

EAGLE Step Two W52P1J-12-R-0076 Questions & Answers

May 03, 2012

Attachments

Q.1A: Reference Attachment 0001 (Performance Work Statement): Regarding the PWS paragraphs 2.4 through 3.16 of the PWS: Must offerors write to the elements of these paragraphs in BOA 2 or are they for reference only until needed in BOA-3 Task Orders.

Q.1B: RFP Section L, Paragraph L.3.1.2 through L.3.1.2.2, Page 106: This section gives directions for addressing the EAGLE functional requirements of maintenance, supply, and transportation services. It does not specify responding to PWS elements 2.4, and 3.0 through 3.16. Please clarify where or if offerors are supposed to address these elements.

A.1: Paragraph 2.4 [in PWS] is addressed in Paragraph L.3.1.2.2.b [in solicitation] as a representative EAGLE mission and is evaluated in Paragraph M.3.1.3.2.2 iv. Offerors are not required to address the information contained in PWS Paragraphs 3.0 through 3.16 unless specifically requested to do so in Section L. Table 2.1 in Section L identifies the PWS paragraphs that must be addressed in Volume I.

Q.2A: Regarding covering areas 2.1.3 through 2.1.10 in the PWS and Organizational Capability Matrix: Does the government intend for these areas to be covered in the proposal response since they are not identified by the government in the Organizational Capability matrix supplied by the government?

Q.2B: Reference Attachment 0003 Functional Area Material Maintenance PWS para 2.1.3 to 2.1.10 are omitted. Should para 2.1.3 to 2.1.10 be added to the attachment?

A.2: The tasks identified in PWS paragraphs 2.1.3 through 2.1.10 will be evaluated as part of PWS Para 2.1 - Installation Materiel Management Activity. Paragraphs 2.1.3 through 2.1.10 should not be added to Attachment 0003.

Q.3: The RFP includes New Equipment Training (NET) and New Equipment Fielding (NEF) as within the EAGLE scope, and among the services to be provided, and among the capabilities to be evaluated. However, PWS 2.4 Training (which includes NET and NEF) is not included in the list of PWS paragraphs to be addressed in the Organizational Capability Narrative per the instructions in Table 2.1, nor are there any PWS subsections within PWS 2.4 Training included in the Organizational Capability table (Attachment 3). We believe that Training can be viewed as 'equivalent' to the elements of maintenance, supply and transportation. Would the Government consider changing the designation of Training (which includes NET and NEF) to be the fourth (4th) EAGLE functional area, after maintenance, supply and transportation?

A.3: Paragraph 2.4 will be added into Table 2.1 in Section L for Attachment 0002 and Organizational Capability Narrative. The approved EAGLE acquisition strategy is based on three functional areas, training will not be added as a fourth functional area.

Q.4: Reference Attachment 0002: Should all the Contract Reference Worksheets be contained in a single MS Excel Workbook for submission?

A.4: Yes

Q.5: Reference Attachment 0004 – Subcontractor Consent Form: Is the Subcontractor Consent Form (Solicitation Attachment 0004) required for:

a. Only the Team Members/Subcontractors whose experience ensures the Offeror can provide all capabilities required by the EAGLE Solicitation OR

b. All Team Members/Subcontractors who are on the Offeror's Team, including those necessary to achieve socioeconomic subcontracting goals or other goals not related to capability?

A.5: Attachment 0004 is required for only the Team Members/Subcontractors whose experience ensures the Offeror can provide all capabilities required by the EAGLE solicitation.

Q.6A: Reference Attachment 0005 – Performance Questionnaire: Questions 1 and 2 of the referenced performance questionnaire of Attachment 0005 ask offerors to identify performance problems and terminations for default or cause for “offeror or any of its team members/subcontractors/joint venture partners.” Elsewhere in the RFP, however (e.g., L.2.3, L.3.1.1), the Government distinguishes between team members who add evaluated capability from team members functioning to achieve socioeconomic subcontracting goals. Will the Government consider helping to keep proposal and review costs to a minimum by modifying Questions 1 and 2 of Attachment 0005 to request performance information only for those team members listed by offerors in Attachment 0002, or does the Government need this information for all team members, including those members of the team who serve only to achieve socioeconomic subcontracting goals?

Q.6B: Is the Performance Questionnaire to be completed by the Offeror (One Copy) or by the POCs for each Experience Citation (Attachment 0002)? If the Performance Questionnaire is to be completed by the Offeror, does the Government also require each named subcontractor to complete the Performance Questionnaire? What about Team Members/Subcontractors who are on the Offeror's Team, including those necessary to achieve socioeconomic subcontracting goals or other goals not related to capability?

Q.6C: Are Prime bidders to submit one for each of their subcontractors, or one each for each of the contracts sited in Attachment #0002 or just one Attachment #0005 form for the team? Please clarify.

Q.6D: How are we to identify the experience/contractor in question, where is the questionnaire to be sent to and in what format (Hard Copy, Email, etc.)?

A.6: Offerors should submit one Attachment 0005. It should be a compilation of contracts where the Offeror/subcontractor(s) experienced performance problems and/or contracts terminated for default or terminated for cause, in whole or in part. Offerors are only required to provide the requested information for the subcontractors whose experience ensures the Offeror can provide all capabilities required by the EAGLE Solicitation (subcontractors listed on Attachment 0002). Offerors are, however, required to provide the requested information for contract held by the prime or any team members. Therefore, the information required is not limited to the provided in Attachment 0002. The Attachment is provided as an editable Microsoft Word file. Offerors must insert the required information directly into the Microsoft Word file. The Proposal submission instructions are provided at Paragraph L.1 of the solicitation.

Q7: Reference Attachment 0005: As a subcontractor, we have reservations about giving this type of competition sensitive information (specifically copies of the requested documentation) to a Prime Contractor. Because the information is competition sensitive, we would prefer not sharing data at this level of detail with companies that we may be competing against for other contracts (non-EAGLE) in the near future. Would the Gov't consider changing the requirement so the subcontractors can send the questionnaire (Attachment 0005 along with supporting documentation) directly to the Gov't?

A.7 The Government will not consider changing the requirement so the subcontractors can send the questionnaires found at Attachment 0005 directly to the Government. The RFP requires that the Offeror provide a consent letter for each subcontractor allowing the release of the subcontractor's present and past performance information to the Offeror.

General

Q.8: No deadline was provided as to the due date for questions for the government. Please advise if there is a deadline, or if questions will be accepted throughout the proposal period.

A.8: Questions will be accepted throughout the process however, the Government is not obligated to provide answers to every question.

ASSIST and ASFI BRS

Q.9: Please clarify the correct system to use for our proposal submission. Do you require us to submit it using both the ASFI BRS and the ASSIST systems?

- Reference: RFP Section A, Paragraph(s) A.2.b.i, Page 2. i. The Army Single Face to Industry's (ASFI) Vendor Bid Response System will be used in this procurement. BRS allows Offerors to electronically submit proposals on solicitations posted to ASFI. Offerors MUST be registered in the Central Contractor Registry (CCR) and have a CCR Marketing Partner Identification Number (MPIN) and CAGE Code to use BRS.
- Reference: RFP Section A, Paragraph(s) A.4, Page 3. 4. Submission of a proposal in response to this solicitation will require Offerors to utilize the Acquisition Source Selection Interactive Support Tool (ASSIST).
- Reference: RFP Section L, Paragraph(s) L.1.3, Page(s) 104. L.1.3 Offeror shall submit their proposal through Army Single Face to Industry (ASFI) Bid Response System (BRS). For the Offerors convenience the ASFI Vendor Guide may be found at Attachment 0006.

A.9: ASFI BRS and ASSIST are two separate systems. Offerors must use ASFI BRS to submit their proposal as e-mail, fax, and hard-copy proposals will not be accepted by the Government. The Government may issue Evaluation Notices for this procurement via ASSIST. ASSIST will allow Offeror(s) to receive and respond to ENs securely on-line.

Section H

Q.10A: As stated in the RFP on page 10 Sec. H 2.b, "It is assumed that if an Offeror proposes a teaming partner(s) in Step 2 it does so because it is not able to fulfill all requirements of the solicitation without said partner(s). As such, Offerors are required to use that partner(s) in Step 3 proposals and in the performance of subsequent task orders..." Can small business offerors propose several teaming partners in Step 2 that possess like capabilities and then determine which one of those companies will be used for the individual Task Orders in Step 3?

Q.10B: Regarding SECTION H, para. 3b, of the Solicitation: At all previous industry sessions for EAGLE, the industry was told that selection for teaming at the Task Order level could vary based on the needs of the Offeror. Although we may have many team mates, we were not expected to go into each task order with the entire team. Paragraph 3b of Section H seems to contradict that statement. Please clarify.

Q.10C: Section H: Paragraphs 2.b, 2.c and 3.b: As it relates to the referenced requirement for using each proposed partner in the Step 3 process; is it allowable for SB Firms to propose multiple (more than one/1) firms to satisfy the Att. 3 PWS subtasks? In other words, is overlapping of capabilities by teaming partners allowed?

Q.10D: Can the Prime submit past performance for their teaming partners (to allow for those capabilities to be assessed) to include functions the Prime can perform, thus providing auxiliary coverage, and not have to propose any of those teaming partners during the Step 3 Task Order process for areas the Prime is qualified to perform?

Q.10E: If more than one teaming partner is proposed to perform a function that the Prime cannot, is it correct that the Prime need only propose one of those teaming partners during the Step 3 Task order process, and not all those that were qualified during the Step 2 process?

Q.10F: Depth of Capability in Step 2. If the Prime proposes two (2) subcontractors in Step 2 that have Railhead Operations experience/capabilities, does the Prime have to propose both of those subcontractors in an RTOR that includes Railhead Operations or can it choose one (1) or the other?

A.10: An Offeror, small or large, may propose multiple subcontractors in Step Two that possess like capabilities. If the Offeror's approach is considered acceptable in Step Two, the Offeror will receive an executed BOA. When the Offeror submits a proposal in Step Three, it must propose the use of an approved subcontractor from Step Two. Offerors, small and large, will determine which approved subcontractor it will use in Step Three. Offerors are required to propose subcontractors approved during Step Two.

Q.11: RFP Section H, Paragraph A.3(c), Page 11: Item c states, "If an Offeror received an executed BOA in Step Two on the basis of fulfilling all requirements without subcontractors, the Offeror is not precluded from proposing subcontractors in its Step Three proposal(s)." This appears to be in conflict with RFP Section H, Paragraph A.1(e), Page 10, which states, "BOA holders determined acceptable under Step Two who wish to have a new approach evaluated, including adding or changing subcontractors included in its Organizational Capability Worksheet per EAGLE Execution Rule 2(b) may do so during the annual review of the BOA." Please clarify the process during the Proposal Phase for Step Three relative to adding or changing subcontractors.

A.11: Section H, Paragraph A. 1(e) applies only to Offeror's who received an executed BOA in Step Two on the basis of fulfilling all requirements subcontractors. You cannot add or change subcontractors in Step Three unless you demonstrated the capability to perform without subcontractors in Step Two. If you were dependent upon subcontractors in Step Two you may only change them in the annual review process or if new requirements are advertised prior to the annual review.

Q.12: Regarding SECTION H of the Solicitation para. 2(b): For the Step 2 BOA, if a Prime proposes for all three main functional areas, plus adds a small business team partner with a past performance for one of the functional areas, is the Prime then required to have the small business perform the function if it receives the task order award?

A.12: If you are capable of performing the entire requirement you should not propose subcontractors in Step Two. In that case, you are able to add subcontractors in Step Three. If you do propose subcontractors in Step Two it is assumed that you do so because you are not able to meet the requirement without them and you will be required to use them in Step Three.

Q.13: Regarding SECTION H of the Solicitation para. 2(b): Is there a compliance issue created if a Prime proposes on all 3 functional areas plus adds a small business team partner to assist with some portion of one of the functional task areas?

A.13: As stated in Section H, Paragraph 2.b of the RFP, it is assumed that if an Offeror proposes a teaming partner(s) in Step Two it does so because it is not able to fulfill all requirements of the solicitation without said partner(s). Therefore, if an Offeror is capable of fulfilling all requirements of the solicitation it should not propose teaming partner(s) in Step Two.

Q.14: Regarding SECTION H of the Solicitation para. 2(b): Does this mean that, in Step 2, if we propose company XYZ to do a portion (sub elements) of the work contained under the Supply functional area and include a past performance for that area as one of our 10 examples, then company XYZ has to always be proposed under Step 3 for any work relevant to those Supply functional sub elements? Or, can a Prime BOA holder in Step 3 propose any qualified member of their team to perform any portion of work based on approach, best value, and other factors which would be advantageous to the Government.

A.14: If an Offeror proposes use of a subcontractor to perform a portion of the subtasks under one of the functions, it is assumed that subcontractor can perform any functions under that function.

Q.15: Regarding SECTION H, para. 3b, of the Solicitation: Will the contractor be reimbursed for initial and on-going HAZWOPER Training?

A.15: The EAGLE BOA RFP does not include a cost/price proposal. Any response would be subject to contract type determination. Specifics will be provided during task order competitions.

Q.16: Regarding SECTION H, paragraph A.1.f: Since EAGLE Task order Requirements will be synopsisized/advertised on an annual basis to allow non-BOA holders an opportunity to become qualified for an executed BOA, what procedure will be used to "qualify" non-BOA holders?

A.16: The Government will follow the evaluation criteria set forth in the Step Two RFP to admit new BOA holders on an annual basis and/or when requirements emerge during the year that were not previously advertised.

Q.17: Regarding SECTION H, para.A.3.c: This appears to contradict SECTION H, para. 2b (page 10). Which statement has precedence?

A.17: If an Offeror is capable of fulfilling all requirements of the solicitation it will not propose teaming partner(s) in Step Two. Section H, Paragraph 3.c states that if an Offeror received an executed BOA in Step Two on the basis of fulfilling all requirements without subcontractors, the Offeror is not precluded from proposing subcontractors in its Step Three proposal(s).

Q.18: Reference Section H.1.b on page 10 and Section A.2.b on page 2: The reference statement on page 10 says "Prior to the annual review and renewal, the PCO will notify the contractor in writing informing them of the review and confirm that the contractor wishes to have its BOA renewed. As BOAs are not contracts, either the Government or the Offeror may elect not to renew the BOA at annual review." Yet referenced statement on page 2 says "The BOAs will be valid for a period of five years beginning from the effective date of the initial BOA execution." Question: These statements seem to conflict as page 10 refers to annual renewal and page 2 says BOA is good for 5 years. Please clarify.

A.18: The BOAs are issued for a five year term. The annual review is to update the terms and conditions of the BOA. If a BOA holder no longer wishes to continue with that agreement, it may opt out.

Q.19: Reference Section H.3.j on page 11: The referenced paragraph on page 11 says "The Government reserves the right not to award a task order to an apparent successful Offeror performing under previously awarded EAGLE task order(s), if the contracting officer finds through a responsibility determination that the Offeror has not demonstrated the capacity to perform an additional EAGLE task order." Question: This is unclear; please clarify what is meant by "perform an additional Eagle task order", especially since it seems to elude an automatic reward to an EAGLE prime incumbent if they met the condition of the last phrase.

A.19: If you are awarded a task order at Ft. XYZ and then submit an offer for Ft. ABC, you will have to demonstrate that you have the capacity to perform simultaneously at both installations in order to receive the award at Ft. ABC.

Q.20: Reference: Sections H.3.b, and L.2.1: The requirements of H.3.b seems to place the subcontractors in a position to decide who will bid or not bid by withholding support for a particular TO by either refusing to bid with their prime or providing non-competitive pricing in favor of another SB prime team they are also on. This appears to present a potential Restraint of Trade environment and could even be considered Bid Rigging. It seems that this will create scenarios when a subcontractor refuses to participate in a particular TO of involvement of the Department of Justice's Anti-Trust Division (USDOJ-ATD) in potential cases against the subcontractor or even the Army the given way the RFP was constructed.

Question: What provisions have been established so that USDOJ-ATD is not involved in EAGLE TO bids when a subcontract causes a prime to "NO-BID" due to non-participation which as per H.3.b makes the prime ineligible for the TO award?

A.20: The intent of this provision is to streamline Step 3 evaluations. It is also intended to prevent a "bait and switch" scenario where a company that is not capable of performing the requirements of the PWS is determined acceptable in Step 2 by using the qualifications of subcontractors that it is not required to use in Step 3. It is up to each offeror to develop the relationships and execute agreements with potential subcontractors that will ensure that it will be in a competitive posture for Step 3 proposals.

Section L

Q.21A: L.3.1.1 Similar Experience. The offeror shall demonstrate experience in performing services similar to the required maintenance, supply, and transportation support services detailed in Attachment 0001 BOA PWS by completing up to ten Contract Reference Worksheets,(Attachment 0002). In section L3 as stated above we complete up to ten reference worksheets. Since I have a rather large team in order to cover all the requirements are we limited to 10 or can we provide whatever is needed to cover all the tasks as listed in the BOA PWS?

Q.21B: The offeror is required to use approved subcontractors from BOA 2 for the subsequent task orders. Due to the fact that only 10 Past Performances may be used in BOA2, and an offeror could have more than 10 companies on their team, is there a contradiction in how team mates are selected per task order?

Q.21C: As Attachment 0002 provides for 10 contract references, is it the Government's intent to limit small business offerors to a team of no greater than 10 companies?

A.21: An Offeror should only propose the team members required to perform at the Year 1 installations that it plans to compete on. When new requirements arise Offerors will be given the opportunity to add subcontractors. As stated in paragraph L.3.1.1, Offerors may complete up to ten Contract Reference Worksheets, Attachment 0002.

Q.22: In your solicitation documents, attachment 0002, you have two versions. Ref sheet 1 is different than Ref sheets 2-10. Ref sheets 2-10 show rows for option years. Which version should we use in our submittal?

A.22: An incorrect version of this Attachment was inadvertently uploaded initially. Attachment 0002 has been re-uploaded to reflect the appropriate format for all worksheets.

Q.23: The listed subtask in attachment 0003 vary from subtask listed in Sec. L.3.1 and Sec M.3.1, and are different in the subtask listed in the task orders to be released. To address the cross reference requirement, does the government intend to evaluate on all tasks or just those listed in attachment 0003? For example in Sec L, Left Behind Equipment (LBE) is referenced but LBE is not on the Attachment 0003 list of subtasks.

