RFP Question and Answer Form: For the Multi-Purpose Reconfigurable Training System Solicitation N61340-14-R-2401

#	Subject (title)	Question	Question Reference (SOW, L&M, Page #s, etc)	Government Answer
1.	Employee's per company	Your RFP modified posting on November 6th, 2013 stated "No more than three employees from each company will be allowed access per day. If we want propose three from the prime, three from a sub-contractor attend, is that allowed?	RFP Modification Posting on November 6th, 2013.	The original posting indicated that no more than three employees per company would be allowed access to view the GFI MRTS software coding. However, the government is restating this to allow a total of four employees per Offeror (employees inclusive of prime contractor and subcontractor). Additionally, Section L PART A, 8.0 ACCESS TO GOVERNMENT FURNISHED INFORMATION, will be amended to reflect potential offerors shall request a time reservation no later than 15 November 2013. Please be advised visit dates are available on the follow days: November 18th, 2013 November 19th, 2013 November 20th, 2013 November 21th, 2013 As stated in the previous notice, these dates are available on a first come first served basis. The on-site visits will be available from 0800-01600EST on the dates above. Please provide Attachment 7 of the RFP when requesting date(s) to attend to view the GFI. All requests should be through Ricardo Elias at Ricardo.L.Elias@navy.mil
2.	ID/IQ contract Delivery Order use in Past Performance Volume	RFP Section L Part B 3.0 VOLUME 3: FACTOR C - PAST PERFORMANCE states in part "Offerors shall not reference an Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity contract without referencing the appropriate DOs containing the effort similar in nature to this requirement. For purposes of this effort, DOs will be considered standalone contracts	RFP Section L Part B 3.0 VOLUME 3: FACTOR C - PAST PERFORMANCE, RFP page 196	Partially correct. If you propose a contract under a Multiple Award Contract (MAC), the government will only evaluate a specific Delivery Order (DO) or Task Order (TO) identified under the basic MAC number. However, under a single-award Indefinite Delivery Contract(IDC), the offeror has the option to provide a past performance reference for either the basic IDC or a specific DO/TO issued under the single-award

		and the Offeror is advised, with regard to this effort, to choose the most relevant specific DO only." We assume that considering DOs as a standalone contract ONLY pertains to contracts that were awarded in a Multiple Award Contract environment (such as TSC III) where individual DOs are competed, and not an ID/IQ contract that was a single award where individual DOs are NOT competed (like this solicited MRTS requirement). Is this correct?		IDC. If an offeror proposes a single-award IDC (basic contract number) as a past performance reference, the offeror must describe the similarity of the service/support effort under each task or delivery order issued, each issued task or delivery order value, the dollar amount of the effort actually performed under each task or delivery order issued, each task or delivery order type issued, the complexity of the effort under each task or delivery order issued, the division and location of the company that performed the work under each task or delivery order issued, and the period of performance of each task or delivery order issued. Therefore, the RFP will be amended to read as follows in Section L Part 3.0 Volume 3: FACTOR C – Past Performance quoted in your question: "The Offeror shall identify up to three (3) of the Offeror's most relevant contracts, and up to two (2) of the most relevant contracts for each principal subcontractor. Any submitted contract must contain performance within five (5) years of this proposal submission date as specified in Block 9 of Standard Form 33 of the RFP (any active portion of performance within five years). Submitted contracts without performance within this specified period will not be considered by the Government. Commercial contracts may be included. In general, recent performance will be considered more relevant than older performance. Offerors shall not reference an Indefinite Delivery Contract (IDC) without referencing the appropriate task or delivery order containing the effort similar in nature to this requirement. For purposes of this effort, task or delivery orders awarded under Multiple-Award Contracts (MACs) will be considered standalone contracts and the Offeror is advised, with regard to this effort, to choose the most relevant specific task or delivery order(s) only. For a single-award IDC, offerors may propose the entire IDC

				(basic contract number) for a past performance reference, or may propose a specific task or delivery order as a past performance reference. If an offeror proposes a single-award IDC (basic contract number) as a past performance reference, the offeror must describe the similarity of the service/support effort under each task or delivery order issued, each issued task or delivery order value, the dollar amount of the effort actually performed under each task or delivery order issued, each task or delivery order type issued, the complexity of the effort under each task or delivery order issued, the division and location of the company that performed the work under each task or delivery order issued, and the period of performance of each task or delivery order issued." In addition, Section L Part 3.0 Volume 3: FACTOR C – Past Performance 3.1 (a) Contract Data Word Table will be modified to reflect a reference to identifying dollar value obligated against the basic IDC contract at the time of the RFP closing date.
3.	Past Performance Questionnaire in Word	To aid our past performance questionnaire recipients, can Attachment (4), the Past Performance Questionnaire, be provided in a standalone Word Document?	Attachment (4)	Yes, the word document for the Past Performance Questionnaire will be provided as a standalone Word Document.
4.	RFP Extension	Do you anticipate extending the proposal due date for this solicitation?	Page 1 Block 9 of the RFP	The Government does not anticipate extending the proposal due date. The government has planned for 45 days of proposal preparation time, to allow for adequate proposal preparation.
5.	Principal Subcontractor	Throughout these instructions, a "principal subcontractor" is defined as a subcontractor who provides at least 30% of the proposed total price/cost (excluding the Offeror's profit/fee), for the contract. "Team member" is defined as those entities that make up a joint venture or any other legal partnership or teaming arrangement formed for the purpose of responding to this solicitation. A team member also could be a corporate parent, division, subsidiary, or affiliate. **Rationale for the questions:** MRTS is a 100%	Section L Part A, General Instruction, Paragraph 1.0	The government team has taken a look again at this requirement and will amend the solicitation to reflect a principal subcontractor is defined as a subcontractor who provides at least 10% (instead of 30%) of the proposed total price/cost (excluding the Offeror's profit/fee). The RFP will be amended to note this change.

		small business set-aside. Small businesses typically develop teams for complex procurements but rarely allocate as much as 30% work share guarantee. Furthermore, complex tasks require team members to be able to produce qualified candidates. An individual team member's abilities may be affected by external circumstances while another member of the team may have the ideal fit at any given moment. Question: Are we correct that the term "principal subcontractor" is only relevant in the context of providing relevant past performance?		
6.	Principal Subcontractor	Is the 30% requirement measured across the life of the contract?	Section L Part A, General Instruction, Paragraph 1.0	The 10% will be a measurement of the proposed amount that the principal subcontractor will propose based on total price/cost (excluding the offeror's profit/fee) for the five year ordering period.
7.	Principal Subcontractor	Would the Government consider reducing the requirement from 30% to 15%?	Section L Part A, General Instruction, Paragraph 1.0	The government team has adjusted this to define a principal subcontractor who provides 10% of the proposed total price/cost (excluding the Offeror's profit/fee) for the contract.
8.	GFI Viewing	The laptop that the Government provided today to view the MRTS source code and related documentation did not have sufficient software to view everything. Specifically, we need the following applications installed on the laptop to view accordingly: 1. Adobe Reader - several PDFs of documentation were mixed in with the code and not included on the CD given to us 2. Visio Viewer - there are some Visio documents that we would like to review 3. Microsoft Visual Studio - though the source code and related project files were readable in Notepad and Wordpad, there were several class diagrams that could only be opened from within Visual Studio.	Section L Part A, General Instruction, 8.0	1. Adobe reader will be installed on all laptops providing GFI. 2. Visio will not be installed. The referenced documents are not applicable to the MRTS sample task(s) and procurement. 3. There are no class diagrams available for the source code, either within Visual Studio or in separate documentation. The NAWCTSD lab does not have the tools within Visual Studio to produce class diagrams. Offerors are advised to include all anticipated tools and efforts for development as part of their bid. 4. Source code is not available for the support libraries referenced in the code and the sample software tasks will not require any modifications to them. Critical user requirements are implemented at the software layer provided for review and Offerors

