

TACOM Strategic Service Solutions (TS3)
 Questions and Answers on FINAL W56HZV-14-R-0032
<https://contracting.tacom.army.mil/services/53/53.htm>

Question Number Final R&D RFP	Question/Comments	Answer/Response	Date Posted to Web
1	I am proposing that you use less restrictive OCI language that has been used in a number of Army contracts. One such Contract is the R2-3G IDIQ contract issued out of CECOM in Aberdeen. Note the OCI language that appears in clause H.1 of the above-referenced IDIQ contract. Language of this sort would be preferable to that proposed in the current RFP, as it is quite a bit less restrictive and would promote better contract utilization.	The OCI provisions contained in paragraph H.16 will not be changed. The OCI provisions contained within R&D RFP Section H.16 have been revised via R&D RFP Amendment 0003.	8/11/2014 REVISED 8/27/2014
2	Will attachment 0003 be provided as an MS Word file and not a pdf file?	Attachment 0003 - R&D Experience Matrix/Narrative has been provided as a Microsoft Word file on the ACC - Warren Procurement Network (ACC-WRN ProNet)	8/11/2014
3	Will the Army provide quantifiable information regarding the level of effort required for the CAD and analysis work? For example, can a representative bill of material be provided for a floor structure and underbody structure that includes all fasteners? If not, how about list from which to help base an estimate that list the number of parts anticipated with will comprise of each design broken down by number of unique parts and number of off-the-shelf items?	No, the Government will not be providing any quantifiable information (i.e., representative bill of material or a list of parts anticipated) regarding the level of effort required for the CAD and analysis work.	8/11/2014
4	Section L.1.10 states, "Proposals shall conform to the requirements of this solicitation. All offerors, including joint ventures (JVs), shall be limited to one proposal." Draft documents stated, "... excluding joint ventures (JVs), shall be limited to one proposal." Will the Government please clarify this change? Specifically, can a Joint Venture submit a proposal for the restricted (SBSA) pool under Research and Development, and one of the ventures submit a separate proposal for the F&O (OTSB) pool?	Yes, a joint venture can submit a proposal under the restricted pool as long as the size status of the joint venture is a small business. If that joint venture submits a proposal under Research and Development in the restricted pool, a member of that joint venture may submit an individual proposal outside of the joint venture in the full-and-open pool under its individual CAGE code and qualifies as an other-than-small-business (OTSB) under the NAICS code. All members of a joint venture are considered to be a single prime offeror and will share the same CAGE code. An individual member of a joint venture may have a separate CAGE code. A joint venture may submit a proposal for the restricted pool under the joint venture's CAGE code, and an individual member of a joint venture may submit a proposal under his own CAGE code for the full-and-open (OTSB) pool.	8/11/2014
5	Please confirm in TS3 R&D RFP W56HZV-14-R-0032, Sections L.4.1.2.1, L.4.1.2.2, L.4.1.2.3, and L.4.1.2.4 that the government will allow Research and Development contracts to be used as suitable experience references for this solicitation.	Yes, service contracts include Research and Development (R&D) efforts. The Government will accept R&D contracts as experience references for Sections L.4.1.2.1, L.4.1.2.2, L.4.1.2.3 and L.4.1.2.4.	8/11/2014
6	Solicitation Sections L.4.1.2.1 through L.4.1.2.4 all state that experience citations should be for "Service contracts performed...". Is it acceptable for Experience citations to be contracts that do not incorporate the Service Contract Act requirements?	Yes, it is acceptable for Experience citations to be service contracts that do not incorporate the Service Contract Act requirements.	8/11/2014
7	Section M, 7.1 Eval. Of Volume IV, page 81: indicates that the Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002) for the MAC IDIQ contract will be evaluated by considering the reasonableness of the proposed fully loaded labor rates (to include profit/fee), as reasonableness is defined in paragraph M.7.3. M.7.2 Eval. Of Volume IV, page 81: indicates the Prime Proposal Summary File (Attachment 0012) will be evaluated for both reasonableness and realism (as defined in paragraph M.7.4). The language in paragraph M.7.5 references both the Attachment 0002 and Attachment 0012, and indicates that evaluators will use one or more of the price and cost analysis techniques and procedures identified in FAR 15.404-1 to determine the cost realism and reasonableness of the proposed costs/prices. Question: Will the Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002): (1) be evaluated for cost reasonableness alone, as indicated in paragraph M.7.1, to ensure the proposed IDIQ maximum rate ceilings are reasonable (i.e. does not exceed what a prudent person would establish as a maximum ceiling IDIQ rate), or (2) will the Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002) also be evaluated for realism (i.e., a rack-and-stack comparison to pre-determined independent Government cost estimate (IGCE) rates, other Government and industry surveys/benchmarks, and comparison with the ceiling rates submitted by other competing Offerors)?	The R&D Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002) will be evaluated for reasonableness alone. The R&D Prime Proposal Summary File - Blast Mitigation (Attachment 0012) will be evaluated for both reasonableness and cost realism. Section M.7.5 refers to the techniques and procedures the Government may use when performing its reasonableness and cost realism assessment. The Government has revised this language in Amendment 0001 to the R&D RFP.	8/11/2014
8	Section L, L.2.4(a), page 67: Files in either Microsoft (MS) Windows Vista/MS Office 2007 or Office XP: Word, Excel, or PowerPoint. Question: Is it acceptable to submit using MS Office 2010?	Offerors shall ensure files are submitted in a MS Office 2007-compatible format.	8/11/2014
9	Section L, L.4.1.2, page 69: "...the offeror shall provide supporting documentation to establish that he performed the work himself in order for the experience to be considered relevant." Question: What type of supporting documentation is considered acceptable? Question: Will the supporting documentation be counted as part of the limited page count for Volume II?	It is the offerors responsibility to determine the type of supporting documentation it chooses to provide to the Government in order to establish that he/she performed the work himself/herself in order for the experience to be considered relevant. All information provided as part of the Experience Volume will be subject to the Page Limits designated within R&D RFP Section L.1.2 via Amendment 0006.	8/11/2014 REVISED 8/27/2014
10	Question: Is there an anticipated start date for pricing purposes for the IDIQ Ceiling Rates?	Yes, the anticipated starting date for the IDIQ Ceiling Rates is Calendar Year 2015.	8/11/2014
11	Question: Is there an anticipated award date for the NIE Task Order, for pricing purposes?	The NIE Task Order is not applicable to the R&D RFP. However, the Blast Mitigation Task Order is anticipated to be awarded within 45 days of the award of the R&D MA IDIQ contracts (Reference Attachment 0009 - Task Order Request: Blast Mitigation, Section A, Part 6).	8/11/2014
12	Attachment 0002, Price Matrix - R&D - 541712 references CY15 - CY23. Question: Does the "CY" reference calendar year or contract year?	The reference to "CY" in Attachment 0002 refers to Calendar Year.	8/11/2014
13	Section H, H.2.1.4.1.1, page 35: "If the Government provides labor categories within the TOR, the contractor's labor rates proposed in response to the TOR shall be predicated on the qualifications for the level designated within the KBS Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002). Question: May the contractor submit labor rates from a higher level of the same labor category or propose a suitable alternate labor category with minimum qualifications and provide rationale for inclusion in the proposed labor mix?	Offerors may only submit rates for the labor categories contained in Attachment 0002 - R&D Pricing Labor Matrix. The contractor may only propose alternate labor category(ies)/qualifications, if requested to do so by a specific TOR.	8/11/2014
14	What if my company was novated? I'm concerned that when I submit our proposal, my experience will be reflected under our "old" company and my proposal will be submitted under my "new" company. I want to ensure that when the Government verifies my claimed experience, there is no confusion as to whether or not I performed the work as a prime contractor.	If your company was novated or underwent a name change, please provide the supporting documentation as part of Volume I.	8/11/2014
15	The Attachment 0002 Pricing Labor Matrix "Category description with Min Quals" spreadsheet tab contains a "Level III" column and a "Level III maximum" column, each of which include different minimum education and experience requirements. However, the "Price Matrix" spreadsheet tab only allows one set of Level III rates to be entered (per labor category and year). (1) What is the intent of the "Level III maximum" column? Are personnel who exceed the maximum requirements (if assumed to be the "Level III maximum" column's minimum education and experience requirements) ineligible to work on the contract? If not, for the purposes of Attachment 0002 should the contractor need to account for all personnel that would exceed the Level III maximum requirements within their ceiling price for the Level III labor category? (2) Are the minimum education and experience requirements in the "Level III maximum" column supposed to be the Level III maximum education and experience requirements? (3) If not, what are the "Level III maximum" column's additional minimum education and experience requirements to be used for, when the "Level III" column already contains minimum education and experience requirements? If not, what are the maximum education and experience requirements for Level III above which a new higher level could be used in task order proposals?	The purpose of the "Level III Maximum" column is to notify offerors that the Government anticipates that the majority of the requirements solicited against the R&D contract suite can be performed by contractor personnel at or below a Level III. The Government may have a requirement for a labor category with qualifications exceeding those listed in Attachment 0002. At the time such a task order is issued, IDIQ contractors will have the opportunity to propose prices for that specific task order. Section H.2.1 of the R&D RFP will be amended to clarify this language. If a specific labor category level (I, II, or III) is required for a task order, the contractor may choose to utilize an employee with qualifications exceeding the Government's required labor category and corresponding level, but the Government will not pay more than the ceiling price in Attachment 0002 for that required category and associated level. Levels I and II represent the minimums of education and experience. Level III constitutes a range spanning the minimum levels of education and experience, up to the described maximums. Attachment 0002 of the R&D RFP will be amended to clarify this language.	8/11/2014
16	PWS (Attachment 0010), page 6, paragraph 5.3.2.1.1 states five (5) assets are to be fabricated in Option 2. Paragraph 5.3.3.1.1 states ten (10) assets are to be fabricated in Option 3. Attachment 0012 has \$26,000 for materials in Option Period 2 and \$26,000 for materials in Option Period 3. Question: Is the Governments estimate of \$26,000 for both 5 and 10 assets correct?	The figures for "Material" in Option 2 and Option 3 have been revised to \$43,500 and \$87,000, respectively. This revision has been provided via R&D RFP Amendment 0004.	8/27/2014

