

The following is a complete list of questions to date submitted to the Government related to the TPS RFP N00383-14-R-TIRES. The Government's responses follow each question.

The responses and other information contained in this document are subject to change without notice. Remarks and explanations shall not change the terms or conditions of solicitation N00383-14-R-TIRE.

QUESTION # 1:

Is the Navy able to explain in more detail the rationale behind the tire/platform category pricing matrix rather than pricing the tires individually by NSN? Changes in aircraft mix or utilization over the potential 10 year term of the contract could create a dramatic disparity in cost for either the Navy or the tire and logistics supplier relative to actual product deliveries. Will proposal remedies to correct for a potential mix shift be accepted?

ANSWER #1:

Tire pricing will be based on Tire Categories, not on NSNs. Proposal remedies will not be accepted.

QUESTION #2:

It was our understanding that sustainment of the F-35 platforms is to be handled through Lockheed Martin. Is it DOD's intent to source the tires through the PBL contract going forward? Is there a transition period?

ANSWER #2:

Amendment 01 will address the F-35 platforms.

QUESTION # 3

Is the Navy able to provide actual demand history for F-35 tire purchases and/or the methodology for developing the forecast?

ANSWER #3

No, best estimated quantities are provided in the RFP Schedule of Supplies.

N00383-14-R-TIRES

QUESTION #4

Which F/A-18 nose tire will be purchased under this contract? Will there be a transition to the tire that is qualified on both the F-18 and F-35C as the exclusive option? The two tires (F/A-18 only and F/A18/F-35C) are designed and qualified to meet different performance requirements.

ANSWER #4

Only the new F-18/F-35C NLG tire, NSN 1RM-2620-01-464-6078 will be used.

QUESTION #5

Will the Navy allow a tire manufacturer to serve as the prime contractor for this PBL contract and ultimately make the tire sourcing and procurement decisions?

ANSWER #5

The RFP is being competed under full and open competition.

QUESTION #6

The pricing instructions require offerors to propose a single unit price by Tire Category, representing the average unit price of all of the individual tires in each Tire Category, rather than price by individual Tire NSN. Proposing a single unit price by Tire Category – both for the Contractor Furnished Tire CLINs and PBL Support CLINs – will force offerors to build additional cost into their prices to compensate for the added risk of variability of relative demand between Tire NSNs. Since manufacturing/ tire purchase costs, freight and material handling costs vary substantially by NSN, variability of NSN demand will substantially impact average Contractor Furnished Tire and PBL Support costs. The incumbent Contractor has detailed NSN demand information that other potential offerors do not possess, giving the incumbent Contractor an unfair competitive advantage with pricing this risk. To prevent an unfair competitive advantage by the incumbent Contractor, mitigate the added pricing risk related to the variability of relative NSN demand, more accurately allocate tire material and PBL costs, and in turn enable offerors to propose lower competitive prices, will the Government allow offerors to propose Contractor Furnished Tire and PBL Support prices by individual Tire NSN?

ANSWER #6

Refer to Answer #1

QUESTION #7

Will the proposed price for CLIN 0001, Transition, be included in the total evaluated price? The RFP states, “Phase I is applicable if a contractor other than the incumbent Tire PBL contractor is awarded the contract.”

ANSWER #7

Amendment 01 will clarify how proposed unit prices will be evaluated.

QUESTION #8

The ordering clause states that delivery orders can be submitted to the Contractor electronically, by mail, or by facsimile. Historically what percentage of the requisitions issued are not submitted electronically?

ANSWER #8

It is anticipated that all delivery orders under the contract will be submitted electronically to the contractor via EDA. It is estimated that approximately 99% of fleet requisitions have been issued electronically via EDI.

QUESTION #9

Will the Government provide detailed historical information on the contract delivery orders issued under the predecessor contract? Information requested, at a minimum, is total number of orders issued per year, average number of tires per order, number of orders and number and type of tires ordered by activity each year. For this Tire Successor PBL contract does NAVSUP plan to issue a single contract delivery order per contract year or other contract period to include multiple CLINs, multiple funding citations, or multiple delivery locations? If not, how does NAVSUP plan to issue delivery orders during each contract year or associated contract period?

