

| Question # | Page | Paragraph | Industry Reference to Question | Industry Question | Government Answer |
|------------|-----------|--------------|---|--|---|
| 1 | 1 | SF33 | | SF33 Block 9 & Section L, Pages 1, 70, 74; SF33 Block 9 (page 1) says to submit sealed offers in original and 2 copies. Section L.1.1 General Instructions (page 70) says to submit the proposal via email. Section L.5.1 Structure (page 74) says offerors shall electronically mail proposals. Please confirm ONLY an email submittal is required in Microsoft Word and PDF formats. | Confirming that the Government is only requiring email submittal in Word and PDF (and Excel for applicable Attachment) as detailed in section L, Block 9 has been updated accordingly. |
| 2 | 1 | SF33 | | SF33 page 1 Block 9, The SF 33 indicates two (2) original sealed copies for delivery. This is inconsistent with Section L, please clarify. | Block 9 has been updated to remove the sealed offer requirement. Information in section L is correct, only email submission of a PDF and Word (and Excel for applicable Attachment) version are required. |
| 3 | 2 | A.2 | Solicitation/Contract Form | Will JE RDAP encompass all phases of acquisition, or only those listed within A.2? EMD is not currently cited as a phase encompassed within scope. Is this intentional? This A.3 section is in contrast to content cited within the SOW/ Section C.3 where EMD is included | JE-RDAP will encompass phases of acquisition from the MDD, to include supporting development as required of the MDD through FOC, fielding and initial sustainment. Correction is being made to ensure EMD is included. |
| 4 | 2 | A.2 | Solicitation/Contract Form | States that the range of activities to be performed under the RDAP is from research and development through production/procurement of future developed capabilities. If that wide range of different kinds of activities is contemplated, why do the draft solicitation and its proposal requirements focus on Project Management, logistics support, and other kinds of services, thereby excluding companies that are not support service contractors? | The JE-RDAP will be an R & D type Contract. Acquisition includes various disciplines that will be needed to perform R & D resulting in production/procurement of CBRNE Defense systems, equipment and material. Specific R & D to be conducted by contract-acquisition personnel will be specified in RDAP Orders. |
| 5 | 2 | A.3 | Solicitation/Contract Form | Would JPEO CBD consider options to permit every task order to be bid under Firm Fixed Price (FFP), Fixed Price Incentive (FPI) and/or Fixed Price with Prospective Price Redetermination (FP-PPR)? | RDAP Orders will be individually tailored to attain the desired degree of flexibility to meet the objectives of research and development. It is contemplated that all types of contracts (cost reimbursable and fixed price) allowable under the FAR may be used to support this effort. |
| 6 | 2 | A.3 C.4.2 | Solicitation/Contract Form | Section A.3 indicates that task orders will be issued under CPFF, CPIF, and Cost. Is DCA auditing required to compete this effort as detailed in C.4.2? and if so what percentage will be available to small businesses that do not have a DCA-audited accounting system? | Cost Accounting System requirements will be applicable at the RDAP Task/Delivery Order level if the requirement meets applicability standards as detailed in Title 48, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 9903.201-1. However, even if CAS standards are not applicable, the Government may request proof of adequate accounting practices to support the execution of cost type contract efforts. The percentage of future awards this will be applicable for is currently unknown: RDAP Orders are for future work |
| 7 | 2 | A.5 | Solicitation/Contract Form | Disclosure of Unit Price Information; Most Contractors consider unit pricing to be competitive sensitive information. Would the government consider removing this clause from the contract to protect industry competitive information? | The Government will not be removing this clause. In the event of a FOIA request, vendors will be notified in accordance with regulations and will have the opportunity at that time to raise objection to release of any information they deem proprietary. |
| 8 | 13 | B | Supplies or Services and Prices Contract Line Item Numbers | Item No 0022 - Will the Government provide a Not to Exceed (NTE) plug number? | The Government will not be providing values associated with any of the Item Numbers in section B. Total program ceiling of \$8.27B for all efforts performed under all RDAP task/delivery orders issued against all IDIQ contracts the contract constraint. |
| 9 | 3 thru 14 | B | Supplies or Services and Prices Contract Line Item Numbers | Please confirm that the CLINs in Section B are provided as place holders only to support various Task Order contract types and that no values are anticipated to be provided in Section B at time of offer. The only pricing to be provided at time of offer is in support of the sample task. | No values will be required for Section B at the IDIQ level. The contract constraint is the overall contract ceiling of \$8.27B for all RDAP task/delivery orders issued against all IDIQ contracts. |

| Question # | Page | Paragraph | Industry Reference to Question | Industry Question | Government Answer |
|------------|-----------|-----------|--|---|---|
| 10 | 3 thru 14 | B | Supplies or Services and Prices Contract Line Item Numbers | FOB Points of Delivery; Is it truly the intent of the government to have all CLINS FOB Destinations, or will FOB points be negotiated at the task order level? | No, FOB points will be determined at the RDAP task/delivery order level |
| 11 | 3 thru 14 | B | Supplies or Services and Prices Contract Line Item Numbers | RFP Section B; Will the Government establish an ODC CLIN/Item with a Not to Exceed (NTE) plug number? | The Government will not be providing values associated with any of the Item Numbers in section B. Total Ceiling for all efforts performed under all RDAP task/delivery orders issued against all IDIQ contract of \$8.27B is the contract constraint. |
| 12 | 3 thru 14 | B | Supplies or Services and Prices Contract Line Item Numbers | The unit of measure for every CLIN is a "Job", which typically means a service. Will this vary at the Task/Delivery Order level? | CLINS will be used for services as well as products. The UOM will carry over to the RDAP task/delivery order to allow maximum flexibility, however, CLIN descriptions will be updated at the RDAP task/delivery order level to clearly depict the effort requirements. |
| 13 | 15 | C.2 | Background | In paragraph two, the draft RFP refers to a number of CBRNE defense capabilities. It appears to omit some potential areas, e.g., it only includes "Medical Devices (Diagnostics)", but does not include medical therapeutics and vaccines. Will the government please add medical vaccines and therapeutics to the paragraph for completeness and ensure they're in scope of this contract? | Not at this time. The JPEO-CBD intends to use "Other Transaction Agreement(s)" (OTAs) to support CBRNE Defense vaccine/therapeutic development. |
| 14 | 15 | C.3 | Scope | C.3 Scope - Per section C.3 Scope, and the wide range of work to be performed across all acquisition phases under JE-RDAP, does the Government foresee conflicts of interest arising, and will the Government use a strategy to mitigate these COI risks? | No. There are no known Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCIs) associated with the JE-RDAP base IDIQ contract. Any issues relative to award of the basic JE-RDAP IDIQ Contract and "subordinate" RDAP Orders that are determined to involve actual or perceived OCIs relative to FAR Subpart 9.5 will be addressed by the Contracting Officer. The Contracting Officer will make an OCI determination, including if existing contractor developed OCI mitigation plans are adequate or need modification for each RDAP Order. |

| Question # | Page | Paragraph | Industry Reference to Question | Industry Question | Government Answer |
|------------|------|-------------------|--|---|--|
| 15 | 15 | C.3 L.3.2 | Scope | <p>Paragraph C.3 states: “RDAP task/delivery orders shall encompass all phases of acquisition as described in the DODI 5000.02, inclusive of Materiel Development Decision (MDD), Materiel Solution Analysis Phase, Technical Maturation/Risk Reduction (TMRR) Phase, Engineering and Manufacturing Development (EMD) Phase and the Production and Deployment (P&D) Phase.”</p> <p>In Paragraph L.3.2, offerors are asked to demonstrate their core competencies only in Technical/Integration and Manufacturing/Production. The two core competency areas in Paragraph L.3.2 seem to be narrower than the scope of the five phases addressed in Paragraph C.3.</p> <p>Will the Government consider rewording Paragraph L.3.2. to ask that offerors demonstrate capabilities in one or more of the five phases described in Paragraph C.3 [i.e., Materiel Development Decision (MDD), Materiel Solution Analysis Phase, Technical Maturation/Risk Reduction (TMRR) Phase, Engineering and Manufacturing Development (EMD) Phase and the Production and Deployment (P&D) Phase] to ensure that technical approach in the proposal is completely aligned with the intended scope of JE-RDAP contract?</p> | In order to provide capabilities across the JPEO-CBD enterprise it is contemplated that offerors with a wide variety of skills and experience will be needed. The Government is looking for providers that may have experience limited to one area of the DODI 5000.02 as well as those having experience that spans the entire DODI 5000.02 spectrum. |
| 16 | 15 | C.4 | Requirements | Does the gov't intend to add additional sub sections after C.4? | The Government does not intend to add additional subsections after C.4. |
| 17 | 15 | C.4.1 | Requirements | Paragraph states that the contractor shall attend a start-of-contract meeting, please clarify if this is applicable to the IDIQ Level or is it intended for the JE-RDAP task/delivery order level. Additionally if it is required at the IDIQ Level, is the costing to be included in Volume III: Cost/Price? | The start-of-contract (start-of-work) meeting is applicable at the IDIQ level. Funding for attendance at this meeting will be provided via the minimum guarantee for the solicitation. |
| 18 | 15 | C.4.2 | Requirements | Approved Cost Accounting System; Are small business subcontractors required to have an approved accounting system? | 48 CFR 9903.201-1(b)(3) exempts contracts and subcontracts with small businesses. However, the Government may still request proof of adequate <u>accounting practices to support the execution of cost type contract efforts.</u> |
| 19 | 15 | C.4.2 | Requirements | Approved Cost Accounting System; The section states that a contractor must have an approved cost accounting system in accordance with 48 CFR 9903.201-1 for all applicable task/delivery orders. The referenced FAR clause states in section b2 that contracts and subcontracts with small business are exempt from all CAS requirements. Is that correct? | That is correct, 48 CFR 9903.201-1(b)(3) exempts contracts and subcontracts with small businesses. However, the Government may still request proof of adequate accounting practices to support the execution of cost type contract efforts. |
| 20 | 23 | H.1.6 L.3.2.1; | Ordering Procedures and Contract Minimum Guarantee | Is an offeror required to identify all prospective teammates in the IDIQ proposal submission, or may teammates be proposed in responses to task order solicitations? | Offerors are not required to identify all prospective teammates in the JE-RDAP IDIQ proposal. Teammates may also be proposed in response to RDAP Orders. |
| 21 | 23 | H.1.6 | Ordering Procedures and Contract Minimum Guarantee | Draft RFP states that IDIQ holders may team or subcontract with other vendors – both IDIQ holders and outside vendors. At the industry day, the government stated that teaming would be limited to IDIQ holders. Please clarify intent regarding teaming/subcontracting relationships. | JE-RDAP IDIQ contractors may team or subcontract with other JE-RDAP IDIQ holders. As the JE-RDAP prime IDIQ contract holder they may team with or have subcontracts with outside vendors. |