TACOM Strategic Service Solutions (TS3)
 Questions and Answers on FINAL W56HZV-14-R-0032
<https://contracting.tacom.army.mil/services/53/53.htm>

Question Number Final R&D RFP	Question/Comments	Answer/Response	Date Posted to Web
17	<p>Reference to question #112 from the consolidated file posted 03 July 2014.</p> <p>The following was the response provided by the Government: Error Noted. CDRL A012 will be revised to reflect the period of performance.</p> <p><u>Follow on question:</u> Reference R&D RFP Attachment 0011 Contract Data Requirements. CDRL A012 Scientific and Technical Reports states:</p> <p>"The Contractor shall deliver the draft Scientific and Technical Report no later than six (6) months after the contract award date; six (6) months after the date of option 1 exercise; four (4) months after the date of option 2 exercise; and four (4) months after the date of option 3 exercise. The COR will review and provide comments within fifteen (15) calendar days of draft submittal. The Contractor shall deliver the final Scientific and Technical Report no later than thirty (30) calendar days from receipt of draft report with comments."</p> <p>Section 1.5 (Period of Performance) states the "The period of performance for the base period of this task order shall be nine months from the date of task order award.</p> <p>The options periods of performance are as follows: Option 1 - nine (9) months after the date of option exercise IAW 5.3.1 below. Option 2 - six (6) months after the date of option exercise IAW 5.3.2 below. Option 3 - six (6) months after the date of option exercise IAW 5.3.3 below."</p> <p>Question:</p> <p>Is it still the Governments intent to receive the final report within 7.5 months of contract award for the Base Period and Option 1? If so what is the intention of the Government for the remaining 1.5 months during the period of performance for the Base Period and Option 1 with regards to any additions to the final report?</p> <p>Is it the Governments intent to receive the final report within 5.5 months of contract award for Option 2 and 3? If so what is the intention of the Government for the remaining 1.5 months during the period of performance for Option 2 and Option 3?</p>	<p>The language in CDRL A012, Block 16(b), has been revised in accordance with R&D RFP, Amendment 0003.</p>	<p>8/26/2014</p>
18	<p>Reference R&D RFP Attachment 0011 Contract Data Requirements. CDRL A005 Manufacturing Steps and Assembly Processes states "The Contractor shall deliver the draft Scientific and Technical Report no later than four (4) months after the task order award date (base period) or date of option(s) exercise. The COR will review and provide comments within fifteen (15) calendar days of draft submittal. The Contractor shall deliver the final Manufacturing Steps and Assembly Process report no later than thirty (30) calendar days from receipt of draft report with comments. Any deviations from the final Manufacturing Steps and Assembly Process report which are utilized during prototype fabrication shall be submitted no later than five business days after completion of fabrication.</p> <p>(1) Is it the Governments intent that the draft Scientific and Technical Report be delivered almost right after the CDR which according to section 5.2.4 takes place 75 business days after the SOWM?</p> <p>(2) If so what is the intention of the Government so the contractor can reach the Performance Requirement of 95% accuracy stated in section 7.3 for the Manufacturing Steps and Process if the design only just went through the CDR which is an 80% solution a few days prior?</p>	<p>(1) Yes.</p> <p>(2) The Government cannot respond to questions regarding speculations or hypothetical situations.</p>	<p>8/27/2014</p>
19	<p>Reference R&D RFP Attachment 0011 Contract Data Requirements. CDRL A006 CAD Models and Blast Modeling Results states "The Contractor shall deliver detailed design CAD models to the COR not later than forty-five (45) days after the contract award".</p> <p>(1) Since the 20% design solution is to be presented at the PDR 40 business days after the SOWM, what does the Government envision to be a detailed design CAD model?</p> <p>(2) Additionally since it is not specified, is the intent to deliver the models within forty-five calendar days or business days?</p>	<p>(1) Reference Attachment 0010, Section 5.1.2, Department of Defense Standard Practice Technical Data Packages, MIL-STD-31000A, dated 13 March 2013.</p> <p>(2) CDRL A006, Block 16(b), has been revised via R&D RFP Amendment 0004 to state "forty-five (45) business days".</p>	<p>8/27/2014</p>
20	<p>Reference R&D RFP Attachment 0011 Contract Data Requirements. CDRL A010 Blast Modeling Results states "The Contractor shall deliver detailed design CAD models and M&S Models to the COR not later than forty-five (45) days after the contract award date or date of option exercise date"</p> <p>Since the 20% design solution is to be presented at the PDR 40 business days after the SOWM, what does the Government envision to be a detailed M&S model?</p> <p>Additionally since it is not specified, is the intent to deliver the models within forty-five calendar days or business days?</p>	<p>(1) Reference Attachment 0010, Section 5.1.2, Department of Defense Standard Practice Technical Data Packages, MIL-STD-31000A, dated 13 March 2013.</p> <p>(2) CDRL A010, Block 16(b), has been revised in R&D Amendment 0004 to state "forty-five (45) business days".</p>	<p>8/27/2014</p>
21	<p>1. Reference: Price Matrix (Attachment 2): The price matrix reflects a rate requirement for nine (9) calendar years.</p> <p>a. Please clarify if nine (9) years of rates are expected/required?</p> <p>b. RFP Pg. 7, Section B CLIN 001 states 1,824 from date of award, then under Deliveries or Performance states 2,922 (8 years) from date award, please clarify the intent of the longer period?</p> <p>c. For pricing purposes, will the Government please provide a start date for the IDIQ labor rate matrix?</p> <p>d. Reference: Task Order Request (Attachment 9): Section F, Deliveries or Performance: The period of performance for the task order is "Date of Award – Nine months after date of award". What start date should be used for the Attachment 0009 – Task Order Request: Blast Mitigation pricing?</p>	<p>1(a). Yes, offerors are required to fill out proposed rates in R&D Attachment 0002 for the nine calendar years provided (CY15-CY23).</p> <p>1(b). The 1,824 days from date of award represents the "ordering period" (5 year ordering period). The 2,922 days represents the "performance period" (8 year period of performance). In accordance with F.4.1, ACC-WRN anticipates that most task orders issued against the R&D contract suite will have up to a three-year performance period. A task order issued on the last day of the ordering period (1,824 days after award) may have a three-year period of performance.</p> <p>1(c). The anticipated start date for the IDIQ Labor Rate Matrix, Attachment 0002, is Calendar Year (CY) 2015.</p> <p>1(d). Reference Attachment 0009 (Task Order Request: Blast Mitigation), Page 1, Section A, Paragraph 6, "The award of this task order is anticipated to be made within 45 days of the award of the TS3 R&D MA IDIQ contracts."</p>	<p>8/19/2014</p>
22	<p>R&D Prime Proposal Summary File – Blast Mitigation (Attachment 0012), sheet entitled "Blast Mitigation Prime". The instructions direct "Do not manipulate any formulas within this tab."</p> <p>(1) The Government's format/formulas do not allow for the offeror to apply fringe benefits separately from overhead in accordance with offeror's disclosed accounting practices/system. Can the offeror insert rows to account for the addition of fringe benefits?</p> <p>(2) The base in column D for Overhead requires changes to bring the application of overhead in line with offeror's disclosed accounting practices/system. Can the offeror make these adjustments to the Government's formulas?</p> <p>(3) The Government's format/formulas apply G&A to costs that are not in accordance with offeror's disclosed accounting practices. Can the offeror change the formulas to make the Government's formula's comply with offeror's disclosed accounting practices/system.</p> <p>(4) This offeror applies Material Overhead to Subcontractor labor (in lieu of G&A). Can the offeror move the Subcontractor cost line above the Material Overhead line so that the application of indirect rates is in accordance with offeror's disclosed accounting practices/system?</p>	<p>(1) - (4) No, offerors shall not manipulate any formulas within R&D Attachment 0012. Reference R&D RFP Section L6.2.2 and the instructions within R&D Attachment 0012.</p>	<p>8/27/2014</p>
23	<p>R&D Prime Proposal Summary File – Blast Mitigation (Attachment 0012), sheet entitled "Blast Mitigation Sub Labor".</p> <p>The Government's format/formulas do not allow for the identification of multiple subcontractors. Can the offeror use Column A or column C to identify which subcontractor the labor category and rate applies to?</p>	<p>In R&D Attachment 0012, tab "Blast Mitigation Sub Labor" Offeror's proposing multiple subcontractors may use Column B (add name of Subcontractor in parenthesis) or may use Column A or Column C to identify multiple subcontractors provided that the labor classification/category is clear.</p>	<p>8/27/2014</p>
24	<p>Reference Attachment 0009 Task order Request and Attachment 0012, Prime Proposal Summary File: Attachment 0012 reflects Subcontractor Labor under the ODC classification; Attachment 0009 Section B requires Labor to be shown under CLIN xxxAA and ODCs to be shown under CLIN xxxAB.</p> <p>Does the Government wish to see Subcontracted Labor shown in CLIN xxxAB?</p>	<p>No. CLIN 0001AA should reflect the total labor amount including any subcontracted labor.</p>	<p>8/27/2014</p>