ANSWER #9

Historically, one annual delivery order was issued against the contract for the total best estimated quantities for the entire year. It is expected that this process will continue.

QUESTION #10

Will the Government amend the solicitation to provide detailed historical requisition data that is collected from the incumbent Tire PBL contract (ref. SOW paragraph 2.4, Data Collection and Reporting)? It is critical that this data be published in sufficient time for analysis prior to the receipt of offers to ensure a fair competition, providing potential offerors reasonable information to estimate infrastructure and transportation costs, considering particularly the historical ship-to and retrograde pickup locations, NSNs and quantities shipped to/ picked up from these locations, and Supply Response Time requirements. We respectfully request that NAVSUP issue individual requisition data for the past 3 years to include the same information described in SOW Paragraph 2.4, Data Collection and Reporting.

ANSWER #10

Amendment 01 will include the historic requisition data for the years JAN 2011 to AUG 2014.

QUESTION #11

Surge is defined as more than 2 times the demand during the same month of the previous contract year. The RFP states that the Contractor may be given schedule relief (i.e. relief from the SRT metric) at the discretion of the contracting officer, however the statement, “the Contractor will not be entitled to an equitable adjustment due to surge demand” seems contradictory. Does the Government intend that the Contractor be eligible for schedule relief but not monetary relief for surge demand? The RFP’s surge definition seems to be intended to take into account the seasonality of demand. While there is some aspect of seasonality with tire demand a more relevant focus is the recent trend in demand. Therefore, will the Government consider changing the definition of surge to equal more than two times the average monthly demand taken over the past 3 to 6 months and defining criteria for schedule or other performance relief if there is surge demand?

ANSWER #11

No.

QUESTION #12

Will all OCONUS orders be delivered by the Contractor to a location within the United States (e.g. U.S. ocean port) for transshipment by the Navy or TRANSCOM to their OCONUS end destination or will the Contractor deliver OCONUS orders direct to their OCONUS end destinations? If yes, what are the anticipated or historical OCONUS delivery locations and estimated delivery volume by location?

ANSWER #12

Amendment 01 addresses CONUS and OCONUS delivery requirements. See answer #10 for historic requisition data.

QUESTION #13

What are the anticipated or historical OCONUS retrograde tire pickup locations and pickup volume by location?

ANSWER #13

Refer to RFP, Attachment “J”.

QUESTION #14

The RFP states that downward price adjustments apply to SRT performance under 95%. Are downward price adjustments applied:

- a. Retroactively to the dollar value of requisitions issued or delivered, or invoices submitted or paid during the 6-month assessment period?
- b. Prospectively to the dollar value of requisitions to be issued or delivered, or invoices to be submitted or paid during the following 6-month period, or another period?

N00383-14-R-TIRES

- c. To the dollar value of requisitions that are delivered late or to all the requisitions issued or delivered during the applicable price adjustment period?
- d. Only to the associated dollar value of Contractor Furnished Tire CLINs, PBL CLINS, or both?

ANSWER #14

Amendment 01 clarifies downward price adjustments for the SRT performance metric.

QUESTION #15

On Attachment A, Listing of Tires by Category, NSN 2620-01-619-8190 is listed in both Categories III and IV. Which is correct and will the RFP quantities be adjusted to remove the apparent duplication?

ANSWER #15

NSN 2620-01-619-8190 is correctly included in both Categories III and IV. This is intentional because Category III represents F 35 A tires and Category IV represents F35 B tires. Attachment "C", Annual Forecasted Demands, shows the total estimated demands for combined F-35A and F35B NSN 2620-01-619-8190.

QUESTION #16

The Schedule of Supplies appears to have Category I and II annual quantities switched. Please confirm that Category I is 12,469 and Category II is 14,102.

ANSWER #16

Confirmed. Category I is 12,469 and Category II is 14,102. Amendment 01 will correct the issue.