| Question # | Page | Paragraph | Industry Reference to Question | Industry Question | Government Answer |
|------------|------|-------------------|--|---|---|
| 22 | 23 | H.1.6 | Ordering Procedures and Contract Minimum Guarantee | JE-RDAP IDIQ Contract Holders; This clause states that IDIQ Contractor holder may team or subcontract with other vendors to include JE-RDAP IDIQ holders. Please clarify how subcontractors are approved by the government. Is approval to subcontract only obtained upon award of the IDIQ? Do Subcontractors have to be named during the solicitation phase? Can Subcontractors bid on task orders if the subcontractor was not on Primes original bid? | Subcontractors are acceptable at the RDAP Order level. Subcontractors do not need to be named at the JE-RDAP IDIQ contract level. Subcontractors who are not prime IDIQ holders may not propose on RDAP Orders as the prime contractor. |
| 23 | 23 | H.2 | Task/Delivery Orders Restricted to Small Business | Will all JE RDAP ID/IQ contract awardees- be presented with ALL task orders to compete, regardless of the pre-determined small business set aside status- during the solicitation and response phases? Will large businesses participating have visibility into every/all tasks being solicited prior to solicitation closing, so that we can determine scope/relevance and pursue strategic partnering accordingly? | It is the Governments intent to post all RDAP task/delivery orders for all JE-RDAP IDIQ contract holders to view regardless of whether a small business set-aside is being utilized to allow for strategic partnering. |
| 24 | 23 | H.2 | Task/Delivery Orders Restricted to Small Business | Task Orders Restricted to Small Business; Can you please briefly describe the process that will be used by the government to determine whether a task is set aside for small business. Stated differently, assuming a requirement is \$5M or less per year of performance, what process will be used within JE-RDAP to determine if two or more small business can perform the proposed service and/or deliver the required product(s) and therefore be set-aside? | The Contracting Officer will make a determination prior to release of any RDAP task/delivery order in accordance with FAR Part 19. The determination will take into account the overall technical, past performance requirements of the effort as well as the estimated cost for each individual RDAP task/delivery order. |
| 25 | 23 | H.2.1 | Task/Delivery Orders Restricted to Small Business | The draft RFP states: "The Government may set aside task/delivery orders estimated at \$5M or less per year of performance (not to exceed \$10M over the duration of the task/delivery order) for small businesses following the procedures of FAR 19.502-4 and in accordance with FAR 16.505(b)(2)(i)(F)." Will the government consider raising the estimated total task/delivery orders from an estimated \$10M up to at least \$13.5M, which is the average small business award under Seaport e for 2015/2016? In fact, in Aug 2016 Imagine One Technology and Management LTD was awarded a SB Task Order with a potential value of \$174M under Seaport e. | The Government does not intend to modify the threshold for small business set asides. |
| 26 | 23 | H.2.5 L.1.1.13 | Task/Delivery Orders Restricted to Small Business | NAICS Codes; Request the Government clarify if a company is considered a small business for this procurement under NAICS Code 541712. | The North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) Codes determined as most applicable are contained within Sector 54/Sub-Sector 541, Professional, Scientific and Technical Services: 541511 Custom Computer Programming (Size Standard - \$27.5M); 541512 Computer Systems Design (Size Standard - \$27.5M); 541711 Research and Development in Biotechnology (Size Standard- 500 Employees), and; 541712 Research and Development in the Physical, Engineering, and Life Sciences (except Biotechnology) (Size Standard - 500 Employees). |
| 27 | 25 | H.8 | Small Business Participation and Subcontracting Plan | Can you please clarify whether there will be any small business goals for the JE-RDAP IDIQ similar to recent IDIQ's like OASIS which has small business goals ~ 40%. | Small business goals will be required at the RDAP task/delivery order level. |

| Question # | Page | Paragraph | Industry Reference to Question | Industry Question | Government Answer |
|------------|------|--------------------------|---|--|---|
| 28 | 25 | H.10 | Key Personnel | This paragraph states that key personnel should be identified at the task/delivery order level as applicable. This appears to conflict with L.3.1.2, which appears to ask for a list of key personnel in the omnibus proposal. | The offeror shall propose key corporate personnel at the IDIQ level. The Government is currently revising the solicitation to clarify. |
| 29 | 25 | H.10 L.3 M.3.2.3.1 | Key Personnel | Please clarify the wording surrounding key personnel. Is the Government seeking description of our process to identify key personnel or for us to identify key personnel who will be used in the performance of future RDAP Orders? | The offeror shall propose key corporate personnel at the IDIQ level. The Government is currently revising the solicitation to clarify. |
| 30 | 25 | H.10.2 | Key Personnel | Will the JPEO consider providing a list of key personnel required for JE RDAP contract holders in advance of the RFP, or will this be included per each individually competed task/delivery order? If it is anticipated each contract are bidding not only key personnel relevant to existing past performance and key personnel currently employed and key personnel tied to individual CAGE codes for both current performance and past performance-it would be helpful to have these requirements as part of the RFP so each contractor can prepare their labor pool and rates in advance. | The offeror shall propose key corporate personnel at the IDIQ level. The Government is currently revising the solicitation to clarify. |
| 31 | 25 | H.10.3 H.10.4 | Key Personnel | Wording of these two paragraphs regarding lead time for approval of personnel substitution are in conflict with each other. | The Government is currently revising the RFP to clarify. |
| 32 | 26 | H.13 | On Ramps | This section indicates that the government will use market research to the JE-RDAP IDIQ holders. Is it only during the On/Ramp phase the Contractors will be permitted to add subcontractors to the overarching IDIQ? | JE-RDAP IDIQ contract holders may add subcontractors at any time during the IDIQ period of performance as necessary for submission of proposals for RDAP task/delivery orders. |
| 33 | 30 | H.20.2 | Disclosure of Information | Will the Government enter into a reciprocal relationship with regard to public release of information, alerting the Contractor to the Government's planned release of information and approval of Contractor planned release of information? | The Government will adhere to the regulations that govern FOIA requests and will notify any contractors of FOIA requests as required. |
| 34 | 34 | | | Is this page intentionally blank? | The blank page is a product of the conversion to PDF, no information is missing from the draft RFP. |
| 35 | 35 | I | Contract Clauses | No clauses regarding intellectual property (IP) or data rights are included in the Draft RFP. Does the Contracting Office plan on including IP and data rights as part of individual task order RFPs? | Required DFARS clauses for data rights and intellectual property are included in RFP and will flow down to the individual RDAP task/delivery orders. |
| 36 | 60 | J | List of Attachments | To reduce administrative processing time, is it possible to issue a general DD254 upon contract award prior to receiving a task order? | A DD Form 254 is not applicable at the IDIQ level; however, security requirements will be added to Section H of the RFP. |
| 37 | 60 | J | List of Documents, Exhibits and Other Attachments | An Attachment 2 Cost/Price Proposal Spreadsheet is referenced. Will this spreadsheet be provided prior to the Final RFP being released? | All exhibits and attachments referenced in Section J that are applicable at the IDIQ level will be provided when the RFP is formally released. Exhibits/attachments applicable at the RDAP task/delivery order will be provided as part of the RFP package. |
| 38 | 60 | J | List of Documents, Exhibits and Other Attachments | Is Attachment 7, Task/Delivery Order Procedure Guide, a Government-provided document? Will this be included with the Final RFP? | RFP has been updated to remove this attachment and section H has been updated to provide ordering procedures. |
| 39 | 60 | J | List of Documents, Exhibits and Other Attachments | Please clarify inclusion of Small Business Subcontracting Plan and Organizational Conflict of Interest Plan. These appear to be contractor generated documents but are not included in the proposal submission per Section L. | Small Business Subcontracting Plans and OCI Plans are not required for the IDIQ Contract Proposal, they will be applicable at the RDAP task/delivery order level. Section J has been updated to make clear when the attachment is applicable. |

| Question # | Page | Paragraph | Industry Reference to Question | Industry Question | Government Answer |
|------------|------|------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 40 | 60 | J | List of Documents, Exhibits and Other Attachments | Attachment 6 – Organizational Conflict of Interest Mitigation Plan and Attachment 8 – Certification of Accounting System Adequacy/Approval Status. Does the Government intend to provide instructions in Section L as to what Volume this information should be provided in and any more detailed instructions as to the required content? Has the Government identified any specific conflicts at this time? | OCI Mitigation Plans are not required for the IDIQ Contract proposal. Attachment 8 has been removed. CAS requirements will be applicable at the RDAP Task/Delivery Order level if the requirement meets applicability standards as detailed in Title 48, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 9903.201-1. |
| 41 | 70 | L.1.1 | General Instructions | Please confirm that Offeror for this procurement is defined as the prime contractor rather than as a prime contractor and its team of companies. | A proposal will be accepted only from the Prime Contractor. |
| 42 | 70 | L.1.1 | General Instructions | Can multiple operating business units within the same business submit proposals under JE RDAP? | An offeror must be operating as a distinct business entity. A company with a different CAGE code does not qualify as a separate offeror if that second offeror is within the legal entity of the first offeror. |
| 43 | 70 | L.1.1 L.1.1.13 | General Instructions | “The Government will accept no more than one (1) proposal from each Offeror.” What is the definition of an ‘Offeror’? Is it defined as per the assigned Contractor place of performance, CAGE Code, and DUNS Number? Please clarify | An offeror must be operating as a distinct business entity. A company with a different CAGE code does not qualify as a separate offeror if that second offeror is within the legal entity of the first offeror. |
| 44 | 70 | L.1.1.1 | General Instructions | States “Each offeror shall submit no more than one (1) proposal”. If a small business teams with a large business for a proposal submission, can the small business also submit a proposal in addition to the one submitted under the teaming agreement? | Yes, the Small Business may submit their own separate proposal to be considered for award of a JE-RDAP IDIQ contract. |
| 45 | 70 | L.1.1.1 L.2 L.3 L.4 | General Instructions | Section L.1.1.1 states that each offeror shall submit no more than one (1) proposal and each proposal volume supports this definition, even down to specific CAGE Code and DUNS Number defining the contractor’s place of performance. Please clarify if it is the Government’s intent to not have a Major Corporation with multiple divisions operating facilities across the US supplying a full portfolio of capabilities to the JPEO-CBD submit one proposal. Does the Government prefer that each division of the same Corporation submit their own proposal as a stand-alone proposal, separable by CAGE Code and DUNS Number and the contractor’s place of performance? | An offeror must be operating as a distinct business entity. A company with a different CAGE code does not qualify as a separate offeror if that second offeror is within the legal entity of the first offeror. |
| 46 | 70 | L.1.1.5 | General Instructions | Section L.1.1.5 indicates that proposal submissions should be organized around the evaluation factors, and that the evaluation factors for the Tech/Management factor have three subfactors: Corporate Management, Technical Approach, and Cost Management; Does this imply that requirements stated in Section C, Descriptions and Specifications, do not need to be specifically addressed--or should be addressed only if they relate to the three subfactors? | The offeror's proposal shall be in accordance with the requirements of Section L of the RFP. |