		4. Finally, there are some support libraries that all of these projects use that do not appear to be included in the shared code. Though referred to frequently in the source we reviewed, it is requested that we could get access to that code as well. This code includes all of the MRTS.* libraries.		are advised to focus their software development on those requirements and less on the architecture to implement them.
9.	Annual Delivery Orders	Based on the quantities listed in Section B of the RFP, it appears that that Government is anticipating 200 Delivery Orders the first year (CLINs 0101=1, 0102=12, 0103=7, 0104-7, 0105=168, 0106=1, 0107=3, and 0108=1). Is this correct?	RFP Section B	No, the quantities provided in Section B of the RFP are used to capture a total evaluated price for this competition and provide for an estimate of taskings for each year. As stated in Section B, CONTRACT MINIMUM/MAXIMUM QUANTITY AND CONTRACT VALUE**,** on pages 19 and 20 of the RFP, "NOTE: The quantities and total amount for all CLINs listed above are estimates that may vary greatly during contract execution but the value of all executed delivery orders shall not exceed the contract ceiling amount of $45,000,000. There is no specified percentage of the ceiling amount for firm, fixed-price CLINs and delivery orders versus cost-plus-fixed-fee CLINs and delivery orders. The quantities and dollar amounts set forth in the individual CLINs are merely estimates. The entire $45 million could be CPFF delivery orders, FFP delivery orders, or any mix of FFP and CPFF delivery orders." Therefore, the quantities listed in Section B of the RFP don't represent the amount of delivery orders anticipated each year.
10.	CLIN 0101 Period of Performance End Date	CLIN 0101 period of performance ends on 16 July 2015. Should this be 15 June 2015?	RFP Section F, RFP page 30	CLIN 0101, Post Award Conference (PAC) and Admin Requirements, is scheduled to take place during 16-JUN-2014 to 16- JUL - 2014. We don't believe this should be 15 June 2015 as we anticipate the PAC taking place no later than one month after contract award.

11.	Government Furnished Material	Question 1: Item "(c)" states that "Only the materials listed in the SOW Appendix A Table A-V, will be furnished by the Government". Appendix A in the SOW has tables listed as Table A-1 through A-VII. Are these the tables referred to as Appendix A Table A-V in this clause? Question 2: Are the Government materials listed in Appendix A of the SOW sufficient to support anticipated Delivery Orders? Question 3: Item (b) states "The material will be delivered at the Contractor's expense to the location designated in the contractor's propos al for performance. Delivery includes disassembly, packing, and shipping from its current location directly to the designated contractor facility for unpacking, assembly, installation, setup, and operation." Is the material referenced in this item "(b)" pertain only to the material in item "(a)" in this clause or all of the items listed in Appendix A of the SOW (referred to in item "(c)" in this clause?	5252.245-9509, RFP page 32	Q1: Yes, table A-V referenced in paragraph 3.1.1.5.1.1 is the table in Appendix A, A-V. Therefore, only the items listed in Appendix A, TABLE A-V will be furnished by the Government. Q2: No, the table lists equipment that may be used to meet the terms of future delivery orders, but is not all inclusive of every possible tool or asset that may be required in the future to support delivery orders. Q3: The material referenced in this item "(b)" pertains to the materials listed in "(a)". The materials listed in item "(a)" are what is referenced in SOW Appendix A Table A-V, with the addition of the MRTS Source Code and Documentation. Item "(b)" instruction is standard instructions for all GFE.
12.	Anticipated Award Date	Clause 5252.215.9503 states that the anticipated award date for this requirement is 19 December 2013, which is one day prior to proposal delivery. Can you please clarify?	Clause 5252.215.9503, RFP page 177	This date was made in error. This date will change in the first amendment to reflect an anticipated award date of June 16th, 2014.
13.	Microsoft Office 2000	We assume that delivery of the proposal in Microsoft Office 2007 is acceptable. Is this correct?	Section L, paragraph 2.0, RFP page 178	No, please provide all proposal information compatible with Microsoft Office 2003. The RFP will be amended in Section L, Part A, 2.0 Proposal Format, to account for this clarification.
14.	Not Counted Pages	We assume that Tabs/Dividers are not page counted. Is this correct?	RFP Section L, Part A, Paragraph 3.0, RFP page 178	Yes, that is correct.
15.	Number of Personnel Allocation Matrices	Section L, Part B 2.0 Element 1.2 opens by stating "The offeror shall provide a Personnel Allocation Matrix for the following CLINs:	Section L Part B 1.0 Element 1.2 – Personnel Allocation, RFP page181 &183	Correct, the sample table should be filled out for each of the contract years 1-5.

		CLIN 0102 Core Sustainment (FFP) and out years (0202, 0302, 0402, 0502) CLIN 0103 Software Development Products (FFP) and out years (0203, 0303, 0403, 0503) CLIN 0104 Software Development Products (CPFF) and out years (0204, 0304, 0404, 0504) CLIN 0105 Software Upgrade Products (FFP) and out years (0205, 0305, 0405, 0505) CLIN 0106 Hardware System Development and/or Technical Refresh (FFP) and out years (0206, 0306, 0406, 0506) CLIN 0107 Documentation (FFP) and out years (0207, 0307, 0407, 0507) CLIN 0108 System Administration (SA) / Information Assurance (IA) (FFP) and out years (0208, 0308, 0408, 0508)" Later, in that same RFP section, it is stated "E. Labor Hours: Identify the proposed labor hours per labor category required to execute the tasking associated with each CLIN in the RFP for one year of the contracted effort." Since the Item "E" noted above mentions the development of labor hours per labor category for one year of the contracted effort, we assume that we are to develop a separate Personnel Allocation Matrix for each year of the contact. For example, the SAMPLE presented on page 182 of the RFP is representative for the initial contact year. Is this correct?		
16.	Personnel Allocation Matrix hours to be developed	As a point of clarification, from the instructions, we are to use the Sample Tasks in RFP Section L Part B Element 1.3 to develop labor categories and labor hours to accomplish that specific sample task (for CLINs 0103, 0104, 0105, 0106, 0107, and	Section L Part B 1.0 Element 1.2 – Personnel Allocation, RFP page181	Correct, however CLINs 0X02 Core Sustainment should still be accounted for in the Personnel Allocation Matrix Table, but will be based on what is asked for in Attachment 1 of the RFP, Statement of Work (SOW).

		0108), and then use those labor categories and hours all out years but adjusting for the quantities listed in Section B. Is this correct?		
17.	Additional Labor Categories for the Personnel Allocation Matrix	Section L, Part B 2.0 Element 1.2 says in part "The offeror shall include all projected labor categories that are necessary in fulfilling these CLIN requirements. This may include additional labor categories beyond those labor categories proposed for the sample tasks." We assume that if we want to propose additional labor categories, we simply list all the information required of the Personnel Allocation Matrix, but leave the "Est Labor Hours" at zero. Is this correct?	Section L Part B 1.0 Element 1.2 – Personnel Allocation, RFP page181	Correct, however Section L, Part B 2.0 Element 1.2 will be amended to include additional information for the inclusion of labor categories not captured under the sample tasks. "G. <u>Additional Labor Category Justification (Only if proposed labor category not captured in Sample Tasks in Element 1.3 – Technical Approach):</u> Provide rationale for the inclusion of the labor category proposed in part A of this section "Labor Categories". Rationale shall include specific SOW references that would justify an additional labor category not captured under the sample tasks referenced in Section L Part B, Volume 1, Element 1.3 Technical Approach as well as any additional substantiation for the necessity of its inclusion in Attachment 2 of the RFP, Resource Allocation Matrix (why a different labor category included in the sample task can't adequately perform the requirement this specific proposed labor category can).
18.	Correction of CLIN 0102 SOW reference	Section L Part B 1.0 Element 1.2 says in part "For CLIN 0102, multiply the hours for each labor category proposed to fulfill the requirements outlined in SOW paragraph 3.2.2, by the quantity multiplier (months) in section B of this solicitation." We believe the correct SOW reference is 3.3.2. Is this correct?	Section L Part B 1.0 Element 1.2 – Personnel Allocation, RFP page181	Correct, this will be changed in the first amendment.
19.	Sample Task Labor Category/Hour Breakout	RFP Section L Part B 1.0 Element 1.3 states in part that we are to describe "vii. Labor categories with associated hours required to accomplish each sample task (#1 and #2), using the Personnel Allocation Matrix, broken down by elements i-vi" We assume elements i-vi are the preceding items (i.e.,	RFP Section L Part B 1.0 Element 1.3 – Technical Approach/B – Software Development Products (FFP/CPFF), RFP page 183	Correct, those statements within RFP Section L Part B 1.0 Element 1.3 refer to the preceding items listed above the sample task(s) within that section.