QUESTION #17

CLIN 0103, Contract Continuation/Transition of Support Phase (REFER TO SOW C-3), is NSP (not separately priced). Does "NSP" mean the price for this service will be negotiated post-award? If not, where should the cost of performing SOW Phase III be included? Specifically, there is the cost of providing two months of Contractor Furnished RFI tire inventory.

ANSWER #17

Amendment 01 will address the Contract Continuation/Transition of Support Phase.

QUESTION #18

To ensure all offerors compete for this solicitation on an equal basis, what measures will the Government take to ensure that the tire manufacturer or manufacturer's designated distributor

N00383-14-R-TIRES

offers equal prices to prospective offerors and the Government (if the tire manufacturer or distributor is bidding this solicitation) for those NSNs listing the same tire manufacturer or distributor as the sole Government-approved source?

ANSWER #18

The RFP is being competed under full and open competition.

QUESTION #19

All tires for the Air Force are supplied through DLA's Tire contract. Therefore, for purposes of this RFP, should future projections of F-35A aircraft and tires exclude the Air Force?

ANSWER #19

The estimated quantities for all F-35 tires are included in the Schedule of Supplies. F-35A or F-35B, or F-35C tires may be supplied under the TPS contract if the option for F-35A, F-35B, or F-35C tires is exercised. Amendment 01 will detail the change in the RFP to make the F-35A/B/C CLINs an option to be exercised at the Government's discretion.

QUESTION #20

What portion of payments are made via EFT versus by check?

ANSWER #20

See RFP, FAR 52.232-33

QUESTION #21:

The BLS series report does include a Carbon Black index identified below:

PCU3251803251802

Could NAVSUP confirm the index for carbon black to be used in the EPA formula?

ANSWER #21

The correct BLS series for Carbon Black is PCU PCU3251803251820. This will be corrected by Amendment 01.

QUESTION #22:

Request NAVSUP to clarify the index to be used for Industrial Chemicals.

ANSWER #22

The correct BLS series for Industrial Chemicals is WP78U061. This will be corrected by Amendment 01.

N00383-14-R-TIRES

QUESTION #23:

Request add an index to take labor cost into account to adequately reflect the true component costs for aircraft tires.

ANSWER #23:

No adjustment will be made to the RFP.

QUESTION # 24:

The upward ceiling caps provided in the RFP are not realistic when compared to the previous 10 year period. Based on historical values, the NAVSUP RFP ceiling caps would require tire manufacturers to absorb 69% of the 55% component cost increases experienced over the previous 10 year period. Request NAVSUP revised the upward price adjustment ceilings.

ANSWER #24:

No adjustment will be made to the RFP.

QUESTION # 25:

The schedule of supplies asks for the unit price of each category of tires for each contract year. Does this indicate that a supplier can have a change of base price other than the EPA for any given contract year and the EPA is then added to that base price?

ANSWER #25

Yes, refer to Amendment 01 for clarification of the EPA clause

QUESTION #26

Is there a cut-off for when questions may be asked?

ANSWER #26

It is strongly encouraged that all questions be submitted in writing to the PCO no later than two weeks before the RFP closing date.

QUESTION #27

Can you please provide a copy of the Schedule of Supplies Table in Excel format?

ANSWER #27

It is not practical for NAVSUP WSS to do so.

N00383-14-R-TIRES

QUESTION #28

Please confirm that Base Period Year 1 is inclusive of the 120-day transition period (if invoked).

ANSWER #28

Confirmed.

QUESTION #29

The Schedule of Supplies table indicates a Best Estimated Quantity (BEQ) of 14,102 units / year for Category I tires and 12,469 units / year for Category II tires. However, based on the NSN categorizations in Attachment A and the forecasted demands for these NSNs in Attachment C, it appears the Best Estimated Quantities should be reversed (i.e. – 12,469 for Category I and 14,102 for Category II). Please clarify which demand quantities should be used in the pricing volume for each Category in the Schedule of Supplies.

ANSWER #29

Amendment 01 will correct the schedule page for the quantities of Category I and Category II tires.

