

## **Question and Answers #2 (numbering continued from previous Q&A document)**

The below questions and answers are for clarification purposes only and do not represent changes to the solicitation. All changes in the solicitation shall be made in the form of an amendment.

### **QUESTION 14**

Will the Government provide a list of applications and software in use at the Naval War College? (RFP Section C.3.1, p.14 of 62)

### **ANSWER 14**

Software / Application	Version	Purpose / Function	IA Enabled (Yes/No)	CC Eval Status (EAL)	DADMS ID	FAM Status
Microsoft Windows Server 2008	STD	Operating System	Yes	EAL1	51070	Approved
Microsoft Windows Server 2008 ENT R2	6.1 BUILD 7600	Operating System	Yes	EAL4+ Augmented with ALC_FLR.3	76646	Approved
Microsoft Windows 7 Enterprise	6.1	Operating System	Yes	EAL4+ Augmented with ALC_FLR.3	67499	Approved
Microsoft Windows Server 2008 R2 DNS Server	STD	Name resolution	Yes	EAL4+ Augmented with ALC_FLR.3	Not listed	NA
Microsoft Windows Server 2008 DHCP Server	STD	Assign IP addresses	Yes	EAL4+ Augmented with ALC_FLR.3	Not Listed	NA
Microsoft Internet Information Services	7.0	Manage internet services	Yes	EAL4+ Augmented with ALC_FLR.3	54994	Approved
Microsoft Windows Server 2012R2	STD	Operating System				
Microsoft SQL Server 2008	2008 SP2	Database services	Yes	EAL1+	79359	Approved
Microsoft Visual Studio 2008	9.0	Developer tools and database software	No	NA	50912	Approved
Microsoft MSXML Core Services	4.20 SP2	Allows applications to build windows native XML apps	No	NA	80518	Approved
Microsoft MSXML Core Services	6.0 SP2	Allows applications to build windows native XML apps	No	NA	76679	Approved
Microsoft Sync Framework Runtime	1	Comprehensive synchronization platform enabling collaboration for applications, services and devices	No	NA	67339	Disapproved
Microsoft Sync Services for <a href="#">ADO.NET</a>	2.0	Provides the ability to synchronize data from disparate sources	No	NA	Not Listed	NA
Microsoft Visual C++ 2005 Redistributable	8.0.61001	Runtime components of Visual C++ libraries required to run applications developed with Visual C++	No	NA	56880	Approved
Microsoft Visual C++ 2008 Redistributable	9.0.30729	Runtime components of Visual C++ libraries required to run applications developed with Visual C++	No	NA	76136	Approved
Microsoft Visual J# 2.0 Redistributable	2.0	Enables developers to use Java-language syntax to build applications and services on the .NET Framework	No	NA	Not listed	NA
Microsoft Windows Server Update Services	3.0 SP2	Update patches for system	No	NA	76424	Approved
Microsoft Visual C++ 2010 Redistributable	10.0.40219	Runtime components of Visual C++ libraries required to run applications developed with Visual C++				
Symantec Endpoint Encryption Framework Client	8.06	Encryption Client for workstations				
Symantec Endpoint Encryption Full Disk Edition Client	8.2.0 MP1	Encryption Client for workstations				
Tumbleweed Desktop Validator	4.11	Provides certificate revocation lookups				
Microsoft .NET Framework Client	4.5.2	Development tool	No	NA	79824	Approved

### **QUESTION 15**

What platform does the NPS currently use or anticipate using for visualization services? (RFP Section C.3.16, p. 22 of 62)

### **ANSWER 15**

As of now NPS does not currently maintain any visualization platform outside 4K projectors. NPS anticipates new requirements for this type of service with performance only limited to the scope of Section C 3.16 utilizing the Labor Categories specified in the RFP and the unique proposal of the selected awardees. In this best Value Tradeoff NPS anticipates receiving unique proposal that allow offerors to

present enhancements and strength that provide unique services in this field and others areas that should allow NPS to utilize throughout performance.

**QUESTION 16**

Section L, Clause 4.0 Volume-II Past Performance states, "Offerors may submit up to three (3) OPPDs as the prime contractor; subcontractors may submit up to two (2) OPPDs." Please confirm that collectively only two OPPDs are allowed for all subcontractors under prime.

