

Question Number 2nd draft posting	Question/Comments	Answer/Response
1	I'm wondering if responses to the TS3 Market Survey will be aggregated/analyzed and shared with the community?	The TS3 Market Survey has been analyzed by ACC-WRN. The analysis will not be shared with industry.
2	For the NAICS (811111) for Equipment Related Services, could you provide the last two competitions that this NAICS code was used?	NAICS Code 811111 is the appropriate code based on the preponderance of the work under the Equipment Related Services (ERS) RFP. W56HZV12C0127 and W56HZV13P0600 are current ACC-Warren contracts under NAICS 811111.
3	For the NAICS (811111) for Equipment Related Services, could you provide the NAICS codes were applied to the last two competitions under Omnibus?	NAICS Code 811111 was not used previously under OMNIBUS III. ERS was not procured under Omnibus III. The NAICS Code currently being used under the OMNIBUS III is 541712.
4	Are Draft Solicitations still anticipated to be released this month for the subject requirement?	Draft RFPs were released on 28 Mar 14.
5	<p>The website states, "Industry shall anticipate that [the NIE] task order will require all Offerors to have an active SECRET Facility Clearance at the time of proposal submission; there is no Level of Safeguarding required. The Government will not be sponsoring Facility Clearance(s) in support of this requirement."</p> <p>Is this a typo? Aren't these two statements directly contradictory?</p>	<p>This language contained within the question was posted prior to the TS3 Strategy Change.</p> <p>There is no typo. The contractors will not have classified information in their custody, so safeguarding is not required. An FCL is still required when contractors need access to classified information. A contractor does not have an active FCL to be eligible to receive an IDIQ award. However, contractors must have an active Secret FCL Clearance or higher in order to be eligible for a NIE task order award. "The Government will not be sponsoring a Facility Clearance" because Defense Security Service (DSS) protocol does not allow the FCL process until there is a need for access to classified information, which in the case of the NIE task order is not until contract award.</p>
6	<p>The website states, "Industry shall anticipate that [the NIE] task order will require all Offerors to have an active SECRET Facility Clearance at the time of proposal submission; there is no Level of Safeguarding required. The Government will not be sponsoring Facility Clearance(s) in support of this requirement."</p> <p>If the Government will not be sponsoring Facility Clearances in support of this requirement but requires an offeror to have a security clearance, how is a potential prime offeror expected to obtain the clearance?</p>	<p>This language contained within the question was posted prior to the TS3 Strategy Change.</p> <p>Performance of the NIE Task Order is schedule driven which means that performance must begin upon award. Contractors must have an FCL to begin performance of the task order. Therefore, the contractor must submit evidence of an active Secret or higher FCL as part of its proposal submission. In accordance with DoD 5220.22-M, Defense Security Service (DSS) will not process FCL clearances unless there is a valid need to access classified information at the time of the request. The NIE Task Order does not require access to classified information during the pre-award stage, so an FCL for NIE cannot be processed pre-award. If a contractor does not have an active FCL, they are still eligible to receive an IDIQ Award.</p>
7	<p>The website states, "Industry shall anticipate that [the NIE] task order will require all Offerors to have an active SECRET Facility Clearance at the time of proposal submission; there is no Level of Safeguarding required. The Government will not be sponsoring Facility Clearance(s) in support of this requirement."</p> <p>Clearances will not be issued without a sponsor; generally a contractor will not be sponsored unless it has been awarded a contract requiring a clearance. How will the Government insure a level playing field in responding to this requirement if it requires a clearance and yet refuses to sponsor contractors?</p>	See responses to Questions #5 & 6.

8	<p>The website states, "Industry shall anticipate that [the NIE] task order will require all Offerors to have an active SECRET Facility Clearance at the time of proposal submission; there is no Level of Safeguarding required. The Government will not be sponsoring Facility Clearance(s) in support of this requirement."</p> <p>Will the Government consider deleting the requirement that an offeror must possess a facility clearance at the time of proposal submission, and allow successful contractors to obtain it after award, as is often done?</p>	No. An active Secret FCL is required at time of proposal submission for the NIE task order.
9	Is the Army still planning to proceed with this program?	Yes. Draft RFPs were released on 28 Mar 14.
10	Para C.3.2 Level II Drawing Sets: MIL STD 31000, 5 Nov 2009 has been superseded by MIL STD 31000A, 26 Feb 2013	Revision Noted. The PWS will be updated to reflect the current MIL-STD-31000A.
11	A completed TDP Option Selection Worksheet, called for by the MIL STD, is applicable and should be included in the solicitation as well as the awarded contract as part of the CDRL.	Noted, the final solicitation will include the applicable TDP Option Selection Worksheet.
12	Note MIL STD 31000A reference, DoD 5010.12-M Procedures for the Acquisition of Technical Data, May 1993, para C6.5. PROCEDURES FOR INSPECTING AND ACCEPTING TDPs.	Noted.
13	<p>Recommend incorporating elements of the specified procedures in Section C.</p> <p>- See also MIL HDBK 288B, Review and Acceptance of Engineering Data Packages, 14 Jan 1991, referenced in DoD 5010.12-M.</p> <p>- Need to address Intellectual Property Data Rights, if not already addressed elsewhere in the basic solicitation documents.</p>	Data rights clauses are included in the RFP, and will be detailed at the task order level when necessary.
14	<p>Recommend reviewing TDP SOW elements and associated CDRL per the following guides:</p> <p>- Army Guide for the Preparation of a Program Product Data Management Strategy (DMS), 31 Aug 2010</p> <p>- Addendum: Army Guide for the Preparation of a Program Product Data Management Strategy (DMS), Transition to Technical Data Rights Strategy (formerly Data Management Strategy), Jun 2012</p> <p>- Better Buying Power initiative guide, DOD Open Systems Architecture, Contract Guidebook for Program Managers, Version 1.1, May 2013.</p>	The Government will take your suggestion into consideration as we finalize the solicitation, and as necessary in developing future task order requests.
15	<p>Reference: DRFP provision L.3.8 which provides: "L.3.8 Evidence that the offeror (AND any subcontractor(s) who may handle and access the SECRET information) currently possesses an active SECRET facility clearance (FCL) or higher that can be verified by the Government in the Joint Personnel Adjudication System (JPAS) database as required by paragraph C.1.6.7 of the NIE PWS (Attachment 0010). The Government will not be sponsoring FCLs in support of the NIE requirement."</p> <p>If the Government will not be sponsoring Facility Clearances in support of this requirement but requires an offeror to have a security clearance, how is a potential prime offeror expected to obtain the clearance?</p>	See responses to Questions #5 & 6.
16	<p>Reference: DRFP provision L.3.8 which provides: "L.3.8 Evidence that the offeror (AND any subcontractor(s) who may handle and access the SECRET information) currently possesses an active SECRET facility clearance (FCL) or higher that can be verified by the Government in the Joint Personnel Adjudication System (JPAS) database as required by paragraph C.1.6.7 of the NIE PWS (Attachment 0010). The Government will not be sponsoring FCLs in support of the NIE requirement."</p> <p>Clearances will not be issued without a sponsor; generally a contractor will not be sponsored unless it has been awarded a contract requiring a clearance. How will the Government insure a level playing field in responding to this requirement if it requires a clearance and yet refuses to sponsor contractors?</p>	See responses to Questions #5 & 6.
17	<p>Reference: DRFP provision L.3.8 which provides: "L.3.8 Evidence that the offeror (AND any subcontractor(s) who may handle and access the SECRET information) currently possesses an active SECRET facility clearance (FCL) or higher that can be verified by the Government in the Joint Personnel Adjudication System (JPAS) database as required by paragraph C.1.6.7 of the NIE PWS (Attachment 0010). The Government will not be sponsoring FCLs in support of the NIE requirement."</p> <p>Will the Government consider deleting the requirement that an offeror must possess a facility clearance at the time of proposal submission, and allow successful contractors to obtain it after award, as is provided in the companion RFP for R&D services?</p>	No. An active Secret FCL is required at time of proposal submission for the NIE task order.

18	<p>Discussion: On page 10, Section C.1 Scope provides the following: "This R&D SOW is intended for Task Order (TO) requirements that will be for creating new processes or products. TOs that do not call for the Contractor to directly perform work that is an integral part of R&D or to create new processes or products will not be solicited under this scope."</p> <p>Issue: The use of the double negative in the above sentences creates a degree of ambiguity regarding the true scope of this contract.</p> <p>Recommendation: Revise Section C.1 Scope to read as follows: "This R&D SOW is intended for Task Order (TO) requirements that will create new processes or products. Only TOs that call for the Contractor to directly perform work that is an integral part of creating new R&D processes or products will be solicited under this scope."</p>	The language in R&D RFP Section C.1 is accurate. If a Task Order is not for creating new processes or products, then the Task Order will not be solicited under the R&D scope.
19	<p>Discussion: Section C.4 Specific Requirements covers, in varying degrees of detail, the end to end DoD 5000 Instruction Acquisition Cycle tasks and related processes and products, and indicates that these are all potential work scope for this contract.</p> <p>Issue: Because of the broadness of Section C.4 it is in conflict with guidance in Section C.1.</p> <p>Recommendation: Revise Section C.4 to read as follows: "C.4 Specific Requirements: The Contractor shall perform work that may involve the following, whether singly or in combination as specified in individual TOs as long as such performance does not result in an Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI). This R&D SOW is intended for Task Order (TO) requirements that will create new processes or products. Only TOs that call for the Contractor to directly perform work that is an integral part of creating new R&D processes or products will be solicited under this scope. Any work scope that is not directly related to creating new R&D processes or products may be solicited under solicitation W56HZV-14-R-0030 (Knowledge Based Services) or solicitation W56HZV-14-R-0031 (Equipment Related Services)."</p>	The suggested language would be partially redundant to Section C.1; the suggested language will not be incorporated.
20	<p>#1: Para 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>Concern: This is too high of a bar for a small business to meet and will make most legitimate small businesses unable to compete. Recommend that the government's needs can be met with alternative language such as "Prime contractor must have experience managing subcontractors and explain their system for managing task orders and subcontractor teammates."</p>	L.4.1.2.1 has been revised to reflect teaming arrangements of three (3) or more sub-contractors. The Government considers its evaluation factors to be reasonably related to the agency's actual needs.
21	<p>#2: Para 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>Concern: This is too high of a bar for a small business to meet (8 people at 3 locations) and will make most legitimate small businesses unable to compete. In practice, the processing for deployment is accomplished at IRDO and the process for the company is no different if they are deploying one employee or fifty employees. By deploying one employee a company will have verified that it can prepare a person for deployment, accomplish the IRDO processes, manage the employee while deployed and manage the return. The company has also put in place the DBA and foreign liability insurance. Recommend that the government's needs can be met with alternative language such as "Prime contractor must have recent experience deploying employees and providing all necessary DBA/Foreign Liability Insurances"</p>	The Government considers its evaluation factors to be reasonably related to the agency's actual needs. No change will be made to the number of individuals that must be deployed, at least 6, and the number of locations, at least 3.

22	<p>1. The first reference is made to the Small Business Act, specifically 15 U.S.C. 644(e)(4) Contract Teaming: "In the case of a solicitation of offers for a bundled contract that is issued by the head of an agency, a small-business concern may submit an offer that provides for use of a particular team of subcontractors for the performance of the contract. The head of the agency shall evaluate the offer in the same manner as other offers, with due consideration to the capabilities of all of the proposed subcontractors. If a small business concern teams under this paragraph, it shall not affect its status as a small business concern for any other purpose."</p> <p>2. A second reference is made to 13 CFR 121.103 (b)(9): "(u) Small Business Teaming Arrangement means an arrangement where: (2) A potential small business prime contractor agrees with one or more other small business concerns to have them act as its subcontractors under a specified Government contract. A Small Business Teaming Arrangement between a prime and its small business subcontractor(s) must exist through a written agreement between the parties that is specifically referred to as a "Small Business Teaming Arrangement" or "Small Business Teaming Agreement" and which sets forth the different responsibilities, roles, and percentages (or other allocations) of work as it relates to the acquisition."</p> <p>Comment: Under these two regulations the Government must evaluate a Small Business Teaming Arrangement (SBTA) offer with due consideration of the capabilities of all the proposed subcontractors. The "Experience" Section L proposal instructions and Section M selection criteria appear to violate both the statute and the SBA regulation by stating that only the prime offerors experience will be evaluated.</p> <p>Question: Will the Government revise the "Experience" instructions and criteria in the final RFP to provide that the experience of all of the proposed subcontractors will be considered and evaluated where the proposal is submitted as a formal SBTA as defined in the CFR?</p>	<p>No. The three separate RFPs are not considered a bundled contract so the requirements pertaining to contract teaming in 15 U.S.C. 644(e)(4) do not apply. Only the experience of the prime contractor will be considered at the IDIQ level.</p>
23	<p>I have interest in ERS. Do our current NAICS codes comply with your scope?</p> <p>[Redacted due to specific company information]</p> <p>333613 – Mechanical Power Transmission Equipment Manufacturing- Small Business Status 333612 - Drives, high-speed industrial (except hydrostatic manufacturing) - Small Business Status 811310 – Commercial/Industrial Machinery and Equipment Repair and Maintenance 811118 - Other Automotive Mechanical and Electrical Repair and Maintenance 811113 - Automotive Transmission Repair 336350 - Motor Vehicle Transmission and Power Train Parts Manufacturing - Small Business Status 336611 - Ship Building and Repairing - Small Business Status</p>	<p>The Government cannot comment on the qualifications of potential offerors.</p>
24	<p>We have submitted two questions closing in on two weeks ago, and I've checked the website every day. These are threshold questions that are critical to a decision as to whether we will attempt to submit any proposals. Is it possible to provide answers if they are available sooner rather than wait for a mass dump? Many other small business firms are in the same position.</p>	<p>Answers to all questions received will be posted to the TS3 website.</p>

25	<p>Section H.22.3.2.1 in all 3 draft RFPs reads as follows: Comment: We believe the above section has the following implications: a. [Redacted] is the OEM on the [redacted]. The above identified section would preclude [redacted], either as a prime or subcontractor, from providing maintenance services to vehicles in the [redacted] under the ERS solicitation. b. [Redacted] is the OEM for the [redacted]. The above situation would preclude [redacted], either as a prime or subcontractor, from providing operational test and evaluation to [redacted] under the KBS solicitation. c. [Redacted] is the OEM for the [redacted]. The above situation would preclude [redacted], either as a prime or subcontractor, from providing a new process or product (or element therein) for the [redacted] under the RD solicitation. The conditions noted in a through c above apply equally to all OEMs who have produced products for TACOM LCMC. Likewise, many other non OEM companies i.e. [redacted], [redacted] who have worked extensively on [redacted] lifecycle support would not be permitted to bid on any [redacted] work in the above according to the current interpretation. The FAR provides a number of exceptions to the potential organizational conflict of interest described above. Per FAR 9.505-2 (a) (1) (i), (ii); (a) (3); and (b) (1) Contractors that prepare specifications or work statements for use in competitive acquisitions can still compete to produce the items. Exceptions are included for development contractors who prepare specifications; for contractors that prepare work statements but participated in the design and development work; and when more than one contractor is involved in preparing a work statement. Recommendation: That section H.22.3.2.1 in all 3 solicitations be revised to recognize and incorporate the exceptions and conditions noted in FAR 9.505-2 (a) (1) (i), (ii); (a) (3); and (b) (1) and like elements of FAR 9.505. Rationale: Enable full and open competition, and ensure the broadest and most capable competitive base of bidders.</p>	<p>Section H.22.3.2.1 will not be revised. The exception and conditions noted in FAR 9.505-2(a) (1)(i), (ii); (a)(3); and (b) (1), and like elements of FAR 9.505 does not have to be mentioned in H.22.3.2.1 in order to invoke them. Therefore, no changes will be made to Paragraph H.22.3.2.1.</p>
26	<p>Request the Government modify the OCI clause (H.26 subparagraph H.22.3.2.1) to clearly state that the non-compete language is only applicable in the absence of an acceptable OCI Mitigation Plan. Having the non-compete clause without the ability to submit a mitigation plan will limit the competition and proposals that the Government will receive on a task order RFP.</p>	<p>Response is the same as Q25.</p>
27	<p>Based on the Scope of work on the ERS RFP, the inclusion of this OCI clause seems overly restrictive. The potential scope of this effort would not warrant a non-compete provision with a 7 year exclusion period and maintaining this type of scrutiny and oversight is costly and time consuming. We agree there is potential to have access to other company's proprietary information, but request that H.22.3.2.1 be removed from the ERS solicitation.</p>	<p>The OCI Plan in H.22.3.2.1 will remain in the RFP, but will be revised for the final RFP release.</p>
28	<p>A 7 year exclusion period is quite restrictive, would the Government consider a 3 year exclusion period?</p>	<p>The language at H.22.3.2.1.1 will be revised in the final RFP to reflect an alternate exclusion period.</p>
29	<p>Regarding the R&D Solicitation (W56HZV-14-R-0032), are task orders exclusively funded by R&D dollars or can they also be funded by PA, OMA and/or OPA dollars?</p>	<p>The Government will fund task orders with the appropriate fund type for task orders within the scope of the R&D Contract suite.</p>
30	<p>Regarding the Blast Mitigation TOR, Part 3 – GFE, Section 3.4 says "Equipment: N/A", yet in 5.1.1.1 it says "compatible with the TARDEC GSS Flooring Evaluation Fixture provided by the Government at the SOWM". This statement appears to be conflicting therefore is this fixture GFE?</p>	<p>Error noted. Conflict will be resolved.</p>
31	<p>Will Other Than Small Business (OTSB) Primes be able to offer a Small Business Teammate/Subcontractor as a Direct Award Candidate?</p>	<p>No. There are no direct awards to small business teammates under TS3 FoC.</p>
32	<p>If a new joint venture is formed to respond to any of these TS3 Family of Contracts, can the contractors forming the new joint venture use their individual experience to count as relevant contracts (as opposed to a pre-existing Joint Venture with existing contract experience as that venture) under the experience requirements?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
33	<p>Can a prime (SB or OTSB) add subcontractors at any time during the period of performance as new task orders are released?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>
34	<p>When can we expect answers to questions that are submitted prior to the 28 April 2014 deadline? Will responses come out en masse after the 28 April 2014 deadline?</p>	<p>The current target is to release responses to all questions received by mid-June 2014.</p>

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 & 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>1. 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>
39	<p>Section A, Paragraph A.4.3 - last sentence: 1. The following sentence was stated in the draft... "For a Mentor-Protégé joint venture to be considered a SB for the MA IDIQ award, the Protégé shall meet the size standard for the primary NAICS code" – This statement implies that a large business can have access to small business contracts if they have a mentor protégé joint venture relationship with a small business. Is this your intent? If yes, then this will give the protégée an unfair advantage because they can leverage the resources of a large business against other small businesses that do not have a mentor protégé relationship. We are asking that this consideration be removed from the solicitation.</p>	<p>The Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture Program is authorized per 13 CFR 124.520.</p>
40	<p>Section L, Paragraph L.4.1: 2. Please consider changing the requirement of not considering the experience of teammates. This requirement in its present form will hurt small business participation, especially since the current set of task orders may not be centered in the core competency of many small businesses.</p>	<p>The Government considers its evaluation factors to be reasonably related to the agency's actual needs. The Experience factor is not an evaluation factor at the representative task order level (but may be for future task order competitions).</p>
41	<p>Section L, Paragraph L.4.1.2.1: 3. Are you requiring the prime to provide contracts where they have managed in "excess of three" subcontractor organizations? If the answer is yes, then this will adversely affect small business participation and we asking that this requirement be removed from the solicitation or make this requirement at the IDIQ level. (In the recent IDIQ history of government procurements (like TS3), the prime offeror may have managed well over 4 subcontractors at the IDIQ level. However, subsequent task order work may not have required 4 or more subcontractors. We can only provide experience that has been dictated by the work itself.)</p>	<p>L.4.1.2.1 has been revised to reflect teaming arrangements of three (3) or more sub-contractors. The Government considers its evaluation factors to be reasonably related to the agency's actual needs.</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>

44	<p>NIE Sample Task Order, page 1: Para 1.4 ends stating that the PWS "provides for 15 Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs) worth of support during the base period. Yet paragraph 1.5 states a base period of "6 months/7680 hours." This equates to 8 FTE. Further, the estimated labor per location totals to 8 FTE. Please clarify.</p>	<p>Error Noted. 8 FTEs is the correct estimated labor. The base period is 6 months. The 7,680 is the estimated labor for 8 FTEs. The correction to 8 FTEs will be made.</p>
45	<p>Do you plan to leave the deployment language in the current TOR? I may be completely wrong, but not sure you will find very many 811111 \$7m Small business that meet this requirement. Is it still your intent that SB with revenues less than \$7m will receive an award on the ERS TOR, and that if revenues are greater than \$7m will have to compete this TOR as a large business?</p>	<p>Yes, the government will leave the deployment language in the current TOR. ACC-Warren's intent is to use NAICS Code 811111 because it is the correct code representing the preponderance of the work under the ERS RFP.</p>
46	<p>Background: The SBA sets the small business standard at \$35.5M and the 561210 NAICS is normally the primary NAICS for this type of requirement. That NAICS also allows maximum flexibility for all future "former FIRST type" TACOM maintenance requirements. Additionally, the past performance deployment requirement is such that only a very small handful of small businesses will be able to meet. With either of these two requirement thresholds, much less both, this exponentially limits the competition pool for this requirement.</p> <p>Question: Is there a specific reason that all small businesses between \$7M and \$35.5M are fundamentally being excluded from being able to competitively bid the ERS requirement?</p>	<p>NAICS 561210 for Facilities Support Services is for performance of support services at a facility, such as janitorial, maintenance, trash disposal, guard and security, mail routing, reception, laundry, and related. This is not the preponderance of anticipated work for the ERS RFP. SBA determines the size standard for each NAICS code. The NAICS code was chosen based on the preponderance of work. The Government is not evaluating past performance in deployment. The Government is evaluating experience in deployment.</p>
47	<p>REFERENCE: Draft RFP for ERS, Section A, Paragraph 4 (A.4.1), selection of NAICS code 811111 for the ERS MA IDIQ solicitation</p> <p>QUESTION: Will the USG consider changing the 811111 NAICS for the ERS MA IDIQ to a more comprehensive NAICS, such as either 541330 Engineering Services or 336992 Armored military vehicles and parts manufacturing, that is more closely aligned with the Robotics TOR used as a representative task order for the ERS contract suite solicitation? Or, is it feasible to raise the small business threshold limit above \$7.0 million average revenue over the last 3 years?</p> <p>RATIONAL: Raising the small business threshold limit for NAICS 811111 or changing the NAICS to a more comprehensive NAICS will enlarge the competition pool for the ERS IDIQ. The low size standard actually limits the number of qualified small businesses that can provide submissions. This serves to limit the pool of fully qualified small business offerors from which the USG may choose and may force the USG to consider firms that are not fully qualified or as capable in terms of the requisite skills and experience across all the task areas of the representative TOR.</p>	<p>The answer is No to both questions. The Government has determined that NAICS code 811111 is the most appropriate for the preponderance of work under the ERS RFP. The ERS contract suite is not for manufacturing and the preponderance of work is not engineering services. In addition, it is not possible for us to change the \$7M revenue threshold. SBA determines the size standard for each NAICS code.</p>
48	<p>I represent a small, non-traditional company that specializes in hardware and software that falls under the scope of the TS3 FoC. We are not planning to bid as a prime, but are very interested in joining other teams. Is there a list of potential interested primes who are likely to bid on one or more of the RFPs that you can provide? We would like to contact them regarding becoming a member of their TS3 bid team.</p>	<p>Reference the TS3 website under section "List of Available Subcontractors" for instructions on how to post your company's information.</p>
49	<p>What is the Governments reason for changing from a consolidation of requirements to a "Family of Contracts"?</p>	<p>The revised strategy was determined to be in the best interest of the Government.</p>
50	<p>A question comes to mind that if an OEM want to compete in this business space, can we with a hypothetical scenario below where we might want to compete to work on [redacted] products for the USG for the future Task Orders (TOs) that will be the specific opportunity drivers for this program? The current verbiage in sections H.22.3.2.1 seems counter to allowing OEMs to compete for work in this program. Please clarify.</p> <p>Hypothetical Scenario:</p> <p>An OEM decides to compete in a services based contract as a sub-contractor with a Prime services vendor [redacted] and by our agreement with this Prime, we have "right of first refusal" in our teaming agreement allowing [redacted] to compete to work on our own equipment that is part of the opportunity.</p> <p>Can we pursue this in the case of [redacted] and/or other products that we have been the OEM for?</p>	<p>The Government will not comment on hypothetical scenarios; however, it is not the intent of H.22.3.2.1 to restrict an OEM from competition, unless an OCI exists that can not be mitigated IAW FAR 9.5 and the Mitigation Plan at H.22.3.</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>	Confirmed.
53	<p>Does ACC-Warren intend to award representative Task Orders with the award of the MA IDIQ contracts?</p>	The Government plans to award the representative task orders subject to the availability of funds and bona fide need at the time of task order award.
54	<p>Please clarify whether the Rule-of-Two will be applied to representative Task Orders during the MA IDIQ proposal evaluation.</p>	The representative (NIE) task order will be awarded to the KBS prime IDIQ contractor whose proposal represents the best value to the Government.
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.
57	<p>Does ACC-Warren intend to award representative Task Orders with the award of the MA IDIQ contracts?</p>	The Government plans to award the representative task orders subject to the availability of funds and bona fide need at the time of task order award.
58	<p>Please clarify whether the Rule-of-Two will be applied to representative Task Orders during the MA IDIQ proposal evaluation.</p>	The representative (RSJPO) task order will be awarded to the ERS prime IDIQ contractor whose proposal represents the best value to the Government.
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.
61	<p>Does ACC-Warren intend to award representative Task Orders with the award of the MA IDIQ contracts?</p>	The Government plans to award the representative task orders subject to the availability of funds and bona fide need at the time of task order award.