TACOM Strategic Service Solutions (TS3)
 Questions and Answers on FINAL W56HZV-14-R-0032
<https://contracting.tacom.army.mil/services/53/53.htm>

Question Number Final R&D RFP	Question/Comments	Answer/Response	Date Posted to Web
25	Section A.4.4, Evaluation of Proposals, states that the R&D MA IDIQ solicitation will be conducted on a Best Value basis using source selection trade off procedures IAW FAR 15.101 and FAR Subpart 15.3. Attachment 0009 – Task Order Request: Blast Mitigation, states that the proposal evaluation and discussion procedures in Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Subpart 15.3 ("Source Selection") do not apply to the evaluation process of this TOR. The Government will conduct evaluations using a best value tradeoff approach and will follow FAR 16.505 ("Ordering Procedures"). These two citations appear to conflict with each other. Can the Government please clarify?	Proposals submitted in response to the R&D RFP are subject to FAR 15.101 and FAR Subpart 15.3. Attachment 0009 - Task Order Request: Blast Mitigation language has been revised via R&D RFP Amendment 0007.	8/28/2014
26	(1) Can the Government please explain how Cost Reimbursable Contract Types are to be invoiced? Task Order pricing requires offerors to provide detailed cost and pricing data. (2) How does the Government intend to award the TO's, for example, total cost plus fee, labor hour and labor rates, etc.?	(1) Cost reimbursable contract types shall be invoiced in accordance with Section G.1, "Invoices". (2) The Government intends to award task orders in accordance with Section H.1.2, "Types of Orders".	8/19/2014
27	Section H.2.1.1 states that Danger Pay and Hardship Pay are authorized if the contractor is required to deploy personnel overseas. In locations where applicable, are Cost of Living and Living Quarter Allowances also authorized?	If Cost of Living and Living Quarter Allowances are applicable to future task order requirements, they will be specified within the Task Order Request (TOR).	8/19/2014
28	The RFP states in L.1.2 that margins are to be "no less than 1 inch (top, bottom, left, and right)." Does the Government require that offerors change the margins of proposal attachments to be one inch? For example, Attachments 0003 and 0004, as provided by the Government, have margins that are less than one inch, which are not in accordance with the paragraph L.1.2 requirements.	No, offerors do not need to change the RFP attachments margins.	8/27/2014
29	Page 30, G.2, Billing Under Cost-Plus Fixed Fee (CPFF) Task Orders. G.2.1.1 and G.2.1.2 state that contractors may only submit for payment of fixed fee when the level-of-effort has been expended for term task orders, or the end product has been completed and delivered under completion task orders, respectively. Please confirm that contractors may submit for payment of fixed fee on a provisional basis pursuant to FAR 52.216-8 -- Fixed Fee.	When a Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee task order is awarded FAR Clause 52.216-8 -- Fixed Fee, applies.	8/19/2014
30	Page 66, L.1.2, Proposal Content. Please confirm that the page count suggestions for Volumes II and III are recommendations and not hard maximums.	Page limits have been implemented and incorporated in Section L.1.2, via R&D RFP Amendment 0006.	8/27/2014
31	CDRL A006 states in the Remarks section, item (c): "Contractor shall deliver final designs, drawings and models to the COR no later than ten (10) business days after the contract completion date." Since the contract completion date is usually the last day of the period of performance, this requirement appears to allow contractor performance (delivery of contract deliverables) outside the period of performance on the contract. Can the Government clarify the intent of this requirement?	The intent of CDRL A006, Block 16(c), "...no later than ten (10) business days after the contract completion date" is to ensure that the Contractor has provided the Government the most complete design, drawings, etc., including any changes identified in designs and fabrication. The language in Block 16(c.) is correctly written.	8/27/2014
32	Per L.3.8 of the solicitation, the Government has indicated they want to verify through JPAS of current facility clearances. Facility clearances are not verified through JPAS – they are verified through another DoD database called ISFD – Industrial Security Facility Database. Can the offeror submit a screen shot from ISFD that validates the current facility clearance held?	It is the offerors responsibility to determine the type of documentation it chooses to provide to the Government as evidence that it possess a current active (TOP SECRET or SECRET) Facility Clearance (FCL). Please note that JPAS and ISFD are two separate systems under the Defense Information System for Security (DISS), DoD-wide system "umbrella". JPAS is the DoD system of record for recording clearance eligibility determinations and access to classified information. ISFD is a Defense Security Service (DSS) centralized web-based management information system for the Industrial Security Program.	8/19/2014
33	Minimum Quals for Level III Maximum Quals Column Per Attachment 2, Pricing Labor Matrix, would the Government please clarify if offerors should treat the years of experience and education defined for the "Level III Maximum" be interpreted as maximum qualifications for the Level III positions? Or, is the intent for offerors to provide an additional rate for highly qualified staff? If the latter, will the Government please update the Attachment 0002, Pricing Labor Matrix to allow for the inclusion of a "Level III Maximum" ceiling rate?	Reference R&D Q&A #15. Level III constitutes a range spanning the minimum levels of education and experience up to the described maximums. Attachment 0002 of the R&D RFP will be amended via Amendment 0003 to clarify this language.	8/19/2014
34	Experience Trade-off for Education Attachment 0012, Instruction 3 Per Attachment 0012, Instruction 3, the Government will consider a tradeoff for years of experience and education at the task order level. Can this tradeoff be made on the R&D Blast Mitigation STO? The instructions tab for the Task Order pricing in Attachment 12 appear to indicate that we are required to follow the contract labor categories along with their minimum qualifications. We would like to seek clarification if additional years of experience could be substituted for the education requirements. For example, could 4 years of additional experience be substituted for a Bachelor's Degree.	No, for the Blast Mitigation task order the Government will not allow for trade-off's or substitutions of experience and education. However, this may be allowable for future task orders under the R&D MA IDIQ contract suite. If allowable for future task orders, it will be identified in the Task Order Request.	8/27/2014
35	CLIN 0001 The narrative of CLIN 0001 indicates that the ordering period is 1,824 calendar days after contract award. In the "Deliveries or Performance" section of CLIN 0001, it is listed as 2,922 Days after award. Would the Government please clarify the ordering period?	The five year ordering period for the R&D MA IDIQ contracts, in accordance with CLIN 0001, is from the date of MA IDIQ contract award through 1,824 calendar days after contract award.	8/19/2014
36	Invoices Per G.1.2.1, the invoicing instructions state that Prime Contractors' invoices should include the names of the individuals that performed the work and their hourly rate. The Government's solicitation is not for individuals, but rather specific labor categories. Would the Government please update the instructions to, "Identify the Labor Category that performed the work?"	No, the Contractor is required to identify the individual(s) assigned to perform the tasks as well as the applicable hourly rate.	8/19/2014
37	Holidays Per H.10, are Contractor Site employees required to follow Federal Holiday Schedules, or can they perform billable services on those dates?	Unless otherwise authorized at the task order level, on-site contractor employees should not be performing billable hours during federal holidays listed in Section H.10. For SCA positions, reference the respective wage determinations for further guidance regarding paid Holidays. (Also reference H.10.3 and H.10.4.)	8/19/2014
38	Overtime Section H.2.1.5 states the Overtime must be approved in advance by the CO. Please confirm advanced CO approval is not required for salaried employees performing Cost Reimbursable task orders for which an overtime premium is not applicable.	Section H.2.1.5 has been revised via R&D RFP Amendment 0003 to state, "In order to be eligible for overtime premiums, overtime shall be explicitly authorized in advance by the contracting officer."	8/19/2014
39	Travel Approval H.2.2.3 states that travel expenses are subject to PCO approval. Section H.2.2, H.2.2.5 and H.2.2.1 state that the COR has the authority to approve travel. Please clarify if PCO approval is required for travel, if the COR approve those expenses on his or her own?	Both the COR and PCO have the authority to approve the necessity of the travel. The PCO has sole authority to determine the allowability of any resulting travel cost(s), in accordance with FAR 31.201-2 -- Determining Allowability.	8/19/2014

