NOTE: The responses below are for informational purposes only and all proposals should be in response to information provided in the Request for Proposal only.

GOVERNMENT RESPONSES TO RFP W56HZV-13-R-0036 QUESTIONS:

Ques #	Section/ Paragraph	Topic	Question	Response	Posted to PROCNET
1	C.4.6.3	Failure Reporting, Analysis, and Corrective Action System (FRACAS)	Will the government require a response to informational TIRs or just confine responses to Minor, Major, and Critical TIRs? Our preference is that informational TIRs are just that, and as such, no response required.	The contractor shall respond to all TIRs.	8/15/2014
2	L.2.2 Volume I, Paragraph 3	Subcontracting Plan	Paragraph 3 states a Subcontracting Plan in accordance with 52.219-9 shall be provided in Volume I. 52.219-9 recognizes a Commercial SB Subcontracting Plan for US large business entities as a U.S. Government "preferred" plan. Please confirm that a U.S. Federal Government and GSA approved Commercial SB Subcontracting plan will be acceptable to the US Army under 52.219-9	Per 52.219-9(g), a commercial plan is the preferred type of subcontracting plan for contractors furnishing commercial items. The Heavy Crane effort is not for commercial items, as defined in FAR 2.101. Accordingly, a commercial subcontracting plan will not be accepted. Every offeror must complete Volume IV "Small Business Participation" as instructed at Section L.4 of the RFP.	8/15/2014
3	L.3.6	Interdivisional Transfers	Section L.3.6 Interdivisional Transfers (if applicable), states "provide the same data for the Prime Offeror (excludes commercial or competitive)." We are unclear on the meaning behind this section. Please clarify.	Interdivisional transfers are materials, supplies, or services that are sold or transferred between divisions, subsidiaries, or affiliates of the contractor under a common control. Per FAR 31.205-26(e), if your price proposal includes interdivisional transfers, you must support allowance of these transfers by showing (1) It is the established practice of the transferring organization to price interorganizational transfers at other than cost for commercial work of the contractor or any division, subsidiary, or affiliate of the contractor under a common control; and (2) The item being transferred qualifies for an exception under 15.403-1(b) and the contracting officer has not determined the price to be unreasonable. Further, you must provide the same data for the division from which the transfer occurs as you are for your own proposal as the prime offeror.	8/15/2014

NOTE: The responses below are for informational purposes only and all proposals should be in response to information provided in the Request for Proposal only.

GOVERNMENT RESPONSES TO RFP W56HZV-13-R-0036 QUESTIONS:

Ques #	Section/ Paragraph	Topic	Question	Response	Posted to PROCNET
4	L.2.3.2 Key Performance Parameters (KPPs), Best Value Trade-off, 3. Reach (3.1.8) and Page 124 of 126, M.5.2 Best Value Evaluation, M.5.2.1 Technical Factor Evaluation, 3. Reach.		Throughout the ATPD# 2408, U.S. Army Type II Heavy Crane Purchase Description (PD) review and development period, "boom length" has been used interchangeably with "reach" by the U.S. Army. In fact, the PD 3.1.8 referenced with the KPP for "reach" is actually titled "Boom". Additionally, in the PD paragraph 3.1.8, it states that, "Type II Heavy Crane Type II shall have a reach of at least 100 ft (minimum 100 ft boom with jib or 100 ft boom (T)." Also, in prior questions submitted and answered by TACOM, Question 11, answers, "A 100 ft main boom can meet the boom requirements stated in ATPD 2408. The 120 ft objective has been removed from the PD (ATPD 3.1.8)." Additionally TACOM answers, "The offered crane shall have a boom with minimum reach of 100 feet with or without jib. Reach exceeding 100 ft may be obtained with a 30 to 40 ft. jib but is not required." From, the language in the PD and the question responses to date, please clarify that a boom with a jib of less than 30 ft could be offered to meet reach or boom length requirement for the solicitation. Again, from prior US Army response, it appears that only 30 to 40 ft. jibs are acceptable, although not required. Also, we do not understand why a shorter than 30 ft jib would not be acceptable for meeting reach or boom length requirement. Why will the US Army not accept a jib shorter than 30 ft?	The reach threshold is 100ft and can be satisfied using a boom plus jib or a boom alone. See ATT 0001, Paragraph 3.1.8. The boom minimum length requirement is 80 ft. Paragraph 3.1.8 in ATT 0001 will be revised in RFP Amendment 0001. Therefore, if using a boom of the minimum required length plus a jib to meet the threshold reach requirement, the jib would be 20ft (80ft boom + 20 ft jib). If using a boom of the minimum required length plus a jib to meet the objective reach requirement, the jib would be up to 40 ft (80ft boom + 40ft jib). NOTE: This response supercedes prior responses on PROCNET, including Question 14 in the Draft Solicitation Q&A and Questions 11 and 37 in the Purchase Description Q&A.	8/15/2014
5	E-4, d(6)	CARC CDRL	The RFP makes reference to CDRL DI-NDTI-80603, but Exhibit A does not have such a CDRL. Please clarify.	The CDRLs referenced in E-4, d(6) and d(7) are not required and, therefore, have not been included in this solicitation.	8/15/2014
6	E.3	Testing	The paragraph makes reference to TABLE II in the ATPD but there is no Table II. Please clarify.	There is only one Table in ATT 0001. Section E of the RFP will be updated to correct the references in RFP Amendment 0001.	8/15/2014
7	Paragraph (a) on page 77 of the RFP		Paragraph (a) on page 77 of the RFP states a FAT report is due (assumed to be a contractor FAT) 180 days after contract award, and the government has 60 days to notify the offeror (Contract award +240 days). However, the offeror must deliver a FAT unit 210 days after contract award. Please clarify that schedule.	Please see FAR Clause 52.209-4(a) for delivery of units under CLIN 0002 (270 calendar days). Government FAT occurs after Contractor FAT and the contractor is responsible for delivering units to the Government for Government FAT after Contractor FAT.	8/15/2014
8	ATT001 ATPD section 3.3.21		The ATT001 ATPD section 3.3.21 requires AWS D14.3/D14.3M, Specification for Welding Earthmoving, Construction, and Agricultural Equipment. However the RFP requires AWS D1.1. Please clarify.	The RFP requires AWS D1.1, AWS D1.2, AWS D1.3 and AWS D14.3. The requirement is to use all four specifications when applicable. ATT 0001, Paragraph 3.3.21 will be updated to reflect all four of the AWS standards in RFP Amendment 0001.	8/15/2014

NOTE: The responses below are for informational purposes only and all proposals should be in response to information provided in the Request for Proposal only.

GOVERNMENT RESPONSES TO RFP W56HZV-13-R-0036 QUESTIONS:

Ques #	Section/ Paragraph	Topic	Question	Response	Posted to PROCNET
9	Section M		A. What is the relationship between the following terms: "Significantly more important than", "somewhat more important than", "more important than" and "approximately equal to"? B. What is the difference between "somewhat more important than" and "more important than"?	A. "Significantly more important than" will be given greater weight than "more important than", which will be given greater weight than "somewhat more important than", which will be given greater weight than "approximately equal to". B. "More important than" will be given greater weight than "somewhat more important than".	8/15/2014
10	Section M.5.2.1		a. Is it possible to be evaluated as "outstanding" without achieving the objective performance level in any individual sub-factor/element? b. If so, at what level of performance between the threshold and objective for any element/sub-factor will the "outstanding rating" be given? c. What level of risk must be substantiated to achieve the "outstanding" evaluation?	a. A rating of outstanding is defined as a proposal which meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements. The proposal contains multiple strengths and no deficiencies. b. Incremental credit above threshold is given for subfactors and factors where noted in Section M. c. In accordance with M.4.2, technical ratings are distinct from risk ratings.	8/15/2014
11	L-18, TACON FAR Supplement 52.215.4003, Handcarried Offers and Section L.1.2		Clause L-18 states ".Handcarried offers, including disks or other electronic media, shall be addressed to." conflicts with clause L.1.2 which states ".No hard copies, CD ROMs or email proposals will be permitted." These two solicitation clauses conflict with each other. Will offerors be able to submit handcarried proposals on electronic media?	Clause 52.215-4003-Handcarried Offers-Including Offers Delivered by Express Services will be removed from the RFP in a future amendment.	8/28/2014

NOTE: The responses below are for informational purposes only and all proposals should be in response to information provided in the Request for Proposal only.