		Requirements analysis and derivation, Engineering and design approach, etc.). Is this correct?		
20.	Contract Data Word Table	Since populating this table with all the required data for all the contracts listed in a single table might be a little cramped, can a separate table be presented for each past performance contract?	RFP Section L Part B 3.1 General (a) – Contract Data, RFP page 197	Yes, that is acceptable and will assist in review of the information by the government.
21.	Contract Table Note 1	Note 1 in the Contract Table states "Place of Performance should be the same as being proposed in this solicitation. If different please include an explanation." We assume that the place of performance is the offeror's location (such as the corporate headquarters that provided contract oversight), and not NAWCTSD (i.e., you want to know if the contact being cited was performed by the same corporate entity or division that is being represented by the MRTS offeror). Is this correct?	RFP Section L Part B 3.1 General (a) – Contract Data, RFP page 197	This particular section is meant to capture the location (Place of performance) where the past performance reference contract was performed as well as verify that the CAGE Code/DUNs # of the company who performed the past performance reference is the same as that who is proposed as a prime, principal subcontractor, or Joint Venture. The RFP will be amended to clarify this point at RFP Section L Part B 3.1 General (a) – Contract Data.
22.	Contract Table Note 2	Note 2 in the Contract Table states "CPARS (yes/no) - CPARS completion date - on DOD PPAIS (yes/no) (Indicate whether or not any CPARS have been completed and identify the last CPARS completion date and if it is currently on DoD PPAIS)". What is the DOD PPAIS?	RFP Section L Part B 3.1 General (a) – Contract Data, RFP page 197	This will be amended to include the correct reference, DoD PPIRS, which is the Department of Defense Past Performance Information Retrieval System where CPARs data is accessed.
23.	Past Performance Information	RFP Section L Part B 3.1 General (b) Past Performance Information states: "The Offeror shall provide a brief description of performance in delivering quality products in each of the following areas: 1) meeting technical requirements, i.e., the quality of technical performance, e.g., performing analysis, design, testing, etc., 2) meeting schedule requirements, i.e., schedule performance, e.g., on time or late delivery, modification of original schedules and	RFP Section L Part B 3.1 General (b) Past Performance Information, RFP page 198	Correct, this information is to reference the contract(s) you provide in the Word Table at RFP Section L Part B 3.1 General (a) Contract Data.

		reasons for any changes, etc., 3) controlling contract cost, i.e., cost performance, e.g., on time or late delivery, modification of original schedules and reasons for any changes, etc., and 4) managing the contracted effort, i.e., program management, e.g., cooperation with customer, subcontract management." We assume that this information is only provided for the contracts we cite in Section 3.1. Is this correct?		
24.	Systemic Improvement Information	RFP Section L Part B 3.1 General (c) Systemic Improvement Information states: "Identify those systemic improvement actions taken to resolve past problems. Describe the techniques, elements, and tools used to correct problems and, if applicable, how these techniques, elements, and tools will be used during this contract." We assume that this information is only provided for the contracts we cite in Section 3.1. Is this correct?	RFP Section L Part B 3.1 General (c) Systemic Improvement Information, RFP page 198	Correct, this information is to reference the contract(s) you provide in the Word Table at RFP Section L Part B 3.1 General (a) Contract Data
25.	Customer Point of Contact Table	The second column from the left in the Customer Point of Contact Table lists items "1" and "4" to be filled in. Are there items "2" and "3", or just the two items?	RFP Section L Part B 3.2 Past Performance Data Requirements, RFP page 198	There are no items "2" and "3", just the two items, it will be changed to reflect just a "1" and "2" on the first amendment.
26.	Labor Rates past Year 5 Ordering period.	If deliverables fall outside the ordering period for Year 5 for any applicable CLIN, will new rates need to be negotiated at that time?	RFP Section L Part B 2.1 Volume Content RFP	No, as year 6 rates are not being established, the Offeror should make the appropriate considerations in the proposed year 5 rates. The offeror should account for up to 210 days after the end of the last ordering period per Clause 52.216-22 Indefinite Quantity. The RFP will be amended to note this and an update will accordingly be made to Attachment 2 of the RFP: Resource Allocation Matrix to provide clarification.
27.	Sample Task #1	The instructions state "…only take the software upgrade to the point of Test Readiness Review #2 (TRR-2)". A similar comment for Task #2 and #3 is made. Please provide confirmation that this means conclude	RFP Section L Part B 1.0 VOLUME 1: Element 1.3 Technical Approach, Sample Task #1, RFP page 184	TRR-2 is the review of last test event in a nominal MRTS trainer upgrade development cycle before the final decision to ship the product to site. Offerors should include presenting the results of DT-4 to the government in the TRR-2 as part of their bid. Simplified exit criteria for TRR-2 is included in the

		the program before starting TRR-2, not through TRR-2.		sample task.
28.	CDRL C001, Sample Task #5	CDRL C001 ISKL, Blk A indicates CLIN 0006. Page 187 Sample Task #5 indicates that the ISKL should be delivered with Documentation, CLIN 0007. Para 3.3.6.1 of the SOW indicates ISKL is delivered with CLIN 0006. Please provide clarification, is the ISKL delivered with Sample Task #4, CLIN 0006 or Sample Task #5, CLIN 0007?	RFP Section J, Exhibits A through F CDRLS, CDRL C001, Page 158. RFP Section L Part B 1.0 VOLUME 1: Element 1.3 Technical Approach, Sample Task #5, RFP page 187. RFP Section J, Attachment 1, SOW, Para. 3.3.6.1, RFP Page 88.	The ISKL is to be delivered with Sample Task #5, CLIN 0007 as indicated in the Sample Task #5. CDRL C001 will be revised to reference CLIN 0006.
29.	Sample Task #1 and #3 instructions	A) For Sample Tasks #1 and #3 with respect to program milestones, there is the following statement "…a combined DT-3 (GPI) and DT-4 (GFI) event accounting for all entrance/exit criteria listed for each event…". DT-4 in the SOW is classified as CFI, not GFI. Was this supposed to be DT-4 (CFI)? B) Please provide clarification on the entrance/exit criteria for these events. Entrance criteria for DT-3 per SOW para. 3.2.7.13.3.1.1.1 states "..exit criteria for TRR-1 have been met". Per para. 3.2.7.13.3.1 of the SOW TRR-1 exit criteria "…will be identified within a DO". The sample tasks do not identify any TRR-1 exit criteria. C) Are we to assume that the exit criteria for the combined DT-3/DT-4 will be the exit criteria for DT-3 SOW para. 3.2.7.13.3.1.1.3?	RFP Section L Part B 1.0 VOLUME 1: Element 1.3 Technical Approach, Sample Task #1, RFP page 184, Sample Task #3, RFP page 186	A). Yes, DT-4 is CFI and the desired event for sample tasks #1 and #3. This is a mistake in the Sample Tasks. GFI will be covered in sample task #4, installation of the hardware on site. B) Sample Task #1 and #3 will be revised to state… "…TRR-1 (exit criteria includes satisfactory deficiency and configuration management review)". These are simplified TRR-1 exit criteria in lieu of DO specific exit criteria. The intent is to provide a software product sufficiently tested and configuration managed to move onto the next phase of development. The Offeror should demonstrate compliance with the intent through their development processes. C) Offerors are advised to look at the intent of TRR-2 for additional guidance on the desired output of DT-4. Additionally, SOW para. 3.2.7.13.3.1.2.1 states "The documented DT-4 (CFI) results, including open deficiencies, shall be presented to the Government on an incremental basis at the next scheduled T&E IPT meeting and in final total form at the TRR-2."
30.	CDRL A00H	Block 16, line 4 states first submission shall be due 30 calendar days prior to start of GFI/DT-5. Block 16, Line 5 states the second submission shall be due 20 calendar days before conduct of GFI/DT-5. The Government has 15 days to review the first submittal. Therefore, the second submittal is due 5 days before the first submittal has been reviewed.	RFP Section J, Exhibits A through F CDRLS, CDRL A00H, Page 130.	CDRL A00H will be revised to reflect the following. The first submission should be 30 calendar days prior to Government Preliminary Inspection (GPI) and not GFI. Future delivery orders will use 30 days prior to GPI for first submission.