**ANSWER 16**

Offerors are allowed two OPPDS per individual identified subcontractor in the proposal.

**QUESTION 17**

Can we use CPARS ratings if available in lieu PPD?

**ANSWER 17**

The solicitation reserves the right to consider CPARS as stated in Section M 5.3. It's up to the Offerors to submit OPPDs or not. In some instances CPARS may not provide as complete of a picture of an Offerors past performance on individual requirements as the OPPDs. The OPPD attachment is tailored for the solicitation with direct relevancy elements contained within that relates to the areas of the PWS.

**QUESTION 18**

Will the government consider extending the deadline by one week given the large size of the technical proposal (85 pages)?

**ANSWER 18**

Please see amendment 0003. Due to changes in Sections L and M, the solicitation response date has been extended to 25 AUG 2016 12:00 PM PDT.

**QUESTION 19**

Will the government consider adding a program manager as well as a project manager to the labor categories?

**ANSWER 19**

This was not considered at the time of at RFP development as direct labor related to the requirements. It is anticipated that any Program Manager costs should be handled indirectly.

**QUESTION 20**

My company has holes in things like Cyber and a few others. Can this be augmented with a teaming partner and do we submit their past performance as well or is this a one company standalone MAC?

#### **ANSWER 20**

Yes, teaming arrangements are allowed pursuant to the terms of FAR 52.219-27 and 52.219-14 dealing with limitations of subcontracting and joint ventures for this type of set-aside. All arrangements should be expressed inside of a **Single Technical Offer** not separately submitted by the individual subcontractors or team partners. However, major subcontractors shall still submit separate cost proposals as indicated by section L 5.3.9. The Contracting officer anticipates making award to successful prime offerors only not separate contracts per team member, affiliate or subcontractor.

Secondly, the evaluation allows for consideration of Subcontractor past performance. See section M 4.5. 4.5 "Offerors may submit past performance information regarding the following: predecessor companies, key personnel who have relevant experience and subcontractors that will perform major aspects of the requirement."

#### **QUESTION 21**

Reference: Solicitation, Section L, page 45 of 62, Section 2.1 and Table at top of page 45, double asterisk note. Please confirm that Volume I – Offer is to include a complete copy of the filled out and signed solicitation (i.e., all 62 pages) and all the pages of any amendments issued which seems to be indicated in the double asterisk note below the table. Or, alternatively, are we to provide the signed cover sheets?

#### **ANSWER 21**

Please see Amendment 0002 attached to the solicitation. The offer is no longer part of Volume 1 and is now a standalone volume titled Offer. That being stated, yes, a complete copy of the filled out and signed solicitation is required as part of your proposal.

#### **QUESTION 22**

Reference: Solicitation, Section L, page 52 of 62, paragraph 5.3.2, "Offeror shall provide a separate schedule of internal salary rates/category rates that may be sent to DCMA/DCAA for rate verification." Please clarify what the offeror is to provide to the government for submission to DCMA/DCAA for rate verification if labor surveys are used and internal labor categories and costs are not?

#### **ANSWER 22**

See Amendment 0003. The language is update to read "For those individuals proposed as current employees of the Offeror, Offeror shall provide a separate schedule of internal salary rates/category rates that may be sent to DCMA/DCAA for rate verification." The schedule is only required if the individuals are current employees of the offeror or proposes major subcontractor. It's noted that amendment 0003 requires the Offeror to provide detailed calculation of proposed rates (e.g., composite rates) for each labor category not just for current employees.

#### **QUESTION 23**

Reference: Solicitation, Section L. Can the government clarify that an offeror is to provide separate labor schedules for each labor category by location – ie all labor categories in the Attachment 1 LABOR

CATEGORIES AND QUALIFICATIONS for each location? Or only those labor categories provided by location in the tables below 5.2.2 which are location specific?

**ANSWER 23**

Only for those labor categories in the tables of 5.2.2. Additionally, See attachment 3 provided through Amendment 0001 that provides labor per location with associated labor categories and direct hours for that location. See section L 5.3.16 for the requirement to submit Format of Spreadsheets and this completed attachments as part of the cost proposal.

