

Question Number 2nd draft posting	Question/Comments	Answer/Response
35	<p>Reference the Draft RFP for KBS, Section L.4, Experience Factor, contracts are defined in section L.4.1 as being Government or Commercial and the offerors shall provide relevant experience as depicted in L.4.1.2.1 and L.4.1.2.2. In L.4.1.2.2, reference is made to at least six deployed individuals simultaneously to more than two OCONUS locations and 'management of deployed individuals' includes the pre-deployment recruitment, training, and processing in and out of the National Deployment Center (NDC) (or equivalent), as well as ensuring the deployed personnel accomplish the mission once deployed. We acknowledge that the NDC standards are for Government Contract deployment requirement.</p> <p>Please define the Commercial Contract equivalent to the NDC and the certification requirements and standards to meet this requirement.</p> <p>Please clarify a Commercial Contract scenario of what is meant by six deployed individuals simultaneously to more than two OCONUS locations. (i.e. Would a scenario of having 6 contractors deployed to 3 different locations in Alaska suffice under this requirement?)</p>	<p>It is the offeror's responsibility to explain why its experience with deployed individuals is equivalent to the NDC process. Commercial contract equivalent is not used in the L.4.1.2 language.</p> <p>If an offeror fails to explain how its experience with deployed individuals is equivalent to the NDC process then it may be evaluated as higher risk. The Government cannot comment on hypothetical scenarios.</p>
36	<p>Reference Draft Solicitations W56HZV-14-R-0030, (KBS) Sections L &amp; M provisions entitled "Experience".</p> <p>Comment: The Government is assessing the offeror's experience on specific OCONUS requirements listed in L.4.1.2.2 and M.5.1.2. The National Security Strategy along with the Defense Budget Priorities and Choices for FY 2014 point to an end of major deployments in Iraq and Afghanistan. Drawdowns coupled with modernization challenges and a declining DoD Budget would suggest a limited OCONUS support capability within the scope of the KBS effort. We recognize the ongoing challenges with the budget and readiness requirements expected by contractors to support globally but assessing KBS experience predominately on specific OCONUS requirements at the MA IDIQ level seems restrictive to small business participation.</p> <p>The Government is using specific requirements spelled out in L.4.1.2.2 and M.5.1.2 to identify the offeror's experience at the MA IDIQ Level. Would the Government consider putting this requirement at the Task Order Level for relative experience needed for specific OCONUS related opportunities to be published?</p> <p>Does the Government anticipate a predominate amount of OCONUS related task orders?</p>	<p>No. The Government considers its evaluation factors to be reasonably related to the agency's actual needs.</p> <p>The Government cannot comment on future procurement actions.</p>
37	<p>L.4.1.1. - Given the recent contracting climate, that is, the reduction in service type contracting opportunities over the last few years, three (3) years for the Relevant Experience is very restrictive for small businesses. Also, due to procurement trends over the past few years, solicitations have been delayed in being issued thus impacting recent and relevant experience. This greatly impacts small businesses that inherently have a smaller contract pool from which to draw. Please consider extending the relevant experience time frame to five (5) years in order to include a larger and fairer pool of capable small businesses.</p>	<p>The Government considers its evaluation factors to be reasonably related to the agency's actual needs.</p>
38	<p>L.4.1.2.1 - Given that the size standard for SB is \$7 million, (L.3.5 NAICS 811111), the requirement limiting recent experience contracts to those with teaming arrangements of four (4) or more sub-contractors is extremely restrictive and especially disadvantageous to otherwise qualified small businesses. Please consider reducing this requirement to one (1) or more subcontractors for small businesses.</p>	<p>L.4.1.2.1 has been revised to reflect teaming arrangements of three (3) or more sub-contractors.</p>
42	<p>Section M, M.5.2: 4. This requirement is confusing. Can you please explain the following... "....any prime experience which is identified in the offeror's experience factor proposal, but the offeror's proposal under the cost/price factor does not clearly support its cited experience is intended to be used by the offeror during contract performance, will be discounted in whole or in part."</p>	<p>This language has been revised in the RFP.</p>
43	<p>Sec L.4.1.2.2, page 213: Under the Experience factor, in considering "deployment and management of at least 6 deployed individuals simultaneously to more than 2 OCONUS locations," will the Government consider the experience of a teammate or subcontractor as relevant experience?</p>	<p>No, teammates or subcontractors are not locked in at the IDIQ level, unless they are part of a joint venture legal agreement.</p>
51	<p>L.4.1.2.1</p> <p>Service contracts performed as the prime contractor which included contractor team arrangement(s) (as defined by FAR 9.601) in excess of three organizations, not including the prime offeror. Include detail discussing what type and portion of work was done by each firm.</p> <p>Please confirm that a company can prime if it has two prime contracts with at least three subcontractors per contract.</p>	<p>The Government cannot comment on a potential offeror's qualifications.</p>
52	<p>L.4.1.2.2</p> <p>Contracts performed either as the prime contractor or subcontractor which required deployment and management of at least six deployed individuals simultaneously to more than two OCONUS locations.</p> <p>Please confirm that this statement means three or more OCONUS locations.</p>	<p>Confirmed.</p>

55	<p>L.4.1.2.1</p> <p>Service contracts performed as the prime contractor which included contractor team arrangement(s) (as defined by FAR 9.601) in excess of three organizations, not including the prime offeror. Include detail discussing what type and portion of work was done by each firm.</p> <p>Please confirm that a company can prime if it has two prime contracts with at least three subcontractors per contract.</p>	The Government cannot comment on a potential offeror's qualifications.
56	<p>L.4.1.2.2</p> <p>Contracts performed either as the prime contractor or subcontractor which required deployment and management of at least six deployed individuals simultaneously to more than two OCONUS locations.</p> <p>Please confirm that this statement means three or more OCONUS locations.</p>	Confirmed.
59	<p>L.4.1.2.1</p> <p>Service contracts performed as the prime contractor which included contractor team arrangement(s) (as defined by FAR 9.601) in excess of three organizations, not including the prime offeror. Include detail discussing what type and portion of work was done by each firm.</p> <p>Please confirm that a company can prime if it has two prime contracts with at least three subcontractors per contract.</p>	The Government cannot comment on a potential offeror's qualifications.
60	<p>L.4.1.2.2</p> <p>Contracts performed either as the prime contractor or subcontractor which required deployment and management of at least six deployed individuals simultaneously to more than two OCONUS locations.</p> <p>Please confirm that this statement means three or more OCONUS locations.</p>	Confirmed.
83	<p>L.4.1.2</p> <p>Relevant Contracts. The ERS Draft RFP states "Relevant contracts are those which, as described below in paragraphs L.5.1.2.1-3, are comparable in scope to this solicitation requirement(s)." We believe "L.5.1.2.1-3" should read "L.4.1.2.1-3." Please clarify.</p>	Error noted. Correction will be made.
88	<p>Section L.4.1</p> <p>In accordance to L.4.1, "A total of no more than two contracts for each of the areas identified in paragraph L.4.1.2, as performed by the prime offeror itself for L.4.1.2.1-4..." In this regard, are offerors permitted to provide separate contracts to address specific requirements? For instance, can offerors provide a response onto Attachment 0003 where Contract 1 merely addresses requirements for L.4.1.2.1 and L.4.1.2.2; and Contract 2 merely address the requirements for L.4.1.2.3 and L.4.1.2.4? Or does each contract referenced by the offeror have to address all four requirements listed under L.4.1.2.1 – 4?</p>	Separate contracts may be used for each area of consideration, but the total of no more than two contracts per area of consideration will still apply.
90	<p>L.4.1.2</p> <p>Relevant Contracts. The R&amp;D Draft RFP states "Relevant contracts are those which, as described below in paragraphs L.5.1.2.1-4, are comparable in scope to this solicitation requirement(s)." We believe "L.5.1.2.1-4" should read "L.4.1.2.1-4." Please clarify.</p> <p>Reference: L. 4 VOLUME II EXPERIENCE FACTOR</p>	Error noted. Correction will be made.