A.23: The government will evaluate in accordance with the criteria in Sec M.3.1. For similar experience, the evaluation of attachment 0002 is based on evaluation of similar experience at the subtask level (M.3.1.2.2, M.3.1.2.3). For Organizational capability, the government will evaluate attachment 0003 and the organizational capability narrative based on how the attachment and narrative support an organizational capability in proposed terms of subtasks (M.3.1.3.2.1), missions (M.3.1.3.2.2), equipment (M.3.1.3.2.3), classes of supply (M.3.1.3.2.4) and transportation areas (M.3.1.3.2.5). The cross-referencing back to attachment 0002 is critical to supporting how similar experience supports the capability statement in the evaluated areas of subtasks, missions, equipment, classes of supply, and transportation areas.

Q.24: Can small business offerors use an IDIQ/MATOC, for example Field and Installation Readiness Support Team (FIRST), contract reference as a single past performance and list multiple associated task orders or must we list each task order reference separately?

A.24: See Section L, paragraph L.3.1.1 (a). A Task Order constitutes as a contract, each must be referenced separately.

Q.25: Reference: RFP Section: L Paragraph: L.2.13, Page 105: The solicitation states "Foldout pages may be used, with each foldout counted as one page" Question: If foldouts may be used, is the authorized size of the fold out 8 1/2 X 17? If so, will it still count as one page?

A.25: Section L, paragraph L.2.13 states each fold is considered one page, based on a page size standard of 8 1/2 x 11 inch paper.

Q.26A: RFP Section L, Paragraph L.2.13, Table 2.1, third item, Page 105: "Required Information/File Name: Organizational Capability narrative - see paragraph L.3.1.2; PWS paragraphs to be addressed: 1.2.1, 2.0, 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3; Limitations: 3 pages." Given that offerors are required to describe their organizational capability to fully meet EAGLE functional requirements at a subtask level of detail, we assume the 3-page limitation is a typographical error. We respectfully request that the page limitation for the Organizational Capability section be amended to 50 pages or more.

Q.26B: Reference Solicitation Paragraph L.2, Proposal Preparation & Organization, Table 2.1: Table 2.1 identifies the required information/file name: Organizational Capability Narrative – see paragraph L.3.1.2; PWS paragraphs to be addressed 1.2.1, 2.0, 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 as having a limitation of 3 Pages.

i. Is the specified 3 Page Limitation for the Offeror to address all paragraph L.3.1.2 and PWS paragraphs 1.2.1, 2.0, 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 requirements or

ii. Is there a 3 Page Limitation to address Solicitation L.3.1.2 and each PWS Paragraph 1.2.1, 2.0, 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3 requirements (3 Pages for L.3.1.2, 3 Pages for PWS 1.2.1, , 3 Pages for PWS 2.0, , 3 Pages for PWS 2.1, etc.) {A total of 18 Pages}?

Q.26C: Regarding SECTION L, page 105, Table 2.1: The requirement for only using 3 pages for an offeror's Organizational Capability narrative appears to conflict with the level of information required to meet the evaluation factors in SECTION M, page 111, para. M 3.1.3.2.2 through 3.1.3.2.5. Please clarify.

A.26: A three (3) page limit [total] will remain as stated. Offerors are encouraged to reference the information provided in Attachment 0002 using the contract reference number as support for establishing EAGLE capability. Information that conveys primarily marketing information, capabilities that do not relate to the specific functional areas/subtasks under evaluation, or other areas are not specifically under evaluation in Sec M.3.1 should not be included in the submission.

Q.27: RFP Section L, Paragraph L.3.1.1, Page 105: This section states, "Each contract referenced shall have a minimum \$1,000,000.00 total dollar value . . ." For references where the Offeror is a subcontractor, does the total contract need to have a value of \$1,000,000.00 or is this applicable to the Offeror's portion of the work?

A.27: Amendment 0001 changed the contract value from \$1,000,000.00 to \$150,000.00. The overall contract value must be \$150,000.00 or more in total value.

Q.28: Regarding BOA 2 Proposal Response Limitations: There were no page limitations identified in BOA2 for offerors responses. Are offerors to assume there is no limit, or is there a limit that was not clearly visible? If there is a page limit what is the page limit for the response?

A.28: Table 2.1 in Section L identifies.

Attachment 0002: lines 10a through 10c have a word limitation of up to 400 words.

Organizational Capability narrative (L.3.1.2): has a page limitation of up to 3 pages.

Q.29: The use of Excel as the word counting mechanism. Since we are writing in Word will the government make the change to word count in MS Word?

A.29: No, see A.28.

Q.30: Regarding Shop Stock management: Does the government intend to have the offerors submit information in the BOA-2 on the management of Shop Stock in the Supply and/or Maintenance areas?

A.30: It is permissible to represent shop stock management as either a maintenance or a supply functional area.

Q.31: Reference L.3.1.1 Similar Experience: With reference to Attachment 2, Contract Reference Worksheets, there is no place to enter contract value (minimum \$1M). Should offerors insert the contract value into the form somewhere?

A.31: Amendment 0001 changed the contract value from \$1,000,000.00 to \$150,000.00. The Offeror asserts that the contract value is at least \$150,000.00 by providing it as a contract reference. Offerors do not need to insert the contract value into the form.

Q.32: Reference L.3.1.2.2 Ensure the narrative addresses capability to perform the following: All functional and subtask level capabilities: This line item seems to be a repeat of what is asked for in L.3.1.2.1. If yes, please remove this line item. If no, please clarify exactly what the government expects in response to this line item requirement that is different from L.3.1.2.1.

A.32: No change will be made. Paragraph L.3.1.2.2 serves to reiterate what must be included in the narrative.

Q.33A: RFP Section L, Paragraph L.3.2.4, Page 107: This paragraph states, "Narratives are not requested and will not be reviewed." What is this comment in reference to?

Q.33B: L.3.2.4 Narratives are not requested and will not be reviewed. QUESTION: We presume this statement is referring to Section L requirement, "L.3.2.3 Offerors must complete Performance Questionnaire, Attachment 0005" and not referring to other Section L requirements. Is this presumption correct?

A.33: Paragraph L.3.2.4 is applicable to L.3.2 Volume II. To clarify, the only documentation we are seeking in this Volume are completed Attachments 0004 and 0005.

Q.34: Section L.2.7 page 104: Does this requirement also apply to the Government Designed Excel forms Attachment #0002 and Attachment #0003, while they currently have blocks for the contractor's name it does not have the other data. Please clarify.

A.34: This requirement does apply to Attachments 0002 and 0003. Offerors must use Microsoft Excel to add headers/footers (Insert/Header – Footer/Custom Header- Custom Footer).

Q.35: Reference: RFP Section L, Paragraph(s) L.2.13, Page(s) 105 of 113: Sentence 2 says "typeface no smaller than 12 point" while sentence 5 says, "There are no font requirements or restrictions but the text should be easily readable.",

which is correct?

A.35: L.2.13 informs Offerors how the government will view the information as outlined below, this is inclusive of Table 2.1. For example, sentence 2 would apply to Table 2.1 Attachment 0003, Organizational Capability narrative. Sentence 5 would apply to Table 2.1 Attachment 0002 Contract Reference Worksheet.

Q.36: Reference: RFP Section L, Paragraph(s) L.3.1.1, Page(s) 106 (Section L, subparagraph beginning with Attachment 0002, j,e,iii. Issue/Receipt) and RFP Attachment 0001, Paragraph(s) 2.3.11 c, Page(s) 15: What is the function to be done here since what is listed on page 15 are systems that perform multiple functions? In addition, if we are talking about discrepancy reporting why are SARSS and GCSS-Army not mentioned?

A.36: Paragraph L.3.1.1 j e iii refers to the issue/receipt aspect of the transportation support area. It involves support to the issue/receipt process to include operating STAMIS/AIS. There are no specific functions associated with Attachment 0001, Paragraph(s) 2.3.11 c, Page(s) 15. This paragraph identified examples of types of STAMIS/AIS that would be involved with transportation support to the issue/receipt process. Proposals are not limited to the listed STAMIS/AIS if needed to propose similar experience or organizational capability.

Section M

Q.37: Reference: RFP Section M, Paragraph(s) M3.1.3.2.5, Page(s) 112 of 113: Includes a sentence at the end of the paragraph as follows: "It is acceptable to propose an organizational capability, in a limited number of subtask areas, when that capability is not supported by similar experience." Please define what "limited" means in terms of subtask areas? Does this statement apply to all three functional areas, e.g., maintenance, supply, and transportation subtasks? Does this mean we can propose some subtasks for which we do not have similar experience and to what degree? Please clarify.

A.37: Limited means that acceptable similar experience may be proposed that does not address 2 subtasks in each of the maintenance, supply, and transportations support areas. (See paragraph M.3.1.2.3). Keeping that in mind, organization capability requires that a capability be proposed for each subtask and be supported by similar experience from Attachment 0002. It is permissible for the Offerors to propose a subtask capability without similar experience when similar experience was not proposed as part of Attachment 0002. Otherwise, similar experience as proposed in Attachment 0002 must be included in the organizational capability narrative to support the proposed capability.

Q.38: RFP Section M.3.1.3.2.5, Paragraph 3, Page 112: Reference the Government's statement that "It is acceptable to propose an organizational capability, in a limited number of subtask areas, when that capability is not supported by similar experience." Does this statement apply only to M.3.1.3.2.5, or does it also apply to M.3.1.3.2.2, M.3.1.3.2.3, and M.3.1.3.2.4?

A.38: The statement at the end of paragraph M.3.1.3, referring to proposing capability without being supported by similar experience, applies to all of M.3.1.3. The intent is to allow acceptable proposals to include capabilities that may not have been proposed on Attachment 0002 but were still considered acceptable based on the Attachment 0002 evaluation criteria in M.3.1.2.3.

Q.39: RFP Section M, Paragraph M3.1.2.3, Page 110: This paragraph states the Offeror must demonstrate experience in performing three or more of the following subtasks for each of the functional areas. We interpret this to mean that the prime's team has to demonstrate that experience and capability. Can you elaborate on the intent behind this requirement?

A.39: The intent is to have the Offerors propose a full capability based on the Prime/Team's similar experience. For similar experience, an acceptable proposal must demonstrate similar experience in 3 or more of the subtasks for each

functional area of maintenance, supply, and transportation support listed. For organizational capability in terms of addressing the subtasks, an acceptable proposal must identify an organizational capability to perform all subtasks. Where similar experience is not available to support a proposed capability, the Offeror should provide some support for how that capability will be delivered.

Q.40: Reference: RFP Section M, Paragraph M3.1.2.5, Page 111: This section indicates an Offeror will not be acceptable if it does not demonstrate experience in performing all of the listed subtasks. As in question 40– we interpret this to mean that the prime’s team has to demonstrate all of that experience and capability. Can you elaborate on the intent behind this requirement?

A.40: The Offeror is considered a single Prime, a team, or a Joint venture. This paragraph is referring to the total proposed similar experience for the prime, team or joint venture.

Q.41: M 3.1.3.2.2 Addresses the capability to perform a minimum of three PWS paragraph 1.2.1 representative mission groups, grouped as follows:

- i. APS/Direct Theater Support/Theater Provided Equipment/ In-theater maintenance, LBE/PDTE, DOL made up of IMMA/CIF/SSA/TMP/ITO/ASP,
- iv. NEF/NET,
- v. ARFORGEN/RESET

QUESTION: We presume items iv and v are numbered out of sequence and should have been numbered item numbers ii and iii. Is this presumption correct? Or, should the mission groups be numbered i through v and offerors select the three groups to which they want to respond?

A.41: The groups are numbers i. through v. as follows:

- i. APS/Direct Theater Support/Theater Provided Equipment/ In-theater maintenance,
- ii. LBE/PDTE,
- iii. DOL made up of IMMA/CIF/SSA/TMP/ITO/ASP,
- iv. NEF/NET,
- v. ARFORGEN/RESET

Keep in mind that M.3.1.3.2.2 is evaluation criteria. The guidance for what information that should be proposed is at L.3.1.2.3 c.

Q.42: Paragraphs M 3.1.3.2.2, M 3.1.3.2.3, M 3.1.3.2.4, M 3.1.3.2.5, M 3.1.3.4.2, M 3.1.3.4.3, M 3.1.3.4.4, M 3.1.3.4.5 pages 111-113...These paragraphs all state multiple groupings of services and requirements and offerors are instructed that in order to be compliant, they must address a minimum number of the groups within each category...If for example, in paragraph M 3.1.3.2.4, page 112, we had significant experience in Class I and Class VII supply items, could we address these and be compliant as having addressed subparagraphs i and iii., or must we be able to address all items listed in Subparagraphs i (Classes of Supply I, II, and IV) and iii (Classes of Supply VII and IX).

A.42: When multiple supply classes are listing in a single grouping, experience in at least one supply class from the group will be evaluated as meeting the requirement for that grouping. In the example presented, the capability for working a minimum of two groups of supply classes would be evaluated as acceptable when supply class I and VII are proposed.

Q.43: Reference paragraph M 3.1.3.3, page 112: “Unacceptable organizational capability proposals are characterized by the following:” “Organizational Capability: Submission fails to identify all proposed members of the team, if more than a single Prime is proposed.” (If we are limited to using only 10 Contract Reference Worksheets, how/where are we to identify team members whose experience is not discussed in the 10 Worksheets? Or similarly, if we have more than 10 companies on our team, where/how are we to list the team members not in the 10 spaces allotted on Attachment 3?).

“The submission fails to show a capability in any listed area of maintenance, supply, and transportation support.” (This sentence states that offerors are deficient if they fail to show a capability in any listed area of maintenance, supply, or transportation support. This conflicts with guidance in paragraph M.3.1.2.3 which states that offerors may perform three or more of certain areas within maintenance, supply and transportation.)

A.43: Paragraph M.3.1.3 allows a limited number of subtasks to be proposed without similar experience. Offerors could use this allowance to include team members that provide niche capability when team size exceeds 10 contractors.

Contracts identified in Attachment 0002 should reflect the most significant contracts with the broadest functional coverage, address the evaluated criteria in section M, and identify the proposed members of the team necessary to represent acceptable similar experience in EAGLE requirements. The evaluation criteria organizational capability narrative should include all proposed team members listed in Attachment 0003. Ten contracts are considered sufficient for Attachment 0002.

M.3.1.2.3 refers to the acceptability criteria for the similar experience involved with evaluation of Attachment 0002. As the question correctly states, there is some allowance provided for Offerors to propose less than 100% similar experience in identified areas and still be considered acceptable. However, for the Organizational Capability Statement, all subtasks listed on Attachment **0003** must be addressed in the capability statement. The evaluation criteria for the organizational capability statement does make an allowance for proposals that fail to address some capabilities that are proposed in terms of representative missions, equipment types, classes of supply, and transportation operations.

Step Three Requirements:

Q.44: Will the Operations and Logistics Support for the Blue Grass Army Maintenance Activity requirement be a procurement under EAGLE?

A.44: Operations and Logistics Support for Blue Grass Army Maintenance Activity is not currently in the annual EAGLE requirements for year 1.

Q.45: Ft Campbell was listed with an estimated RFP date of 3 July. According to the MICC Ft Bragg FIRST web site, the contract end date for the DOL TO is April 2014. Will this be procured early?

A.45: No, the EAGLE task order will be a follow-on to the current contract.

Q.46: Other DOL's are scheduled to be re-competed during the period cited, notably Ft Bliss. Can you provide ASC's intentions for these other task orders?

A.46: The DOLs undergoing EAGLE re-compete are listed in the year 1 workload.

Q.47: I saw that part or all of the logistics support under the Fort Gordon ISS contract will be procured under the EAGLE contract. Can you please explain the impact to the ISS contract (will the public works services still be competitively procured?), and provide a revised estimated total contract value (\$) for the ISS contract?

A.47: Public works services will not be procured under EAGLE. No information will be provided regarding the estimated total contract value.

Q.48: I have been following contract W911SE07C0013 which was awarded to Akima Facilities Management for Installation Support Services for Fort Gordon Georgia, and I am trying to figure out if the addition of the Ground Maintenance Support Services at Fort Gordon to the EAGLE requirement is going to replace the potential follow-on of contract W911SE07C0013. It is currently unclear to me if a portion of the work will be absorbed by EALGE or if the entire follow-on will. Anything you might be able to provide to help clarify this would be greatly appreciated.

A.48: Ft Gordon information will be provided as part of the Step Three RFP for that requirement.

Q.19: We understand that the operation of Dining Facilities (DFAC) will not be contracted using the EAGLE contract vehicle. Will the operation of the Troop Issue Subsistence Activity (TISA) / Class I warehouse on installations be within the scope of EAGLE?

A.49: TISA will be in the scope of EAGLE.

Q.50: Regarding Government-Furnished Property (GFP). Does the government intend to provide a list of GFP that is expected to be phased-out or retired before contract start for task orders?

A.50: As stated in Paragraph 3.15 of the PWS, Government owned materials, office space, communications capability and information available for use will be provided in Step Three - Task Order Request.

Teaming Arrangements

Q.51: While we understand that vendors are considered subcontractors, we are trying to understand what "subcontractor's/teamates" must be identified during Step 2 versus Step 3. As with the OCONUS work discussed in Question 111 (from EAGLE Questions & Answers_27Mar12 file), it is equally difficult to determine all needs required for a CONUS task order prior to reviewing the PWS for the specific mission. For example, it is common on CONUS tasks as well to require the rental of pickup trucks and forklifts or the purchase of office supplies, keys, etc., and other products and services that are needed to meet mission requirements, but don't seem to rise to the level of a "teammate" for purposes of identification during Step 2. Can the government clarify if these types of products/services can be added during Step 3 Task Order bids for both OCONUS and CONUS?

A.51: We are only interested in the subcontractors that will perform PWS tasks.

Q.52: Regarding the use of BOA 1 team mates: Will BOA holders be allowed to utilize companies not on BOA 2 Past Performance Questionnaires, but who were on BOA 1 for task orders if they have the unique capabilities and social-economic statuses needed to increase viability in competition?

A.52: Step One of this multi-step process was strictly an advisory process. Nothing in Step One is binding. Proposals submitted in Step Two and Three are binding and will be incorporated into any resultant Task Order.

Q.53: Regarding small business requirements of Large Businesses: What small business contracting plan requirements (percentage of work to small business) will be used, or is it at the discretion of the Large Business Prime to ensure the goals that the government expects in BOA 2 and BOA 3 are met?

A.53: Subcontracting goals will be provided at Step Three.

Q.54: Are offerors allowed to propose any sort of depth of capability in its Step 2 response? For example, if the Prime is not one that is capable of performing all three (3) functional areas and subtasks by itself, but has experience and can perform, let's say, Railhead Operations (PWS 2.3.5), is it allowed to propose a subcontractor that fills other gaps, but also performs Railhead Operations capabilities as well (and acknowledge same by adding depth in Railhead Operations)? (Railhead provided as an example only)

A.54: Yes.

Technical

Q.55A: GFEBs was not mentioned as a software solution for accounting and accountability purposes. Will GFEBs experience and knowledge be required by offerors on any of the task orders anticipated for EAGLE?

