

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 1**

Subject:  Past Performance – Attachment 5 – CPARS Update Questionnaire		
Reference:  RFP Section J	Paragraph:	Page  21
Question/Comment:  CPARS Update Questionnaire (Attachment 5) is listed in RFP Section J, page 21 but its use is not defined in the RFP. It appears to duplicate some questions on Attachment 6 Past Performance Questionnaire. a. Question - Please define the requirements and use for Attachment 5 CPARS Update Questionnaire.		
Response:  RFP L.B.2.1.f. (page 35): Forward a copy of the Past Performance Questionnaire (Attachment 6) to the past performance contract customer's Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO), Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO), Program Manager and Point of Contact for the following past performance contracts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Past performance contracts that do not have CPARS Reports, and</li><li>• Past performance contracts with CPARS Reports completed by the Assessing Official more than six months prior to the RFP's proposal due date.</li></ul> Please disregard Attachment 5. Amendment 01 removes this Attachment.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 2**

Subject:  Volume 1 Technical – Hidden Text		
Reference:  RFP Section L Part B	Paragraph:  1.0 Volume 1: Technical	Page  34
Question/Comment:  RFP Section L Part B 1.0 page 34; When this section is viewed in Microsoft Office 2013 there is hidden text that can be viewed on-screen which details requirements for the proposal response in section 1.1 Element 1 Overall Approach paragraph a and in paragraph (c) to include requirements for submitting names and letters of commitment. These requirements do not show up in print form or when the document is viewed in Microsoft Office 2010. A. Question – are the requirements of the hidden text valid or should they be disregarded?		
Response:  Hidden text should be ignored. PDF version of the RFP has been uploaded to FedBizOps and supersedes the earlier Microsoft Word version of the RFP.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 3**

Subject:  Volume 1 – Technical Page Count		
Reference:  RFP Section L Part A	Paragraph:  4.0 Proposal Volumes	Page  30, 31
Question/Comment:  RFP Section L Part A 4.0 page 31 details a 30 page limit for the contents of Volume 1. Volume 1 requires a cover page, table of contents, list of figures, a list of acronyms, and the use of tabs/dividers. Volume 1 content includes the Integrated Master Schedules detailed in Part B 1.2. a. Question – Are any these required documents/contents excluded from the page count?		
Response:  <b>This answer has been modified with Amendment 03.</b> Cover page, table of contents, list of figures, list of acronyms, and tabs/dividers are excluded from the 30 page limit. However, Integrated Master Schedules are included in the 30 page limit. Any pages submitted beyond the 30 page limit will not be evaluated. RFP L.A.4.0 has been updated.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 4**

<p>Subject:</p> <p>Past Performance Contract Information</p>		
<p>Reference:</p> <p>RFP Section L Part B</p>	<p>Paragraph:</p> <p>2.2 Past Performance Contract Information</p>	<p>Page</p> <p>36</p>
<p>Question/Comment:</p> <p>RFP Section L Part B Section 2.2 page 36 requires information identified in the table to be provided for each contract.</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a. Question – does the government want the data for all contracts in combined in one all-inclusive table or do they want the information provided for each past performance separately?</p>		
<p>Response:</p> <p><b>This answer has been modified with Amendment 03.</b> The information should be submitted as one separate table for each past performance contract. RFP L.B.2.2 has been updated.</p>		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 5**

<p>Subject:</p> <p>Page Limit for Technical Proposal</p>		
<p>Reference:</p> <p>Section L – Part A – 4.0 Proposal Volumes Section L – Part B – 1.0 – Volume 1: Technical</p>	<p>Paragraph:</p> <p>4.0 Proposal Volumes 1.2 – Schedule, subpara. 1.2.1</p>	<p>Page:</p> <p>31 34</p>
<p>Question/Comment:</p> <p>Page 31, Proposal Page limits indicate that Volume 1: Technical is limited to 30 pages.</p> <p>Page 34 of the RFP requires that an IMS be developed as part of Volume 1: Technical (see page 34, item 1.2.1 – Schedule).</p> <p>Please confirm that the IMS (Technical Proposal – Element 1.2) is not included in the 30 page limit for the Technical Proposal.</p>		
<p>Response:</p> <p><b>This answer has been modified with Amendment 03.</b> Integrated Master Schedules are included in the 30 page limit. Any pages submitted beyond the 30 page limit will not be evaluated. See QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 3.</p>		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 6**