62	Please clarify whether the Rule-of-Two will be applied to representative Task Orders during the MA IDIQ proposal evaluation.	The representative (Blast Mitigation) task order will be awarded to the R&D prime IDIQ contractor whose proposal represents the best value to the Government.
63	<p>Section L.6.2.1; Attachment 0002</p> <p>The RFP References define the Contract Ceiling Rates for the MA IDIQ Pricing Labor Matrix; citing applicability to (1) all contract types, (2) labor that is performed by the prime or subcontractors, and (3) Service Contract Act (SCA) compliance. For TOs that include SCA labor, pricing will necessarily vary by place of performance in accordance with (IAW) the applicable Department of Labor (DOL) Wage Determination.</p> <p>Request the Government mandate that all offerors are pricing to the same requirement in developing their SCA Contract Ceiling Rates by issuing a specific DOL Wage Determination with the RFP for proposal evaluation purposes.</p>	The Government is not mandating a specific DOL Wage Determination for the contractor to use in developing their Contract Ceiling Rates. The Government expects offerors to consider numerous components in developing ceiling rates for each labor category listed in Attachment 0002.
64	<p>Section L.6.2.1; Attachment 0002</p> <p>The RFP References define the Contract Ceiling Rates for the MA IDIQ Pricing Labor Matrix; citing applicability to (1) all contract types, (2) labor that is performed by the prime or subcontractors, and (3) SCA compliance. For TOs that include SCA labor, pricing will necessarily vary by TO place of performance IAW the applicable DOL Wage Determination.</p> <p>Request the Government to confirm that increases to the SCA Contract Ceiling Rates are allowable at the TO-level based on the applicable DOL Wage Determination for the TO place of performance.</p>	All rates in Attachment 0002 will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates that will not be subject to future adjustments.
65	<p>Section L.6.2.1; Attachment 0002</p> <p>The RFP References define the Contract Ceiling Rates for the MA IDIQ Pricing Labor Matrix; citing applicability to (1) all contract types, (2) labor that is performed by the prime or subcontractors, and (3) SCA compliance. For TOs that include Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) labor, pricing for selected labor categories will necessarily vary based on the applicable CBA for the TO place of performance.</p> <p>Request the Government to confirm that increases to the Contract Ceiling Rates are allowable at the TO-level based on the applicable CBA for the TO place of performance, and CBA terms and conditions in force during the period of performance.</p>	All rates in Attachment 0002 will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates that will not be subject to future adjustments.
66	<p>Section L.6.2.1; Attachment 0002</p> <p>The RFP References define the Contract Ceiling Rates for the MA IDIQ Pricing Labor Matrix; citing applicability to (1) all contract types, (2) labor that is performed by the prime or subcontractors, and (3) SCA compliance. For TOs that include Davis Bacon Act (DBA) labor, pricing for selected labor categories will necessarily vary based on the applicable DBA requirements for the TO place of performance.</p> <p>Request the Government to confirm that increases to the Contract Ceiling Rates are allowable at the TO-level based on the applicable DBA for the TO place of performance.</p>	All rates in Attachment 0002 will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates that will not be subject to future adjustments.
67	<p>Section L.6.2.1; Attachment 0002</p> <p>The RFP References define the Contract Ceiling Rates for the MA IDIQ Pricing Labor Matrix; citing applicability to (1) all contract types, (2) labor that is performed by the prime or subcontractors, and (3) SCA compliance. The pricing in Attachment 0002 does not distinguish between work performed at On-Site locations (i.e., Government/Other Contractor location) versus work performed at Off-Site locations (i.e., Contractor's own location). Many offerors use a separate overhead rate for work performed at Government locations to more precisely reflect the reduced costs of performing work at these locations.</p> <p>For the purposes of ensuring a homogeneous cost/pricing proposal evaluation, request the Government to mandate that all Contract Ceiling Rates be based on work performed at Contractor locations. During TO bidding/execution, reduced rates would be allowable based on the TO place of performance requirements.</p>	The Government is not mandating that contractors use On-site or Off-site locations in developing their Contract Ceiling Rates.

68	<p>Section L.6.2.1; Attachment 0002</p> <p>The RFP References define the Contract Ceiling Rates for the MA IDIQ Pricing Labor Matrix; citing applicability to (1) all contract types, (2) labor that is performed by the prime or subcontractors, and (3) SCA compliance.</p> <p>For TOs that may include Overtime requirements, request the Government confirm that increases to the Contract Ceiling Rates for Overtime are allowable IAW TO requirements.</p>	<p>RFP Language will be amended to state Pricing Labor Matrix ceiling rates do not apply to OCONUS or OT work. All rates in Attachment 0002 will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates that will not be subject to future adjustments.</p>
69	<p>Section L.6.2.1; Attachment 0002</p> <p>The RFP References define the Contract Ceiling Rates for the MA IDIQ Pricing Labor Matrix; citing applicability to (1) all contract types, (2) labor that is performed by the prime or subcontractors, and (3) SCA compliance. For TOs that include OCONUS labor, pricing will necessarily include certain Department of State (DOS) allowances that will vary by the place of performance.</p> <p>Request the Government to confirm that OCONUS uplifts will not be included in the MA IDIQ Pricing Labor Matrix, but will either be allowable increases to the Contract Ceiling Rates or allowable Other Direct Costs during TO bidding/execution.</p>	<p>RFP Language will be amended to state Pricing Labor Matrix ceiling rates do not apply to OCONUS or OT work. All rates in Attachment 0002 will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates that will not be subject to future adjustments.</p>
70	<p>Section L.7.1.3; Attachments 0005 & 0006</p> <p>Both the Small Business Participation (SBP) Factor (% of Total Contract Amount) and the Small Business Subcontracting Plan (SBSP) (% of Total Subcontracting Amount) are currently based on the specific/unique requirements of the Task Order Request (TOR) (Attachment 0012).</p> <p>As these TOR-level requirements may not adequately represent the depth and breadth of our Team's SB resources, request the Government consider establishing a Notional Total Contract Amount for all offerors to use in developing a IDIQ Contract-level SBP and/or SBSP. This would be more representative of each team's SB resources/planned participation at the contract level, while precluding teams from shaping/bidding their teams to score unrealistically high during this initial proposal evaluation.</p>	<p>The Governemnt does not plan on changing its approach to the Small Business Participation (SBP) factor and the Small Business Subcontracting Plan (SBSP) for TS3. We determined this to be the best approach to use at the IDIQ level since it is unknow at this time what the future requirements will be under TS3..</p>
71	<p>Section L.7.1.3; Attachments 0005 & 0006</p> <p>Both the Small Business Participation (SBP) Factor (% of Total Contract Amount) and the Small Business Subcontracting Plan (SBSP) (% of Total Subcontracting Amount) are currently based on the specific/unique requirements of the Task Order Request (TOR) (Attachment 0012).</p> <p>What are the IDIQ Contract-level Small Business goals, by socio-economic category, for this solicitation?</p>	<p>The IDIQ SBP Evaluation will be based on the goals submitted for the representative task order since future requirements are unknown at this time.</p>
72	<p>Section H.35</p> <p>Section H.35, Incorporation of Rates and Labor Descriptions, addresses cost-plus-fixed-fee (CPFF) TOs and time and material (T&M) TOs. There is no mention of firm-fixed-price (FFP) TOs or how FFP rates will be handles in the Contract or at the TO-level.</p> <p>As FFP risk will vary based on the TO requirement, request the Government confirm that increases to the Contract Ceiling Rates for FFP labor are allowable IAW FFP TO requirements.</p>	<p>Draft RFP H.35 Language will be amended to include all contract types. All rates in Attachment 0002 will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates that will not be subject to future adjustments.</p>
73	<p>Section H.35</p> <p>Section H.35, Incorporation of Rates and Labor Descriptions, states that "For billing purposes under cost-reimbursement TOs, the direct and indirect (including the applicable fixed fee dollar amount in each TO) rates shall be billed using the rates in the contract, the rates proposed/negotiated under the TO, or the actual rates, whichever is lower."</p> <p>Request confirmation that it is the Government's intent to apply these individual direct/indirect/fee ceilings during TO-level bidding/billing.</p>	<p>Section H.35 has been revised for the final RFP. All rates in Attachment 0002 will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates that will not be subject to future adjustments.</p>

74	<p>Section H.35</p> <p>If it is the Government's intent to apply CPFF individual direct/indirect/fee ceilings during TO-level bidding/billing, request the Government reconsider this 'ceiling rate' methodology based on the timeframe required for projected pricing, and potential changes in corporate structures and business activities over that period of time.</p> <p>Request the Government review the documented lack of use of similarly structured IDIQ contract vehicles (i.e., R2-3G).</p>	<p>Historical information was considered when developing the acquisition strategy.</p> <p>No change will be made to this section.</p>
75	<p>Section H.35; Attachment 0002</p> <p>One methodology for developing the Contract Ceiling Rates will be to use composite rates (i.e., a blending of the primes and subcontractor fully loaded rates). Due to the proprietary nature of the subcontractor indirect rates, the prime will only be proposing a composite fully loaded labor rate with no access to individual direct/indirect rate ceilings.</p> <p>Request the Government clarify how this methodology will be evaluated for the proposal.</p>	<p>The Cost/Price Factor will be evaluated in accordance RFP Section M.7.</p>
76	<p>Section H.35; Attachment 0002</p> <p>One methodology for developing the Contract Ceiling Rates will be to use composite rates (i.e., a blending of the primes and subcontractor fully loaded rates). Due to the proprietary nature of the subcontractor indirect rates, the prime will only be proposing a composite fully loaded labor rate with no access to individual direct/indirect rate ceilings.</p> <p>Request clarification as to how the Government will handle this approach during TO-level bidding/billing.</p>	<p>RFP H.35 Language will be amended to remove "indirect rates". All fully loaded rates (including profit/fee) in Attachment 0002 will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates that will not be subject to future adjustments.</p>
77	<p>Section H.35; Attachment 0002</p> <p>Offeror's proposed fee/profit will be incorporated into the Attachment 0002 Fully Burdened Rate and this fee/profit will vary based upon the TO contract type/risk (i.e., CPFF vs. T&M).</p> <p>How will the Government discern the ceiling for the CPFF Fee or T&M Profit during TO bidding/billing?</p>	<p>All rates in Attachment 0002 will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates regardless of contract type. RFP H.35 language will be clarified.</p>
78	<p>Section L.6.2.1.2</p> <p>SCA and DBA wage and fringe benefit (i.e., Health and Welfare) rates are revised annually by the DOL. Request the Government confirm that annual adjustments to SCA and DBA wage and H&W rates will be allowable and incorporated into the Contract Ceiling Rates to ensure contractor compliance with future changes to these statutory requirements.</p>	<p>All rates in Attachment 0002 will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates that will not be subject to future adjustments. The Government expects offerors to consider numerous components in developing ceiling rates for each labor category listed in Attachment 0002.</p>
79	<p>Attachment 0012, NIE Prime worksheet</p> <p>NIE prime worksheet only includes calculations for Overhead but not Fringe. Is the offeror allowed to make adjustments to the worksheet to adjust it based on the cost elements applicable to the offeror's accounting system? If not, will the Government adjust worksheet to account for calculations of the fringe?</p>	<p>Offeror is not permitted to make adjustments to the worksheets. Per RFP Section L.6.2.2.1, Offerors shall submit spreadsheets in their own format, which shall reconcile to their input on the USG standardized spreadsheets.</p> <p>The Government will not adjust worksheet to account for calculations of fringe.</p>
80	<p>Section L.6.2.2, pg 215; Attachment 0012</p> <p>Section L.6.2.2, NIE Task Order, requires offeror to provide detailed cost buildup to include proposed direct and indirect rates. Is the same information required to be provided by the subcontractors? Since this information is considered to be proprietary, can the subcontractors provide their detailed cost buildup directly to the Government electronically via ASFI?</p>	<p>Detailed cost build-up, to include direct and indirect rates, is not required to be provided by the subcontractors.</p>
81	<p>Attachment 0012, NIE Prime Labor worksheet</p> <p>Can the Government clarify what is meant by the statement "Offeror is to provide a composite G&A rate"?</p>	<p>Composite G&A Rate: If for any reason an Offeror has two or more G&A rates, they shall indicate only one (composite) rate on the USG standardized spreadsheets.</p>

82	<p>Attachment 0012, Robotics Prime worksheet (cells B72 and B73)</p> <p>Can the Government clarify what is meant by the statement "Offeror is to provide a composite G&A rate"?</p>	<p>Composite G&A Rate (cell B72): If for any reason an Offeror has two or more G&A rates, they shall indicate only one (composite) rate on the USG standardized spreadsheets.</p> <p>Composite FCCM Rate (cell B73): If for any reason an Offeror has two or more FCCM rates, they shall indicate only one (composite) rate on the USG standardized spreadsheets.</p>
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>	<p>Error noted. Correction will be made.</p>
84	<p>Attachment 0012, Blast Mitigation Prime worksheet</p> <p>Blast Mitigation Prime worksheet only includes calculations for Overhead but not Fringe. Is the offeror allowed to make adjustments to the worksheet to adjust it based on the cost elements applicable to the offeror's accounting system? If not, will the Government adjust worksheet to account for calculations of the fringe?</p>	<p>Offeror is not permitted to make adjustments to the worksheets. Per RFP Section L.6.2.2.1, Offerors shall submit spreadsheets in their own format, which shall reconcile to their input on the USG standardized spreadsheets.</p> <p>The Government will not adjust worksheet to account for calculations of fringe.</p>
85	<p>Section L.6.2.2; Attachment 0012</p> <p>Section L.6.2.2, Blast Mitigation Task Order, requires offeror to provide detailed cost buildup to include proposed direct and indirect rates. Is the same information required to be provided by the subcontractors? Since this information is considered to be proprietary, can the subcontractors provide their detailed cost buildup directly to the Government electronically via ASFI?</p>	<p>Detailed cost build-up, to include direct and indirect rates, is not required to be provided by the subcontractors.</p>
86	<p>Attachment 0012, Blast Mitigation Sub Labor worksheet</p> <p>The Government provided NTE plug numbers for materials (flooring concepts and underbody structures) for Option Periods 2 and 3. However, no plug numbers were provided for Base period and Option Period 1. Can the Government provide NTE plug numbers for materials for Base Period and Option Period 1?</p>	<p>No, the Government does not anticipate that direct materials will be required for the base or option period one, therefore no plug number will be provided.</p>
87	<p>Attachment 0012, Blast Mitigation Prime worksheet (cells B109 and B110)</p> <p>Can the Government clarify what is meant by the statement "Offeror is to provide a composite G&A rate"?</p>	<p>Composite G&A Rate (cell B109): If for any reason an Offeror has two or more G&A rates, they shall indicate only one (composite) rate on the USG standardized spreadsheets.</p> <p>Composite FCCM Rate (cell B110): If for any reason an Offeror has two or more FCCM rates, they shall indicate only one (composite) rate on the USG standardized spreadsheets.</p>
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>	<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.</p>
89	<p>Section L.4.1. and L.4.1.2</p> <p>In light of the small business participation requirement, would the Government allow the use of a small business subcontractor's past experience as a relevant contract?</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>
90	<p>L.4.1.2</p> <p>Relevant Contracts. The R&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>Error noted. Correction will be made.</p>

91	<p>Reference: L. 4 VOLUME II EXPERIENCE FACTOR</p> <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 & 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 & 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.
97	<p>Under the heading of Solicitation Structure (A.4), the TS-3 Knowledge Based Services (KBS) and Equipment Related Services (ERS) draft RFPs include provisions for the establishment of two pools at the MA IDIQ Contract Level (restricted and full and open) and also include a provision for establishment of two pools at the TO level. The restricted pool will be comprised of only SB prime contractors and the full and open pool will be comprised of both SB and OTSB prime contractors. The TS-3 R&D draft RFP, on the other hand, has a provision for the establishment of two pools at the MA IDIQ Level, but has no similar provision for the establishment of two pools at the TO level. The R&D draft RFP states that all (SB and OTSB) prime contractors will be eligible to submit a proposal against competitive TOs issued against the R&D contract suite, further stating that there will be no segregation of prime contractors (between SBs and OTSBs) for TO competitions. Is the lack of establishment of two pools at the TO level for the R&D solicitation intentional? Or is it an oversight? What is the rationale for variance in solicitation structure within the TS-3 Family of Contracts?</p>	The draft is correct. There are two pools under the R&D RFP, however, there is no set-aside threshold established at this time. Rationale for the difference is that the Government determined this strategy to be in the best interest of the Government.

98	Section A.8.4 of the R&D draft RFP states "The Government intends to solicit, negotiate, and award ERS TOs on a bilateral basis; however, the Government reserves the right to unilaterally award TOs subject to the terms and conditions of the contract and shall be considered accepted by the contractor unless rejected in writing within three business days after issuance." Is the reference to ERS TOs in this R&D solicitation intended? Or should ERS be changed to R&D?	Error noted. The correction will be made in the final RFP.
99	Section A.10 of the R&D draft RFP (Source Selection Process) states "The Government will evaluate all offerors responding to the R&D MA IDIQ solicitation using, among other criterion, a representative (i.e., live). This representative TO is intended to be demonstrative of the type of R&D requirement that may be executed under this contract suite in the future." The phrase "a representative (i.e., live)" at the end of the first sentence is not clear. Should "TO" be inserted after "a representative"?	Error noted. The correction will be made in the final RFP.
100	Reference Section C.4.1.2.1.4 of the R&D draft RFP (Production and Deployment Phase). This subparagraph requires "BMMP compliance". This acronym is not explained. What does "BMMP" stand for?	BMMP is defined in R&D RFP C.4.1.2.1.2(f). BMMP stands for Business Modernization Management Program.
101	Section H.1.1 of the R&D draft RFP (Authority to Place a TO) states "This MA IDIQ contract suite will be primarily used by PEO CS&CSS, PEO GCS, SoSE&I, TARDEC, PM ILAV, ILSC, and any organization under TACOM LCMC; however, on a case-by-case basis, other US Army contracting offices having Knowledge-Based Service requirements within the scope of this contract suite may be delegated authority to place orders against this contract suite by the TS-3 PCO which is currently Ms. Renee Marie Collica, Imailto:renee.m.collica.civ@mail.mil <mailto:renee.m.collica.civ@mail.mil>. Is the reference to Knowledge-Based Service requirements in this R&D solicitation intended? Or should KBS be changed to R&D?	Error noted. The final RFP will be corrected.
102	Section H.1.6 of the R&D draft RFP (Security Requirements) addresses the handling of classified information. Subsection H.1.6.4 states "The contractor shall not release any information or data to third parties without the express written approval of the TO PCO." Does the requirement to obtain written approval from the PCO also apply to unclassified information or data?	H.1.6.4 has been revised to add classified to the sentence. This change will be reflected in the Final RFP.
103	Section H.11 of the R&D draft RFP identifies paid federal holidays. Although the day after Thanksgiving is not a paid holiday for federal workers, TACOM is closed. Should the day after Thanksgiving also be identified as a day support contractor personnel are unable to access TACOM for work?	Section H.11.4 addresses task order specific work schedules. The day after Thanksgiving will be addressed at the Task Order Level.
104	Reference subparagraph H.22.3.1.1 of the R&D draft RFP: The text "In performing work required by the SOW, employees of a contractor awarded a TO may perform work on Government premises, in close proximity to Government employees, thus creating a possibility that contractor employees will obtain advance planning information (potential source selection information) regarding current or future Government requirements that either have not yet been released, or will not be released to the general public. If this potential OCI is not negated or mitigated, this may provide the contractor with an unfair competitive advantage, creating an OCI described in FAR 9.505(b)(2)." is repeated twice. Was this duplication intended for emphasis?	Error noted. This is a typographic error, this section will be revised in the final RFP.
105	Section H.22.3.2.1.1 of the R&D draft RFP states "The contractor agrees that it shall not compete for or accept any contract or subcontract for the production of any system, component or items on which it has worked, or provided recommendations on, under this contract or TO. In addition, the contractor agrees not to work as a subcontractor (including but not limited to, development or production, engineering, and consulting) to any hardware vendor to provide any system, component, or item on which he has worked under this contract. This prohibition shall be in effect from contract award through seven years after the end of the period of performance of the applicable TO." The use of the pronoun "he" in the second sentence is ambiguous. Does its use refer to the contractor or to the hardware vendor?	Error noted. Change 'he' to 'it'. The reference is directed to the contractor. This will be revised in the final RFP.
106	Subparagraph L.4.1.2 of the R&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"?	Error noted. Correction will be made.
107	Reference R&D draft RFP Attachment 0010 PERFORMANCE WORK STATEMENT (PWS). Section 1.6.1 Quality Control identifies the need to generate and deliver a Quality Control Plan (QCP). This section references CDRL A0013, yet there is no CDRL A0013 included in Attachment 11. Is a QCP required? If so, will an appropriate CDRL be added to Attachment 11?	CDRL A013 will be provided in the final solicitation.