Q.55B: Will GFEBs be in place at the time of Task Order Release?

Q.55C: Regarding SAMS-IE and other Maintenance and Logistics Software: The Contractor shall use the Standard Army Maintenance System-Installation Enhanced (SAMS-IE) to input work data and manage maintenance operations and shall utilize labor distribution codes. Will GFEBs be used to replace and/or augment SAMS-IE at the time of Task Order Release?

A.55: The status of GFEBs and any requirement for use will be provided as part of the Step Three RFPs. GFEBs experience is not part of the EAGLE BOA evaluation process.

May 18, 2012

ASSIST

Q.56: General Announcement on IBOP web page: New Opportunities will no longer be posted to the IBOP. All functionality related to posting new government items (e.g., solicitations, contracts, RTEPs) is now disabled. Existing posts retain their specific functionality (e.g., Post Bid, Ask Question, Post Messages and Documents, etc.).

A.56: IBOP is used in conjunction with ASSIST only in terms of having a "public" website with an established user account system to be able to setup secure pages where the offeror's can eventually go to access any ENS/questions that have been issued to them. The Offerors register via the IBOP homepage, but after that, ACC-RI will be sending them a specific URL (one for each offeror) if/when there are exchanges/discussions that need to occur. IBOP will continue to be used in this manner until the next version of ASSIST is deployed.

Attachments

Q.57: Reference Attachment 0002: Should Line 7 be populated with the company's EAGLE Team role, or the role on the referenced contract?

A.57: Attachment 0002, Line 7, refers to the offeror/team member/joint venture/subcontractor's role on the referenced contract on Attachment 0002, Line 6. (i.e. role of prime contractor, subcontractor, etc...) [See Q&A # 161.](#)

Q.58A: L.3.1.1-j provides offerors with instructions/guidance on the information to be entered into lines 10a-10c on Attachment 0002; however, M.3.1.2.2 defines how Attachment 0002 will be evaluated for acceptability. The evaluation criteria does not directly match the information instructed to be entered, e.g., there is no mention in the evaluation criteria of missions supported, classes of supply (other than III), in-transit-visibility, etc. that is instructed to be entered per L.3.1.1. The evaluation criteria appear to be focused on demonstrating experience only the 29 subtask areas.

1. Why is there an apparent disconnect between what offerors are specifically instructed to enter on Attachment 0002 and what information will be evaluated?

2. What information is expected to be entered on Attachment 0002, the absence of which will deem a response unacceptable?

3. Is the information requested in L.3.1.1, paragraph j, going to be evaluated as part of Attachment 0002, and by what specific criteria is Attachment 0002 going to be evaluated?

Q.58B: The listed subtask in Attachment 0003 vary from subtask listed in Sec. L.3.1 and Sec M.3.1, and are different in the subtask listed in the task orders to be released. To address the cross reference requirement, does the government

intend to evaluate on all tasks or just those listed in attachment 0003? For example in Sec L, Left Behind Equipment (LBE) is referenced but LBE is not on the Attachment 0003 list of subtasks.

A.58: Incorrect, the subtasks in Attachment 0003 and Section L.3.1/M.3.1 coincide. There are 29 evaluated subtasks. Maintenance has 9 subtasks, Supply has 9 subtasks, and Transportation support has 11 subtasks. Further, the specific requirements for corresponding Task Orders have yet to be released; those provided in the Step Two synopsis provide a general statement of what may be solicited in the Step Three process for each respective installation. Attachment 0002 provides the narrative opportunity for proposing subtask similar experience under each functional area of Maintenance, Transportation, and Supply. Attachment 0003 corresponds directly with the PWS subtasks and shows which team member/subcontractor/Joint Venture, etc will be the responsible party for those subtasks to ensure an organizational capability is proposed for subtasks in each functional area. The organizational capability narrative criteria evaluates for subtasks, representative missions, equipment, classes of supply, and transportation capability. Regarding LBE, it is a representative mission and not a subtask. Offerors are instructed to address any similar experience for any representative missions at a corresponding subtask level.

Q.59: "By signing below I attest I am the individual who has the authority to sign for and legally bind the company. " Can this wording be removed or changed as it may imply that their Chief, BMO probably cannot sign this as written. As written, they have indicated the line would require a USG KO with a warrant to normally sign as written and a legal JAG review.

A.59: No, the document requires the signature of an individual who is authorized by his/her management to bind the company in a legal agreement.

Q.60A: While we do not believe it is the Government's intent to provide the framework for the inappropriate release of a company's proprietary information, a frank assessment of Attachment 004 Consent Form's verbiage can easily be interpreted as overly-broad. There are no constraints on what, how, and the duration of contractual information that may be released. In addition, potential subcontractors would have no knowledge of what information is being sourced, from whom, and when. Therefore, the current Consent Form's lack of clarity and detail could provide an opportunity for a prime contractor to gain an unfair advantage for future work. This is clearly outside established and documented Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) practices. Considering these issues, will the Government please revise Attachment 004 Consent Form to provide clarity and detail regarding the release and discussion of subcontractor "present and past performance"?

Q.60B: What are the limits of what can be shared with the prime contractor, for example, will discussion be limited to "present and past performance" information that is currently publically accessible, i.e. CPARS?

A.60: IAW FAR 15.306 (b) (4), the Government shall address adverse past performance information for which the offeror has not previously had an opportunity to comment. IAW 15.306 (d) (3), the contracting officer must indicate to, or discuss with, each offeror still being considered for award, deficiencies, significant weaknesses, and adverse past performance information to which the offeror has not yet had an opportunity to respond.

The consent letter found at Attachment 0004, allows the Government to release and discuss the subcontractor's present and past performance information with the prime contractor during the source selection process. Only adverse present/past performance which could negatively impact an Offeror's ability to obtain a BOA will be discussed in Step Two.

Q.61: Does the subcontractor have the opportunity to limit or redact any potential proprietary, restricted, or confidential "present and past performance" information PRIOR to discussions between the Government and the prime contractor?

A.61: The Prime Contractor is required to include the information requested in the Performance Questionnaire [for the Prime, its team members/subcontractors/joint venture partners] found at Attachment 0005 in its proposal. Therefore,

the subcontractor may not limit or redact requested information.

Q.62: Will the prime be required to notify and/or discuss with the subcontractor the specific “present and past performance” questions or information that will be discussed/sourced with or from the Government?

A.62: Communications and/or discussions are held between the Government and the Prime contractor (Offeror). It is up to the Prime contractor to obtain any necessary information from its subcontractors.

Q.63: Is there an expiration date associated with the subcontractor’s consent and release/discussion of “present and past performance”? Specifically; Does the authority granted by signing the Consent Form extend beyond the Step 2 BOA source selection process? Does the Consent Form apply to Task Order competition after BOAs are awarded?

A.63: IAW Paragraph 3.1.3.1 on page 18 of the DoD Source Selection Procedures "The past performance evaluation performed in support of a current source selection does not establish, create, or change the existing record and history of the offeror’s past performance on past contracts; rather, the past performance evaluation process gathers information from customers on how well the offeror performed those past contracts." Therefore, the letter of consent is valid through the Step Two source selection process.

General

Q.64: In preparing our response to the EAGLE Step 2 RFP we are unclear as to whether you consider work performed under Delivery Orders the same as Task Orders?

A.64: In general, the term "Task Orders" applies to those situations where the Government procures services and the term "Delivery Orders" for those cases where the Government procures supplies; the specific definitions of each are found in FAR Subpart 2.1. Some in Government & private sector incorrectly use these terms interchangeably, so the determining factor wouldn't be whether they were referred to as task/delivery orders so much as the work that was contractually done underneath them.

Q.65: Reference: RFP Sections E, F, I, K, L, and M contain the following sentence preceding a list of FAR provisions. “If the provision requires additional or unique information, then that information is provided immediately after the provision title.” Question: Have any provisions been flagged as requiring additional or unique information?

A.65: As stated in each section of the RFP, those provisions that require additional or unique information will have that information provided immediately after the provision title. It is up to each Offeror to read through the RFP in its entirety and process the information as indicated.

Q.66: Is it acceptable to include a Transmittal Letter and/or Executive Summary as part of our proposal?

A.66: Information submitted as part of an Offeror's proposal and not requested as specified in the RFP will not be reviewed by the Government.

Q.67: Can the government please share a draft copy or an example of what the BOA will look like?

A.67: The BOA will follow the Uniform Contract format described in FAR 15.204-1. The executed BOA will include Parts I, II and III of this solicitation.

OCONUS Requirements

Q.68: Reference DFARS clause 252.225-7040: All required security and background checks are complete and acceptable.” Joint Ventures must have U.S. government facility clearance to comply with contractor security clearance requirements.

Will the government sponsor a Facility Security Clearance for Joint Ventures supporting EAGLE?

A.68: Per DFARS 225.7402-5, this clause is only applicable in solicitations and contracts that authorize contractor personnel to accompany U.S. Armed Forces deployed outside the United States in—(1) Contingency operations; (2) Humanitarian or peacekeeping operations; or (3) Other military operations or military exercises, when designated by the combatant commander. Guidance on future OCONUS requirements will be provided in Step Three Task Order Requests.

Section H

Q.69: Section H, Paragraph 3c, page 11: If a Prime proposes a group of subcontractors in the Step Two BOA, but does not propose subcontractor X for a functional area in the Step Two BOA, can the Prime add the unproposed subcontractor for Step Three proposals in addition to the subcontractors proposed in the Step Two BOA?

A.69: See Q&A # 10.

Q.70: Paragraph 2(b) , Page 10: QUESTION – If the Offeror has three (3) sub-contractors having equal capability in a specific subtask, does the Offeror have to use all 3 subs in the performance of that task or can the Offeror select one of the three? QUESTION – If limited to one, does that sub-contractor have to perform that specific subtask on every subsequent TO. QUESTION – In the above example, if Company B elects not to participate in a TO, can the Prime use another of its qualified subcontractors or bring on a new partner with Government approval?

A.70: See Q&A # 10.

Q.71: Paragraph 2, Page 10: We are trying to clarify the Government's intent regarding the use of teammates in Step 3 Task Order submissions. Please address the example and question that follows: Small business company X is awarded a BOA in Step 2 as the prime. Company X built its team with multiple companies who all provide past performance in a number of the required sub task areas. The makeup of the team is such that Teammates A, B and C have past performance in the same sub task area of Installation Materiel Maintenance Activity (as an example). A task order comes out in Step 3 and Installation Materiel Maintenance Activity is included in the task order. Is company X required to use all three (3) companies (A, B, and C) in their proposal; or can company X select one or more of the teammates for the task?

A.71: See Q&A # 10.

Q.72: Because the RFP limits the number of Contract Reference Worksheets, what is the process to add teammates after BOA award?

A.72: See Q&A # 11.

Section I

Q.73: Reference: RFP Section I, Paragraph I-233, Page 46. The Government has included 52.244-2 Subcontracts and 252.244-7001 Contractor Purchasing System Review Administration. Is it the Governments intent to include 52.244-2 (JUN 2007), Alt. 1 (OCT 2010)? Recommend the addition of 52.244-2 Subcontracts (Oct 2010) - Alternate I (June 2007) as prescribed in 44.204(a)(2) in order to expedite order placement (services and purchasing) where appropriate. This would benefit the prime contractor and government in providing the necessary materials and services needed to maintain a facility.

A.73: IAW FAR 44.204 (a) (2), if a cost-reimbursement contract is contemplated, for civilian agencies other than the Coast Guard and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the contracting officer shall use the clause [52.244-2] with

its Alternate I. FAR 52.244-2 Alternate I will not be included as the requirements solicited are not for civilian agencies.

Q.74A: Reference Clauses 52.216-21 Requirements Alternate I and 52.216-21 Requirements: If the Government requires early delivery of an item, request the Government include language that “the Contractor will be entitled to an equitable adjustment for cost and schedule if early delivery is requested by the Government.”

Q.74B: Reference Clauses 52.216-21 Requirements Alternate I and 52.216-21 Requirements: Please confirm that if Contractor is not able to meet the accelerated delivery schedule as requested by the Government that the Government will accept the items on the original delivery date specified in the task order and the Contractor will not be penalize for not being able to meet the accelerated delivery date.

A.74: As stated in Section A (2)(b)(vi), This solicitation includes clauses that may apply to future Task Order Requirements. The Task Order Requests for Proposals will provide all required provisions and clauses applicable to that specific requirement.

Q.75: Reference Clause 52.216-10 Incentive Fee: Request the Government remove paragraph (b)(2) regarding the fee withholding. Given the release of withhold is contingent on settlement of final indirect cost rate proposal and given that final indirect rates may not be negotiated for several years after contract completion , it seems unreasonable to retain this withhold for settlement of indirect rates between the Contractor and DCAA given it is outside the control of the Contractor.

A.75: The prescription in FAR 16.307 does not provide this authority to the Contracting Officer. Offerors with suggested revisions to the FAR may pursue them IAW FAR Subpart 1.5 - Agency and Public Participation.

Q.76A: Reference Clause 52.219-10 Incentive Subcontracting Program: How often is the subcontracting plan reviewed against the actual subcontracting effort being performed on the task order? Is this annual review, does it occur at the end of a task order POP?

Q.76B: Reference Clause 52.219-10 Incentive Subcontracting Program: How will the contractor receive the subcontracting incentive?

A.76: Use of this clause is at the discretion of the Contracting Officer and may be employed during the Step Three process if determined to be in the best interest of the Government. Specifics as to how the clause will be applied will be communicated at that time if it is incorporated in the resulting Task Order contract.

Q.77A: Reference clause 252.234-7002 Earned Value Management System: Will the EVMS requirement be determined at the task order level?

Q.77B: Section I-248 - 252.234-7002 - EARNED VALUE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM: Considering the varying size, scope, and complexity of the individual orders, will EVMS requirements be invoked at the task order level?

A.77: Use of the Earned Value Management System (EVMS) will be IAW DFARs 234.201(1) at the Task Order level.

Q.78: Reference clause 252.237-7023 Continuation of Essential Contractor Services: Are the mission essential services considered part of a task order requirement or does this clause pertain to pop up support that may be required outside of the scope of the task order when proposed? Please confirm that Contractor will not be penalized if they cannot perform any of the contractor essential services being directed to perform by the CO.

A.78: This clause may apply to the Requests for Task Order Proposals during the Step Three process. Essential Contractor Services at the time of Task Order award are identified IAW DFARs 252.237-7023(b), but do not include requirements that are outside the scope of the task order.

Section K

Q.79A: Is Contractor required to submit a Representation and Certification Package with our Step 2 BOA proposal?

Q.79B: Are the Representations and Certifications to be completed only by the Prime company or by all companies on the team?

A.79: Paragraph L.2.3 specifies Representations and Certifications in Section K must be completed by the Offeror (prime) as part of their proposal package, only the prime must submit this information.

Q.80: DFAR 252.225-7023 Preference for Products or Services from Iraq or Afghanistan. Request this clause be removed as Contractor is not providing any pricing information in the Step 2 bid. Will the Contractor be required to complete a representations and certifications package or each task order.

A.80: See Q&A 74. Specific requirements for Requests for Task Order Proposals will be communicated in the respective solicitation during the Step Three process.

Section L

Q.81: (Reference L.3.1.1) Since each functional area in Attachment 0002 is limited to 400 words for 10a – 10c, where would the Government like the offeror to address the additional requirements for L.3.1.1 (j), L.3.1.1 (j) (a), and L.3.1.1 (j) (b) (i, ii, iii, iv, and v) ? Should the offeror assume that they must add a row above 10a with a number 10 to address these requirements?

A.81: Offerors should address similar experience for L.3.1.1 j a, L.3.1.1 j b, L.3.1.1 j c, L.3.1.1 j d, and L.3.1.1 j e. within the 400 word limit for blocks 10a-10c. Information included in these blocks should be concise and focus on addressing Section M evaluation criteria for Attachment 0002, Attachment 0003, and the Organizational Capability Statement.

Q.82: Reference L.2.13: Is Arial Narrow font acceptable? In order to fully address all of the RFP requirements, PWS task and subtask requirements, we respectfully ask the Government to increase the Organizational Capability Narrative page count from three to six pages. Would ASC consider expanding the text allowed to be 800 words versus 400 words?

A.82: Paragraph L.2.13 was clarified in Amendment 0001. Arial Narrow is not an acceptable font for the Organizational Capability Narrative. The page count limitation for the Organizational Capability Narrative will remain at 3 pages and the word count limitation for Lines 10a-10c in Attachment 0002 will remain at 400 words each.

Q.83: Reference L.3.1.1: Similar Experience states “Small Business Subcontracting Plans will be requested and evaluated during Step Three, Task Order Request for Proposals”. The Step Two BOA RFP includes FAR Clause 52.219-9 Alternate II, which requires submission of a subcontracting plan with the contractor’s proposal. Please confirm no Small Business Subcontracting Plan is required at the Step 2 proposal submission.

A.83: Correct, a Small Business Subcontracting Plan is not required from Offerors as part of the Step Two process.

Q.84: 1. Reference RFP Section L, Paragraph (s) L.2.13, Table 2.1, Attachment 0003 - Organizational Capability, Page(s) 105 of 113.

2. Reference RFP Section L, Paragraph (s) L.3.1.1j, Lines 10a-10c, Summary of Services as they relate to EAGLE PWS at the Subtask Level, Page(s) 106 of 113

3. Reference RFP Section L, Paragraph (s) L.3.1.1j.a., Services performed in terms of full time equivalents, work orders, material release orders, lines of supply, value of managed items, fleet size, or number of movements supported, etc., Page(s) 106 of 113

4. Reference RFP Section L, Paragraph (s) L.3.1.1j.b., Experience with any representative EAGLE missions (DOL, APS, TPE,

LBE, PDTE, NET, NEF, RESET) Page(s) 106 of 113 Q: Since reference 1 limits the response to only 400 words each for lines 10a-10c in Attachment 0003, will the Government consider allowing offerors to provide a supplemental limited attachment/table to lines 10a-10c to provide sufficient supporting experience addressing the full range of detail required in references 1 through 4 as well as the L.3.1.1.j.c, M.3.1.2.2, and M.3.1.2.3 references applicable to each major area (Maintenance, Supply, and Transportation)?

A.84: Word counts will remain unchanged at 400 words for blocks 10a-10c, attachment 0002. The organizational capability narrative will remain unchanged at three pages. Information included in Attachment 0002 and the Organizational Capability narrative should be concise and focus on addressing submission requirements from Section L and how Section M will evaluate for Attachment 0002 and the Organizational Capability Statement.

Q.85: If a contract has a value of over the \$1,000,000 threshold, but no single delivery order meets the \$1,000,000 threshold, may the contract as a whole be cited without citing its individual delivery orders?