		Please clarify.		
31.	TECD CDRLs A00N and D004	Para. 3.1.1.6.2 of the SOW states that contractor "...shall prepare the Technical Directive (TD) (Training Equipment Change Directive (TECD) (CDRL D004) IAW CDRL A00N. A review of the Block 4 Authority for CDRLs A00N and D004 seems to indicate that these are the same document. Please clarify. Furthermore CDRL A00N references CLINs 0003-0007 and CLIN D004 references 0007. It is not clear under which sample task this (these) CDRL(s) are to be included.	RFP Section J, Exhibits A through F CDRLS, CDRL A00N, Page 145 and CDRL D004 Page 167, Section J, Attachment 1, SOW, Para. 3.1.1.6.2, RFP Page 59.	Previously addressed in another set of questions. CDRL D004 is the correct CDRL with the correct references. CDRL D004 will be revised to reference CLINs 0003-0007.
32.	Product Drawings	Does the Government currently own the drawings of the existing trainers? If yes are they available in electronic, native format? If yes what format?		Yes. All drawings are in Visio 2007 format. We are not providing source as part of the RFP, however, all drawings are included in the SIM manual in PDF form. The selected Offeror will receive source files in Visio 2007 format for future modifications.
33.	TSSD	Can the government provide a more up to date acronym list? When viewing the source code, there were a number of program specific acronyms used that had no definition. These include (but not limited to) TDMA, TIP, KIV, BAV, KWR, MCAP, IRM, HPA, OIU, PTP, NESP.	GFI Document: Draft MRTS 21H45 TSSD P-9059 Rev B 2-26-13 with attachments	The TSSD, along with all manuals, are provided as is. Future updates to the products will be part of specific delivery orders.
34.	Sample Task #2	In description of requirements for Sample Task #2 there is no mention of Windows 7 as there was for Sample Task #1. Please confirm that upgrading to Windows 7 is not a requirement for Sample Task #2.	RFP Section L Part B 1.0 VOLUME 1: Element 1.3 Technical Approach, Sample Task #2, RFP page 185	Sample Task #2 will be revised to include upgrading to Windows 7 as part of the requirement.
35.	Sample Task #2	Requirement for Sample Task #2 states "…only take the software development to the point of CFI (DT-4, software only)". Are we to assume, different from Task #1, that there will NOT be a combined DT-3(GPI)/DT-4(CFI)? If the requirement is for a combined DT-3/DT-4 please clarify what is meant by "to the point of CFI".	RFP Section L Part B 1.0 VOLUME 1: Element 1.3 Technical Approach, Sample Task #2, RFP page 185	Sample Task #2 will be revised to include the same condition testing requirements. The change is as follows for Sample Task #2: "… This task does not need to include the actual installation at the school training sites, but only take the software development to the point of and including Test Readiness Review #2 (TRR-2,). Include those factors that would be different from sample task #1 in regards to SRR, PDR, CDR, DT-2 (Government Preliminary Evaluation), TRR-1 (exit

				criteria includes satisfactory deficiency and configuration management review), a combined DT-3 (Government Preliminary Inspection, software only) and DT-4 (Contractor Final Inspection, software only) event accounting for all entrance/exit criteria listed for each event, and TRR-2 (exit criteria includes satisfactory deficiency and configuration management review)."
36.	Sample Task #2	In description of requirements for Sample Task #2 there is no mention of the Cisco 4800 Router 3-D model as there was for Sample Task #1. Please confirm that creating the Cisco 4800 model is not a requirement for Sample Task #2.	RFP Section L Part B 1.0 VOLUME 1: Element 1.3 Technical Approach, Sample Task #2, RFP page 185	Yes, creating the 3-D model is not a requirement of sample task #2.
37.	CDRL C001	CDRL C001 ISKL requires the first submittal 2 weeks before the SRR. This seems very early in the program to submit the initial ISKL, as at this point in the program typically a final hardware configuration is not Government approved. Please confirm that this is the correct date for the first submittal of C001.	RFP Section J, Exhibits A through F CDRLS, CDRL C001, Page 158.	The date for first submittal of C001 will be revised to read as follows: "FIRST SUBMISSION SHALL BE DUE 30 DAYS PRIOR TO GOVERNMENT PRELIMINARY EVALUATION (DT-1) AND SHALL CONTAIN ALL LOGISTICS MANAGEMENT INFORMATION (LMI) DATA PRODUCTS. SUBMISSION SHALL INCLUDE LONG LEAD ITEMS AND INDICATE THE MAJOR ASSEMBLY OF ITEMS BEING RECOMMENDED FOR SUPPORT AND SHALL INCLUDE ALL REQUIREMENTS INDICATED IN THE ANNEX TO EXHIBIT C."
38.	CDRL C001	CDRL C001 Second submission references Provisioning Item Selection Conference and Provisioning Guidance Conference. The SOW makes no reference to the conferences as to requirements or timing. Please provide additional guidance on requirements and timing of these two conferences.	RFP Section J, Exhibits A through F CDRLS, CDRL C001, Page 158.	The date for the second submission for CDRL C001 will be revised to read as follows: "SECOND SUBMISSION SHALL BE DUE 30 DAYS PRIOR TO TRR-2. THE SUBMISSION SHALL CONTAIN THE SPARES AND REPAIR PARTS, AND ENGINEERING DATA FOR PROVISIONING AS AGREED UPON BY THE CONTRACTOR AND GOVERNMENT."
39.	Sample Tasks #1 through #6	It appears that Task #1, #2 and #6 are totally independent and exclusive of each other. Task #3 appears to assume that Task #1 has completed but otherwise is an independent effort. Task #4 if awarded, is awarded	RFP Section L Part B 1.0 VOLUME 1: Element 1.3 Technical Approach, Sample Tasks, RFP pages 183 – 188	Each sample task centers around demonstrating capabilities related to the CLINs. There are numerous scenarios where delivery orders would include various combinations of CLINs. Offeror's Technical Approach should be specific to each Sample Task.

		simultaneously with Task #1. Task #5, if awarded, is awarded simultaneously with Task #1 and #4. Please provide clarification on the relationship among Sample Tasks #1 - #6, and how we are to fashion our technical response.		References among sample tasks are provided to show the relation of deliverables define for this contract. Sample Task #1 is independent of other sample tasks. It is the primary development effort the MRTS lab has engaged in previously. This task readies a large training capability/baseline to be delivered to already installed training systems. Sample Task #2 is like Sample Task #1 and independent and exclusive of any other sample task. This task readies a large training capability/baseline to be delivered in parallel with the tactical development for use in already installed training systems. Sample Task #3 is related to Sample Task #1. It calls for a requirement to update an end of life device in an already approved baseline. For Sample Task #3, the baseline referenced is the product in Sample Task #1. Therefore, the assumption that sample task #1 has completed is correct. Sample Task #4 is related to Sample Task #1 as its referencing delivery of a new training system inclusive of the product delivered under Sample Task #1. . Sample Task #5 is related to the products delivered in Sample Task #1 and #4. This type of requirement is triggered by any condition that drives a change in a trainer baseline. Sample Task #6 is independent of the other sample tasks, however, in practice, it would not be issued without a similar development product such as sample task #1 or #2 being included in the effort.
40.	Sample Tasks #1 through #6	Several of the sample tasks identify specific CDRLs that must be updated (or created) for that task. Are those the only CDRLs required to be updated/developed for that task (along with a technical response and associated labor	RFP Section L Part B 1.0 VOLUME 1: Element 1.3 Technical Approach, Sample Tasks, RFP pages 183 – 188	For consistency, only propose those efforts that include referenced CDRLs in the sample task. They are sample tasks and not intended to cover every aspect of an actual delivery order.