108	Reference R&D draft RFP Attachment 0010 PERFORMANCE WORK STATEMENT (PWS). Section 1.6.1 Quality Control identifies the need to generate and deliver a Quality Control Plan (QCP). This section states "The Contractor shall develop and include procedures covering key control that shall be included in the QCP, if applicable, see 1.6.7.2." There is no section 1.6.7.2 included in the PWS. Where do we find the referenced guidance?	CDRL A013 will be provided in the final solicitation.
109	Reference R&D draft RFP Attachment 0010 PERFORMANCE WORK STATEMENT (PWS). Section 5.2.4 Complete Design Review (CDR) (80 percent Concept Design Review) Meeting identifies some deliveries in terms of business days and others in terms of calendar days. This sections states "The contractor shall prepare briefing materials no later than five days prior to the meeting IAW CDRL A002." This statement does not require delivery of the briefing materials nor does it specify convention (business or calendar days) for the preparation of the materials. What are the delivery requirements, if any?	CDRL A002 states under Block 16(b) that delivery is five business days.
110	Reference R&D draft RFP Attachment 0010 PERFORMANCE WORK STATEMENT (PWS) Under 5.3.1 Option 1 Additional Concepts. 5.3.1.1.1 States "The Contractor shall develop and provide detailed designs for up to four additional concept drawings (over and above those provided per 5.1.3 above)" yet set 5.3.1.2.1 specifies these as pertaining to "two additional vehicle underbody concepts and two additional flooring concepts IAW para 5.3.1.1.1". Has it already been established that the four additional concepts developed under section 5.3.1.1.1 are to be two vehicle underbody concepts and two additional flooring concepts?	No, the language in section 5.3.1 will be reviewed for consistency and revised.
111	Reference R&D draft RFP Attachment 0010 PERFORMANCE WORK STATEMENT (PWS). Section 5.2.2 Weekly Meeting states "The topics of the meetings may include, but are not limited to, discussion of potential design changes, review of the previous weeks F&A results, and discussion to promote design advancement." We are unfamiliar with the meaning of the acronym F&A and what it entails. Could the Government please expand on this?	Error Noted. This acronymyn will be revised to 'FEA' IAW section 5.1.1.2.
112	Reference R&D draft RFP Attachment 0011 Contract Data Requirements Listing. CDRL A012 Scientific and Technical Reports states "The Contractor shall deliver the draft Scientific and Technical Report no later than six (6) months after the contract award date. The COR will review and provide comments within fifteen (15) calendar days of draft submittal. The Contractor shall deliver the final Scientific and Technical Report no later than thirty (30) calendar days from receipt of draft report with comments." Section 1.5 (Period of Performance) states the "period of performance for the base period of this task order shall be nine months from the data of task order award." If the Government intends on receiving the final report within 7.5 months of contract award what is the intention of the Government for the remaining period of performance to entail? Should the due dates provided in CDRL A012 be extended to represent the period of performance specified in section 1.5?	Error Noted. CDRL A012 will be revised to reflect the period of performance.
113	Section H.2.1.3 of the R&D draft RFP appears to be missing. Was this intentional of the Government to exclude this section or does the Government intend to add additional requirements?	Error noted. The final RFP will be corrected.
114	In reference to Attachment 0002 (Pricing Labor Matrix) to the R&D Draft RFP: Can labor categories other than those listed in the Labor Matrix be proposed?	No additional labor categories will be added to the Attachment 0002 Price Matrix. Alternate labor categories may be considered at the task order level, but will be handled on an individual task order basis via the changes clause.
115	In reference to Attachment 0002 (Pricing Labor Matrix) to the R&D Draft RFP: Are proposed rates required for each listed labor category in the matrix?	Yes, proposed rates are required for all listed labor categories in the Pricing Labor Matrix.
116	RFP Reference: M.1.1 Topic: Number of awards Question: Will the Government consider increasing the number of unrestricted awards from 5 to 8? Recommendation: In order to increase the pool of service logistics providers available to support requirements beyond that of current OEMs, provide a desired level of competition, achieve cost goals and to meet anticipated missions, we believe a slight increase of IDIQ awards will provide the Government increased selection capability	The Government does not intend at this time to increase the number of awards, however, the SSA retains the discretion to award more or less than 5 MA IDIQ contracts to Other Than Small Business Concerns.

117	<p>RFP PWS Reference: 1.6.15</p> <p>Topic: Non US Employees</p> <p>Question: Since some task orders could potentially be accomplished overseas, will the Government allow non-US citizens on Task Orders based on specific labor category requirements?</p> <p>Recommendation: There are cases, in overseas environments where non-US citizens may be more advantageous to Government requirements as it may reduce cost.</p>	<p>If Third Country Nationals or Local Nationals are authorized at the Task Order Level, those rates will be identified at that time IAW the changes clause.</p>
118	<p>All RFPs: RFP PWS Reference: 1.6.15</p> <p>Topic: Contractor Security Clearance</p> <p>Question: Will the Government waive the SECRET Clearance requirements for non-US and US employees in CONUS operations? If not, will the Government allow non-US citizens to have clearances commensurate with the mission rather than requiring all to have a SECRET clearance?</p> <p>Recommendation: Security clearances should be allocated based on task order requirements. There are cases where non-US citizens may be more advantageous to Government requirements. Recommend clearances be required commensurate to missions.</p>	<p>All employees working under the NIE and RSJPO task orders must hold a security clearance (Sec 1.6.15 does not exist in Attachment 0010 of the R&D TOR). No changes can be made to this requirement. DoD 5220.22-m Section 2-209 provides that only U.S. citizens are eligible for a security clearance, except in exceptional circumstances which will be handled at the task order level, if necessary.</p>
119	<p>RFP Reference: M.1.1.1</p> <p>Topic: ERS NAICS Code 811111</p> <p>Question: Will the Government consider changing the NAICS code from 811111 to 561210 or another appropriate NAICS in order to increase the ceiling level from \$7M?</p> <p>Recommendation: Changing the task order NAICS code from 811111 to 561210 or another appropriate NAICS will allow increased participation and competition among small business teams</p>	<p>Please see the response to Question #46.</p>
120	<p>RFP Reference: L.4.1</p> <p>Topic: Experience Factor</p> <p>Question: Will the Government change the past experience requirement from 2 to 4 contract citations? If agreed to increase from 2 to 4 citations, will the Government allow up to 2 of the 4 past experience contract citations to be by subcontractor teammates?</p> <p>Recommendation: Allowing past experience beyond the prime will allow the Government a more complete view of contractor team support capabilities.</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>
121	<p>RFP Reference: Section G: Contract Administration Data</p> <p>Topic: Missing RFP Section</p> <p>Question: Draft RFP appears to be missing Section G: Contract Administration Data; is this an oversight, or will the final RFP also not contain this section?</p>	<p>The RFPs posted are drafts, and are subject to change. If a Section G is necessary for any of the three final RFPs, it will be included.</p>
122	<p>RFP Reference: Section D: Packaging and Marking</p> <p>Topic: Missing RFP Section</p> <p>Question: Draft RFP appears to be missing Section D: Packaging and Marking; is this an oversight, or will the final RFP also not contain this section?</p>	<p>The RFPs posted are drafts, and are subject to change. If a Section D is necessary for any of the three final RFPs, it will be included.</p>

123	<p>RFP Reference: M.7.4 (for both ERS and KBS)</p> <p>Topic: Cost Realism Analysis</p> <p>Question: In both the KBS and R&D solicitations, it appears that the Government will be conducting a cost realism analysis in the price evaluation process. This section does not appear in the ERS solicitation. Is it the Government's intention that a Cost Realism Analysis will not be performed on ERS, or will the Government be including this analysis in the final RFP?</p> <p>Recommendation: We recommend cost realism be conducted.</p>	<p>No. Cost Realism analysis will not be performed on the Robotics (ERS) Task Order. The NIE (KBS) and Blast Mitigation (R&D) task orders are on a cost-reimbursement basis which requires evaluations to include a cost realism analysis.</p>
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>	<p>Additional language will be incorporated into L.1.2 to clarify.</p>
125	<p>RFP Reference: Section C.3.9, p. 11 & Section F.2, p. 46</p> <p>Topic: Place of Performance (OCONUS)</p> <p>Question: Can the USG identify a preliminary list of potential or likely OCONUS places of performance for future Task Orders?</p> <p>Recommendation: Recommend that the USG provide a tentative list of potential OCONUS places of performance per MA ID/IQ to allow greater understanding of the scope of these efforts.</p>	<p>No. Future requirements are not known at this time.</p>
126	<p>RFP Reference: Section A-7, p. 6, Distribution and Destruction of Export Control Technical Data Package</p> <p>Topic: Requirement for filing DD 2345 with DLIS</p> <p>Question: Will the USG clarify whether all contractors and subcontractors working in support of the R&D ID/IQ Suite and/or R&D Task Orders are required to have a DD 2345 on file with the Defense Logistics Information Service (DLIS), or is does the requirement only pertain to those contractors directly accessing Technical Data Package (TDP)?</p> <p>Recommendation: Recommend that USG provide clarity on the requirement for filing DD 2345 with DLIS.</p>	<p>Clause 52.227-4500 will be removed from the final RFP and included on a case-by-case basis at the task order level. However, when the clause is invoked the following will apply: The requirement for a DD 2345, Militarily Critical Technical Data Agreement applies to the contractor and any subcontractor to which any portion of the data will be distributed, see Department of Defense Directive 5230.25.</p>
127	<p>RFP Reference: Attachment 0009 KBS TOR, Section 8 Additional Terms and Conditions and Task Order Clauses, item 32, p. 7</p> <p>Topic: 52.222-42, Statement of Equivalent Rates for Federal Hires (MAY 1989)</p> <p>Question: Given that there is currently an incumbent contractor on the task, what is the relevance of TOR Section 8, Item 32, statement of equivalent rates for federal hires to include the references concerning fringe vacation and sick hours?</p> <p>Recommendation: Recommend that USG provides clarification on the inclusion of this clause and, if it is not directly applicable but required, then provide a statement that the clause does not apply given current circumstances.</p>	<p>Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 22.1006(b) requires the clause 52.222-42 to be completed for this acquisition. Pursuant to clause 52.222-42, the information provided is for informational purposes only.</p>

128	<p>RFP Reference: Attachment 0009 TORs, Section 3, Guidelines for Responding to this TOR, paragraph 4, p.2-3</p> <p>Topic: Workforce seniority data</p> <p>Question: Will the USG provide seniority data on the current incumbent workforce for these TORs and for subsequent Task Orders issued under each respective MA ID/IDQ?</p> <p>Recommendation: Recommend that the USG provide incumbent seniority data for Task Orders with an incumbent workforce as the data is essential for the proper costing of benefits</p>	<p>No seniority data will be provided on the incumbents for the representative task orders. Seniority data on future task orders will be addressed at the time of the requirement, if necessary.</p>
129	<p>RFP Reference: Attachment 0009 TORs, Section 3, Guidelines for Responding to this TOR, paragraph 4, p.2-3</p> <p>Topic: Wage Determination for SCA Positions</p> <p>Question: Will the USG clarify which WD(s) will be incorporated into each respective TOR, the national wage determination or local wage determination (revision and issuance dates)?</p> <p>Recommendation: Recommend that the USG use the national wage determination.</p>	<p>The wage determinations have been incorporated into the TORs as appropriate. Only the ERS TOR for Robotics has known locations for non-exempt SCA positions.</p>
130	<p>RFP Reference: Attachment 0009 TORs, Section 3, Guidelines for Responding to this TOR and Section 8 Additional Terms and Conditions and Task Order Clauses</p> <p>Topic: Collective Bargaining Units</p> <p>Question: In the KBS TOR, Section 8, Item 32, p.7, a mention is made of Collective Bargaining Units. Will the USG clarify whether any of the incumbent workforces under the TORs is a union workforce working under a Collective Bargaining Agreement?</p> <p>Recommendation: Recommend that the USG clarify whether any incumbent workforce under all three TORs is unionized and, if so, to provide a copy of the CBA for review as this data is essential for understanding the requirements of the workforce and for proper costing.</p>	<p>The workforces under the NIE, Robotics, and Blast Mitigation task orders are not under a Collective Bargaining Agreement.</p>
131	<p>RFP Reference: Section A, Paragraph A.4.3</p> <p>Topic: Mentor Protege</p> <p>Question: The following sentence was stated in the draft... "For a Mentor-Protégé joint venture to be considered a SB for the MA IDIQ award, the Protégé shall meet the size standard for the primary NAICS code" – This statement implies that a large business can have access to small business contracts if they have a mentor protégé joint venture relationship with a small business. Is this your intent?</p> <p>Recommendation: Please clarify.</p>	<p>The Mentor-Protégé Joint Venture Program has been established by 13 CFR 124.520. The rules for this type of Joint Venture has been established by this regulation.</p>

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>	<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.</p>
133	<p>Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) Plan (Section H.22.3.2.1. - in the RD, ERS and KBS draft RFPs)</p> <p>Section H.22.3.2.1 in all 3 draft RFPs under review reads as follows:</p> <p>I have read the above, and believe that it has the following unintended implications:</p> <p>A. The above situation would preclude any OEM, either as a prime or subcontractor, from providing maintenance services to vehicles in which they are the OEM for under the ERS solicitation.</p> <p>B. The above situation would preclude any OEM, either as a prime or subcontractor, from the production of any system or component in which there are the OEM for under the KBS solicitation.</p> <p>The conditions noted above apply equally to all OEMs who have produced products for TACOM LCMC. Neither of the above conditions to my knowledge are restrictions to the current TACOM Omnibus contract, and further are not restrictions on any OEMs Systems Technical Support contract that are currently in place.</p> <p>The FAR provides a number of exceptions to the potential organizational conflict of interest described above. Per FAR 9.505-2 (a) (1) (i), (ii); (a) (3); and (b) (1) Contractors that prepare specifications or work statements for use in competitive acquisitions can still compete to produce the items. Exceptions are included for development contractors who prepare specifications; for contractors that prepare work statements but participated in the design and development work; and when more than one contractor is involved in preparing a work statement.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>That section H.22.3.2.1 in all 3 solicitations be revised to recognize and incorporate the exceptions and conditions noted in FAR 9.505-2 (a) (1) (i), (ii); (a) (3); and (b) (1), and like elements of FAR 9.505.</p>	<p>Section H.22.3.2.1 will not be revised. The exception and conditions noted in FAR 9.505-2(a) (1)(i), (ii); (a)(3); and (b) (1), and like elements of FAR 9.505 does not have to be mentioned in H.22.3.2.1 in order to invoke them. Therefore, no changes will be made to Paragraph H.22.3.2.1.</p>

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 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>
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>138</p>	<p>RFP Section L Paragraph(s) L.6.1.1 Page(s) 214</p> <p>RFP Wording Copied:</p> <p>L.6.1 General Information. Cost/price factor volume proposals shall be submitted as follows:</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 the Government to evaluate the offeror's price/cost proposal for Cost Realism. The offeror shall show complete development of the elements of the price/cost proposal. The Government may consult with DCAA or DCMA for cost verification. Offerors may submit any other additional price and financial information it considers to be helpful in the Government's evaluation of its price/cost 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>Detailed cost build-up, to include direct and indirect rates, is not required to be provided by the subcontractors.</p>

<p>139</p>	<p>RFP Section: Attachment 0010; Paragraph(s) 1.4, 1.5, 2.13; Page(s) 240-241, 244</p> <p>RFP Wording Copied:</p> <p>TOR PWS 1.4 Scope: Services covered by this PWS include Public Affairs Officer (PAO)/Protocol/Administrative Services; Schedule/Risk/Data Management Services; Operations Management Services; Doctrine, Organization, Training, Leadership, Material, Education, Personnel, and Facilities (DOTLM-PF) /Operations Management Services; and Logistics Support Services. The Contractor shall provide these services to support Government managers, engineers, and technicians responsible for short- and long-range planning staffing, and coordination of NIE activities; coordinating site visits by senior Army and Department of Defense (DoD) leaders; developing and coordinating NIE reports and assessments; training soldiers and Government employees; and managing logistics and support activities that enable system engineering and integration of networked and non-networked systems onto multiple platforms. In performing these services The Contractor shall be a member of an integrated team that is comprised of Government civilian employees, uniformed military personnel and other Government contractors. Detailed requirements are set forth under Paragraph 5 Requirements of this PWS. This PWS provides for 15 Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs) worth of support during the base period.</p> <p>TOR PWS 1.5 Period of Performance:</p> <p>Phase-In Period (30 days)</p> <p>Base Period (6 months / 7,680 hours):</p> <p>Estimated labor per location:</p> <p>1 FTE PAO/Protocol/Admin Officers Services 6 months Ft. Bliss, TX</p> <p>TOR PWS 2.13 Full Time Equivalent (FTE): A FTE equals 1,920 hours per year.</p> <p>Question: Please clarify whether the PWS provides for 15 FTEs worth of support during the base period (1.4) or 7,680 hours during the Base Period (1.5). According to 2.13, a FTE equals 1,920 meaning 15 FTEs for 6 months would provide for 14,400 hours.</p>	<p>Error Noted. 8 FTEs is the correct estimated labor. The base period is 6 months. The correction to 8 FTEs will be made. The 7,680 is the estimated labor for 8 FTEs.</p>
<p>140</p>	<p>RFP Section: H; Paragraph(s) H.35; Page(s) 69</p> <p>RFP Wording Copied: H. 3 5 INCORPORATION OF RATES AND LABOR DESCRIPTIONS</p> <p>All direct and indirect rates (including fee) shown on the KBS Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002) will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates, subject to downward negotiation only. For cost-plus-fixed-fee TOs, the fee percentage proposed in the KBS Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002) shall serve as a capped percentage, subject to downward negotiation only, at the TO level, in which the resultant fee will become a fixed dollar amount.</p> <p>All direct and indirect rates shown on the KBS Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002) for time-and-materials TOs will be incorporated into the contract. The fully loaded time-and-materials labor rates, including allowable profit, will be incorporated into the contract as ceilings, subject to downward negotiation only, as set forth in the KBS Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002).</p> <p>For billing purposes under cost-reimbursement TOs, the direct and indirect (including the applicable fixed fee dollar amount in each TO) rates shall be billed using the rates in the contract, the rates proposed/negotiated under the TO, or the actual rates, whichever is lower.</p> <p>For billing purposes under time-and-materials TOs, the fully loaded rates (including allowable profit) shall be billed using the rates in the contract or the rates proposed/negotiated, whichever is lower. The labor descriptions are incorporated into the contract and are set forth the KBS Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002).</p> <p>*Please note, a separate and distinct Program Management Office (PMO) indirect rate is unallowable for cost-reimbursement and time-and materials contract types.</p> <p>Question: Throughout the RFP the Government references ceiling rates at the IDIQ level which may not be exceeded but may be discounted at the TO level. In Section H.35 the government states "All direct and indirect rates (including fee) shown on the KBS Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002) will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates, subject to downward negotiation only." However Attachment 0002 only includes fully burdened rates and other parts of the RFP only reference capped ceiling labor rates. Attachment 0012 – Task Order Pricing is the only place that the offeror will show the cost elements of their fully burdened rates. By capping the individual cost elements of a fully burdened rate, the Government would negatively impact their ability to obtain competition. Please confirm that the Government's intent is to incorporate only fully burdened labor ceiling rates into the resultant IDIQ award and all subsequent Task Orders.</p>	<p>RFP H.35 Language will be amended to remove "indirect rates".</p>

<p>141</p>	<p>Reference: RFP Section L Paragraph(s) L.4.1.2 Attachment 0004 Page(s) 211 and Attachment 0004 RFP Wording Copied: 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). Attachment 0004: Definition of Relevance Levels 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. 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>
<p>142</p>	<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 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. 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. 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. 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>L.4.1.2.1 has been revised to reflect teaming arrangements of three (3) or more sub-contractors.</p>
<p>143</p>	<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 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. 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. 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. 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 three or more. This language will be clarified in the final RFP.</p>

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>

146	<p>RFP Section: H; Paragraph(s) H.35; Page(s) 68 RFP Wording Copied: H. 3 5 INCORPORATION OF RATES AND LABOR DESCRIPTIONS: All direct and indirect rates (including fee) shown on the KBS Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002) will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates, subject to downward negotiation only. For cost-plus-fixed-fee TOs, the fee percentage proposed in the KBS Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002) shall serve as a capped percentage, subject to downward negotiation only, at the TO level, in which the resultant fee will become a fixed dollar amount.</p> <p>All direct and indirect rates shown on the KBS Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002) for time-and-materials TOs will be incorporated into the contract. The fully loaded, time-and-materials labor rates, including allowable profit, will be incorporated into the contract as ceilings, subject to downward negotiation only, as set forth in the KBS Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002).</p> <p>For billing purposes under cost-reimbursement TOs, the direct and indirect (including the applicable fixed fee dollar amount in each TO) rates shall be billed using the rates in the contract, the rates proposed/negotiated under the TO, or the actual rates, whichever is lower.</p> <p>For billing purposes under time-and-materials TOs, the fully loaded rates (including allowable profit) shall be billed using the rates in the contract or the rates proposed/negotiated, whichever is lower. The labor descriptions are incorporated into the contract and are set forth the KBS Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002).</p> <p>*Please note, a separate and distinct Program Management Office (PMO) indirect rate is unallowable for cost-reimbursement and time-and materials contract types.</p> <p>Question: Throughout the RFP the Government references ceiling rates at the IDIQ level which may not be exceeded but may be discounted at the TO level. In Section H.35 the government states "All direct and indirect rates (including fee) shown on the KBS Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002) will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates, subject to downward negotiation only." However Attachment 0002 only includes fully burden rates and other parts of the RFP only reference capped ceiling labor rates. Attachment 0012 – Task Order Pricing is the only place that the offeror will show the cost elements of their fully burdened rates. By capping the individual cost elements of a fully burdened rate, the Government would negatively impact their ability to obtain competition. Please confirm that the Government's intent is to incorporate only fully burdened labor ceiling rates into the resultant IDIQ award and all subsequent Task Orders.</p>	<p>RFP H.35 Language will be amended to remove "indirect rates". Ceiling rates are fully burdened rates through profit/fee.</p>
147	<p>Attachment 10, page 1</p> <p>1.4 Scope states " This PWS provides for 15 Full-Time Equivalents (FTE) worth of support during the base period."</p> <p>1.5 Period of Performance. The Base period hours shown 7,680 for 6 months at Ft Bliss would convert to ~ 7.5 FTE. Should we assume the same labor levels for FSMR, which would then yield ~ 15FTE?</p>	<p>Error Noted. 8 FTEs is the correct estimated labor. The base period is 6 months. The correction to 8 FTEs will be made. The 7,680 is the estimated labor for 8 FTEs.</p>
148	<p>Section L.4 Volume II Experience Factor</p> <p>L.4.1.2 Relevant Contracts:</p> <p>L.4.1.2.1 Would the government please consider changing the requirement to "2 or more organizations, not including the Prime."</p> <p>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>
149	<p>The Price Labor Matrix includes SCA labor categories anticipated for use in the KBS contract. In order to ensure compliance with the SCA, contractors will need the WD schedules for the corresponding locations. Please provide the WD schedules.</p> <p>If locations are not provided, will there be an allowable mechanism to increase proposed ceiling rates to account for location during contract execution?</p>	<p>No. The Attachment 0002 rates are ceiling rates that will not be adjusted. The Government is not mandating a specific DOL Wage Determination for the contractor to use in developing their SCA Contract Ceiling Rates. The exact places of performance are unknown until each TO is issued. The Government expects offerors to consider numerous components in developing ceiling rates for each labor category listed in Attachment 0002.</p>