A.85: No. IAW paragraph L.3.1.1.a, A task order [or delivery order] constitutes a contract. If multiple contracts and/or task orders [or delivery orders] are listed on one contract reference worksheet, that worksheet will not be evaluated. Note the dollar threshold was changed to \$150,000 in Amendment 0001.

Q.86A: RFP Section L.3.1.1, Paragraph(s) j(a), Page(s) 106 and Attachment 002 Contract Reference Worksheet: Section L instructs us to "Address the services performed, in terms of full time equivalents, work orders, material release orders, lines of supply, value of managed items, fleet size, or number of movements supported, etc." in Attachment 002. There does not appear to be a space provided for this information in Attachment 002. Please clarify where this should go.

Q.86B: RFP Section L.3.1.1, Paragraph(s) j(b), Page(s) 106 and Attachment 002 Contract Reference Worksheet: Section L instructs us to "Address experience with any representative EAGLE missions" in Attachment 002. There does not appear to be a space provided for this information in Attachment 002. Please clarify where this should go.

A.86: Lines 10a-c of Attachment 0002.

Q.87A: RFP Section L, Paragraph L.2.3, Page 104: Although the Government requires a submission of a signed SF-33 (with amendment if any), as well as submission of the entire RFP with fill-ins, it does not indicate which Volume encompasses this document. Recommendation: We recommend the addition of a third Volume: Administrative, which would encompass all the documents referenced in L.2.3.

Q.87B: RFP Section L, Paragraph L.2.3, Page 104 Although the Government requires a submission of a completed Section K, it does not indicate which Volume encompasses this document. Recommendation: We recommend the addition of a third Volume: Administrative, which would encompass all the documents referenced in L.2.3.

Q.87C: RFP Section L, Paragraph L.2.3, Page 104 Although the Government requires a submission of signed subcontractor Letters of Intent, it does not indicate which Volume encompasses these documents. Recommendation: We recommend the addition of a third Volume: Administrative, which would encompass all the documents referenced in L.2.3

Q.87D: L.2.3 - Our interpretation of this paragraph is that the offerors are required to sign and submit one (1) copy of the continuation sheets (Sections A through M) with our proposal (113 sheets). Is this a correct interpretation of Section L? If this is correct, in what volume should the contractor include this document?

Q.87E: Paragraphs L.3.1 and L.3.2 list the requirements for Volumes I and II as two (2) all-encompassing volumes; however, Table 2.1 have the requirements listed as separate files. Does the Government want the required files listed in Table 2.1 to be submitted separately or in their corresponding volume, as described in Paragraphs L.3.1 and L.3.2?

Q.87F: Section L, paragraph L.2.3, Page 104 & Section L, Table 2.1, Page 105: Does the Government require that all 113 pages be submitted? We believe the effect of the transmission will be affected if it is required to submit all pages. Since the section is confusing, will the Government please clarify?

A.87: This solicitation requires Offerors to submit their proposal through ASFI's BRS. Table 2.1 identifies the files that are required for proposal submission. Based on the information provided in Table 2.1, a proposal will have 6 files:

- Attachment 0002 - Contract Reference Worksheet
- Attachment 0003 - Organizational Capability
- Organizational Capability narrative
- Attachment 0004 - Written Consent Form
- Attachment 0005 - Performance Questionnaire
- Signed SF 33 (all the contents of paragraph L.2.3) In accordance with Paragraph L.2.3, the Offeror must submit the following: a signed SF 33, signed solicitation amendments, continuation sheets (sections A-M) [these sheets need not be signed], letter(s) of intent, JV information (if applicable), company POC information for two individuals responsible for reading and responding to ENs through ASSIST.

As noted in paragraph L.1.3.3. - an offeror can break attachments into smaller files if it exceeds 10 Mb. Therefore, an Offeror is not precluded from having more than six files. Instructions for digital file names are provided at paragraph L.2.10.

Q.88: RFP Section L, Paragraph L.2.7, Page 104: The Government requires that each page shall include the complete Offeror name, volume number, date, and solicitation number in a header and/or footer. Does this include the signed SF-33 (with amendment if any), as well as submission of the entire RFP with fill-ins?

A.88: Those digital files containing the SF 33, continuation pages, amendments, and those requiring fill-ins need not have a header and/or footer as noted in L.2.7; however, each of these digital files shall include the respective Offeror's name & file name as noted in L.2.10.

Q.89: The government states that "The Offeror shall provide letters of intent between the prime and its subcontractors, except those only required to achieve socioeconomic subcontracting goals or other goals not related to capability, as well as joint venture agreements if the prime is a joint venture." Letters of Intent are not listed among the requirements in Table 2.1 (Section L, Para. L.2.13, page 105). Should Letters of Intent be included in the proposal and if so is there a designated naming convention to be used for the files (Section L, Para. L.2.10, page 104)?

A.89: Table 2.1 specifies the required SF33 and directs Offerors to see paragraph L.2.3, it is in this paragraph where Letters of Intent are discussed. Instructions for digital file names are provided at paragraph L.2.10.

Q.90A: Reference: RFP Section L, paragraph L.2.3, page 104, requires offerors to provide letters of intent between the prime and its subcontractors; L.3.2.2, on page 107, requires offerors to provide a consent letter for each subcontractor using the Consent Form provided in Attachment 0004.

Question: Is the "letter of intent" referred to in L.2.3 the same as the Consent Form provided in Attachment 0004? If not, what information should be included in the "letter of intent"?

Q.90B: Section L, Paragraph L.2.3, Page 104: What constitutes and acceptable letter of intent or does the Government want copies of formal teaming agreements?

Q.90C: Paragraph L.2.3: Concerning the letters of intent requested, it may be inferred that the consent letters for past performance are a letter of intent. Will the consent letter be sufficient, or does AMC require a separate and distinct letter from the subcontractor indicating their plan to work with the Prime Contractor on ARMY EAGLE?

A.90: The "Letter of Consent" provided as Attachment 0004 is separate from any "Letter of Intent" between an Offeror and its teammates/subcontractors. A "Letter of Intent" is customarily employed as a preliminary understanding of parties that intend to enter into a contract. The specifics of which are for the Offeror to decide. A "Letter of Consent" authorizes the Government to release and discuss a subcontractor's present and past performance information with the prime contractor.

Q.91: Reference: RFP Section L, paragraph L.2.3, page 104 states, "The proposal shall include one (1) signed and completed copy of the Standard Form 33 (SF 33), all solicitation amendments, and continuation sheets (Sections A

through M) ...” Question: Is it your intent for all offerors to submit all sections of the RFP or only those sections affected by an amendment to the RFP and the subsequent continuation sheets and Section K? Question: Because this information has not been identified to be submitted in a designated Volume, should this information be submitted separately and identified as RFP Documents?

A.91: Offerors must submit the RFP in its entirety as stated in L.2.3. See Q&A # 87.

Q.92: Question: Offerors are limited to 400 word descriptions for each major task area (maintenance, supply, transportation). When 400 word descriptions are developed within the appropriate cells and/or cut and pasted into the appropriate cell they can subsequently only be displayed in their entirety (on a computer screen) by double clicking the cell. The contents of the form, including the 400 word descriptions, cannot be printed in their entirety. Therefore, we cannot do an internal quality control audit of our 400 word descriptions using printouts, we are forced to use Excel and double click on each description to review and change each description online as appropriate. A) Please clarify if the government wants to protect the integrity of a one-page form for each contract reference? Or can we force each reference into multiple pages. B) If offerors can't review the 400 word descriptions using printouts, please clarify how the government will review and evaluate each 400 word task description response? Will government reviewers go into Excel and double click on each description cell to read, review, and evaluate each response for each task area?

A.92: For Attachment 0002 - Contract Reference Worksheet, page limitations do not apply. The EXCEL word count feature shall be used as stated in L.2.13.

Q.93: Under Section L, Paragraph L.2.3, page 104 of 113, the Government states the Offeror shall provide letters of intent between the prime and its subcontractors, except those only required to achieve socioeconomic subcontracting goals or other goals not related to capability

Question: Will the Government please provide the information which they would like to be included in the “letters of intent”? Question: Will the Government please advise if copies of teaming agreements satisfy the requirement of “letters of intent”? Question: Will the Government please advise if “letters of intent” are limited to those subcontractors whose past performance will be cited as a reference in the Offerors response?

A.93: See Q&A 90. Yes, teaming agreements satisfy the requirement of Letters of Intent. Yes, Letters of Intent are only required for those team members/subcontractors/JV partners the Offeror is depending upon to demonstrate the Organizational Capability to perform as a Single Logistics Provider.

Q.94: Under Section L, Paragraph L.2.8, page 104 of 113 of the RFP states that “Digital files must be compatible with Microsoft* Office 2007: Word, Excel, PowerPoint, or Access.” Question: Offerors are required to submit copies of “letters of intent” per Paragraph L.3.2.2, and Attachment 4, Consent Form which will include signatures. Will the Government accept PDF attachments for requirements which contain signatures?

A.94: A PDF file is acceptable for the submission of a Letter of Intent and Attachment 0004 - Consent form.

Q.95A: RFP Section L, Paragraph(s) L.2.13, Table 2.1; Page(s) 105 of 113: Please clarify if the 3 page narrative is a single document, referencing all 10 contracts for a total of 3 pages -- or -- 10 separate 3-page narratives, one 3 page narrative for each contract for a total of 30 pages?

Q.95B: Paragraphs L 2.13 (Table 2.1), L 3.1.2.1, and M 3.1.3 , Pages 105, 106, and 111: Is the 3 page limitation for each of the three principal PWS sections (ie, supply, maintenance, transportation)?

A.95: See Q&A # 26.

Q.96: RFP Section L , Paragraph L 2.13 (Table 2.1) , Page 105: Neither Attachment 0002 nor 0003 provide an appropriate area to address the requirements of PWS Paragraph 1.2.1. Will the Government modify the two matrices to include a

specific area (for example, 10d in 0002) to address this requirement?

A.96: The reference to PWS Paragraph 1.2.1 was removed from Table 2.1 (Attachment 0003) in Amendment 0001. PWS Paragraph 1.2.1 shall be addressed in lines 10a-10c of Attachment 0002. This is identified in Table 2.1.

Q.97: Paragraph L.1 , Page 104: Can the Offeror include an Executive Summary? If yes, how many pages will be allowed?

A.97: The Government will not evaluate an Executive Summary. Therefore, the Offeror shall not provide one.

Q.98: Reference RFP Section L.2.4, Paragraph L.2.4, Page 104 of 113. This section states: "The Offeror's proposal shall be submitted as set forth in Table 2.1. The Offeror must not merely re-state the requirements stated in the RFP, but must provide narrative evidence in support of any statements relating to proposed capabilities or similar experience. Proposals must provide documentary evidence in support of any conclusive statements relating to its proposed capability." The reference to Table 2.1 is unclear because we do not see where a Table 2.1 has been provided. Does Table 2.1 refer to Attachment 0002?

A.98: Table 2.1 is provided in narrative format in Section L, page 8 of Amendment 0001.

Q.99: Section L.2.3, pg 104: Does the government prefer the SF33, amendments, Reps and Certs, and Letters of Intent uploaded in separate files or in one file? Does the government prefer MS Word or PDF for these files?

A.99: (Page 7 in Amendment 0001) The SF33, amendments, Reps and Certs, and Letters of Intent shall be named IAW L.2.10. Note the 10mb file upload limit per submission of 5 files communicated in L.1.3.3, this may result in Offerors submitting several batches of files for their proposal to be complete. The Government has no preference (MS Word vs PDF) for these files.

Q.100: Section L.3.1.2.1, pg 106: Due to the large number of requirement bidders must address in the narrative, will the government increase the page limitations to at least five pages?

A.100: See Q&A # 26.

Q.101: The solicitation and the Q&A's keep referring to a proposal Volume 1 and 2 -- We thought Table 2.1 constituted the proposal submission requirements; the six packets described therein make no mention of a Volume 1 and/or 2. Please clarify the use of Volumes 1 and/or 2 and any submission requirements related thereto.

A.101: Volumes I & II refer to the separate volumes of information which an Offeror must provide as specified in L.3 Proposal Content. Table 2.1 is a roll-up summary of the information required for a complete proposal in response to the RFP. L.3 tells Offerors where the information listed in Table 2.1 should be provided in their proposal. Volume I is inclusive of Attachment 0002, Attachment 0003, and the Organizational Capability Narrative. Volume II is inclusive of Attachments 0004 and 0005. The SF33 portion that is noted in L.2.3 is not an evaluation factor and is not placed in separate volume.

Section M

Q.102: Under section M 3.1.3.2.4 page 112 of 113 of the RFP requires the offeror to " Addresses a capability to perform services involving a minimum of two supply classes from PWS paragraph 2.2 grouped as follows: i. Classes of Supply (I, II, IV), ii. Classes of Supply (III, IIIP), iii. Classes of Supply (VII, IX), iv. Class of Supply (V)

It would appear that offerors are only required to address two (2) of the nine (9) classes of supply listed above. But the grouping of classes is confusing and implies the answer must address two (2) of the four (4) grouping of supply classes listed above. Question: Please provide the rationale for the supply class grouping (Class I, II and IV together and so on). Question: Will the government clarify the requirement only requires the offeror to address two (2) of the nine (9) classes

of supply or is the requirement to address two of the four categories that are grouped together under i. through iv.?

A.102: Groupings are provided to ensure Offerors address a range of classes of supply in the organizational capability statement. The criteria is for the Offeror to address two of the four groups. The minimum acceptable number of supply categories is two, with one in each of two classes of supply groups.

Q.103: Paragraph M.3.1.3.2.5: Does M.3.1.3.2.5 reference only Transportation – related services discussed in paragraph PWS 2.3, or does it include all PWS 2.3 subparagraphs?

A.103: Paragraph M.3.1.3.2.5 addresses all of Attachment 0001 PWS paragraph 2.3.

Q.104: Paragraph M.3.1.2.2: Does the offeror have to demonstrate similar experience in all of the subtasks listed in subparagraphs i, ii, and iii on each contract cited, or can the offeror use multiple contract citations to demonstrate this experience?

A.104: The Offeror can use multiple contract citations to demonstrate this experience.

Q.105: Table 2-1 and paragraphs M.3.1.3.1 and M.3.1.3.2 indicate that the Organizational Capability information should provide Attachment 0003 first, followed by the Organizational Capability narrative section. However, paragraphs L.3.1.2.1 and L.3.1.2.2(3) show the narrative first, with Attachment 0003 second. Please clarify the order in which you would like this material to be submitted.

A.105: See Q&A # 87.

Q.106: RFP Section M, Paragraph(s) M 3.1.3.2, Page(s) 111 of 113: Do the evaluation factors at M.3.1.3.2.2 only apply to the Organizational Capability Statement (3 page narrative), as stated in M.3.1.3.2? What about the EAGLE mission information that is requested in Attachment 2? How is that to be evaluated?

A.106: The evaluation factors at M.3.1.3.2.2 only apply to the organizational capability statement. Evaluation criteria for Attachment 0002, Contract Reference Worksheet, is found at paragraph M.3.1.2

Q.107: Paragraph M 3.1.3 , Page 112: This indicates that if a team is composed of a Prime and nine (9) sub-contractors, there is a requirement for a past performance for each of the companies in Attachment 0003. Is this correct?

A.107: In this example, the Offeror must provide a contract reference for each of its subcontractors in order for the Government to evaluate and approve each team member.

Q.108: Paragraph(s) M.3.1.2.2 and M.3.1.2.3, Page(s) 110 of 113: We presume these evaluation factors refer to all 10 contract references submitted in Attachment 2 as a group and not to an individual, single contract reference. Is this presumption correct?

A.108: Yes, the evaluation is based on the total similar experience of the Prime, Team with subcontractors, or Joint Venture.

Q.109: Paragraph(s) M.3.1.3.1, Page(s) 111 of 113: We presume that all the evaluation factors falling under M.3.1.3.1 (M.3.1.3.1.1 through M.3.1.3.1.5) refer to all 10 contract references taken together and submitted as part of the 3 page narrative and not to an individual, single contract reference. Is this presumption correct?

A.109: Paragraph M.3.1.3.1 refers to the evaluation of Attachment 0003. Paragraphs M.3.1.3.2 through M.3.1.3.1.5 refer to evaluation of the organizational capability statement. Both Attachment 0003 and the organizational capability

statement should refer to all 10 contract reference taken together. Available similar experience, supporting the Offeror's proposed capabilities, should be cross-referenced back to specific contracts identified in Attachment 0002.

Teaming Arrangements

Q.110: Reference: Section L.2.3 in Amendment #0001

Referenced paragraph was changed to now read, "The Offeror shall provide letters of intent (including teaming agreement between the prime and subcontractors) between the prime and the subcontractors, identified on Attachment 0002 - Contract Reference Worksheet, as well as joint venture agreements if the prime is a joint venture." The way this reads is now there is a Letter of Intent required (as in the original RFP) but now we are to also include in addition the actual teaming agreements (TA). Why are two documents needed? This seem to be a duplication if you have a Letter of Intent why is the Teaming Agreement required and the same if you submit the TA, why do you need a Letter of Intent? Question: Does the contractor have to provide both Letter of Intent and a copy of the Teaming Agreement as L.2.3 seems to require for each subcontractor shown in Attachment #0002.

A.110: See Q&A # 93.

May 30, 2012

Attachments

Q.111: Please clarify if the Government wants the Offeror to self-certify that it has (or any of its team members/subcontractors/joint venture partners) had any relevant contracts where it experienced performance problems, or is the Offeror required to submit Attachment 0005 to the POC specified in the corresponding Contract Reference Worksheet (Attachment 0002) for each contract?

A.111: As stated in L.3.2.5 of Amendment 0002, the Offeror and each team member/subcontractor/jv partner, etc.. is required to disclose to the Government any relevant contract where it experienced performance problems as specified in Attachment 0005 - Performance Questionnaire. As stated in L.2.4, the Offeror must submit their proposal as set forth in Table 2.1. This form should be included in the Offeror's proposal package and should not be sent directly to the Government by the Offeror's team members/subcontractors/jv partners.

Q112. Is there a requirement to maintain a single page template for Attachment 0002?

A112. As specified in Table 2.1, the EXCEL word count feature will be utilized to to inspect this form. No, there is not a requirement to maintain a single page template.