91	<p>L.4.1.2 Relevant Contracts. Relevant contracts are those which, as described below in paragraphs L.5.1.2.1-3, are comparable in scope to this solicitation requirement(s). Where prior relevant experience is under a broader IDIQ, BPA, BOA, or FSS-type contract, the offeror shall not just cite the broader IDIQ, BPA, BOA, or FSS-type contract. Rather, the offeror shall include the specific individual task order(s), delivery order(s), or work directive(s) which it considers to be reflective of relevant prior experience. In accordance with paragraph L.4.1, each prior contract(s) identified by the offeror as being applicable will be evaluated based upon the extent to which prior experience is relevant to the solicitation requirements.</p> <p>The referenced paragraph L.5.1.2.1-3, content is missing from draft solicitation text. Would the government please clarify?</p> <p>Would the Government please clarify if L.5.1.2.1-3 should actually read L.4.1.2.3.1-3?</p>	Error noted. Correction will be made.
92	<p>Reference: M. 5 EVALUATION OF VOLUME II - EXPERIENCE FACTOR (reference the proposal information submitted in response to L.4)</p> <p>Would the Government please clarify if the relevancy of experience is evaluated against the Section C - Description/Specifications/Work Statement, Statement of Work (SOW) for Equipment Related Services (ERS) or, the Performance Work Statement (PWS) for Robotics, Systems Engineering &amp; Technical Assistance (SETA) Support Services?</p>	Experience will be evaluated based on the factors set forth in L.4.1.2.

93	<p>L.4.1 A total of no more than two contracts for each of the areas identified in paragraph L.4.1.2, as performed by the prime offeror itself for L.4.1.2.1-3, which are the most recent (as defined by paragraph L.4.1.1) and relevant (as defined by paragraph L.4.1.2) to the relevance considerations specified in paragraphs L.4.1.2.1-3.</p> <p>Would the Government please clarify if the relevancy of experience is determined by Section C - Description/Specifications/Work Statement, Statement of Work (SOW) for Equipment Related Services (ERS) or, the Performance Work Statement (PWS) for Robotics, Systems Engineering &amp; Technical Assistance (SETA) Support Services?</p>	Experience will be evaluated based on the factors set forth in L.4.1.2.
94	<p>Reference draft solicitation document Attachment 0003 ERS Experience Matrix.</p> <p>Would the Government please clarify if each Relevance Consideration/Example must be a separate contract, delivery order or task order and only cited once?</p> <p>May the same contract, delivery order or task order be used/repeated in more than one experience example?</p>	Yes, the same contract, delivery order, or task order may be cited for the each area of consideration, but it is not required.
95	<p>L.4.1.2.1 Service contracts performed as the prime contractor which included contractor team arrangement(s) (as defined by FAR 9.601) in excess of three organizations not including the prime offeror. Include detail discussing what type and portion of work was done by each firm.</p> <p>Would the Government please clarify if the requirement "in excess of three organizations" is understood as 4 or more subcontractors?</p>	L.4.1.2.1 has been revised to reflect teaming arrangements of three (3) or more sub-contractors.
96	<p>L.4.1.2.2 Contracts performed either as the prime contractor or subcontractor which required deployment and management of at least six deployed individuals simultaneously to more than two OCONUS locations. For this solicitation, 'management of deployed individuals' includes the pre-deployment recruitment, training, and processing in and out of the National Deployment Center (or equivalent), as well as ensuring the deployed personnel accomplish the mission once deployed.</p> <p>Would the Government please clarify if the requirement "more than two OCONUS locations" is understood as a minimum of 3 locations?</p> <p>Would the Government please clarify if the requirement of "OCONUS locations" is determined by Country or Site Facility?</p>	More than two means three or more. This language will be clarified in the final RFP. OCONUS locations are potentially by country and facility location.
106	<p>Subparagraph L.4.1.2 of the R&amp;D draft RFP (Relevant Contracts) states "Relevant contracts are those which, as described below in paragraphs L.5.1.2.1-4, are comparable in scope to this solicitation requirement(s)." There are no paragraphs L.5.1.2.1 through L.5.1.2.4. Should the referenced paragraph be "L.4.1.2.1 through L.4.1.2.1.4"?</p>	Error noted. Correction will be made.
124	<p>RFP Reference: L.1.2</p> <p>Topic: Font Size</p> <p>Question: Currently, the font size requirements are no less than 10-point font. For most graphics, this would be rather large. Would the Government consider making exceptions for graphics or charts, for no less than 8-point font?</p>	Additional language will be incorporated into L.1.2 to clarify.
132	<p>RFP Reference: General</p> <p>Topic: Future task order content</p> <p>Question: Since the ERS task order reflects support to robotic equipment, does the Government anticipate more future task order work for TACOM non-standard equipment or a balance of this equipment with legacy equipment and systems such as wheeled and tracked vehicles?</p> <p>Recommendation: That the Government issue two task orders within the solicitation covering both non-standard equipment such as robotic and standard TACOM supported equipment such as wheeled vehicles. We believe this will provide a true picture of a contractor's capabilities in support of TACOM current and emerging requirements.</p>	No. The ERS task order represents a current requirement for the Government. No other task orders are anticipated for release with the ERS RFP.

134	<p>Paragraph(s) L.4.1.2, Attachment 0004, Page(s) 213 and Attachment 0004</p> <p>RFP Wording Copied: L.4.1.2 Relevant Contracts. Relevant contracts are those which, as described below in paragraphs L.4.1.2.1 and L.4.1.2.2, are comparable in scope to this solicitation requirement(s).</p> <p>Attachment 0004: Definition of Relevance Levels</p> <p>Very Relevant - Present/past experience involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires. Relevant - Present/past experience involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires. Somewhat Relevant - Present/past experience involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires. Not Relevant - Present/past experience involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.</p> <p>Question: Is it the Government's intention that offerors provide relevant Corporate Experience contracts that are comparable in scope, as identified in L.4.1.2, or comparable in scope and magnitude of effort and complexities, as identified in Attachment 0004? Would the Government please define scope, magnitude, and complexity, as</p>	<p>ACC-WRN uses adjectival ratings derived from the Army Source Selection Supplement. Attachment 0004 will be clarified in the final RFP. Attachment 0004 provides the relevance levels for information submitted under L.4.1.2. The Government has no special definition for the words scope, magnitude, or complexity beyond their ordinary meaning.</p>
135	<p>RFP Sections: Attachment 0003, L and M Paragraph(s): Attachment 0003 Relevance Consideration # 1, L.4.1.2.1, M.5.1.1 Page(s): Attachment 0003 pages 1 and 2, Section L page 213, Section M page 228</p> <p>RFP Wording Copied: Attachment 0003 Relevance Consideration # 1: Recent and relevant prior Experience pertaining to service contracts performed as the prime contractor which included Contractor Teaming Arrangement(s) (as defined by FAR 9.601) in excess of three organizations, not including the prime Offeror.</p> <p>L.4.1.2.1 Service contracts performed as the prime contractor which included contractor team arrangement(s) (as defined by FAR 9.601) in excess of three organizations, not including the prime offeror. Include detail discussing what type and portion of work was done by each firm.</p> <p>M.5.1.1 Service contracts performed as the prime contractor which included contractor team arrangement(s) (as defined by FAR 9.601) in excess of three organizations, not including the prime offeror.</p> <p>Question: To clarify, does the Government intend for this statement to be interpreted as three or more organizations or four or more organizations?</p>	<p>In excess of three means four or more. This language will be clarified in the final RFP.</p>