| Question # | Page | Paragraph | Industry Reference to Question | Industry Question | Government Answer |
|------------|--------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|--|---|
| 47 | 70 | L.1.1.6 | General Instructions | States that: "All proposals must demonstrate that the Offeror has an understanding of the requirements and associated risks. The Government considers statements that the prospective Offeror understands, can, or will comply . . . to be inadequate and unsatisfactory." Please explain how an Offeror can comply with this requirement considering that the scope of the draft solicitation is a diverse and undefined range of services, goods, and data, and the requirements include those in all FAR, DFARS, and solicitation provisions applicable to any and all of them. | The RFP has been updated to make clear what the minimum response requirement is. |
| 48 | 70, 74-75 | L.1.1.6 L.3 L.5.1.2 M.3.2 | General Instructions | 7 pages in 12-point Calibri font for the Technical/Management volume does not allow adequate space to address proposal content and requirements as specified in sections L.1.1.6 and L.3. We respectfully request that the page count be increased to 20. | The Government does not intend to change the page limit. |
| 49 | 71 | L.1.1.9 | General Instructions | States "The Offeror shall make a clear statement that the proposal is valid until such date in the Administrative Volume of the proposal." Does the Government intend to include a requirement for an Administrative Volume? | The Government is not requiring an Administrative Volume. This language is being removed from the RFP. |
| 50 | 71 | L.1.1.9 | General Instructions | Reference in paragraph to an Administrative Volume of the proposal but there is no definition of the Administrative Volume in Section L. Can you please clarify if an Administrative Volume is required, and if so, please include the requirements for the volume? | The Government is not requiring an Administrative Volume. This language is being removed from the RFP. |
| 51 | 71 | L.1.1.9 | General Instructions | Regarding a Proposal validity date of 365 days, Does the JPEO envision that contractors can adjust pricing between the submitted task order proposal and award period if the award and start date of a proposed effort falls into a proceeding calendar year with permissible rate increase changes given the long (nonstandard) proposal validity request period? Section M.1.2 states the intent to award without discussions unless the KO deems necessary- are allowing for rates adjustments included in necessary discussions? | The proposal validity date is to allow for ample time for the Government to evaluate proposals and is not linked to a specific period for the IDIQ contract. Rate adjustments will be addressed in the future under RDAP task/delivery orders efforts as necessary. |
| 52 | 71 | L.1.1.9 | General Instructions | States: "The offeror's proposal shall be valid for no less than 360 calendar days from the proposal due date. The Offeror shall make a clear statement that the proposal is valid until such date in the Administrative Volume of the proposal." An "Administrative Volume" is not mentioned anywhere else in the solicitation. Is the "Administrative Volume" a separate volume of the proposal, or is it included in another volume? | The Government is not requiring an Administrative Volume. This language is being removed from the RFP. |
| 53 | 71 | L.1.1.9 | General Instructions | Will Contractors be allowed to modify labor categories and rates beyond the 360 day proposal validity timeline? | No, the validity timeline is to allow the Government ample time to evaluate and award IDIQ base contracts. |
| 54 | 71 | L.1.1.13 | General Instructions | The Draft RFP states that the Government will accept no more than one proposal per offeror. Does a company with a different CAGE code qualify as a separate offeror, even if that second offeror is within the legal entity of the first offeror? | An offeror must be operating as a distinct business entity. A company with a different CAGE code does not qualify as a separate offeror if that second offeror is within the legal entity of the first offeror. |

| Question # | Page | Paragraph | Industry Reference to Question | Industry Question | Government Answer |
|------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 55 | 71 72 74 79 | L.2 L.5.1.2 M2.2 M3.1 | Past Performance | A total of 5 pages in 12-point Calibri font for Volume I, Past Performance does not allow adequate space to respond to requirements in Sections L.2.2 and L.2.3 and to permit evaluation in accordance with M.3.1. Further, given the increased relative order of importance of Past Performance (M.2.2), we respectfully request that the page limitation of 5 pages total for the Past Performance volume be increased to 20 pages total for the Past Performance volume. | The Government is revising the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 56 | 71 | L.2 | Past Performance | The DRFP asks for two sections (Contract description and Performance), each covering three relevant past performance citations. Would the government allow offerors to provide 3 past performance citations where each citation stands alone and includes the two sections (Contract description and Performance)? Rationale: it is easier to read and track compliance if we are allowed to provide three past performance citations each containing the contract description and performance rather than write three contract descriptions, then later in the volume, describe the performance on the three as currently required. | The Government is revising the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 57 | 71 | L.2.2 | Contract Descriptions | “The past performance information may be from predecessor companies or key personnel who have relevant experience.”; The intention of this statement is unclear conflicting with the Governments Response to Question 17 of the Pre-Solicitation dated 9/9/16 stating “Past performance of an individual working for another company would not be acceptable.” Will the government consider changing the statement to “The past performance information may be from predecessor companies or teammates who have relevant experience.”? | The Government is revising the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 58 | 71 | L.2.2 | Contract Descriptions | States that “Offerors shall submit contract descriptions of performance (for which Prime and/or Major Subcontractor support was provided), representing three (3) Government and/or commercial contracts, in performance or awarded during the past three (3) years, which are relevant to the efforts required by this solicitation; Must an offeror submit Qty three (3) past performances, or is it up to three past performances? Is it acceptable to submit past performances for teammates?” | The Government is revising the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 59 | 71 | L.2.2 | Contract Descriptions | For small businesses, can you please clarify what is meant by a “Major Subcontract” that is acceptable to demonstrate our past performance on efforts <u>relevant to this solicitation</u> ? | The Government is revising the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 60 | 71 | L.2.2 M.3.1.2.1.1 | Contract Descriptions Past Performance Evaluation | “in performance or awarded during the past three (3) years”; Will the Government consider performance during five (5) years period to expand <u>more competition</u> ? | The Government is revising the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 61 | 71 | L.2.2 | Past Performance Contract Descriptions | The government states "Offerors shall submit contract descriptions of performance (for which Prime and/or Major Subcontractor support was provided..." Request that the Government define the criteria for a "Major Subcontractor"? | The Government is revising the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |

| Question # | Page | Paragraph | Industry Reference to Question | Industry Question | Government Answer |
|------------|------|--|--|--|--|
| 62 | 71 | L.2.2 | Past Performance Contract Descriptions | The subparagraphs detail the information required in the contract descriptions; however the second sentence of this paragraph states “The past performance information may be from predecessor companies or key personnel who have relevant experience.” The relevant contract description/information resides with the prime contract (or subcontractor). How will a contractor provide past performance information for a key personnel regarding a contract for which they legally have no right to claim? | The Government is revising the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 63 | 71 | L.2.2 | Past Performance Contract Descriptions | Will the government be providing a past performance template that meets the requirements of subsections L.2.2.1 thru L.2.2.10? | The Government is revising the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 64 | 71 | L.2.2 | Past Performance Contract Descriptions | Do the three past performance contracts need to be from the Prime Company or can they be a combination of Prime and team members? | The Government is revising the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 65 | 71 | L.2.2 | Past Performance Contract Descriptions | “Prime and/or Major Subcontractor support”; Will the government please clarify if “Major Subcontractor” is the prime offeror or can be a teammate of the offeror and what is considered “major”? | The Government is revising the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 66 | 71 | L.2.2 | Past Performance Contract Descriptions | “The past performance information may be from predecessor companies or key personnel who have relevant experience.” Are offerors expected to identify key personnel in the IDIO proposal submission? | The Government is revising the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 67 | 71 | L.2.2 | Past Performance Contract Descriptions | Draft RFP states offerors shall submit three past performance contract descriptions. Is the intent for offers to submit exactly three, at least three or no more than three contract descriptions? Concerned that establishing three or more may limit or prevent otherwise well qualified small businesses from submitting offers. | The Government is revising the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 68 | 71 | L.2.2 | Past Performance Contract Descriptions | What defines a Major Subcontractor? | The Government is revising the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 69 | 72 | L.2.3.2 - L.3.2.5 | Performance | Can the Government clarify that these requirements pertain only to each of the contracts listed in the Contracts Description (L.2.2) and not all contracts as a whole? | The Government is revising the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 70 | 72 | L.2.3.4 L.2.3.5 L.5.1.3 L.2.3.4 | Performance | Requires a list with explanations for all contracts terminated for default or cause. L.2.3.5 requires descriptions, available documentation, and monitoring methods for compliance with FAR 52.219-8, and documentation for achieving goals for compliance with 52.219-9. Since L.5.1.3 limits Vol I Past Performance to 5 pages for 3 citations, would the gov't consider increasing the page count to 10 pages to accommodate these requirements? | The Government is revising the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 71 | 72 | L.2.3.5 | Past Performance | Some requested information that is solely applicable to Large Businesses has the potential to consume a large portion of the five pages allocated for the entire Past Performance Volume. Suggest this data be excluded from the page count established for the Past Performance Volume. | The Government is revising the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |

| Question # | Page | Paragraph | Industry Reference to Question | Industry Question | Government Answer |
|------------|----------|----------------------|---|---|---|
| 72 | 72 | L.2.4 | Past Performance Questionnaire | Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) says for each contract requested in the Contract Descriptions section, the Offeror shall distribute a Past Performance Questionnaire. To reduce the onus on our Government clients/references who have previously completed a PPQ, may we submit the previously completed PPQ in lieu of having our clients prepare another one? If available, may we submit a completed CPARS evaluation for our contract in lieu of having our clients prepare a new PPQ for the same contract? | The Government is revising the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 73 | | L.2.4.1 | Past Performance Questionnaire | Request the Government provide the referenced Past Performance Questionnaire (Section J, Attachment 1 of the solicitation). Note that the link to this document at http://www3.natick.army.mil/docs/JE-RDAP/Attachment%20%20-%20Past%20Performance%20Questionnaire.docx has been removed. | The Government is revising the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 74 | 73 | L.3.1.2 L.3.3.1 | Corporate Management Cost Management | L.3.1.2 states that the offeror describe its approach for managing, overseeing, and executing cost...on future task/delivery orders... L.3.3.1 states the offeror describe its approach to implement cost control methodologies...applied to research, development, etc....of [s] system or capability. It seems that these two requirements both point to the same types of tools and techniques (e.g., earned value technique) Might the Government view these as the same "cost control" related processes (approaches)? If not, can the Government help clarify as to how these might be different processes (approaches)? | The Government is revising Section L of the RFP to clarify this requirement. |
| 75 | 73 | L.3.1.2 | Corporate Management | How does the government want us to "identify experienced key personnel" – shall we include resumes, bios, list of names only, how please? How many key personnel, what labor categories, etc? What is the effect on page count please? | The Offeror shall identify (number, labor categories etc.) of key corporate personnel (L.3.1.1). It is incumbent upon the Offeror to describe how those key corporate personnel may be utilized in their future approach to managing, overseeing and executing cost, schedule and performance on future RDAP Orders. The Government is not asking for resumes or biographies. |
| 76 | 73 83 | L.3.1.2 M.3.2.3.1 | Corporate Management | These sections state, that the Offeror shall ...identify experienced key personnel to be utilized at the RDAP Order level. "Key" often designates individuals with [a] very important role[s] in a particular task, tasks, or role, and who has additional requirements levied in order to be replaced. Given the broad and inclusive nature of this IDIQ, might it be more useful to have offerors identify key personnel for each task or delivery order, and not have this be a requirement or evaluation criterion at the IDIQ response level? It will be very difficult to designate key personnel against unspecified tasks. If this is an attempt to have offerors identify some of the likely individuals who might be called upon to execute later-defined tasks, could the Government consider rewording this requirement to accommodate that, or at least remove the qualifier, "key"? | The Government is revising Section L of the RFP to clarify this requirement. |

