

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

Government responses to DRAFT Solicitation questions:

1. Solicitation Reference: I-127 and I-128

Question/Issue: Clause I-127 paragraph a states "...360 calendar days before the beginning of the first article test..." Clause I-128 paragraph a states "...within 270 calendars days from the date of this contract..." These clauses are not consistent. Please clarify.

[Answer –The Final RFP will have the correct number of days.](#)

2. Solicitation Reference: Web Posting Regarding Response Date

Question/Issue: On the web page of the solicitation, ("https://acquisition.army.mil/asfi/solicitation_view.cfm?psolicitationnbr=DRAFT_W56_HZV13R0036") it says a response deadline of 10 June. At the bottom of the webpage it says questions are due 3 June. While at Industry Day it was stressed to monitor PROCNET for postings, yet PROCNET has no deadlines. Please clarify.

[Answer - Questions regarding the Heavy Crane effort can be submitted up until the solicitation closes. However, questions received 7 calendar days before the closing date of the RFP may not be answered before the RFP closes.](#)

3. Solicitation Reference: Section J, List of Attachments

Question/Issue: Attachment 0001, Type II Heavy Crane PD 2408 indicates a date of 15-Oct-2013, whereas the date of the latest PD is 6-Feb-2014. Please clarify.

[Answer –The date will be updated when the Final RFP is released. .](#)

4. Solicitation Reference: L.3.4.b

Question/Issue: This paragraph refers to "CLIN 0004 – Production Units Type II Heavy Cranes" whereas Section B refers to CLIN 0003 as being associated with the Production Units. Please clarify.

[Answer – The CLIN will be updated when the Final RFP is released.](#)

5. Solicitation Reference: C.12.6.2

Question/Issue: This paragraph state "...The contractor shall conduct ILSC..." "ILSC" appear to be a typo. Please change "ILSC" to "ICLS."

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

Answer – The typo will be corrected when the Final RFP is released.

6. Solicitation Reference: Section B and Section C

Question/Issue: Section B defines ICLS as Integrated Contractor Logistics Support whereas Section C defines ICLS as Interim Contractor Logistics Support. Please clarify.

Answer – This will be revised when the Final RFP is released.

7. Solicitation Reference: Page 65 of 126, F-10, (C), (1),(i).

Question/Issue: Paragraph (i) states if FAT is required, then start deliveries 180 days after the delivery order date. But, from Page 78 of 126, I-128 (a), the contractor is directed to (shall) deliver 3 units of CLIN 0002 within 270 calendar days from date of contract to the Government for FAT. The second paragraph is consistent with Industry Day statement that FAT deliveries would be 270 days. We concur with the 270 days as the minimum required delivery for FAT cranes. There are long lead items associated with large crane production that can often be impacted by market forces and take longer than 180 days for delivery. We recommend the Government use 270 days for FAT deliveries to Aberdeen.

Answer – Section F-10 well be revised in the Final RFP.

8. Solicitation Reference: Page 77 of 126, I-127 (b)

Question/Issue: Paragraph (b) states that the contractor shall submit the first article test report within 90 calendar days from the date of this contract to..... However, given the initial three FAT test cranes are not due for delivery until 270 days after order, there seems to be a disconnect with delivery of FAT test reports within 90 days from date of contract. We believe the government intention would more reasonably be 90 days after completion of FAT testing for delivery of FAT test report. Please clarify.

Answer – The Final RFP will have the correct number of days.

9. Solicitation Reference: Page 115 of 126, L.2.2 Volume I, paragraph 5.

Question/Issue: Paragraph 5. States a letter identifying the offerors secret facility clearance number, and a DD Form 254 containing the information required in blocks 2c., 3, 4, 5, and 6 shall be provided in Volume I. An earlier clarification posting on PROCNET indicated that a prime could use a subcontractor with the appropriate secret facility clearance to support the program. Please clarify.

Answer – In the Final RFP L.2.2 Volume I, paragraph 5 will state the following: “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, and 6.”

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

10. Solicitation Reference: Page 119 of 26, L.3.4.6 Profit.

Question/Issue: Section L.3.4.6 states the offeror shall include the proposed profit rate. If the profit rate is proposed, is it the U.S. Government's intent to control profit margin for the awarded contractor so that such a proposed rate is fixed? Under what U.S. Government policy or FAR clause is the proposed profit rate required for inclusion under section L?

Answer – The Government is requesting the proposed profit rate for evaluation purposes only. This is a competitive action and it is not the Government's intent to control profit margins nor conduct any negotiations in regards to the profit rate. The data will be used strictly for evaluation purposes and to verify the accuracy of the spreadsheet totals.

11. Solicitation Reference: Page 122 of 126, M.2 Rejection of Offers

Question/Issue: Section M.2.1.5 states the offeror (or any subcontractor who will handle or have access to classified information) does not have SECRET Facility Clearance along with the safeguarding capabilities required to view the classified B-Kit specifications at the time of proposal submission, would be rejected. PROCNET posted a clarification which was interpreted to state that if an offeror had a subcontractor with capability to handle or have access to classified information and the subcontractor had a valid SECRET Facility Clearance for viewing the classified B-Kit specification, the offeror would not be rejected for submission. Please clarify.