Subject:  Submission requirements		
Reference:  RFP Section L Part A	Paragraph:  Section 4.0	Page  30
Question/Comment:  RFP Section L Part A Section 4.0 requires submission of proposal fully compatible with Microsoft Office 2007 while RFP Section L Part B 1.2 Schedule page requires submission of Integrated Master Schedule in Microsoft Office Project 2010.  A. Question - Please confirm that these are the two versions that are required for submission.		
Response:  Microsoft Office Project 2007 or later for the submission of the Integrated Master Schedule is acceptable. Sections L.A.4.0 and L.B.1.2 have been updated to reflect this change.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 7**

Subject:  General – Contract Performance		
Reference:  N/A	Paragraph:  N/A	Page  N/A
Question/Comment:  a. Question – Are these types of services being performed under an existing contract?  b. Question – If the answer is yes, please provide the contract number and incumbent contractor?		
Response:  Services are not being performed; however, under contract #N61340-12-D-7205-0003, Carley Corporation is developing courseware requirements.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 8**

Subject:  Notional Schedule		
Reference:  RFP Section F.1 table	Paragraph:  N/A	Page  9
Question/Comment:  <p><b>Notional Schedule; RFP Section F.1 table, page 9</b> identifies required minimum frequencies for a number of tasks (meetings, trips, etc.). While In-Process Reviews are detailed as Quarterly in frequency, the remainder just provide a number.</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">a. Question – Are the numbers in reference to the number of times to be conducted within the Period of Performance (PoP) for the associated CLIN, e.g. 1 = 1 time per PoP, or number per year; e.g. 1 = annually, 4 = quarterly, etc?</p>		
Response:  Frequency refers to the number of times conducted during the POP for the specified CLIN. For example, for CLIN 0001, there are a minimum of three (3) MQ-8C Mx Gap Analysis Data Gathering Trips required for the POP identified for CLIN 0001.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 9**

Subject:  Notional Schedule		
Reference:  RFP Section F.1 table	Paragraph:  N/A	Page  9
Question/Comment:  <p><b>Notional Schedule; RFP Section F.1 table, page 9</b> contains two columns (first and last) that are listed as CLIN. The numbers in these two columns do not agree. For example MQ-8C Operator Content Design meetings has CLIN 2 in the first column and CLIN 0004 in the last column.</p> <p style="margin-left: 40px;">a. Question – Please clarify the CLINs associated with Section F Deliveries of Performance f. Notional Schedule.</p>		
Response:  RFP Section F.1 table, page 9 has been updated to correct the inconsistency within CLIN identification.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 10**

Subject:  CDRL Listing; MQ-8C Mx F CDRLs,		
Reference:  RFP Section J / SOW 150026 Appendix F	Paragraph:  Exhibit 1	Page  21-22 / 72
Question/Comment:  CDRL Listing; MQ-8C Mx F CDRLs, RFP Section J Exhibit 1 page 21-22, and SOW 150026 Appendix F page 72. The Instructional Media Package - On Screen Lessons CDRL provided with MQ-8C Mx F CDRLs and in RFP Section J Exhibit 1 is listed as CDRL F004.  Question - Recommend Mx CDRL F004 be renumbered CDRL F006 and updated in the Mx F CDRLs and RFP table, to match the Mx SOW Appendix F and Operator CDRL structure.		
Response:  MQ-8C Mx F CDRL for Instructional Media Package – On-Screen Lessons, currently F004, will be changed to F006. Section J has been updated to reflect this change.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 11**

Subject:  Integrated Master Schedule		
Reference:  CDRL B002	Paragraph:	Page
Question/Comment:  Integrated Master Schedule; CDRL B002, Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) and associated DID, DI-MGMT-81861 describes an Earned Value Management (EVM) requirement, with all DID paras and subpara items applicable to this effort. Per DoD Instruction 5000.02, only DI-MGMT-818615 Format 6 is required for contracts less than \$20 million, with additional DID tailoring allowed at the discretion of the Program Manager based on cost-benefit analysis.  Question - Given that EVM requires significant additional resources, based on its very robust IMS requirements, is it the intention of the Government to require EVM for this effort?  Question – Will the Government tailor the DID to reflect only Format 6 applies to CDRL B002 with additional DID tailoring to remove all EVM requirements from CDRL B002?		
Response:  Question 1 – No, it is not the intention of the Government to require EVM for this effort.  Question 2 – No, the Government will not tailor the DID. DI-MGMT-81861, Section 2.8.2 identifies format required if EVM is not applicable for the specific effort. The current CDRL B002 DID will remain DI-MGMT-81861.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 12**

Subject:  Statement of Work 150025		
Reference:  Statement of Work 150025	Paragraph:  Sec 3.3.6	Page  19
Question/Comment:  Statement of Work 150025 Sec 3.3.6 page 19 refers to A.3.1. (See A.3.1).  Question – which document / location is it referring to?		
Response:  There is no corresponding document/location applicable to A.3.1 in SOW 150025. Disregard the reference cited in SOW 150025, Section 3.3.6, page 19. The reference has been removed.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 13**