150	For non-SCA labor categories, competitive salary ranges will be influenced by location (and corresponding cost of living). Please provide the location for the labor categories identified in Attachment 0002. If locations are not provided, will there be an allowable mechanism to increase proposed ceiling rates to account for location during contract execution?	The Government is not mandating a specific performance location for the contractor to use in developing their non-SCA Contract Ceiling Rates. All rates in Attachment 0002 will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates that will not be subject to future adjustments.
151	Across industry, IT professional's skill level is typically determined by work experience and certifications in place of a degree. Would the Government consider allowing a combination of years of experience and education to equal a total of relevant years applicable to the given job function for the IT job functions listed below? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15-1121 Computer Systems Analyst • 15-1132 Software Developers, Applications • 15-113 Software Developers, System Software • 15-1134 Web Developers • 15-1141 Database Administrators • 15-1151 Computer User Support Specialists 	Alternate minimum qualifications, such as experience as a replacement for education, will be considered at the task order level.
152	Would the Government consider allowing a combination of education and experience (to equal a total of relevant years applicable to the given job function) in place of the currently prescribed Bachelors' degree requirement? Based on our knowledge of the expected work, we believe that the duties described for some of the contract labor categories can be effectively performed by individuals without a Bachelor's Degree. For example, a 20 year Veteran without a Bachelor's degree would not qualify for a Logistician, Level III position even though he/she may be considered a Subject Matter Expert in their field.	Alternate minimum qualifications, such as experience as a replacement for education, will be considered at the task order level.
153	Will the Government provide a definition of "specialized field" and "specialized experience" as used in the SOC Level I requirements?	A degree in a specialized field will have developed knowledge for the scope of the position described. Specialized experience is experience in an area with substantially the same scope and practices as the position described.
154	Will the Government define "applicable specialized field" and "applicable experience" as used in the SOC Level II requirements?	See response to Question #153. "Applicable," as used in the Level II qualifications, is somewhat more broad than a specialized field or experience. This language has been revised in Attachment 0002.
155	Paragraph 1.4 states that the PWS provides for 15 FTEs during the base period of performance; however the FTE estimates provided in paragraph 1.5 amounts to 8 FTEs. Please clarify the estimated FTEs for the base period of performance. Further, please verify that the level of effort for each period (base and all options) is consistent.	Error Noted. The base period is 6 months. The correction to 8 FTEs will be made. The 7,680 is the estimated labor for 8 FTEs.
156	The CDRL requirement for the Phase Out plan states that the plan is due to the PCO 75 days before the beginning of the first option year. Given that the period of performance for the base and all subsequent options is only 6 months (and not a full year), what is the intended due date for the Phase Out Plan?	The Phase Out language will be updated in the final release to clarify the timing requirements in the TOR.
157	Will the Government please clarify the correct PWS numbers listed under Labor Overhead in Attachment 0012 KBS for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •5.1.4 Program Management, Business Operations Specialists, All Other, Level III; •5.1.5.1.1 Logistician, Level II •5.1.5.1.2 Logistician, Level II The corresponding numbers in the Section L, PWS, part 2 are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •5.1.4.1.1 Program Management Business Operations Specialists, All Other, Level III (Section L, PWS, Part 5, page 9, Number 5.1.4.1.1) •5.1.4.1.2 Logistician, Level III (Section L, PWS, Part 5, page 10, Number 5.1.4.1.2) •5.1.4.1.3 Logistician, Level III (Section L, PWS, Part 5, page 10, Number 5.1.4.1.3) 	Error Noted. The attachment will be reviewed for consistency.
158	The SOW states that the contractor shall employ its certified quality management system to the extent the system applies and is specified in the TO. Is a certified quality system a requirement at the TO level? Is a compliant quality system (as opposed to certified) acceptable?	This language has been revised. Individual TOs will address the extent that the quality system applies.
159	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.
160	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.

161	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.
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.
163	The Price Labor Matrix includes SCA labor categories anticipated for use in the ERS contract. Please provide the WD schedules. If locations are not provided, will there be an allowable mechanism to increase proposed ceiling rates to account for location during contract execution?	No. The Attachment 0002 rates are ceiling rates that will not be adjusted. The Government is not mandating a specific DOL Wage Determination for the contractor to use in developing their SCA Contract Ceiling Rates. The exact places of performance are unknown until each TO is issued. The Government expects offerors to consider numerous components in developing ceiling rates for each labor category listed in Attachment 0002.
164	For non-SCA labor categories, competitive salary ranges will be influenced by location (and corresponding cost of living). Please provide the location for the labor categories identified in Attachment 0002. If locations are not provided, will there be an allowable mechanism to increase proposed ceiling rates to account for location during contract execution?	The Government is not mandating a specific performance location for the contractor to use in developing their non-SCA Contract Ceiling Rates. The Government expects offerors to consider numerous components in developing ceiling rates for each labor category listed in Attachment 0002. All rates in Attachment 0002 will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates that will not be subject to future adjustments.
165	Across industry, IT professional's skill level is typically determined by work experience and certifications in place of a degree. Would the Government consider allowing a combination of years of experience and education to equal a total of relevant years applicable to the given job function for the IT job functions listed below? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15-1121 Computer Systems Analyst • 15-1132 Software Developers, Applications • 15-113 Software Developers, System Software • 15-1134 Web Developers • 15-1141 Database Administrators • 15-1151 Computer User Support Specialists 	Alternate minimum qualifications, such as experience as a replacement for education, will be considered at the task order level.
166	Would the Government consider allowing a combination of education and experience (to equal a total of relevant years applicable to the given job function) in place of the currently prescribed Bachelors' degree requirement? Based on our knowledge of the expected work, we believe that the duties described for some of the contract labor categories can be effectively performed by individuals without a Bachelor's Degree. For example, a 20 year Veteran without a Bachelor's degree would not qualify for a Logistician, Level III position even though he/she may be considered a Subject Matter Expert in their field.	Alternate minimum qualifications, such as experience as a replacement for education, will be considered at the task order level.
167	Will the Government provide a definition of "specialized field" and "specialized experience" as used in the SOC Level I requirements?	A degree in a specialized field will have developed knowledge for the scope of the position described. Specialized experience is experience in an area with substantially the same scope and practices as the position described.
168	Will the Government define "applicable specialized field" and "applicable experience" as used in the SOC Level II requirements?	See response to Question #167. "Applicable," as used in the Level II qualifications, is somewhat more broad than a specialized field or experience. This language has been revised in Attachment 0002.
169	In order to ensure compliance with the SCA in pricing the Robotics SETA Services TO, contractors will need the WD schedules for the 14 CONUS work locations listed in Attachment 0010 as well as the labor categories supporting RSJPO at each location. Will the Government breakout the labor categories at each of the 14 CONUS work locations and provided the WD schedule? If locations are not provided, will there be an allowable mechanism to increase proposed ceiling rates to account for location during contract execution?	The Government will provide the WDs that apply to the locations listed in Attachment 0010. Regarding labor breakout, the Government is requesting one CONUS composite rate to be billed to the Government, regardless of geographic location, reference Attachment 0012.

170	In Task Area 1 of Attachment 0012 the SOC 13-1081 Logistician III does not match the job duties described in the PWS for 5.1.1, (Section M, Part 5, Page 12, 5.1.1.1). Consider instead the following SOC for this job functions: 17-2051 Electrical Engineer or 17-2112 Industrial Engineer or 17-2199 Engineer, All Others.	Attachment 0012 will be updated to remove SOC 13-1081 Logistician III and replace with SOC 17-2071 Electrical Engineer III.
171	In Task Area 1 of Attachment 0012 the SOC 17-2199 Engineers, All others III, does not match the job duties described in the PWS for 5.1.3, (Section M, Part 5, Page 13, 5.1.3.1). Consider instead the following SOC's for this job functions: 17-2111 Health and Safety Engineer.	Attachment 0012 will be updated to remove SOC 17-2199 Engineer and replace with SOC 17-2111 Health and Safety Engineer III.
172	The SOW states that the contractor shall employ its certified quality management system to the extent the system applies and is specified in the TO. Is a certified quality system a requirement at the TO level? Is a compliant quality system (as opposed to certified) acceptable?	This language has been revised. Individual TOs will address the extent that the quality system applies.
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.
178	The Price Labor Matrix includes SCA labor categories anticipated for use in the R&D contract. In order to ensure the ceiling rates proposed for SCA categories meet the highest applicable WD contract location wide, could the government please provide the corresponding WD schedules?	No. The Attachment 0002 rates are ceiling rates that will not be adjusted. The Government is not mandating a specific DOL Wage Determination for the contractor to use in developing their SCA Contract Ceiling Rates. The exact places of performance are unknown until each TO is issued.
179	For non-SCA labor categories, competitive salary ranges will be influenced by location (and corresponding cost of living). Please provide the location for the labor categories identified in Attachment 0002. If locations are not provided, will there be an allowable mechanism to increase proposed ceiling rates to account for location during contract execution?	The Government is not mandating a specific performance location for the contractor to use in developing their non-SCA Contract Ceiling Rates. The Government expects offerors to consider numerous components in developing ceiling rates for each labor category listed in Attachment 0002. All rates in Attachment 0002 will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates that will not be subject to future adjustments.

180	<p>Across industry, IT professional's skill level is typically determined by work experience and certifications in place of a degree. Would the Government consider allowing a combination of years of experience and education to equal a total of relevant years applicable to the given job function for the IT job functions listed below?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15-1121 Computer Systems Analyst • 15-1132 Software Developers, Applications • 15-113 Software Developers, System Software • 15-1134 Web Developers • 15-1141 Database Administrators • 15-1151 Computer User Support Specialists 	<p>Alternate minimum qualifications, such as experience as a replacement for education, will be considered at the task order level.</p>
181	<p>Will the Government define "applicable specialized field" and "applicable experience" as used in the SOC Level II requirements?</p>	<p>"Applicable," as used in the Level II qualifications, is somewhat more broad than a specialized field or experience. This language has been revised in Attachment 0002. A degree in a specialized field will have developed knowledge for the scope of the position described. Specialized experience is experience in an area with substantially the same scope and practices as the position described.</p>
182	<p>Would the Government consider allowing a combination of education and experience (to equal a total of relevant years applicable to the given job function) in place of the currently prescribed Bachelors' degree requirement? Based on our knowledge of the expected work, we believe that the duties described for some of the contract labor categories can be effectively performed by individuals without a Bachelor's Degree. For example, a 20 year Veteran without a Bachelor's degree would not qualify for a Logistician, Level III position even though he/she may be considered a Subject Matter Expert in their field.</p>	<p>Alternate minimum qualifications, such as experience as a replacement for education, will be considered at the task order level.</p>
183	<p>The instructions for completing the Small Business Prime List tab of Attachment 0005 are unclear in the event that a prime offeror is a Joint Venture that is considered to be a Small Business. Please provide clarification regarding the instructions for SB JV prime offerors. As written, we believe that this tab would be completed as follows for an unpopulated SB JV that involves companies A, B, and C where company A is the JV managing partner:</p> <p>Line 1: JV "ABC" and corresponding information (city, state, cage, and JV stated as commitment) Line 2: Company A and corresponding information. For the commitment, the statement JV Managing Partner Line 3: Company B and corresponding information. For the commitment, the statement JV non-managing partner Line 4: Company C and corresponding information. For the commitment, the statement JV non-managing partner.</p>	<p>The example is an accurate use of Attachment 0005.</p>
184	<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>
185	<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>
186	<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>
187	<p>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?</p>	<p>No. Offerors are reminded that excerpts should be relevant, so the full PWS should not be included in most cases.</p>
188	<p>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?</p>	<p>Error noted. Correction will be made.</p>

189	<p>L.4.1 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>Teaming and subcontracting will be needed in order to meet the full scope of requirements per Section C and the Government's subcontracting goals. It will be difficult for offerors to show experience covering the full scope of the KBS SOW if teammate and subcontractor experience is not considered by the Government and may limit competition. Recommend adding a section for teammate/first tier subcontractor experience and increasing the page limit to 30 pages.</p>	<p>No. The Government considers its evaluation factors to be reasonably related to the agency's actual needs. Experience will be evaluated based on the factors set forth in L.4.1.</p>
190	<p>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>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."</p>	<p>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.</p>
191	<p>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.</p> <p>Will the Government allow a multiple award IDIQ or BPA referencing several task or delivery orders to be considered as a single Experience example?</p>	<p>No.</p>
192	<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>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p>
193	<p>L.6.2.1.1 The offeror shall fill in all proposed fully loaded labor rates (to include profit/fee) directly in the R&D Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002) in accordance with the instructions detailed within said attachment. These rates will become the ceiling rates for all future task orders awarded under this contract suite. Ceiling rates will cap the total cost per labor hour to the Government per labor category regardless of the contract type or whether the proposed labor is performed by the prime contractor or subcontractor. In cases where subcontracted labor is used, ceiling rates include the subcontractor rate plus all applicable prime contractor indirect rates plus applicable prime profit or fee.</p> <p>Does the government intend these to be ceiling rates for bidding purposes only or will the ceiling also apply for billing purposes post-award even on CPFF?</p>	<p>The Government intends these ceiling rates to apply to billing / post award reimbursement, regardless of the contract type. Section H.35 of the Draft RFP will be revised in the final RFP.</p>
194	<p>Attachment 0010, Section 1.4: This PWS provides for 15 Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs) worth of support during the base period.</p> <p>Section 1.4 refers to 15 FTEs, but the breakout in Section 1.5 lists 8 FTEs. Which is correct?</p>	<p>Error Noted. 8 FTEs is the correct estimated labor. The correction to 8 FTEs will be made.</p>
195	<p>Attachment 0010, Section 1.5</p> <p>There is no specific labor category mentioned for a contract/program manager. Is this position included in the labor categories listed in Section 1.5?</p>	<p>No, this position is the contractor's designated point-of-contact as described in Attachment 0010, Section 1.6.10.</p>
196	<p>Attachment 0010, Section 1.5 specified less than one FTE for Scheduling Services.</p> <p>A NIE Event will require scheduling of numerous resources and frequent schedule reporting (Attachment 0010, Sections 5.1.2.2.1 and 5.1.2.2.2), hence substantial schedule development, status collection and input, analysis, and reporting. Is less than one FTE sufficient to perform these tasks?</p>	<p>The base period is 6 months. The correction to 8 FTEs will be made. The 7,680 is the estimated labor for 8 FTEs.</p>

197	<p>Attachment 0010, Section 1.5: The period of performance of this Task Order shall be for one Base period (6 months), which may, in the Governments sole discretion, be extended, in whole or in part, for up to an additional 24 months in the form of five-6-month options</p> <p>Five 6-month options is 30 months. Is it 24 months or 30 months?</p>	Error Noted. 30 months is correct.
198	<p>L.4.1 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>Teaming and subcontracting will be needed in order to meet the full scope of requirements per Section C and the Government's subcontracting goals. It will be difficult for offerors to show experience covering the full scope of the ERS SOW if teammate and subcontractor experience is not considered by the Government and may limit competition. Recommend adding a section for teammate/first tier subcontractor experience and increasing the page limit to 30 pages.</p>	No. The Government considers its evaluation factors to be reasonably related to the agency's actual needs. Experience will be evaluated based on the factors set forth in L.4.1.
199	<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)</p> <p>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."</p>	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	<p>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.</p> <p>Will the Government allow a multiple award IDIQ or BPA referencing several task or delivery orders to be considered as a single Experience example?</p>	No.
201	<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>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	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.
202	<p>L.6.2.1.1 The offeror shall fill in all proposed fully loaded labor rates (to include profit/fee) directly in the R&D Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002) in accordance with the instructions detailed within said attachment. These rates will become the ceiling rates for all future task orders awarded under this contract suite. Ceiling rates will cap the total cost per labor hour to the Government per labor category regardless of the contract type or whether the proposed labor is performed by the prime contractor or subcontractor. In cases where subcontracted labor is used, ceiling rates include the subcontractor rate plus all applicable prime contractor indirect rates plus applicable prime profit or fee.</p> <p>Does the government intend these to be ceiling rates for bidding purposes only or will the ceiling also apply for billing purposes post-award even on CPFF?</p>	The Government intends these ceiling rates to apply to billing / post award reimbursement, regardless of the contract type. Section H.35 of the Draft RFP will be revised in the final RFP.
203	<p>Attachment 0010, 5.1.4.1 (b.) Provide Field Service Representatives (FSR) to monitor testing and repairing test assets during developmental testing on RSJPO Robotic Systems and subsystems cited in paragraph 1.4.1 (A001).</p> <p>Attachment 12 allocates 1 FTE throughout the period of performance to support over 12 systems identified in paragraph 1.4.1, does Attachment 12 accurately capture the proposed scope of work?</p>	This estimate reflects the Government requirement at this time.

204	<p>Attachment 0010, 5.2.4.1 and 5.2.4.2</p> <p>There are approx. 45 FTEs between these 2 paragraphs in Attachment 12, can labor be moved from this Task to support any additional effort beyond the 2 FTEs allocated/identified in Task Area 1 (5.1.1 and 5.1.4)?</p>	<p>For proposal and evaluation purposes offerors shall propose in accordance with the instructions in Attachment 0012. During performance, the contractor may allocate labor as necessary to meet the PWS requirements.</p>
205	<p>Attachment 0010, 5.3 Task Area 3 Product Assurance, Test and Configuration Management</p> <p>There are 2 FTEs for this Task Area. Does the customer expect a only subset of the 12+ systems identified in paragraph 1.4.1 to be addressed in Task Area 3?</p>	<p>This estimate reflects the Government requirement at this time.</p>
206	<p>1. The first reference is made to the Small Business Act, specifically 15 U.S.C. 644(e)(4) Contract Teaming: "In the case of a solicitation of offers for a bundled contract that is issued by the head of an agency, a small-business concern may submit an offer that provides for use of a particular team of subcontractors for the performance of the contract. The head of the agency shall evaluate the offer in the same manner as other offers, with due consideration to the capabilities of all of the proposed subcontractors. If a small business concern teams under this paragraph, it shall not affect its status as a small business concern for any other purpose."</p> <p>2. A second reference is made to 13 CFR 121.103 (b)(9): "(u) Small Business Teaming Arrangement means an arrangement where:</p> <p>(2) A potential small business prime contractor agrees with one or more other small business concerns to have them act as its subcontractors under a specified Government contract. A Small Business Teaming Arrangement between a prime and its small business subcontractor(s) must exist through a written agreement between the parties that is specifically referred to as a "Small Business Teaming Arrangement" or "Small Business Teaming Agreement" and which sets forth the different responsibilities, roles, and percentages (or other allocations) of work as it relates to the acquisition."</p> <p>Comment: Under these two regulations the Government must evaluate a Small Business Teaming Arrangement (SBTA) offer with due consideration of the capabilities of all the proposed subcontractors. The "Experience" Section L proposal instructions and Section M selection criteria appear to violate both the statute and the SBA regulation by stating that only the prime offerors experience will be evaluated.</p> <p>Question: Will the Government revise the "Experience" instructions and criteria in the final RFP to provide that the experience of all of the proposed subcontractors will be considered and evaluated where the proposal is submitted as a formal SBTA as defined in the CFR?</p>	<p>No. The three separate RFPs are not considered a bundled contract so the requirements pertaining to contract teaming in 15 U.S.C. 644(e)(4) do not apply. Only the experience of the prime contractor will be considered at the IDIQ level.</p>
207	<p>A . 5 NUMBER OF PRIME MA IDIQ CONTRACT AWARDS ANTICIPATED</p> <p>The Government intends to award approximately 13 IDIQ contracts between the SB and OTSB prime contractors ...</p> <p>Input: Though the DRFP does state the government "reserves the right to award more or less than 13 IDIQ contracts ..."; we would recommend planning on 10 SB and 10 OTSB awards. Our experience on other major IDIQs is that approximately 20 Prime contracts increases the breadth of viable competition at the task order level without creating a measureable increased workload for the government.</p>	<p>The Government does not intend at this time to increase the number of awards, however, the SSA retains the discretion to award more or less than 8 MA IDIQs to Small Businesses and 5 MA IDIQ contracts to Other Than Small Business Concerns.</p>
208	<p>H.22.3.2.1 Organization Conflict of Interest Plan</p> <p>H.22.3.2.1.1 The contractor agrees that it shall not compete for or accept any contract or subcontract for the production of any system, component or items on which it has worked, or provided recommendations on, under this contract or TO. In addition, the contractor agrees not to work as a subcontractor (including but not limited to, development or production, engineering, and consulting) to any hardware vendor to provide any system, component, or item on which he has worked under this contract. This prohibition shall be in effect from contract award through seven years after the end of the period of performance of the applicable TO.</p> <p>Input: While we recognize the need to avoid actual or perceived conflict of interest with respect to task work to be solicited under this contract, we find the OCI language to be prohibitively restrictive and inhibiting. Prohibitive language regarding exclusion from any system which was previously worked on would result in the exclusion of companies that are in the best position to add value to the task for which assistance is being solicited, and would limit participation to firms with a very narrow scope, experience, and focus. Please revise the OCI language to be less restrictive and more in line with traditional language that would seek to prohibit participation of those companies in a clear position to gain an advantage based on their actual knowledge of, or association with, the work being contemplated.</p>	<p>The Governemnt will take your suggestion into conderation while we finalize the RFP.</p>

209	<p>H . 35 INCORPORATION OF RATES AND LABOR DESCRIPTIONS</p> <p>All direct and indirect rates (including fee) shown on the KBS Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002) will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates, subject to downward negotiation only.</p> <p>Input: This clause is in conflict with L.6.2.1.1 which states the fully loaded rates are the ceiling rates.</p> <p>L.6.2.1.1 The offeror shall fill in all proposed fully loaded labor rates (to include profit/fee) directly in the KBS Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002) in accordance with the instructions detailed within said attachment. These rates will become the ceiling rates for all future task orders awarded under this contract suite.</p> <p>We strongly recommend changing H.35 to indicate that the ceiling rates will be the fully loaded rates.</p> <p>Establishing ceiling rates at individual element of direct and indirect rates was an approach used on the Army R2-3G contract, and it resulted in extensive issues for industry since organizational changes over time made the contract less than viable for use, particularly in later years of the contract. In addition both the government and industry were forced to utilize a manual tracking system for direct and indirect rates for both bidding and invoicing which was an administrative burden, increasing labor hours required to properly manage the contract and task orders. It would be advisable for ACC Warren to contact ACC APG and the Army R2-3G project office to discuss the complications and negative impact that resulted from placing caps on individual elements of cost in order to reinforce the value of our recommendation for establishment of ceiling rates as fully loaded labor rates.</p>	RFP H.35 Language will be amended to remove "indirect rates".
210	<p>C.1 Scope: This KBS SOW is intended for Task Order (TO) requirements that call for the Contractor to directly perform work that involves program or project management and administration, the furnishing of professional advice or assistance, to include Engineering and Technical Services, Logistics Management Services, Management Support Services and Professional Services.</p> <p>Input: The language "to include" indicates that the requirements for "Engineering and Technical Services, Logistics Management Services, Management Support Services and Professional Services" all will be requirements as subsets of "professional advice or assistance", thus limiting this support to professional advice or assistance.</p> <p>Recommend changing language of C.1 to delete the words "to include" so to read as "...perform work that involves program or project management and administration, the furnishing of professional advice or assistance, Engineering and Technical Services, Logistics Management Services, Management Support Services and Professional Services.</p>	Paragraph C.1 will be revised. The revised language will be reflected in the final RFP revision.
211	<p>A . 4 SOLICITATION STRUCTURE</p> <p>A.4.1 The contracting officer has selected North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code 811111, General Automotive Repair, for the ERS MA IDIQ solicitation and resultant contracts, as it encompasses the effort likely to account for the greatest percentage of contract value.</p> <p>Input: Recommend changing or adding NAICS codes that will allow General Engineering Services. Restricting the NAICS code to 811111 would exclude many industry representatives that provide systems support to the ground vehicles this contract will serve.</p>	NAICS Code 811111 is the appropriate code based on the preponderance of the work under the Equipment Related Services (ERS) RFP.
212	<p>Attachment 12 Excel - Tab 1 Instructions (Instructions to Offerors): "Do not manipulate any of the other cells except for those that are highlighted in yellow"</p> <p>Input: Would this preclude us from adding lines to the work sheet for NIE Prime's to adequately reflect the applicable indirect burdens in order for us propose in accordance with our disclosed Cost Accounting Practices? We recommend allowing such flexibility so that we can propose compliantly.</p>	Offeror is not permitted to make adjustments to the worksheets. Per RFP Section L.6.2.2.1, Offerors shall submit spreadsheets in their own format, which shall reconcile to their input on the USG standardized spreadsheets.
213	Attachment 2; In Attachment 2 it says to provide ceiling rates for SCA labor categories. Which SCA schedules should the ceilings be based on?	The Government is not mandating a specific DOL Wage Determination for the contractor to use in developing their SCA Contract Ceiling Rates. The offeror is to submit a Cost/Price Volume as described in Section L.6 in accordance with the contractor's standard accounting practices.