**QUESTION 24**

Reference: Solicitation, Section L, page 53 of 62, paragraph 5.3.7, 5.3.8 and 5.3.9. Please confirm that even though a major subcontractor might be proposed at T&M and FFP rates, they still need to complete a cost proposal as required the sections 5.3 and 5.5. Are they (the subcontractors) to use the same labor hours listed in the solicitation or the proposed labor hours provided by the subcontractor in their cost proposal to the offeror as indicated in paragraph 5.3.7?

**ANSWER 24**

All major subcontractors are required to submit a cost proposal as required by the RFP. The subcontractor proposal should only reflect those hours the prime offeror anticipates it performing. Additionally, the subcontractor shall utilize the format provided through attachment 3 of the solicitation IAW 5.3.16. All offers are responsible for tailoring the attachment to properly reflect the proposed effort of direct labor hours of the prime and its subs.

**QUESTION 25**

Reference: Solicitation, Section L, page 53 of 62, paragraph 5.3.9, Major Subcontractors proposal to the government. If a major subcontractor's sealed cost proposal is not submitted on time or is for some reason deemed unacceptable by the government, does that disqualify the prime contractor's bid? Or will the Prime contractor have an opportunity to withdraw the subcontractor or replace them and amend their proposal?

**ANSWER 25**

A complete proposal is required from all primes and subs prior to the closing date specified in the RFP. The Government intends to award a contract without discussions as authorized by FAR 52.215-1. Any exception to the Government's technical requirements/specifications must be resolved prior to the solicitation closing date.

**QUESTION 26**

Reference: Solicitation, Section L, page 53 of 62, paragraph 5.3.9, Major Subcontractors proposal to the government. In order to propose a subcontractor as a "major subcontractor", is the subcontractor required to have their accounting system deemed adequate by DCMA/DCAA and meet all the requirements in 5.5?

**ANSWER 26**

Section M 6.5 requires only the prime to hold an adequate accounting system as part of an acceptable proposal. Any Offeror that fails to demonstrate an "Acceptable accounting system " as defined in DFARS 252.242-7006 may render the entire proposal ineligible.

**QUESTION 27**

Reference: Solicitation, Section L, page 53 of 62, paragraph 5.3.2 and 5.3.15, Historical Rates. If an offeror uses salary surveys, as allowed in paragraph 5.3.2, how should the offeror provide the labor rates required in paragraph 5.3.15? If labor surveys were used, they would not have a projected versus incurred rate for the years indicated.

**ANSWER 27**

Its historical rate escalation used throughout the offeror's company as whole in percentage terms not necessarily for just the labor categories specified in the RFP. The historical direct labor rates are requested if available see amendment 0003. The historical indirect rates are required as stated in the RFP.

**QUESTION 28**

Reference: Solicitation, Section L, page 55 of 62, paragraph 5.5.3, maintaining adequate accounting system. Can the government clarify would documentation an offeror should provide to demonstrate that is maintains as adequate accounting system? Or is the DCAA letter that is required in paragraph 5.5.1.8 sufficient?

**ANSWER 28**

The letter under 5.5.1.8 is sufficient or any other information from DCAA or DCMA that provide sufficient information that the Offeror's accounting system is adequate.

**QUESTION 29**

Reference: Paragraph 3. Requirements – Security. Please confirm that a DoD/DSS Top Secret Facility Clearance is required.

**ANSWER 29**

Please review Amendment 0002 and the DD Form 254 attached to the solicitation. Both indicate only a secret clearance is required.

**QUESTION 30**

I can see that the opportunity will be released as a total service disabled veteran owned small business (SDVOSB) set-aside. Am I interpreting correctly that the SDVOSB is required to be the PRIME on the contract?

**ANSWER 30**

The prime contractor must be the SDVOSB contractor. See the terms of FAR 52.219-27 dealing with limitations of subcontracting and joint ventures for this type of set-aside

**QUESTION 31**

Reference: Section L Volume III-Cost and Cost Template Attachment-3. The RFP template is built for CPFF cost/pricing for the MAC contract for cost proposal submission. Please explain the basis under which Government may also issue Task Orders on FFP basis under this MAC contract.