| Question # | Page | Paragraph | Industry Reference to Question | Industry Question | Government Answer |
|------------|------|------------------------|---|---|--|
| 77 | 73 | L.3.1.2 | Corporate Management | The paragraph states that the offeror in his proposal shall "...identify experienced key personnel to be utilized at the RDAP order level." This can only reasonably be done at the time of response to task/delivery order RFPs, as the contractor cannot know in advance which personnel will be key on as of yet unidentified tasks. | The Government will evaluate an offeror's management approach at the IDIQ level to include the key corporate personnel proposed. |
| 78 | 73 | L.3.1.2 L.3.3.1 | Corporate Management Cost Management | L.3.1.2 states: "The offeror shall provide its approach for managing...cost..." on task/delivery orders. L.3.3.1 states: "The offeror shall describe its approach to implement cost control methodologies (processes/procedures)..." Since we are limited to seven pages for the Technical/Management Volume, please clarify how the Government intends offerors' response to L.3.1.2 'approach for managing costs' to differ from offerors' response to L.3.3.1 'approach to cost control'. | The Government is revising Section L of the RFP to clarify this requirement. |
| 79 | 73 | L.3.2.1 | Corporate Management | JE-RDAP is Joint Enterprise-Research, Development, Acquisition, and Production/Procurement. However as written paragraph L.3.2.1 heavily emphasizes R&D and not Acquisition, and Procurement and Integration. Can you please rewrite this paragraph and subordinate paragraphs to allow Offerors with experience mostly in CBRNE Defense system/capability Acquisition, and Procurement and Integration to confidently propose? This near singular emphasis on R&D seems to go against messaging that occurred in the industry days as well as the prior draft RFP. | The Government is revising Section L of the RFP to clarify this requirement. |
| 80 | 73 | L.3.2.1 L.3.2.1.1 | Technical/Integration Approach | L.3.2.1 is entitled "Technical/Integration Approach" and yet the subsequent/subordinate paragraph L.3.2.1.1 does not include the word "integration". Can paragraph L.3.2.1.1 be modified to include the word "integration" and/or "acquisition and deployment" of a CBRNE Defense system/capability? | The Government is revising Section L of the RFP to clarify this requirement. |
| 81 | 73 | L.3.2.1.1 | Technical/Integration Approach | Specifies that the technical approach described in the proposal shall demonstrate an "understanding" of the Defense Acquisition System process and procedures. Is it sufficient to demonstrate an understanding or must one demonstrate direct experience with prior acquisition programs performed IAW DODI 5000.02? Must experience with DODI 5000.02 be reflected in Past Performance? | The Offeror may demonstrate their understanding by describing a previous experience implementing/executing a DODI 5000.02 program, or by demonstrating that the Offeror has had training on the DODI 5000.02 process and procedures and can apply that working knowledge to implement/execute future RDAP Orders. The Offeror must possess enough familiarity to develop a future approach which demonstrates the ability to implement/execute the DODI 5000.02 processes/procedures on a future RDAP order. The Government is revising the solicitation to remove the Past Performance Requirement. |
| 82 | 73 | L.3.2.1.1 L.3.2.1.2 | Technical/Integration Approach | Paragraph L.3.2.1.1 seems to be focused on R&D and paragraph L.3.2.1.2 seems to be focused on integration. Can we address L.3.2.1.1 or paragraph L.3.2.1.2 but not both? Just one, not both. | In paragraph "L.3.2 Technical Approach" Offerors are permitted to address one or both of the requirements for paragraphs L.3.2.1 and L.3.2.2. Section L will be revised to provide additional clarity. |

| Question # | Page | Paragraph | Industry Reference to Question | Industry Question | Government Answer |
|------------|------|------------------------|--------------------------------|--|---|
| 83 | 73 | L.3.2.1.1 L.3.2.1.2 | Technical/Integration Approach | In its response to Question #20 concerning the pre-solicitation notice for this IDIQ, the Government stated that RDAP Delivery/Task Orders would include acquisition and production/procurement activities. However, the technical approaches required by L.3.2.1-2 seem focused only on research & development, integration, manufacturing, and production. Does the Government intend that an acceptable technical approach may also include acquisition and procurement activities? | In paragraph "L.3.2 Technical Approach" Offerors are permitted to address one or both of the requirements for paragraphs L.3.2.1 and L.3.2.2. Section L will be revised to provide additional clarity. |
| 84 | 73 | L.3.2.1.2 | Technical/Integration Approach | States "The Offeror shall describe its approach, as part of a team or as a standalone organization, to integrate systems, equipment, or materiel into broad-based, synergistic, system-of-systems capabilities related to research and development". Since most systems integration is post R&D phase...can you strike the words "research and development" or add the words "or force protection" so the end of the sentence would read "...related to research and development or force protection"? | The Offeror's approach may also include acquisition and procurement. |
| 85 | 73 | L.3.2.4 | Past Performance | Past Performance; Suggest that information pertaining to contract terminations be excluded from the page count established for the PP volume. | The Government is revising the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 86 | 73 | L.3.3.2 | Cost Management | Requires cost savings and avoidance examples. Are these examples limited to the three Past Performance citations used or any corporate examples? | The Government is revising the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 87 | 73 | L.4 | Cost/Price | Q&A Question #12; Will the government release a draft "common task" scenario as the basis for Volume IV prior to release of the final RFP ? As a follow on question, is the government's intent that the language in Section L.4.2 that simply references providing "cost/price information on personnel required to develop a Program Management Plan (PMP)" describes this scenario? | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |
| 88 | | L.4 | VOLUME III - COST/PRICE. | It is clear what the government wants priced, it is unclear as to the value of the pricing to the expected Task Orders. Can the government explain how pricing a PMP is relevant to the RDAP IDIQ? Are you evaluating the number of hours it takes or the labor categories used or the rates per category? Is the request to show OH, G&A and other rates? | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |
| 89 | 73 | L.4.1 | Cost/Price | Should providing the cost/price information for development of the PMP be based on L.3.2.1 Technical/Integration Approach and/or L.3.2.2 Manufacturing/Production Approach? Will there be a definition of size, and technical complexity to bind the level of effort required to scope, price and assess risk under the PMP? | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |
| 90 | 74 | L.4.2 | Cost/Price | Requests the costing/price to develop a PMP that includes: a. Technical Approach to execute a future RDAP Order b. Schedule/milestone chart capturing major activities c. Cost d. Program risk An actual PMP would include many more elements not listed in paragraph L4.2. In our proposal costing should we restrict the cost estimates to only the four items listed or include everything normally included in a PMP? | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |

| Question # | Page | Paragraph | Industry Reference to Question | Industry Question | Government Answer |
|------------|------|-----------|--------------------------------|---|---|
| 91 | 74 | L.4.2 | Program Management Plan | Q12 from Q&A from original Pre-solicitation notice; Please confirm that the common task referenced in Q12 is in fact the PMP referenced in L.4.2. | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |
| 92 | 74 | L.4.2 | Program Management Plan | “The offeror shall complete the attached spread sheet, to include the labor categories, position level, hours and rates, and total cost/price necessary to develop a PMP”; To simplify and drive commonality amongst bidders, would the government consider providing prescribed labor categories associated with a PMP to price | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |
| 93 | 74 | L.4.2 | Program Management Plan | The offeror shall provide cost/price information on personnel required to develop a Program Management Plan (PMP). The offeror shall complete the attached spread sheet, to include the labor categories, position level, hours and rates, and total cost/price necessary to develop a PMP that would include the following elements: a. Technical Approach to execute a future RDAP Order b. Schedule/milestone chart capturing major activities c. Cost d. Program risk (Note: The offeror is not required to develop or submit a PMP; but only provide the cost/price information required to develop a PMP.) Will the spreadsheet have labor categories/hours (level of effort) provided and industry provide rates and total cost? | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |
| 94 | 74 | L.4.2 | Program Management Plan | The Government is requesting offerors to provide cost/price information needed to develop a Program Management Plan (PMP) but does not state the type of contract (CPFF, FFP, etc) offerors are to take into consideration when developing these costs. Will the Government clarify for consistency in evaluation, the geographic locations and work sites (Government or contractor) to be used for costing? | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |
| 95 | 74 | L.4.2 | Program Management Plan | Cost to develop a Program Management Plan (PMP); The effort to develop a PMP is very a narrow work scope that typically requires only a few labor categories. It is highly unlikely that a PMP effort would include all the labor categories necessary to establish a ceiling for the range of categories needed to execute most JE-RDAP task orders. Recommend that a wider labor category list be provided for pricing either in addition to or instead of this common task approach. | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |
| 96 | 74 | L.4.2 | Program Management Plan | Cost to develop a Program Management Plan (PMP); The inclusion of Item c. "cost" is confusing since all other elements in this section already refer to providing costs. To avoid confusion, should this be re-worded as "the effort to estimate task order cost" or "the effort to perform cost monitoring and control"? | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |

| Question # | Page | Paragraph | Industry Reference to Question | Industry Question | Government Answer |
|------------|------|-----------|--------------------------------|---|---|
| 97 | 74 | L.4.2 | Program Management Plan | Cost to develop a Program Management Plan (PMP); Understand that the spreadsheet for offerors to use in preparing a notional PMP will be provided with the final RFP but want to validate that guidance will be provided (e.g., sample labor categories, labor category descriptions, task size/duration, work scope definition, etc.) that will enable the government to make equitable evaluations of the cost/price information submitted | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |
| 98 | 74 | L.4.2 | Program Management Plan | In which you state "provide the cost/price information required to develop a PMP," we don't understand how this provides the government with labor categories representative of planned technical efforts. It seems that non-technical people can develop a PMP. | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |
| 99 | 74 | L.4.2 | Program Management Plan | How will Subcontractors price be evaluated as the sample task of establishing a Program Management Plan (PMP) would not include subcontractor rates? | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |
| 100 | 74 | L.4.2 | Program Management Plan | States: The offeror shall provide cost/price information on personnel required to develop a Program Management Plan (PMP). The offeror shall complete the attached spread sheet, to include the labor categories, position level, hours and rates, and total cost/price necessary to develop a PMP that would include the following elements. When the official RFP is issued, will there be a PMP costing template worksheet provided, or should the offeror develop its own template? | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |
| 101 | 74 | L.4.2 | Program Management Plan | Request the Government provide additional information such as a sample task or sample PMP to allow the Offeror to accurately estimate the labor required to develop the PMP. The complexity of the effort may dictate the time needed to determine technical approach, schedule, cost, and risk. | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |
| 102 | 74 | L.4.2 | Program Management Plan | Will the Government provide an excel spreadsheet template for developing the PMP? | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. The Attachment will be released with the RFP. |
| 103 | 74 | L.4.2 | Program Management Plan | What contract type should the offeror assume for the cost estimate to develop the PMP? | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |
| 104 | 74 | L.4.2 | Program Management Plan | Program Management Plan; Request the Government confirm that Offeror should assume application of FFP in response to L.4.2. | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |
| 105 | 74 | L.4.2 | Program Management Plan | The referenced cost spreadsheet was not included in the DRFP release. Will the JPEO CBD consider releasing this in advance of the RFP to allow responding contractor's ample opportunity and time to prepare their responses to the RFP? | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The Attachment will be released with the RFP. |

| Question # | Page | Paragraph | Industry Reference to Question | Industry Question | Government Answer |
|------------|------|------------------|---|---|---|
| 106 | 74 | L.4.2 | Program Management Plan | Will you provide a standardized template for a Program Management Plan (PMP)? | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |
| 107 | 74 | L.4.2 | Program Management Plan | Are offerors expected to provide a narrative with the cost/price volume detailing assumptions attached to proposing the labor categories, position level, hours and rates for the PMP? | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |
| 108 | 74 | L.4.2 | Program Management Plan | Paragraph provides instructions for costing and pricing a Program Management Plan (PMP). Is this the “common tasker” referred to in the answers to Questions 4 and 12 issued under the title Industry Question Submission in response to JE-RDAP Pre-solicitation Notice? | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |
| 109 | 74 | L.4.2 | Program Management Plan | The size and scope of the task/DO will determine the resources required to prepare the PMP. Will you define in more detail the scope of an example program to develop a PMP? | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |
| 110 | 74 | L.4.2 | Program Management Plan | Draft RFP states that offerors shall provide cost/pricing information on personnel required to develop a Program Management Plan. Please explain the purpose of this pricing approach as each RDAP order will vary greatly in terms of scope and complexity. Recommend you revise this requirement and request vendors to provide a labor schedule including LCAT description and rates (both government site and contractor site). Consider developing a Labor Schedule as part of the final RFP and allow offerors to propose rates and recommend additional LCATs and rates. Awards to offerors can include these labor schedules and encourage discounts for each task order/RDAP order released. | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |
| 111 | 74 | L.4.2 L.5.1.3 | Program Management Plan Proposal Volumes | L.4 Volume III references an Excel spreadsheet file to be completed. Under L.5.1.3 only a PDF and Microsoft Word file is specified for Volume III. Please clarify number of files and file format to be submitted. | RFP has been updated to reflect requirement for submission of one copy of the Microsoft Excel spreadsheet provided as an Attachment in Section J |
| 112 | 74 | L.4.2 M.3.3.1 | Program Management Plan | Given the wide range of scope defined in RFP section C, a Project Management Plan (PMP) that would cover the full range of phases of the DoD 5000.2 instructions could be very complex from both a technical and a program management perspective. a) Can the gov't provide clarity on expectations for this requirement either in terms of program size or technical complexity so that we can devise a proper PMP estimate? b) If not, then in what parts of the cost volume will the government look to identify the scope of the program plan being proposed? | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |
| 113 | 74 | L.4.2 M.3.3.1 | Program Management Plan Cost/Price | The requirement to provide information required for execution of a notional PMP is unclear. Please confirm that the customer intends to identify a specific sample task in the final RFP as a basis for price comparison. | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |

| Question # | Page | Paragraph | Industry Reference to Question | Industry Question | Government Answer |
|------------|------|-----------|--------------------------------|---|--|
| 114 | 74 | L.5.1.1 | Proposal Delivery | Please provide clarification between section L.1.1.2 and L.5.1.1 subject line submittal requirements . | RFP has been updated to clarify the requirements and remove the contradiction |
| 115 | 74 | L.5.1.2 | Proposal File Format | Page size is specified to be 8x11. Please confirm that page size of 8.5x11 is to be used | The correct page size requirement is 8 ½" x 11". RFP has been updated to reflect this change . |
| 116 | 74 | L.5.1.2 | Proposal File Format | To allow adequate space to address all RFP requirements, please consider changing font requirement for text from 12-point minimum font size in Calibri to a minimum font size of 10-point for text. | The Government does not intend to change the page limit. |
| 117 | 74 | L.5.1.2 | Proposal File Format | Reference is made to "A table of contents and a cross-reference matrix corresponding to the requirements listed above in L 2.0 are required". There does not appear to be a para L 2.0. Please advise. Also please give more details on the cross reference matrix - what exactly do you want to see cross referenced please? | The Government is revising the RFP to correct paragraph numbering |
| 118 | 74 | L.5.1.2 | Proposal File Format | Please confirm page size should be 8 1/2" W x 11" H versus 8" W x 11" H. | The correct page size requirement is 8 ½" x 11". RFP has been updated to reflect this change . |
| 119 | 74 | L.5.1.2 | Proposal File Format | States that a cross reference table is required corresponding to requirements in paragraph L 2.0. This subject of this paragraph is past performance. What is the correct paragraph? | The Government is revising the RFP to correct paragraph numbering and remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 120 | 74 | L.5.1.2 | Proposal File Format | States that the header/footer needs to include SOURCE SELECTION INFORMATION. Please define source selection information. | "Source Selection Information" is defined in FAR 3.104. |
| 121 | 74 | L.5.1.2 | Proposal File Format | States that the required page size as 8" x 11". Is the paper size meant to be 8.5" x 11"? | The correct page size requirement is 8 ½" x 11". RFP has been updated to reflect this change . |
| 122 | 74 | L.5.1.2 | Proposal File Format | Please confirm that the Offeror is not required to conform the Excel Cost/Price Proposal Spreadsheet to the font and format specified in Section L.5.1.2. | The offeror may use the same font that is already being utilized in the spreadsheet. |
| 123 | 74 | L.5.1.2 | Proposal File Format | Proposal File Format says the page size shall be 8" W x 11" H. Please clarify if this is meant to reflect the standard letter page size of 8 ½" W x 11" H. | The correct page size requirement is 8 ½" x 11". RFP has been updated to reflect this change . |
| 124 | 74 | L.5.1.2 | Proposal File Format | Request the Government confirm use of standard size 8.5" by 11" paper. | The correct page size requirement is 8 ½" x 11". RFP has been updated to reflect this change . |
| 125 | 74 | L.5.1.2 | Proposal File Format | The Government specifies Calibri font for regular text. Request Government confirm that Offeror should also use Calibri font for graphics, tables and charts | RFP has been updated to indicate the use of Calibri font for the proposal in it's entirety. |
| 126 | 74 | L.5.1.2 | Proposal File Format | Proposal File Format (PDF page 74 of 84), The Page Size requirement states 8"W x 11" implying eight inches by 11 inches. Will the Government consider changing the width requirement from 8 inches to 8 ½ (eight and one-half) inches, as it is more standard? | The correct page size requirement is 8 ½" x 11". RFP has been updated to reflect this change . |
| 127 | 74 | L.5.1.2 | Proposal File Format | Section L.5.1.2 indicates a cross-reference table corresponding to the requirements listed in L2.0. L2.0 refers to Past Performance. Is it possible that this citation is an error? And if it is not an error, what should a small business cross reference if it is choosing to submit with no past performance? | The Government is revising the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |

| Question # | Page | Paragraph | Industry Reference to Question | Industry Question | Government Answer |
|------------|----------|--------------------|--------------------------------|--|---|
| 128 | 74 | L.5.1.2 | Proposal File Format | The Solicitation instructs offerors to submit via email a word and PDF version of each volume. In this section the direction also indicates "indexing" requirement. Please confirm a result of the electronic submittal a table of contents meets the requirement of "indexing"? | RFP has been updated to clearly state a Table of Contents is required. |
| 129 | 74 | L.5.1.2 | Proposal File Format | Proposal File Format says to provide two identical versions of each volume required, one in Microsoft Word and one in PDF. Since the submittal requires some completed PDF forms (SF33, SF30 Amendments, etc.), the PDF version would contain the complete forms as an insert, but the Microsoft Word version will not. Please confirm that it is acceptable that the Microsoft Word version and PDF versions are to be identical, except for inserted PDFs, as applicable, as long as all narratives are identical. | That is correct, the Word and PDF volume content should be identical. Proposal submission for the IDIQ contract will not require the completion of any PDF forms. |
| 130 | 74 | L.5.1.2 L.5.1.3 | Proposal File Format | Is the Cost/Price volume also supposed to be in Word/PDF, or can it be submitted in Excel? | The RFP is being revised to correct this. The spreadsheet (Attachment) is Excel. |
| 131 | 74 75 | L.5.1.2 L.5.1.4 | Proposal File Format | The paragraph states, "...A table of contents and a cross-reference matrix corresponding to the requirements listed above in L.2.0 are required, but will not be included in the page count. Additional allowances are made in L.5.1.4, last sentence. If desired, may offerors also include a list of abbreviations and acronyms that is excluded from page count?" | A table of acronyms does not count toward the proposal page count. The solicitation will be revised to clarify. |
| 132 | 74 | L.5.1.3 | Proposal Volumes | May we additionally provide a 1 page cover letter introducing our firm, with the specified Volumes as enclosures? | Cover Pages to proposal volumes are acceptable and are not included in the page count |
| 133 | 74 | L.5.1.3 | Proposal Volumes | Regarding "Section 3: Past Performance Questionnaire" - do we include draft unsigned (by client) Past Performance Questionnaire forms? How much of the form do you want completed please for including with Offer? May we provide a list of persons receiving the forms and their contact information in lieu of the completed forms? | The Government is revising Sections L and M of the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 134 | 74 | L.5.1.3 | Proposal Volumes | Regarding Page Limitations - Since the Section 1 Contract Description consumes about a page to a page and a half, may we please have 5 pages minimum for Section 2 Performance? | The Government does not intend to change the page limit. |
| 135 | 74 | L.5.1.3 | Proposal Volumes | Are contractors allowed 5 pages per Past Performance or is it 5 Pages Total for all 3 Past Performance references. | The Government is revising Sections L and M of the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 136 | 74 | L.5.1.3 | Proposal Volumes | Recommend requirement for past performance questionnaire to be included in volume I be removed. This table provides outline of contents for each proposal volume and page limitations. Paragraph L2.4.1 states the offeror is to complete part 1 then provide it to technical representative of contract who are responsible for return no later than proposal due date to government representatives. | The Government is revising Sections L and M of the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 137 | 74 | L.5.1.3 | Proposal Volumes | Says Volume III: Cost/Price shall contain "...One copy in Microsoft Word [and] One copy in PDF"; Will a spreadsheet saved as Microsoft Excel be expected in Volume III, and (if so) should this Excel file (a) replace or (b) supplement the requested Word and PDF files? If the Excel file will supplement the Word and PDF files, what should the latter files contain? | The RFP is being revised to correct this. The spreadsheet (Attachment) is Excel. |