		categories and hours), or do we need to include updates to all of the requisite CDRLs, according to the associated CDRL delivery dates, for each sample task (for example, Task #1 only calls out the SRS and SDD; however, according to the CDRL documents, the IRS (A004), IDD (A006), SSDD (A009) and RTVM (A00K) are all due prior to SRR-1…which is just the subset due at SRR...and we need to know if we are to account for them in our technical response and labor hour estimates)?		
41.		The following statement is made above the Sample Task 1 description on RFP page 183: "Describe the approach for developing MRTS software products, as outlined in SOW paragraph 3.3.3". SOW Section 3.3.3 also requires us to perform the product development in accordance with SOW sections 3.1 and 3.2, which encompass basically all phases of trainer development including almost all of the A series CDRLs. A similar statement is also made for Sample Tasks #2, #3, and #4. Are our technical responses to these Sample Tasks required to address all of these SOW 3.1 and 3.2 sections?	RFP Section L Part B 1.0 VOLUME 1: Element 1.3 Technical Approach, Sample Tasks, RFP pages 183 – 188	Technical responses should address the related basic SOW paragraph for items identified in the Section L, Part B, Factor A, Element 1.3 Technical Approach, sample tasks.
42.	Management Plan	Section L, Para 3.0 Excludes from the page limit for the Technical/Management Volume, the standalone Software Development Plan and the personnel allocation matrix. **Question:** inasmuch as the Management Plan is a stand-alone document, will the Government exclude the Management Plan from the page limit as well?	Section L, Para 3.0	The government will revise its instruction under Section L, Part B, Factor A, Element 1.1 Management, to request a detailed management process for "Element 1.1 – Management". There will be no request of a stand-alone document under this Element other then the SDP. It was the government's intent for this process to be addressed under the Technical Volume maximum page count.
43.	Software Development Plan	Section L, Para 3.0 Excludes from the page limit for the Technical/Management Volume, the Software Development Plan and Element 1.1 implies in "D" that the SDP be included in the Management Plan.	Section L, Para 3.0 and Part B, Element 1.1 AND Section M, Part B, Paragraph 1.0	Please refer to Question and Answer #16 above. Since the reference to a Management Plan is removed, the SDP is the only stand alone document. Additionally, only the SDP will not count against the page limit under Element 1.1. Additionally, Section M, Part B,Para 1.0, Element 1.1

		Furthermore, Section M, Part B, Paragraph 1.0 states that "[t] he offeror's Technical Approach in Section L, Factor A, Element 1.1 will be evaluated for consistency with the proposed Software Development Plan." This implies that the SDP is <u>not</u> part of the Management Plan Question: inasmuch as the Management Plan is a stand-alone document, and the Software Development Plan is not subject to the page limit, does the Government intend for the Software Development Plan to be included as part of the management plan or will it (the SDP) also be a stand-alone document?		should read as follows: "Element 1.1: Management - the Government will evaluate the completeness of the offeror's management process as outlined in Section L, Factor A, Element 1.1 of this RFP. Additionally, the Government will assess the adequacy of the offeror's organizational structure, management approach and start-up/transition plan to successfully complete all contracted requirements. The offeror's proposed SDP will be evaluated to ensure it is appropriate for the MRTS development and meets standard level of completeness IAW with CDRL A003 (SDP) and for process quality."
44.	CLIN 0X04 Section B	The CLIN description states the estimated quantity for this CLIN is 7; however, the estimated quantity identified under EST. QUANTITY for each 0X04 CLIN is blank. Please confirm that the correct quantity for CLINs 0X04 is 7.	Section B CLIN 0X04	Correct, for the 0X04 CLINs Software Development Products (CPFF), the estimated quantity is 7.
45.	Proposal Format	Written proposals must be formatted using a Times New Roman 12 pt normal font (no reduction permitted), single-spaced with 1-inch margins all around, and formatted for standard 8.5 x 11 inch paper. **All pages should be numbered with section and page numbers**. When foldout pages are used they must not exceed 11 x 17 inches and will be counted as 1 page. Drawings may be provided separately and may be any size, but should be folded to approximately 8.5 x 11 inch standard size and will count as 1 page. Graphs shall be presented in no smaller than a 10 pt font and should contain a grid, which allows values to be read directly from the graph to the same accuracy that a 10 x 10 to the ½ inch grid provides.	Section L, Part A, page 178	The reference is made to Graphs. As it states, graphic resolution should be consistent with the purpose of the data presented. The 10pt font for graphics and tables shall be consistent with the proposal format, which is Times New Roman normal font.

		Graphic resolution should be consistent with the purpose of the data presented. Should this reference "Graphics, Charts and Tables" instead of "Graphs" Must the 10pt font for Graphics and Tables also be in "Times Roman"?		
46.	SDP	Section L requests delivery of the SDP with the proposal; however, A003 indicates first submittal of the SDP is 30 days after contract award. Please confirm SDP is to be delivered with the proposal. Is this first submittal referenced in A003 required for potential updates to the SDP?	Section L, Para. 3.0 and CDRL A003	The request for the SDP for the RFP is not a CDRL requirement since there is no contract at this point. In the context of the CDRL, first submission will be considered when the SDP is delivered after contract award. The SDP requested for RFP is considered "proposed" for the purposes of evaluating contractor capability.
47.	CPFF CLINs	Section H1 Labor Categories for the CPFF CLINs states that the contractor will be paid only the fully burdened rates (exclusive of fee) established in Attachment 2, Resource Allocation Matrix. The fixed fee will be negotiated on each DO and paid accordingly. Is it the Government's intent to pay the contractor the fully burdened rates (exclusive of fee) established in Attachment 2, Resource Allocation Matrix even if the contractor's actual costs are less than the rates in Attachment 2? Or are the rates in Attachment 2 intended to be the maximum amounts that will be paid to the contractor?"	Section G1, Section H, H1 – Labor Categories, page 40	The government will pay the fully burdened rates (exclusive of fee) established in Attachment 2, Resource Allocation Matrix even if the contractor's actual costs are more or less than the rates in Attachment 2.
48.	Man-hours Involved in Each Major Phase of Testing the Original	Sample Task #3 partial requirements: "The device to be replaced is in the C12811 project of the source code.	PART B SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS Element 1.3 - Technical Approach	The original SCSS code was developed as a NAWCTSD in-house effort and did not go through the indicated SETR events. As such, no hours are available. The

	C12811 Project to Establish a Baseline	… but only take the software upgrade to the point of Test Readiness Review #2 (TRR-2). Include SRR, PDR, CDR, DT-2 (Government Preliminary Evaluation), TRR-1 (exit criteria includes satisfactory deficiency and configuration management review), a combined DT-3 (Government Preliminary Inspection, software only) and DT-4 (Government Final Inspection, software only) event accounting for all entrance/exit criteria listed for each event, and TRR-2 (exit criteria includes satisfactory deficiency and configuration management review)." Please specify the amount of effort/man-hours involved in each major phase of testing the **original** C12811 project to establish a baseline? 1) SRR 2) PDR 3) CDR 4) DT-2 (Government Preliminary Evaluation) 5) TRR-1 6) Combined DT-3 (Government Preliminary Inspection, software only) 7) DT-4 (Government Final Inspection, software only) \ 8) TRR-2	C, 1. Page 186	sample tasks limit development to a modification of the original baseline, and the devices are clearly identified. The Offeror should estimate the amount of effort to support SETR events in a product based contract based on the entrance/exit criteria as defined in the SOW and sample tasks.
49.	GFE	The Section L ask the contractor to describe a startup plan that includes the receipt, operation and maintenance of GFE per SOW 3.1.1.5 and "Table A-II". 1) Is Table A-II the only GFE the contractor will be responsible for?	Section L.1.C.i line 4-5, page 181. SOW, paragraph 3.1.1.5, page 59. SOW Appendix A, Tables A-II (page 89) and A-V (page 91)	1. Question and Answer #11 on the most recent Q&A posting titled "MRTS_RFP_Question_and_Answer_11-27-13" addresses this question. Amendment 1 of the Solicitation changed the reference of Table-II to Table A-V in Section L Part B, Factor A Element 1.1(C)(i). Therefore, Table A-V will be the GFE the contractor will be responsible for. 2. The items in table A-V will be available at the start of a delivery order that would require them.