Section H

Q113. Reference: Section (unnumbered) Small Business Provisions, Joint Ventures, Teaming Agreements, and Subcontracting Para F, page 12. Referenced paragraphs has the sentence "An offeror will also be found to be affiliated with its subcontractor(s) if the offeror is unusually reliant upon its ostensible subcontractors or if the subcontractor(s) will perform primary and vital requirements of a contract." Given the EAGLE requirements for mandatory use any subs proposed in Phase 2 (which means they will perform vital areas to obtaining the BOA award) in Phase 3 this seems to be make those subcontractors affiliated the SB prime. Question: How is will mandatory use of subs in Phase 3 given they were need to get a Phase 2 BOA be viewed by the SBA since the BOA goes for 5 years and hence they will be required to be used during the period for every TO the SB prime bids. It seems that if a SB uses any company as part of their Phase II submittal round out their ability to become fully qualified in all the area required by Section M, they must then use them for the next 5 years for those functions they were listed for in Phase II submittal. That long term use of the same

company for the same function seems to force a SB into an affiliation with another company since they needed them to get the EAGLE BOA award.

A113. A company will not be found to be affiliated with another company solely because it relies upon a subcontractor to perform a portion of a task order.

Section L

Q.114: Reference: Attachment #0002 and RFP Section L.3.1.1.a-k Instructions for Attachment #0002. It appears from the instruction in L.3.1.1.a-k that the name of the contract is not to be used anywhere on Attachment #0002 and especially in Block #1. Question: Is it correct that the name of the contract is not to be listed on Attachment #0002 and only the contract number should be in Block #1 of Attachment #0002?

A.114: The name of the contract is not required.

Q.115: Reference: Attachment #0003 and RFP Section L.3.1.2.2.a-c Instructions for Attachment #0003. It appears from the instruction in L.3.1.2.2.a-c that the name of the contract is not to be used anywhere on Attachment #0003 and especially in Row #3. Question: Is it correct that the name of the contract is not to be listed on Attachment #0003 and only the Cage Code should be in ROW #3 of Attachment #0003?

A.115: The name of the contract is not required.

Q.116: Reference: RFP Section L, paragraph L.2.7, page 104 states, "Each page shall include the complete offerors name, volume number, date, and solicitation number in a header/footer". Question: In order to avoid altering the format and therefore the readability of Attachment 0002 through 0005, will you consider allowing this information to be presented on a title page, thereby eliminating the header/footer requirement?

A.116: Header and footers should be placed in responses as specified in the RFP.

Q.117: Ref Q&A # 43. When developing the 3 page narrative, are written responses needed for 100% of all EAGLE tasks/subtasks (3 tasks, 29 subtasks) or will a checklist suffice?

A.117: A narrative is required.

Q.118. Question: Offerors are limited to 400 word descriptions for each major task area (maintenance, supply, transportation). When 400 word descriptions are developed within the appropriate cells and/or cut and pasted into the appropriate cell they can subsequently only be displayed in their entirety (on a computer screen) by double clicking the cell. The contents of the form, including the 400 word descriptions, cannot be printed in their entirety. Therefore, we cannot do an internal quality control audit of our 400 word descriptions using printouts, we are forced to use Excel and double click on each description to review and change each description online as appropriate.

A) Please clarify if the government wants to protect the integrity of a one-page form for each contract reference? Or can we force each reference into multiple pages.

B) If offerors can't review the 400 word descriptions using printouts, please clarify how the government will review and evaluate each 400 word task description response? Will government reviewers go into Excel and double click on each description cell to read, review, and evaluate each response for each task area?

A.118. For Attachment 0002 - Contract Reference Worksheet, page limitations do not apply. The EXCEL word count feature shall be used as stated in L.2.13.

Q.119. RFP Section L, Paragraph(s) L.2.7, Page(s) 104 of 113: Please clarify which submission documents this requirement

pertains to: all pages submitted in Attachments 2, 3, 4, 5; the 3 Page Narrative; and REPS and CERTS? Or, just the 3 page narrative? Or, a subset of these documents?

A.119. This requirement does apply to Attachments 0002 and 0003. Offerors must use Microsoft Excel to add headers/footers (Insert/Header – Footer/Custom Header- Custom Footer). The SF 33, continuation pages, amendments, and those with fill-ins do not require a header and/or footer.

Q.120. Reference: Section L.2.13.a.6 in Amendment #0001. L.2.13.a.6 stated that all pages must have “1” margins on all sides”. The Attachment #0002 issued by the Government does not have 1” margins they much less than 1” closer to 1/2” on the top and bottom and 5/8” on the right and left sides of Attachment #0002. Question: Is the contractor to adjust the Government’s margins on Attachment #0002 or leave them at the smaller margins as issued?”

A.120. Offerors should not alter the margins of Attachment 0002.

Q.121. Ref Q&A # 43. When developing the 3 page narrative, are written responses needed for 100% of all EAGLE tasks/subtasks (3 tasks, 29 subtasks) or will a checklist suffice?

A.121. A narrative is required.

Q.122. Section L.2.3 indicates “The proposal shall include one (1) signed and completed copy of the Standard Form 33 (SF 33), all solicitation amendments, and continuation sheets (Sections A through M) signed by a person authorized to enter into the proposed Basic Ordering Agreement on behalf of the Offeror..... Offerors shall complete the Representations and Certifications in Section K. Is it the Government’s intent based upon the above, that continuation sheets A through M be submitted in their entirety as part of our proposal submission?”

A.122. Yes.

Q.123. Reference: RFP Section L.2.8, Paragraph(s) _____, Page(s) 104, reads “Digital files must be compatible with Microsoft* Office 2007: Word, Excel, PowerPoint, or Access.” However, on page 10 of the ASFI Vendor Guide, it says: “If you are using Microsoft Office 2007 products, please use the 'Save As' function and choose the 'Office 97-2003' option when saving documents. This will ensure the greatest compatibility for users that have not migrated to Office 2007 and are unable to install the compatibility pack.” Please clarify the version of MS Word, as instructions appear to contradict.

A.123. Army Contracting Command - Rock Island has migrated to Microsoft Office 2007. The instructions provided in Section L of the RFP prevail.

Q.124. Reference: RFP Section L.2.8, Paragraph(s) _____, Page(s) 104, reads “Digital files must be compatible with Microsoft* Office 2007: Word, Excel, PowerPoint, or Access.” Since Excel, Power Point, etc are mentioned, may we assume that these may be used (tables, for example) to clarify a response in Attachment 002 and/or Organizational Capability narrative ?

A.124. It is up to the Offeror to decide how it will present the information in its proposal within the guidelines of Section L.

Q.125. Reference: RFP Section L.2.13 (modified per Amendment 1) . This paragraph addresses formats, page counts, and other metrics generally associated with delivery of a hard copy proposal. Please confirm that no hard-copies of the proposal are required.

A.125. No hard copies of proposals are allowed.

Q.126. Reference: RFP Section: L Paragraph: L.2.13, Page 105: Sentence 5 states there are no font requirements or restrictions but the text should be easily readable. Question: When the Attachment 0002 is printed out, is the expectation that the table should print on an individual page? If not, can the printed version be landscaped? To meet the requirements of 1" margins and foldouts limited to an 8 ½ X 11, the amount of information required to fill out the table and be printed does not meet the "easily readable" requirement to fit on one page. Reference: RFP Section: L Paragraph: L.2.13, Page 105: Sentence 5 states there are no font requirements or restrictions but the text should be easily readable. Question: Since this is an electronic submission, are there any screen viewing requirements for Attachment 0002?

A.126. As stated in Table 2.1, the Limitations for Attachment 0002 are those found in L.2.13.b. The Page Count limitations found in L.2.13.a do not apply to Attachment 0002.

Q.127. Reference: Section L.2.13 Section L.2.13 (4) states, "no smaller than 12-point (smaller fonts are acceptable for graphics, figures, tables, footnotes, and legends)." When completing Attachment 0002, the write-up for each functional area (maintenance, supply, and transportation) is exceeding the maximum allowable Excel cell size. The word count is within the 400 words, but the text extends beyond the maximum cell size, which will cause text to not be printed when the document is printed. Will the government allow a smaller font size for the 400 word write-ups for each functional area?

A.127. As stated in the RFP, the Government is requesting the electronic submission of proposals. An Offeror need not be concerned that "text extends beyond the maximum allowable Excel size." Should the Government find the need to print Attachment 0002, the Government shall do so in such a way that provides for the Offeror's submitted information to be viewable IAW the conditions of the RFP. It is for this reason, in part, that page limitations do not apply to Attachment 0002 and the word count feature of Excel is being used.

Q.128. Reference: RFP Amendment 0001, Section L, paragraph L.3.2.5.

Amendment 1, Section L.3.2.5 indicates the following: Offerors must complete Performance Questionnaire, Attachment 0005....b. The Offeror shall disclose all of its contracts and those of joint venture partners or subcontractors named in Attachment 0002 that were terminated for default or terminated for cause, in whole or in part, within five years of the issue date of this Request for Proposal (RFP) and provide the reason for the termination. This request applies to all contracts of the named parties regardless of whether or not the contract meets the definition of relevance in L.3.2.4 and regardless of whether or not it is listed in Attachment 0002. Will the government clarify that for Item 2 in Attachment 0005 that the words "applies to all contracts" as clarified in Amendment 1 pertains to all contracts with the Federal Government? Or in this context does "applies to all contracts" apply to all contracts with Federal, State and Local governments, and/or US commercial entities?

A.128. "Applies to all contracts" includes all Federal, State, local government and commercial contracts.

Q.129. Reference RFP Section L.2.5, Page 104 Are charts, diagrams, graphs, etc. allowed in the organizational capability narrative?

A.129. Yes; however, per L.2.5 charts, diagrams, graphs, etc. shall not be used as a substitute for narrative text.

Section M

Q.130: Reference: RFP Section M, Paragraph 3.1.3.4.2, 3.1.3.4.3., 3.1.3.4.4, 3.1.3.4.5, Pages 111 and 112. M.3.1.3.4.2, M.3.1.3.4.3, M.3.1.3.4.4, M.3.1.3.4.5 define the groupings of services or support required for acceptability in the Organizational Capability Statement. Must the offeror exhibit capability in all items in a defined group in order to be

deemed acceptable, e.g., must an offeror exhibit capability in the support of APS/Direct Theater Support/Theater Provided Equipment/In-theater Maintenance in order to be acceptable for the group of missions supported – or – does support capability in one (or a subset) of the items in the group constitute acceptability for that group?

A.130: In this example, addressing the capability of either APS, Direct Theater Support, Theater Provided Equipment, or In-theater maintenance will address the capability to provide services for this group.

Q.131: Paragraph M.3.1.2.2: Does the offeror have to demonstrate similar experience in all of the subtasks listed in subparagraphs i, ii, and iii on each contract cited, or can the offeror use multiple contract citations to demonstrate this experience?

A.131: The Offeror can use multiple contract citations to demonstrate this experience.

Annual Review Process

Q.132. Are there specific criteria contractor is required to meet to have BOA renewed each year?

A.132. The contractor will have to agree to whatever updates the Government makes in the terms and conditions of the BOA. If the contractor proposes changes in its approach at the annual review, those changes will have to be determined acceptable by the Government.

June 08, 2012

** Note: the answers to previously posted questions have been amended, see Q&As # 43 & 111. These are identified as Track Changes and are underlined.

Attachments

Q.133a. On Amendment 1 page 8 Table 2.1 the first paragraph it states that PWS 2.4 was added to attachment 2, however, on your updated attachment 2 excel worksheet there is no block for training...only the 3 functional areas are listed. Are we to add another block under transportation as 10d and address training or is the government going to publish a revised attachment 2?

Q.133b. Reference: Amendment 0001, Section A, Item 6; Page 2 of 15, and amended Attachment 002 . The amended Attachment 002 does not include an entry for the required response to PWS 2.4. Please clarify where vendors should enter this response and how many words will be allowed.

A.133. Reference Amendment 0003: the requirement to address PWS paragraph 2.4 in Attachment 0002 was removed.

Q.134. Reference: Amendment 0001, Section A, Item 6, Page 2 of 15, and amended Attachment 003. Are vendors required to address PWS 2.4 in Attachment 003? If so, please clarify where vendors should enter this response.

A.134. See Q&A # 127.

Q.135. Does the statement "present and past performance" refer ONLY to the past performance submitted by the subcontractor for the EAGLE effort?

A.135. In reference to paragraph L.3.2.2, "present and past performance information" refers to any information the Government discovers during the Past Performance evaluation. Note, it is not limited to the past performance submitted by the subcontractor for the EAGLE effort.

Q.136. What is the purpose of listing PWS para 2.1 “Installation Materiel Maintenance Activity” (IMMA) along with the sub-tasks in the Materiel Maintenance Functional area of the Attachment? As we understand IMMA, it is a physical entity, not a specific function. Essentially, 2.1.1 thru 2.1.17 are subordinate functions within the scope of and cross-level to, the IMMA.

A.136. The purpose is to allow the Offerors to identify similar experience and organizational capability to deliver an IMMA capability. *See also Q&A 139.*

Q.137. Reference: RFP Section Attachment_0001_BOA_PWS, Paragraph 2.3.4 Household Goods Operations, Page 13 AND RFP Section L, Paragraph L.3.1.1 Similar Experience, Page 105 of 113. PWS Paragraph 2.3.4 states: “Manage and operate Personal Property Shipping Office (PPSO) functions or Personal Property Processing Office (PPPO) in accordance with DTR Part IV, Personal Property Consignment Information Guide (PPCIG), JTR, JFTR and Service Supplements serving members of the Army, Air Force, Navy, Coast Guard, Marine Corps and DOD civilian employees seeking assistance.” Section L states “Attachment 0002 - Contract Reference Worksheet is located at Attachment 0002 and is provided as a template for identification of similar experience information based on contracts. Instructions for completing attachment are below: a. Line 1 - Identify the contract number (and task order number if applicable). NOTE: A task order constitutes a contract. As a Department of Defense (DoD) approved Transportation Service Provider (TSP), we do business daily with all Military Services transporting general freight & Direct Procurement Method (DPM) shipments thru Government Bills of Lading (GBL) that are procured through the use of Tender of Services (TOS) filed at dedicated Installations. As DPM shipments are part of the Household Goods program, can this business be credited for “Past Performance” versus the noted required past performance under a FAR-Based contract as long as the dollar threshold is met?”

A.137. Experience as a transporter of freight and household goods is not considered similar experience for this subtask.

Q.138. Attachment 0002, Line 8 – Under Place of Performance, this requirement asks us to identify multiple locations if the work was performed in multiple locations. If we are currently supporting 64 FOBs in Afghanistan, should we list each one on the form, or is Afghanistan sufficient?

A.138. Listing Afghanistan is sufficient.

Performance Work Statement (PWS)

Q.139a. Reference: Attachment 0003, line 4: Line 4 of Attachment 0003-Organizational Capability refers to PWS Paragraph 2.1. This would allow for all of the subtasks of Section 2.1 on Attachment 0001- BOA PWS to fall under this one area? Was this meant to be 2.1.1 instead of 2.1?

Q.139b. Reference: Amendment 0001, Section A, Item 6, Page 2 of 15, and amended Attachment 003. We understand that PWS 2.1.3 – 2.1.10 must now be addressed as part of 2.1 in Attachment 003. Attachment 003 now accounts for all PWS three-level headings, with the exception of 2.1.1. Should vendors also address 2.1.1 as part of 2.1.

Q.139c. RFP Section L, Paragraph L.2.13, Table 2.1, page 15 of Amendment 0001 – Under the Required Information for Attachment 0003, there is a new requirement listed that says: “(PWS paragraphs 2.1.3 – 2.1.10 should be addressed when providing response to PWS Paragraph 2.1 – Installation Material Management Activity).” Is this requirement actually supposed to be incorporated into the next paragraph (i.e., Required Information: Organizational Capability Narrative)?

Q.139d. 2.1 in Attachment #3 seems de-synched from Para 2.1 in the PWS which is labeled “Maintenance and Supporting Functions.” If the decision is to leave 2.1 in the Attach #3 cross ref box, then would it make sense to add to 2.2 (Supply) and 2.3 (Transportation Support) to the Supply and Transportation functional sections of Attachment #3?

A.139. You should address paragraphs 2.1.3-2.1.10 in the narrative in block 10a of Attachment 0002. To put an "X" in the

corresponding contract reference column on Attachment 0003 the contractor must have performed all tasks (2.1.3-2.1.10) under the referenced contract.

Q.140. Does the government expect transportation service providers (TSPs) to strictly tender freight using current STAMIS/AIS or can TSPs utilize internal procedures/systems to move cargo quickly, thus improving the installation's effectiveness and potentially reducing cost? Will cargo movement (via truck and rail in CONUS) be tendered through EAGLE Task 2.3.5 at designated installations or will the Global Freight Management (GFM) System or Defense Transportation Coordination Initiative (DTCI) continue to drive the movement of long haul moves/deployments?

A.140. Individual task order competitions in step 3 will identify required STAMIS/AIS. The EAGLE Transportation support capability does not extend to supplying long-haul transportation capability.

Q.141. 2.3.3.1 Operate, maintain and manage the rail transportation service assigned to the installation.

a. Please clarify what is defined as rail transportation service.

b. Will the offeror be responsible for providing Railhead Safety Officer? Loading vehicles onto trucks? Rail loading with assistance of local movement control or rail personnel?

c. Will the responsibilities of the offeror include maintaining track, roadbed, locomotive engines and rolling stock?

d. Will the offeror be responsible for providing locomotive engineers and performing braker/switcher duties?

A.141. The scope of railhead operations are subject to the requirements of each Step 3 task order. In general, Rail transportation service is defined as support provided to the freight section to support oversized and large quantity movements. The Contractor will be responsible for providing Railhead Safety Officer. Contractors must be capable of providing blocking, bracing, tie down and loading. Contractors will not be responsible for maintaining track or roadbed. They will be responsible for maintaining any locomotive engines and rolling stock provided as Government Furnished Equipment. Contractors will be responsible for providing locomotive engineer, conductor, and braker/switcher duties.

Section H

Q.142a. Reference: RFP Section A.6, Paragraph 1, Page 3; Reference: RFP Section H.A.2.b, Paragraph 1, Page 10; Reference: RFP Section H.A.3.b, Paragraph 1, Pages 10-11. Some offerors have teamed with many small businesses across the country to address the full scope and geographic requirements covered by EAGLE. The referenced sections of the RFP make clear that offerors will be required to bid the same companies in task orders that we list in our Organizational Capabilities Worksheet. Potential unintended consequences of this approach include limitation of industry's ability to assemble the best team possible for a downstream task order to meet constraints such as geography, niche mission capabilities, and cost. To maximize industry's ability to employ all its teammates, would the government consider allowing offerors to add a contract reference for each of our teammates so we can include them in downstream task order competitions?