| Question # | Page | Paragraph | Industry Reference to Question | Industry Question | Government Answer |
|------------|------|-----------|--------------------------------|--|---|
| 138 | 74 | L.5.1.3 | Proposal Volumes | The submission requirement for Volume III: Cost/Price is one copy in Microsoft Word and one copy in pdf. Will the Government modify the requirement to also include a copy of the cost estimate spreadsheet in an Excel file? | The RFP is being revised to correct this. The spreadsheet (Attachment) is Excel. |
| 139 | 74 | L.5.1.3 | Proposal Volumes | States: Volume III: Cost/Price shall be delivered as "One copy in Microsoft Word and One copy in PDF". If a PMP costing worksheet is issued by the Government at the time of the RFP, will that be in addition to a Microsoft Word submission | The RFP is being revised to correct this. The spreadsheet (Attachment) is Excel. |
| 140 | 74 | L.5.1.3 | Proposal Volumes | The submission requirement state "One copy in Microsoft Word and One copy in PDF." Will there be a requirement to submit "One copy in Microsoft Excel"? | The RFP is being revised to correct this. The spreadsheet (Attachment) is Excel. |
| 141 | 74 | L.5.1.3 | Proposal Volumes | The Government states that the Volume III submission should be in PDF and MS Word format, however L.4.2 indicates a template in Excel. Please confirm the format requirement for Volume III for the tables and a cost narrative, if applicable. | The RFP is being revised to correct this. The spreadsheet (Attachment) is Excel. |
| 142 | 74 | L.5.1.3 | Proposal Volumes | Would the Government consider increasing the page limits for both Volume I, Past Performance, and Volume II, Technical and Management Capabilities, in order to ensure adequate coverage of the diverse requirements? | The Government is revising Sections L and M of the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. The Government does not intend to change the page limit. |
| 143 | 75 | L.5.1.3 | Proposal Volumes | Proposal Volumes table, The draft RFP requires Volume III, Cost, to be submitted "One copy in Microsoft Word, One copy in PDF", however, on page 83, M.3.3.1.1, it states "The Government will evaluate the offeror's cost/price information in the Spreadsheet cost/price data associated with the costs for the development of a..." Does the Government anticipate that Volume III will be submitted in a combination of Microsoft Word and Microsoft Excel, as well as in PDF? | The RFP is being revised to correct this. The spreadsheet (Attachment) is Excel. |
| 144 | 75 | L.5.1.4 | Proposal Volumes | Please allow a List of Acronyms/Abbreviations to be included as part of the proposal and excluded from specified page limitations. | A table of acronyms does not count toward the proposal page count. The RFP will be revised to clarify. |
| 145 | 75 | L.5.1.4 | Proposal Volumes | If a table of acronyms is included in a volume, does the table count against page count limitations? | A table of acronyms does not count toward the proposal page count. The RFP will be revised to clarify. |
| 146 | 75 | L.5.1.4 | Proposal Volumes | Paragraph defines each volume to be written on a stand-alone basis. Will the Government amend this paragraph to include an introductory section describing the offeror such that the volume is truly stand-alone? | Offerors may include an introductory cover page although it is not a requirement of the RFP. |
| 147 | 75 | L.5.1.4 | Proposal Volumes | Please clarify what types of "indices" are allowed. | RFP language has been updated to clearly indicate what is required. |
| 148 | 79 | M.1 | General | Regarding basis of award, is the intent to follow 'Best Value' as cited within M.1 or that cited in Section A.3 "best value, trade-off, or Lowest Price, Technically Acceptable (LPTA) procedures". Will the JPEO CBD provide prioritized requirements within section M for the DRFP and/or for future task/delivery orders to inform the proposing contractors which criteria are of most value to the JPEO CBD either at the RFP level and/or individual task/delivery order? | The Government is currently revising the RFP. The evaluation approach will be based upon technical acceptability with price reasonableness and realism. Specifics will be provided in Section M of the revised RFP. |

| Question # | Page | Paragraph | Industry Reference to Question | Industry Question | Government Answer |
|------------|------|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| 149 | 80 | M.2.2 M.2.3 M.3.1.1 | Basis for Contract Award | In order to be considered for an award, offerors shall receive a minimum rating of Satisfactory Confidence for Past Performance. Yet offerors with no past performance or unknown past performance will be given Satisfactory as the minimum rating. Can the gov't clarify if Past Performance will continue to be the most important rated factor (M.2.2, M.3.1.1) if offerors with no past performance are eligible for award? | The Government is revising Sections L and M of the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 150 | 80 | M.3.1.1 | Past Performance Minimum Requirements | The Offeror demonstrates past performance that met cost, schedule, and performance requirements on relevant programs in the context of the Technical/Management Factor for this effort The Technical/Management Factor permits approach to be "as a standalone organization or as part of a team" but does not clearly permit this for past performance. For consistency, will the Government consider defining "offeror" in Section L.2.2 to be "as standalone organization or part of a team"? | The Government is revising Sections L and M of the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 151 | 80 | M.3.1.1 | Past Performance Minimum Requirements | States that Offerors must demonstrate acceptable past performance "on relevant programs", but section M.3.1.2.1.3. further qualifies this by stating that "Relevant" performance is limited to "logistics support, including supply chain management operations, management and administration, maintenance, calibration, training, and fielding support." That is a very narrow subset of the range of contract experience in the CBRNE Industrial Base, all the rest of which is defined by the draft solicitation as irrelevant. Why does the draft solicitation limit relevant past performance to logistics support services? | The Government is revising Sections L and M of the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 152 | 80 | M.3.1.2.1 | Past Performance Evaluation | Is the 'solicitation' defined as the overarching JE RDAP RFP, and/or the individual task/delivery orders? Is the JPEO CBD planning to request relevant past performance per each individual 'solicitation'? It is understood that past performance is required with the JE RDAP RFP proposal submission. It is not clear whether the past performance is also required at task/delivery order level competition? If the JPEO CBD does not evaluate past performance for each task order/delivery order- how will relevance as defined within direct scope and within last three years be achieved per sections M.3.1.2.1.1-M.3.1.2.1.3? Please clarify. | The Government is revising Sections L and M of the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 153 | 80 | M.3.1.2.1.2 | Past Performance Evaluation | Would the Government consider redefining "recent" to mean taking place within the last five (5) years of the issuance of this solicitation? | The Government is revising Sections L and M of the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 154 | 80 | M.3.1.2.1.2 | Past Performance Evaluation | States that: "Aspects of relevancy that will be reviewed are similarity of service/support to the solicitation requirements; complexity, dollar value, contract type, and degree of subcontracting/teaming". Why are these aspects of "service/support" contracts deemed to be more important to this solicitation than developing, manufacturing, or fielding a CBRNE capability, considering the Objective stated in Section C? | The Government is revising Sections L and M of the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |

| Question # | Page | Paragraph | Industry Reference to Question | Industry Question | Government Answer |
|------------|------|-------------|--------------------------------|--|--|
| 155 | 80 | M.3.1.2.1.3 | Past Performance Evaluation | States: "Relevant" means performance that demonstrates the Offeror has provided logistics support, including supply chain management operations, management and administration, maintenance, calibration, training, and fielding support. This section seems to define relevance in areas that do not seem to be related to either of the core competency areas defined in Section L.3.2. Please clarify. | The Government is revising Sections L and M of the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 156 | 80 | M.3.1.2.1.3 | Past Performance Evaluation | "Relevant" means performance that demonstrates the Offeror has provided logistics support, including supply chain management operations, management and administration, maintenance, calibration, training, and fielding support."; This conflicts with Section C Scope. Will the government consider changing to "Relevant means performance that demonstrates the Offeror has supported contracts requiring research, development, acquisition, and/or production/procurement (RDAP) support, and may include experience with Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear, and High-Yield Explosives (CBRNE) and/or implementation of the Department of Defense Instruction (DODI) 5000.02"? | The Government is revising Sections L and M of the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 157 | 80 | M.3.1.2.1.3 | Past Performance Evaluation | States "Relevant" means performance that demonstrates the Offeror has provided logistics support, including supply chain management operations, management and administration, maintenance, calibration, training, and fielding support; Is logistics support, including supply chain management operations, management and administration, maintenance, calibration, training, and fielding support, within the scope of IE-RDAP? | The Government is revising Sections L and M of the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 158 | 80 | M.3.1.2.1.3 | Past Performance Evaluation | States that "Relevant" means performance that demonstrates the Offeror has provided logistics support, including supply chain management operations, management and administration, maintenance, calibration, training, and fielding support." This does not appear to align with the requirements of this solicitation. Can the Government please clearly define the requirements that "are relevant to the efforts required by this solicitation" stated as required in L.2.3.1 and L.2.2? | The Government is revising Sections L and M of the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 159 | 80 | M.3.1.2.1.3 | Past Performance Evaluation | States that "Relevant" means performance that demonstrates the Offeror has provided logistics support, including supply chain management operations, management and administration, maintenance, calibration, training, and fielding support. Is it possible that this set of relevancy criteria is not correct for this solicitation? | The Government is revising Sections L and M of the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 160 | 80 | M.3.1.2.1.3 | Past Performance Evaluation | The Government describes "Relevant" as meaning performance that demonstrates the Offeror has provided logistics support, including supply chain management operations, management and administration, maintenance, calibration, training, and fielding support. This definition, however, appears to be inconsistent with the C.3 Scope narrative. Request the Government confirm its definition of "Relevance" in M.3.1.2.1.3 | The Government is revising Sections L and M of the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |

| Question # | Page | Paragraph | Industry Reference to Question | Industry Question | Government Answer |
|------------|------|-------------|--------------------------------|---|---|
| 161 | 80 | M.3.1.2.1.3 | Past Performance Evaluation | The criteria for evaluating relevancy for the past performance citations are skewed towards manufacturing and production. The relevant tasks cited include: providing logistics support, including supply chain management operations, management and administration, maintenance, calibration, training, and fielding support. None of these functions apply to the conduct of CBRN/non-CBRN hardware, software, or combined hardware/software intensive research and development. The tasks listed are not conducted during R&D and are only conducted when an item goes to production. If the contractor is allowed to propose an approach to either technical/integration (L.3.2.1) or manufacturing/production (L.3.2.2), what criteria will be used to determine past performance relevance for a technical/integration approach? | The Government is revising Sections L and M of the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 162 | 80 | M.3.1.2.1.3 | Past Performance Evaluation | Please clarify how logistics support, including supply chain management operations, management and administration, maintenance, calibration, training, and fielding support will be evaluated and result in a rating of relevant. | The Government is revising Sections L and M of the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 163 | 80 | M.3.1.2.1.3 | Past Performance Evaluation | Definition of "Relevant"; Section states that "Relevant" means "has provided logistics support, including supply chain management operations, management and administration, maintenance, calibration, training, and fielding support." This definition of "Relevant" does not agree with the scope of work which is defined elsewhere in the DRFP as "research and development", "production/procurement", and "all phases of acquisition as described in DODI 5000.02". | The Government is revising Sections L and M of the solicitation to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 164 | 80 | M.3.1.2.1.3 | Past Performance Evaluation | "Relevant"; Definition of "relevant" contained in the referenced section includes only performance areas that would be attributed to Operations & Maintenance (O&M) and Logistical programs and excludes those contract efforts that would encompass research, design, and development of CBRNE or a non-CBRNE R&D program. Suggest that Section M be expanded to include the evaluation of relevant research and development programs that include "Technical/Integration Approach" as defined in L.3.2.1 and "Manufacturing/Production Approach" as defined in L.3.2.2. | The Government is revising Sections L and M of the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 165 | 80 | M.3.1.2.1.3 | Past Performance Evaluation | "Relevant" is defined as logistics, supply chain management, training and field support that is typically associated with the O&M phase and not with R&D phases. Does the gov't intend to expand the definition of relevance to include R&D? | The Government is revising Sections L and M of the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 166 | 80 | M.3.1.2.1.3 | Past Performance Evaluation | The draft RFP states: "Relevant" means performance that demonstrates the Offeror has provided logistics support, including supply chain management operations, management and administration, maintenance, calibration, training, and fielding support." We believe this refers to a definition from JE-CLASS vice RDAP, and describes Logistics and sustainment actions of past performance vice R&D or procurement. Will the government please revise M.3.1.2.1.3 to ensure "relevancy" encompasses both sub-sections of the M.3.2.3.2 Technical Approach? | The Government is revising Sections L and M of the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |

| Question # | Page | Paragraph | Industry Reference to Question | Industry Question | Government Answer |
|------------|------|----------------------|--------------------------------|--|---|
| 167 | 80 | M.3.1.2.1.4 | Past Performance Evaluation | Please describe: 1) magnitude of effort and 2) complexities that will earn a past performance rating of "Very Relevant" and "Relevant." | The Government is revising Sections L and M of the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 168 | 81 | M.3.1.4 | Past Performance Evaluation | States that "In the case of here an Offeror has not been subject to the requirements of FAR Part 19, including never holding a contract incorporating FAR 52.219-8 and FAR 52.219-9 as detailed in M.4.4.5.5, and the Offeror provided a statement supporting this situation, then the evaluation of M.4.4.5.5 will be considered "Unknown" and therefore "Acceptable"; The solicitation does not have a Paragraph M.4.4.5.5. Can the Government, please clarify? | The Government is revising Sections L and M of the RFP to remove the Past Performance requirement. |
| 169 | 82 | M.3.1.7 | Past Performance Evaluation | What criteria identifies Small Business set-asides. May Large Businesses team and sub with small businesses. | Small business designations are based on the requirements of FAR 52.219. Yes, large businesses and small businesses may team with an IDIQ holder. |
| 170 | 82 | M.3.2.2 | Technical/Management | Technical/Management Factor Ratings table; Rating column in the table is blank, should include ACCEPTABLE and UNACCEPTABLE. | The Technical/Management Factor Ratings table will be complete upon release of the solicitation. |
| 171 | 83 | M.3.2.3.1 | Corporate Management | This section is titled corporate management and requests a corporate org structure, etc. Can the gov't clarify if the requirement is to describe our overall corporate management, covering a wide range of IDIQ and individual contract research work, or is the requirement for details on our JE-RDAP IDIQ-level organizational structure and the Task Order level organizational structure? | The offeror shall address corporate management requirements from an IDIQ level. Specifics for managing or executing future RDAP orders will be addressed in an individual order as appropriate. |
| 172 | 83 | M.3.2.3.1 L.3.1.1 | Corporate Management | In Q&A question 5 the Government states that it is not its intent that specific/named teams be established at the IDIQ level. However in L.3.1.1 and M.3.2.3.1 Corporate Management, the Government asks the Offeror to clearly identify roles and responsibilities of "personnel and subcontractors". Request that the Government clarify if it intends to evaluate an Offeror's response to the IDIQ based on the Prime's experience alone or based on an Offeror's "team's experience" (e.g., assumes the Offeror will propose a team of subcontractors). | The Government will evaluate an offeror's corporate management approach at the IDIQ level to include the key corporate personnel proposed. The Government will evaluate the offeror's experience either at the prime level, or if an offeror team's with subcontractors, team experience will be evaluated. |
| 173 | 83 | M.3.3 | Cost/Price | Section M.3.3, page 83, Factor III Cost/Price; Some subsections are mis-numbered as 3.1.2, 3.1.2.1, 3.1.2.1.1, 3.1.2.1.2 | The Government will correct the RFP paragraph numbering. |
| 174 | 83 | M.3.3 | Cost/Price | Will offerors be expected to submit fully burdened labor rates (and establish ceiling rates) for labor categories other than those proposed for development of the PMP? If yes would these fully burdened labor rates include proposed subcontractor labor rates? | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |
| 175 | 83 | M.3.3.1 | Cost/Price | Says, "Minimum Requirements: The Government will evaluate the extent to which the Offeror provides a complete Cost/Price volume in accordance with the Solicitation requirements and the Section J Attachment 2 spreadsheet."; Does the Draft RFP include the Section J Attachment 2 spreadsheet, and (if so) where is it? | No, the Draft RFP did not include any attachments as was noted in the posting as they are currently under review and subject to change. All attachments will be included when the RFP is formally released. |
| 176 | 83 | M.3.3.1 | Cost/Price | Will the JPEO consider providing draft contents for the items within Section J to facilitate Contractor's RFP response in advance of the RFP? Of particular interest is Attachment 2- Cost/Price Proposal Spreadsheet. | Section J attachments, to include the Cost/Price Attachment, will be provided with the solicitation. |

| Question # | Page | Paragraph | Industry Reference to Question | Industry Question | Government Answer |
|------------|-------|-----------|--------------------------------|---|---|
| 177 | 83 | M.3.3.1.1 | Cost/Price | States: "The Government will evaluate the offeror's cost/price information in the Spreadsheet cost/price data associated with the costs for the development of a Program Management Plan (PMP)". Will the Government be providing further detail on the type of program for which the offeror would be developing a PMP? For example, will the Government specify if the level of effort for the PMP should be based on a two-year production project or a five-year integration program? | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |
| 178 | 83 | M.3.3.1.2 | Cost/Price | M.3.3.1.2 Fee. Is the fee applied to the PMP cost the fee we have to use for every Task Order or will the Government set a standard max fee and review each task order for compliance with the max fee? | The Government is revising the solicitation. The PMP will no longer apply. Pricing arrangements will be dependent upon individual RDAP orders. |
| 179 | 83 | M.3.3.1.2 | Cost/Price Evaluation | Fee; Fee will be established as the task order level based on task order type contract. Please confirm ceiling fully burden rates will be exclusive of fee. | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment) to clearly indicate which rates Fee should and should not be included in. |
| 180 | 83/84 | M.3.1.2 | Cost/Price Evaluation | M.3.1.2 (actually 3.3.2) says, "...Proposed pricing will serve as a ceiling price (with future economic adjustment), not a basement price, for future task/delivery order price proposals."; Would you consider removing the "ceiling rate" requirement as it will be very difficult to project 15 years of pricing with any realism? | The Government will not be removing the requirement for ceiling rates. |
| 181 | 83/84 | M.3.1.2 | Cost/Price Evaluation | M.3.1.2 (Page 83-84) is duplicate numbering of M.3.1.2 (Page 80); Will the Government please correct? | The RFP is being revised to correct this. |
| 182 | 83/84 | M.3.1.2 | Cost/Price Evaluation | M.3.1.2 Cost/Price Evaluation "Proposed pricing will serve as a ceiling price (with future economic adjustment)"; Does this mean any proposed prices for LCATs could become ceiling rates? Will the Government clarify what elements would become "ceiling price" applicable to future Task Orders? | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |
| 183 | 83/84 | M.3.1.2 | Cost/Price Evaluation | M.3.1.2, Cost/Price Evaluation; M.3.1.2 on page 83 of 84 appears to be mis-numbered and should correctly be numbered M.3.3.2. | The Government is revising Section M of the RFP to correct the paragraph numbering. |
| 184 | 83/84 | M.3.1.2 | Cost/Price Evaluation | M.3.1.2, Cost/Price Evaluation; The Government states 'Proposed pricing will serve as a ceiling price (with future economic adjustment), not a basement price, for future task/delivery order price proposals. Given that the cost analysis associated with the PMP provides for limited labor categories and associated pricing analysis, request the Government clarify how this approach will serve as a ceiling at the IDIO level | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |
| 185 | 83/84 | M.3.1.2 | Cost/Price Evaluation | The Cost/Price Evaluation states "Proposed pricing will serve as a ceiling price (with future economic adjustment), not a basement price, for future task/delivery order price proposals." Would the Government consider removing this statement since developing PMPs may vary based on the scope of the effort? | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |

| Question # | Page | Paragraph | Industry Reference to Question | Industry Question | Government Answer |
|------------|-------|-----------|--------------------------------|---|--|
| 186 | 83/84 | M.3.1.2 | Cost/Price Evaluation | The DRFP States, "Although the Cost/Price Factor will be evaluated, it will not be rated. Proposed pricing will serve as a ceiling price (with future economic adjustment), not a basement price, for future task/delivery order price proposals." Can the government explain how the pricing of a PMP equates to the ceiling pricing for future task orders? The pricing sheet won't have all possible labor categories associated with doing RDT&E work in pricing a PMP | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |
| 187 | 83 | M.3.1.2 | Past Performance Evaluation | Other than the labor rates and categories submitted under the PMP, does the government expect contractors to provide additional labor rates and categories and if so, would the government provided those expected categories? | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |
| 188 | 83/84 | M.3.1.2 | Cost/Price Evaluation | Evaluation; Please clarify/correct "Proposed pricing will serve as a ceiling price (with future economic adjustment) not a basement price for future task/delivery order price proposals." | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP no longer applies. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. |
| 189 | N/A | N/A | General | For contracts where we served as a subcontractor to a large Prime (LSI or UARC), is it acceptable to send the Past Performance Questionnaire to a technical and contracts representative at the Prime since we did not have direct contact with the Government representative? | Past Performance Questionnaires are no longer required at the IDIQ level and are not required for proposal submission until the RDAP task/delivery order level. |
| 190 | N/A | N/A | General | "Proposals shall include a small business participation plan". Per previous Q&As- this was clarified to be required at the individual task order/delivery order level. Is it required to have small business participants included in a plan already be pre-approved within the JE RDAP awardees, hence with pre-approved past performance and rates, or is small business participation full and open? | Plans do not have to be approved prior to IDIQ award and will not be required until the RDAP task/delivery order level. |
| 191 | N/A | N/A | General | Because of the fundamental differences between contracts for goods and contracts for services under the FAR and DFARS, many companies that manufacture or supply goods do not have management or accounting systems for service contracting or cost-type contracting. Fundamental and very expensive changes would be needed in order for manufacturers who do not also provide services to comply with the requirements of the draft solicitation, so they would be de facto excluded. Considering that CBRNE Defense companies that are not in the business of providing services, or of contracting on a cost-reimbursable basis, are unlikely to compete for or win those kinds of Task/Delivery Orders, why exclude them from the ID/IQ contract awardee pool by requiring a proposal based on service | The Government is revising Section G of the solicitation. Section G addresses the requirements for an accounting system for cost-reimbursement RDAP Orders. Requirements for cost accounting systems will be in accordance with the requirement as detailed in Title 48, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 9903.201-1. |
| 192 | N/A | N/A | General | Can you also provide an expected award date window for JE-RDAP? For example, is it now estimated that awards will occur in 2nd QTR FY2017? | The Government is currently revising the draft RFP to address industry comments. Offerors are advised to monitor the web site for posting of the final RFP. |

