

Industry Questions #3 ETIS II NNG 13451194R

1. L.14 (3), Subfactor B, p. 93 and L.14 (3), Subfactor B p. 94

The last full paragraph on page 93 of Section L, Subfactor B instructs the offeror to address the authorities and responsibilities of all contract management, including: span of control, degree of autonomy, lines of communication, and the process for resolving priority conflicts.

On page 94, the paragraph that begins, “*The management plan...*” also instructs the offeror to discuss span of control of the PM’s support staff. This should have been covered already in the discussion from page 93 and appears redundant. Please provide clarification on the different intent (if any) between the two requested discussions on span of control.

On page 94, the paragraph that begins, “*Describe the process to be followed by the Program Manager....*” instructs the offeror to discuss the degree of autonomy of the PM and the process for resolving priority conflicts. This appears to be redundant with the requirement stated on page 93. Please provide clarification on the different intent (if any) between the two requested discussions on autonomy and resolving priority conflicts.

Response: We have reorganized the order of these sections; however the “management plan...” on page 94 is looking at it from an organizational perspective and “the process followed by the program manager...” language is specific to the Program Manager.

2. L.14 (3), Subfactor B, p. 95

The second paragraph on page 95 states that as part of the staffing plan, the contractor shall include a comprehensive hiring plan which presents the expected number of personnel to be hired from incumbents, those to be transferred from within the offeror’s organization, and those from other sources. This is the same information as is requested in the cost volume Exhibit 4. Is it the government’s intent that this information be provided in both places?

Response: The Government’s intent is that the Mission Suitability Volume will contain a narrative to substantiate the information provided in Exhibit 4. Please reference to Exhibit 4 in your response when appropriate.

3. L.14 (3)(a)(2), Subfactor C, p. 97 L.14 (3)(a)(7), Subfactor C, p. 98

In paragraph L.14 (3)(a)(2), the DRFP lists the goals expressed as a percent of IDIQ MAXIMUM ORDERING VALUE. In paragraph L.14 (3)(a)(7), the DRFP requires both IDIQ MAXIMUM ORDERING VALUE and TOTAL PLANNED SUBCONTRACTS in completing the Exhibit 13. In addition, there is a note that follows to list the goals in the

Subcontracting Plan as a PERCENT OF TOTAL SUBCONTRACTS, which does not match the two previously identified ways to express the goals. Section M.3 (1), Subfactor C, paragraph (a)(1) references IDIQ MAXIMUM ORDERING VALUE. Please clarify how the goals should be expressed.

Response: This will be updated in the Final RFP.

4. *Section L.14.Subfactor C.(a).2 -Small Business Utilization (SBU)*, Small Business Subcontracting; compared to *Section L.14.Subfactor C.(a).7.NOTE -Small Business Utilization (SBU)*, Small Business Subcontracting.

It is unclear how the subcontracting plan goals should be expressed and stated. Could there be clear and defined language stating how the subcontracting plan goals should be stated in the Small Business Subcontracting Plan? Also, could you express the subcontracting plan goals that will be measured for the proposal, against either the IDIQ MAXIMUM ORDERING VALUE or PERCENT OF TOTAL SUBCONTRACTS?

Response:

Small Business Subcontracting Plan goals are to be expressed in terms of percentage of TOTAL PLANNED SUBCONTRACTING DOLLARS. Please refer to 52.219-9 Small Business Subcontracting Plan (Alternate II), (d)(1) states “The offeror’s subcontracting plan shall include the following:

Goals, expressed in terms of percentages of total planned subcontracting dollars, for the use of small business, veteran-owned small business, service-disabled veteran-owned small business, HUBZone small business, small disadvantaged business, and women-owned small business concerns as subcontractors. The offeror shall include all sub-contracts that contribute to contract performance, and may include a proportionate share of products and services that are normally allocated as indirect costs...”

(7) In addition to submitting a Small Business Subcontracting Plan in accordance with the Section I FAR clause 52.219-9--Alternate II, offeror’s shall complete **Exhibit 12, SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING PLAN GOALS, which provides a breakdown of the offeror’s proposed goals, by small business category, expressed in terms of both a percent of the \$250M IDIQ MAXIMUM ORDERING VALUE and a percent of TOTAL PLANNED SUBCONTRACTS. Offerors shall show the proposed subcontracting goals for the basic contract requirement and each option separately.**

Per Section M, the proposed subcontracting goals are to be part of the Small Business Subcontracting Plan, which will be evaluated in terms of the Offeror’s proposed subcontracting goals (overall subcontracting goals and individual subcontracting goals by category) in comparison to the Contracting Officers assessment of the appropriate subcontracting goals for this procurement. The

Contracting Officers assessment of the appropriate subcontracting goals is based on the IDIQ MAXIMUM ORDERING VALUE.

The table will be updated in the Final RFP as well as the Exhibit that should be referenced above (as Exhibit 12).

5. Attachment A, SOW 1.1.5, p. 11

The third paragraph of SOW 1.1.5 states that “*Current LDE and PVS inventory shall be provided as a reference within Task Orders.*” Please clarify whether the inventory shall be provided by the Government or the contractor.