		2) When will the table A-V items be available.		
50.	Verification and Validation	Sample Task 5 requires the contractor to define processes and procedures for V&V of documentation. The SOW is otherwise silent on requirements for V&V. Is the contractor free to propose/use his standard processes?	RFP, Section L, para 1.3.E.ii, page 187	Yes.
51.	LOC	It is desired that the Government provide the number of lines of code for the following project folders within the code base made available on the industry day. 1-BBScomputer 2- FOT_n10 3-AM3924 4-MD1054 5-MD1293 6-MDGUI93 7-FiberHub 8-C13620 The lack of proper tools during the industry day made it impossible to get a lines of code count to support estimation of the sample tasks.	SOW page 184, 2nd paragraph.	Lines of code: SCSS Baseline: 133,443 lines BBScomputer 344 FOT_n10 385 AM3924 685 MD1054 24 MD1293 3,334 MDGUIV3 241 FiberHub 566 C13620 230
52.	SDD, IDD, SSDD CDRLs Date of First Submission	The CDRL 1423 for the SDD, IDD and SSDD all have a first submission date prior to the SRR/SFR. Following standard System Engineering Practices, the first submission date of these documents is prior to the PDR.	CDRLs page #114, 115, and 117; CDRLs A006, A007 and A009.	Yes, a change will be made in the next amendment to account for this. CDRLS A006, A007, and A009 were revised to account for first submission 30 days prior to PDR, and final submission is due 30 days after CDR.

		Will the Government make a RFP amendment to correct the first submittal date for these documents?		
53.	ISKL CDRL Date of First Submission	The CDRL 1423 for the ISKL has a first submission date prior to the SRR/SFR. Following standard Logistics Engineering Practices, the first submission date of this document is after the CDR. Will the Government make a RFP amendment to correct the first submittal date for this document?	CDRLs page #158; CDRL C001.	Question #37 on the most recent Q&A posting titled "MRTS_RFP_Question_and_Answer_11-27-13" addresses this question. Amendment 1 of the solicitation has been changed to account for first submission to occur prior to DT-1, which is after CDR.
54.	Existing MRTS CDRLs	Are there existing Engineering CDRLS (A001 thru A00R) for the MRTS that would be made available as GFI as part of the RFP and/or contract?	CDRL pages 109 - 151	No. The MRTS program is transitioning from in-house development to a product based contract requirement that will be fulfilled under this Single Award Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract, and so the majority of material that exists today does not completely correspond to the CDRLs. There are some test procedures and minimal requirements and design documents that will be available to the selected Offeror after contract award, but nothing exists today that is in accordance with the CDRLs.
55.	Existing MRTS CDRLs	Are there existing Logistics Documents (CDRL C001, D001 thru D004, E001, F001, F002) for the MRTS that would be made available as GFI as part of the RFP and/or contract?	CDRL page 158 - 170	CDRL E001, Systems Interface Manual, is provided for all devices as part of the RFP. CDRL F001, Training Systems Support Document, is provided for all devices as part of the RFP. The selected Offeror will be able to leverage from existing documentation for D004 post award. There are no existing artifacts for the remaining CDRLs in the MRTS program.
56.	Location of Resource Allocation Matrix in Proposal	Section 2.1 asks for the Resource Allocation Matrix IAW Attachment 2, along with a number of supplemental tables.	Section L, paragraph 2.1 pages 188-192. Section 2.4.a.v page 193.	Section L, Part B, Factor B, Section 2.1 provides direction on how to fill out Attachment 2 of the RFP, the Resource Allocation Matrix. This is to include all labor categories proposed in the Personnel Allocation Matrix provided in Section L, Part B, Factor A, Element 1.2, with accompanying labor rates. The

		Section 2.4.a.v requests the Resource Allocation Matrix be placed in the "Administrative" Data listed. 1) Is this correct? 2) Should the 2.4.a.v location contain all the supplemental tables? 3) Should the 2.4.a.v location contain all the additional pricing requested in 2.1.b-h?		proposed Resource Allocation Matrix, which will only include labor categories, labor rates, and fixed factors, will be provided in section 2.4(a)(v). The supplemental tables, which are used to provide your price breakout for each CLIN's sample task as noted within Section L, Part B, Factor B, Section 2.1, are to be provided within their requested section. Therefore, all supplemental tables requested should remain under the appropriate 2.1 section (b-h). 1). Correct, a completed proposed Attachment 2 of the RFP, Resource Allocation Matrix, shall be located in Section 2.4(a)(v). 2). 2.4(a)(v) shall not contain the supplemental tables, only the Resource Allocation Matrix. 3). 2.4(a)(v) shall not contain all the additional pricing requested in 2.1.(b-h). That information should remain under the part of the price/cost proposal and administrative information volume where it is requested.
57.	Pricing additional information	Section 2.2 request several acknowledgements and (potentially) amplifying/clarifying information on pricing. Should this information be placed in Volume 2 in a section numbered 2.2, ahead of the (apparent) bulk of the pricing information in section 2.4.a.v and vii?	Section L, paragraph 2.2 pages 192-193.	The referenced information in Section L, Part B, Factor B, Section 2.2(a-c) shall be placed in those specific areas and not under Section 2.4(a)(v) or (vii).
58.	Source Code Delivery	For the GFI (3) Source Code, it states that this is available 30 days after acceptance of the OPSEC plan (A00G). According to the CDRL, this plan is due 30 days after contract award, and the Government has 60 days to review and approve or reject. Adding on the 30 days after approval and this could equate to 4 months into the contract. Request that the Government consider reducing these dates for source code availability to provide earlier.	RFP page 32	The Government will revise CDRL A00G to account for a 30 day review and approve or reject.

	Device Reference	Section 1.3.2 references an integration lab device of 21E22M that is not defined in section 1.1. Clarify.	RFP page 54	Device 21E22M is the MRTS BLQ-10 maintenance trainer. This device is currently under development and is scheduled to be fielded in FY14.
59.	Existing System IA	Is the current system compliant to IA MAC III?	RFP page 64	Many required configurations have been implemented; however, verification/validation that system is MAC III compliant have not been completed.
60.	PAC Location	Request clarification on the PAC conference location.	RFP page 85	The Post Award Conference (PAC) location will be at NAWCTSD, Orlando.
61.	Reference to IAP document	Section 3.3.3, CLIN 0103 (and associated out-years) Software Development Products (Firm Fixed Price (FFP)), refers to an IAP but IAP is not defined in the RFP material. We assume that this is an IA Plan. Will the Government provide a CDRL form for the IAP to specify the document type, content, submission dates, distribution, etc.?	SOW sections 3.3.3, 3.3.4, page 85	SOW section 3.3.1.2 will be revised to define the IAP acronym within this section and properly note the CDRL as A00J. IAP is referring to the Implementation Plan. This is portion of the PRA CDRL (A00J), it is its own tab in that CDRL.
62.	RTVM first submission date	The CDRL 1423 for the RTVM has a first submission date that is 45 calendar days prior to the SRR. Can the Government provide rationale for delivery 45 days prior to SRR vs. a shorter period (14 days/2 weeks) which is more in line with the standard process and should provide adequate time for Government review.	CDRL A00K, page 141	After review, the government will adjust the CDRL to account for 30 days prior to each event for each submission. Amendment 2 will revise CDRL A00K to account for this change.
63.	Sample Task #1 Test Events Issue	Please clarify the Test Events and the stopping point for this task. The text indicates to stop at TRR-2 (see highlighted text). The RFP states: "This task does not need to include the actual installation at the school training sites, but only take the software upgrade to the point of	Sample Task #1, page 184, last paragraph.	Question #29 on the most recent Q&A posting titled "MRTS_RFP_Question_and_Answer_11-27-13" addresses this question. Amendment 1 of the solicitation has been changed to account for the question and answer.