136	<p>RFP Sections Attachment 0003, L and M Paragraph(s): Attachment 0003 Relevance Consideration # 2, L.4.1.2.2, M.5.1.2 Page(s): Attachment 0003 pages 3 and 4, Section L page 213, Section M page 228</p> <p>RFP Wording Copied: Attachment 0003 Relevance Consideration # 2: Recent and relevant prior Experience pertaining to contracts performed either as the prime contractor or subcontractor which required deployment and management of at least six deployed individuals simultaneously to more than two OCONUS locations.</p> <p>L.4.1.2.2 Contracts performed either as the prime contractor or subcontractor which required deployment and management of at least six deployed individuals simultaneously to more than two OCONUS locations. For this solicitation, 'management of deployed individuals' includes the pre-deployment recruitment, training, and processing in and out of the National Deployment Center (or equivalent), as well as ensuring the deployed personnel accomplish the mission once deployed.</p> <p>M.5.1.2 Contracts performed either as the prime contractor or subcontractor which required deployment and management of at least six deployed individuals simultaneously to more than two OCONUS locations. For this solicitation, management of deployed individuals includes the pre-deployment recruitment, training, and processing in and out of the National Deployment Center (or equivalent), as well as ensuring the deployed personnel accomplish the mission once deployed.</p> <p>Question: To clarify, does the Government intend for this statement to be interpreted as two or more OCONUS locations or three or more OCONUS locations?</p>	<p>More than two means at least three. This language will be clarified in the final RFP.</p>

<p>137</p>	<p>RFP Section L; Paragraph(s) L.1.2 , L.4.4; Page(s) 211 , 214</p> <p>RFP Wording Copied:</p> <p>L.1.2 General: The offeror's proposal shall be submitted in five separate volumes, as set forth below. All proposal information shall be in the English language. Font size shall be no smaller than 10 point with margins no less than 1 inch (top, bottom, left, and right) excluding headers, footers, and page numbers. The offeror shall number each page and provide an index with each volume. The complete set of volumes shall be accompanied by a cover letter prepared on the company's letterhead. Each of the volumes shall be separated and labeled with full pagination. The proposal shall include a volume for each of the evaluation factors. The offeror's proposal shall be uploaded to the Army Single Face to Industry (ASFI) Bid Response System (BRS) website (in accordance with paragraph L.1.4), clearly labeled, with volumes divided as follows:</p> <p>Volume # Volume Title Page Suggestions  Volume I: Proposal Terms and Conditions N/A  Volume II: Experience Factor 15 pages  Volume III: Technical Factor 20 pages  Volume IV: Cost/Price Factor N/A  Volume V: Small Business Participation Factor N/A</p> <p>L.4.4 Cross-Reference Matrix. In addition to populating the KBS Experience Matrix/Narrative (Attachment 0003) required by paragraph L.4.2, the offeror shall also complete the KBS Cross-Reference Matrix (Attachment 0004). The offeror shall populate the yellow-shaded cells by citing up to two prior contracts and assigning a corresponding relevance level, based on the relevance definitions provided within Attachment 0004. The offeror's cited contracts should reflect the types of experience the Government will be using for evaluation purposes, as identified in paragraphs L.4.1.2.1 and L.4.1.2.2.</p> <p>Question:  L.1.2 provides suggested page counts for each volume. Is the offeror permitted to exceed the suggested page count for each volume at their discretion? If not, is the ERS Cross-Reference Matrix (Attachment 4) included in the page count for Volume II: Experience Factor?</p>	<p>The page counts provided are suggestions, and it is highly recommended that offerors adhere to these suggestions to the extent practicable. Reference question #360.</p>
<p>141</p>	<p>Reference: RFP Section L  Paragraph(s) L.4.1.2  Attachment 0004  Page(s) 211 and Attachment 0004</p> <p>RFP Wording Copied:</p> <p>L.4.1.2 Relevant Contracts. Relevant contracts are those which, as described below in paragraphs L.5.1.2.1-3 (Typo – should read L.4.1.2.1-3), are comparable in scope to this solicitation requirement(s).</p> <p>Attachment 0004: Definition of Relevance Levels</p> <p>Very Relevant - Present/past experience involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.  Relevant - Present/past experience involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.  Somewhat Relevant - Present/past experience involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.  Not Relevant - Present/past experience involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.</p> <p>Question:  Is it the Government's intention that offerors provide relevant Corporate Experience contracts that are comparable in scope, as identified in L.4.1.2, or comparable in scope and magnitude of effort and complexities, as identified in Attachment 0004? Would the Government please define scope, magnitude, and complexity, as appropriate?</p>	<p>ACC-WRN uses adjectival ratings derived from the Army Source Selection Supplement. Attachment 0004 will be clarified in the final RFP. Attachment 0004 provides the relevance levels for information submitted under L.4.1.2. The Government has no special definition for the words scope, magnitude, or complexity beyond their ordinary meaning.</p>

142	<p>Reference: RFP Sections Attachment 0003, L and M  Paragraph(s): Attachment 0003 Relevance Consideration # 1, L.4.1.2.1, M.5.1.1  Page(s): Attachment 0003 pages 1 and 2, Section L page 211, Section M page 225</p> <p>RFP Wording Copied:  Attachment 0003 Relevance Consideration # 1: Recent and relevant prior Experience pertaining to service contracts performed as the prime contractor which included Contractor Teaming Arrangement(s) (as defined by FAR 9.601) in excess of three organizations, not including the prime Offeror.</p> <p>L.4.1.2.1 Service contracts performed as the prime contractor which included contractor team arrangement(s) (as defined by FAR 9.601) in excess of three organizations, not including the prime offeror. Include detail discussing what type and portion of work was done by each firm.</p> <p>M.5.1.1 Service contracts performed as the prime contractor which included contractor team arrangement(s) (as defined by FAR 9.601) in excess of three organizations, not including the prime offeror.</p> <p>Question: To clarify, does the Government intend for this statement to be interpreted as three or more organizations or four or more organizations?</p>	L.4.1.2.1 has been revised to reflect teaming arrangements of three (3) or more sub-contractors.
143	<p>RFP Sections Attachment 0003, L and M  Paragraph(s): Attachment 0003 Relevance Consideration # 2, L.4.1.2.2, M.5.1.2  Page(s): Attachment 0003 pages 3 and 4, Section L page 211, Section M page 225</p> <p>RFP Wording Copied:  Attachment 0003 Relevance Consideration # 2: Recent and relevant prior Experience pertaining to contracts performed either as the prime contractor or subcontractor which required deployment and management of at least six deployed individuals simultaneously to more than two OCONUS locations.</p> <p>L.4.1.2.2 Contracts performed either as the prime contractor or subcontractor which required deployment and management of at least six deployed individuals simultaneously to more than two OCONUS locations. For this solicitation, 'management of deployed individuals' includes the pre-deployment recruitment, training, and processing in and out of the National Deployment Center (or equivalent), as well as ensuring the deployed personnel accomplish the mission once deployed.</p> <p>M.5.1.2 Contracts performed either as the prime contractor or subcontractor which required deployment and management of at least six deployed individuals simultaneously to more than two OCONUS locations. For this solicitation, management of deployed individuals includes the pre-deployment recruitment, training, and processing in and out of the National Deployment Center (or equivalent), as well as ensuring the deployed personnel accomplish the mission once deployed.</p> <p>Question: To clarify, does the Government intend for this statement to be interpreted as two or more OCONUS locations or three or more OCONUS locations?</p>	More than two means three or more. This language will be clarified in the final RFP.