Answer - Either the offeror or any subcontractor who will handle or have access to classified information must possess a SECRET Facility Security Clearance at the time of proposal submission or may have its proposal rejected IAW M.2.1.5.

12. Solicitation Reference: Page 124 of 126, M.5.2.1 Technical Factor Evaluation

Question/Issue: Section M.5.2.1 Technical Factor Evaluation, Technical Subfactors: Key Performance Parameter (KPP) states that a KPP is “1. Lift at 10 ft Boom Extension”. The use of the term “Boom Extension” is inconsistent with all prior ATPD and Industry Day discussions and submitted Questions and Answers prior to release of the Draft solicitation. We believe this is a TYPO and that the proper KPP should be corrected to read “Load Radius” instead of “Boom Extension”. The term “Load Radius” is consistent with industry terminology for published load chart crane rating. Recommend change of “Boom Extension” in KPPs to “Load Radius”.

Answer – The Final RFP will be revised to state that the KPP Is “Lift at 10 ft radius”.

13. Solicitation Reference: Page 124 of 126, M.5.2.1 Technical Factor Evaluation

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

Question/Issue: Section M.5.2.1 Technical Factor Evaluation, Technical Subfactors: Key Performance Parameter (KPP), states “ the KPP for Crew Protection Operator Position Protection is Objective Class 3 Protection as the desired highest protection.” Prior to draft solicitation release, the U.S. Army has consistently identified that the upper cab or “operator position” would not require the same desired level of crew protection as the lower cab or “Driver Position”. Having an objective for Class 3 Protection on the lower cab or “Driver Position” is understood. The ATPD only establishes a “desire” for Class 3 Protection on the lower cab or “Driver Position”. Please clarify the difference between the KPP and the ATPD in terms of best value assessment for the upper cab or “operator position”.

Answer – The required, or threshold, level of protection for both cabs is class 2. Class 3 is the DESIRED, or objective, level for both cabs.

14. Solicitation Reference: Page 116 of 126, 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.

Question/Issue: 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, the definition of “reach” has been used interchangeably with “boom length”. In particular, the TACOM states in the PD, “a minimum 100 ft boom is the threshold.” We recognize that stating a minimum 100 ft boom as threshold can be very different than stating a crane reach must be 100 ft. Please clarify that reach, as defined in the PD and as described in the draft solicitation, is equivalent to “boom length”. This definition has been consistently supported by TACOM in the PD and questions and answers. However, due to the potential for mis-interpretation in evaluation of newly established KPPs, please clarify that “reach” is equivalent to “boom length”.

Answer - Yes “reach” is equivalent to the required “boom length”. The length of the boom required is 100 ft. The requirement is not 100ft reach.

15. Solicitation Reference: Page 116 of 126, 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.

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

Question/Issue: 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.

[Answer 18: If a jib is provided to meet the reach or boom length requirement, the acceptable length of the jib ranges from 30-40ft.](#)

16. Solicitation Reference: Reference (1) – Industry Day Briefing. Reference (2) – Draft Solicitation Page 2 of 126 – various FAR 15.208 (a) and (b) references. \

Question/Issue: At Industry Day, the U.S. Army indicated the solicitation would be conducted under FAR Part 15. FAR Part 15 is referenced throughout the Draft Solicitation. In review of FAR Part 15, it states in paragraph 15.304 – Evaluation Factors, that, “Except as set forth in paragraph (c)(3)(iii) of this section, past performance shall be evaluated in all source selections for negotiated competitive acquisitions expected to exceed the simplified acquisition threshold. Paragraph (c)(3)(iii) further states that, “Past performance need not be evaluated if the contracting officer documents the reason past performance is not an appropriate evaluation factor for the acquisition.” As, past performance is not included in the solicitation as an evaluation factor, two questions surface. **One, why is past performance not an appropriate evaluation factor for this acquisition? Two, if past performance is written into the proposal to address risk, will it be considered by the Government, or will the Government give evaluation team instructions to disregard all reference to past performance?** Please clarify on both questions as this solicitation significantly exceeds the simplified acquisition threshold and failure to take into account past performance to any degree would seem to be dismissive of the FAR in particular in consideration of risk mitigation to the government in a best value decision.

One, why is past performance not an appropriate evaluation factor for this acquisition?

[Answer - In accordance with FAR 15.304\(c\)\(2\), quality of the product will be assessed through both a technical Acceptable/Not Acceptable evaluation and subsequent Technical Trade-Off Evaluation. The RFP includes a Technical Evaluation of key performance](#)

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

characteristics and will require that offerors provide substantiating data, including validated test data, to support adherence to the requirements in the solicitation. Per the solicitation under clause 52.209-4011 “Contractor Responsibility and Eligibility for Award” (a) the Government will award a contract to the offeror that (3) meets all the responsibility criteria at FAR 9.104. Therefore, IAW FAR 15.304(c)(3)(iii), the PCO determined past performance is not an appropriate evaluation factor for the acquisition.

Two, if past performance is written into the proposal to address risk, will it be considered by the Government, or will the Government give evaluation team instructions to disregard all reference to past performance?

Answer - Evaluation will be in accordance with Section M.