**ANSWER 31**

CPFF is the pricing mechanism for the basic contract as enough information does not exist to provide for every FFP action anticipated during performance. At the task order level the ordering office should be able to provide enough information to allow contract holders to compete through the FAR 16.505 fair opportunity process and propose firm fixed prices.

**QUESTION 32**

Reference: Labor Categories and Qualification (RFP-attachment-1): Information Assurance Systems Specialist. Please confirm that candidate should have Bachelor's degree and/or minimum of five years of experience. It appears that "And/Or" is omitted in the document (RFP-attachment-1)

**ANSWER 32**

The And/ Or language was mistakenly omitted from the Information Assurance System Specialist labor category on Attachment 1. This language was also accidentally omitted from the Service Center Technician, Vulnerability Threat Specialist, and Web Architect. The government prefers that both education and experience requirements of each labor category are met; however, this is not a requirement, and either education or experience will suffice.

**QUESTION 33**

The RFP says that "1.3 Each contract will provide for the issuance of Firm Fixed Price (FFP) or Cost Plus Fixed Fee (CPFF) task orders; however, the Government intends to maximize the use of FFP task orders." If a major subcontractor proposes only FFP pricing and later bid only those FFP task orders, does the DCAA requirement apply to the subcontractor?

**ANSWER 33**

Section M 6.5 requires only the prime to hold an adequate accounting system as part of an acceptable proposal. Any Offeror that fails to demonstrate an "Acceptable accounting system " as defined in DFARS 252.242-7006 may render the entire proposal ineligible. See Amendment 0003 that updates Section L 5.3.9.

**QUESTION 34**

Pricing: Please clarify if all proposed candidates (key and non-key) should be priced at the DoD Secret level clearance.

**ANSWER 34**

The RFP requires personnel to hold a secret clearance pricing should reflect the terms of the RFP.

**QUESTION 35**

Labor Categories and Qualifications: Kindly let us know which all labor categories will fall under DoD 8570 Workforce Improvement Program. Additionally, please also identify the levels at IAT level I, II and III of those LCs.

**ANSWER 35**

This will be provided in the next amendment.

**QUESTION 36**

RFP, Sect. L.2.1 – In this section there are two instructions about the submission of the soft or electronic copies. It reads that, “Hard copy is in addition to one electronic copy provided by email...” and “Soft copies are to be submitted on a CD mailed with a hard copy of the proposal.” Will the Government clarify this instruction? We recommend that electronic copies be provided by email.

**ANSWER 36**

Email language is removed. The Navy email server limits the electronic size standard of attachments and file of this size may not come through.

**QUESTION 37**

RFP, Sect. L.2.1 – Will the Government revise the instructions to eliminate the submission of hard copies as it will burdensome to the Government to distribute these copies to evaluators that are geographically dispersed?

**ANSWER 37**

No, the hardcopy submission ensures that all offerors information is correctly presented in the way it intended to respond to the RFP requirements.

**QUESTION 38**

RFP, Sect. L.2.1 – The page limitations for Volume II – Past Performance reads, “2 pages exclusive of the Offerors Past Performance Data – Attachment 2.” Then, in Sect. 4.0 it reads that “Completed OPPDs

shall be submitted by email..." hence, they will not be available to the Offeror to include in Volume II. Will the Government confirm that Volume II consists of the 2 pages of reference information, and that the OPPDs will not be included in the volume?

**ANSWER 38**

It's anticipated that all OPPDS should be submitted directly to the email specified in the RFP and the instruction is to ensure that those submitted electronically do not count against the page count.

**QUESTION 39**

RFP Amend 0002, Page 23, Para 2.1. Why are Letters of Intent (LOIs) required at the Basic Contract level? Key personnel may vary depending upon the specific requirements of a task order. It is recommended that the Government delete the LOI requirement.

**ANSWER 39**

While key personnel are not required an offer may submit a letter of intent.

**QUESTION 40**

RFP Amend 0002, Page 24, Para 3.1. It states "Volume I of the proposal is the Technical Volume and is comprised of the Factor, and Subfactors. It also includes the offer and signature page." Shouldn't the Offer and Signature Page be placed in the Offer Volume?

**ANSWER 40**

Yes, see amendment 0003 that adds section 2.9 to section L and removes the language from section L 3.1.