Q.142b. Reference: A, parag. 6: "Offerors must demonstrate the capability to perform all three functional areas. That capability may be achieved with or without teammates. It is assumed that if an Offeror proposes a teaming partner(s) in Step Two, it does so because it is not able to fulfill all requirements of the solicitation without said partner(s). As such, Offerors are required to use that partner(s) in Step Three proposals and in the performance of subsequent task orders unless the capability that the partner provides is not a requirement of the Step Three requirement."

This solicitation appears to favor large corporations who can perform all of the requirements in Step Two with a limited number of subcontractors. Small- and mid-size companies must team to a greater extent; hence will have more team-mates than those annotated in the 10 contract references as per Attachment 0002. To meet the requirements of the RFP and PWS; to choose the companies that have the best capability and best price based upon the task order requirements; and, to substitute for a company that is not available for a given task order, would the Government

consider allowing the prime to use its entire team vice just those who submitted contract references as per Attachment 0002?

Q.142c. Reference: RFP Section A.6, Paragraph 1, Page 3; Reference: RFP Section H.A.2.b, Paragraph 1, Page 10; Reference: RFP Section H.A.3.b, Paragraph 1, Pages 10- 11; Reference: RFP Section L.3.1.1, Paragraph 1, Page 105; Reference: RFP Section L.3.1.2.1, Paragraph 1, Page 106. The subject RFP sections limit offerors to listing at most 10 companies in the Organizational Capabilities Worksheet cross-referenced to the Contract Reference Worksheets and to use these same companies during Step 3 task order bids. This could potentially restrict offerors from bidding task orders in Step 3 when a key subcontractor listed in Step 2 refuses to join the offeror's team for a task order (perhaps to prime the task order itself). In such a case, the offeror might well have other companies on its team with the same capability. If, however, these other companies were not listed in Step 2 due to the limitation of 10 contract references, the offeror could potentially be prevented from bidding by the absence of the single key subcontractor. To mitigate this possibility, would the Government consider removing the language in A.6: "As such, Offerors are required to use that partner(s) in Step Three proposals and in the performance of subsequent task orders unless the capability that the partner provides is not a requirement of the Step Three requirement" and also text from H.A.2.b: "As such, Offerors are required to use that partner(s) in Step 3 proposals and in the performance of subsequent task orders unless the capability that the partner provides is not a requirement of the Step 3 requirement" and the subsequent example, and also the text in H.A.3.b, "The Offeror is required to use approved subcontractor(s) from Step Two in its Step Three proposals and in the performance of resultant Task Orders. The Government will verify that the Offeror is proposing approved subcontractors by comparing the Offerors proposal to the Organizational Capability Worksheet."

Alternatively, would the Government consider allowing industry to provide a team-wide Organizational Capability Worksheet in Step 2, but with only 10 full-scale Contract Reference Sheets for evaluation purposes?

Q.142d. Section H, Amendment 1, Paragraph A2, page 4. We are a small business that requires teammates to meet all functional capabilities. We would like to propose more than 10 teammates to ensure sufficient reach back and strategic partnerships for the anticipated Year 1 requirements. May an Offeror propose more than 10 teammates?

Q.142e. Section H, Amendment 1, Paragraph A 2 (e), Page 4. If an Offeror proposes more than 10 teammates, shall the Offeror introduce their name and CAGE Code in the 3-page narrative?

Q.142f. Section H, Amendment 1, Paragraph A 2 (b,c), Page 4. It appears that there are differing standards for small businesses that require teammates to meet all functional capabilities and larger small businesses that do not require teammates to meet all functional capabilities. The former must propose all teammates in Step 2 and the latter doesn't have to. Would the government consider making this requirement consistent? (i.e., all Offeror's must propose all teammates at Step 2; OR all Offeror's may add additional teammates at Step 3.

Q.142g. RFP Section H.A.3.b, Paragraph 1, Pages 10-11: Assuming a prime offeror bids other companies listed on its Organizational Capability Worksheet for a task order as required, can the offeror also include other companies in that same bid that are not in the Organizational Capability Worksheet?

Q.142h. Reference: Amendment 0001, Page 7, L.2.3 that required Letters of Intent and Teaming Agreements be provided. Question: May we submit Letters and TAs for team members above and beyond those cited in Attachment 0002, contract Reference Worksheet, to indicate the breadth, depth, and contractor uniqueness we offer to ADC? **Q.142i.** Concerning the number of Contract Reference Worksheets, currently limited to 10. We have developed more than 9 sub-contract companies with Cage Code references (bringing the total number of cage code references above 10). Would it be appropriate to include these as additional?

Q.142j. Section M.3.1.3.3: Page 112: By limiting organizational capability to listing only (10) contracts, the evaluation factor automatically prevents an offeror from, "identifying all proposed members for the team on Attachment 0003, Organizational Capability". Please clarify!

Q.142k. Are subcontractors identified in the Organizational Capabilities Narrative, but who do not provide a past performance reference (Attachment 0002) and therefore are not identified in Attachment 0003 Organizational Capability matrix, allowed to be used as a subcontractor in Step Three?

Q.142l. Are we allowed to propose subcontractors who provide depth and regional coverage in the Organizational Capabilities Narrative, but who do not provide a past performance reference (Attachment 0002) and therefore are not identified in Attachment 0003, Organizational Capability matrix? If so, are they allowed to be used as a subcontractor in Step Three?

Q.142m. Ref Q&A # 43. The question dealt with Attach 2 (400 word summaries) and the answer introduces an evaluation factor (M.3.1.3) for organizational capability (Attach 3 and 3-page narrative). Sounds like the 3 page narrative is the only place where offerors can: a) introduce capability without similar experience and b) niche contractors. Is this presumption correct?

A.142. The number of subcontractors that one prime can propose is limited to ten for Year One requirements for Directorates of Logistics (DOL) (maintenance, supply, and transportation support on the identified installation) and Left Behind Equipment (LBE)/Pre-Deployment Training Equipment (PDTE) task orders. Additional team members may be proposed in the Organizational Capability Statement narrative to support the capability to perform the representative missions of Army Prepositioned Stocks (APS)/Theater Provided Equipment (TPE)/In-Theater Maintenance; New Equipment Training (NET)/New Equipment Fielding (NEF); or RESET. You will be allowed to add or change team members/subcontractors proposed for these representative missions in Step Three as these requirements will be advertised as they are known and will be evaluated separately. You will also be afforded the opportunity to add team members/subcontractors for subsequent year DOL/LBE/PDTE requirements.

Q.143. Reference: RFP Section A.6, Paragraph 1, Page 3. Reference: RFP Section H.A.2.b, Paragraph 1, Page 10 Reference: RFP Section H.A.3.b, Paragraph 1, Pages 10-11. When an offeror bids a task order using a company listed in its Organizational Capabilities Worksheet for a particular capability, will the Government confirm that the offeror can share in the task execution for that capability as the Prime?

A.143. The prime may perform any tasks that it demonstrated capability to perform in Step 2.

Q.144a. Reference Question 12. Is the government's intent to allow an offeror to propose a subcontractor in Step 3, for government approval, that was not included in Step 2?

Q.144b. Offerors, especially small businesses, or the smaller large businesses, may cover the performance work areas but not have the required resources in depth or "bandwidth" to effectively perform or bid a desirable task order and thus be at a significant disadvantage. Would the Government consider allowing bidders to include more than itself or multiple subcontractors for each PWS area even if the prime has qualifying past performance in the area so as to be able to effectively compete on the larger or multiple delivery orders?

A.144. A prime contractor may add subcontractors in Step Three for any function/task that it demonstrated the capability to perform itself in Step Two.

Q.145. RFP Section H, Paragraph 3.b, Pages 10-11: The Government requires that all proposed subcontractors in Step 2 be proposed on any relevant Task Orders in Step 3, however, the Government does not address what is allowed/required if the proposed subcontractor is either unwilling or unable to perform the proposed work in Step 3.

Will the prime contractor then be permitted without prejudice to propose an alternate subcontractor not previously identified, to perform the work? Recommendation: We recommend that if a proposed subcontractor is unable or unwilling to participate in a Task Order proposal submitted by the prime, the prime contractor be allowed to propose alternate subcontractors, provided that the prime includes written notification from the originally proposed Step 2 subcontractor indicating their intent to not bid a Task Order as part of the team.

A.145. It is up to each offeror, large and small, to build teams that provide it with the capability, capacity, and competitive advantage necessary to be successful in Step 3. Prime Contractors will not be permitted to propose an alternative subcontractor that was not previously identified (evaluated and approved in Step Two). BOA holders who wish to have a new approach evaluated may do so during the annual review of the BOA.

Q.146. RFP Section H, Paragraph 3.c, Page 11: The Government is allowing Offerors proposing without subcontractors in Step 2 the option to add subcontractors in Step 3 if issued a BOA. Will the Government consider allowing all BOA awardees the option of adding additional subcontractors on a case-by-case basis at Step 3? Recommendation: As this

limitation seems to give advantage to Offerors without subcontractors, we recommend that all Offerors be permitted to add subcontractors on a case-by-case basis.

A.146. No, the Government will not allow all BOA holders the option of adding subcontractors on a case-by-case basis at Step Three. BOA holders who wish to have a new approach evaluated may do so during the annual review of the BOA.

Q.147. Paragraph 2.b, page 10: Assume a prime offer has received a BOA in Step 2 by proposing themselves and subcontracting team members to fulfill any capability gaps.

Q1. As long as the subcontracting team members proposed in Step 2 are used, is the Prime able to use additional subcontracting team members in a Step 3 Task Order?

Q2. In response to a Step 3 Task Order, must Company A use Company B, who was proposed in Step 2, for all of the work in that supply functional area?

Q3. Assume Company A is a Small Business (SB) and a SB Task Order is released which Company A intends to submit a TO Response. If the maintenance and transportation functional areas combined make up less than 50% of the contract's labor dollars, then based on requirements of CFR 13 §125.6, is Company A prohibited from submitting an offer?

A.147. Q1. The prime contractor may add subs only for those tasks that it was determined capable in Step 2 of performing itself. Q.2. Reference Q&A # 10. Q3. Company A would not be eligible to submit a proposal in response to a task order that was set-aside for small business if it were not performing at least 50% of the cost of labor with its own employees.

Q.148. Reference: Questions 10 A-F. In response to the answers provided for Question 10 A-F, additional clarification is requested. If a prime contractor proposes to self-perform (use no subcontractors) specific areas of the PWS, as shown by attachment 0003, but has proposed teaming partners in other areas, will the prime contractor be allowed to add or delete subcontractors for the areas proposed to be self-performed? Additionally, if the prime contractor has proposed a large business partner for a specific performance area, but later determines that a small business could perform that tasking under a specific task order, will the prime be allowed to bid a non-approved small business in the place of an approved large business partner to meet small business goals?

A.148. See Q&As 185 & 189.

Section I

Q.149. Reference Clauses 52.246-19 Warranty of Systems and Equipment Under Performance Specifications or Design Criteria - Alt I, 52.246-19 Warranty of Systems and Equipment Under Performance Specifications or Design Criteria, and 52.246-20 Warranty of Services: Please confirm that if supplies are corrected or replaced and/or services re-performed then warranty on those correct supplies or services will continue for the duration of the warranty period and not restart. Please clarify how the Government will determine if the requirement to re-perform a service is a result of Contractor error or an external factor that resulted in an issue that requires re-performance.

A.149. Warranty requirements will be addressed in Step 3 RFPs.

Q.150. Reference Clause 52.215-23 - LIMITATIONS ON PASS-THROUGH CHARGES: Please confirm that the 70% subcontracting requirement on the Limitation of Pass Through Charges is calculated at the BOA level and not by task order. Will it be calculated annually?

A.150. A BOA is not a contract pursuant to FAR 16.703 (a) (3). Any limitation on pass-through charges will be applied to the Task Order. Pass-through charges will be reviewed by the respective contracting officer IAW FAR 52.215-22 &

52.215-23.

Q.151. Reference Sections PWS 2.3.9 Arrival/Departure Airfield Control Group (A/DACG), Paragraph 2.3.9.1, Page 14 of 2. Question: Please clarify whether this scope will require the inclusion of DFAR 252.228-7001 Ground and Flight Risk into the RFP.

A.151. Use of this clause is at the discretion of the Contracting Officer and may be employed during the Step Three process if determined to be in the best interest of the Government. Specifics as to how the clause will be applied will be communicated at that time if it is incorporated in the resulting Task Order contract.

Section L

Q.152. Reference RFP Section L.2.3, Paragraph L.2.3, Page 104 of 113. This section states that the offeror shall provide Letters of Intent between the prime and its subcontractors, except those only required to achieve socioeconomic subcontracting goals or other goals not related to capability. If the offeror is not submitting technical similar experience and organizational capability of their subcontractors, are letters of intent still required?

A.152. Any subcontractor that will perform PWS tasks and that is required by the prime to demonstrate capability must be identified in Step 2 and must have a letter of intent. If the prime contractor demonstrates in Step Two the capability to perform the function/task itself, it is not required to identify subcontractors in Step Two and therefore is not required to submit letters of intent for subcontractors not included in the proposal.

Q.153. When a small business is on a large business team BOA and is providing a need capability to the large business, what happens if the small business decides not to bid a task order with the large business? Can the large business substitute another small business? What is the process?

A.153. BOAs will be issued to prime contractors, not to teams of contractors. In this example the prime contractor could propose another subcontractor only if, as the prime, it also demonstrated the capability in Step 2 to perform the same functions as the subcontractor or if it proposed an alternate subcontractor in Step 2 that was determined capable.

Q.154. RFP Section L, Paragraph(s) L.3.1.2.2.a, Page(s) 106 of 113: Please clarify exactly what is expected in response to L.3.1.2.2.a since we already provided this information in response to L.3.1.2.1. (L.3.1.2.1 Submit a narrative describing the organizational capability of the offeror to fully meet the EAGLE functional requirements of maintenance, supply, and transportation services to a subtask level of detail). Does the government expect the same response in both sections or something different in each section? We suggest removing L.3.1.2.2.a as a requirement since it is redundant.

A.154. L.3.1.2.2.a refers to the narrative in L.3.1.2.1. that requires the Offeror to provide an organizational capability statement for the Prime, team, or Joint Venture. This is a restatement of the L.3.1.2.1 requirement and does not require a separate submission. The paragraph will remain unchanged.

Q.155. RFP Paragraph L.3.1.1, page 105: Please confirm that Offerors will be able to add subcontractors at Step 3 to meet small business goals required by specific task orders.

A.155. Offerors that demonstrated capability without subcontractors may add them in Step 3. Subcontractors for supplies or services that do not involve performance of PWS tasks may also be added.

Q.156. RFP Section L, Paragraph(s) L.3.1, Page(s) 106 of 113: L.3.1.1.j.b asks for mission experience to be provided in Attachment 2 as part of three 400 word functional task descriptions. L.3.1.2.2 asks for mission experience to be provided as part of the 3 page narrative. There is no corresponding evaluation factor in Section M for mission experience placed in

Attachment 2. The only evaluation factors in Section M for mission capability are provided at M 3.1.3.2.2, which is part of M 3.1.3.2, the evaluation factors for the Organizational Capability Statement (3 page narrative). The evaluation factors at M.3.1.3.2.2 state the government will evaluate the offeror's capability to perform a minimum of three groups of EAGLE missions [implied-as provided in the 3 page narrative]. Also the EAGLE mission list in Section L is different from the EAGLE mission list in Section M. (see below) L.3.1.1.j.b.i: Directorates of Logistics (DOL) (maintenance, supply, and transportation support) M.3.1.3.2.2: DOL made up of IMMA/CIF/SSA/TMP/ITO/ASP. Question: Please clarify the makeup of EAGLE missions and how many and how and where EAGLE mission experience is to be provided and how the information will be evaluated.

A.156. EAGLE missions are listed in PWS para 1.2.1. Evaluation criteria for EAGLE missions are located at paras M 3.1.3.2.2 and M 3.1.3.4.2. Experience with EAGLE missions, if available, should be provided in attachment 0002 under the appropriate functional areas (10a, 10b, or 10c). The ability to perform EAGLE missions that are not supported by experience will be evaluated as stated capabilities provided in the organizational capability statement. Evaluation criteria for EAGLE Mission capability is located in paragraphs M 3.1.3.2.2 and M 3.1.3.4.2.

Q.157. RFP Section L, Paragraph(s) L.3.1.2.1, Page(s) 106 of 113: PWS Paragraph 1.2.1 does not describe functional requirements for maintenance, supply, and transportation as stated in L.3.1.2.1 but rather it itemizes the EAGLE mission groups. Please clarify the references to PWS 1.2.1 as used in the RFP.

A.157. The purpose of referencing para 1.2.1 in L 3.1.2.1 is to identify the population of representative missions that should be addressed in the organizational capability statement, in addition to the functional areas/subtasks. The requirement is restated in L.3.1.2.2b for emphasis. The evaluation paragraphs are at M 3.1.3.2.2 and M 3.1.3.4.2.

Q.158. Ref Q&A # 37. Since capabilities stated in the 3 page narrative are supposed to refer back to a contract number in Attachment 2, how are offerors to identify/highlight these limited number of "proposed organizational capabilities" which are inserted into the 3 page narrative?

A.158. It is up to the Offeror to adequately identify in writing these proposed organizational capabilities to perform the subtasks not covered by similar experience. Offerors should focus on the evaluation criteria to address what is being evaluated. Do not include marketing information or areas not pertinent to the areas under evaluation. For subtasks that are supported by similar experience, the contract reference numbers should be used to avoid restating details already provided. Example: If you have done maintenance on 250 M1 in Kuwait annually as noted in contract reference 1, then for organizational capability you need only to identify they you perform maintenance on track vehicles (CR1).

Q.159. References: Amendment 0001, Section L.3.2.4.a, Page 10 of 15: "Recent contracts which provided services in any of the three functional areas of Maintenance, Supply, and/or Transportation services; representative missions; maintain equipment; or manage classes of supply as outlined in Section L.3.1.1;" and Amendment 0001, Section M.3.1.3.2.2, item(s) i "Direct Theater Support/Theater Provided Equipment/ In-theater maintenance;" and Item v "RESET;" and Section M.3.1.3.2.3, item i "Major Weapon Systems," Page 13 of 15. We fully understand that EAGLE will not include any Aviation Maintenance tasks or activities. However, for the purposes of meeting the Relevancy Clauses for representative missions and maintaining equipment and classes of supply, as well as providing Direct Theater Support and In-Theater Maintenance and Reset activities, do Rotary Wing aircraft (e.g. AH-64 Apache), constitute as a "Major Weapon System", and does providing direct maintenance support and RESET activities on such types of aircraft for the US Army in the Southwest Asia Theater considered Direct Theater Support and In-Theater Maintenance? According to the DOD definition of a major weapon system: "One of a limited number of systems or subsystems which, for reasons of military urgency, criticality, or resource requirements, is determined by the Department of Defense as being vital to the national interest." Please confirm whether or not an AH-64 Apache is considered a "major weapon system".