TACOM Strategic Service Solutions (TS3)
 Questions and Answers on FINAL W56HZV-14-R-0032
<https://contracting.tacom.army.mil/services/53/53.htm>

Question Number Final R&D RFP	Question/Comments	Answer/Response	Date Posted to Web
40	Font and Format a. The Government states that font size shall be no smaller than 10 point. Would the Government please confirm that 10 point Arial Narrow is compliant? b. Will the Government please confirm the font size requirement does not apply to tables and graphics as long as the font used is legible? c. Would the Government please confirm that Offerors can format Solicitation Attachments to ensure compliance and consistency?	a.) Yes. b.) Reference R&D RFP Amendment 0003. Section L.1.2 language has been revised to clarify the font size requirement. c.) Reference R&D Q&A #28. Offerors do not need to format the solicitation attachments to ensure compliance and consistency.	8/27/2014
41	Subcontracting Goals FAR clause 52.219-9 Alt II, as included in the solicitation, requires Offerors to submit a small business subcontracting plan that addresses dollar and percentage subcontracting goals for small businesses and each socio-economic category for the basic contract and each option year, collectively representing the subcontracting goals for the entire life of the contract. The evaluation factor in M.8.1.1 appears to be in conflict with this FAR clause as it requires our proposed goals for the Small Business Participation Plan and Small Business Subcontracting Plan to be based on the Sample Task Order. Goals based on the Sample Task Order value are not likely to be representative of the goals to be executed for the aggregate of the basic contract and each option year as required by the FAR clause. In addition, the Offeror's ability to meet each socio-economic goal at the Sample Task Order level may be impeded based on the limited scope and size of the STO PWS. (1) Would the Government please clarify if the intent of the solicitation is to incorporate our proposed Subcontracting Goals into the awarded overall IDIQ Contract based on the goals proposed at the Sample Task Order level? (2) If yes, would the Government please advise how an Offeror's proposal will be evaluated if we are unable to meet all of the socio-economic goals based on the limited scope and size of the Sample Task Order? (3) Would the Government please advise if the Offeror provides clarification between any discrepancies between the Sample Task Order price proposal, SB Participation Workbook, SB Participation Plan and SB Subcontracting Plan, would the plans be negatively evaluated?	(1) Yes. In accordance with R&D RFP Section L.7.1.8(a)(4), the subcontracting plan shall include goals expressed based on the percentage of the total subcontracting amount for the Blast Mitigation task order. In accordance with R&D RFP Section L.7.1.8(b)(4), the small business participation factor goals are to be expressed as a percentage of the total contract amount for the Blast Mitigation task order. If Government goals for future task orders change, subcontracting plans may be updated. (2) The Government will evaluate the Small Business Participation (SBP) Factor in accordance with Section M.8. (3) It is the responsibility of the offeror to submit a properly prepared proposal.	8/27/2014
42	Electronic Submission In Question 2 in the KBS Questions and Answer released 11 August, 2014, the Government specifies that submissions should be in Microsoft 2007 – Compatible Software. Would the Government allow Offerors to submit all proposal requirements, excluding spreadsheet attachments, in .pdf format? This will reduce the size of the files and reduce the chance of errors as documents transfer between computers with different versions of word processing software.	Yes, as stated in R&D RFP Section L.2.4(b).	8/27/2014
43	Facility Clearance Documentation (1) Per Section L.3.8, are all Subcontractors required to submit evidence that they possess a current, active (TS or Secret) Facility Clearance (FCL) or is the Prime the only company required to provide that documentation in Volume 1? (2) Will the evaluation of an Offeror's proposal be affected if a Subcontractor does not have an FCL?	(1) No, the Facility Clearance (FCL) requirement is only applicable to the prime offeror at the R&D MA IDIQ level. The prime offeror is the only one that needs to submit FCL evidence in accordance with Section L.3.8. (2) No, the evaluation of an offeror's proposal will not be affected if a subcontractor does not have an FCL for award of an R&D MA IDIQ contract. However, subcontractors may be required to have an FCL based on the requirements of a specific task order.	8/19/2014
44	Proposal Volume 1 Per Section L.3.9, please confirm that Offerors with DCAA -approved accounting systems can submit documentation proving certification in lieu of a DCAA Preaward Survey of Prospective Contractor Accounting System Checklist.	It is the offerors responsibility to determine the type of documentation it chooses to provide to the Government as evidence that it possess an adequate financial management and accounting system and fund tracking procedures. In addition to any evidence an offeror chooses to provide, offerors shall also complete and submit a Defense Audit Agency (DCAA) Preaward Survey of Prospective Contractor Accounting System Checklist.	8/19/2014
45	Subcontractor Labor Rates The instructions in Section L for the IDIQ Contract Ceiling rates and the Pricing Instructions for the Task Order appear to indicate that Subcontractors are only required to show their fully loaded labor rates regardless of contract type. Subcontractors would consider their direct and indirect rates as proprietary, therefore, they would not disclose that data to the Prime Contractor and the Prime Contractor would then have no way to disclose that information in our Prime proposal files. Please confirm that Subcontractors are not required to provide any further breakdown of their direct (salary) and indirect (G&A, OH, etc.) rates.	Correct, subcontractors are not required to provide any further breakdown of their direct and indirect rates.	8/27/2014
46	Cost Elements for Ceiling Rates Section L.6.1.1 indicates, "the offeror shall show complete development of the elements of the cost/price proposal." However, Attachment 2, Pricing Labor Matrix, does not require provision of the individual cost elements for the ceiling rates. Will the Government please clarify which portions of the proposal (Attachment 2, Pricing Matrix and/or Attachment 12, Sample Task Order) require offerors to show the complete development of the cost elements?	In accordance with Section L.6.1.1, "Sufficient detail shall be included to allow the Government to evaluate the offeror's cost/price proposal for Cost Realism at the task order level. For the Blast Mitigation task order, offerors propose using R&D Attachment 0012. In accordance with Section L.6.2.2, offerors shall provide supporting documentation on its "Offerors Format Spreadsheets" and in the "Roadmap" (Reference Section L.6.2.2.3) which reconciles the "Offeror's Format Spreadsheets" to Attachment 0012.	8/27/2014
47	Experience Factor Adjectival Rating The Government states in its response to Question #6, "The Government will evaluate each of the considerations in Section L.4.1.2 to establish an adjectival Experience rating for each offeror." Would the Government please describe the adjectival Experience ratings and define how each offeror will be evaluated against the ratings?	The adjectival Experience ratings are derived from the DoD and Army Source Selection Guide. The Government will evaluate all offerors in accordance with Section M - Evaluation Factors For Award.	8/27/2014
48	R&D Attachment 12 Template In Section L, Attachment 12 TOR Proposal Summary File for Blast Mitigation, The "Blast Mitigation Prime Tab" does not include a place to enter the Fee on Subs. This fee is not a part of the "Total dollar value for any potential subcontractor labor effort will be pulled (by formula) from the "Blast Mitigation Sub Labor" tab onto the Subcontractor line under ODCs." Since the Attachment Instructions also state "do not manipulate any of the other cells except for those that are highlighted in yellow" please advise on the preferred approach to ensuring accurate disclosure of Fee on Subs on "Blast Mitigation Prime Labor" Tab.	Offeror's should include fee on their subcontractors (ODC's) with their "Prime Offeror's Fee (Line 98) and should explain in their cost narrative how the "Prime Offeror's Fee" is allocated.	8/27/2014
49	Attachment 0003 - The R&D Attachment 0003 is a PDF. Can the offeror convert to a Microsoft Word document like the KBS and ERS files?	Reference R&D Q&A #2. Attachment 0003 - R&D Experience Matrix/Narrative has been provided as a Microsoft Word file on the ACC - Warren Procurement Network (ACC-WRN ProcNet)	8/19/2014

TACOM Strategic Service Solutions (TS3)
 Questions and Answers on FINAL W56HZV-14-R-0032
<https://contracting.tacom.army.mil/services/53/53.htm>