QUESTION #30

Do the BEQs for Category 3, 4, and 5 include JSF partner nations? If Yes, please provide DODAAC, Project Codes, and ship to locations for partner nations?

ANSWER #30

Yes, Amendment 01 addresses JSF partner nations.

QUESTION #31

The Schedule of Supplies for Option Period, Year 1 does not include an Item No. 0055, which is inconsistent with the Item No. structure in all other periods. Can this be updated to maintain CLIN structure consistency?

ANSWER #31

Amendment 01 will correct the schedule page for CLIN structure consistency.

QUESTION #32

The Schedule of Supplies for Option Period, Year 2 contains a duplicate CLIN (0066). Furthermore, CLINs for this time period begin at Item No. 0064, which is inconsistent with the structure in prior years. Can this be updated / corrected to maintain CLIN structure consistency?

ANSWER #32

Amendment 01 will correct the schedule page for CLIN structure consistency.

QUESTION #33

Given that an Economic Pricing Adjustment clause will be applied against all Tire Category CLINs, please confirm that the Unit Prices proposed in years 2 through 10 can be escalated for economic factors not accounted for in the RFP EPA.

ANSWER #33

Unit Prices proposed in years 2 through 10 can be escalated for economic factors not accounted for in the RFP EPA.

QUESTION #34

Given the monthly invoice requirement defined in Section (4)(a), will the Contractor be allowed to initiate monthly invoicing immediately (i.e. - 1st month) in Base Period Year 1? Or must the contractor wait until the 120 day transition period (if invoked) expires to commence monthly billings?

ANSWER 34

Refer to RFP, page 16, "Payment", Paragraph 3.

QUESTION #35

RFP states that tires can only be procured from qualified suppliers identified on the QPL. The F-35A Nose and Main, F-35 B Main, and F-35 C Main are not on the QPL. Please clarify QPL requirement for F-35 tires.

ANSWER #35

Amendment 01 addresses F-35 tire sources.

QUESTION #36

With regards to government-furnished inventory transferred to the Contractor the last section of paragraph 4 states, "...the Contractor shall invoice at the *Government-furnished* PBL Support Price until the quantity of transferred inventory is completely invoiced for. The Contractor shall invoice for the total quantity of the transferred inventory by the conclusion of month twelve (12)." What happens if it takes more than 12 months to exhaust the GFM for a specific NSN?

ANSWER #36

Amendment 01 will clarify.

QUESTION #37

It states that each page should have a font with a point size of 12 or greater. Can graphics/tables be a lesser font than 12 point, minimum of 8 point?

ANSWER #37

No.

N00383-14-R-TIRES

QUESTION #38

Index Number PCU3251823251820 (Carbon, Black) - specified in the price index weighting table at the end of page 67 - does not appear on the BLS website. Can you verify that this is the correct Index Number for use in EPA measurement?

ANSWER #38

Refer to answer #21.

QUESTION#39

In the price index weighting table at the end of page 67, the index number provided for Textile Products and Industrial Chemicals is the same (WPU031502). Please confirm these are the correct index numbers for use.

ANSWER #39

Refer to answer # 22

QUESTION #40

NSN 2620-01-619-8190 appears in both Category 3 and 4. NSN 2620-01-464-6078 appears in both Category 1 and 5. Please confirm that these NSNs should be included in price computation for each category.

ANSWER #40

Refer to answer #15. Refer to the notes on Attachment "C" for NSN 2620-01-464-6078.

QUESTION # 41

Dunlop is not listed as a current tire repair and production facility. Should Dunlop be added/listed in this Attachment based on the requirements?

ANSWER #41

Amendment 01 will address current tire repair and production facilities.

QUESTION #42

Regarding the sentences:

“The solicitation, however, does not require participation by such entities.” and “If the offeror fails to provide targets for the contract and/or any of the seven socio-economic factors, the offeror's proposal will be evaluated at zero percent and/or zero dollars for the contract and/or any socio-economic factor for which a target is not provided.” If the offeror provides zero-dollar

N00383-14-R-TIRES

targets for one or more socio-economic categories, how will the offeror's proposal evaluation be affected?

