

1. Page 72, L-13.11; the RFP states that the type size for cost volume will be 12 point. We use Pro Pricer which produces "canned" reports and we do not have the ability to change the fonts or formats. Would this be acceptable?

Pro Pricer is acceptable as long as it meets the 12 point font size requirement.

2. Sect B Travel, Materials and ODC CLIN's all have TBD. Confirming that these items will be left as TBD on proposal submission.

Travel, ODC's, and materials will be funded by the Government following contract award. These shall be left as TBD on the offerors' proposals.

3. M-4.1.6(1) Table; please clarify what is meant by percentage of subcontract amount. Are your percentages based on subcontracted dollars or are the percentages based on small business goals?

The percentages in the table listed in Section M-4.1.6(1) are based upon subcontracted dollars.

4. The Government benefits greatly from contractor teaming arrangements that bring best practices from offerors who would otherwise be competitors. Therefore, it seems counterintuitive as well as counterproductive to limit contract references to the prime offeror of the team. By enforcing this limit the incumbent's advantage is greatly enhanced. Would the Government reconsider allowing major subcontracting team mates (greater than \$500K proposed) references be submitted?

Yes. Sections L and M of the RFP will be amended as follows:

Section L-16.1.9.1: Offerors shall provide information on 5 previous Government or commercial contracts or subcontracts performed by it or its prospective subcontractors (that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement) whose effort was relevant to the effort required by this solicitation; the contracts provided should have been performed within the last five years. This information shall be provided by the submission of Attachment 2 ("Reference Information Sheet") for each contract.

Section M-4.1.5: The sentence fragment in sentence 9 of Section M-4.1.5 "The Government will evaluate the offeror' past performance. . . ." is hereby replaced with the following sentence fragment: "The Government will evaluate the offeror's (and prospective subcontractors', if such information was provided by the offeror) past performance. . . ."

5. It is still unclear if the "contracting team" that prepares the response to sample task 3 is limited to the 5 people who may work the oral presentation. In other words are the preparation personnel a subset of the 5 oral participants? Please clarify.

There is no limitation on the number of people who may be used to prepare Sample Task 3. A total of five people may be used for oral presentation as long as they meet the requirements as stipulated in Section L-15.3.

Section L-15.3 shall be amended to read "... The offeror will be provided a separate room to prepare Sample Task 3. At the conclusion of presenting Sample Task 2, the offeror shall have 60 minutes to caucus to finalize its Sample Task 3 response ...".

An example could be the offeror can have a separate group prepare Sample Task 3 that may not involve any of the five oral presenters. However, it will be left to the offeror's discretion to determine the number of these individuals that may be involved with both preparation and/or presentation of Sample Task 3.

6. Since the response to sample task 3 will be prepared via computer, will the Government allow a computer operator for sample task preparation?

Yes. See question #5 above for clarification.

7. Section M stated that Small Business goals would be evaluated on the percent of subcontracted amount vs. total acquisition. Section L requires both. Does the Government intend to evaluate Small Business participation as a percentage of total acquisition?

Yes, the Government intends to evaluate Small Business participation as a percentage of total acquisition. For the breakdown of the percentages of the Department of Navy's small business utilization goals as listed in this RFP, please refer to Section M-4.1.6 and tables (1) and (2).

8. Page 80 states resumes should be no more than 2 pages, which conflicts with previously answered question #11. Please clarify.

Section L-16.1.5.3 states that "The offeror shall submit no more than ten resumes of key personnel." Section L-16.2.2 states that "Resumes shall be no more than two pages in length."

Table 1 of Section L-13.9 will be modified to include the Slide/Page Limit of 20 for (G) Past Performance.

9. For the narrative response to sample task #2, is there a page limit?

Section L-13.9, Table 1, states that the Slide/Page Limit is 25.

Section L-16.1.7.2 shall be amended to read "... the content and level of detail of the TO shall be left to the discretion of the offeror ..."

10. Attachment #2 limits response for contract reference to 3 pages each (i.e. Form plus 2 sheets for block 15). This would imply the section is limited to 15 pages. Please clarify.

If the offeror had 5 previous Government contracts whose effort was relevant to the effort required by this solicitation and performed within the last 5 years, the limit of pages for Attachment 2 and its associated pages would be 15 total pages.

11. The attachment (4) and (5) TDL's as written lack definitive descriptions to assign staff days with any certainty without budgetary insight for each area. The stated deliverables that are "as needed" or "after request" give no insight into the projected workload. Therefore, proposing performance matrices would have to be based on assumptions not provided. Please clarify.

The attached TDL's are example tasks that the offeror is required to translate into Performance-Based Task Orders. The TDL gives example deliverables that the Government would require in a normal period of performance, the offeror as part of their management approach should provide recommendations and processes that would satisfy the Government requirements. As stated in the TDL, deliverables are required "as necessary" or "when requested by the Government", to allow for work plan flexibility due to the unplanned nature of drills, data calls, and meetings that originate outside the Program Office. The offeror should include in its plan processes and procedures to deal with requirement surges while maintaining cost, schedule, and performance.

12. **Prior contractor question:** Page 75, Sect L-16.3.2 Would the Government consider removing the requirement to segregate cost by contractor's fiscal/accounting year? This requirement would cause 1st-tier subcontractors to have to segregate cost/price estimates by their respective fiscal years, but also by the prime's fiscal year as well as contract year. We recommend allowing offerors to propose cost by contract period only, showing calculations for composite/weighted average indirect rates, based upon applicable contract period occurring within each fiscal year of the contractor, if the offeror's fiscal year does not coincide with the contract year specified period.