		Test Readiness Review #2 (TRR-2). Include SRR, PDR, CDR, DT-2 (Government Preliminary Evaluation), TRR-1 (exit criteria includes satisfactory deficiency and configuration management review), a combined DT-3 (Government Preliminary Inspection, software only) and DT-4 (Government Final Inspection, software only) event accounting for all entrance/exit criteria listed for each event, and TRR-2 (exit criteria includes satisfactory deficiency and configuration management review). " The test events that precede TRR-2 are DT-1 (GPE), DT-2 (CPI) and DT-3 (GPI). Test Events DT-4 (CFI) and DT-5 (GFI) occur after TRR-2. Please clarify which Test Event to stop the description of the engineering processes, either TRR-2 or DT-5 (GFI).		
64.	Sample Task #1 Test Events Issue	Please clarify the Test Event association in the Sample Task #1 (see highlighted text). The RFP states: "Include SRR, PDR, CDR, DT-2 (Government Preliminary Evaluation), TRR-1 (exit criteria includes satisfactory deficiency and configuration management review), a combined DT-3 (Government Preliminary Inspection, software only) and DT-4 (Government Final Inspection, software only) event accounting for all entrance/exit criteria listed for each event, and TRR-2 (exit criteria	Sample Task #1, page 184, last paragraph. SOW section 3.2.7.1.3 T&E Program Components, page 80.	Question #29 on the most recent Q&A posting titled "MRTS_RFP_Question_and_Answer_11-27-13" addresses part of this question. Amendment 1 of the solicitation has been changed to account for DT-4 reference. Amendment 2 will provide an additional revision to Sample Tasks #1, #2, and #3, to change DT-2 reference to be the Contractor Preliminary Inspection as indicated in SOW section 3.2.7.1.3.

		includes satisfactory deficiency and configuration management review). " See SOW section 3.2.7.1.3 T&E Program Components: DT-1 (GPE) DT-2 (CPI) DT-3 (GPI) DT-4 (CFI) DT-5 (GFI) These sample task and the SOW references are not consistent and need clarification.		
65.	Base Device for Sample Tasks	Please clarify why the Sample Tasks use the SCSS, Device 21H42, instead of the CSRR Maintenance, Device 21H45, as the basis for the new SRCRR since it appears that the CSRR Maintenance has the same basic functionality, both operator and maintenance, required for the SRCRR.	Sample Task #1 and #2, page 184.	The SCSS code was chosen based on its simpler baseline requirements to simplify the sample tasks. A stand-alone, 3D model development task was added to sample task #1 to evaluate certain maintenance requirements.
66.	Proposal Due Date Extension Request	Offeror respectfully requests an extension to the proposal due date of at least two (2) weeks to ensure that a fully compliant proposal can be adequately prepared, to include properly addressing the following: 1) the Q&A answers released on 11/21/13 (16 days after RFP release);	Standard Form 33 Block 9, Section L 4.0 Proposal Submission (pg. 180)	The government is respectfully declining an extension to the proposal submission deadline for this solicitation. We understand there have been several rounds of Q&As and one amendment (second one coming); however, the Government believes the 45 days allotted for proposal development is adequate to allow for a fully compliant and competitive proposal to be submitted by all potential offerors.

		2) the **pending** RFP Amendment identified within the Q&A answers released on 11/21/13 (TBD days after RFP release); 3) the **pending** Q&A answers that will be provided to the Offerors based on questions submitted by NLT 11/26/13 (ref. Section L 9.0) (TBD days after RFP release); 4) the anticipated release of the RFP Amendment that potentially will be required to address Q&A answers related to questions submitted thru 11/26/13 (TBD days after RFP release); 5) In addition as part of the industry day meeting, the MRTS source code was provided with no software development environment tool for viewing the project code, dependencies and resources. This did not allow an assessment of the software in support of our technical approach and additional analysis is required. Also the 3D environment code was not provided as part of the source code as was expected and also led to the need for additional analysis. This additional analysis has delayed the development of our technical approach. Even though the government has planned for 45 days of proposal preparation from the 11/05/13 RFP release of which the Offeror is grateful, item 1 being available to the Offerors approximately 16 days post RFP release and items 2-4 availability of TBD, and item 5, does negatively impact the Offerors ability to prepare a fully compliant and adequate		

		proposal for submission with the current due date.		
67.	Gov't IPT	Please identify the composition of the Government IPT that would be supporting the MRTS contract.	Page 58, Section 3.1.1.2	The government will provide the identity of the personnel apart of the Government IPT at the PAC.
68.	Development Tools	Regarding sections a. 3.2.2.7.1.1.1 Software Development Languages, Libraries and Tools and section b. 3.2.2.7.1.1.2 Software Development Languages, Libraries and Tools Are there any additional tools which are not listed in these sections regarding the development tools used for coding or creating 3D animations?	Page 70, Sections 3.2.2.7.1.1.1, 3.2.2.7.1.1.2	The listed software tools are the ones that have been used to develop MRTS products and are listed to identify format and development requirements.
69.	Integration Lab	Does the Government have any plan to relocate the MRTS Integration Lab during the period of performance of the IDIQ or will it remain in the current facility?	Page 54, Section 1.3.2	The location of the MRTS integration lab may change during the period of performance. There currently is no plan to relocate the lab away from the immediate vicinity of Naval Support Activity (NSA) Orlando.
70.	Integration Lab	Please verify that the MRTS Integration Lab is not available for contractor development and the contractor will be required to develop its own integration lab/system for the IDIQ effort.	Page 54, Section 1.3.2	The MRTS integration lab will not contain development systems. It will be available for testing and a resource for the selected Offeror to manage. The selected Offeror will be responsible for providing a development capability. It is left to the Offerors to propose the best, most cost-effective means of achieving that.
71.	Period of Acceptance	Please Clarify. Is the required minimum period of acceptance 120 or 180 days?	Page 185, Section 2.4(d) of Amendment 1 conformed	The required minimum period of acceptance is 180 days. This will be revised in Amendment 2.

		(d) The period for acceptance of the offer stating how long the offeror agrees to honor the proposed prices. This period shall be, at a minimum, **one hundred twenty (180) calendar days** from the date specified for receipt of offers.		
72.	Price Volume 2.4(a) inclusion	Section L, Part B, Factor B, Section 2.4(a) states, "The following sections of the solicitation shall be completed and included in Volume III of the offeror's proposal:". Does the government mean Volume II instead of Volume III for the information asked in section 2.4(a)?	Page 185, Section 2.4(a) of Amendment 1 conformed	Yes, this will be revised in Amendment 2.
73.	NAWCTSD Drawing	Referenced specification refers to "MRTS Cabinet Over-All Assembly Drawing (NAWCTSD P-8652-15) in two places. Can we get a copy of that drawing?	SOW, Section 2.1, Specifications, NAWCTSD P-8651	The drawing P-8652-15 is for a custom cabinet used in Device 21H42. Future MRTS cabinet/mounting hardware should be based on commercially available equipment and not custom designed. The drawing is not provided for this reason.
74.	Follow-up Question to the Government Response to Question 11	Response Q1 and Q3 essentially states that only a Canon Vixia HV40 Camcorder, Nikon D90 Digital SLR Camera, and MRTS Source Code and Documentation will be provided to the Contractor. Question 1: Will the equipment listed in SOW Appendix A Tables A-I, A-II, A-III, A-IV, A-VI, and A-VII be made available for contractor use to perform contractor software development	Government Response to Question 11.	1. No, the equipment listed in in SOW Appendix A Tables A-I, A-II, A-III, A-IV, A-VI, and A-VII will only be available for testing. Items listed in Appendix A represent resources in the MRTS lab for core sustainment estimates. There is a Defense Research and Engineering Network (DREN) connected network with workstations for managing the Government's repository of source code baselines and other MRTS related software/documentation (Tables A-IV and A-VII). Team Foundation will be loaded for the purposes of configuration management. There is one engineering development model (EDM) (Tables A-I