Question Number Final R&D RFP	Question/Comments	Answer/Response	Date Posted to Web
50	In L.1.10, it states "All Offerors, including joint ventures (JVs), shall be limited to one proposal." (1) Is this limitation based on the offeror submission as a prime contractor? (2) Is there any limitation of cross teaming?	(1) Section L.1.10 means that each JV may submit only one proposal (Reference Section L.4., "Due to affiliation, all members of a joint venture are considered to be a single prime offeror.") (2) No, there is no limitation on cross teaming.	8/27/2014
51	In section L.3.3, you request "An Affirmative Statement that all the offeror proposes to meet all requirements of Section C, or through the use of subcontractors." Is the government looking for any additional substantiation on how the offeror will meet the requirements for this requirement?	No, the Government is only looking for an Affirmative Statement for Volume I - Proposal Terms & Conditions.	8/27/2014
52	R&D RFP Volume III Technical Factor, Attachment 0010, Part 7, Technical Exhibit / Attachment Listing. Question: The Government proposes metrics (expressed as percentages) for accuracy and completeness of deliverables to include CAD and Modeling & Simulation (M&S) products, final reports (see CDRLS 6, 7, 10). Can the Government identify the basis (i.e., published military or commercial standards) for these metrics?	The stated metrics satisfy the Government's requirements.	8/27/2014
53	R&D RFP Attachment 0010 Section 5.1.1.1 (Concept CAD Models) states: "The contractor shall research flooring concepts to identify and develop the most efficient and effective solution compatible with the TARDEC GSS Flooring Evaluation Fixture provided by the Government at the SOWM. The contractor shall research underbody design concepts to identify, mature, and develop the TARDEC provided concepts into the most efficient and effective solution compatible with the TARDEC GSS Underbody Evaluation Fixture provided by the Government at the SOWM." Question: The TARDEC GSS Flooring Evaluation Fixture and TARDEC GSS Underbody Evaluation Fixture are not included in Section 3 under Government Furnished Items and Services. It is assumed these will be provided as part of the GFI. However, there is no specification as to how these will be provided as either Level II TDP drawings, 3D CAD models, M&S models, physical fixture, etc. Will the Government please clarify that these will be GFI and in what format they will be provided, as the format will affect scheduling and cost?	The TARDEC GSS Flooring Evaluation Fixture and TARDEC GSS Underbody Evaluation Fixture will be provided as GFI. Fixtures will be provided as 3D CAD models, as either a STEP file or in a common file format	8/27/2014
54	R&D RFP Attachment 0010 Section 3.5 (Materials/Information). Question: Will the Government also provide information relating to design requirements and constraints for both the flooring and underbody concepts at the SOWM to include items such as weight, cost, space claim, etc.?	Not for the Blast Mitigation task order.	8/27/2014
55	R&D RFP Attachment 0010 Section 1.2 Background states: "The blast impulse parameters will be provided by TARDEC GSS at the Start of Work Meeting (SOWM) (see 5.2.1 below)." Question: Will the blast input parameters include charge size, type, depth of burial, soil type, soil properties, etc.?	The blast input parameters will be provided at the Start of Work Meeting (SOWM).	8/27/2014
56	R&D RFP Attachment 0010 Section 5.3.2.1.1 states: "Unless otherwise specified by the COR and bilaterally modified into the task order, the contractor shall fabricate the prototypes using A36 Mild Steel with the exception of the underbody hull and structure which shall be fabricated of 5083 Aluminum." (1) Is it the intent of the Government to disallow the use any other material during the fabrication process other than A36 Mild Steel and 5083 Aluminum? This would indicate that the Government may be unnecessarily limiting the design and material selection. Additionally, Section 5.1.1.1 CAD Models states: "both models shall be based on readily available (with lead times not to exceed two weeks from the time the materials are ordered) and reasonably priced materials." which does not specify the requirement for A36 Mild Steel and 5083 Aluminum. (2) Will the Government please clarify the discrepancy? Will the COR be able to approve the use of other materials during the design phase?	(1) The A36 Mild Steel and 5083 Aluminum were chosen so that the design could be tested independent of material. Material may or may not be able to be changed if the design makes it to production, but for comparison purposes, the A36 Mild Steel and 5083 Aluminum will be kept constant. (2) The language in the Blast Mitigation PWS, Section 5.1.1.1 has been revised via Amendment 0007.	8/28/2014
57	R&D RFP Attachment 0010 Section 5.1.1.1 CAD Models states: "both models shall be based on readily available (with lead times not to exceed two weeks from the time the materials are ordered) and reasonably priced materials." Question: Will the COR approve materials with lead times in excess of 2 weeks if the design calls for it?	The Government cannot respond to speculation or hypothetical situations.	8/26/2014
58	R&D RFP Volume III Technical Factor, Attachment 0010, Section 1.5 (Period of Performance). (1) Will the Options be exercised sequentially or could Option 1 and Option 2 be exercised at the same time? (2) Will the options' periods of performance be additive to the base period and each other?	(1) and (2): The Government cannot respond to speculation or hypothetical situations.	8/26/2014
59	R&D RFP Volume III Technical Factor, Attachment 0010, Section 5.3.2.3.2. (1) For costing purposes what destination should be assumed for FOB Destination? (2) Does the contractor pay for shipping the concepts to a specific address if the fabrication options are exercised? (3) Two concepts are shipped to Michigan, while four will be shipped to an alternate destination address?	(1) In accordance with Section 5.3.2.3.2, the destination location will be provided at the time of Option exercise. For proposal purposes, offerors should use Carson City, NV to estimate shipping costs. (2) Yes. (3) Section 5.3.2.3.2 states that two floor assets shall be shipped to a location to be provided at the time of option exercise (Note: As stated above for proposal purposes, offerors shall use Carson City, NV as the shipping destination to estimate shipping costs). Section 5.3.2.3.2 also states that one of the three flooring concept assets shall be shipped to TARDEC in Warren, MI.	8/28/2014
60	R&D RFP Volume III Technical Factor, Attachment 0010, Section 5.2.2. (1) Is there an estimated length of time that should be assumed for executing the weekly meetings? (2) Is it the Governments intent that CAD and M&S products be viewed during these meetings? (3) Will the Government provide a secure link with sufficient bandwidth /speed for viewing modeling?	(1) It is the offerors responsibility to determine the length of time for weekly meetings in their proposal. (2) CAD and M&S products may be viewed during the meetings, if necessary. (3) The Government can provide a Defense Connect Online (DCO) link, when appropriate.	8/27/2014

TACOM Strategic Service Solutions (TS3)
 Questions and Answers on FINAL W56HZV-14-R-0032
<https://contracting.tacom.army.mil/services/53/53.htm>

