph L.5.1.5? How exactly does the Agency want pricing data submitted for the RFP?

Disclaimer: If any answer to a question listed in this document conflicts with solicitation W56HZV-11-R-0412, the solicitation shall take precedence.

36A. Question #11 above, solicitation Attachment 0001 and Section L.5.1.1 state the offeror is to fill out Attachment 0001 (please use revised version provided in Amendment 0004). Section L.5.1.5 will be deleted in Amendment 0004 to remove the requirement to submit additional pricing information to support the evaluation of reasonableness. The Government reserves the right, if necessary, to request additional information to aid in its evaluation of price reasonableness in accordance with L.5.2.

37. On the excel spreadsheet Attachment 0001 the source pages for the different configuration tabs are not carrying over to the CLN Prices tab. Is this spreadsheet functioning right?

37A. Solicitation Amendment 0004 will revise Attachment 0001 to remove the configuration tabs; offerors are to fill in the CLIN Tab in accordance with solicitation Attachment 0001 and Section L.5.1.1.

38. On M-3 method of price evaluation it states;

“The unit price for each year will be multiplied by the estimated annual requirement for the corresponding year, and the results for each year added together to produce the evaluated price for the total maximum quantity. Based on this method of evaluation, award will be made to the responsible offeror whose offer represents the lowest evaluated price, or, if applicable, represents the best value to the Government as outlined elsewhere in this solicitation.”

My question is in the Attachment 0001 the spreadsheet calculates total evaluated price based on the minimum QTYs while in M-3(a) the evaluated price is based on the maximum QTYs because the estimated QTY's in section B are the maximum QTY's. What is the evaluated price based on the min or max QTY's?

38A. The evaluation of price is defined in Section M.7.2. The total evaluated price for each CLIN will be based on the evaluated unit price for each CLIN multiplied by the estimated ordering quantity for that CLIN identified in Attachment 0001 - FTFS Pricing Spreadsheet. The total evaluated price for each offeror proposal shall consist of the sum of the total evaluated prices for each CLIN as listed in Attachment 0001. Solicitation Amendment 0004 will remove the minimum quantities of year two and three from the CLIN Prices tab of Attachment 0001.

39. The minimum QTY order in Attachment 0001 for the 1st ordering year is actually the minimum QTY's listed for the minimum 3 year order. Then there are follow on QTYs for year 2 and 3 even though the min QTYs had already been fulfilled in the 1st year according to the spreadsheet. Can you clarify this discrepancy?

39A. Solicitation Amendment 0004 will remove the minimum quantity from years two and three on the CLIN Tab of Attachment 0001.

40. The max orders for Kit D in Attachment 0001 do not reflect the change in QTY's from Amendment 01. In amendment 01 the estimated / max QTYs are changed from 200 in year 1, 300 in year 2, and 300 in year 3 to 100 in year 1, 150 in year 2, and 150 in year 3. This change from the amendment is not reflected in Attachment 0001 as it still has the original QTYs listed. Can you clarify and update these QTYs in Attachment 0001?

40A. Solicitation Amendment 0004 will revise the quantities for Kit D in Attachment 0001 to match the quantity changes in Amendment 0001 as specified in question #8 above.

41. The PLS 1074 A0 and A1 variants are listed in Table C.2.1 as not having co-driver side full tanks. These variants are also known as "crane" variants. Can the engineers from the PLS program of PM HTV please confirm that they indeed will not require a kit on the co-driver side on these 1074 variants?

41A. Solicitation Amendment 0004 will revise Table C.2.1 to add a passenger side fuel tank to the M1074A1 PLS variant as configuration 10. Kit H (CLIN 0101) will consist of both the driver side and passenger side fuel tanks (configurations 4 and 10) for the M1074A1 PLS. The M1074A0 PLS variant does NOT have a passenger side fuel tank.

42. In D.3.2 Validation testing of Packaging. If a vendor has a different crate for each Kit can they conduct validation testing for one crate and validate by similarity for the rest of the crates if they are made to the same standard?

42A. Validation testing of packaging shall be conducted in accordance with ASTM D 4169, Distribution Cycle 18, Assurance Level 1 with Acceptance Criterion 3, as specified in D.3.2 and CDRL 009.

43. Section L-16 allows for a situation where a partial waiver may be granted. Since the agency has only asked for a "lot" price for FAT/FAI, how will it evaluate the vendor's price for a partial waiver? For example, if the government elects to waive all testing but the PLS kit, how will it evaluate the vendor's price for FAT/FAI on the PLS kit when the vendor is required to only submit a price as if no waivers are granted and every kit is tested?

43A. The Government will not waive FAT in part or in full prior to contract award. Solicitation Amendment 0004 will remove clauses 52.209-4005, 52.209-4006, 52.209-4007. The Government will evaluate proposals in accordance with Section M.7.

44. Question #30 above says an offeror must submit test report numbers to obtain specific classified data from the Government. What if we don't have test report numbers, but can provide contract numbers and approximate dates of testing?

Disclaimer: If any answer to a question listed in this document conflicts with solicitation W56HZV-11-R-0412, the solicitation shall take precedence.

44A. Please disregard the answer to question #30, this contracting office is unable to provide Government owned contractor test data. Solicitation Amendment 0004 revised the language in Sections L.3.2.1 and M.5.1 to address test data.

45. Under Amendment 0004, requests for classified data are due by 12/10/12. I wanted to see how it was going on our request for this type of data that we submitted in October.

45A. Solicitation Section L.6.1.6 refers to a deadline to request the classified ballistic specification, not Government owned contractor test data. Regarding requests for Government owned contractor test data, please see Question #44 above. This contracting office is unable to provide Government owned contractor test data. Amendment 0004 revised the language in Sections L.3.2.1 and M.5.1 to address test data.

46. In regards to 7. Section L note g, I am requesting the following classified information before the deadline of 10DEC2012 passes. We have requested this classified information in the past and this note in amendment 0004 seems to contradict the question 44a that states that the contracting office will not supply test data. Can you clarify whether or not vendors will be provided classified reports that will be evaluated in M.5.1 to determine risk of fulfilling performance requirements?

46A. The deadline of December 10, 2012 was added to Section L.6.1.6 in Amendment 0004. Section L.6.1.6 refers to the request for the classified ballistic specification, not for Government owned contractor test data. See questions #44 and #45 above.

47. I am requesting an extension on the Ballistic Specification Due date originally dated for 10 Dec 2012 since we just found out about this important solicitation that my technology with past performance can be applied to.

47A. The deadline to request the ballistic specification will NOT be extended, nor will the proposal due date. Please refer to Sections A.2 and H.3, "Extensions to this RFP will NOT be granted by the Government to allow time for potential Offerors to obtain the aforementioned clearances (i.e. facility clearances) if they do not already possess them".