**QUESTION 41**

RFP Amend 0002, Page 25, Para 3.3.1. It states "Demonstrate that they are capable of fulfilling requirements of all three Naval Higher Education Information Technology Consortium (NHEIT): Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA; Naval War College, Newport, RI; and Naval Academy, Annapolis, MD; and, \_\_\_\_\_. This sentence is incomplete. Please provide missing information.

**ANSWER 41**

See amendment 0003 that corrects this.

**QUESTION 42**

RFP Amend 0002, Page 25, Para 3.3.3. It states "The contractor shall provide a proposal that demonstrates the offeror meets applicable DoD facility requirements IAW the DD254". The DD254 was not provided with the solicitation. Please provide Form DD254.

**ANSWER 42**

The DD254 is attached to the solicitation. Please look at attached documents on NECO or the Federal Business Opportunity website [www.fbo.gov](http://www.fbo.gov)

**QUESTION 43**

RFP Amend 0002, Page 26, Para 3.5.2. It states " The proposal shall detail the approach the offeror plans to implement on meeting DoD staff investigation requirements for IT-I, IT-II, and IT-III level positions..." However, RFP Page 14, Para 3.0 identifies Levels I and II. Please clarify the proper IT levels. What is IT-III?

**ANSWER 43**

This should read IT-III. See amendment 0003

**QUESTION 44**

RFP Amend 0002, Page 26, Para 3.5.2. It states "The proposal shall detail the offeror's approach to recruit and retain\_\_\_\_\_ " The last sentence is incomplete. Please provide missing information.

**ANSWER 44**

The sentence is removed. See amendment 0003

**QUESTION 45**

RFP Amend 0002, Pages 27 thru and 29. The level of effort hours identified for each of the three school locations do not include a Program or Project Management Labor Category and associated hours. Will the Government provide a Program and Project Management Labor Category and associated hours to support the contract? Where is the Program Manager to be located? Are Project or Task Managers required to be on-site at each of the three primary work locations?

**ANSWER 45**

See answers 19 and 23 above.

**QUESTION 46**

Attachment 1, Labor Categories and RFP Amend 0002, Page 26, Para 3.5.3. Attachment 1 conveys only technical labor categories. One or several labor categories could be key given a specific set of requirements defined at the Task Order (TO) level. Since this is a MAC, the awardees have no work to perform under the basic contract. Key personnel should be identified during the TO competition stage when specific requirements will be identified in the associated PWS. Will the Government delete the Key Personnel requirement at the Basic Contract level and add the Key personnel requirement, if applicable, at the TO Level?

**ANSWER 46**

The section 3.5.3 is removed.

**QUESTION 47**

Issue: Section L.3.3.1, Page 47 of 62 states, "... Demonstrate that they are capable of fulfilling requirements of all three Naval Higher Education Information Technology Consortium (NHEIT): Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA; Naval War College, Newport, RI; and Naval Academy, Annapolis, MD; and..." and, Section M.4.1.1, page 58 of 62 states, "... the Government will evaluate the technical approach to determine the offerors' overall understanding and capability to successfully provide required services to support the activities of Naval Higher Education Information Technology Consortium support services across all three member institutions.

Could the Government clarify its intent and provide additional detail on having an Offeror demonstrate its "capabilities" to delivering the PWS services outlined?

**ANSWER 47**

The Navy is interested in seeing if the offerors technical knowledge, resources and ability to provide support across the geographical region. It is up to the offeror to express its unique capabilities and whether those fit against those outlined in the PWS.

**QUESTION 48**

Issue: Section L.3.3.2, Page 47 of 62 states, "Offerors must demonstrate they are capable of fulfilling requirements at all three geographic areas. Geographic areas of the Naval Higher Education Information Technology Consortium (NHEITC) which includes Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA, Naval War College, Newport, RI, and the Naval Academy, Annapolis, MD." Could the Government clarify its intent in separating this criterion as it appears inclusive and the same information is being asked in Section L.3.3.1? Also we should not that Section M.4.1.1 does not appear to clearly define grading criteria for L.3.3.1. and L.3.3.2. Could the Government please clarify how these will be evaluated?

**ANSWER 48**

Section 3.3.1 language is removed and this section is reserved. The Navy interested in seeing if the offerors technical knowledge, resources and ability to provide support across the geographical region. It's up to the offeror to express its unique capabilities and whether those fit against those outlined in the PWS.