214	NIE PWS (1.4, 1.5), Attachment 12; The NIE PWS indicates in section 1.4 that the PWS provides for 15 FTEs of support in the base period, then goes on in section 1.5 to list out 8 FTEs. Furthermore, Attachment 12 for NIE indicates maximum hours which work out to 8 FTEs per period on the hours checkup tab. Please clarify.	Error Noted. 8 FTEs is the correct estimated labor. The correction to 8 FTEs will be made.
215	L.7.1.6.a; What is meant by 'first-tier SB subcontracts'? Does the Government mean to imply that Large Primes will only get SB credit for certain small business subcontractors and not all of them under the SBP Factor?	A prime contractor will receive small business subcontract credit for subcontracts awarded directly by the prime contractor to small businesses.
216	Attachment 6, page 3-subk participation dollars (g.2); Excerpt from attachment 6: (1) Other (13 CFR 125.3(a)(1)(iii)): Exclude Internally generated costs such as salaries and wages; Employee insurance; Other employee benefits; Payments for petty cash; Depreciation; Interest; Income taxes; Property taxes; Lease payments; Bank fees; Fines, claims, and dues; Original Equipment Manufacturer relationships during warranty periods (negotiated up front with product); Utilities such as electricity, water, sewer, and other services purchased from a municipality or solely authorized by the municipality to provide those services in a particular geographical region; Philanthropic contributions. Please define 'internally generated salaries and wages'. Does this mean offerors are to exclude things like G&A labor from the subk participation calc?	Prime G&A should not be added to the subcontract participation calculation. ACC-WRN does not have a special definition for the phrase "internally generated salaries and wages" beyond its ordinary meaning (the language used is directly from 13 CFR 125.3(a)(1)(iii)).
217	Attachment 6 -SB part. Factor workbook instructions; Should a large prime treat its own burdens and fee on SB labor as Prime or SB dollars?	Prime dollars.
218	A.9.3; Since the NIE Sample T/O appears to be under the \$3M threshold the OTSB primes are NOT able to bid on it. Will there be a Sample T/O coming out in the final RFP that is above the \$3M set aside threshold level?	No. The NIE task order will be full and open. The \$3M set-aside threshold will not apply to the sample task order. Language has been added to Section L to reflect this information.. It will be contained in the final RFP.
219	A.9.3; Does the government plan to allow OTSB primes to bid on specific T/O's that are under the \$3M threshold?	No. However, see paragraph H.3.1.3.2 for further information on what happens if no responses are received for actions solicited in the restricted pool.
220	Where does the government stand on the "peer review" process of all three IDIQs?	Please reference the milestones available on the TS3 website for dates that the Government is making available to industry.
221	Does the government intend to stagger the release of the three IDIQs since many contractors will bid on all three or 2 of the 3?	The intent is to release the RFPs concurrently.
222	Attachment 2; In Attachment 2 it says to provide ceiling rates for SCA labor categories. Which SCA schedules should the ceilings be based on?	The Government is not mandating a specific DOL Wage Determination for the contractor to use in developing their SCA Contract Ceiling Rates. The offeror is to submit a Cost/Price Volume as described in Section L.6 in accordance with the contractor's standard accounting practices.
223	Robotics TOR (section 1, #8), Attachment 12 (prime tab); The Robotics TOR indicates that option period 1 is 12 months, but Attachment 12 indicates that the option period 1 is 9 months. Which one is correct?	Error Noted. Attachment 0012 is correct, the PWS will be updated for consistency.
224	Attachment 12 (prime tab); Why does the Robotics Prime tab include subcontractor labor? Was there originally meant to be a separate tab for subcontractor labor like NIE?	Due to different contract types, there was no intention for a separate subcontractor tab as with NIE. Per the instructions tab (cell B19), the T&M labor rates input by the offeror shall represent a composite rate between the prime and any subcontractors.
225	Robotics TOR (Section 1, #8); Attachment 12 (Prime tab); If awarded, would the base surge complement the base or replace it in terms of level of effort?	If exercised, the base surge would be in addition to the base labor.

226	L.7.1.6.a; What is meant by 'first-tier SB subcontracts'. Does the Government mean to imply that Large Primes will only get SB credit for certain small business subcontractors and not all of them under the SBP Factor?	A prime contractor will receive small business subcontract credit for subcontracts awarded directly by the prime contractor to small businesses.
227	Attachment 6, page 3-subk participation dollars (g.2); Excerpt from attachment 6: (1) Other (13 CFR 125.3(a)(1)(iii)): Exclude Internally generated costs such as salaries and wages; Employee insurance; Other employee benefits; Payments for petty cash; Depreciation; Interest; Income taxes; Property taxes; Lease payments; Bank fees; Fines, claims, and dues; Original Equipment Manufacturer relationships during warranty periods (negotiated up front with product); Utilities such as electricity, water, sewer, and other services purchased from a municipality or solely authorized by the municipality to provide those services in a particular geographical region; Philanthropic contributions. Please define 'internally generated salaries and wages'. Does this mean offerors are to exclude things like G&A labor from the subk participation calc?	Prime G&A should not be added to the subcontract participation calculation. ACC-WRN does not have a special definition for the phrase "internally generated salaries and wages" beyond its ordinary meaning (the language used is directly from 13 CFR 125.3(a)(1)(iii)).
228	Attachment 6 -SB part. Factor workbook instructions; Should a large prime treat its own burdens and fee on SB labor as Prime or SB dollars?	Prime dollars.
229	A.9.3; Does the government plan to allow OTSB primes to bid on specific T/O's that are under the \$3M threshold?	No. However, see paragraph H.3.1.3.2 for further information on what happens if no responses are received for actions solicited in the restricted pool.
230	Will the government allow the successful offeror to add teammates after contract award?	Yes. Teammates/subcontractors are not locked in at the IDIQ Level.
231	Although the Price Matrix provided with each draft RFP includes 138 different job categories, there are no positions available for technical or management positions that require experience in excess of nine years. Since these are competitive proposals, bidders will provide their most competitive prices, ceiling rates, for each category, which may eliminate many of their more experienced employees, anyone with greater than nine years of experience. Question – Will the government consider adding job categories that allow bidders to include highly experienced technical and management resources for those task orders that may require individuals with significantly more than nine years of experience?	Attachment 0002 will be amended to incorporate Level III Maximum Qualifications.
232	Attachment 10, paragraph 4.1 Citation from Paragraph: The Contractor shall furnish all supplies, equipment, facilities and services required to perform work under this Task Order that are not listed under Part 3 of this PWS. Question: Paragraph 3.3 Most of the work performed must occur on-site in the offices of the RSJPO. Each contractor assigned to work on-site will be provided the "equipment" adequate to accomplish their assigned tasks. Question, Para 4.1 states contractor shall furnish supplies, equip, etc., but 3.3 say the government will provide what is needed to accomplish tasks. Which statement is correct?	The Government will clarify the language Sections 3.3 and 4.1.
233	Attachment 10, paragraph 1.6.17.1.1 Citation from Paragraph: The contractor shall submit as part of its proposal a detailed description of the procedures it will employ during the Phase-In period.... Question: Where is this plan located within the proposal volumes? Is this included in the 20 page limit technical volume? Can the government clarify how the phase-in plan is to be provided?	This will be clarified in the final RFP.

234	<p>TOR, Section 1, Item 8</p> <p>Citation from Paragraph:</p> <p>Phase-In (60 days): Date of Award – 60 days After Date of Award (ADA) Base Period (03 Months): Date of Award – 3 Months After Date of Award (ADA) Base Option (12 Months): Date of Award – 12 Months After Date of Award (ADA) Option Period One (12 Months): Date of Option Exercise – 12 Months After Date of Option Exercise Option Period Two (12 Months): Date of Option Exercise – 12 Months after Date of Option Exercise</p> <p>Question: Attachment 0012 ERS TOR Attachment 3, ERS Prime Proposal Summary File-Robotics POP for Base Option does not correspond with the PO Base Option from the TOR instructions. Assume Base Option should be 3 month POP. Please confirm.</p>	The assumption of an initial 3 month base is correct at this time, subject to the availability of funds.
235	<p>H.1.9.5</p> <p>Citation from Paragraph: The contractor shall ensure that all work is performed by skilled personnel in the most economical and expeditious manner, in conformance with the MA IDIQ contract and TO requirements, and in conformity with the highest standards.</p> <p>Question: Please define what the highest standards means. Suggest this be deleted as it is subjective</p>	This language has been removed from the RFP.
236	<p>H.22.3.1.1</p> <p>Citation from Paragraph: NA</p> <p>Question: Duplicate paragraph. Please delete.</p>	Error noted. The final RFP will be corrected.
237	<p>H.3.5 INCORPORATION OF RATES AND LABOR DESCRIPTIONS</p> <p>Citation from Paragraph: Paragraphs 1, 3-5</p> <p>Question: This Clause addresses rates and labor descriptions in ERS Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002) which are fully burdened rates through fee. Suggest that the reference to indirect rates in paragraph 1 be deleted and insert "All fully burdened rates (including fee)...". In addition, suggest paragraphs 3-5 be deleted as they reference invoicing which is already included elsewhere in the RFP and conflict with FAR 52.216-7 Allowable Cost and Payment.</p>	RFP H.35 Language will be amended to remove "indirect rates". All fully loaded rates (including profit/fee) in Attachment 0002 will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates that will not be subject to future adjustments.
238	<p>PWS, Part 1, Paragraph 1.5</p> <p>Citation from Paragraph: The period of performance of this Task Order shall be for one Base period (3 months), which may, in the Governments sole discretion, be extended, in whole or in part, for up to an additional 24 months in the form of a base surge option, a nine month option, and two-12month options, which may be exercised separately, in whole or in part, by the Contracting Officer to extend the period of performance.</p> <p>Question: Given the base is 3 months, surge is 3 months, Option I is 9 months, Option II is 12 months and Option III is 12 months is the statement the POP... may be extended up to an additional 24 months correct?</p>	Error Noted. Paragraph 1.5 will be revised for consistency.
239	<p>Page 213, Section L.3.8 – Requires "Evidence that the offeror (AND any subcontractor(s) who may handle and access the SECRET information) currently possesses an active SECRET facility clearance (FCL) or higher that can be verified by the Government in the Joint Personnel Adjudication System (JPAS) database as required by paragraph C.1.6.7 of the NIE PWS (Attachment 0010)." Does the offeror's facility holding the Secret FCL have to be at Warren, or will this requirement be based on individual task orders?</p>	There is no requirement for the contractor to have a facility located in Warren for the NIE task order. Security requirements for future task orders will be determined based on the individual requirement.
240	<p>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 they types of contract for these two paragraphs?</p>	Section L.4.1.2.2 is changed to "Service contracts..." in the final RFP. "Service Contract" is defined in FAR 37.101.

241	Page 213, Section L.4.1.2.1 – Regarding the required subcontractor number, do vendors for a given contract count toward meeting the "in excess of three organizations" requirement? Our definition of a vendor is a company that was only used to purchase materials not any labor. Given this definition, would a business relationship with a material vendor on a task order contract qualify as a "contractor team arrangement" and therefore qualify the vendor to be included as one of the "organizations" to meet the required number in paragraph L.4.1.2.1?	No.
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.
243	Page 215, Section L.6.2.1.1 – States that "Ceiling rates will cap the total cost per labor hour to the Government per labor category regardless of the contract type or whether the proposed labor is performed by the prime contractor or subcontractor. Is it the Government's intention to impose labor category caps on CPFF efforts?"	The Government intends these ceiling rates to apply to billing / post award reimbursement, regardless of the contract type. Section H.35 of the Draft RFP will be revised in the final RFP.
244	Page 215, Section L.6.2.1.2 - States "The offeror shall ensure that the rates proposed for all of the labor categories subject to the Service Contract Act (SCA) comply with the minimums specified by the applicable Department of Labor (DoL) Wage Determination." Since the place(s) of performance will be determined at the task order level will the Government provide the wage determination(s) that we should utilize for the development of our proposed ceiling rates?	The Government is not mandating a specific DOL Wage Determination for the contractor to use in developing their SCA Contract Ceiling Rates.
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.
246	Page 229, Section M.8.1 – This section states "The Government will evaluate the offerors proposed extent of SBP in the performance of the contract for the SB categories listed in M.8.2 below. M.8.2 The evaluation will consist of the following: a. An assessment of the extent to which the proposal identifies participation by U.S. SB concerns to achieve the Governments goals for U.S. SBs in the categories listed below and expressed as percentage of Total Contract Amount. The term Total Contract Amount is defined for evaluation purposes as total proposed amount for all of the Basic CLINs and all of the Option CLINs identified in the KBS Prime Proposal Summary File NIE (Attachment 0012). 15% for SB 2% for Small Disadvantaged Business (SDB) 2% for Woman Owned Small Business (WOSB) 1% for Historically Underutilized Business Zone Small Business (HUBZone SB) 1% for Veteran Owned Small Business (VOSB)1% for Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business (SDVOSB) b. An assessment of the probability that the offeror will achieve (i.e., the risk that the offeror will not achieve) the levels of SBP identified in the proposal." The Small Business Participation (SBP) goals are applicable to the NIE Task Order. It appears, however, that it is the Government's intent to evaluate SBP at the contract level. In the KBS Prime Proposal Summary File, however, the only CLIN cited is for the NIE representative task order. Can the government please clarify whether the SBP Goals are required at the NIE Task Order level or at the master contract level or both?	See Question 71.
247	Attachment 0010, Page 1, Section 1.4 – States that "This PWS provides for 15 Full-Time Equivalents (FTEs) worth of support during the base period. However, the effort during the six-month base period is only 7,680 hours, which does not equate to 15 FTEs. Furthermore, the Estimated labor per location shows only 8 FTEs in the base period. Would the Government clarify this inconsistency?"	Error Noted. 8 FTEs is the correct estimated labor. The base period is 6 months. The correction to 8 FTEs will be made. The 7,680 is the estimated labor for 8 FTEs.

248	<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 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?</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>
249	<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>
250	<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>
251	<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>
252	<p>Reference paragraph A.4.1, The contracting officer has selected North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code 811111.</p> <p>Question: 811111 is limited to companies that have averaged \$7 million in revenue over the previous 3 years.</p> <p>Preamble and Concern. Any small business that have extensive experience deploying (Experience Factor L.4.1.2.2) and maintaining equipment in a war zone, mostly likely have grown past this threshold because their contracts increased as the war requirements increased and most contracts paid far above prevailing SCA hourly rates (as well as hardship and hazard pay) For instance, a mechanic working on an MRAP program could earn over \$160,000 in Kuwait (even more in Iraq or Afghanistan). Adding an average wrap rate (1.50%), travel and ODCs (\$30,000 per year), a small business would only have to employ 26 individuals a year to push past the \$7 million mark annually. This NAIC will disqualify the very SBs you are seeking.</p> <p>Question: Would the USG considered using a more broader NAIC Code such as 541330 or 561210 for this opportunity?</p>	<p>Neither NAICS code, 541330 or 561210, is appropriate for the preponderance of work being performed under the ERS contract suite. NAICS Code 811111 is the appropriate code based on the preponderance of the work under the Equipment Related Services (ERS) RFP.</p>
253	<p>Reference paragraph A.4.1, The contracting officer has selected North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code 811111. And, the Robotics Task Order, Page 238 ERS of the DRFP.</p> <p>Question: Considering the TOR has a five Task Areas, and maintenance is limited to just 1 of 7 subtasks under the Logistics Task Area, we believe NAIC 811111, for General Automotive Repair, is ill suited to cover the work required under the Robotics TO. Would the USG consider using NAIC 541330 for this ERS, or using 811219, "Other Electronic and Precision Equipment Repair and Maintenance" for this TOR specifically?</p>	<p>No. NAICS Code 811111 is the appropriate code based on the preponderance of the work under the Equipment Related Services (ERS) RFP. Alternate NAICS codes will not be used.</p>

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&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	<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>
262	<p>Section H.22.3.2.1 in all 3 draft RFPs under review reads as follows: We have read the above, and we believe that it has the following implications:</p> <p>a. [Redacted] is the OEM on the [redacted]. The above situation would preclude [redacted], either as a prime or subcontractor, from providing maintenance services to vehicles in the [redacted] under the ERS solicitation.</p> <p>b. [Redacted] is the OEM for the [redacted]. The above situation would preclude [redacted], either as a prime or subcontractor, from providing operational test and evaluation to [redacted] under the KBS solicitation.</p> <p>c. [Redacted] is the OEM for the [redacted]. The above situation would preclude [redacted], either as a prime or subcontractor, from providing a new process or product (or element therein) for the [redacted] under the RD solicitation.</p> <p>The conditions noted in a through c above apply equally to all OEMs who have produced products for TACOM LCMC. Likewise, many other non OEM companies i.e. [redacted], [redacted] who have worked extensively on [redacted] lifecycle support would be permitted to bid on any [redacted] work in the above according to the current interpretation.</p> <p>The FAR provides a number of exceptions to the potential organizational conflict of interest described above. Per FAR 9.505-2 (a) (1) (i), (ii); (a) (3); and (b) (1) Contractors that prepare specifications or work statements for use in competitive acquisitions can still compete to produce the items. Exceptions are included for development contractors who prepare specifications; for contractors that prepare work [redacted] Comments and Recommendations for the TACOM S3 Family of Contracts Draft RFPs statements but participated in the design and development work; and when more than one contractor is involved in preparing a work statement.</p> <p>Recommendation: That section H.22.3.2.1 in all 3 draft solicitations be revised to recognize and incorporate the exceptions and conditions noted in FAR 9.505-2 (a) (1) (i), (ii); (a) (3); and (b) (1), and like elements of FAR 9.505.</p>	<p>Section H.22.3.2.1 will not be revised. The exception and conditions noted in FAR 9.505-2(a) (1)(i), (ii); (a)(3); and (b) (1), and like elements of FAR 9.505 does not have to be mentioned in H.22.3.2.1 in order to invoke them. Therefore, no changes will be made to Paragraph H.22.3.2.1.</p>
263	<p>paragraphs C.1 (page 10) and C.4 (pages 12 - 26)</p> <p>Discussion: On page 10, the solicitation provides the following: "This R&D SOW is intended for Task Order (TO) requirements that will be for creating new processes or products. TOs that do not call for the Contractor to directly perform work that is an integral part of R&D or to create new processes or products will not be solicited under this scope."</p> <p>The use of the double negative in the above sentences creates a degree of ambiguity regarding the true scope of this contract.</p> <p>Paragraph C.4 covers, in varying degrees of detail, the end to end DoD 5000 Instruction Acquisition Cycle tasks and related processes and products, and indicates that these are all potential work scope for this contract.</p> <p>Because of the broadness of items identified in paragraph C.4, it is in conflict with guidance in paragraph C.1.</p> <p>Recommendation: Revise paragraph C.1 and C.4 to read as follows: "This R&D SOW is intended for Task Order (TO) requirements that will be for creating new processes or products. Any work scope that is not directly related or required to directly support the creation of new processes or products will not be solicited under this scope, and may be solicited under solicitation W56HZV-14-R-0030 (Knowledge based Services) or solicitation W56HZV-14-R-0031 (Equipment Related Services)."</p>	<p>The language in R&D RFP Section C.1 is accurate. If a Task Order is not for creating new processes or products, then the Task Order will not be solicited under the R&D scope.</p>