Question Number Final R&D RFP	Question/Comments	Answer/Response	Date Posted to Web
61	R&D RFP, Attachment 0012 R&D Prime Proposal Summary File-Blast Mitigation. Question: For costing purposes, should the assumption be made that the options will take place sequentially (for cost escalation) or should all options be costed in base year dollars?	The Government cannot respond to assumptions or hypothetical situations.	8/27/2014
62	R&D RFP Section L.3.2. Question: Are all pages of Sections A-K required to be submitted or only those with fill-in requirements?	All pages of the R&D solicitation (Sections A-K) are to be submitted with all clauses and fill-ins completed.	8/27/2014
63	R&D RFP Section L.3.8. Question: Is submittal of our facility's SMO code sufficient evidence that we possess a current active FCL?	It is the offerors responsibility to determine the type of documentation it chooses to provide to the Government as evidence that it possess a current active (TOP SECRET or SECRET) Facility Clearance (FCL).	8/19/2014
64	R&D RFP Section L.6.2.1.1. Question: Are cost build-ups required to support the fully loaded labor rates being proposed?	No, cost build-ups are not required to support the fully loaded labor rates being proposed for the R&D Pricing Labor Matrix, Attachment 0002.	8/27/2014
65	R&D RFP Attachment 0002, R&D Pricing Labor Matrix (With Labor Descriptions / Minimum Qualifications): Can labor categories other than those listed in the Labor Matrix be proposed?	No.	8/27/2014
66	R&D RFP Attachment 0002, R&D Pricing Labor Matrix (With Labor Descriptions / Minimum Qualifications). Question: Are proposed rates required for each listed labor category identified in the Labor Matrix?	Yes, proposed rates are required in all yellow highlighted cells within R&D Attachment 0002.	8/19/2014
67	Section H.2.1.4 states "The contractor's R&D Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002) proposed in response to the IDIQ solicitation sets forth the labor categories and associated maximum labor rates the Government will reimburse for any given performance period. Offerors are advised that the proposed labor rates to successfully perform any task order issued hereunder should reflect the most competitive price. At the task order level, should the applicable Wage Determination rate(s) increase during task order performance, the Contracting Officer can make adjustments in accordance with FAR 52.222-43, "Fair Labor Standards Act and Service Contract Labor Standards -- Price Adjustment (Multiple Year and Option Contracts)." And Section H.21 states "All fully loaded labor rates (including profit/fee) shown on the R&D Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002) will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates for all contract types. The ceiling rates are for regular (non-overtime) CONUS labor and are subject to downward negotiation only. Ceiling prices will apply, unless an applicable Wage Determination increases beyond the ceiling; see H.2.1.4. The contractor shall account for all conceivable contingencies when developing its ceiling rates for each labor category listed in Attachment 0002." Question: The last sentence states that all conceivable contingencies should be accounted for when developing ceiling rates. Please confirm that the Contractor should not account for possible increases in wage	If rate adjustments are necessary, the adjustments will be made at the task order level and in accordance with FAR Clause 52.222-43.	8/27/2014
68	Section H.5 states that the Government may conduct an Open Season approximately 2.5 years into the R&D MA IDIQ performance period and H.5.3 states "Existing R&D MA IDIQ contractors may also participate in Open Season in order to make downward cost/price adjustments." (1): Since Prime Contractor pricing for the R&D MA IDIQ provides ceiling rates that must account for all possible contingencies and these rates are discounted at the Task Order level to account for actual requirements, what would be the purpose and benefit to the Government/Contractor to participate in Open Season to make downward cost/price adjustments? (2): Would the Government consider letting Prime Contractors make upward cost/price adjustments during any Open Season period in the event they need to adjust for contingencies that are precluding the Contractor from participating but for which they were unable to account during preparation of their original submission?	1.) This is a matter for an offeror to decide. 2.) No.	8/27/2014
69	Section L.4.1 A states: "...contract shall be defined as: (a) single Government or Commercial contract; or, (b) a single task order placed under a single award or multiple-award IDIQ task order contract..." Our interpretation is that by this definition, an Omnibus contract on its own does not qualify as a single contract. Is this interpretation correct?	Yes.	8/19/2014
70	Section L.4.1.2.1 defines a relevant contract, in part, as: "Services contracts performed either as the prime contractor team arrangements (CTAs) with at least three other organizations not including the prime contractor, or services contracts performed as the prime contractor that involved the award of subcontracts to at least three other organizations." (1) If an offeror is a prime contractor on an Omnibus contract with more than three subcontractors where the three subcontractors do not work collectively on any single task order but rather on several different task orders, does this qualify under the definition provided? (2) Or, is it the Government's intent that in order to qualify under the definition an offeror must have worked as a prime contractor together with three or more subcontractors on the same task order?	The Government cannot comment on a prospective offeror's qualifications. The Government cannot respond to hypothetical scenarios.	8/19/2014
71	FAR 52.219-9, when incorporated, states that a small business offeror must ensure that "at least 50% of the cost incurred for personnel shall be expended by employees of the concern." (1) Does this calculation and guarantee apply to each individual task order or is it an overall contract calculation? In other words, can a SB offeror incur 40% of the personnel costs on one task order and 70% on another, thereby achieving the required minimum 50%?	Please note that the correct FAR clause reference is FAR 52.219-14(c)(1) (1) FAR Clause 52.219-14 applies to the individual task order. Reference 52.219-14(b).	8/28/2014
72	Is a Small Business offeror permitted to propose in excess of 50% of the personnel costs on a given services task order to personnel of a teammate if that teammate is also a small business concern and still be compliant with the requirements in this solicitation?	The Blast Mitigation task order is not a SBSAs, so FAR 52.219-14, "Limitations on Subcontracting", does not apply. The Government cannot speculate about the specific requirements for future task orders.	8/27/2014
73	Section L.6.2.1.2 states that the offeror shall ensure that the rates proposed for all of the labor categories subject to the SCA comply with the minimums specified by the applicable DOL WD. There are no WDs provided as part of the solicitation. Request the Government to provide applicable WDs.	Reference R&D RFP Section H.18. Offerors shall consult the Department of Labor (DOL) website: https://www.dol.gov for specific wage determinations as appropriate.	8/19/2014
74	Section H.19 states that the contractor shall ensure that the base rates proposed for personnel subject to the DBA, meet or exceed the corresponding minimum wages established by the DOL for the corresponding region. For TOs that include Davis Bacon Act (DBA) labor, pricing for selected labor categories will vary based on the applicable DBA for the TO place of performance. Request the Government to confirm that increases to the Contract Ceiling Rates are allowable at the TO-level based on the applicable DBA for the TO place of performance.	If rate adjustments are necessary, the adjustments will be made at the task order level and in accordance with FAR Clause 52.222-43.	8/27/2014
75	The RFP References define the Contract Ceiling Rates for the MA IDIQ Pricing Labor Matrix; citing applicability to (1) all contract types, (2) labor that is performed by the prime or subcontractors, and (3) Service Contract Act (SCA) compliance. For TOs that include SCA labor, pricing will vary by place of performance in accordance with (IAW) the applicable Department of Labor (DOL) Wage Determination. Request the Government mandate that all offerors are pricing to the same requirement in developing their SCA Contract Ceiling Rates by issuing a specific DOL Wage Determination with the RFP for proposal evaluation purposes.	The R&D RFP will not be revised and the Government will not be issuing a specific DOL Wage Determination for the R&D RFP.	8/27/2014
76	The RFP References define the Contract Ceiling Rates for the MA IDIQ Pricing Labor Matrix; citing applicability to (1) all contract types, (2) labor that is performed by the prime or subcontractors, and (3) SCA compliance. For TOs that include Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) labor, pricing for selected labor categories will necessarily vary based on the applicable CBA for the TO place of performance.	If rate adjustments are necessary, the adjustments will be made at the task order level and in accordance with FAR Clause 52.222-43.	8/27/2014

TACOM Strategic Service Solutions (TS3)
 Questions and Answers on FINAL W56HZV-14-R-0032
<https://contracting.tacom.army.mil/services/53/53.htm>