144	<p>RFP Section L; Paragraph(s) L.1.2, L.4.4; Page(s) 209, 212</p> <p>RFP Wording Copied:</p> <p>L.1.2 General: The offeror's proposal shall be submitted in five separate volumes, as set forth below. All proposal information shall be in the English language. Font size shall be no smaller than 10 point with margins no less than 1 inch (top, bottom, left, and right) excluding headers, footers, and page numbers. The offeror shall number each page and provide an index with each volume. The complete set of volumes shall be accompanied by a cover letter prepared on the company's letterhead. Each of the volumes shall be separated and labeled with full pagination. The proposal shall include a volume for each of the evaluation factors. The offeror's proposal shall be uploaded to the Army Single Face to Industry (ASFI) Bid Response System (BRS) website (in accordance with paragraph L.1.4), clearly labeled, with volumes divided as follows:</p> <p>Volume # Volume Title Page Suggestions  Volume I: Proposal Terms and Conditions N/A  Volume II: Experience Factor 20 pages  Volume III: Technical Factor 20 pages  Volume IV: Cost/Price Factor N/A  Volume V: Small Business Participation Factor N/A</p> <p>L.4.4 Cross-Reference Matrix. In addition to populating the ERS Experience Matrix/Narrative (Attachment 0003) required by paragraph L.4.2, the offeror shall also complete the ERS Cross-Reference Matrix (Attachment 0004). The offeror shall populate the yellow-shaded cells by citing up to two prior contracts and assigning a corresponding relevance level, based on the relevance definitions provided within Attachment 0004. The offeror's cited contracts should reflect the types of experience the Government will be using for evaluation purposes, as identified in paragraphs L.4.1.2.1-3.</p> <p>Question:  L.1.2 provides suggested page counts for each volume. Is the offeror permitted to exceed the suggested page count for each volume at their discretion? If not, is the ERS Cross-Reference Matrix (Attachment 4) included in the page count for Volume II: Experience Factor?</p>	<p>The page counts provided are suggestions, and it is highly recommended that offerors adhere to these suggestions to the extent practicable. Reference question #360.</p>
145	<p>RFP Section L  Paragraph(s) L.6.1.1  Page(s) 212</p> <p>RFP Wording Copied:</p> <p>L.6.1.1 Proposal Structure. The instructions that follow are not intended to be all-inclusive. The cost/price factor volume shall include data to support the reasonableness of the proposed amounts. Sufficient detail shall be included to allow verification of the price. Offerors may submit any other additional price and financial information it considers to be helpful in the Government's evaluation of its price proposal.</p> <p>Question:  Does the Government desire that prime contractor's teammates or subcontractors to provide pricing and cost/price data similar to the primes requirement in section L.6.1? If so, how should the teammates or subcontractors submit this proprietary cost/price data?</p>	<p>Teammates or Subcontractor cost/price data is not required.</p>
148	<p>Section L.4 Volume II Experience Factor</p> <p>L.4.1.2 Relevant Contracts:  L.4.1.2.1  Would the government please consider changing the requirement to "2 or more organizations, not including the Prime."  L.4.1.2.2  Would the government please consider changing the requirement to read "to two or more OCONUS locations"</p> <p>Since numerous companies bidding as SB will focus on the TOs' that are in the restricted pool which will likely not have the broader requirements of the larger TOs' competition for awards would be broadened.</p>	<p>The requirement for L.4.1.2.1 will be revised to "three or more" and L.4.1.2.2 will be clarified to "three or more separate OCONUS locations" in the final RFP. The Government considers its evaluation factors to be reasonably related to the agency's actual needs.</p>
159	<p>The Government does not specify details on a Table of Contents. Will the Government allow a Table of Contents to be used, outside of page count, to help the Government review proposals?</p>	<p>Yes, language is revised to allow an index/Table of Contents. The index is not subject to the suggested page count.</p>
160	<p>Will the Government allow 11*17 pages to be used in the proposal? If so, will it count as 2 pages?</p>	<p>Section L.1.2 will be revised to permit the use of 11x17" paper for drawings and graphics. A single sheet of 11x17" paper will count as one page.</p>
161	<p>Section L does not provide any information regarding graphics. Will the Government please clarify any restrictions on graphics used in the proposal?</p>	<p>Section L.1.2 will be revised to permit the use of 11x17" paper for drawings and graphics. A single sheet of 11x17" paper will count as one page.</p>

162	Volume II Experience Factor page "suggestion" is 15 pages. Considering the requirement of Attachment 0003 Section 7 to copy and paste applicable PWS/SOW excerpts, relevant excerpts alone could exceed the page limitation. Would the government allow the excerpts section to be an attachment outside of page count?	No. Offerors are reminded that excerpts should be relevant, so the full PWS should not be included in most cases.
173	The Government does not specify details on a Table of Contents. Will the Government allow a Table of Contents to be used, outside of page count, to help the Government review proposals?	Yes, language is revised to allow an index/Table of Contents. The index is not subject to the suggested page count.
174	Will the Government allow 11*17 pages to be used in the proposal? If so, will it count as 2 pages?	Section L.1.2 will be revised to permit the use of 11x17" paper for drawings and graphics. A single sheet of 11x17" paper will count as one page.
175	Section L does not provide any information regarding graphics. Will the Government please clarify any restrictions on graphics used in the proposal?	Section L.1.2 will be revised to permit the use of 11x17" paper for drawings and graphics. A single sheet of 11x17" paper will count as one page.
176	Volume II Experience Factor page "suggestion" is 20 pages. Considering the requirement of Attachment 0003 Section 7 to copy and paste applicable PWS/SOW excerpts, relevant excerpts alone could exceed the page limitation. Would the government allow the excerpts section to be an attachment outside of page count?	No. Offerors are reminded that excerpts should be relevant, so the full PWS should not be included in most cases.
177	This section references paragraph L.5.1.2.1-3. Since there is not a section L.5, we believe this should maybe be L.4.1.2.1-3. Will the government please clarify?	Error noted. Correction will be made.
184	The Government does not specify details on a Table of Contents. Will the Government allow a Table of Contents to be used, outside of page count, to help the Government review proposals?	Yes, language is revised to allow an index/Table of Contents. The index is not subject to the suggested page count.
185	Will the Government allow 11*17 pages to be used in the proposal? If so, will it count as 2 pages?	Section L.1.2 will be revised to permit the use of 11x17" paper for drawings and graphics. A single sheet of 11x17" paper will count as one page.
186	Section L does not provide any information regarding graphics. Will the Government please clarify any restrictions on graphics used in the proposal?	Section L.1.2 will be revised to permit the use of 11x17" paper for drawings and graphics. A single sheet of 11x17" paper will count as one page.
187	Volume II Experience Factor page "suggestion" is 25 pages. Considering the requirement of Attachment 0003 Section 7 to copy and paste applicable PWS/SOW excerpts, relevant excerpts alone could exceed the page limitation. Would the government allow the excerpts section to be an attachment outside of page count?	No. Offerors are reminded that excerpts should be relevant, so the full PWS should not be included in most cases.
188	This section references paragraph L.5.1.2.1-4. Since there is not a section L.5, we believe this should maybe be L.4.1.2.1-4. Will the government please clarify?	Error noted. Correction will be made.
190	L.4.1.2 Relevant Contracts. Relevant contracts are those which, as described below in paragraphs L.4.1.2.1 and L.4.1.2.2, are comparable in scope to this solicitation requirement(s).  Does the Government expect each Experience example to address the scope of requirements in Section C of the draft RFP, the NEI PWS (Attachment 10), or just to address the requirements as stated in L.4.1.2.1 and L.4.1.2.2? Please clarify what the Government means by "comparable in scope."	Address the requirements as stated in L.4.1.2.1 and L.4.1.2.2. The language in this section will be revised. The Government has no special definition for the word scope beyond its ordinary meaning.
191	L.4.1.2 Where prior relevant experience is under a broader IDIQ, BPA, BOA, or FSS-type contract, the offeror shall not just cite the broader IDIQ, BPA, BOA, or FSS-type contract. Rather, the offeror shall include the specific individual task order(s), delivery order(s), or work directive(s) which it considers to be reflective of relevant prior experience.  Will the Government allow a multiple award IDIQ or BPA referencing several task or delivery orders to be considered as a single Experience example?	No.
192	L.4.2.7 Copies (excerpts) of all SOW/PWS paragraph(s) from the contract(s) cited per paragraph L.4.2.1 describing experience which is relevant to the relevance considerations cited in paragraphs L.4.1.2.1 and L.4.1.2.2.  L.4.1.2.1 specifies the requirement for Experience examples which include management of a team of at least three other organizations. There is unlikely to be a corresponding requirement in the PWS/SOW for any contract since teaming and subcontracting arrangements are not specified by the Government.  Although we have frequently responded to RFP Section L requirements to describe our teaming arrangements and subcontract management processes, we have never seen a PWS or SOW paragraph that addresses the requirement to manage a team of a specific size or composition. Request the requirement to provide copies (excerpts) of PWS/SOW paragraphs supporting the requirement in L.4.1.2.1 be removed.	It is the offeror's responsibility to explain why its teaming experience is relevant to L.4.1.2.1. The Government considers its evaluation factors to be reasonably related to the agency's actual needs.
199	L.4.1.2 Relevant Contracts. Relevant contracts are those which, as described below in paragraphs L.5.1.2.1-3, are comparable in scope to this solicitation requirement(s).  Does the Government expect each Experience example to address the scope of requirements in Section C of the draft RFP, the Robotics PWS (Attachment 10), or just to address the requirements as stated in L.4.1.2.1-3? Please clarify what the Government means by "comparable in scope."	Address the requirements as stated in L.4.1.2.1-3. The language in this section will be revised. The Government has no special definition for the word scope beyond its ordinary meaning.