A.159. Yes, for the purposes of similar experience, the AH-64 is considered a major weapons system. Ensure descriptions of similar experience cover the scope of the maintenance performed.

Q.160. If a large business is a non-exclusive sub on multiple BOA teams (a common industry practice) with each led by a small business prime, what happens to the other teams when the large business decides (also according to common industry practice) to bid a task order exclusively with only one small business prime? In other words, should small business primes have more than one large business on their team in case a large business sub team member decides not to bid on a task order with them?

A.160. It is up to each offeror, large and small, to build teams that provide it with the capability, capacity, and competitive advantage necessary to be successful in Step 3. It is permissible to propose multiple subcontractors with the same capabilities to increase capacity or to have an alternate subcontractor available in case one subcontractor is not willing to bid a particular requirement.

Q.161. RFP Section L, Paragraph(s) L.3.1.1, Page(s) 105 of 113: Regarding the instructions for filling in Attachment 2, Lines 2 through 7: If we are a sub to a large prime on a reference contract, where do we put our name? In line 2? Line 4? Do we put the name of the large prime in Line 2 (even though they are not subcontracting to us on EAGLE) and our name in Line 4? We don't seem to fit the criteria for Line 4 as we are not a proposed EAGLE subcontractor but rather an EAGLE prime. Please clarify.

A.161. In your example, lines 2 and 3 should identify the large prime to whom you were a subcontractor. Lines 4 & 5 should identify your company information. Line 6 should identify your company name and line 7 should identify your role on EAGLE is the Prime Contractor

Q.162. Reference is made to Section L.2.13, Table 2.1, page 105 of subject solicitation. Table 2.1 identifies the PWS paragraphs to be addressed in Attachment 0002, Attachment 0003, and the Organizational Capability Narrative. The PWS paragraphs listed include 1.2.1, 2.0, 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3. However, the PWS has an additional item 2.4 Training. Would you kindly confirm whether or not it is the Government's intention for Offerors to address PWS item 2.4 in their responses on Attachments 0002 and 0003 and the Organizational Capability Narrative.

A.162. Table 2.1 was updated in Amendment 0003. Note that PWS paragraph should be addressed in the Organizational Capability narrative.

Q.163. Reference: RFP Attachment_0005_Performance_ Questionnaire. Paragraph 1 states, "Has the Offeror or any of its team members/subcontractors/joint venture partners had any relevant contracts where it experienced performance problems?" The government's response to questions dated May 3, 2012, Answer A6, third sentence says " Offerors are, however, required to provide the requested information for any contract held by the prime or any team members." For some offeror's, particularly large business, providing the requested information for any contract held by the prime or any team members could be hundreds of pages. Is it the government's intent for contractors to provide explanation for any relevant contracts rather than any contracts held by the prime or any team member? If the government wants it for any contract, is there a time frame, such as the last year, that the government is limiting the information to?

A.163. Amendment 0003: Reference paragraph L.3.2.5.a - "The offeror shall identify all RELEVANT contracts where it or any of the joint venture partners or subcontractors named on Attachment 0002 experience any performance problems." Reference paragraph L.3.2.5.b - "The offeror shall disclose ALL of its contracts and those of joint venture partners or subcontractors named in Attachment 0002 that were terminated for default or terminated for cause, in whole or in part, within five years of the issue date of this RFP...."

Q.164. What is the designated file name for the Letter of Intent?

A.164. Reference paragraph L.2.10.

Q.165. Section L.2.4, pg 104 states “Proposals must provide documentary evidence in support of any conclusive statements relating to its proposed capability”. Aside from Attachment 2, Please clarify what constitutes “documentary evidence”.

A.165. When there is similar experience, documentary evidence involves providing a contract reference with associated narrative in attachment 0002, referencing that experience in the organizational capability statement, and annotating attachment 0003 with an "X" for subtask capability. When there is no similar experience, documentary evidence involves providing a viable approach in the organizational capability statement to support establishing a capability and properly annotating attachment 0003 with a "Z" for subtask capability.

Section M

Q.166a. Reference: M.3.1.2.2.: The RFP requires “demonstrated similar experience” in STAMIS/AIS in the areas of Maintenance, Supply and Transportation. The PWS lists Maintenance STAMIS/AIS systems in Para 2.1.17, Supply STAMIS/AIS systems in Para 2.2.9, and Transportation STAMIS/AIS systems in Para 2.3.11. STAMIS/AIS cover a large number of systems that are in various stages of enhancement and/or replacement. The RFP and PWS are vague as to the desired scope of “demonstrated similar experience.” This could be: Automated Management Information System experience in the generic categories of Supply, Maintenance and Transportation, or Similar experience in each system listed in the PWS. Companies that have demonstrated experience in Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) type systems in each of the three categories should be readily capable of rapid assimilation of new modules/systems. A requirement that interprets “demonstrated similar experience” in each of the systems listed in the PWD could radically restrict smaller companies. One approach to foster increased competition and take into account the fact that STAMIS/AIS applications will evolve over the life of EAGLE would be to: Approve generic STAMIS/AIS in Step 2, and then Address specific STAMIS/AIS expertise in each Step 3 task order. The specific STAMIS/AIS expertise cited could then be current and pertinent to the specific task order. Clarification by the Army on this issue would help ensure that quality proposals are submitted and make evaluation of the proposals easier. Question: Will the contractor have to provide “demonstrated similar experience” in each of the systems outlined in the PWS or “demonstrated similar experience” in the three generic categories (supply, maintenance, and transportation)?

Q.166b. Reference: RFP Section M, Paragraphs 3.1.2.2, 3.1.2.5, Pages 110, 111:

1. For evaluation of Attachment 0002, is it expected that the offeror exhibit experience with all STAMIS/AIS noted in PWS sections 2.1.17, 2.2.9, and 2.3.11 in order to be deemed acceptable? 2. If the answer above is NO, what specific STAMIS/AIS are offerors required to demonstrate experience with in order to be deemed acceptable? 3. Are there additional STAMIS/AIS that the government is expecting offerors to demonstrate experience with, other than those listed in PWS section 2.1.17, 2.2.9, and 2.3.11, the absence of which on Attachment 0002 or the Organizational Capability Statement, will deem the offeror’s submission unacceptable? If so, what are they?

A.166. The Government understands that the number and complexity of STAMIS/AIS operated will be different from task order to task order. Offerors are not required to provide experience in each individual STAMIS/AIS identified in Attachment 0001 paragraphs 2.1.17, 2.2.9.3, and 2.3.11. STAMIS/AIS identified in proposal should be the STAMIS used in performing the referenced contract. You need to have used at least one STAMIS to record an "X" for the contract reference in Attachment 0003.

Q.167a. Reference: RFP Section M, Paragraphs 3.1.2.2, 3.1.2.3, 3.1.2.5, 3.1.2.6, 3.1.3.1, 3.1.3.3, Pages 110, 111, 112: 1. Must the offeror exhibit experience and capability in all 29 subtask areas evaluated on both Attachment 002 and 003 to be deemed acceptable and, if not, why are the 29 subtask areas being evaluated differently on Attachment 0002 and Attachment 0003, i.e., partial capability acceptable for Attachment 002 and full capability required for Attachment 0003? 2. How will Attachment 0002 and Attachment 0003 be evaluated for acceptability?

Q.167b. RFP Section M, Paragraph(s) M 3.1.2, Page(s) 110 of 113: Most of the sub factors under evaluation factors M.3.1.2 state offerors will be evaluated for performing a subset (3, 4, 5 subtasks) of each EAGLE functional area (maintenance, supply, transportation) rather than 100% of each EAGLE functional task and subtasks. Please clarify that

EAGLE offerors do not have to meet 100% of the PWS requirements.

Q.167c. M.3.1.3.2.5: This paragraph states: “It is acceptable to propose an organizational capability, in a limited number of subtask areas, when that capability is not supported by similar experience.” Could you please clarify what types of organizational capabilities the Government will accept as an alternative to similar experience?

Q.167d. Relative to Organizational Capability Statement, it is stated in M.3.1.3.2.5 that: “It is acceptable to propose an organizational capability, in a limited number of subtask areas, when that capability is not supported by similar experience.” This statement is confusing and unclear. The statement is also contradicted by the acceptability criterion that follows it in M.3.1.3.4.1. Additionally, Section L.3.1.2.1 specifically states, relative to the Organizational Capability Statement, that: “...capability must be cross-referenced back to Attachment 0002 – Contract Reference Worksheet using the contract cross-reference number.”

1. What, specifically is meant/intended by the statement, “It is acceptable to propose an organizational capability, in a limited number of subtask areas, when that capability is not supported by similar experience”?
2. What is the “limited number of subtask areas” that is acceptable?
3. How could an offeror respond per the statement in M.3.1.3.2.5 and still be deemed acceptable given the instructions in Section L and the evaluation criteria in Section M?

A.167. The offeror is required to propose organizational capability in all subtask areas to be acceptable, but does not need to demonstrate similar experience on Attachment 0002 for all of the listed subtasks. M.3.1.2.2 and M.3.1.2.3 establish the criteria for acceptability. Those subtasks that cannot be supported by similar experience (attachment 0002) and summarized on (attachment 0003) should be proposed in the Organizational Capability narrative. (For subQ’s c & d, referenced statement was removed in Amendment 0003.)

Q.168. Section M.3.1.2.2: Page 110-111: The evaluation presented by the Government for the offeror to demonstrate (similar experience) in this paragraph does not correlate to the how the Government will evaluate in Section M.3.1.2.5, demonstrate (experience). Please clarify whether the Government will evaluate the offeror demonstrating “similar experience”; or whether the Government will evaluate the offeror demonstrating only “experience” in each subtask area.

A.168. Section M.3.1.2.2 (acceptable “similar experience”) is aligned with Section M.3.1.2.5 (unacceptable “similar experience”). Similar experience is being evaluated.

Q.169. Paragraph M 3.1.3.2.5: Section M 3.1.3.2.5 does not reference any specific PWS paragraph(s) as the description of the ‘services’ that an offeror must be able perform to support the ‘transportation capability areas’. Sections M.3.1.3.2.2-M.3.1.3.2.4 all reference specific PWS paragraphs. Should M.3.1.3.2.5 reference PWS 2.3 Transportation Support?

A.169. The services identified in M.3.1.3.2.5 come from the STAMIS area groupings provided in attachment 0001, PWS para 2.3.11. The intent is to ensure that transportation services are address in the organizational capability statements. Offerors are instructed to address these services in generic terms associated with installation logistics services using the services in PWS para 2.3.

Q.170. If the offeror is expected to address all services in Transportation – (PWS section 2.3 subparagraphs that is 3.5 pages in length), will the Government consider increasing the page count of the Organizational Capability Statement from 3 pages to 6 pages, so the offeror can sufficiently address all such services for each of the three (or more) transportation capability areas?

A.170. The Offeror is expected to provide an organizational capability statement. The 3 page limit is considered adequate given the ability to reference similar experience using the attachment 0002 contract reference numbers. In-depth explanations of functional areas are not required. Focus should be on how the Prime, team, or Joint Venture is capable of delivering EAGLE services.

Q.171. Paragraph M.3.1.2.2: Does the offeror have to demonstrate similar experience in all of the subtasks listed in subparagraphs i, ii, and iii on each contract cited, or can the offeror use multiple contract citations to demonstrate this experience?

A.171. The Offeror can use multiple contract citations to demonstrate this experience.

Q.172. M 3.1.3.2.2 : Which represents what is meant by “three” – either

- the offeror needs to have experience within three of the following five enumerated mission groups, or
- the offeror is to provide three contract references for each of the five mission groups. Request clarification.

A.172. Paragraph M.3.1.3.2.2 is the evaluation criteria for the organizational capability statement for representative missions. The Government will evaluate the organizational capability statement for the offeror’s proposal to provide the services required in three or more of the representative mission groupings. Similar experience is not required for all areas. When there is similar experience to support the organizational capability, this experience must be cross-referenced back to Attachment 0002, Contract Reference Worksheet using the contract cross reference number.

Q.173. Ref Q&A # 10. Please clarify what constitutes an "acceptable offeror approach" to proposing multiple subcontractors.

A.173. Evaluation factors for award (i.e. execution of a BOA) are provided in Section M of solicitations. See paragraph M.3. in Amendment 0001.

Q.174. M.3.2.7 Please provide examples of criteria that would cause the gov to have " a reasonable expectation that the offer will not be able to successfully perform the required effort".

A.174. Reference FAR 15.305 (a) (2) (i). The currency and relevance of the information, source of the information, context of the data, and general trends in contractor’s performance shall be considered.

Q.175. In the answer for Question 43 from the 3 May 2012 Q&A release, it states that M.3.1.3 allows a limited number of subtasks to be proposed without similar experience and that this allowance could be used to include team members that provide niche capability. Since the Government has indicated that Prime Contractors that use subcontractors to win Step Two BOAs cannot add subcontractors at the Step Three RFP stage, can or should subcontractors that are not included in the Attachments 0002 and 0003 be identified in the 3 page Organizational Capabilities Narrative? Would this make it allowable for these subcontractors to be used in Step Three proposals? if we can (and do) include a subcontractor only in the 3 page Organizational Capabilities Statement, do we need to include a signed Attachment 0004 Subcontractor Letter and teaming agreement document with our submittal?

A.175. No letters of intent are required for team members/subcontractors proposed in the Organizational Capability Statement narrative to support the capability to perform the representative missions of Army Prepositioned Stocks (APS)/Theater Provided Equipment (TPE)/In-Theater Maintenance; New Equipment Training (NET)/New Equipment Fielding (NEF); or RESET. *See also Q&A 142.*

Q.176. Based on the responses to several Section M questions in the 3 May 2012 Questions and Answers we interpret the guidance as follows: Attachment 0003 matrix is to identify organizational capabilities to be provided by up to 10 team members. Must every subtask block be checked? Is this a correct interpretation?

A.176. Yes, Attachment 0003 summarizes the information provided in the organizational capability statement for the prime, subcontractors or joint venture partners. The offeror is required to propose an organizational capability to perform all 29 subtasks listed on the attachment; therefore an offeror must check all of the subtasks. M.3.1.2.2 and M.3.1.2.3 address the minimum criteria for acceptability. For situations where similar experience is not available to

support an organizational capability, place a Z in each row that signifies a capability proposed for the offeror/joint venture partner/subcontractor represented in the column, but not supported by experience from the applicable contract reference. Capabilities proposed but not supported by experience derived from the contract reference (Zs) must be supported in the Organizational Capability Narrative.

Q.177a. 1. Reference RFP Section L, Paragraph (s) L.2.13, Table 2.1, Attachment 0003 - Organizational Capability, Page(s) 105 of 113 2. Reference RFP Section L Paragraph (s) L.2.13, Table 2.1, Organizational narrative, Page(s) 105 of 113. Q: There appears to be an inconsistency with References 1 and 2. Reference 1 seems to require PWS paragraphs 1.2.1, 2.0, 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 to be addressed as part of Attachment 0003 with no applicable page limitation. However, Attachment 0003 is a one page document with 29 PWS subparagraphs under Maintenance, Supply, and Transportation to be completed per specific L.3.1.2.3 (corrected reference) instructions. Reference 2 also requires PWS paragraphs 1.2.1, 2.0, 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 to be addressed but as part of the Organizational Capability narrative with a 3 page limitation. Please clarify the Government's requirements for Reference 1.

Q.177b. Based on the responses to several Section M questions in the 3 May 2012 Questions and Answers we interpret the guidance as follows: the Organizational Capabilities Narrative should address capability for every subtask. If more than 10 team members are required to cover all subtasks, those not identified in the Attachment 0003 matrix can be identified in the narrative. Is this a correct interpretation?

Q.177c. Based on the responses to several Section M questions in the 3 May 2012 Questions and Answers we interpret the guidance as follows: for those subtasks, and/or subcontractors that do not have contracts identified in Attachment 0002, their experience and capability can be addressed in the Organizational Capabilities Narrative. Is this a correct interpretation?

Q.177d. Based on the responses to several Section M questions in the 3 May 2012 Questions and Answers we interpret the guidance as follows: every contract cited in Attachment 0002 must correlate to a prime or subcontractor identified in Attachment 0003. But subcontractors identified in Attachment 0003 may not necessarily have a past contract listed in Attachment 0002. In those cases, their experience is to be addressed in the Organizational Capabilities Narrative. Is this a correct interpretation?

Q.177e. Reference L.3.1.2.1: Can you please elaborate on what you would like to see in our Organizational Capability Narrative? Is this to be a summary of our capabilities as already described in our Attachment 2? Can the narrative contain charts and/or tables?

A.177. Attachment 0003 is a one page document with 29 subtasks that summarize the information in the organizational capability statement for the prime, subcontractors or joint venture partners. Capabilities are summarized by placing an "X" in the appropriate subtask row, where organizational capability is proposed based on experience demonstrated in Attachment 0002, and aligned with the appropriate Prime-subcontractor-joint venture partner column. Place a Z in each row that signifies a capability proposed for the offeror/joint venture partner/subcontractor represented in the column, but not supported by experience from an applicable contract reference. Capabilities proposed but not supported by experience derived from the contract reference (Zs) must be supported in the Organizational Capability Narrative. The Organizational Capability Narrative represents the Offeror's opportunity to propose, in narrative form, the full capabilities proposed by the prime, subcontractor or joint venture partners to satisfy the requirements of L.3.1.2.2 that may or may not be supported by experience shown in Attachments 0002 and 0003.

Q.178. Based on the responses to several Section M questions in the 3 May 2012 Questions and Answers we interpret the guidance as follows: Attachment 0002, limited to 10 contracts, should address experience in as many Attachment 0003 subtasks as possible, but might not cover every subtask in Attachment 0003. Those subtasks not covered in Attachment 0002 can be identified in the 3 page Organizational Capabilities Narrative. Is this a correct interpretation?

A.178. Yes.

Q.179. M 3.1.3.2.3 : Which represents what is meant by "three" - either

- the offeror needs to have experience within three of the following five enumerated equipment types, or

- the offeror is to provide three contract references for each of the five equipment types

Request clarification

A.179. Paragraph M.3.1.3.2.3 is the evaluation criteria for the organizational capability statement for types of equipment maintenance. The Government will evaluate the organizational capability statement for the offeror's proposal to provide the services required in three or more of the enumerated equipment types. Similar experience is not required for all types of equipment. When there is similar experience to support the organizational capability, this experience must be cross-referenced back to Attachment 0002, Contract Reference Worksheet using the contract cross reference number.