ANSWER #42

Amendment 01 will address targets.

QUESTION #43

The quality assurance and Government inspection requirements of contract clause 52.212-4 and SOW paragraph 9.4, which references FAR clause 52.246-2, are very different. FAR 52.212-4 relies on the Contractor's quality assurance and provides for Government inspection only after items have been tendered for acceptance; whereas SOW 9.4 stipulates Government contract quality assurance and Government inspection before goods are delivered. For which Tire NSNs does FAR 52.212-4 apply and for which Tire NSNs does SOW 9.4 apply?

ANSWER #43

Amendment 01 will address SOW paragraph 9.4

QUESTION #44

Does SOW paragraph 9.4 require Government Source Inspection (GSI)? If so, please clarify the following:

- 1) For which Tire NSNs is GSI required?
- 2) Is GSI performed at the tire manufacturer's facility or Contractor's warehouse used for tire distribution for this contract?
- 3) Is GSI performed for each contract delivery order that is issued for NSNs having the GSI requirement and must the GSI be completed before the Contractor can ship the delivery order?
- 4) Will the Contractor's SRT metric performance be adjusted to exclude time to complete GSI?

ANSWER #44

No, SOW paragraph 9.4 does not require GSI.

QUESTION #45

How should an Offeror respond to the Navy Tires PBL Successor RFP if a supplier listed as a qualified tire source does not provide a quote? The particular tire in question is a sole source supplier for JSF.

ANSWER #45

Business matters are not handled by the Government.

QUESTION #46

Certain historical performance information from the incumbent contract is needed to estimate available supply of Ready-For-Issue retrograde tires that will be used to fill estimated tire demand. Due to the substantial cost difference between a RFI repaired or retreaded tire and a new tire of the same NSN it is essential that offerors have sufficient information to estimate by NSN the percentage of tire demand that reasonably can be filled by RFI repaired retrograde tires compared with new tires, and that this data be published in sufficient time for analysis prior to the receipt of offers to ensure a fair competition. Please provide data in response to the following questions:

- 1) What is the current on-hand quantity by NSN of RFI retrograde tires stored in the Contractor's inventory on the incumbent contract?
- 2) What is the current on-hand quantity by NSN of retrograde tire casings stored with the retrograde tire processor and awaiting processing into RFI retrograde tires?
- 3) What is the historical pickup quantity of retrograde tire casings by NSN and location over the last 3 years on the incumbent contract?
- 4) What is the historical scrap or failure rate of retrograde tire casings by NSN that are picked up under the incumbent contract for repair or retreading over the last 3 years?
- 5) Will all RFI retrograde tires remaining in the incumbent Contractor's inventory at the end of the incumbent contract be transferred to the successor contractor (if not the incumbent) as Government Furnished Inventory and if not what portion?

ANSWER #46

- 1) The tire inventory held by the incumbent contractor is owned by the incumbent contractor.**
- 2) Retrograde tire casings inventory held by the incumbent contractor is owned by the incumbent contractor.**
- 3) See attachments "J" and "K" to the RFP.**
- 4) This information is not available. See RFP page 33, Clause 6.3 for TPS requirements.**
- 5) Retrograde tire casings inventory held by the incumbent contractor is owned by the incumbent contractor.**

QUESTION #47

The RFP calls for the Contractor to develop and submit as part of its proposal, an Industrial Base Plan and an Obsolescence and Diminishing Manufacturing Sources and Material Shortages (DMSMS) Management Plan. Do the submittal of those two plans count towards the Volume I – Non-price Proposal 75 page count restriction? Can they be submitted as an attachment that is supplemental to the Volume I – Non-price Proposal?

ANSWER #47

No.

N00383-14-R-TIRES

QUESTION #48

The current due date for proposal delivery is October 31, 2014. Request a thirty-one (31) day extension for proposal delivery to December 1, 2014.

ANSWER #48

See Amendment 01.