GOVERNMENT RESPONSES TO RFP W56HZV-13-R-0036 QUESTIONS:

Ques #	Section/ Paragraph	Topic	Question	Response	Posted to PROCNET
12	Draft Solicitation Page 125 of 126, Section M.5.2.5 Speed Subfactor Rating. Additionally, Page 115 of 126 Section L.2.3.1 Dynamic Input Data and VehDyne Analysis Program		In section M.5.2.5 the Government states that in evaluating the speed elements it will apply the VehDyne analysis program to the data provided by offerors in the dynamic input data IAW Section L.2.3. The Government states in section L.2.3.1 that offerors shall obtain a copy of the VehDyne Version 4.1 Analysis Program from the US Army Corps of Engineers. Further, the Government states that the VehDyne spreadsheet required for download and data input included all the vehicle dynamic data deemed by the Government to be relevant for evaluating proposed speed. Upon our review of the VehDyne model, it is our belief the Government should provide industry with the various terrain files and the scenario data files associated with the VehDyne evaluation to be conducted. Without these data files industry cannot evaluate the course performance of our systems in the VehDyne model. Case in point, if the Government required testing of a vehicle system on a specific course at Aberdeen Proving Grounds, the type course and TOPs would be referenced. In a similar fashion, if the Government is going to evaluate our system against a specific set of terrain and course data files, we believe it is important for us to have access to those files describing the primary, secondary, and off-road conditions for evaluation of offers. Please provide the terrain and scenario data files for VehDyne Version 4.1 primary, secondary, and off-road courses to be used in evaluation of our systems so we can model and understand how our systems will perform and be evaluated by the Government.	In accordance with TOP 01-1-014A, the vehicle speeds will be evaluated to insure it is capable of producing a ride of 6 watts absorbed power, or less, at the driver's seat in the vertical axis for each required speed and surface roughness. Primary roads will be simulated with terrain file Chv_6d.prf (RMS 0.2 inches), secondary roads with file Chv_1ad.prf (RMS 0.36 inches), and off road with any of the other terrains included in the VehDyne 4.1 distribution with an RMS value greater than 0.6 inches.	8/15/2014
13	Draft ATPD dated 6 Feb 2014, Page 35, Paragraph 3.3.20 Treatment and Paint		The Draft ATPD Paragraph 3.3.20 states all external surfaces of the Type II Heavy Crane suitable for painting shall be cleaned, treated, and CARC painted. Other than the armor kits, there are limited specifications for attachment or associated attachment container painting (if containerized). We envision that the Government would not want all components painted with CARC due to end use abrasive coating conditions for certain attachments. Is there a requirement by the Government for CARC painting of all attachments and/or attachment shipping containers, if applicable. If so, please specify which attachments must be CARC painted and specify if there is a range of mil-spec color requirements that will be provided in delivery orders.	CARC paint is required on all external surfaces of the Type II Heavy Crane to include attachments, less the sling set, except those that reach a temperature of 400°F (See ATT 0001, Paragraph 3.3.20) and are not exempted in ATT 0001, Paragraph 6.3.9. ATT 0001 will be revised in RFP Amendment 0001 regarding the sling set. The base color will be identified in the delivery order.	8/15/2014

NOTE: The responses below are for informational purposes only and all proposals should be in response to information provided in the Request for Proposal only.

GOVERNMENT RESPONSES TO RFP W56HZV-13-R-0036 QUESTIONS:

Ques #	Section/ Paragraph	Topic	Question	Response	Posted to PROCNET
14	Draft ATPD dated 6 Feb 2014, Page 24, Paragraph 3.3.5.2 Nuclear, Biological, and Chemical (NBC) Contamination		The reference states that the type II Heavy Crane components shall be able to operate in an NBC environment and survive decontamination. It further states Materials, particularly those used externally, shall be resistant to chemical and biological agents and to the decontaminators used to neutralize these agents. For discussion, the US Army has in its inventory standard decontaminants for certain agents that can be corrosive or harmful to certain types of materials. Please specify the standard and non-standard decontaminants anticipated for use on the Type II Heavy Crane. We understand in particular that certain rubber or plastic components and/or electronics can be damaged by certain military standard decontaminants. If caustic or material damaging decontaminants are anticipated, please consider that it would not be possible to guarantee being able to survive decontamination for all automotive materials. Please provide a specific list of military standard and non-standard decontaminants anticipated to be used for vehicle decontaminants on the Type II Heavy Crane. Additionally, please provide any lessons learned or best practices from Dugway Proving Grounds from prior tests indicating which parts for similar systems require replacement after decontamination.	The following list of decontaminants was provided by the Contamination Survivability Assessor, at Dugway Proving Grounds, William Davis. The list may also be found in the Army Field Manual FM 3-5: Standard decontaminants are: SuperTropical Bleach (STB) - this may be in a slurry or dry High Test Hypochlorite (HTH) Hot, soapy water with brushing may cause some removal, but little neutralization Non-standard decontaminants are: Caustic soda (lots of personnel issues); Ammonia; Plain dirt can absorb and remove agents Usual parts that MAY require replacement are things like rubbers and some plastics used in seals, hoses, gaskets, cable covers, etc. Components that are braided, cloth, etc. are good candidates for replacement consideration. The parts are usually system specific.	8/15/2014

NOTE: The responses below are for informational purposes only and all proposals should be in response to information provided in the Request for Proposal only.

GOVERNMENT RESPONSES TO RFP W56HZV-13-R-0036 QUESTIONS:

Ques #	Section/ Paragraph	Topic	Question	Response	Posted to PROCNET
15	Attachment 0001, ATPD #2408, Paragraph 3.3.6, SAFETY	Safety	Paragraph 3.3.6 SAFETY states, "…The crane shall have a mirror near the cable hoist drum so that the crane operator can ascertain the number of cable wraps left on the drum." …presumably for both the winches. Would it be an acceptable alternative to have a sensor in each winch that will stop the winch down function when the minimum amount a cable is reached instead of having mirrors? As additional discussion. There are improved safety advantages to use of sensors instead of mirrors. The operator does not need to be watching the winches for cable play out. This is very important because it allows maximum concentration by the operator on the lifted load. The sensor approach will work under all climatic conditions, to include high glare, icing, and dusty conditions. Mirrors get dirty or out of alignment which can easily obscure the operators view of the winches. To view winch drums, mirrors will have to be located at or near the highest point on the crane. This will subject them to greater risk of damage or require operator climbing to heights for making adjustments. Additionally, mirrors will likely need to be removed to minimize transportation footprint of the crane whereas sensors do not. Finally, industry safety standards and best practice are use of sensors to gage minimum cable wrap.	Yes, sensors placed in each winch, that will stop the winch down function when the minimum amount of cable is reached is acceptable. The operator must also have the ability to visually confirm. ATT 0001, Paragraph 3.3.6, will be revised in RFP Amendment 0001.	8/15/2014

NOTE: The responses below are for informational purposes only and all proposals should be in response to information provided in the Request for Proposal only.

GOVERNMENT RESPONSES TO RFP W56HZV-13-R-0036 QUESTIONS:

Ques #	Section/ Paragraph	Topic	Question	Response	Posted to PROCNET
16	Section I-138, Section L.2.2, and L.4.8	Subcontracting Plan	Section I-138 states: "Commercial plan" means a subcontracting plan (including goals) that covers the offerors fiscal year and that applies to the entire production of commercial items sold by either the entire company or a portion thereof (e.g., division, plant, or product line)" and, "Electronic Subcontracting Reporting System (eSRS)" means the Government wide, electronic, web-based system for small business subcontracting program reporting. The eSRS is located at http://www.esrs.gov." The section further states, "(g) A commercial plan is the preferred type of subcontracting plan for contractors furnishing commercial items. The commercial plan shall relate to the offerors planned subcontracting generally, for both commercial and Government business, rather than solely to the Government contract. Once the Contractors commercial plan has been approved, the Government will not require another subcontracting plan from the same Contractor while the plan remains in effect, as long as the product or service being provided by the Contractor continues to meet the definition of a commercial item. A Contractor with a commercial plan shall comply with the reporting requirements stated in paragraph (d)(10) of this clause by submitting one SSR in eSRS for all contracts covered by its commercial plan. This report shall be acknowledged or rejected in eSRS by the Contracting Officer who approved the plan. This report shall be submitted within 30 days after the end of the Governments fiscal year. Section L.2.2 Volume I (Proposal Terms and Conditions). States, "In Volume I the offeror shall provide....."3. A Subcontracting Plan in accordance with 52.219-9, if the offeror is other than a US small business, as defined by the North American Classification System (NAICS) code applicable to this RFP." Section L.4.8 goes on to state, "a. The Small Business Subcontracting Plan: (1) is not required of small businesses (2) is developed and submitted in accordance with FAR 52.219-9 Small Business Subcontracting Plan and its ALT II and DFARS 252.219-7003 incorporated by reference in Section I (or DFARS 252.219-7004 if the Offeror has a comprehensive subcontracting plan) and TACOM Clause 52.219-4004 in Section L." For clarification, does the U.S. Army Contracting Command accept a U.S. Federal Government approved annual "Commercial Plan" in effect at time of submission for an offeror as an acceptable Small Business Subcontracting plan for inclusion in Volume I of the proposal for this solicitation?	See response to Question #2.	8/15/2014
17	Attachment 0001, ATPD #2408, Paragraph 3.3.6.3	FOPS	It was noted in the ATPD section 3.3.6.3 FOPS that under the verification requirements is the ability to pass the force requirements of ISO3471. ISO3471 is the requirement for ROPS not the requirement for FOPS. It is clear in the ATPD section write-up that the government is referring to FOPS and not ROPS. Please confirm this is an incorrect reference for verification. We recommend changing the reference from "…..requirements of ISO 3471" to read"…..requirements of ISO 3449", which is the correct ISO standard for FOPS.	ATT 0001, Table I, Paragraph 3.3.6.3, FOPS Test section, will be updated in RFP Amendment 0002 to remove the statement that includes the reference to ISO 3471.	8/15/2014

NOTE: The responses below are for informational purposes only and all proposals should be in response to information provided in the Request for Proposal only.

GOVERNMENT RESPONSES TO RFP W56HZV-13-R-0036 QUESTIONS:

Ques #	Section/ Paragraph	Topic	Question	Response	Posted to PROCNET
18	Attachment 0001, ATPD #2408, Paragraph 3.3.9	Hydraulic system	In ATPD 2408 section 3.3.9 regarding the general requirements for the hydraulic system, it is listed that the hydraulic oil will meet MIL-PRF-2104. MIL-PRF-2104 is a standard for engine oil and not hydraulic oil. We recognize this as an incorrect reference because it is clear the hydraulic system would not be filled with engine oil. We recommend the referenced standard be changed to MIL-PRF-46170 for the hydraulic system, as also referenced in section of 3.3.10 of the ATPD 2408.	ATT 0001, Table I, Paragraph 3.3.9-Hydraulic system will be updated in RFP Amendment 0002 to reflect MIL-PRF-46170 as the required fluids for the hydraulic system. The Army does use MIL-PRF-2104 as a hydraulic fluid, but not for this application.	8/15/2014
19	CDRL A022	Field Maintenance Manual Including Parts Information (-23&P)	CDRL A022, Field Maintenance Manual Including Parts Information (-23&P), indicates that the DEP IETM will be delivered on DVD and in hard copy, and that the FRC will be on DVD in both IETM format and Electronic Technical Manual (ETM) (page-based) format. While it is possible to print an IETM, the pages will not be a formatted, ETM output. They print as web pages. Does the Government really want hard copies of the IETM to be printed? If so, what format are they expecting for that output?	For the -23&P IETM, no printed pages will be required for the FRC delivery. CDRL A022 will be updated in a future RFP amendment.	8/28/2014
20	ATT 0030	Price Evaluation Worksheet	On Attachment 30 Worksheet Year 7 on Row 37 column P, there appears to be a missing formula as we are seeing incorrect totals. Please confirm that the Attachment 30 worksheet has a formula error and re-publish as appropriate	The missing formula on Tab "Year 7", cell P37, will be added to Attachment 0030 in a future RFP amendment.	8/28/2014
21	L.2.2, Para 5	Volume I	Paragraph 5 states: “A letter identifying the offeror’s (or subcontractor’s) secret facility clearance number, and a DD Form 254 containing the information required in blocks 2c, 3, 4, 5, 6.” 'Based on this paragraph is it acceptable for an offeror to only submit the subcontractor’s secret facility clearance number along with the DD254?	Yes.	8/28/2014

NOTE: The responses below are for informational purposes only and all proposals should be in response to information provided in the Request for Proposal only.