Response: The inventory is owned by the government, but maintained and updated by the ETIS contractor.

6. General Question

Other than TIMIS, what Government provided software must the contractor use in execution of the ETIS II contract?

Response: There are many test facility control, data acquisition and processing, and associated software programs utilized to execute the ETIS contract. A complete list is not available.

7. Reference Draft RFP Q&A #48: Will the Government please provide the Section M evaluation criteria section used to assess the acceptance or rejection of the CBA?

Response: The Government will not be including the acceptance or rejection of the CBA as an evaluation criterion.

8. Reference Draft RFP Q&A #49: This offeror would like to further understand the applicability of the CBA as it relates to this contract. The current CBA will expire April 30, 2014. How will the re-negotiated CBA information be evaluated equally amongst offerors if the incumbent contractor is the only offeror to have the insight to how the CBA will be renegotiated?

Response: All offeror’s are required to use the current CBA that is provided in the elibrary and the proposals should reflect the information currently available on the existing CBA.

9. Reference Draft RFP Q&A #50 and Sections F.4 and I.110. Would the Government please define what period is “the first term of the new contract”?

Response: The first term is the first year of the new contract.

10. Reference Draft RFP Q&A #50 and Sections F.4 and I.110. Would Government please provide the reference for the “Successor Contract Rule”?

Response: FAR Clause 52.222-41, Service Contract Act of 1965, As Amended, will be included in the new contract. Paragraph (f) contains the requirement (commonly called the Successor Contractor Rule—FAR 22.1008-2) that the new contractor must pay no less than the wages and benefits of any existing collective bargaining agreements for at least the first term of the new contract. The purpose of this requirement is to allow the new contractor time to negotiate a new CBA with the union.

11. Reference Draft RFP Q&A # 50: Please provide an explanation for interpreting the years of service data provided by labor category. For example, data provided for the Engineering Technician VI labor category is provided as follows:

- Percentage of employees with 11 to 15 years of service = 7.2%
- Percentage of employees with 16 to 20 years of service = 5.6%
- Percentage of employees with 21 years of service and over = 4%

What employee base do the 7.2%, 5.6% and 4% apply?

Response: The percentages represent the staff that has the appropriate numbers of years of experience over the total number of staff qualified in that category and with the requisite experience.

12. Reference Draft RFP Q&A #53: The Government response indicates a 30 page limit for the scenario response as well as responses to SOW 1.1.4.2 and SOW 1.1.5. Given that Subfactor A is worth 650 points, we respectfully request that an additional 20 pages be provided in the page allocation (i.e., 50 page limit for scenario and SOW responses).

Page Allocation -- The page allocations for the Mission Suitability volume is still not clear. Please clarify the page allocation for Subfactor A, Subfactor B and Subfactor C individually.

Response: This section has been revised in the Final RFP.

13. We ask for further clarification regarding Question 53, the Governments response and what the resulting update to the table on page 86 of the Draft RFP will be. Our original understanding of the page limitations was that the Scenario/Task A/Task B was limited to 30 of the 80 page Mission Suitability Volume page allocation and that the remainder of the 80 page limit could be allocated as we saw fit:

Element	Page Limit	Evaluation Points
Subfactor A SOW 1.1.4.2 and 1.1.5	*	650
Subfactor A Scenario/Task A/Task B	NTE 30	
Subfactor B Business Approach	*	250
Subfactor C Small Business Utilization (including SB Subcontracting Plan)	Excluded	100
Total	80	1000

* = TBD by Offeror

The response seems to indicate that the page allocation will be as follows:

Element	Page Limit	Evaluation Points
Subfactor A SOW 1.1.4.2 and 1.1.5	NTE 30	650
Subfactor A Scenario/Task A/Task B		
Subfactor B	*	250
Subfactor C Small Business Utilization (including SB Subcontracting Plan)	Excluded	100
Total	80	1000

If the Government intent was the latter, this seems to conflict with the evaluation points allocation. Please clarify what the updated page limit table will be.

Response: The table has been revised in the Final RFP.

14. The table on page 86 also indicates that the plans required by Subfactor B are also excluded from the page limits. This explicitly excludes:
- Total Compensation Plan
 - Phase-In Plan
 - Safety and Health Plan
 - Quality Assurance Plan

The table is silent on the Hiring/Staffing Plan required by Subfactor B. Is the staffing/hiring plan part of the Subfactor B page limitation, part of the phase-in plan, or a separate page excluded volume?

Response: The Hiring/Staffing Plan is included in Subfactor B and it is a part of that page limitation.

15. Question 49 inquired about the incumbent labor rates. The response indicates that the rates are already provided in the Collective Bargaining Agreement. The CBA does provide Min/Max *ranges* for the labor rates by category. However, those ranges can be quite large (e.g., Engineer V from 4/14 through 3/15 can range from \$38.50 to \$83.46). Will the Government provide current year *average rates* for each CBA labor category so that we can provide accurate pricing for the Government price model?

Response: An enclosure will be provided at Final RFP that will provide the average incumbent CBA rates to be used for pricing with the GPM model.