Question Number Final R&D RFP	Question/Comments	Answer/Response	Date Posted to Web
77	SCA and DBA wage and fringe benefit (i.e., Health and Welfare) rates are revised annually by the DOL Request the Government confirm that annual adjustments to SCA, DBA and CBA wage and H&W rates will be allowable and incorporated into the Contract Ceiling Rates to ensure contractor compliance with future changes to these statutory requirements.	If rate adjustments are necessary, the adjustments will be made at the task order level and in accordance with FAR Clause 52.222-43.	8/27/2014
78	Paragraph L.1.2 states that an index/Table of Contents shall be provided with each volume. Does this index/Table of Contents (as well as a cover and any blank pages) count toward the volume "Page Suggestion" numbers specified later in the paragraph?	The table of contents is not subject to page limits.	8/27/2014
79	If, as specified in paragraph L.1.2, larger paper (e.g., 11x17-inch) is used to accommodate some drawings/graphics foldouts, does the larger paper still count as one page?	Yes, the 11 x 17 size paper counts as one page. However, offerors may not utilize paper that is larger than 11 x 17.	8/27/2014
80	Attachment 0012 – R&D Prime Proposal Summary File – Blast Mitigation file provides estimated values for the material costs of flooring and underbody concepts, but does not include comparable estimated shipment costs of the fabricated prototypes in this attachment. Considering some destination locations are indicated" ... to be provided at time of option exercise." In the PWS, can the Government provide a location assumption to level related pricing estimates for prototype fabrication shipments?	Reference response to R&D Q&A #59. Offerors shall use Carson City, NV in order to estimate shipment pricing.	8/28/2014
81	For pricing purposes only, what is the anticipated date of award of the IDIQ contract and Task Order?	The anticipated date of award of the R&D MA IDIQ contracts is Calendar Year 2015. Reference R&D Q&A #11. The Blast Mitigation Task Order is anticipated to be awarded within 45 days of the award of the R&D MA IDIQ contracts.	8/19/2014
82	Reference H.2.1.4.1.2: "If a Task Order Request directs contractors to propose the labor mix to achieve the requirements of the Government, the contractor shall utilize its R&D Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002) and corresponding ceiling labor rates to propose labor categories to accomplish the tasks." Reference Attachment 0009, Section L.4 Volume IV: ".....The offeror shall only submit one Cost/Price Volume, which will be used by the Government for both the MA IDIQ level and task order level evaluations." (1): As the pricing provided in Attachment 0002 establishes the ceiling rates, it is anticipated that the labor rates at the IDIQ level may differ from the rates proposed at the task order level. As the IDIQ establishes maximum rates, task order rates may be discounted (with supporting information). Is this acceptable? (2a): If yes, is the intent for the Offeror to provide supporting cost information for both the ceiling rates and the task order rates? It appears the solicitation requests supporting information for the task order level only. For example, Section L.6.1.1 states "...Cost Realism at the Task Order Level", and Section L.6.1.3 states "...Supporting information in Excel may be provided as a separate file or as added tabs to the R&D Prime	(1) Yes. (2a) Supporting cost information is only required for the task order. (2b) Supporting documentation is not required for Attachment 0002.	8/27/2014
83	Reference L.6.2.1.1: "...In cases where subcontracted labor is used, ceiling rates include the subcontractor rate plus all applicable prime contractor indirect rates plus applicable prime profit or fee." (1): As labor categories may be used by both the Prime Offeror and Subcontractor (depending on the requirements of the Task Order) and subcontracting requirements are unknown at the MA IDIQ level, is it acceptable for the prime to solely establish the ceiling rates at the IDIQ level and have the subcontractor provide pricing at the task order level (as applicable) so long as the total fully burdened subcontractor rate proposed (inclusive of Prime burdens/fee) at the task order level does not exceed the ceiling rate established by the Prime Offeror? (2): Do subcontractors need to be identified at the MA IDIQ level to be considered at the Task Order level? Or, can they be identified at the Task Order level (as applicable)?	(1) Yes. (2) No, Subcontractors can be identified at the task order level.	8/27/2014
84	Reference Section L.6.2.2.1.3 – (1) are unsanitized proposals required from subcontractors at the task order level? (2) Or is the Prime Offeror's evaluation of the subcontractor's pricing IAW L.6.2.2.1.3 (b) sufficient to justify the fully burdened rates proposed by the subcontractor?	(1) No. (2) Yes.	8/27/2014
85	Reference Section A, paragraph (f) – " Any award issued as a result of this solicitation will be distributed electronically. Awards and modifications posted on ProcNet represent complete OFFICIAL copies of contract awards and will include the awarded unit price. This is the notice required by Executive Order 12600 (June 23, 1987) of our intention to release unit prices in response to any request under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 USC 552. Unit price is defined as the contract price per unit or item purchased as it appears in Section B of the contract and is NOT referring to nor does it include Cost or Pricing data/information. If you object to such release in the base contract or contract modifications, and you intend to submit an offer, notify the contracting officer in writing prior to the closing date identified in this solicitation and include the rationale for your objection consistent with the provisions of FOIA. A release determination will be made based on rationale given. Please confirm unit price definition is per CLIN item number and not labor rates.	"Unit price" means any price(s) listed in Section B (Supplies or Services and Prices/Costs).	8/19/2014
86	General Question #1 - In light of the fact that many prospective offerors are interested in bidding on all three in the FoC, -30, -31, and -32, a less than 35 day period to respond to the Final RFPs presents an undue burden on those offerors. Respectfully request the Contracting Office extend the response period for all three in the FoC a period of 10 days to Saturday, 13 September	Army Contracting Command - Warren will not be extending the proposal closing date. Reference R&D RFP Amendment 0006, Section L.1.3. Offerors proposals shall be received no later than 12:00 PM Eastern Standard Time on Wednesday, 10 September 2014.	8/19/2014 REVISED 8/27/2014
87	L.1.2 Proposal Content Question: Can the header and footer font sizes be less than 10 point font?	Header and Footer font sizes shall be in accordance with the 10 point font listed in Section L.1.2.	8/27/2014
88	Can the font within the artwork used on graphics be less than the specified 10 point font if it is still readable?	Reference R&D Q&A #40. Via R&D RFP Amendment 0003, Section L.1.2 language has been revised to clarify the font size requirement for graphic presentations.	8/27/2014
89	Does an 11 x 17 page count as two pages or as one?	Reference R&D Q&A #79. The 11 x 17 size paper counts as one page.	8/27/2014
90	Volume III Technical Factor is page limited to 20 pages. If we wanted to include a Work Breakdown Structure (WBS) and a program schedule can these be included as an appendix to Volume III and referenced in our response? To get them to fit within the page limit will render them unreadable.	The offeror shall submit its proposal within the page limits designated within R&D RFP Section L.1.2, via Amendment 0006. The offeror shall also note the instructions regarding font size within this same paragraph.	8/27/2014
91	L.4.1 "A total of two or more contracts for each area identified in..." Is this to be interpreted as two relevant experience examples can be provided for each referenced paragraph resulting with potentially up to 8 relevant examples?	Yes.	8/27/2014
92	L.4.1.2 Relevant Contracts (2nd paragraph) "offeror shall provide supporting documentation to establish that he performed the work himself." This volume is limited to 25 pages; short of providing copies of the deliverables (CDRLs, drawings, analysis, etc.) it will be difficult to provide supporting documentation to satisfy the evaluation team without exceeding the page limit. What is considered acceptable proof?	Reference R&D RFP, Amendment 0006. R&D RFP Section L.1.2 has been revised to state "Page Limits". However, it is the offerors responsibility to determine the type of supporting documentation it chooses to provide to the Government in order to establish that he/she performed the work himself/herself in order for the experience to be considered relevant.	8/27/2014
93	M.8.1.1/8.1.2 Small Business Assessment (1) Is the intent of the evaluation criteria to meet all the small business goals with this one task order? (2) As a small business we can perform all the task work as the prime and propose 100% small business for this task; or we could sub some limited activities out to other socio-economic small businesses. How is this requirement/goals going to be weighted in the evaluation?	The Government's goals apply to the TO. The Government cannot comment on hypothetical scenarios. The relative importance of the evaluation factors is located in R&D RFP Section M.4.3.	8/27/2014
94	W56HZV-14-R-0032 RFP attachment 10 RD PWS paragraph 5.1.1.1 Is it possible to obtain more information on the TARDEC GSS Flooring Fixture to get a better understanding of the complexity of the fixture, potential complexity of the government furnished concepts, etc.?	No, the Government will not be providing more information on the TARDEC GSS Flooring Fixture.	8/27/2014

TACOM Strategic Service Solutions (TS3)
 Questions and Answers on FINAL W56HZV-14-R-0032
<https://contracting.tacom.army.mil/services/53/53.htm>