200	L.4.1.2 Where prior relevant experience is under a broader IDIQ, BPA, BOA, or FSS-type contract, the offeror shall not just cite the broader IDIQ, BPA, BOA, or FSS-type contract. Rather, the offeror shall include the specific individual task order(s), delivery order(s), or work directive(s) which it considers to be reflective of relevant prior experience.	No.
201	Will the Government allow a multiple award IDIQ or BPA referencing several task or delivery orders to be considered as a single Experience example? L.4.2.7 Copies (excerpts) of all SOW/PWS paragraph(s) from the contract(s) cited per paragraph L.4.2.1 describing experience which is relevant to the relevance considerations cited in paragraphs L.4.1.2.1 and L.4.1.2.2. L.4.1.2.1 specifies the requirement for Experience examples which include management of a team of at least three other organizations. There is unlikely to be a corresponding requirement in the PWS/SOW for any contract since teaming and subcontracting arrangements are not specified by the Government. Although we have frequently responded to RFP Section L requirements to describe our teaming arrangements and subcontract management processes, we have never seen a PWS or SOW paragraph that addresses the requirement to manage a team of a specific size or composition. Request the requirement to provide copies (excerpts) of PWS/SOW paragraphs supporting the requirement in L.4.1.2.1 be removed.	It is the offeror's responsibility to explain why its teaming experience is relevant to L.4.1.2.1. The Government considers its evaluation factors to be reasonably related to the agency's actual needs.
240	Page 213, Section L.4.1.2.1 – Can the government provide clarification on what types of contracts are comprised by the term “service contract” as there are a variety of vehicles currently being used by TACOM to accomplish this work. Also, paragraph L.4.1.2.2 only uses the word “contract” for this category of corporate experience examples. Can the government please clarify the difference between the types of contract for these two paragraphs?	Section L.4.1.2.2 is changed to "Service contracts..." in the final RFP. "Service Contract" is defined in FAR 37.101.
242	Page 213, Section L.4.1.2.2 – Does the requirement to have deployed at least six people simultaneously to more than two OCONUS locations mean at least 12 deployed individuals (i.e., 6 or more at EACH OCONUS location) or at least 6 deployed individuals (e.g., 4 at one OCONUS location and 2 at another OCONUS location)?	L.4.1.2.2 will be revised in the final RFP. At least 6 individuals (meaning 6 or more) simultaneously deployed to three or more separate OCONUS locations.
245	Page 228, Section M.5.3 – States that “any prime experience which is identified in the offeror's experience factor proposal, but the offeror's proposal under the cost/price factor does not clearly support its cited experience is intended to be used by the offeror during contract performance, will be discounted in whole or in part. The offeror may also be evaluated based on other Government or private source information.” There is no requirement in Section L for the Cost/Price volume to show that its cited experience is intended to be used by the offeror during contract performance. Offerors are not even required to provide a supporting cost narrative, as per Page 215, Section L.6.1.3, which states “The offeror shall provide its supporting narrative, if necessary, in Microsoft Word format.” Will the Government allow offerors to show how their experience is to be used in Volume III, Technical Factor, instead?	This language has been revised in the RFP.
248	Reference L.4. Vol II Experience Factor, L.4.1 Paragraph 3. The Government will not consider the past experience of any proposed subcontractors or teammates in its evaluation under the Experience Factor. Only the experience of the prime offeror will be considered. Question: Most SBs receive single sourced, directed contracts. Also, most SBs have limited lines of work, perhaps Engineering focused, or Programmatic and Support focused, so there may not be the need to have more than 3 primes (L.4.1.2.1) or to do OCONUS work (L.4.1.2.2). And, most SBs have put together a solid stable of companies to perform all work on the KBS effort. With this background, would the USG consider using the past performance of Subcontractors, in an effort to help level the playing field for SBs vis-à-vis LBs?	No. In accordance with M.1.1.1, SBs will be evaluated under a restricted pool. Other than small businesses (OTSBs) will qualify for the full and open pool. SBs will only be evaluated against other SBs for an MA IDIQ award. OTSBs will only be evaluated against OTSBs for an MA IDIQ award. The Government considers its evaluation factors to be reasonably related to the agency's actual needs. The Government is not evaluating past performance.
249	Reference L.4.1.2.1, Contracts performed as the prime contractor which included contractor team arrangement(s) (as defined by FAR 9.601) in excess of three organizations, not including the prime offeror. Include detail discussing what type and portion of work was done by each firm. Question: Most SBs receive single sourced, directed contracts. In these cases, there is no need to add subcontractors. And, since the contracts are relatively small, \$1 to \$10 million range, there is a limited or no need to add subcontractors, let alone three plus. Would the USG consider the past performance of Subcontractors or relaxing the team requirements, in an effort to help level the playing field for SBs vis-à-vis LBs?	No. In accordance with M.1.1.1, SBs will be evaluated under a restricted pool. Other than small businesses (OTSBs) will qualify for the full and open pool. SBs will only be evaluated against other SBs for an MA IDIQ award. OTSBs will only be evaluated against OTSBs for an MA IDIQ award. The Government considers its evaluation factors to be reasonably related to the agency's actual needs. The Government is not evaluating past performance.
250	Reference L.4.1.2 Relevant Contracts... Where prior relevant experience is under a broader IDIQ, BPA, BOA, or FSS-type contract, the offeror shall not just cite the broader IDIQ, BPA, BOA, or FSS-type contract. Preamble: Under an IDIQ contract like FIRST or EAGLE, we must manage each of the 10 to 20 subcontractors as we bid each individual task orders. We must manage and balance the USG's requirements against the underlying contractual commitments, desires and prices of our teammates to deliver a technically acceptable, and competitive, proposal. This is like TS3, once the contract is in execution phase. Question: Considering SBs are already at a disadvantage as per .4.1.2.1 (Contracts performed as the prime contractor which included contractor team arrangement(s) (as defined by FAR 9.601) in excess of three organizations...), would the USG consider using BPAs, IDIQs, BOAs, and FSS type contracts in an effort to help level the playing field for SBs vis-à-vis LBs?	No. In accordance with M.1.1.1, SBs will be evaluated under a restricted pool. Other than small businesses (OTSBs) will qualify for the full and open pool. SBs will only be evaluated against other SBs for an MA IDIQ award. OTSBs will only be evaluated against OTSBs for an MA IDIQ award. The Government considers its evaluation factors to be reasonably related to the agency's actual needs.
251	Reference L.4.1.1 Recent Contracts. Recent contracts are those performed within three years of the date of issuance of this solicitation. Question: We have concerns that the USG may limit past performance to a short timeframe (3 years). This proposal has been on the street now for 21 months years, and the potential for contract recency is diminishing. With this background, would the USG considering expanding the window to five years?	No. Three years is the limit. The Government is not evaluating past performance.