**QUESTION 49**

Issue: Section L.3.3.1, Page 47 of 62 and Section L.3.3.1, Page 47 of 62 both ask the Government to propose against fulfilling the requirements at all three Naval Higher Education Information Technology Consortium (NHEIT): Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA; Naval War College, Newport, RI; and Naval Academy, Annapolis, MD. However, Section M 1.1 states, "The award resulting from this solicitation shall include two or more Indefinite-Delivery/Indefinite-Quantity type contracts with Cost

Plus Fixed Fee and Firm Fixed Price Task Orders resulting from this solicitation [later in the same paragraph it states the Government reserves the right to make not to exceed ten awards total). The response and evaluation sub-factor criteria suggests a single award selection as the evaluation of the response for each geographic location will be “bundled” into its technical Capability grading criteria.

If subsequent task order competition will be conducted post award as the RFP states, could the Government explain its intent for Offerors to propose its response as if the requirements constitute a single enterprise rather than seeking responses to individual PWS requirements and asking for past experiences to evaluate technical risk regardless of geographic location?

**ANSWER 49**

The government seeks to only make award to qualified and responsible offerors responding to the solicitation. The evaluation anticipates making multiple awards and the evaluation criteria will be used as such. See amendment 0003 for updated submission requirements and section M 4.1.1 evaluation criteria.

**QUESTION 50**

Issue: Section L.3.3, Page 47 of 62. Upon review of the Sub-factor 1, Technical Approach response criteria, it appears only Section L3.3.3 requires Offerors to provide a “planned approach [meeting DoD security standards]”. Yet it is unclear what the Government’s intent is on requesting an Offeror’s capability to fulfilling requirements at all three geographic locations. Could the Government please confirm it is NOT its intent to require Offerors to provide an approach to accomplishing each of the 14 critical support categories or each of the 17 requirements listed in RFP Section 3 within its Section L.3.3.1 response or elsewhere in proposal? [Note: Section M.4.1 does not provide sufficient information/grading criteria to resolve this issue as well.]

**ANSWER 50**

The Technical evaluation factor I speak towards experience and capability of these areas and not a planned approach. See amendment 0003 that updates section M 4.1.

**QUESTION 51**

Issue: Section L 3.4.1, Page 46 of 62 states, “The technical proposal shall contain a management plan that incorporates and demonstrates the offeror’s ability to meet technical performance objectives to support the requirements of the three NHEITC member institutions.” Upon review of the RFP, specific technical performance objectives supporting the requirements of the three NHEITC member institutions could not be found. Could the Government clarify its intent for Offerors to respond or provide the technical performance objectives (IDIQ and/or task order level) that it expects the Offerors to achieve? Could the Government please provide its Performance Requirements Summary which contains the standards for technical performance?

**ANSWER 51**

See amendment 003 it reflects management of an IDIQ and ensuring the management plan provides for quality control of task orders. The majority of specific performance objectives shall be at the task order level.

**QUESTION 52**

Issue: Amendment 0002, Section L.5.2 Contractor Labor Categories, page 27 through 29 of 32 provides the specific labor categories and labor hours estimates for each of the three (3) geographic locations: NPS, NWC, USNA. Amendment 0002, Section 3. Requirements does not address program, project or site management requirements at the contract level or subsequent task order level. Could the Government clarify its intent for contract level and task order / site specific project level responsibilities within Section 3.0 requirements or within the RFP. Additionally, could the Government clarify its intent on how Offerors are to respond to these requirements inherent within a Performance Work Statement and how the Government intends to evaluate in Volume III Costs, this element?

**ANSWER 52**

The government anticipates project management at the offerors corporate level and as such it should be handled as part of the offers indirect costs.

**QUESTION 53**

Issue: Amendment 0002, Section 3, page 9 of 32 requirements states "Security requirements are at a minimum: background investigation, NACLIC for IT Level II access, SSBI for IT Level I access, and up to Secret, NATO Secret, and Top Secret." Could the Government clarify its intent on when they will release information that aligns the labor categories outlined in Section L.5 with the determination of the IT (and IAT) level assigned?

**ANSWER 53**

This will be provided in the next amendment.