Question Number Final R&D RFP	Question/Comments	Answer/Response	Date Posted to Web
95	Relative to Attachment 0002: In the instructions for Attachment 0002, can the government spell out the Education/Experience equivalency? It appears to be a standard across all SOC categories, but it is not separately stated. For example it appears as though: BS degree (in specialized field) = BS degree (not in specialized field) + 2 years of experience MS degree = BS degree + 6 years or + 8 years if degree not in specialized field PhD degree = BS degree + 12 years or + 10 years if degree not in specialized field Would the following be true? PhD degree = MS + 6 years	No.	8/27/2014
96	Relative to Attachment 0002: (1) Is it true that personnel without a minimum of a bachelor's degree cannot be mapped to any of the SOC job categories regardless of the number of years of experience in that specialized field, they can only be mapped to SCA job categories? (2) The only exception to this rule are the "First-line supervisor" job categories?	(1) Yes. (2) Yes.	8/27/2014
97	Relative to Attachment 0002: We are not clear on how to use the Level 3 Maximum category descriptions when determining pricing since there are no entries under the Price Matrix worksheet for that category. Will the attachment be revised to capture this additional category?	Reference R&D RFP Amendment 0003 which provided clarification to Attachment 0002.	8/27/2014
98	Page 70, Paragraph L.3 Volume I - Proposal Terms and Conditions Question: While we understand that the Government is evaluating the Prime Contractor, the truth is that we have assembled a team for this effort, and will be proposing selected teammates in Volume III as part of our Task Order proposal. Would the Government consider adding a three page Executive Summary to Volume I allowing us to introduce our Team?	The Government will not be adding an Executive Summary requirement within Section L.3. It is the offeror's responsibility to determine how it chooses to submit its proposal.	8/27/2014
99	Page 70, Paragraph L.3.1 Question: L.3.1 states: "An electronic cover letter (letter of transmittal) which shall identify all enclosures being transmitted in the message." Does the "message" referred to mean the proposal upload? Does "all enclosures" this mean all enclosures in Volume I?	"Message" refers to the proposal uploaded for Volume I. "All enclosures" refers to the content offerors are to provide within Volume I.	8/27/2014
100	Page 71, Paragraph L.3.8 Question: Reference states that, "Because offerors and subcontractor(s) may handle or access classified information, all are required to . submit evidence that it possess a current active (TOP SECRET or SECRET) Facility Clearance (FCL) that can be verified by the Government." Does this mean all subcontractors we have entered teaming agreements with to date? Does it mean any subcontractors that we propose in the Task Order? Does it mean just the Offeror?	Reference R&D Q&A #43. The Facility Clearance (FCL) requirement applies only to the prime offeror.	8/19/2014
101	Page 70, Paragraph L.6.2.1.1 Question: Reference states "the labor rates proposed will become the ceiling rates for all future task orders". Will we be allowed to discount rates from these ceiling rates for the current task order and all future task orders?	Yes.	8/27/2014
102	Attachment 9 Task Order Question (1): Should we anticipate/budget for any travel related to the current task order? Question (2): The "Blast Mitigation Sub Labor" tab on Attachment 12 is broken down by PoP (two 9 month and two 6 month periods); however, the instructions on pg. 71 of the "TS3 R&D RFD" pdf (L.6.2.2.1.3a) ask for a quarterly time-phased breakout of the subcontract costs'. Please advise if the quarterly breakdown is necessary. Question (3): Is it safe to assume that the PoP for the current task order will begin on 1-Jan-2015?	(1) No. (2) Yes. (3) Reference R&D RFP Q&As #11, #21 and #81. The award of the Blast Mitigation task order is anticipated to be made within 45 days of the award of the TS3 R&D MA IDIQ contracts.	8/27/2014
103	Can the government change the NAICS code for Research Based Services from 541712 to 541330? The latter seems to be a better fit for based on the PWS.	No, the Government will not be changing the NAICS code for the Research and Development (R&D) RFP. NAICS Code 541712 is the appropriate code based on the preponderance of the work anticipated under the R&D RFP.	8/28/2014
104	Reference: S.1.1.1 R&D RFP Attachment 0010: "compatible with the TARDEC GSS Flooring Evaluation Fixture provided by the Government at the SOWM." and "compatible with the TARDEC GSS Underbody Evaluation Fixture provided by the Government at the SOWM." Question: Can the Government provide and expected weight and/or size for the fixtures as this may affect the cost estimates?	No, no until the Start of Work meeting (SOWM).	8/28/2014
105	Attachment 0012. The Government's pricing template is arranged to allow for a single rate per contract year. When the contract year crosses over the calendar rate years, what rate would the Government like to see for the contract period. For example, Option Year 1 is partially in Calendar year 2015 and partially in Calendar year 2016. To properly show the rates for comparison to the ceiling rates, two rate and hour columns would be required for Option year 1.	R&D Attachment 0012 should reflect a composite rate if the calendar year and the offeror's fiscal year do not coincide. The Offerors Format Spreadsheets (Reference Section L.6.2.2.1) shall show the rates time phased by quarter and cross-walk those rates into R&D Attachment 0012 through the Roadmap (Reference Section L.6.2.2.3).	8/28/2014
106	I request a two week extension on submitting the TS3 R&D proposals.	The R&D RFP closing date was extended to no later than 12:00 PM Eastern Standard Time on Wednesday, 10 September 2014, via R&D RFP Amendment 0006.	8/28/2014
107	Both the Small Business Subcontracting Plan and the Small Business Participation Factor use the R&D Prime Proposal Summary File Blast Mitigation (Attachment 0012) file to determine the Total Contract Amount. Since the Summary File Blast Mitigation sample task order represents such a small value in comparison to the expected contract value, and will likely not cover all of the small business classifications, is it the Government's intention that the Small Business Subcontracting Plan and the Small Business Participation Factor be based on just the sample task order rather than on the total expected contract value?	Yes.	8/28/2014
108	After reading Section H "Conflict of Interest" of the R&D RFP: (1) Does serving as a sub-contractor for a prime on the R&D contract suite preclude us from bidding on/accepting production contracts from the government for that item? (2) Does it preclude us from subcontracting with a vehicle OEM to supply that item?	(1) and (2) It depends upon the role your company played in performing under that prime contract as to whether or not a Conflict of Interest exists. Please note, in accordance with R&D RFP Section H.16.3, offerors shall review and compare its existing contracts to the circumstances identified in H.16.3, and notify the PCO of any potential or actual OCIs before the closing date of this solicitation.	8/28/2014
109	Can you please explain the numbering system of the Q&A response of 19 August? Numbers are in random order and go from 21 to 100. Since the last Q&A release was for questions #1 – 15, this is puzzling.	Reference language provided on the R&D RFP PROCNET webpage, which states, "The Q&As released below are not in sequential order. Please pay attention to the last column titled, "Date Posted to Web", as this will be revised and expanded upon with each Q&A version released."	8/28/2014

TACOM Strategic Service Solutions (TS3)
 Questions and Answers on FINAL W56HZV-14-R-0032
<https://contracting.tacom.army.mil/services/53/53.htm>

Question Number Final R&D RFP	Question/Comments	Answer/Response	Date Posted to Web
110	<p>Is it correct to assume that the Q&A period for each of the solicitations is closed and that the government will be responding to no further questions? And that the government has responded to all questions delivered prior to the close date of 12 August?</p> <p>Regardless, a notice(s) should be posted on the website indicating</p> <p>a. That questions can still be submitted or</p> <p>b. No further questions will be accepted and</p> <p>c. That all questions received have been answered or</p> <p>d. Further answers are still pending against the original questions</p>	<p>All questions/comments submitted regarding the final R&D RFP were to be submitted no later than 5:00 PM Eastern Standard Time (EST) on Tuesday, 12 August 2014. The Government will respond to all questions submitted by the 12 August 2014 date before the R&D RFP closes. Any questions submitted after that date will be answered by the Government but may not be answered before the R&D RFP closes.</p>	8/27/2014
111	<p>Does the Government have a preferred naming scheme for the uploaded proposal files to the ASFI BRS site?</p>	<p>Each electronic file shall be labeled as follows so it is easily identifiable for evaluation purposes:</p> <p>"[Your Company Name]-V[X]-F[X]of[X]-[Solicitation Number]"</p> <p>As an example:</p> <p>"CompanyName-V1-F1of1-W56HZV14R0032.xls"</p> <p>Note: A maximum of 40 characters is allowed for filenames (https://acquisition.army.mil/asfi/BRS_guide.do). Special characters, to include semi-colons, are not permitted. Abbreviations are allowed, if necessary.</p>	<p>8/28/2014 REVISED 9/5/2014 REVISED 9/8/2014</p>
112	<p>We would like to officially request a proposal due date response extension due to the recent flooding our office has suffered that has had a negative effect on our computer hardware and facility work location in recent weeks. We appreciate your positive response to the unforeseen hardship that nature has caused to our facility.</p>	<p>The RFP closing date and time will remain unchanged.</p>	8/29/2014
113	<p>I would like to request an extension for TS-3 KBS, ERS, and R&D. Due to the flooding in Michigan, we have experienced some technical difficulties with our servers, and would like to have additional time to finish our responses. Please let me know if this is possible.</p>	<p>The RFP closing date and time will remain unchanged.</p>	8/29/2014
114	<p>QA #59 states that the contractor pays for shipping the concepts to Carson City, NV. The Government's Attachment 0012 does not specify a location to price the shipping costs; and QA # 22 does not allow the contractor to manipulate the Government's Attachment 0012 pricing template. Where would the Government like the contractor to put the addition of the shipping costs?</p>	<p>If the Offeror does not account for shipping costs in an overhead account, it shall enter in the shipping costs on R&D Attachment 0012, under the "Blast Mitigation Sub Labor" tab. Offeror's can input "Shipping Costs" in Column B (under the "Subcontractor Labor") and input the dollar amount in the same row under the "Rate" column of the applicable period.</p>	9/3/2014
115	<p>For the subject RFP, offerors are required to complete specific sections of the SF33 to include Section 14 (Acknowledgement of Amendments). The format of the SF33 allows the offeror to acknowledge up to four (4) amendments (a total of four "blocks" are provided on the form). However, there are seven (7) amendments associated with the RFP. Is there an approved addendum form to the SF33 or other preferred method that can be used to acknowledge the additional amendments?</p>	<p>There is no approved addendum form to the SF33. Offeror's can add lines to Clause 52.214-4000 if needed in order to include acknowledgement of all the R&D RFP Amendments.</p>	9/3/2014
116	<p>Section L.4.2 of the R&D solicitation and Attachment 0003 references recent and relevant past performance / experience.</p> <p>Will the Government please clarify whether or not a prime offeror is required to complete all four considerations for R&D in order to submit a compliant proposal?</p>	<p>The Government is not evaluating past performance. Yes, a prime offeror is required to complete all four considerations for R&D in order to be eligible for award of a R&D MA IDIQ contract.</p>	9/3/2014
117	<p>While creating a timing plan for the blast mitigation task order base effort per the due dates of each of the deliverables, it appears as though it is structured to be completed within 6 months after contract award, rather than the full 9 months as specified for the period of performance of the base effort. Should the due dates of the deliverables be updated to fully utilize the 9 month PoP?</p>	<p>No, the Government will not be updating the due dates of the deliverables within R&D RFP Attachment 0011.</p>	9/3/2014
118	<p>For Volume II submittal. Should Attachment 003 and Attachment 004 be submitted as two separate documents or can the content of Attachment 004 be combine with Attachment 003 to create one document?</p>	<p>No, Attachment 0003 and Attachment 0004 shall be submitted as two separate documents.</p>	9/5/2014
119	<p>Reference R&D RFP Section L.1.2. Do the attachments count toward the page count limit? Specifically, does Attachment 0003 count toward the 30 page limit of Volume II?</p>	<p>No, attachments will not count towards the page limits specified in R&D RFP Section L.1.2. No, Attachment 0003 will not count towards the 30 page limit for Volume II.</p>	9/5/2014
120	<p>In response to question no. 59, where would we put that shipping cost in Attachment 12 workbook? There is no field for shipping in the workbook.</p>	<p>Reference response to R&D Q&A #114.</p>	9/5/2014