

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.

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?

- 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

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.

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.

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.

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

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.

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.

QUESTION #49

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?

ANSWER #49

Yes.

QUESTION #50

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. Can they be submitted as an attachment that is supplemental to the Volume I – Non-price Proposal?

ANSWER #50

No.

QUESTION #51

Can the DFAR Clause 252.219-7004 Small Business Subcontracting Plan (Test Program) be added to the solicitation for Offerors that have a comprehensive subcontracting plan approved under the DOD Test Program?

ANSWER #51

Refer to Amendment 02

QUESTION #52

The RFP describes a process whereby the Contractor invoices monthly for 12th of the annual delivery order value for Contractor Furnished Tire and PBL Support CLINs, then submits an invoice reconciling ordered quantities with the actual quantity 30 days following the end of the term of the delivery order. To avoid this reconciliation process and save associated administration cost would the Government instead allow the Contractor to invoice each requisition via EDI when it is shipped and pay the Contractor's invoice using Fast Pay procedures? The Fast Pay invoicing and payment method would also improve the Contractor's cash flow, reduce performance risk, and as a result enable offerors to propose lower prices for this solicitation.

ANSWER # 52

No, the invoice and reconciliation process will not be changed.

QUESTION #53

What is the process for establishing QPL sources for repairable tires for the tires in Category II that do not currently have a QPL source listed, and when does the Government anticipate these sources will be identified?

ANSWER #53

Although a tire may be retreadable, it is possible that there is no currently approved source to repair the tire. In such cases, the tire will not appear on the QPL list for repairable tires because there is no currently approved source to list on the QPL. Tire manufacturers/tire repair facilities that desire to be added to the QPLs must initiate the request and are required to follow the established procedures set forth by the Navy engineering and technical personnel at Naval Air Systems Command North Island Aircraft Tire Fleet Support Team in accordance with QPL qualification procedures at FAR 9.203.

QUESTION # 54

The RFP states a requirement all export OCONUS shipments entering the Defense Transportation System must be pre-cleared using an Advanced Transportation Control and Movement Document(s) through the sponsoring shipper service Airlift Clearance Authority. What portion of OCONUS orders will be shipped through the Defense Transportation System and for those that are is the Contractor's delivery considered complete when the Contractor delivers all Tires in the associated requisition to the Defense Transportation Services receiving location?

ANSWER #54

Refer to Amendment 02

QUESTION #55

The statement in the first paragraph to 5.1, "the Contractor is required to satisfy 100% of the requisitions within specified timeframes", suggests that the Contractor will potentially be in default of the contract if any single requisition is not delivered within the applicable Supply Response Time (SRT). This is inconsistent with paragraph 5.1.2 which states that the Contractor is required to maintain an average on-time SRT performance of 85% or higher during each performance period and is only required to submit a recovery plan if SRT performance falls below 85% during any performance period. Therefore, will the Contractor be in default of the contract if any requisition is not delivered on time, i.e. 100% on-time SRT performance is not met? If not, what level of SRT performance does the Contractor need to maintain to satisfy the minimum contract performance requirement and not be in danger of being in default of the contract? If less than 100%, will the Government remove the 100% on-time SRT performance requirement or re-state it as a goal?

ANSWER #55

Refer to Amendment 02.

QUESTION #56

If the 48th hour of a CONUS requisition/ 96th hour for an OCONUS requisition falls on a weekend or Federal holiday at the delivery destination is delivery due by 6:00 p.m. local time on the following working day at the delivery destination? The problem with not extending the due date for delivery to the next business day is if the Contractor's carrier arrives to deliver tires on a weekend or Federal holiday for on-time delivery the base or facility receiving location will most likely be closed, preventing tire delivery.

ANSWER #56

Amendment 02 will address this issue.

QUESTION #57

In the table to paragraph 5.1.2, the SRT percentage range for a 0% adjustment appears incorrect. No adjustment for SRT performance between 95% and 99.9% is specified, however we assume the value is 0%. Therefore should the level of SRT performance for a 0% adjustment be changed from "100%" to "95-100%"?