Q.180. M 3.1.3.2.4 : Which represents what is meant by "two" - either

- the offeror needs to have experience within two of the following four enumerated class groups, or
- the offeror is to provide two contract references for each of the four class groups

Request clarification

A.180. Paragraph M.3.1.3.2.4 is the evaluation criteria for the organizational capability statement for services involving various supply classes. The Government will evaluate the organizational capability statement for the offeror's proposal to provide the services required in two or more of the indicated supply classes. Similar experience is not required for all supply classes. When there is similar experience to support the organizational capability, this experience must be cross-referenced back to Attachment 0002, Contract Reference Worksheet using the contract cross reference number.

Q.181. M 3.1.3.2.5 : Which represents what AMC means by "three" - either

- the offeror needs to have experience within three of the following five enumerated transport services, or
- the offeror is to provide three contract references for each of the five transport services

Request clarification

A.181. Paragraph M.3.1.3.2.4 is the evaluation criteria for the organizational capability statement for services involving various supply classes. The Government will evaluate the organizational capability statement for the offeror's proposal to provide the services required in two or more of the indicated supply classes. Similar experience is not required for all supply classes. When there is similar experience to support the organizational capability, this experience must be cross-referenced back to Attachment 0002, Contract Reference Worksheet using the contract cross reference number.

Q.182. Ref Q&A # 14. Please clarify this answer. How can the government assume that proposed subcontractors for a particular subtask execute all subtasks under that EAGLE functional area? Did the government mean to say all functions under that subtask?

A.182. Yes, Any function under that subtask.

Step Three Requirements

Q.183. In reviewing the various EAGLE documents including the PWS, there are multiple references to what many call installation supply support functions. However, there is no specific mention, either inclusive or exclusive, of that part of installation supply support, which some refer to as SSSCs ~ self service supply centers. Are SSSCs included in the EAGLE program ?

A.183. "Self-Service Supply" does not apply to the Installation Logistics Supply which falls under the EAGLE program.

Q.184. Reference: RFP Section A, Paragraph 2.c., Page 2 of 113. RFP states: "c. Step Three. The PCO will issue competitive Task Order Requests (TORs) for specific requirements that will result in one Requirements Task Order per installation." Please provide a sample Step 3 Task Order Request so that we can review what the task order requirements

will look like.

A.184. The EAGLE program is currently in the Step Two process. Specific requirements for Requests for Task Order Proposals will be communicated in the respective solicitation during the Step Three process. No sample is available at this time.

Teaming Arrangements

Q.185a. Reference: RFP Section H Para 2, page 10 , Section L, Para L.2.3, page 104 and Question and Answers, Q109. Will small business prime and its proposed teaming partners be able to add 2nd tier subcontractors not previously identified in the EAGLE BOA 2 response for EAGLE Step 3 Task Order proposal responses?

Q.185b. If the offeror proposes performing based on itself and several team members, can it add Small Business subcontractors not identified in Step Two in order to meet subcontracting goals in Step Three?

A.185. Any subcontractor that will perform PWS tasks and that is required by the prime to demonstrate capability must be identified in Step 2.

Q.186. If an Offeror (Prime Contractor/BOA Holder) proposes Company "X" to perform a specific function (e.g. CIF) and, when a Task Order is released, Company "X" decides not to participate with the Offeror who proposed them to perform the specific functional task/subtask is:

- a. The Offeror precluded from bidding the Task Order?
- b. Can the Offeror use a un-named socioeconomic Partner with the appropriate experience to perform the task?
- c. Can the Offeror use non-team partners to propose the work?
- d. Can the Offeror opt to perform the work themselves?

A.186. a – The Offeror would be precluded from bidding if Company "X" was the only company on the team to demonstrate CIF capability in Step 2 and if CIF capability was a task order requirement.

b – No, not unless the capability was demonstrated in Step 2 by the proposed sub.

c – Non-team members (not listed on Attachment 0003) may not be proposed to do work.

d – The Offeror can do the work themselves if it demonstrated the capability to perform that function in Step 2.

Q.187. We have seen a number of Teaming Agreements that require the Subcontractor to be exclusive at the Task Order level, which is contrary to the Governments answer to Question 60, of EAGLE Q&A (from Step 1). Given the requirements of Section H, is exclusivity at the Task Order level appropriate? Is exclusivity at the Task Order level Permissible under EAGLE?

A.187. It is up to the Prime contractor to form its teaming arrangements. Exclusivity is neither required nor prohibited.

Q.188. If one company is on many teams and is the recognized "expert" in one or more functional subtasks, it could possibly be a named subcontractor in a large number of proposals, which could conceivably, allow it to nearly guarantee that it will get the work being competed among all Prime Offerors. This would appear, at face value, to be competition restrictive within that specific task/subtask. How does the Government intend to ensure this situation does not occur at the subcontractor level?

A.188. It is up to each offeror, large and small, to build teams that provide it with the capability, capacity, and competitive advantage necessary to be successful in Step 3. The Government does not intend to influence competition at the subcontract level. Our market research does not indicate the potential problem that is referred to in this question.

Q.189. If a prime offeror proposes a company as a subcontractor to fill a gap in an area where they lack capability, can

the prime decide in Step 3 to propose that company perform a portion of the work in an area where the prime does not lack capability? In other words, is a prime offeror prohibited from subcontracting any work that they are capable of performing themselves?

A.189. A prime contractor is not prohibited from subcontracting any work that it was found capable of performing itself in Step 2.

Q.190. RFP Section H, Paragraphs 2.b) and 3.b), Page 10: The 10 contract reference limitation in Attachment 0002 and its effect on an offeror's ability to propose a protégé from an approved Department of Defense (DoD) or Small Business Administration (SBA) Mentor-Protégé program that has no experience during Step 2. Consistent with the small business goals and objectives of this program, will a Basic Ordering Agreement (BOA) holder be able to propose an approved DoD or SBA protégé during Step 3 who was not previously submitted during Step 2

A.190. A prime contractor may add a protégé in Step 3 as long as the prime itself demonstrated capability in Step 2 to perform the tasks assigned to that protégé.

Q.191a. Reference Section H, Para 2. If a Prime can perform all of one functional area, Supply for example, but must propose subcontractors to qualify in Maintenance and Transportation, can the Prime propose at Step 3 a subcontractor for Supply (the area in which the Prime is fully qualified alone) that was not listed in Step 2?

Q.191b. Reference Section H, Para 2. If a Prime can perform all of one functional area, Supply for example, but must propose subcontractors to qualify in Maintenance and Transportation, can the Prime propose at Step 3 a subcontractor for Supply (the area in which the Prime is fully qualified alone) that was not listed in Step 2?

A.191. Yes, although if a small business prime is subcontracting all of maintenance and transportation and part of supply it may be in violation of subcontracting limitations for small-business set-asides.

Q.192. Reference Question and Answers Q.54: Are offerors allowed to propose any sort of depth of capability in its Step 2 response? For example, if the Prime is not one that is capable of performing all three (3) functional areas and subtasks by itself, but has experience and can perform, let's say, Railhead Operations (PWS 2.3.5), is it allowed to propose a subcontractor that fills other gaps, but also performs Railhead Operations capabilities as well 13 (and acknowledge same by adding depth in Railhead Operations)? (Railhead provided as an example only) A.54: Yes. In the above example, must the prime then use the subcontractor on any TO with Railhead Operations even though the Prime is qualified in Railhead Operations without the sub?

A.192. The prime may subcontract any task that it demonstrated the capability to perform itself in Step Two.

Q.193. Reference: RFP Section L.2, Paragraph(s) L.2.1, Page(s) 104 of 113. Reference: RFP Section L.2, Paragraph(s) L.2.1, Page(s) 7 of 15 (Amendment 0001). Question: This paragraph defines an offeror as follows: An Offeror is defined as a single firm that has the capability to provide all required maintenance, supply and transportation support services and plans to use subcontractors for economic reasons or to meet subcontracting requirements; a prime contractor that cannot provide all required maintenance, supply, and transportation support services and therefore forms a teaming agreement including subcontractors in order to provide the required services; or a team of two or more firms that have entered into a joint venture agreement to provide all required maintenance, supply and transportation support services. In the definition of an offeror as a Joint Venture, there is no mention of subcontractors. If a Joint Venture cannot provide all of the support services, is it acceptable for the Joint Venture to form a teaming agreement with one or more subcontractors to fill any gaps in support services? Please clarify.

A.193. Yes as long as the subcontractors demonstrate capability in Step 2.

Q.194. We have a partner who is a new corporation and therefore no company past performance. How may we apply

their past performance within our proposal in terms of their capabilities to support EAGLE requirements?

A.194. See Amendment 0003, specifically paragraphs L.3.2.7 and M.3.2.8.

June 12, 2012

** Note: the answers to previously posted questions have been amended, see Q&As # 57. These are identified as Track Changes and are underlined.

Section L

Q.195. Reference: Amendment 3 to EAGLE RFP, Paragraph L.3.1.2.3.c. Question: Reference states that "Capabilities proposed but not supported by experience derived from the contract reference (Zs) must be supported in the Organizational Capability Narrative." Since this is a new requirement that 1) may require additional narrative in the current three page Organizational Capability Summary; and 2) potentially allow us to consider additional companies to be represented in Attachments 2 and 3, will the Government consider: 1) expanding the page limitation for the Organizational Capability Summary from three to five pages; and 2) extending the proposal due date to 18 June?

A.195. No the requirement to support capability in the Organizational Capability Statement that is not supported by experience in Attachment 0002 is not a new requirement. Therefore no additional pages are necessary.

Q.196. Reference: Amendment 003, Section A, #6, #7, Page 2. The instructions for Attachment 003 were changed in L.3.1.2.3 to indicate that "Capabilities proposed but not supported by experience derived from the contract reference (Zs) must be supported in the Organizational Capability Narrative." However, in #7, the evaluation criteria for the Capabilities Narrative (M.3.1.3.2.5) were also changed to delete "It is acceptable to propose an organizational capability, in a limited number of subtask areas, when that capability is not supported by similar experience." This seems to be a direct contradiction, i.e., we are instructed to input and address capabilities not supported by experience in the narrative (L.3.1.2.3); however, that is no longer admissible (M.3.1.3.2.5) and may be grounds for a non-acceptable rating. Please clarify both Attachment 0003 and the Capability Narrative instructions and Evaluation Criteria.

A.196. The statement in M.3.1.3.2.5 was removed because as it was positioned, it appeared to apply only to Transportation requirement. In fact, it was always intended to apply to all of M.3.1.3.2. It was also misleading as written. It was always intended to refer to the fact that there are 29 subtasks listed on Attachment 0003 but in accordance with the criteria in M.3.1.3.2, it is not required that an offeror demonstrate experience in all 29 tasks. The criteria makes it possible to be acceptable with experience in 23 of the 29 tasks if the offeror can demonstrate capability in the Organizational Capability Statement for the remaining 6 tasks through some means other than experience. This is a clarification of the original intent, not a change.

Q.197. Reference: Amendment 0003 Section A, L.3.1.2.3, paragraph c change, Page 2. The change of Section L.3.1.2.3 to read "Capabilities proposed but not supported by experience derived from the contract reference (Zs) must be supported in the Organizational Capability Narrative" directly contradicts the Organizational Capability Narrative instruction that "Stated experience supporting the offerors capability must be cross-referenced back to Attachment 0002 - Contract Reference Worksheet using the contract cross reference number." If an Offeror marks "Z" in Attachment 0003 for a subtask, but then cannot support that subtask by writing to directly related experience within the Contract Reference in Attachment 0002, then there is no possible way to cross-reference a "Z" marked subtask within the Capability Narrative. Could the Government please clarify how a "Z" marked subtask can be referenced in the Capability Narrative but not tied to any specific contract in Attachment 0002?

A.197. Experience (X's) must be cross-referenced to Attachment 0002. Capability not supported by experience (Z's) does not have to be tied back to the tasks performed under the contract referenced. It means that the contractor that performed under the referenced contract is also proposed to perform other tasks (Z's) and that the capability to perform those tasks is demonstrated in the Organizational Capability Statement through some means other than experience.

Q.198. Reference L.3.1.2.1 . What does the Government mean by "same"? Each EAGLE PWS Subtask has multiple sub-subtasks, specified and implied. For example, if the Offeror has documented Field Maintenance experience supporting communications/electronic equipment, but no other maintenance experience, does or does not the Offeror have Field Maintenance experience? Based on the revised L.3.1.2.1, the Offeror is correct in claiming Field Maintenance experience, yet does not demonstrate a comprehensive Field Maintenance capability, without including one or more subcontractors. As section M does not address the relative "Goodness" of the experience/past performance, it is unclear if the Offerors experience will be favorably evaluated. Please explain.

A.198. In the stated example, the proposal would demonstrate acceptable similar experience for field maintenance provided equipment type and quantity relate to EAGLE type requirements. If an organizational capability statement then proposes a field maintenance capability, based on this similar experience, it would be evaluated as proposing an acceptable field maintenance organizational capability.

Q.199. Most Subtasks consist of multiple sub-subtasks. If the Offeror covers three of five sub-subtasks and a subcontractor covers four of five sub-subtasks, the Team Covers all sub-subtasks and has overlap in two sub-subtasks. As the Narrative is focused at the subtask level, in accordance with L.3.1.2.1, we should address both Prime and Subcontractor as they do not provide the "same capability." Please confirm this statement is correct. If incorrect, please explain why.

A.199. The Offeror is not required to propose to a sub-subtask level. Where possible, the prime should propose a standalone organizational capability without adding subcontractors for sub-subtask level organizational capability.

Q.200. Reference: RFP Section L.3.1.2.3, Paragraph 1, Amendment 0004, p. 6. In Q&A 18 posted with the 23 May APBI briefing, the Government indicates offerors should not identify a subcontractor for a capability if the prime can demonstrate that capability. This seems to contradict Q&A 54 of 3 May, which indicates that offerors may show depth of capability by proposing subcontractors that not only fill gaps, but that also provide the same capabilities offered by the prime. For maximum flexibility in task order delivery, will the Government reiterate that showing depth of capability as described in Q&A 54 of 3 May is the approach desired as opposed to the approach given in Q&A 18 of the 23 May APBI briefing?

A.200. There evaluation is on an "acceptable, not acceptable" basis. There is no advantage to showing "depth" in Step Two. The requirement is only to demonstrate the capability to perform the required tasks. If the prime contractor demonstrates the capability to perform a task/function in Step Two, it is not precluded from subcontracting the task in Step Three to obtain depth. The purpose of requesting that offerors not propose capabilities for subcontractors that have already been demonstrated by the prime is to reduce the time that it will take to evaluate Step Two. If the prime cannot demonstrate the capability to perform a task, it may propose two subs in Step Two with the same capability so that it will have more "depth of coverage" in Step Three.

Section M

Q.201. Reference L.3.1.2.2 and M.3.1.3.2.2, B. Representative EAGLE Missions, C. Maintenance of the Type of Equipment Associated with EAGLE Requirements, D. Management of the Classes of Supply Associated with EAGLE Requirements, E. Management of the Transportation Areas Associated with EAGLE Requirements.

Question: Is the Government looking for an approach of how the offeror would perform these functions, or the

offeror's capability of performing these functions?

A.201. The Government is looking for the Offeror to describe the capability not the approach of how the offeror would perform these functions.

Q.202. Reference: RFP Section M 3.1.3.2.3, Paragraph (i): For this requirement to be met, does the offeror have to have experience with performing both, track vehicles and major weapons systems? Or, If the offeror has experience with performing maintenance on just track vehicles and not major weapons systems is the requirement still met?

A.202. An acceptable proposal evaluated IAW M3.1.3.2.3 will identify an organizational capability for maintenance on tracked vehicles or major weapons systems, or both. This assumes that organizational capability is proposed as one of the three needed to be evaluated as acceptable.

Step Three Requirements

Q.203. Why are some DOL requirements being procured outside of EAGLE? What is the criteria for the government determining what DOLs will be procured under EAGLE and not under EAGLE?

A.203. There are a number of reasons why a DOL requirements may not be included in EAGLE re-compete actions. Examples include year 1 schedule conflicts between required award dates and BOA availability, an anticipated lack of specific set-aside contractors in the group of BOA holders, or contract requirements less than \$1M and not planned for consolidation.

January 14, 2013

Q.204. The Ft Polk EAGLE DOL opportunity (Solicitation scheduled for 14 Mar 2013) is now showing as Unrestricted. We never saw a market research associated with that, and continue to hold the opinion that the Rock Island Contracting Office is not following the same Rule of 2 Business Rule steps (first determine if there are 2 SBs capable of meeting the requirements for opportunities >35.5mil, before deeming these Lg Business opportunities)...We have no issue if they are choosing to pursue a different strategy for determining set asides vs Lg Business opportunities, but we believe they should address why they are not following the procedure they set out in the EAGLE business rules.

A.204. Extensive market research to support the EAGLE strategy was conducted in August 2011 which determined the strategy for the EAGLE requirements. At that time, it was determined that small business was capable of performing up to \$35.5M on an annual basis and the strategies for the EAGLE task order requirements were set utilizing this determination. However, it was also determined that for those requirements that are not set-aside for small business (over \$35.5M annually), the PCO would conduct market research at the task order level. If, at the time of the task order requirement, the PCO found two or more responsible small business BOA holders that are capable of executing the logistics requirement, the task order will be competed among Small Business BOA Holders. To date, there have been no EAGLE task orders awarded. Therefore, we do not have any additional information on the Small Business BOA Holders which would lead us to a different conclusion than what our initial market research has garnered which is relevant to the EAGLE mission. As task orders are solicited, evaluated and awarded, the information received on the task order RFP submissions and resultant task order awards will be utilized to determine the capabilities and capacity of the Small Business BOA Holders to support requirements that exceed the \$35.5M annual threshold.

Q.205. Do you have any indications from Ft Irwin that they are considering an 8(a) set-aside for their upcoming DOL or NTC logistics opportunities?

A.205. The Ft. Irwin requirements are being assessed at this time. No final decision has been made regarding an 8(a) set-aside strategy. The requirement was synopsized as a Small Business Set-aside. Unless an amended announcement is advertised in FEDBIZOPS, the SBSA strategy will be followed.

Q.206. I was asked by our CFO the following question; Is there a requirement for a bond on the EAGLE Task Orders? Our staff have checked the PWS and solicitations. They have not found any requirements about a bond. Can you clarify this question for me? As an Army logistician with 30 years of experience I do not remember having a bond requirements on DOL contracts. When I was the DOL Director at Ft. Campbell my staff never brought this subject up to me. I would assume that the bond requirements applies for DPW vertical construction work?

A.206. For task order specific requirements please ensure you read the solicitation and the PWS in its entirety for all applicable terms and conditions. All requirements will either be identified or referenced in those documents. If you have a question regarding a specific task order please submit a question in accordance with the instructions identified in the particular solicitation.