

Q1. There seems to be a potential conflict between the PWS and the issued Q&A.

Original Question: If both teams develop all ten of the CBRN hazard modeling capabilities listed in Section 4.2.1 h), there may be wasteful duplication of effort, particularly for capabilities where one team or the other has significant advantage because of past experience. It might make sense to divide the ten tasks equally between the two teams based on their proposed task-by-task approaches to allow each team to focus competitively on the remaining requirements a) through g).

Government Response: Contractors are not expected to develop new modeling capability. The majority of modeling capability is provided in the Technical Data Package (TDP). Where the Contractor has a more mature, superior model that better meets the needs of an operational user than those included in the TDP, the model may be integrated, but should already be TRL 6. The majority of the development activity should be focused on providing a robust end user architecture and graphical user interface that meets JEM Incr 1 and Incr 2 requirements and provides a substantial improvement over the existing JEM Incr 1 product.

PWS 4.2.1 states that all software components must be CCMI compliant, which we believe conflicts with the statement that majority of the development activity should be focused on the architecture and user interface.

Can the Government confirm that as part of the base year prototyping effort, the contractor must provide full CCMI compliance for all PWS 4.2.1 required CCMI components?

A1. Yes, the contractor must provide full CCMI-compliant components in accordance with the PWS and its attachments. The Government's prior response regarding the focus on architecture and user interface was intended to highlight the expectation that Contractors not develop new modeling capability. The specific allocation of resources between making components CCMI-compliant and adding end-user interface/architecture improvements is for the offerors to describe within their proposals.

Q2. Should a subcontractor have an accounting system deemed "unapproved or inadequate... as determined by DCAA" (p. 49), does the requirement to furnish "acceptable documentation" to verify realism still apply? If so, please clarify what form(s) of documentation would be expected to support Time & Materials rates furnished by a subcontractor.

A2. See Q&A Set #1, A15. Yes. If the prime has an approved Purchasing System, the Government expects the prime to provide documentation, prepared in accordance with its own approved procedures, demonstrating the evaluation and determination of reasonableness of the subcontractor's cost/technical proposal, regardless of subcontract type. If the prime does not have an approved Purchasing System, such documentation is not required.

Q3. Are the title page and table of contents excluded from the page count for Volume I?

A3. Yes, the title page and table of contents are excluded from the page count for Volume I. See Amendment 0003 for additional proposal format instructions.

Q4. The instructions for hard-copy delivery of the signed proposal (Box 9. of SF 33, page 1 of the RFP) are missing from the solicitation. Could you please advise as to the location of the depository for hand-delivered proposals?

A4. If Offerors intend to hand-deliver the original, signed paper version of their proposal (Volume I), per SF 33, Page 1, Box 9, and Section L, Clause L-349 Submission of Electronic Proposals, they shall deliver to the following address:

SPAWAR 02 Contracts  
Attn: Lindsay Taelman, OT-4, Room 1025  
4301 Pacific Highway  
San Diego, CA 92110-3127