| Question # | Page | Paragraph | Industry Reference to Question | Industry Question | Government Answer |
|------------|------|-----------|--------------------------------|--|--|
| 193 | N/A | N/A | General | Clause 52.216-1; Is it the Government's intention to award various contract type contracts to the same IDIQ holder or will it be one contract containing the various Contract types? | The Base IDIQ contracts will contain various CLINs, some Cost-reimbursement, some Fixed Price. JE-RDAP task/delivery orders will be issued using one or more of the CLINs from the base IDIQ contract tailored to the specific requirement. |
| 194 | N/A | N/A | General | Do we understand correctly that this "cost/price information on personnel required to develop a Program Management Plan" for a hypothetical Task/Delivery Order would "serve as a ceiling price . . . for future task/delivery orders" (Section M.3.1.2) for the entire 10 years of the Base Contract, subject only to undefined "future economic adjustment", regardless of the nature of the future task or when over the next 10-15 years that task would be performed? | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP will no longer apply. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. The binding rates to be proposed are subject to economic adjustment as appropriate for future RDAP orders. The Government does not intend to identify a "hypothetical Task/Delivery Order". |
| 195 | N/A | N/A | General | Does the Government intend to Issue a DD254 upon IDIQ award so that the awardees can ensure that they have appropriate facility and personnel clearance ahead of task order-level competition? | A DD Form 254 will be issued for RDAP orders when applicable. Information regarding security requirements will be included in Section H of the solicitation. |
| 196 | N/A | N/A | General | I am unable to determine from the solicitation, how we may participate and offer a single product. We are interested in providing explosive detection devices as a partial purchased solution. Can you please advise? | Specific material and equipment requirements will be identified or specified in future RDAP orders. Orders may call for development of a single item or integration of items into a system capability. RDAP Orders under the IDIQ will be competed using fair opportunity. As an IDIQ holder when responding to an RDAP order an offeror may team with prime or subcontract to provide equipment to meet RDAP solutions |

| Question # | Page | Paragraph | Industry Reference to Question | Industry Question | Government Answer |
|------------|------|-----------|--------------------------------|--|--|
| 197 | N/A | N/A | General | <p>Industry Day briefings have stressed the Government’s interest in awarding ID/IQ contracts to all experienced CBRNE Defense contractors and others with the qualifications to join the Industrial Base. However, the draft solicitation is written for companies that provide services (rather than goods) driven by the labor rates of different categories of personnel. For example, Section L.4.2 requires that:</p> <p>“The offeror shall provide cost/price information on personnel required to develop a Program Management Plan (PMP). The offer shall complete the attached spread sheet, to include labor categories, position level, hours and rates, and total cost/price necessary to develop a PMP that would include the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Technical Approach to execute a future RDAP order b. Schedule/milestone chart capturing major activities c. Cost d. Program risk.” <p>(See also Section M.3.1.2, which states that the Government “will evaluate the proposed fully burdened labor rates submitted by each Offeror.”) It is unclear how manufacturers could “provide cost/price information on personnel required to develop a Program Management Plan” without knowing what the particular Task/Delivery Order was for. If a manufacturer were able to do so, even though that is not its business, it is unclear how it could do so competitively with support service contractors that bid for contracts to perform such tasks as their deliverables. It is also unclear how this kind of information could enable the Government to determine “best value”, unless the Government is in fact looking only for support service contractors. Would you please explain this difference between the inclusive nature of the briefings to Industry, and the exclusive nature of the draft solicitation due to its focus on service contracts?</p> | <p>The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). The PMP will no longer apply. Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. The RDAP is an R&D effort that is primarily a supply-type contract (Ref FAR Part 35). Future RDAP orders may require procurement, manufacturing, to include manufacturing scale-up, fielding, and initial sustainment.</p> |
| 198 | N/A | N/A | General | <p>Is the JPEO CBD planning to release draft task orders, or actual task orders as part of the bid process associated with the JE RDAP RFP? If so, when does the JPEO CBD plan to provide this content to prospective offerors?</p> | <p>The Government does not intend to release draft or actual task orders with the RFP.</p> |
| 199 | N/A | N/A | General | <p>It has been indicated that in a recent conference, participants were told that the solicitation release is expected in late Q1 FY 17. Can you confirm expected release?</p> | <p>The Government is currently revising the draft RFP to address industry comments. Offerors are advised to monitor the web site for posting of the final RFP.</p> |

| Question # | Page | Paragraph | Industry Reference to Question | Industry Question | Government Answer |
|------------|------|-----------|--------------------------------|--|---|
| 200 | N/A | N/A | General | <p>Our Company has a developed, tested and vetted CBRN decontamination liquid formula that is already in use by international clients, including the Canadian military. As part of the JE-RDAP program it is our understanding that there are USG grant programs and funding available for R&D to improve our current CBRN decon chemistry capabilities. To that end I would like to formally ask several questions:</p> <p>153.1. We would like to have the process explained for us to apply for grant dollars for additional research to allow our decon chemistry to be improved, tested and validated for use on bare-human skin. Could you please clarify the process and direct us to the website or provide us with the proper application forms to allow us to apply for these R&D funds?</p> <p>153.2. We would like to have the process explained for us to apply for grant dollars for additional research to allow our decon chemistry to be improved, tested and validated to create a POWDER version of our existing formula to help minimize the logistical requirements of the warfighter. Could you please clarify the process and direct us to the website or provide us with the proper application forms to allow us to apply for these R&D funds?</p> <p>153.3. Our tested and approved liquid formulation needs additional testing and lab work to make the skin formula and powder derivative. Please clarify and advise us of the process, your exact requirements for applying and the timelines for submission of our grant funding requests.</p> | It is incumbent upon the offeror to research the requirements for Grants. The JE-RDAP solicitation is based on the Federal Acquisition Regulation and the FAR does not address the Grants process. |
| 201 | N/A | N/A | General | Question 4's Government Response to original Pre-Solicitation Notice says, "...A cost/price volume will be required at the IDIQ level and will be based upon 'common tasker' yet to be defined."; Will this spreadsheet be where the Offeror proposes IDIQ rates in a common task scenario? | The Government is currently revising the spreadsheet (Attachment). Offerors will be required to identify key corporate personnel and provide fully burdened cost-reimbursement and fixed price rates for the key corporate personnel proposed. The Government does not intend to provide a common task scenario. |
| 202 | N/A | N/A | General | Regarding the Past Performance Questionnaires, from reading the draft copy, it is my understanding once the final solicitation is released we should proceed in submitting the questionnaires to you and Kevin Parker. Is that correct? Also, I have on file several Performance Evaluation's from NASA previous contracts and other agencies. Will these be acceptable to submit directly to you versus completing the forms provided in the solicitation? | The requirement for submission of the Past Performance Questionnaires has been removed for the IDIQ Contract RDP. However, past performance will be evaluated at the individual RDAP Task/Delivery order level which will require submission of Past Performance Questionnaires. Instructions for submission will be provided at the individual RDAP task/delivery order level. |
| 203 | N/A | N/A | General | Thank you for posting the DRAFT RFP. How will this affect the release of the final RFP? | The Government is currently revising the RFP to address industry comments. Offerors are advised to monitor the web site for posting of the final RFP. |

| Question # | Page | Paragraph | Industry Reference to Question | Industry Question | Government Answer |
|------------|------|-----------|--------------------------------|--|---|
| 204 | N/A | N/A | General | The 10-year term of the contract, when combined with the elimination of “off-ramps”, means that a company that became an awardee would have to bear the administrative burden and expense of complying with the full range of applicable FAR and DFARS provisions in the solicitation, including those that would not otherwise apply to it, for 10 years even if it received no awards beyond the \$1,000 guaranteed minimum. This is prohibitive. Why have off-ramps been eliminated, especially considering that individual Task/Delivery Orders will be extendable for as long as 5 years? | The RDAP Orders are to be executed in accordance with the FAR and DFARS. Off-ramps were eliminated because the Government does not want to exclude offerors from proposing altogether if they opt not to propose to an individual RDAP order during the period of performance of the IDIQ. RDAP orders will be offered using fair opportunity in accordance with FAR 16.505. It is the offeror's prerogative to propose or not propose to future RDAP orders. |
| 205 | N/A | N/A | General | The draft solicitation appears to be drafted for, or at least favor, System Integrators instead of other kinds of companies. See, e.g., L.3.2.1 (Instructions to Offerors – Volume II, Technical Management – Technical/Integration Approach): “The Offeror shall describe its approach, as part of a team or standalone organization, to integrate systems, equipment, or materiel into broad-based, synergistic, system-of-system capabilities related to research and development.” Is that the intent at the ID/IQ contract level, instead of on a case-by-case basis at the Task/Delivery Order level? | In paragraph "L.3.2 Technical Approach" Offerors are permitted to address one or both of the requirements for paragraphs L.3.2.1 and L.3.2.2. Section L will be revised to provide additional clarity. |
| 206 | N/A | N/A | General | When the IDIQ contracts are awarded, will they be specific to focus areas? If they are specific to focus areas, will the successful IDIQ holder of said contract be permitted to propose on Delivery Orders beyond the focus areas? | The IDIQ contracts will not be structured by focus areas. |
| 207 | N/A | N/A | General | Will the government be able to place task orders for COTS items using OEM part numbers or will the orders specify salient characteristics? (i.e.: form, fit and function) | Future RDAP orders may require establishing agreements with Original Equipment Manufacturers (OEMs) or if use of non-OEM parts or components is proposed, prior Government approval shall be required. |