264	<p>Subj: Off Ramps (paragraph H.4.1 the RD, ERS and KBS draft RFPs)</p> <p>Discussion: The draft provides the following:</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>The current language in the draft RFP needs to be very clear and explicit, and be revised to reflect the following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) How will the USG determine that the "contractor has a reasonable chance for award" if a prime contractor does not bid? The USG needs to be very clear and direct about this guidance, as this metric appears to be in conflict with the teaming information in the draft RFP. 2) How will OCI exclusions be addressed in the "three strikes - you're out" limit? Is this addressed by the "reasonable chance" phrase? Appropriate clarification for these facts need to be explicit and direct in the RFP. 	<p>The language at Paragraph H.4.1 concerning Off-Ramping has been revised. The final RFP will contain the revised language.</p>
265	<p>Subj: IDIQ contract awards (paragraph A.5, all draft RFP's)</p> <p>Discussion: The paragraph identifies this as an Indefinite Delivery, Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract. Throughout the document and during Industry Day, the need for the most robust competition for each task order award has been stressed and appears to be an underlying imperative of this program. However, the paragraph provides the following:</p> <p>This language reflects the potential to award to a pool of prime contractors potentially greater than 13 in number, but clearly favors a smaller pool, especially amongst other than small companies. Additionally, the use of an IDIQ contract venue for the TS3 family of contracts may drive redundant and repetitive contract administration and negotiations. The following descriptive comparisons between an IDIQ and a Basic Ordering Agreement (BOA) apply:</p> <p>The IDIQ (Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity) methods are used when the government cannot estimate with certainty its needs. This allows for an estimate with minimum and a maximum quantity. The government guarantees the contractor a minimum amount of the product or service will be procured. After the minimum the government is free to continue purchasing under the contract, until the maximum is achieved or go elsewhere for its needs. Under the Requirements type contract there is no minimum. A requirements contract provides for filling all actual purchase requirements of designated Government activities for supplies or services during a specified contract period, with deliveries or performance to be scheduled by placing orders with the contractor. The only thing the contractor gets is that if we buy the product or service we will buy it from them.</p> <p>A basic ordering agreement is a written instrument of understanding, negotiated between an agency, contracting activity, or contracting office and a contractor, that contains</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) terms and clauses applying to future contracts (orders) between the parties during its term, (2) a description, as specific as practicable, of supplies or services to be provided, and (3) methods for pricing, issuing, and delivering future orders under the basic ordering agreement. <p>A basic ordering agreement is not a contract. Basic ordering agreement may be used to expedite contracting for uncertain requirements for supplies or services when specific items, quantities, and prices are not known at the time the agreement is executed, but a substantial number of requirements for the type of supplies or services covered by the agreement are anticipated to be purchased from the contractor. A basic ordering agreement shall not state or imply any agreement by the Government to place future contracts or orders with the contractor or be used in any manner to restrict competition. The BOA does not obligate the government, instead it sets the ground work for future contracts that may use the BOA as a foundational document.</p> <p>Given the above situation, and the need to maximize competition for these requirements while seeking administrative efficiencies in contract administration, it appears evident that the use of a BOA is more applicable to this situation than an IDIQ contract. This is particularly true now that the previously large scope, single contract has been broken into 3 discrete element contracts.</p> <p>Recommendation: That the contract venue for the TACOM S3 Family of Contracts be changed from IDIQ to BOA in order to increase the degree of competition in the award of task orders, and to reduce the administrative resources required to award and administer task order contracts. And, in order that maximum competition be attained, that the number of BOAs awarded be unlimited.</p>	<p>The Government analyzed all contract types and determined that an Indefinite-Delivery, Indefinite-Quantity (IDIQ) is the most appropriate contract type for TS3. No change will be made to the contract type.</p>
266	<p>Subj: Solicitation Structure (para A.4.1, W56HZV-14-R-0031 (Equipment Related Services)).</p> <p>Discussion: Paragraph A.4.1 reads as follows:</p> <p>NAICS 811111 (General Automotive Repair) does not provide adequate coverage of the equipment that could potentially be placed on task orders under this contract. The following additional NAICS are required to augment NAICS 811111 in order to provide coverage of the full range and scope of equipment that is covered under solicitation W56HZV-14-R-0031:</p> <p>561210 Facilities Support Services</p> <p>Unfortunately, there is not a NAICS that deals with the servicing of Ground Combat Vehicles, which are a big part of the supported population within this program.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Amend paragraph A.4.1 of solicitation W56HZV-14-R-0031 to require that prime contractors possess both NAICS 811111 and 561210 as a matter of their assuredness to cover the entire spectrum or work in this solicitation.</p>	<p>Only one NAICS code can be assigned at the IDIQ and it is based on the preponderance of the work being performed. NAICS Code 811111 is the appropriate code based on the preponderance of the work under the Equipment Related Services (ERS) RFP. NAICS Code 561210 is not the correct code for the ERS RFP as the tasks described in that code are not the tasks required by the ERS RFP.</p>

267	<p>Subj: Applicability of the JPO Robotics Task Order to the ERS draft RFP (W56HZV-14-R-0031)</p> <p>Discussion: The sample task order for draft RFP W56HZV-14-R-0031 involves equipment related services for JPO robotics. A couple of points are germane on this task order:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Currently, JPO robotics does not support any Programs of Record (PoR); thus, the need for equipment related services outside of the OCO-fielded robots is limited. 2. DoD designed those robots fielded during OIF and OEF to have standardized parts. The only "part" of the robot that is not standardized is the software. This again reduces the need for equipment related services. 3. Much of the task order pricing is based upon OEF deployed forces. Currently, it appears that the majority of US forces will be redeployed from OEF in the very near future, and this work will be eliminated. <p>Recommendation Replace the JPO Robotics task order with a task order that has a higher degree of applicability to near future work involving PoR weapons systems, and supports weapons systems with a greater degree of differentiation in order to permit more objective selection between the applicable bidders.</p>	The Government will not be replacing the Robotics Task order with another task order.
268	<p>Subj: Award Evaluation criteria for KBS sample task order</p> <p>Discussion: The following award evaluation criteria are furnished with the sample task order for the KBS solicitation:</p> <p>"Offerors will be evaluated on two factors: (1) Technical and (2) Cost/Price. For the purposes of this task order, the Technical Factor is somewhat more important than the Cost/Price Factor. However, if the Technical evaluations are equal, then cost/price will be the deciding factor."</p> <p>While not explicitly stating it, this could readily be interpreted to be a Lowest Price/Technically Acceptable (LPTA) award evaluation. Others could interpret it to be "Best Value".</p> <p>Recommendation Use in the clear description of the award evaluation criteria, and revise the award evaluation criteria for the KBS sample task order (Support to the Network Integration Experimentation) with such explicit language.</p>	The KBS TOR specifies that it will be awarded on a best value basis.
269	<p>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.</p>	Teammates or subcontractors are not locked in at the IDIQ level, unless they are part of a joint venture legal agreement.
270	<p>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?</p>	Yes, that would be allowed.
271	<p>Paragraph A.4.1 states "The contracting officer has selected North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code 541330, with a size standard of either \$35.5M or \$14M. The larger amount is for Military and Aerospace Equipment and Military Weapons . If the Government selects the small size standard, it appears the Government being unnecessarily too restrictive. TACOM WRN has always higher size standards 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 higher standard provides a highly competitive environment while still sustaining diverse SB participation. If such a small amount is used for SB, TACOM is unnecessarily limiting the ability of Small Business to participate in the SB pool.</p>	The correct quote for A.4.1 is "The contracting officer has selected North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code 541330, Engineering Services Except Military and Aerospace Equipment and Military Weapons." The size standard is \$35.5M.
272	<p>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.</p>	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.
275	Is there an incumbent for this sample Task Order?	Yes. The Tolliver Group, Inc.; and Manufacturing Technical Solutions, Inc.
276	Paragraph A.4.1 states "The contracting officer has selected North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code 811111, with a size standard of \$7M. With the Government selecting this small size standard, it appears the Government is being unnecessarily too restrictive. TACOM WRN has always higher size standards in their IDIQ services predecessor contracts like Focused Sustainment, Omnibus I/II/III, TARDEC's IDIQ contract, FIRST and ILS Omnibus. Even the EAGLE solicitation to provide maintenance support to automotive equipment for Detroit Arsenal DOL has a higher size standard. Especially for Small Business, the effect of higher standard provides a highly competitive environment while still sustaining diverse SB participation. If such a small amount is used for SB, TACOM is unnecessarily limiting the ability of Small Business to participate in the SB pool.	NAICS Code 811111 is the appropriate code based on the preponderance of the work under the ERS RFP. Other NAICS codes have been used in the past for different scopes of work. The dollar threshold established for this code was determined by SBA. A NAICS code is not chosen based on its size standard.
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.
280	Is there an incumbent for this sample Task Order?	The incumbent, Qualis Corporation, is identified in the first paragraph of the Task Order Request (Attachment 0009).

281	<p>Background: Draft RFP Clause H.31 Consent to Add/Delete Subcontractors states: "In accordance with FAR 52.232-7, Subcontractors may include profit on their loaded labor rates. However, in order to avoid excessive pass-through charges, prime profit will not be allowed on subcontractor T&M loaded labor rates." We note that FAR 52.232-7 includes no language regarding "excessive pass-through charges." FAR 52.215-23 Limitations on Pass-Through Charges defines "avoid excessive pass-through charges" with respect to subcontracting." That clause is only applicable if the prime contractor intends to Subcontract 70% or more of the contract or task order effort, and, if such is the case, the Contractor does not perform subcontract management functions that the Contracting Officer determines are a benefit to the Government. Neither of those conditions is expected to be applicable to the TACOM TS3 Contract, from our perspective. Generally, some allowance for prime contract profit is permitted to Prime Contractors in recognition of the risk they undertake in being responsible for Subcontractor performance, and managing Subcontractor efforts, including performance against the requirements, deliverable inputs, compliance, invoicing, payment, subcontract reporting, etc., on contracts/tasks not subject to the 70% rule in FAR 52-215-23.</p> <p>Question 1A: Will the Government please consider removing the prohibition on prime contractor fee/profit on Subcontractor T&M Rates, or at least limit that restriction to cases where the prime contractor subcontracts 70% or more of the work and does not add value as defined in FAR 52-215-23?</p> <p>Question 1B: Are the provisions of H.31 only applicable to subcontractors identified and added after the initial prime contract award?</p>	This section has been revised for the final RFP. The statement, "However, in order to avoid excessive pass-through charges, prime profit will not be allowed on subcontractor T&M loaded labor rates," has been removed.
282	<p>Background: Draft RFP Clause F.4.3 states "Task order option periods may be exercised after the KBS contract suite ordering period expires as long as the final task order option period does not extend the cumulative term of the task order beyond five years after the KBS contract suite ordering period expires. However, Draft RFP Clause H.1.9.4 states: "TOs may be placed at any time during the five-year ordering period of the contract as identified in Section F. Any TO issued during the ordering period shall be valid as long as the total period of performance of the MA IDIQ contract does not exceed eight years from the date of MA IDIQ contract award."</p> <p>Is the longest period a task order may run, if awarded on the last day of the 5-year contract ordering period: (1) five years after the KBS contract suite ordering period expires (i.e., ten years from the date of MA IDIQ contract award); or (2) eight years from the date of MA IDIQ contract award?</p>	Error noted. The final RFP will be corrected.
283	<p>Background: Draft RFP Section H.2.1.2 states: "In the event a TO contains a requirement for the contractor to deploy personnel to an overseas location, contractor employees that are required to work in a contingency location are authorized the following costs applied to their wages; however, the rates charged to the Government shall not exceed the allowable rates as determined by the State Department for the area of operation: H.2.1.2.1 Danger Pay; H.2.1.2.2 Hardship Pay."</p> <p>If applicable to a task order, would Danger Pay and Hardship Pay be in addition to the Contract Ceiling Rates, or do the Contract Ceiling Rates have to be proposed high enough to include the possibility of Hardship Pay and Danger Pay?</p>	Section H will be revised to state that OCONUS and Overtime rates are not included in the ceiling rates in Attachment 0002.
284	<p>For the Knowledge Based Services Draft solicitation there is a discrepancy between the Evaluation Criteria listed in the Draft RFP for KBS – W56HZV-14-R-0030 and accompanying Attachment 0009, Task Order Request (TOR): Network Integration Exercise (NIE).</p> <p>Draft RFP for KBS – W56HZV-14-R-0030, Section M.3.6 Evaluation Criteria, M3.6.1, page 227 states "The Government will assess each offeror on four Factors: (1) Experience; (2) Technical, (3) Cost/Price, and (4) Small Business Participation (SBP)." Attachment 0009, Section 5, Evaluation Criteria, paragraph 1. states "Offerors will be evaluated on two factors: (1) Technical and (2) Cost/Price."</p> <p>Which is correct?</p>	The KBS RFP and the TOR each have their own criteria for award.
285	<p>Draft RFP for KBS – W56HZV-14-R-0030, Attachment 0002 and Draft RFP for R&D – W56HZV-14-R-0032, Attachment 0002 identifies numerous technical/professional labor categories each with only three levels of experience. The highest level (Level III) only requires a master's degree in a specialized field plus a minimum of 1 year of specialized experience. We have found that the complex requirements of TACOM/TARDEC often require significantly more than this level of experience to address. We also believe that having a mix of senior and junior personnel on a project team is the lowest risk and most cost effective approach to staffing a project.</p> <p>Would the Government consider adding at least two more levels of experience and/or increase the years in the current levels to reflect the broad range of experience required to perform their complex tasks?</p>	Attachment 0002 will be amended to incorporate Level III Maximum Qualifications.

286	<p>Draft RFP for KBS – W56HZV-14-R-0030, Section A.8.2, page 3 and Draft RFP for R&D – W56HZV-14-R-0032, Section A.8.2, page 3 states:</p> <p>The labor categories and their respective ceiling prices proposed within the KBS Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002) will be part of the awarded IDIQ contract and shall be used to propose labor rates at the TO level. Additional labor categories that are not listed in the KBS Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002) may be added at the TO level as long as the rates proposed for said labor categories are commensurate with the pricing methodology used by the contractor to establish the labor rates for the labor categories contained within the KBS Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002).</p> <p>Question 1: If the offeror believes that Level 3 of a defined labor category does not provide sufficient experience to perform anticipated tasks can they propose additional, more qualified levels (i.e., Level 4, or 5) in a task order proposal?</p> <p>Question 2: How different from an existing labor category must a proposed additional labor category be?</p> <p>Question 3: Do proposed additional labor categories need to use the same three levels of experience?</p>	<p>Q1: Attachment 0002 will be amended to incorporate Level III Maximum Qualifications.</p> <p>Q2: An additional labor category must be sufficiently different that the existing category cannot perform the work within the general scope of the position description.</p> <p>Q3: Not necessarily. The additional labor categories will be determined at the task order level, and will be in accordance with the changes clause.</p>
287	<p>Draft RFP for KBS – W56HZV-14-R-0030, Section L.6.2.2.1, page 215 and Draft RFP for R&D – W56HZV-14-R-0032, Section L.6.2.2.1, page 215 states that the cost for direct labor shall include a “quarterly time-phased breakout of the direct labor hours, by labor category (cost element) appropriate to the offeror’s accounting system.” Attachment 0012 of the solicitation (TOR Attachment 3, KBS Prime Proposal Summary File – NIE) is designed for input on 6 month periods.</p> <p>Should Attachment 0012 be modified to require input by quarter?</p>	<p>Existing tabs on the Attachment 0012 spreadsheets shall not be modified. Language in RFP Section L.6.2.2.1 has been revised to read (in part): L.6.2.2.1 Offerors Format Spreadsheets: The offeror shall provide spreadsheets, in accordance with their own accounting practices, as added tabs to the KBS Prime Proposal Summary File NIE (Attachment 0012) or as a separate Excel file...</p>
288	<p>Draft RFP for KBS – W56HZV-14-R-0030, Section M.7, page 228 and Draft RFP for R&D – W56HZV-14-R-0032, Section M.7, page 228.</p> <p>The cost/price factor volume evaluation will include consideration of the reasonableness, as defined in paragraph M.7.3, of each of the proposed fully loaded labor rates (to include profit/fee) in the KBS Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002) for the MA IDIQ contract.</p> <p>a) Many of the labor categories in the KBS Pricing Labor Matrix have three levels of experience. The highest level only requires a master's degree in a specialized field plus a minimum of 1 year of specialized experience. Will the bid price of a level 3 labor category be determined to be reasonable based strictly on the stated minimum level of experience? For example, if we determine that an electrical engineer with a masters and 20 years of experience will be needed at times and we use the cost of this person to set the rate for the Electrical Engineer Level 3 position in the matrix will this rate be determined to be unreasonable as it is substantially higher than the cost of an electrical engineer with only a masters and one year of experience?</p> <p>b) The KBS Pricing Labor Matrix does not indicate any requirement for domain specific experience (i.e., the electrical engineer labor category does not require experience in designing power systems for ground combat systems). Does this mean that the Government does not intend to require any domain specific experience in Task Order RFPs? Will such domain specific experience be considered in the Government’s evaluation of reasonableness for prices in the KBS Pricing Labor Matrix? Personnel with domain specific experience generally cost more than personnel without it.</p> <p>c) The KBS Pricing Labor Matrix does not indicate any requirement for security clearances yet section H.1.6.1 indicates that some Task Orders may contain classified task. Will security clearances experience be considered in the Government’s evaluation of reasonableness for prices in the KBS Pricing Labor Matrix?</p>	<p>Q a) See responses provided in Questions #231 and #151.</p> <p>Q b) The Minimum Qualifications discuss applicable experience. This is considered experience that applies to the scope of work that may be performed under the contract.</p> <p>Q c) Security clearances should be considered, up to Secret, and would be considered as a reasonable qualification for potential labor that would be considered in developing a ceiling price for TS3.</p>
289	<p>Draft RFP for R&D – W56HZV-14-R-0032, Section L.5.1.3, page 214 states that the offeror must “discuss the proposed workforce, including the minimum qualifications (years and types of experience), to perform the requirements.”</p> <p>Is use of the labor categories included in the R&D Pricing Labor Matrix required in addressing L.5.1.3? If so, what should the offeror do if they believe that the minimum qualifications for Level 3 of a labor category are insufficient to perform all tasks?</p>	<p>An offeror may create a higher Level labor category that it believes is necessary to complete the tasks on the Blast Mitigation task order. A higher level position must clearly be beyond the qualifications for a Level III position in the same category.</p>
290	<p>Please confirm that the ceiling rates requested under Attachment 0003 for each of the sample tasks are only intended to cover straight time billing rates and not overtime.</p>	<p>Please see question #68 (Attachment 0002 contains ceiling rates, not Attachment 0003)</p>

291	Normally an escalation is not proposed for SCA rates and Contractors are able to seek equitable adjustment upon award of an option when the prevailing wage determination is increased. How are contractors to account for the future escalation of the SCA rates/fringe entitlements in the Attachment 0003 submittals for each sample task?	In reference to Attachment 0002, the offeror is to submit a Cost/Price Volume as described in Section L.6 in accordance with the contractor's standard accounting practices. All rates in Attachment 0002 will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates that will not be subject to future adjustments. The Government expects offerors to consider numerous components in developing ceiling rates for each labor category listed in Attachment 0002.
292	Will a contractor be allowed to seek an adjustment to their ceiling rate in a situation where a CBA is in place and results in a significant increase that cannot be covered within the ceiling rate identified in Attachment 0003 submissions?	All rates in Attachment 0002 will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates that will not be subject to future adjustments. The Government expects offerors to consider numerous components in developing ceiling rates for each labor category listed in Attachment 0002.
293	Will the Government be using a comparison of proposed ceiling labor rates received in Attachment 0003 as a means for determining price reasonableness, as each Offeror's pricing may not be based on the same assumptions and, therefore, may not result in a fair comparison?	Attachment 0002 will contain the proposed ceiling labor rates. Per RFP paragraph M.7, EVALUATION OF VOLUME IV COST/PRICE FACTOR, The Government will assess the proposed fully loaded labor rates in the Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002) and the total evaluated cost/price from the each Prime Proposal Summary (Attachment 0012) using one or more of the price and cost analysis techniques and procedures identified in FAR 15.404-1.
294	Section H.34 Hazardous Duty / Isolation Pay in each TS3 solicitation states "In the event contractors must pay additional compensation to retain or obtain personnel to perform in a hazardous location, the contractor shall be entitled to equitable compensation at rates set in accordance with the State Department guidelines. If the need to pay the Hazardous Duty premium is discovered, the contractor shall promptly notify the Government and request an Equitable Adjustment in price." Does this same equitable adjustment apply to other costs incurred by the contractor in the performance of OCONUS work (DBA Insurance Premium, Tour Completion Pay, reimbursable travel/medical expenses) that could potentially increase labor costs and/or indirect expenses?	RFP Language will be amended to state Pricing Labor Matrix ceiling rates do not apply to OCONUS or OT work. All rates in Attachment 0002 will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates that will not be subject to future adjustments.
295	ISCA Categories 99240 (Inspector) and 99610 (Quality Control Inspector) do not have published rates on the Wage Determinations we reviewed. The SCA Directory of Occupations state for these two categories that the "FGE is one grade above the class that performs the work being inspected." Can the Government clarify how much more these labor categories should be compensated over and above the labor classification(s) being inspected?	The 99240 and 99610 positions will be removed from the Price Matrix.
296	For the KBS sample task order, TOR W56HZV-14-X-KB01 requires contractors to price a 30 day phase-in period. However, the PWS does not detail the Phase-In requirement in order for contractors to ascertain related phase-in cost. Please provide the Phase-In requirements for this specific TOR.	Phase-in is a portion of the evaluation of the technical factor. Phase-in requirements are determined by each offeror's plan to meet the PWS.
297	For the KBS sample task order, Section L.6.2.2.1 states "The offeror shall provide spreadsheets as added tabs to the KBS Prime Proposal Summary File NIE (Attachment 0012) or as a separate Excel file showing the proposed costs for each CLIN (as defined in Section B of the RFP). Each spreadsheet shall be organized by cost element (i.e. Direct Labor, Subcontracts, Material, Other Direct Costs, Overhead/Indirect, Fee, etc.) time phased by quarter and sub-totaled by calendar year." Why is there a requirement to time phase by quarter and sub-total by calendar year within each CLIN? Will the Government provide estimated Period of Performance dates to ensure consistency in offers?	Time phasing by quarter and sub-totaling by calendar year allows the USG visibility into Offeror's rates that bridge accounting periods / fiscal years.
298	For the ERS sample task order, will the government identify the primary place of performance for each CONUS position in the final TOR?	Please reference the Task Order Request (Attachment 0009), Section 1, paragraph 9, for potential performance locations.
299	For the ERS sample task order, for those positions covered by the SCA, will the Government provide the applicable wage determination in the final TOR?	Yes.

300	For the ERS sample task order, how is the Contractor to reflect costs associated with paying hazard and differential pay in accordance with State Department Guidelines for OCONUS positions?	Offerors shall propose in accordance with their standard accounting practices. Attachment 0012 has been revised to allow for OCONUS related ODC input.
301	For the ERS sample task order, how is the Contractor to reflect the costs associated with Defense Base Act Insurance for OCONUS positions?	Offerors shall propose in accordance with their standard accounting practices. Attachment 0012 has been revised to allow for OCONUS related ODC input.
302	For the ERS sample task order, how is the Contractor to reflect the costs associated with paying Tour Completion Bonus for OCONUS positions?	Offerors shall propose in accordance with their standard accounting practices. Attachment 0012 has been revised to allow for OCONUS related ODC input.
303	For the ERS sample task order, the TOR states "for pricing purposes contractors should assume that NO Government Furnished Contractor Support will be available. Since ODC and Travel are plugged figures, how are Contractors to factor these additional costs into their proposal?"	Offerors shall propose in accordance with their standard accounting practices. Attachment 0012 has been revised to allow for OCONUS related ODC and Travel input.
304	For the ERS sample task order, the Draft PWS and Attachment 0012 both indicate that the period of performance is: Phase-In: 60 days Base Period: 3 months Base Sure: 3 months Option Period One: 9 months Option Period Two: 12 months Option Period Three: 12 months This is different from the period of performance identified in the TOR. Which is correct?	Error Noted. The PWS and Attachment 12 are correct. The documents will be reviewed and revised for consistency.
305	For the ERS sample task order, PWS 1.6.18.4.7 states "The Contractor shall pay for shots, physicals, and any other medical evaluations required in order for its designated employee to be medically cleared for deployment." Are theater-specific immunizations and/or medications not available to the general public reimbursable costs?	The Pre-Deployment Instruction Guide provides a list of vaccines that are required to be provided by the contractor and who will be responsible for those costs: http://www.cpmos.osd.mil/expeditionary/pdf/Pre-D_guide.pdf . The current list of CENTCOM vaccines can be found at this link: http://www.vaccines.mil/resource/GenerateDiseasePDF.aspx?requesttype=region&regionid=1 . AR 40-562 Sec 3-4 provides additional information.
306	For the ERS sample task order, PWS 1.6.18.2 states "The Contractor, at their own expense, may rotate or replace personnel in OCONUS locations..." and 1.6.18.5 states "The Government will provide transportation to the AOR from CONUS and then for return to CONUS under a standard tour of twelve months (12) for the Base Period and twelve months (12) for each Option Period, if exercised. If for any reason an employee must be removed from AOR ONCONUS, per section 2.6.11 the employee removal must be coordinated with the Contracting Officer, but that employees transportation is considered a rotation and at the expense of the Contractor under Section 1.6.18.2. This would be at the nearest major airport that has flights to Southwest Asia." Subquestions related to these statements include: SubQ1: PWS Section 1.6.18.5 makes reference to Section 2.6.11, however, there is no Section 2.6.11 in the PWS, please provide correct reference. SubQ2: Does the Government anticipate flights in and out of the AOR to be commercial flights or will MILAIR flights be provided? SubQ3: If flights are commercial will the Government only reimburse costs comparable to the flight cost of the nearest major U.S. airport that has flights to Southwest Asia regardless of the location of the deployment center? SubQ4: If an employee leaves the AOR through no fault of the Contractor prior to serving their twelve month tour, is the Contractor responsible for the flight costs from AOR to CONUS regardless if the flight is commercial or MilAir? SubQ5: Are flights from a Contractor employee's home of record (HOR) to Camp Atterbury (or other deployment center location) upon deployment and from Camp Atterbury to HOR upon out-processing a reimbursable travel expense?	SubQ1: Error noted. The section reference will be corrected. In the posted draft, the reference should be 1.6.15.1.b SubQ2: The Government will provide military aircraft flights into and out of AOR sites on standard 12-month rotations. If early rotation applies or a contractor is requested to leave, Military Flights will be provided into AOR at contractor's expense but leaving AOR will be by Commercial Flights at contractor's expense. SubQ3: Contractor's going through IRDO back to AOR due to early rotation will use Military Air. The cost of this flight will be at contractor's expense. SubQ4: If a contractor has to leave AOR at Government's request, the cost of the flight home will be at Government Expense whether it be commercial or Military Air depending on what is available. SubQ5: Costs from HOR to and from the deployment center are at Government Expense.