**Prior Government answer:** Due to program office funding requirements, the Government requests that offerors segregate cost by fiscal/accounting year.

**Follow-up contractor question:** As program office funding requirements are based on the Government's fiscal year, we believe that the intent of the answer to Question 9 was to state "Due to program office funding requirements, the Government requests that offerors segregate cost by Government fiscal year". Please confirm. Also will an amendment be issued to revise the second sentence in Section L-16.3.2 to read "Each CLIN spreadsheet shall be further segregated into separate spreadsheets for each of the Government's fiscal/accounting year that falls within that CLIN's period of performance."

**Follow-up Government answer:** The Government will amend its answer to state "Due to program office funding requirements, the Government requests that offerors segregate cost by **Government** fiscal year". The section sentence in section L.16.3.2 will be revised to state "Each CLIN spreadsheet shall be further segregated into separate

spreadsheets for each of the Government's fiscal/accounting year that falls within that CLIN's period of performance."

13. Sect B; the Material CLIN's refer to only G&A. Is procurement handling fee allowed?

Procurement handling fees shall be included as Other Direct Costs (at cost (including FCCOM) plus G&A only (not fee bearing)) in CLIN's 0004, 0009, 0014, 0019, and 0024.

14. Sect B; in most cases the Contract Line Item Numbers (CLIN's) are informational line items and the SubContract Line Item Numbers (SUBCLIN's) have the associated funding. We are requesting clarification of the CLIN structure; will the SUBCLIN's be completed and rolled up to the CLIN's?

Yes. The sum of the subCLIN's for each ordering period that will be completed by the offeror will equal the total price of the respective CLIN for that same ordering period.

15. L-13.8 Page 71. Table 1 provides the organization and page limit for the 3 volumes to be submitted at the same time on 17 June. But the Final RFP includes Sample Task order 3 in the table that cannot be prepared until orals. Please clarify the organization of Volume I to be submitted on the proposal due date. One could infer that no response to Sample Task 1 is expected.

Sample Task 1 has a 25-page limit and will be submitted to the Government as part of Volume I.

Table 1 of Section L-13.9 will be modified to the following:

**Table 1**

<b>Vol. No.</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Slide/Page Limit</b>	<b>Electronic Copy</b>	<b>Hard Copy</b>
I	Technical Proposal Content:		1 Compact Disk	1
	(A) Mandatory Requirements	2		
	(B) Technical Approach	15		
	(C) Management Approach:			
	Proposed Organization	5		
	Proposed Staffing Plan	5		
	Resumes of Proposed Key Personnel	NONE		
	(D) Initial Task Orders	NONE		
	(E) Sample Tasks:			
	Sample Task 1 Task Order	25		
	Sample Task 2 Task Order	25		
	(F) Facilities	5		
	(G) Past Performance	20		
	(H) Small Business Utilization	NONE		
II	Cost Proposal	NONE	1 Compact Disk	1
III	Contract Proposal	NONE	1 Compact Disk	1
	Transmittal Letter	NONE		
	Proposed Contract	NONE		
	Representations and Certifications	NONE		
	Subcontracting Plan	NONE		

16. We are having difficulty determining which instructions in L-13.8 through L-13.12 apply to the written Volume I technical proposal documents, and which apply to the Oral presentation slides. Some instructions have raised doubts that they are intended to be two distinct documents. The following questions are intended to resolve these difficulties:

- a. Is the volume I identified in L-13.8 and outlined in Table 1 a distinct document from the Oral Presentation Slides identified in L-13.9? Or are the slides a part of volume I?
- b. If the latter, is it then the intent of the Government that the Technical and Management approaches be described only in presentation slides? Or does the Government want up to 15 pages of technical approach text (in typical word document format) in addition to 15 slides for the oral presentation?
- c. If the former, should L-13.8 be amended to indicate that four total volumes are to be submitted?

Section L-13.8 provides the format requirement for submitting the three volumes that are in response to this RFP and Table 1 in Section L-13.9 outlines the slide/page limits for each of the volumes. All three volumes make-up the written response to the RFP and the oral presentations slides are a part of the written response. However, all of the items in Table 1 are not part of the oral presentation (refer to Section L-15.4).

17. Attachment (4) / Page 94 / RDT&E TDL's: The Task Order Summary for the RDT&E TDL's is titled "FY04 RDT&E. The corresponding period of performance is 01 August 2004 through 30 September 2004 (two months). This seems contradictory to the

table on the same page that requires summary hours for the months of October through March and April through September. Attachment (5) (page 118) has similar seemingly contradictory requirements. What is the anticipated period of performance for the Initial Delivery Orders? Are they for FY04 (2 months) or FY05 (12 months) efforts?

The anticipated period of performance for the Initial Delivery Orders is two months (August and September 2004) and will be verified upon contract award.

**The following question was initially answered on 20 May 2004. However, the Government hereby amends its answer as follows:**

**Original Question:** Page 12, Sect C-2(c) states, “The Contractor shall be paid the prices per staff-day as set forth in the schedule for each staff-day of services rendered, which is agreed to be the services of one technician/engineer for one day of eight hours, Monday through Friday (excluding holidays).” Given that this a Cost-type contract with reimbursement for labor hours based on actual costs associated with recorded time, would the Government consider removing this language from the RFP?

**Modified Answer:** Section C-2(c) shall be amended to read “The Contractor shall be paid its allowable, allocable and reasonable costs for each staff-day of services rendered, which is agreed to be the services of one technician/engineer for one day of eight staff hours, Monday through Friday (excluding holidays).”