254	<p>Reference L.4. Vol II Experience Factor, L.4.1 Paragraph 3. The Government will not consider the past experience of any proposed subcontractors or teammates in its evaluation under the Experience Factor. Only the experience of the prime offeror will be considered.</p> <p>Question: Most SBs receive single sourced, directed contracts. Also, most SBs have limited lines of work, perhaps Engineering focused, or Programmatic and Support focused, so there may not be the need to have more than 3 primes (L.4.1.2.1) or to do OCONUS work (L.4.1.2.2). And, most SBs have put together a solid stable of companies to perform all work on the EBS effort. With this background, would the USG consider using the past performance of Subcontractors, in an effort to help level the playing field for SBs vis-à-vis LBs?</p>	<p>No. In accordance with M.1.1.1, SBs will be evaluated under a restricted pool. Other than small businesses (OTSBs) will qualify for the full and open pool. SBs will only be evaluated against other SBs for an MA IDIQ award. OTSBs will only be evaluated against OTSBs for an MA IDIQ award. The Government considers its evaluation factors to be reasonably related to the agency's actual needs. The Government is not evaluating past performance.</p>
255	<p>Reference L.4.1.2.1, Contracts performed as the prime contractor which included contractor team arrangement(s) (as defined by FAR 9.601) in excess of three organizations, not including the prime offeror. Include detail discussing what type and portion of work was done by each firm.</p> <p>Question: Most SBs receive single sourced, directed contracts. In these cases, there is no need to add subcontractors. And, since the contracts are relatively small, \$1 to \$10 million range, there is a limited or no need to add subcontractors, let alone three plus. Would the USG consider the past performance of Subcontractors or relaxing the team requirements, in an effort to help level the playing field for SBs vis-à-vis LBs?</p>	<p>No. In accordance with M.1.1.1, SBs will be evaluated under a restricted pool. Other than small businesses (OTSBs) will qualify for the full and open pool. SBs will only be evaluated against other SBs for an MA IDIQ award. OTSBs will only be evaluated against OTSBs for an MA IDIQ award. The Government considers its evaluation factors to be reasonably related to the agency's actual needs. The Government is not evaluating past performance.</p>
256	<p>Reference L.4.1.2 Relevant Contracts... Where prior relevant experience is under a broader IDIQ, BPA, BOA, or FSS-type contract, the offeror shall not just cite the broader IDIQ, BPA, BOA, or FSS-type contract.</p> <p>Preamble: Under an IDIQ contract like FIRST or EAGLE, we must manage each of the 10 to 20 subcontractors as we bid each individual task orders. We must manage and balance the USG's requirements against the underlying contractual commitments, desires and prices of our teammates to deliver a technically acceptable, and competitive, proposal. This is like TS3, once the contract is in execution phase.</p> <p>Question: Considering SBs are already at a disadvantage as per .4.1.2.1 (Contracts performed as the prime contractor which included contractor team arrangement(s) (as defined by FAR 9.601) in excess of three organizations...), would the USG consider using BPAs, IDIQs, BOAs, and FSS type contracts in an effort to help level the playing field for SBs vis-à-vis LBs?</p>	<p>No. In accordance with M.1.1.1, SBs will be evaluated under a restricted pool. Other than small businesses (OTSBs) will qualify for the full and open pool. SBs will only be evaluated against other SBs for an MA IDIQ award. OTSBs will only be evaluated against OTSBs for an MA IDIQ award. The Government considers its evaluation factors to be reasonably related to the agency's actual needs.</p>
257	<p>Reference L.4.1.1 Recent Contracts. Recent contracts are those performed within three years of the date of issuance of this solicitation.</p> <p>Question: We have concerns that the USG may limit past performance to a short timeframe (3 years). This proposal has been on the street now for 21 months years, and the potential for contract recency is diminishing. With this background, would the USG considering expanding the window to five years?</p>	<p>No. Three years is the limit. The Government is not evaluating past performance.</p>
258	<p>Reference L.4. Vol II Experience Factor, L.4.1 Paragraph 3. The Government will not consider the past experience of any proposed subcontractors or teammates in its evaluation under the Experience Factor. Only the experience of the prime offeror will be considered.</p> <p>Question: Most SBs receive single sourced, directed contracts. Also, most SBs have limited lines of work, perhaps Engineering focused, or Programmatic and Support focused, so there may not be the need to have more than 3 primes (L.4.1.2.1) or to do OCONUS work (L.4.1.2.2). And, most SBs have put together a solid stable of companies to perform all work on the R&amp;D effort. With this background, would the USG consider using the past performance of Subcontractors, in an effort to help level the playing field for SBs vis-à-vis LBs?</p>	<p>No. In accordance with M.1.1.1, SBs will be evaluated under a restricted pool. Other than small businesses (OTSBs) will qualify for the full and open pool. SBs will only be evaluated against other SBs for an MA IDIQ award. OTSBs will only be evaluated against OTSBs for an MA IDIQ award. The Government considers its evaluation factors to be reasonably related to the agency's actual needs. The Government is not evaluating past performance.</p>
259	<p>Reference L.4.1.2.1, Contracts performed as the prime contractor which included contractor team arrangement(s) (as defined by FAR 9.601) in excess of three organizations, not including the prime offeror. Include detail discussing what type and portion of work was done by each firm.</p> <p>Question: Most SBs receive single sourced, directed contracts. In these cases, there is no need to add subcontractors. And, since the contracts are relatively small, \$1 to \$10 million range, there is a limited or no need to add subcontractors, let alone three plus. Would the USG consider the past performance of Subcontractors or relaxing the team requirements, in an effort to help level the playing field for SBs vis-à-vis LBs?</p>	<p>No. In accordance with M.1.1.1, SBs will be evaluated under a restricted pool. Other than small businesses (OTSBs) will qualify for the full and open pool. SBs will only be evaluated against other SBs for an MA IDIQ award. OTSBs will only be evaluated against OTSBs for an MA IDIQ award. The Government considers its evaluation factors to be reasonably related to the agency's actual needs. The Government is not evaluating past performance.</p>
260	<p>Reference L.4.1.2 Relevant Contracts... Where prior relevant experience is under a broader IDIQ, BPA, BOA, or FSS-type contract, the offeror shall not just cite the broader IDIQ, BPA, BOA, or FSS-type contract.</p> <p>Preamble: Under an IDIQ contract like FIRST or EAGLE, we must manage each of the 10 to 20 subcontractors as we bid each individual task orders. We must manage and balance the USG's requirements against the underlying contractual commitments, desires and prices of our teammates to deliver a technically acceptable, and competitive, proposal. This is like TS3, once the contract is in execution phase.</p> <p>Question: Considering SBs are already at a disadvantage as per .4.1.2.1 (Contracts performed as the prime contractor which included contractor team arrangement(s) (as defined by FAR 9.601) in excess of three organizations...), would the USG consider using BPAs, IDIQs, BOAs, and FSS type contracts in an effort to help level the playing field for SBs vis-à-vis LBs?</p>	<p>No. In accordance with M.1.1.1, SBs will be evaluated under a restricted pool. Other than small businesses (OTSBs) will qualify for the full and open pool. SBs will only be evaluated against other SBs for an MA IDIQ award. OTSBs will only be evaluated against OTSBs for an MA IDIQ award. The Government considers its evaluation factors to be reasonably related to the agency's actual needs.</p>

261	Reference L.4.1.1 Recent Contracts. Recent contracts are those performed within three years of the date of issuance of this solicitation. Question: We have concerns that the USG may limit past performance to a short timeframe (3 years). This proposal has been on the street now for 21 months years, and the potential for contract recency is diminishing. With this background, would the USG considering expanding the window to five years?	No. Three years is the limit. The Government is not evaluating past performance.
269	Paragraph L.4.1 states "The Government will not consider the past experience of any proposed subcontractors or teammates in its evaluation under the Experience Factor. Only the experience of the prime offeror will be considered." We believe the Government is being unnecessarily too restrictive. TACOM WRN has always considered teammate past experience in their IDIQ services predecessor contracts like Focused Sustainment, Omnibus I/II/III, TARDEC's IDIQ contract, FIRST and ILS Omnibus. Especially for Small Business, the effect of teaming brings multiple entities together and provides a highly competitive environment. By restricting the past experience of subcontractors, TACOM is unnecessarily limiting the ability of Small Business to participate.	Teammates or subcontractors are not locked in at the IDIQ level, unless they are part of a joint venture legal agreement.
270	Paragraph L.4.1 states "A total of no more than two contracts for each of the areas identified in paragraph L.4.1.2". Does this mean we are allowed to use 2 each Experiences for L.4.1.2.1, L.4.1.2.2, L.4.1.2.3 and L.4.1.2.4?	Yes, that would be allowed.
272	Paragraph L.4.1 states "The Government will not consider the past experience of any proposed subcontractors or teammates in its evaluation under the Experience Factor. Only the experience of the prime offeror will be considered." We believe the Government is being unnecessarily too restrictive. TACOM WRN has always considered teammate past performance in their IDIQ services predecessor contracts like Focused Sustainment, Omnibus I/II/III, TARDEC's IDIQ contract, FIRST and ILS Omnibus. Especially for Small Business, the effect of teaming brings multiple entities together and provides a highly competitive environment. By restricting the past experience of subcontractors, TACOM is unnecessarily limiting the ability of Small Business to participate.	Teammates or subcontractors are not locked in at the IDIQ level, unless they are part of a joint venture legal agreement.
273	Paragraph L.4.1 states "A total of no more than two contracts for each of the areas identified in paragraph L.4.1.2". Does this mean we are allowed to use 2 each Experiences for L.4.1.2.1 and L.4.1.2.2?	Yes, that would be allowed.