307	For the R&D sample task order, Section L.6.2.2.1 states "The offeror shall provide spreadsheets as added tabs to the R&D Prime Proposal Summary File Blast Mitigation (Attachment 0012) or as a separate Excel file showing the proposed costs for each CLIN (as defined in Section B of the TOR). Each spreadsheet shall be organized by cost element (i.e., Direct Labor, Subcontracts, Material, Other Direct Costs, Overhead/Indirect, Fee, etc.) time phased by quarter and sub-totaled by calendar year. Why is there a requirement to time phase by quarter and sub-total by calendar year within each CLIN? Will the Government provide estimated Period of Performance dates to ensure consistency in offers?	Time phasing by quarter and sub-totaling by calendar year allows the USG visibility into Offeror's rates that bridge accounting periods / fiscal years. The period of performance may be based on the milestones on the TS3 website, plus up to 45 days for task order award as stated in Attachment 0009.
308	For the R&D sample task order, the Period of Performance time frames on the Draft Attachment 0012 (Base - 6 months; Option 1 - 6 months; Option 2 - 2 months; Option 3 - 2 months) do not match what is stated in the draft TOR/PWS (Base - 9 months; Option 1 - 9 months; Option 2 - 6 months; Option 3 - 6 months). Which is correct?	Error Noted. The TOR and PWS will be reviewed for consistency and revised, if appropriate.
309	Will draft Task Order proposals be provided for each task order? If so, what is the expected timeframe for review and comment?	The Government will not provide any draft Task Order Proposals.
310	Approximately how many Unrestricted and Set Aside Task Orders does the Government expect to release each year?	Unknown at this time.
311	Can the Government identify on an annual basis, how many task orders would be Cost Plus, T&M and FFP	Unknown at this time.
312	If the Contractor is able to steer work onto this vehicle, will this work be competed or will it go sole source to the Contractor who brought the work to the vehicle?	Tasks orders issued against TS3 will be competed unless an Exception to Fair Opportunity applies.
313	Request DFAR 252.219-7004 be included for those Contractors that participate in Test Program.	A Comprehensive Subcontracting Plan under the Test Program may be submitted. If award is made, the DFARS 252.219-7004 clause would be added to the contract.
314	ERS Draft RFP A.8.2 Is the Contractor to propose CONUS and OCONUS Rates? If no OCONUS rates are to be proposed how will OCONUS costs be proposed/reimbursed at the task order level?	RFP Language will be amended to state Pricing Labor Matrix ceiling rates do not apply to OCONUS or OT work. All rates in Attachment 0002 will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates that will not be subject to future adjustments.
315	ERS Draft RFP A.8.2 Is the Contractor permitted to propose Government site and Contractor site rates?	The Government is not mandating that contractors use On-site or Off-site locations in developing their Contract Ceiling Rates.
316	ERS Draft RFP A.8.2 If the Contractor uses Third Country Nationals or Local Nationals will those rates and positions be proposed at the task order level?	If Third Country Nationals or Local Nationals are authorized at the Task Order Level, those rates will be identified at that time IAW the changes clause.
317	ERS Draft RFP A.8.2 Are Contractors to assume US citizens will be staffing each labor category for purposes of establishing rates and creating an equal proposal evaluation landscape?	No, the Government does not mandate that assumption.
318	ERS Draft RFP H.1.8.4 SB Subcontracting Requirement For Task Order Proposals, does the offeror need to show having the required small business participation % on day one of task order start or only that the Contractor has a plan to meet the small business participation % during the Task Order POP?	At proposal submission, contractors must submit a plan to meet the SB Subcontracting Requirement percentage. Contractor's show this as part of their cost proposal. They must adhere to this goal throughout the performance of the contract.
319	ERS Draft RFP H.2.1.2 Will the Hardship and Danger Pays referenced in this clause be proposed and reimbursed as Cost Reimbursable costs under an ODC CLIN on a Task Order basis?	Hardship and Danger Pay will be proposed at the task order level. Individual requirements are unknown at this time.

320	ERS Draft RFP H.2.1.5 If an unscheduled gate closures impacts schedule or performance on a FFP TO, please confirm that the Government will accept an REA for schedule and/or cost adjustment incurred as a result of these delays.	REAs are addressed on a case-by-case basis. The Government cannot comment on hypothetical scenarios.
321	H.31 CONSENT TO ADD/DELETE SUBCONTRACTORS In Attachment 0012 it indicates "Ceiling rates will cap the total cost per labor hour to the Government per labor category regardless of the contract type or whether the proposed labor is performed by the prime contractor or subcontractor." However, H.3.1 indicates "However, in order to avoid excessive pass-through charges, prime profit will not be allowed on subcontractor T&M loaded labor rates." If subcontractors labor rates fit under the prime ceiling rates, why is fee not permitted? With this fee exclusion on subcontractor T&M rates what incentive does the prime contract have to subcontract to large or small business subs? What is the intent of this clause?	Section H.31 will be removed from the final RFP. Subcontractor information has been moved to H.1.7.4. The final revisions will be contained in the final RFP.
322	H.31 CONSENT TO ADD/DELETE SUBCONTRACTORS Is this clause applicable for subcontractors added after the IDIQ award? Are subcontractors to have their own set of T&M rates under the prime IDIQ? Please clarify what the intent of this clause is.	Section H.31 will be removed from the final RFP. Subcontractor rates should be contained in your matrix ceiling rates. There are no separate rates for subcontractors.
323	H.32 Services Contract Act Please advise or provide the appropriate Wage Determination (WD) that should be used to price the ceiling rates?	The Government is not mandating a specific DOL Wage Determination for the contractor to use in developing their SCA Contract Ceiling Rates.
324	H.32 Services Contract Act Will the Offerors update IDIQ ceiling rates based on changes to the WD or will WD adjustments be handled at the task order proposal level?	All rates in Attachment 0002 will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates that will not be subject to future adjustments.
325	H.35 INCORPORATION OF RATES AND LABOR DESCRIPTIONS This clause indicates "All direct and indirect rates (including fee) shown on the ERS Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002) will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates, subject to downward negotiation only." Attachment 0002 only requests the fully burdened labor rate, where does the offeror identify the indirect rates and profit?	RFP H.35 Language will be amended to remove "indirect rates". All fully loaded rates (including profit/fee) in Attachment 0002 will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates that will not be subject to future adjustments.
326	H.35 INCORPORATION OF RATES AND LABOR DESCRIPTIONS For CPFF tasks, does the Contractor use actuals to price the direct labor?	RFP H.35 Language will be amended to remove "indirect rates". All fully loaded rates (including profit/fee) in Attachment 0002 will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates that will not be subject to future adjustments.
327	H.3 5 INCORPORATION OF RATES AND LABOR DESCRIPTIONS For CPFF Task Orders, if the Contractor's Cognizant Federal Agency acknowledges changes to an Offers provisional billing rates and if those rates exceed the ceiling rates on contract, will the Contractor be permitted to bill at the Cognizant Federal Agency approved rates?	All rates in Attachment 0002 will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates that will not be subject to future adjustments. Section H of the RFP will be clarified for the ceiling price applicability for cost-type task orders.
328	H.3 5 INCORPORATION OF RATES AND LABOR DESCRIPTIONS Clause indicates "For cost-plus-fixed-fee TOs, the fee percentage proposed in the ERS Pricing Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002) shall serve as a capped percentage, subject to downward negotiation only." Without knowing the scope and complexity of future CPFF task orders it is difficult for Offerors to speculate on a fixed fee that would be commensurate with the risk level of the task order scope of work. Would the Government consider a revision to allow Offerors to propose fee on CPFF task orders in accordance with the FAR requirements?	RFP H.35 Language will be amended to remove this sentence that is referenced in the question. All fully loaded rates (including profit/fee) in Attachment 0002 will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates that will not be subject to future adjustments.
329	Please confirm that final billing for CPFF task orders will be handled in accordance with the Contractors final negotiated rates with their Cognizant Federal Agency.	The Government intends these ceiling rates to apply to billing / post award reimbursement, regardless of the contract type. Section H.35 of the Draft RFP will be revised in the final RFP.

330	<p>H.4.1.5 Off Ramp</p> <p>Request the Government remove this statement "If a prime contractor does not pay its subcontractors/teammates within 30 days, despite receiving payment by the Government for such services." It is not reasonable for a prime to pay its subcontractor if the Government has not paid the Prime Contractor. If the Government cannot remove this clause suggest the clause be changed to "If a prime contractor does not pay its subcontractors/teammates within 30 days of Prime Contractor receiving payment by the Government for such services."</p>	<p>The language at Paragraph H.4.1 concerning Off-Ramping has been revised. The final RFP will contain the revised language.</p>
331	<p>H.22 Avoidance of Conflict of Interest (OCI)</p> <p>Is the OCI clause included in the ERS meant to restrict the Contractor performing non OCI related activities? For example, if the Contractor is performing vehicle maintenance, does this OCI clause prohibit the Offeror from providing maintenance of these vehicles either as prime or a subcontractor on another contract? It is unclear how this OCI clause will apply to the ERS Task Orders.</p>	<p>The answer to the first question is no.</p> <p>The answer to the second question is a case-specific question which would be addressed between the contractor and the contracting officer on the other contract.</p>
332	<p>H.22.6 Avoidance of Conflict of Interest (OCI)</p> <p>Request the Government include a statement to cap the liability to the value of the task order.</p>	<p>The Government cannot cap the liability . See DFARS 227.7103-7(c)(5) (Use and non-disclosure agreement) and 252.227-7025(c) (Limitations on the Use or Disclosure of Government-Furnished Information Marked with Restrictive Legends (MAY 2013)) for further information on this issue.</p>
333	<p>H.22.6 Avoidance of Conflict of Interest (OCI)</p> <p>Please confirm that the Contractor is only liable for Contractor and their Subcontractor employees who misuse, release, display, reproduce third party proprietary data. Contractor will not be responsible for personnel other than Contractor or associated subcontractor release of proprietary information.</p>	<p>Under H.22.6 the Contractor is liable for their employees and those parties that the Contractor has disclosed protected data to, see DFARS 227.7103-7(c)(5) (Use and non-disclosure agreement) and 252.227-7025(c) (Limitations on the Use or Disclosure of Government-Furnished Information Marked with Restrictive Legends (MAY 2013)).</p>
334	<p>H.22.6 Avoidance of Conflict of Interest (OCI)</p> <p>Suggest the following be added to H.22.6 "Contractor is not liable for any claims or liability arising from the negligence or misconduct of Government or third parties. Notwithstanding any other provision to the contrary, the Contractor's total liability will not exceed the total value of task order regardless of the legal theory assert, unless such liability arises from Contractor's gross negligence or willful misconduct." This added language would clarify that prime and their subcontractors are only liable for their own actions.</p>	<p>The prime and their subcontractors are only liable for their own actions, see DFARS 227.7103-7(c)(5) (Use and non-disclosure agreement) and 252.227-7025(c) (Limitations on the Use or Disclosure of Government-Furnished Information Marked with Restrictive Legends (MAY 2013)).</p>
335	<p>H.22.6 Avoidance of Conflict of Interest (OCI)</p> <p>For any tasks which contain support to the RSJPO, does the Government believe there are ways of successfully mitigating OCI for future acquisition programs released by the RSJPO?</p>	<p>The Government will not speculate how a contractor can successfully mitigate OCIs on a current RSJPO Action so they could be successfully mitigated on future acquisition programs released by RSJPO. Any future OCIs would have to be addressed between the contractor and the contracting officer on the future requirement.</p>
336	<p>I-219 (252.234-7002 EARNED VALUE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM)</p> <p>Will the requirement for EVMS be identified and applicable at the task order level?</p>	<p>The Clause Section of each RFP has been revised. This provision will be included at the Task Order Level when applicable.</p>
337	<p>Attachment 0002 Pricing</p> <p>The Government is requesting rates for an 8 year period of performance, which is a significant amount of time for Contractors to be locked into rates. Would the Government consider a reopener clause after year 4 to allow Contractor to update rates, which may also provide reduced rates to the Government?</p>	<p>There will be no reopener clause.</p>
338	<p>Attachment 0002 Pricing</p> <p>If the Contractor has changes to its Government submitted Forward Pricing Rate Proposal, will the Contractor be able to update ceiling rates for these changes?</p>	<p>All rates in Attachment 0002 will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates that will not be subject to future adjustments.</p>

339	<p>Robotics Task Order, Place of Performance</p> <p>Afghanistan is identified as a place of performance. Will Contractor employees be performing effort on US military Installations in Afghanistan? Will Contractor be deploying for a US Government run CRC or a commercial CRC? Will Contractor be required to be armed? Will Government be providing housing, transportation and security to Contractor employee while in Afghanistan? Will US military be providing force protection to Contractor employees? If not, who will be providing the force protection of Contractor employees? In the event security conditions deteriorate to a level that threatens the safety of Contractor employees, please confirm that Contractor is permitted to evacuate employees for their safety and Contractor will not be penalized or terminated for removing employees.</p>	<p>Q1: Anticipate performance on a US installation Q2: A US Government CRC is anticipated. Q3: Reference Attachment 0010, paragraph 1.6.18.1.1. Q4: See Attachment 0010, paragraphs 1.6.18.6.1 & 4. Q5: See Attachment 0010, paragraphs 1.6.18.6.1 & 4. Q6: Reference the May 2014 revision to DFARS 252.225-7040(h)(2), which will be included in the final solicitation.</p>
340	<p>Robotics Task Order-Attachment 012, General Question</p> <p>Where does the Offeror price DOS premiums on the sample task order?</p>	<p>Per the instructions tab, (cell B20), The T&M Labor rates input by the offeror shall be fully burdened (base rate + all applicable burdens, including profit).</p>
341	<p>Robotics Task Order-Attachment 012, General Question</p> <p>If the Contractor chooses to utilize Third Country Nationals (TCNs) and/or Local Nationals (LNs) how should TCN's/LN's be priced?</p>	<p>Please see Attachment 0010: PWS at paragraph 1.6.15, TCNs and LNs are not authorized under this task order.</p>
342	<p>Robotics Task Order-Attachment 012, General Question</p> <p>The instructions contained in Attachment 012 indicate "Do not manipulate any of the other cells except for those that are highlighted yellow." If the Offeror has indirect rates that are not included on Attachment 012, how does the Offeror include those costs?</p>	<p>In accordance with RFP Sections L.6.2.2.1 through L.6.2.2.3, Offerors shall submit spreadsheets in their own format (L.6.2.2.1), Input that data into the USG standardized spreadsheets (L.6.2.2.2), and provide a roadmap / reconciliation between the two formats (L.6.2.2.3).</p>
343	<p>Is the Sample task provided for W56HZV14R0031-ERS Robotics Task new work or is there an incumbent contractor? If an incumbent contractor exists, can the government provide the current task order and contract number?</p>	<p>There is an existing contract for the Robotics Task Order. The contract number is W56HZV-09-A-A911, task order 0002.</p>
344	<p>PWS, Page 239 Para 1.6.2</p> <p>When will the Government's Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan be available to the successful bidder?</p>	<p>The QASP will not be provided to the Contractor. The QASP is primarily focused on what the Government must do to ensure that the Contractor has performed in accordance with the Performance Standards outlined in Technical Exhibit 1 of the Task Order attachment.</p>
345	<p>PWS, Page 239, Para 1.6.4 and 1.6.4.1</p> <p>These two paragraphs appear to contradict each other. As reads, "Para 1.6.4 :The Contractor is responsible for conducting services beginning as early as 6:00 AM and ending as late as 6:00 PM, Monday through Friday" This equates to 60 hours per week. Whereas in Para 1.6.4.1 the PWS reads, "For Contractors serving in CONUS, a standard workweek will consist of 40 hours, 8 hours per day, 5 days per week." Are prospective bidders to price 40 or 60 hours per week in their estimates?</p>	<p>Paragraph 1.6.4 details the hours when the contractor will provide service between. The contractor is responsible for providing 40 hours of service a week, so long as the services fall between the hours of 0600 and 1800, Monday through Friday.</p>
346	<p>PWS, Page 239/240, Para 1.6.5</p> <p>Is the Place of Performance location list all inclusive?</p>	<p>Yes, the list at 1.6.5 includes all locations where the Government requires service at this time. The inclusion of additional locations may be subject to FAR 52.212-4(c).</p>
347	<p>PWS Section 1.6.15: Security Clearance</p> <p>Is the Secret Clearance requirement only for personnel on the contract that will be accessing the Government Database or does this requirement apply to other employees on the contract?</p>	<p>This requirement applies to all employees performing on the task order.</p>
348	<p>PWS Section 1.6.17.1.3, Inventory</p> <p>During phase in, upon an inspection of GFE, if the contractor discovers unserviceable equipment, who will have the responsibility to dispose of such equipment?</p>	<p>The incumbent contractor has the responsibility to turn in unserviceable equipment.</p>

349	<p>C.4.1.2.1.1 Materiel Solution Analysis Phase</p> <p>It appears the tasks related to the MSA-phase would prohibit any contractor working within this area to be precluded from working on an acquisition program resulting from this development work. If a prime contractor is awarded this task, would any and all sub-contractors on that team be precluded from future acquisitions of a related program?</p>	<p>This question cannot be answered until the actual work performed is known. Section H "Avoidance of Organizational Conflicts of Interest" would apply unless an exception exists.</p>
350	<p>The RFP clearly defines how the Government will treat Joint Ventures with respect to size standard determination and small business participation. However, the RFP is silent on how the Government intends to evaluate the capabilities and past performance of joint ventures.</p> <p>Question: Would the Government consider adding the following to L.4, "The Government will consider past performance from any company participating in a joint venture as offeror past performance, as long as the joint venture is a formal arrangement (i.e., its own legal entity with a separate Cage code)? The Government will treat informal joint ventures (i.e., not its own legal entity) as a prime/subcontractor arrangement, with the Managing Partner designated as the Prime when evaluating past performance."</p>	<p>Past Performance is not being evaluated under any of the 3 RFPs. Experience is being evaluated. The Government will evaluate the combined experience of all members of a joint venture the same as it will evaluate the experience of any other prime offeror.</p>
351	<p>ERS NAICS Code Assignment: 13 C.F.R. § 121.402(b) states, Primary consideration is given to the industry descriptions in the U.S. NAICS Manual, the product or service description in the solicitation and any attachments to it, the relative value and importance of the components of the procurement making up the end item being procured, and the function of the goods or services being purchased, when assigning a NAICS code to a procurement.</p> <p>The Contracting Officer assigned NAICS code 811111 to the Equipment Related Services RFP. The US Census Bureau defines this code as, This U.S. industry comprises establishments primarily engaged in providing (1) a wide range of mechanical and electrical repair and maintenance services for automotive vehicles, such as passenger cars, trucks, and vans, and all trailers or (2) engine repair and replacement.</p> <p>This definition does not appear to address the preponderance of the requirements contained within Section C of the RFP. C.1 of the Statement of Work defines the scope of task order requirements to relate to the maintenance, repair and overhaul, equipment modification, installation of equipment and technical representative services to keep machines, systems, and vehicles functioning or in working order. However, paragraphs C.4.1.1-9 include a broad range of requirements that go well beyond mechanical and electrical repair and maintenance. These requirements include test and evaluation strategy, planning, execution and analysis; full lifecycle logistics support; human-systems integration; MANPRINT and manpower estimation; cost estimation; demilitarization and disposal; integration of hardware and software into subsystems or components; demonstration planning and execution; configuration management; producibility analysis; product improvement planning; modernization planning; value engineering; laboratory support; system support packages; quality assurance; reliability, availability and maintainability; facilities assessment; Army transformation planning; and XML conversion. Further, the definition for NAICS Code 811111 appears to apply only to passenger cars, trucks, vans and trailers. However, TACOM's mission includes robots, Army watercraft and tracked vehicles.</p> <p>If the Government's analysis proves the preponderance of the work contractors will perform under the Equipment Related Services contract will be limited to passenger cars, trucks, vans and trailers, would the Government consider amending the Statement of Work to reflect this analysis? If the Statement of Work is accurate, would the Government consider changing the NAICS code to better reflect the preponderance of work. Our analysis of previous contracts, task orders and the Statement of Work shows assignment of either of the following NAICS codes would better represent the scope of work (NOTE: the Government originally competed the TOR W56HZV-11-JJ-001 associated with the ERS RFP under NAICS 541330):</p> <p>541330 Engineering Services: This industry comprises establishments primarily engaged in applying physical laws and principles of engineering in the design, development, and utilization of machines, materials, instruments, structures, processes, and systems. The assignments undertaken by these establishments may involve any of the following activities: provision of advice, preparation of feasibility studies, preparation of preliminary and final plans and designs, provision of technical services during the construction or installation phase, inspection and evaluation of engineering projects, and related services.</p> <p>541614 Process, Physical Distribution, and Logistics Consulting Services: This U.S. industry comprises establishments primarily engaged in providing operating advice and assistance to businesses and other organizations in areas, such as: (1) manufacturing operations improvement; (2) productivity improvement; (3) production planning and control; (4) quality assurance and quality control; (5) inventory management; (6) distribution networks; (7) warehouse use, operations, and utilization; (8) transportation and shipment of goods and materials; and (9) materials management and handling.</p>	<p>NAICS Code 811111 is the appropriate code based on the preponderance of the work under the ERS RFP. Section C of the ERS RFP does contain a description of some ancillary tasks, but the preponderance of work falls under NAICS code 811111. NAICS code 541330 is for Engineering Services that represent the preponderance of the work under the KBS RFP. NAICS Code 541614 is for Consulting Services. Neither code constitutes the preponderance of the tasks to be performed for the ERS RFP.</p>
352	<p>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.</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>
353	<p>If the company qualified as a small business under 541712 for the TS3 F/D FoC, is a small business plan required?</p>	<p>Small businesses are not required to submit a small business plan.</p>

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	<p>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.</p>	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 <sample> 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.