GOVERNMENT RESPONSES TO RFP W56HZV-13-R-0036 QUESTIONS:

Ques #	Section/ Paragraph	Topic	Question	Response	Posted to PROCNET
22	ATPD 3.1, 3.1.1	FAT & Armor Kit	Please clarify if the Government expectation is that one B-Kit will be included with each FAT machine ordered on contract award. We are unclear on this because the B-kit's are not "one for one" ordered with each Type II Heavy Crane. Additionally, they are not considered a crane lifting attachment or a part of the BII. For description of the FAT system, we are referring in the solicitation to specifically 3.1 and 3.1.1, which do not call out the B-kit's. The sections only make reference to cabs.and B-kit's are not cabs. Because the required pricing sheet has two (2) B-kit's specified for year one, our initial assumption has been that the Government would only be ordering two "B" kits for testing at Aberdeen In review, we see that the Government may be expecting 3 B-kit's to be provided with FAT machines and then ordering two additional cabs for any reason desired. Please respond back with clarification as soon as possible. This does impact our pricing and subcontractor pricing.	The RFP will be amended to revise the First Article Test (FAT) Unit CLIN structure and add paragraphs C.4.6.1.1 and C.4.6.1.2 to clarify the FAT hardware deliverables. The date for receipt of offers will be extended.	9/26/2014
23	AMD 0006	N/A	Please provide a more detailed explanation regarding what specifically must now be classified as a result of the new contract mod. We need to clearly interpret the changes correctly. Specifically, regarding paragraph 1.b.1To:, stating: "Proposal Submission Procedures for CLASSIFIED Information. Any responses or information in an offerors proposal regarding crew protection and any other information based on, related to or referencing the classified Annex 01 to PD 2408 (Attachment 0037) ARL-RP-89 dated December 2004 and Attachment 0036-Form DD 254, are considered classified information and shall be properly marked as such." We need specific clarification on what must be classified in our proposal regarding "crew protection". Is all reference to crew protection classified? ....and if so to what level? FOUO, Confidential, Secret, etc.? Is the above statement meant to convey that "all" information derived or developed from the classified Annex 01 to PD 2408 (Attachment 0037) ARL-RP-89 dated December 2004 and Attachment 0036-Form DD 254 is considered classified? ...or is there something new that specifically makes the information classified?	The classified annex was sent separately per classified mailing procedures. Treat responses regarding crew protection or any other information based on, related to or referencing Classified Annex 01 to PD2408 (Attachment 0037) and Attachment 0036 as you did any information that you considered classified prior to Amendment 0006, and in accordance with National Industrial Security Program Operating Manual (NISPOM) DoD 5220.22-M.	1/29/2015

NOTE: The responses below are for informational purposes only and all proposals should be in response to information provided in the Request for Proposal only.

GOVERNMENT RESPONSES TO RFP W56HZV-13-R-0036 QUESTIONS:

Ques #	Section/ Paragraph	Topic	Question	Response	Posted to PROCNET
24	AMD 0006	N/A	Please provide additional explanation on why section L is changing regarding classification instructions to offerors after proposal submission. Is the AMD 0006 retroactively classifying all information provided on "crew protection"? ...if so back to what date? ....or is the AMD 0006 requiring that our classification revisions take place just from the date of AMD 0006 release forward?	The changes made by AMD 0006 are effective as of the amendment issue date and are not retroactive.	1/29/2015
25	AMD 0006	N/A	Will the U.S. Army be providing updated security classification guidance in the form of a security classification guide; DD Form 254 indicating the security classification guidance changes; or other documentation completed by an Original Classification Authority? Regarding the initially provided classification guide, we need to understand specifically where and what (and if any) changes, are being made and...specifically will a revised classification guide be provided?.	No updates to the security classification guidance will be provided.	1/29/2015
26	AMD 0006	ATT 0037-Classified Annex 01 to PD 2408	Following a review of the information contained within the classified annex, is the information contained in a previous unclassified proposal classified?	The changes made by AMD 0006 are effective as of the amendment issue date and are not retroactive.	1/29/2015