274	Paragraph L.4.1.2.2 states "Contracts performed either as the prime contractor or subcontractor which required deployment and management of at least six deployed individuals simultaneously to more than two OCONUS locations. For this solicitation, 'management of deployed individuals' includes the pre-deployment recruitment, training, and processing in and out of the National Deployment Center (or equivalent), as well as ensuring the deployed personnel accomplish the mission once deployed." Can the two experience references combined total personnel and locations provide the two locations and six deployed individuals if they were performed at the same time?	No. Note that the requirement is for 3 or more locations.
277	Paragraph L.4.1 states "The Government will not consider the past experience of any proposed subcontractors or teammates in its evaluation under the Experience Factor. Only the experience of the prime offeror will be considered." We believe the Government is being unnecessarily too restrictive. TACOM WRN has always considered teammate past experience in their IDIQ services predecessor contracts like Focused Sustainment, Omnibus I/II/III, TARDEC's IDIQ contract, FIRST and ILS Omnibus. Especially for Small Business, the effect of teaming brings multiple entities together and provides a highly competitive environment. By restricting the past experience of subcontractors, TACOM is unnecessarily limiting the ability of Small Business to participate.	Teammates/subcontractors are not locked in, therefore subcontractor experience will not be considered.
278	Paragraph L.4.1 states "A total of no more than two contracts for each of the areas identified in paragraph L.4.1.2". Does this mean we are allowed to use 2 each Experiences for L.4.1.2.1, L.4.1.2.2 and L.4.1.2.3?	Yes, that would be allowed.
279	Paragraph L.4.1.2.2 states "Contracts performed either as the prime contractor or subcontractor which required deployment and management of at least six deployed individuals simultaneously to more than two OCONUS locations. For this solicitation, 'management of deployed individuals' includes the pre-deployment recruitment, training, and processing in and out of the National Deployment Center (or equivalent), as well as ensuring the deployed personnel accomplish the mission once deployed." Can the two experience references combined provide the two locations and six deployed individuals if they were performed at the same time?	No. Note that the requirement is for 3 or more locations.
352	With regard to the past experience requirement for TS3 R/D, would the government consider a member of the Prime's team past experience for L.4.1.2.1-4? For small businesses, it is unlikely that small R/D firms focus on prototype development, validation testing and modeling and simulation activities – but instead focus on one or two of these facets.	No. Teammates or subcontractors are not locked in at the IDIQ level, unless they are part of a joint venture legal agreement.

354	<p>Reference: M.5.1. The Government will assess the expectation that the offeror will successfully perform the required effort. This assessment will result in the application of a Confidence Rating which will be based upon the extent to which recent prior experience is relevant to the solicitation requirements: The Government does not currently provide a definition of the Confidence Rating(s) in the solicitation (Section M) that assesses the relevant experience that offerors will provide in their proposal responses. Providing this definition in the solicitation will remove any perceived ambiguity between confidence ratings of an offeror's experience relative to the solicitation requirements.</p> <p>Question: Will the Government consider including Experience Factor Confidence Rating definitions to the solicitation, similar to the table below?</p> <p>EXPERIENCE FACTOR CONFIDENCE ASSESSMENTS</p> <p>Rating - Description</p> <p>SUBSTANTIAL CONFIDENCE - Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant experience, the Government has a high expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.</p> <p>SATISFACTORY CONFIDENCE - Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant experience, the Government has a reasonable expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort.</p> <p>LIMITED CONFIDENCE - Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant experience, the Government has a low expectation that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort</p> <p>NO CONFIDENCE - Based on the Offeror's recent/relevant experience, the Government has no expectation that the Offeror will be able to successfully perform the required effort.</p> <p>UNKNOWN CONFIDENCE (NEUTRAL) - No recent/relevant experience is available or the Offeror's experience is so sparse that no meaningful confidence assessment rating can be reasonably assigned.</p>	No. ACC-WRN uses adjectival ratings derived from the Army Source Selection Supplement but will not be including that language in the solicitation.
355	<p>Question: The solicitation does not include Experience Factor Relevancy definitions in Section M. Attachment 0004 defines relevancy, but Section M does not utilize these definitions in its evaluation factors. In order to alleviate ambiguity, and decrease the Government's burden in responding to questions, would the Government please consider including the following relevancy definitions in Section M.</p> <p>EXPERIENCE RELEVANCY</p> <p>RATING - DEFINITION</p> <p>VERY RELEVANT - Present/past experience involved essentially the same scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.</p> <p>RELEVANT - Present/past experience involved similar scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.</p> <p>SOMEWHAT RELEVANT - Present/past experience involved some of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.</p> <p>NOT RELEVANT - Present/past experience involved little or none of the scope and magnitude of effort and complexities this solicitation requires.</p>	No. ACC-WRN uses adjectival ratings derived from the Army Source Selection Supplement. Attachment 0004 provides the relevance levels for information submitted under L.4.1.2.
356	<p>Reference: L.4.1.2. Specifically, the extent of relevant experience with the following solicitation requirements will be assessed by the Government: L.4.1.2.1. Service contracts performed as the prime contractor which included contractor team arrangement(s) (as defined by FAR 9.601) in excess of three organizations, not including the prime offeror. Include detail discussing what type and portion of work was done by each firm.</p> <p>Question: The Government requires offerors to describe their experience managing contractor teaming agreements (CTAs) discuss details of the type and portion of work performed by each firm. Section M of the solicitation does not include an evaluation of this management experience as part of the overall confidence rating or experience relevancy. The opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of an offeror's management of large teams performing work of similar scope, magnitude and complexity as TS-3 provides the Government will significantly lower the Government's risk in the execution of the contract. Will the Government consider expanding Experience Volume instructions to require offerors to provide specific evidence of successful performance (e.g., metrics, awards, specific improvements) in the management of these CTAs, and consider this evidence as part of the confidence rating evaluation in Section M?</p>	No. The Government considers its evaluation factors to be reasonably related to the agency's actual needs.
357	The prime is responsible for establishing a contractor team with the breadth of capabilities to address the entire PWS/SOW, and providing the infrastructure and process to simultaneously respond to, execute, manage, and effectively deliver a large volume of simultaneous task orders (TOs) (including international TOs) with multiple subcontractors across multiple requirements for multiple clients. It is clear the Government plans to evaluate the prime offeror's past experience managing teams in the execution of IDIQ contracts. Would the Government consider allowing offerors to submit subcontractor experience to prove their teams' capability to address the PWS/SOW requirements? This would provide the Government with greater confidence that an offeror's team has the capabilities to deliver required products and services successfully. We recommend the Government allow up to three subcontractor experience examples as part of the Experience Factor evaluation.	No. Teammates or subcontractors are not locked in at the IDIQ level, unless they are part of a joint venture legal agreement.
358	<p>Reference: L.4.1.2.2 and M.5.1.2. The Government states, Contracts performed either as the prime contractor or subcontractor which required deployment and management of at least six deployed individuals simultaneously to more than two OCONUS locations.</p> <p>Will the Government confirm this requirement is for a total of six deployed individuals across two or more OCONUS locations?</p>	No. L.4.1.2.2 will be revised in the final RFP. At least 6 individuals (meaning 6 or more) simultaneously deployed to three or more separate OCONUS locations.

359	<p>Reference: L.4.2.7. Copies (excerpts) of all SOW/PWS paragraph(s) for the contract(s) cited per paragraph L.4.2.1 describing experience which is relevant to the relevance consideration cited in paragraphs L.4.1.2.1-3, and Paragraph 7 of the Experience Matrix/Narrative (Attachment 0003); Performance Work Statement (PWS) / Statement of Work (SOW) paragraph(s) (copy and paste the specific applicable PWS/SOW excerpts – do not simply provide a paragraph number(s)) from the Contract reflecting experience pertaining to the relevance considerations cited in paragraph L.4.1.2.1.</p> <p>The stated requirement requires offerors to copy and paste the applicable PWS/SOW excerpts from the referenced contract, which will significantly impact the amount of content the offeror can provide the Government.</p> <p>Will the Government please consider expanding the page count by five pages or allow the inclusion of a cross-reference matrix containing the required references, but not included within page count?</p>	No. The Government will authorize an index/Table of Contents that is not included in the page count.