ANSWER #57

Amendment 02 will address this issue.

QUESTION # 58

The RFP provides the number of retrograde pickups but the scrap rate (percentage of retrograde tires by NSN that are not reparable/ retreadable into Ready For Issue tires). The scrap rate by NSN is essential to accurately estimate the supply of repaired/ retreaded RFI tires and in turn submit a competitive price for Category II Contractor Furnished Tires and avoid an unfair competitive advantage by the incumbent Contractor who has this information. Please provide this information as a supplement or update to Attachment J.

ANSWER #58

Scrap rates are unavailable and are a business decision to be made by the contractor within the constraints of the latest revision of MIL-PRF-7726. Each manufacturer is qualified to different R-levels and individual R-levels are available from the manufacturers.

QUESTION #59

At the conclusion of the contract term, the Contractor shall, at no additional cost to the Government, deliver to the Government designated destination, the quantity of ready-for-issue (RFI) tires as computed

by the formula in C3-3.0". Therefore is it correct that the Contractor will not be permitted to invoice the Government for the quantity of RFI tires delivered to the Government at the end of the contract term (e.g. at the associated Contractor Furnished Tire CLIN price and PBL CLIN price)? If not, should offerors build the costs associated with the delivery of these tires into its prices for the Contractor Furnished Tire and PBL CLINs.

ANSWER #59
Refer to Amendment 01

QUESTION #60
Will the Government permit the use of 10 point font on graphics, charts and tables to facilitate readability?

ANSWER #60
No.

QUESTION #61
Regarding the RFP's instructions for the price proposal, "the price proposal shall include all elements of price and such other price information as considered appropriate to support the offeror's proposal" besides submitting a completed price schedule, what kind of documentation and data is the Government seeking to evaluate in support of the offeror's price proposal?

ANSWER #61
Amendment 02 will address this issue.

QUESTION #62
The price adjustment example in the clause appears incorrect. Below shows what we calculated with corrected values in bold text.

Base Price Index - 129.68*

Adjusting Price Index - 132.85*

Less Base Price Index - 129.68

Change to Index - 3.17

Divide the Change to the Index

By Base Price Index - $3.17 / 129.68 = 0.024445$ (2.445%) **

Multiply by the

Base Unit Price – \$100.00 x **0.02445** = **\$2.45***** = Unit Price Adjustment

New adjusted unit price= \$100.00 + **\$2.45** = **\$102.45**

Are our calculations in this example correct?

ANSWER #62.

Refer to Amendment 01.

Note that the Base Price Index computation is rounded to the fifth decimal place equaling 0.02444. The correct adjusted unit price is \$102.44.

QUESTION #63

The clause defines “base unit price” for the second contract year and subsequent contract years as the final contract unit price of the contract line item *at the end of the immediately preceding* contract year. Since unit prices for the second contract year and each subsequent contract year are already established in the contract, i.e. pre-priced in the contract price schedule, should “base unit price” for the second contract year and subsequent contract years instead be defined as the *existing* contract unit price of the contract line item at the *beginning* of the *adjustment period*?

ANSWER #63

Refer to Amendment 01.

QUESTION #64

FAR 52.225-1, Buy American Act--Supplies (Feb 2009) is check marked as applicable for this contract, however, DFARS 225.1101(2)(i) states to use clause 252.225-7001, Buy American and Balance of Payments Program, instead unless, among other exceptions, DFARS 252.225-7021, Trade Agreements, applies. It appears that DFARS 252.225-7021, Trade Agreements, applies instead (ref. DFARS 225.1101(6)(i)) because tires as a general product category should be covered by the World Trade Organization Government Procurement Agreement.

ANSWER #64

Both Buy American and Trade Agreements Clauses shall remain in the RFP until such time that Offerors indicate the origins of the tires that will be provided under the contract.