		and testing? Question 2: If any of the equipment listed in SOW Appendix A Tables A-I, A-II, A-III, A-IV, A-VI, and A-VII is made available for contractor use, we assume that this equipment will be housed in the Government's facility. Is this correct?		and A-II) configured similar to Device 21H45 and one EDM for the WLCTT (Table A-VI) for use by the selected Offeror as testing resources. WLCTT and MRTS Radio Room resources are located in two different locations. The camera and camcorder (Table A-V) will be available to the selected Offeror when a delivery order is written for data collection that requires these resources, and may be requested as GFE at that time. 2. The equipment listed in SOW Appendix A Tables A-I, A-II, A-III, A-IV, A-VI, and A-VII will only be available for testing. Appendix A Tables A-I through A-VII, will be housed at the Government's leased facility or at NAWCTSD. Please note, all equipment listed in Appendix A are equipment to be maintained under CLIN 0X02, Core sustainment, and maintained in the Government leased facility or at NAWCTSD.
75.	CDRL TECD	Answer states "previously addressed in another set of questions". We cannot find a previous answer. Can the question number to the previous answer be identified? The answer states "will be revised to reference CLINS 0003-0007". For the sample tasks it is not clear as to the Government's expectation about which CLIN(s) should include the TECD, if any. Please clarify. Answer to 40 states "only propose efforts that include referenced CDRLs in the sample task". A TECD is not listed in any of the sample tasks. Please clarify if a TECD is to be delivered with any of the sample tasks.	MRTS RFP Questions and Answers dated 11-27-13, Answers 31 and 40.	The answer "previously addressed in another set of questions" was incorrectly input. The TECD will not be required by any sample task. Assume the government will develop the TECD.
76.	Sample Tasks CDRLs	Answer states "only propose those efforts that include referenced CDRLs in the sample task". Accordingly please confirm the following. Sample Task #1: SRS, SDD	MRTS RFP Questions and Answers dated 11-27-13, Answer 40.	All sample tasks have been revised to include the CDRLs the government is ordering with each task. Note that the RTVM is now required, as well as other CDRLs that were implied through the SETR event

		Sample Task #2: SRS, SDD Sample Task #3: SRS, SDD Sample Task #4: None Sample Task #5: ISKL, TSIP, SIM, drawings Sample Task #6: A00H, A00J The sample tasks include test events, please confirm that no CDRLS associated with testing, i.e. A001, A002, A00L, are required. Please confirm that EIR D001 is not required for Sample Task #4. Please confirm that only the items for Sample Task #5 as noted on page 187 of the RFP are required and not all CDRLs listed in SOW 3.3.7. Sample Task #4 requirements include "train the schoolhouse on the operation and maintenance of the training device". There are no training document CDRLs, i.e. F002, included in the sample task requirements. Please clarify.		entrance/exit criteria. Offerors should only include the listed CDRLs in their proposals.
77.	Cost allocation for sample tasks	Instructions from the RFP state "labor categories with associated hours required to accomplish the sample task #X, using the Personnel Allocation Matrix, broken down by elements i-iv". The Government confirmed that i-iv are the preceding lines for each sample task. For several of the tasks it is not clear under which item certain efforts should be included. For example, Sample Task #4, it is not clear under which item procurement and manufacture of the trainer should be. For Sample Task #5, it is not clear under which item the actual production/modification of the manuals should be. We can make assumptions about the most appropriate category but there	MRTS RFP Questions and Answers dated 11-27-13, Answer 19.	The offeror should note their efforts in the most appropriate item based on their technical approach. Given, the offerors could have varying approaches, the offeror's efforts could be noted in different items.

		is a concern that inconsistency amongst bidder assumptions could unfairly penalize incorrect assumptions. Please clarify.		
78.	CPFF CLINs	The listed CLINS are labeled as Cost Plus Fixed Fee (CPFF) but are to be bid and charged and paid using fixed contract labor rates set forth in Attachment 2 Resource Allocation Matrix, per H1. Also a fixed factor will apply to ODC per H2. Due to the fixed rates and factors, the listed CLINS do not seem to be CPFF subject to cost reimbursement payments, but rather Time and Material. Please clarify whether the listed CLINS are Time and Material or CPFF and if the latter, how cost reimbursement payments will apply.	Reference CLINS 0104, 0204, 0304, 0404, 0504 and RFP paragraphs C4, G1, H1 and H2	0X04 CLINs are classified as CPFF CLINs for the purpose of this competitive. Although this pricing structure is an alternative to a T&M CLIN, this structure allows for fixed labor rates, with fee to be negotiated prior to delivery order award. As noted in Section H, H1 – Labor Categories, the contractor will be paid the CPFF labor rates (exclusive of fee) established in the Resource Allocation Matrix, Attachment 2 in Section J of the RFP and the fixed fee amount negotiated on each individual delivery order to be paid accordingly as a completion type CPFF CLIN. Amendment 2 of the RFP will revise "G1 CPFF CLIN Payment" to provide additional clarity.
79.	GFE	Question 10 from the MRTS pre-solicitation conference of February 19, 2013, states: "10. Would the labs remain at their current locations?" The answer to Question 10 includes this sentence: "At this time it is anticipated that one of the MRTS Engineering Production Models currently housed in the Government integration lab will be made available to the contractor as GFE for use at their facility in support of the MRTS contract."	Appendix A of the SOW: Table A-V, Government Equipment Available for use as GFE, lists a camcorder and a camera.	1. The GFE is now limited to what is stated in Table A-V of Appendix A of the SOW. 2. No, the RFP never promised an EPM as GFE and no EPM will be provided as GFE for use by the awarded contractor.

		Is the GFE 1) now limited to the camcorder and the camera or 2) is the GFE still anticipated to include one of the MRTS Engineering Production Models currently housed in the Government integration lab will be made available to the contractor as GFE for use at their facility in support of the MRTS contract?		
80.	Source Code Lines of Code (LOC)	The Government's response to Part 4 of Question 8 states in part: "Source code is not available for the support libraries referenced in the code and the sample software tasks will not require any modifications to them.". In the sample tasks, it is stated that the total LOC for the MRTS system is 130K. Now, as the Government would not provide an Integrated Development Environment (IDE), we had no way to grab actual LOC when looking at the code on the laptop while performing our analysis. The sample tasks specify that the development effort for the new items will match the old and since there is no design data provided, we can only base our estimates on LOC. Can the Government provide the LOC count for the source code that was made available during our on-site visit to NAWCTSD?	MRTS RFP Questions and Answers dated 11-27-13, Answer 8 Part 4.	Please refer to the Answer provided for Question 51.
81.	Past Performance Questionnaire (RFP Attachment 4)	RFP Section L Part B 3.1 states in part "For contracts or DOs that have CPARS Reports that are more than six months old, e.g., the date the Assessing Official completed the assessment is more than six months before the due date for this Past Performance Volume, or contracts or DOs identified which do not have CPARS Reports, the Offeror will forward a copy of the Past Performance Questionnaire (Attachment 4) to that contract customer's Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO), Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO),	RFP Section L Part B 3.1	Correct, if there is a FINAL CPAR that has been generated for a specific DO/TO or contract, a past performance questionnaire (Attachment 4 of the RFP) does not need to be provided for that DO/TO or contract.

		Program Manager or Point of Contact (as required per Section 3.2)." We assume for contracts that are completed and a FINAL CPAR has been generated, we do not need to provide Attachment 4 to our points of contact and we can provide these printed CPARs as required by RFP Section L Part B 3.1(e). Is this correct?		