360	<p>Reference L.4.4. Cross-Reference Matrix. In addition to populating the ERS Experience Matrix/Narrative (Attachment 0003) required by paragraph L.4.2, the offeror shall also complete the ERS Cross-Reference Matrix (Attachment 0004).</p> <p>Will the Government confirm that the Cross-Reference Matrix (Attachment 0004) does not count against the page limit for Volume II?</p>	Confirmed.
361	<p>Reference M.6.1. This factor will be evaluated in terms of the extent to which and probability that the offeror's proposed approach will meet the schedule and performance requirements of the &lt;sample&gt; task order, through effective and detailed planning:</p> <p>Question: The Government does not currently provide a definition or description for determining the extent and probability that offerors will meet the schedule and performance requirements of the TO. Further, the Government does not include its definition for assessing risk. Would the Government consider providing an adjectival rating system for the technical factor?</p>	No. ACC-WRN uses adjectival ratings derived from the Army Source Selection Supplement but will not be including that language in the solicitation.
362	<p>In order to alleviate ambiguity, and decrease the Government's burden in responding to questions, would the Government please consider including the following technical and risk descriptions in Section M?</p> <p>Combined Technical / Risk Rating</p> <p>Color - Rating - Description</p> <p>Blue - Outstanding - Proposal meets requirements and indicates an exceptional approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths far outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is very low.</p> <p>Purple - Good - Proposal meets requirements and indicates a thorough approach and understanding of the requirements. Proposal contains strengths which outweigh any weaknesses. Risk of unsuccessful performance is low.</p> <p>Green - Acceptable - Proposal meets requirements and indicates an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. Strengths and weaknesses are offsetting or will have little or no impact on contract performance. Risk of unsuccessful performance is no worse than moderate.</p> <p>Yellow - Marginal - Proposal does not clearly meet requirements and has not demonstrated an adequate approach and understanding of the requirements. The proposal has one or more weaknesses which are not offset by strengths. Risk of unsuccessful performance is high.</p> <p>Red - Unacceptable - Proposal does not meet requirements and contains one or more deficiencies. Proposal is not awardable.</p>	No. ACC-WRN uses adjectival ratings derived from the Army Source Selection Supplement but will not be including that language in the solicitation.
369	<p>Attachment 0003, Experience Matrix/Narrative</p> <p>Relevance Consideration # 1: Recent and relevant prior experience pertaining to service contracts performed as the prime contractor which included contractor team arrangement(s) (as defined by FAR 9.601) in excess of three organizations, not including the prime Offeror. Include detail discussing what type and portion of work was done by each firm.</p> <p>L.4.1.2.1, Service contracts performed as the prime contractor which included contractor team arrangement(s) (as defined by FAR 9.601) in excess of three organizations, not including the prime offeror. Include detail discussing what type and portion of work was done by each firm.</p> <p>L.4.2.7, Copies (excerpts) of all SOW/PWS paragraph(s) from the contract(s) cited per paragraph L.4.2.1 describing experience which is relevant to the relevance considerations cited in paragraphs L.4.1.2.1 and L.4.1.2.2.</p> <p>Question: The PWS does not address contractor team arrangements. This consideration is addressed in the draft RFP in Section H and the Subcontracting Plan. Can the requirement of a one-to-one PWS match be changed to a one-to-one match of the contract that would include Section H and Subcontracting Plan?</p>	No. Offeror's are to take excerpts from a SOW/PWS of a contract reference provided by the offeror as required by L.4.1, and detail the type or portion of work performed by the teammate/subcontractor.

370	<p>Attachment 0003, Experience Matrix/Narrative</p> <p>Relevance Consideration # 2: Recent and relevant prior experience pertaining to contracts performed either as the prime contractor or subcontractor which required deployment and management of at least six deployed individuals simultaneously to more than two OCONUS locations. For this solicitation, 'management of deployed individuals' includes the pre-deployment recruitment, training, and processing in and out of the National Deployment Center (or equivalent), as well as ensuring the deployed personnel accomplish the mission once deployed.</p> <p>L.4.1.2.2 Contracts performed either as the prime contractor or subcontractor which required deployment and management of at least six deployed individuals simultaneously to more than two OCONUS locations. For this solicitation, 'management of deployed individuals' includes the pre-deployment recruitment, training, and processing in and out of the National Deployment Center (or equivalent), as well as ensuring the deployed personnel accomplish the mission once deployed.</p> <p>L.4.2.7 Copies (excerpts) of all SOW/PWS paragraph(s) from the contract(s) cited per paragraph L.4.2.1 describing experience which is relevant to the relevance considerations cited in paragraphs L.4.1.2.1 and L.4.1.2.2.</p>	<p>No. Offeror's are to take excerpts from a SOW/PWS of a contract reference provided by the offeror as required by L.4.1, and detail contracts performed that required the deployment of personnel in order to perform the tasks required under the contract.</p>
371	<p>Attachment 0003, Experience Matrix/Narrative</p> <p>Can different experience citations be used for each of the considerations or must one experience citation be used for all considerations?</p>	<p>Yes, different contracts/task orders may be cited for each experience consideration.</p>
382	<p>L.1.2 General</p> <p>Proposal Instructions direct offerors to "provide an index with each volume." Please confirm that this statement refers to a Table for Contents for each volume.</p>	<p>The index is equivalent to a table of contents. The language will be clarified.</p>
403	<p>Solicitation requirement L.4.1.2.1 states: "L.4.1.2.1 Service contracts performed as the prime contractor which included contractor team arrangement(s) (as defined by FAR 9.601) in excess of three organizations, not including the prime offeror. Include detail discussing what type and portion of work was done by each firm." This statement, as drafted, appears to limit responses to only those Service contracts which the Offeror has served as the prime which 1) included contractor team arrangement(s) (as defined by FAR 9.601), and 2) included in excess of three organizations, not including the prime offeror. If this interpretation is correct, this would eliminate all Service contracts which do not involve a contractor team arrangement. Should the statement instead read as follows: "L.4.1.2.1 Service contracts performed as the prime contractor, which may include contractor team arrangement(s) (as defined by FAR 9.601), in excess of three organizations, not including the prime offeror. Include detail discussing what type and portion of work was done by each firm."</p>	<p>The Government will evaluate the offeror's experience with team arrangements. The number of organizations will be reduced to "at least three." Experience with service contracts that do not include a teaming arrangement may be considered higher risk.</p>
404	<p>Assuming the language in L.4.1.2.1 of the draft solicitation is correct, L.4.2.8 requires "A discussion of specific similarities between the contract SOW/PWS paragraphs included as a result of paragraph L.4.2.7 and the relevance considerations cited in paragraphs L.4.1.2.1". Are the responses to L.4.2.7 and L.4.2.8 limited to only relevant contracts performed under contractor team arrangements for which 1) the offeror was the prime contractor and 2) which included in excess of three organizations, not including the prime offeror? Please clarify the Government's expectations for the copying of relevant SOW/PWS paragraphs (L.4.2.7) and the discussion of specific similarities (L.4.2.8) as they relate to L.4.1.2.1.</p>	<p>SOW/PWS paragraphs from the submitted contract examples should support the experience claimed by showing the the type and portion of work performed by teammate/subcontractor.</p>
406	<p>PARA L.4.1.2 Relevant Contracts, states "Relevant contracts are those which, as described below in paragraphs L.5.1.2.1-3, are comparable in scope to this solicitation requirement(s)." Additionally, the Market Survey provided the following reference: "RFP # 2, pertaining to Equipment Related Services. This functional area will serve as a means for TACOM LCMC to supplement the Army workforce pertaining to its mission for "non-professional" disciplines in both CONUS and OCONUS performance locations, which are both commercial and non-commercial in nature. Examples of Facility/Equipment Related Services that are forecasted to be included in this RFP are as follows: General Warehousing and Storage, Facilitates Support Services, Maintenance, Repair, and Overhaul, Equipment Modification, Total Package Fielding, Contractor Logistic Services , Field Service Representatives, Up-armor Vehicle Services, Supply Chain Management." Question: In addressing/evaluating "comparable in scope" in past performance evaluations, are the factors listed in the Market Survey the relevant factors?</p>	<p>No. The only relevant factors are in the RFP. Note correction of reference to L.5.1.2.1-3 to L.4.1.2.1-3. The Government is not evaluating past performance.</p>