363	<p>Our incumbent experience delivering relevant services to TACOM currently allows us to recognize the Government requires access to highly-experienced engineers/scientists to address the complex requirements associated with achieving TACOM's mission.</p> <p>The SOC labor categories provided in Attachment 0002 of the solicitation are not broad enough to provide the Government access to the highly-qualified subject matter experts required to perform the solicitation requirements.</p> <p>Question: Will the Government consider adding an additional level (Level IV- A master's degree in a specialized field plus a minimum of 5 years of specialized experience, or, a bachelor's degree in any field with a minimum of 15 years of specialized experience) to the SOCs provided in Attachment 0002 to allow access to highly experienced experts for the following labor categories:</p> <p>Engineering Managers - 11-9041; Computer and Information Research Scientist - 15-1111; Computer Systems Analysts - 15-1121; Software Developers, Applications - 15-1132; Software Developers, Systems Software - 15-1133; Web Developers - 15-1134; Database Administrators - 15-1141; Computer Network Architects - 15-1143; Computer User Support Specialists - 15-1151; Operations Research Analysts - 15-2031; Chemical Engineers - 17-2041; Civil Engineers - 17-2051; Electrical Engineer - 17-2071; Electronics Engineer - 17-2072; Health And Safety Engineer - 17-2111; Industrial Engineer - 17-2112; Marine Engineer - 17-2121; Materials Engineer - 17-2131; Mechanical Engineers - 17-2141; Engineers, All Others - 17-2199; Program Management/Business Operations Specialist, All Other - 13-1199</p>	<p>Alternate labor categories may be considered at the task order level, but will be handled on an individual task order basis. Alternate minimum qualifications, such as experience as a replacement for education, will be at the task order level.</p>
364	<p>Question: If the Government decides against adding an additional level (Level 4), will the Government consider adding additional labor categories to Attachment 0002 that include the higher-end technical specialists including engineers and scientist categories?</p> <p>Chief Engineer/Scientist - Level III/IV/V - Performs the functions of a technical expert in the relevant engineering/scientific field in the support of major programs or system development. Applies engineering/scientific expertise in defining and resolving system issues, performing analysis and developing plans and requirements in the subject-matter area for complex systems. Coordinates and manages the preparation of analyses, evaluations, and recommendations for proper implementation of programs and systems.</p> <p>Level III: PhD in a specialized field plus a minimum of 5 years experience; or a master's degree in a specialized field plus a minimum of 10 years of specialized experience; or, a bachelor's degree in any field with a minimum of 15 years of specialized experience.</p> <p>Level IV: PhD in a specialized field plus a minimum of 10 years experience; or a master's degree in a specialized field plus a minimum of 15 years of specialized experience; or, a bachelor's degree in any field with a minimum of 20 years of specialized experience.</p> <p>Level V: PhD in a specialized field plus a minimum of 15 years experience; or a master's degree in a specialized field plus a minimum of 20 years of specialized experience; or, a bachelor's degree in any field with a minimum of 25 years of specialized experience.</p> <p>Subject Matter Expert</p> <p>III/IV/V - Provides extremely high level subject matter expertise for work described in the task. Provides advanced technical knowledge and analysis of highly specialized applications and operational environment, high-level functional systems analysis, design, integration, documentation, training, and implementation advice on complex problems which require doctorate level knowledge of the subject matter for effective implementation. Applies principles, methods, and knowledge of specific functional areas of expertise to specific task order requirements. Provides advice on esoteric problems which require extensive knowledge of the subject matter. Designs and prepares technical reports, studies, and related documentation, makes charts and graphs to record results, prepares and delivers presentations, training, and briefings as required by the task order.</p> <p>Level III: PhD in a specialized field plus a minimum of 5 years experience; or a master's degree in a specialized field plus a minimum of 10 years of specialized experience; or, a bachelor's degree in any field with a minimum of 15 years of specialized experience.</p> <p>Level IV: PhD in a specialized field plus a minimum of 10 years experience; or a master's degree in a specialized field plus a minimum of 15 years of specialized experience; or, a bachelor's degree in any field with a minimum of 20 years of specialized experience.</p> <p>Level V: PhD in a specialized field plus a minimum of 15 years experience; or a master's degree in a specialized field plus a minimum of 20 years of specialized experience; or, a bachelor's degree in any field with a minimum of 25 years of specialized experience.</p>	<p>Alternate labor categories may be considered at the task order level, but will be handled on an individual task order basis. Alternate minimum qualifications, such as experience as a replacement for education, will be at the task order level.</p>

365	<p>In our review of the PWS/SOW and subsequent evaluation of the SOCs, we recognize there is no research engineer/scientist labor category available to address specific portions of the solicitation requirements. This particular labor category addresses the engineering/scientific disciplines required to meet technical requirements such as scientific research and development, and technical direction for complex systems. Will the Government consider adding a Research Engineer/Scientist category?</p> <p>Research Engineer/Scientist - Level I/II/III - Provides scientific research and engineering, technical, and managerial direction for problem definition, analysis, requirement development and implementation for complex systems in the engineering/scientific disciplines required to meet technical requirements. - Makes recommendations and advises on research development, improvements, optimization, or support efforts. Performs risk assessments and innovative use of new research concepts or improved techniques and procedures.</p> <p>Level I: A bachelor's degree in the specialized field; or, a bachelor's degree in any field, from an accredited college or university, with 2 years of specialized experience.</p> <p>Level II: A bachelor's degree in an applicable specialized field plus one full academic year of graduate education in the specialized field; or, a bachelor's degree in an applicable specialized field plus 3 years of applicable experience; or, a bachelor's degree in any field with a minimum of 5 years of specialized experience</p> <p>Level III: A master's degree in a specialized field plus a minimum of 1 year of applicable experience; or, a bachelor's degree in the specialized field plus 7 years of applicable experience; or, a bachelor's degree in any field with a minimum of 9 years of specialized experience</p>	There is no SOC category for Research Engineer/Scientist.
366	<p>Reference L.6.2.1.2. states that all rates proposed in Attachment 0002 must comply with SCA minimum wages. The wage basis for SCA rates varies widely by location. Would the Government please define the location upon which offerors should base their rates? If not, would the Government consider a rate reasonable if the DL basis is within the aggregate range that includes all locations (i.e., the reasonableness floor is the bottom of the salary range for the location with the lowest salary basis and the ceiling would equal the top of the salary range for the location with the highest salary basis)?</p>	The Government is not mandating a specific DOL Wage Determination for the contractor to use in developing their SCA Contract Ceiling Rates. The exact places of performance are unknown until each TO is issued. The reasonableness of each rate will be determined in accordance with M.7.
367	<p>Reference M.7: The Government's evaluation criteria related to realism are clear. However, the Government should expect offerors to discount the rates used to create the Total Evaluated Price for the RTO since the rates in Attachment 0002 represent not to exceed ceilings. M.7.3 states, A cost/price is considered reasonable if it does not exceed what would be incurred by a prudent person in the conduct of competitive business. How does the Government intend to establish this standard? Does the Government intend to compare the Attachment 0002 submissions from all offerors?</p>	Ceiling rates proposed in Attachment 0002 will be evaluated separately from Task Order rates for consideration of reasonableness. Per RFP paragraph M.7, EVALUATION OF VOLUME IV COST/PRICE FACTOR, The Government will assess the proposed fully loaded labor rates in the Labor Matrix (Attachment 0002) and the total evaluated cost/price from the each Prime Proposal Summary (Attachment 0012) using one or more of the price and cost analysis techniques and procedures identified in FAR 15.404-1.
368	<p>Given that the SOC labor categories provide the basis for the rate card, the Government should expect to see a very broad range of rates for the Level 3 categories, as some offerors bid the very minimum experience level, while others provide true ceilings to address the senior engineers, analysts and technicians required to perform TACOM's most complex requirements. The US Department of Labor assigns a salary range for each SOC category. Would the Government please consider judging an offeror's rates as "reasonable" if the DL basis falls within the DOL defined range for the locations where the work is performed?</p>	Reference response to Question #231. Price reasonableness will be evaluated in accordance with M.7.
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>Question: The draft PWS does not address required deployment and management of at least six individuals simultaneously to more than two OCONUS location. This consideration is addressed in the draft PWS in Section H.4.1.2.1. Can the environment of access to an OCONUS location be used to support this requirement?</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>
372	<p>A.1 and C.1.2 Please identify Government customers that are eligible to use this contract vehicle.</p>	<p>Please see Sections A.1 and C.1.2 of the draft RFPs.</p>
373	<p>H.1.1 2nd paragraph, Where can the TS3 Family of Contracts Ordering Guide be found? Please provide a link or copy</p>	<p>TS3 Ordering Guide has not been developed yet but will be an internal document that outlines the procedures for using TS3.</p>
374	<p>H.1.7.2 references "the prime contractor shall establish a single mailbox for the Government". Please confirm this means an email mailbox.</p>	<p>The language will be clarified to state "e-mail mailbox."</p>
375	<p>H.1.8.6 The Government may reject a TO proposal if it is determined that the offeror is delinquent (more than 30 calendar days late) in paying any of its subcontractors. Does the Government mean 30 days late beyond payment terms negotiated between the Prime and Sub? What is the Government mechanism/process for measuring late payment?</p>	<p>This language has been removed from the RFP.</p>
376	<p>H.2.2.5.4.5 Estimated costs are on a not to exceed basis. Recommend this be cost reimbursable. Contractor's price travel based upon per diem and current rates at the time they request approval. Example, airfare costs fluctuate daily and could cause a significant increase causing the contractor to be out of pocket for any airfare beyond the NTE cost.</p>	<p>Reference H.2.2.5.5: "Any cost(s) that exceed the original estimate shall be approved in advance by the COR. Failure to obtain advance approval from the COR will result in the contractor only receiving reimbursement for the allowable per diem amounts(s) or the NTE cost already approved by the COR."</p>
377	<p>H.4 OFF-RAMPS and H.5 ON-RAMPS</p> <p>Please confirm that Off-Ramping and On-Ramping will not be used to (1) increase the number of MA IDIQ awardees or (2) to change the mix of SB and OTSB awardees.</p> <p>H.4.1.5 Off-ramping can occur if a subcontractor is not paid within 30 days. Does the government mean 30 days late beyond payment terms negotiated between the Prime and Sub and receipt of an acceptable invoice and payment has been received by the Government for services invoiced. What is the government mechanism for measuring late payment?</p>	<p>Off-Ramping will occur via Termination for Convenience of the Government, mutual agreement between the Government and the contractor, or based on a determination of non-responsibility. On-Ramping will occur to maintain an optimal mix of both SB and OTSB prime contractors. The off-ramping language has been revised to remove the language regarding subcontractors.</p>
378	<p>H.22.3.1.1 is repeated twice.</p>	<p>Error noted. The final RFP will be corrected.</p>
379	<p>H.27 The government COR has 10 days to review and approve invoices, request this be changed to 3-5 days as this has an impact on payment to both Prime and subcontractors.</p>	<p>H.27 has been moved to Section G. No change will be made to the number of days the COR has to review invoices.</p>

380	H.31 "...Prime profit will not be allowed on subcontractor T&M loaded labor rates." Request this be removed. T&M rates should be established as a ceiling rate by the Prime and subcontractor rates should be at or below the ceiling established by the Prime. The Prime will be responsible for work being performed at or below these rates. Rates proposed by Prime will be based upon a competitive price to win strategy. Additionally, Clause 52.213-23 Limitations on Pass-Through Charges is incorporated.	Section H.31 has been removed from the RFP.
381	H.35 Cost Reimbursement Task Orders should be invoiced at actual cost not lowest rate. A Prime may propose a rate based upon an average salary but the person hired to perform the work may have an actual cost higher than the average salary. Prime should be reimbursed at their actual cost.	Section H.35 of the draft will be amended. The ceiling price in Attachment 0002 will apply to all contract types.
382	L.1.2 General 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.	The index is equivalent to a table of contents. The language will be clarified.
383	In the SB restricted pool, is the 51% requirement managed at the TO level, at the contract level, both?	When a Task Order is solicited in the restricted pool, the 51% requirement applies.
384	Is CMM/CMMI a requirement for software?	Yes. Level 3 required. CMMI Level 2 is acceptable if in process to implement Level 3.
385	Will the Government award Task Orders based on the sample task response?	The Government plans to award the representative task orders subject to the availability of funds and bona fide need at the time of task order award.
386	Section C, A.4.1 NAICS Code 811111, and M.1.1.1 Basis for Award Due to the broad similarity between the technical requirements of the three solicitations, it appears that the NAICS code of 811111 specified for ERS is incompatible with much of the technical requirements. We suggest the addition of a NAICS code in the 541xxx series be added to cover the breadth of the technical requirements specified.	The purpose of the ERS RFP is to cover equipment and maintenance type services; the other services listed are incidental to the preponderance of the work that will be performed under this RFP. NAICS Code 811111 is the appropriate code based on the preponderance of the work under the ERS RFP.
387	A.8.2 & Labor Categories and Teaming Partners added at the TO level Does the Offeror have to submit pricing for all labor categories?	Yes, proposed rates are required for all listed labor categories in the Pricing Labor Matrix.
388	A.9.2 Small Business Participation Under what circumstances would R&D TO's be set aside for SB Prime Contractors?	R&D task orders may be set-aside at the contracting officer's discretion in accordance with FAR 19.502-4(c).
389	L.6.2 Ceiling Labor Rates, A.4.1 NAICS Code and M.1.1.1 Basis for Award Does each offeror have to submit a price for all labor categories in Attachment 2?	Yes, proposed rates are required for all listed labor categories in the Pricing Labor Matrix.
390	Section 1.2: Background – Does the COR have a list of approved (validated, verified, accredited (VV&A)) software capable of modeling high strain rate blast events in which the contractor must/may utilize one or more, or is the application /selection of software open to contractor choice and if so, is it intended that the contractor is responsible for VV&A?	The contractor shall determine the software it needs to perform the requirements.
391	Section 1.5: POP – is it expected that options 1 and 2 are not to be conducted concurrently, or is it intended that prototyping of the base designs may be conducted concurrently with the development of additional designs	It is possible that options 1 and 2 are performed concurrently, however the Government is unable to provide any further information at this time.
392	Section 5.1.1.1: Concept CAD – what is the expected CAD format?	CDRL A006, Block 16(d) details the requirements for the CAD format
393	Section 5.1.1.1: Concept CAD – are there restrictions on material vendors (i.e. no foreign material acquisition)?	There are no current restrictions on material vendors for this specific requirement.

394	Section 5.1.1.1: Concept CAD – will the COR define/quantify “Economical”, e.g. Maximum Dollar value per pound of material?	"Economical" will be revised to "reasonably priced", see FAR 31.201-3.
395	Section 5.1.4: Reports – The BOM IAW CDRL A008 as required in section 5.1.3 was not included within the reports required as specified in section 5.1.4, was this an oversight or intentional?	Pursuant to CDRL A008, Block 16, a BOM is required with each submission of CDRL A007.
396	Section 5.2.3: 20% concept meeting – This section implies 15 day cycle from receipt of sketches at SOWM (held 10 days after start) to presentation of 3D model review (days prior to meeting held 30 days from start), is it the COR intent that the 3D model be 20% complete or that the concept(s) be 20% developed and the 3D model be sufficient enough to reflect concept progress?	That the concepts be 20% developed and the model sufficient to adequately reflect the concept being presented.
397	Section H.35 states: “All direct and indirect rates (including fee) shown on the KBS Pricing Labor Matrix will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates, subject to downward negotiation only. For cost-plus-fixed fee TOs, the fee percentage proposed in the KBS Pricing Labor Matrix shall serve as a capped percentage, subject to downward negotiation only, at the TO level, in which the resultant fee will become a fixed dollar amount. For billing purposes under cost-reimbursement TOs, the direct and indirect (including the applicable fixed fee dollar amount in each TO) rates shall be billed using the rates in the contract, the rates proposed/negotiated under the TO, or the actual rates, whichever is lower.” Under a cost plus contract type, direct and indirect rates are typically proposed and billed at their actual costs versus being capped at the IDIQ level. Please confirm that the direct and indirect rates aren't being capped for future cost-reimbursement Task Orders.	RFP H.35 Language will be amended to remove "indirect rates". All fully loaded rates (including profit/fee) in Attachment 0002 will be incorporated into the contract as ceiling rates for all contract types.
398	The draft solicitation is silent on the physical location for each labor category to be proposed as part of the Pricing Labor Matrix. If offerors make assumptions around the location it will result in very different proposed labor pricing for each offeror, making the evaluation of labor rates more challenging for the government. Can the Government please provide the location offerors should assume for labor rate pricing?	The Government is not mandating a specific location for the contractor to use in developing their Contract Ceiling Rates.
399	Section L requests that each offeror shall proposed fully loaded labor rates to establish a ceiling rate, which will cap the total cost per labor hour. Attachment 0002 only requests one set of rates. Is the Government expecting offerors to only propose one rate that covers both Government and Contractor Site? If so, we recommend having both a Government Site and Contractor Site set of labor categories as it will result in the best and most competitive pricing for the Government.	The Government is not mandating that contractors use On-site or Off-site locations in developing their Contract Ceiling Rates.
400	Estimated direct labor hours are provided for the Task Order. Are offerors required to bid the hours provided in the Task Order Request and Pricing Model?	Yes.
401	Attachment 0005 ERS & KBS tab 2 (Prime \$) delineates 7 different business size categories as follows: 1. Other Than Small Business 2. Small Business 3. Small Disadvantaged Business 4. Woman Owned Small Business 5. Historically Underutilized Business Zone Small Business 6. Veteran Owned Small Business 7. Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business Tab 3 (Sub \$) lists the above 7 categories but also adds Alaskan Native Corporation or Indian Tribe Subcontracts at Lower than First Tier, and also adds Excluded Subcontracts, for a total of 9 business size categories. Tab 6 (Con) lists the same 7 categories as tab 2 and tab 7 (Roll-up) provides for a roll-up of nine business size categories. Should business size categories be the same across all tabs?	No. There is no need for a separate line for ANCs and ITs on the 'Prime \$' tab. The ANCs and IT Primes would be listed in whatever category they would fall under. For example, sometimes ANCs are 8(a) SBs, so the dollars would apply to the SDB category and the SB category. There is no need to have an "Excluded Subcontracts" line on the 'Prime \$' tab. The 'Prime \$' tab is dollars for the work performed by the prime, not the subcontractor(s). There is no need to have either of these lines on the 'CON' tab because goals for these would not be placed in the Subcontracting Plan. All items are included on the Roll-up tab for all the calculations to be correct. See the column labeled "Reference Tab and Line(s) or Calculation" for line 1 especially.
402	The NAICS code for ERS is stated as 81111. This NAICS code has a Small Business size standard of \$7M. We are attempting to find a Small Business to partner with for ERS but have been unable to locate a company that meets this size standard and also possesses the required experience factors listed in Section L. Will the NAICS code change for ERS, and if not, will the Government furnish the names of the small businesses who qualify to prime ERS?	There is no plan to change the ERS NAICS Code. The Government is prohibited from providing a list of potential prime offerors.

403	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."	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.
404	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.	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.
405	Is the Contractor required to comply with Afghanistan Local Labor law under the Robotics Task Order?	The contractor is expected to comply with host nation laws to the extent required by Army Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (AFARS) 5152.225-5903, Compliance with Law and Regulations (DEC 2011)
406	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, Facilities 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?	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.
407	PARA A .1 BACKGROUND/DESCRIPTION OF THE ACTION states, "The TACOM Strategic Service Solutions (TS3) Family of Contracts (FoC), estimated at \$3.2 billion, is intended to result in three distinct Requests for Proposals (RFPs) with three respective sets of multiple-award indefinite-delivery, indefinite-quantity (MA IDIQ) contracts (i.e. contract suites). Each RFP will cover services primarily from one portfolio group of services; however, there will be overlap in the scopes of the RFPs to permit an order with a preponderance of work in one portfolio group and ancillary services in one or both of the other portfolio groups needed as part of the total requirement." Question: Can you define what the distinctive elements of scope are for the ERS solicitation, are they as indicated in the market survey?	Reference Section C.1 of the draft ERS RFP for the type of services that will be performed under this RFP.
408	PARA A .4 SOLICITATION STRUCTURE. A.4.1 The contracting officer has selected North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code 811111, General Automotive Repair, for the ERS MA IDIQ solicitation and resultant contracts, as it encompasses the effort likely to account for the greatest percentage of contract value. This NAICS code, 811111, will also be used for all task orders (TOs) issued against the ERS contract suite. Question: In addressing/evaluating "comparable in scope" is this a factor?	Evaluation of Experience is based on the work performed, not the NAICS code.
409	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)." Question: There is no L.5.1.2.1-3 should this be L.4.1.2.1-3?	Error noted. Correction will be made.
410	Is the scope of this solicitation as indicated in PARA M.5.1.3, "mechanical or electrical technical maintenance of military vehicles or systems, to include ground, air, or sea vehicles." Is relevant experience therefore limited to: 1) Maintenance in conjunction with military or commercial maintenance manuals"? 2) Repair in conjunction with military or commercial maintenance manuals"? 3) Fault isolation in conjunction with military or commercial maintenance manuals"? 4) Troubleshooting and replacement of subsystems or parts in conjunction with military or commercial maintenance manuals"?	Yes, for M.5.1.3.

411	The scope is not clear; is mechanical or technical maintenance of non-vehicular systems in-scope for this solicitation?	Yes.
412	Para L.4.2.7 requires that we submit excerpts from a SOW/PWS to demonstrate the presence of in-scope activities in submitted past performances. Will the government accept other-than-SOW documents, such as communications from the government indicating a task to be performed on contract?	The Government will only accept excerpts from a contract's SOW/PWS, technical instructions, or work directives. It is the offeror's responsibility to show relevancy. The Government is not evaluating past performance.
413	PARA L.7.1.3(a) Small Business Participation Factor Workbook (Attachment 0005) and Small Business Participation Factor Workbook Instructions (Attachment 0006) states that "All offerors. . .are required to complete the Small Business Participation Factor Workbook (Attachment 0006). . . Question: Did the government mean to reference Attachment 0005 instead of Attachment 0006?"	Error noted. Correction will be made.
414	PARA L.7.1.3(b) Small Business Participation Factor Workbook (Attachment 0005) and Small Business Participation Factor Workbook Instructions (Attachment 0006) states that "an offeror shall fill out the Small Business Participation Factor Workbook (Attachment 0006). . Question: Did the government mean to reference Attachment 0005 instead of Attachment 0006?"	Error noted. Correction will be made.
415	PARA L.7.1.7(a)(4) The Small Business Subcontracting Plan states that The Small Business Subcontracting Plan "has goals that are expressed as a percentage of 'Total Subcontracting Amount' for all of the Basic CLINs and all of the Option CLINs identified in the ERS Prime Proposal Summary File Robotics (Attachment 0012)". Question: Since subcontracting opportunities under the scope of the Robotics task may not be representative of subcontracting opportunities under the broader scope of the IDIQ, does the government intend to negotiate a Small Business Subcontracting Plan at the IDIQ level prior to contract award? Will the evaluation Small Business Subcontracting Plan applicable to the Robotics task as outlined in this paragraph be solely for evaluation purposes?	The SBSP submitted for Robotics as part of an offeror's proposal will apply to the IDIQ contract if awarded, with the exception of the goals. The goals within that plan will apply to the Robotics task order. If awarded the task order, reporting on the goals will be required. The goals in the plan may be updated when future task orders are awarded.