Subject:  MQ-8C Mx F CDRLs F003, F004, F005, F007, F008, F009, F00A, F00B, F00C		
Reference:	Paragraph:	Page
Question/Comment:  MQ-8C Mx F CDRLs F003, F004, F005, F007, F008, F009, F00A, F00B, F00C – These CDRLs all indicate CLIN 0002 and 0003 in Box A, but CLIN 0002 is the Operator Courseware CLIN.  A. Question – Request clarification		
Response:  CLIN reference for these CDRLs should be CLIN 0003 and CLIN 0004. CDRLs will be updated accordingly.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 14**

Subject:  MQ-8C Ops F CDRLs		
Reference: CDRLS	Paragraph:	Page
Question/Comment:  MQ-8C Ops F CDRLs - all CDRLs reference CLIN 0004 in Box A, but CLIN 0004 is the Maintenance Tech CLIN.  a. Question – Request clarification		
Response:  CLIN reference for these CDRLs should be CLIN 0002. CDRLs will be updated accordingly.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 15**

Subject:  MQ-8C Ops F CDRLs		
Reference:	Paragraph:	Page
Question/Comment:  MQ-8C Mx F CDRLs; CDRL F001 Blk 16 indicates to include paragraph 2.3.5 in the tailored DID, there is no paragraph 2.3.5.  a. Question – Request clarification		
Response:  Reference to 2.3.5 Task information summary and clarification is now 2.3.4 in the latest available version of DI-SESS-81518. The DID should reference paragraph 2.3.4, found in DI-SESS-81518C on page 4. The CDRL will be updated to reflect the correct DID paragraph.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 16**

Subject:  CDRL Listing		
Reference:  Section J	Paragraph:  Exhibit 1	Page  21-22
Question/Comment:  RFP Section J Exhibit 1 page 21-22, SOW 150025 Appendix C page 46, and MQ-8C Ops F CDRLs. CDRL F00A is listed in the RFP table Exhibit 1 for CLIN 0003 and 0004 for both Training System Support Document (TSSD) and for Instructional Media Package – Final CD-ROM.  a. Question – Recommend update of CD-ROM CDRL in RFP Section J Exhibit 1 table for CLINs 0003 and 0004 from F00A to F00C, to match Ops F CDRLs and SOW App C		
Response:  RFP Section J Exhibit 1 table will be updated to reflect correct CDRL (F00C) for Instructional Media Package – Final CD-ROM for CLIN 0003 and CLIN 0004.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 17**

Subject: CDRLs		
Reference: RFP, Section J	Paragraph: Exhibit 1 MQ-8C CDRL Listing Table	Page 22
Question/Comment:  Regarding the CDRL table entry on page 22, in the last row for columns CLIN 0003 and CLIN 0004: Should the correct CDRL actually be F00C?		
Response:  RFP Section J Exhibit 1 table will be updated to reflect correct CDRL (F00C) for Instructional Media Package – Final CD-ROM for CLIN 0003 and CLIN 0004.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 18**

Subject: In Process Reviews (IPRs)		
Reference: RFP, Section F	Paragraph: F.1 Notional Schedule	Page
Question/Comment:  In section F.1 Notional Schedule, it shows that IPRs are at contractor's facility. Are these to be virtual or face-to-face?		
Response:  Both. Government Working Integrated Project Team (WIPT) members are based in several locations and IPRs will require face-to-face and virtual logistical support. Section F has been updated to reflect this requirement.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 19**

Subject: Section B CLINs		
Reference: RFP, Section B	Paragraph: N/A	Page 3
Question/Comment:  Per Section B, there are no CLINs for travel or ODCs. Is this accurate?		
Response:  Costs for travel and ODCs should be built into the proposed prices for FFP CLINs 0001 through 0004, for each effort, respectively.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 20**

Subject: Submission		
Reference: RFP, Section L, Part A	Paragraph: 4.0	Page 30
Question/Comment:  The Government states that the offeror should “provide a complete copy of the proposal fully compatible with Microsoft Office 2007 on a Compact Disk Read-Only Memory (CD-ROM)” and later adds that “The offeror will ensure that the Price Volume is provided on a separate CD-ROM in Microsoft Office 2007 Excel format, with spreadsheets protected.”  a. Does the Government wish to have 1 CD with both the Technical and Past Performance volumes on it? Then another CD with just the Pricing volume on it?  b. If yes, are these 2 CDs in addition to the CD copies shown as required in the table in Section L, Part A, para 4.0?  c. Or is the intent to have a total of 3 CDs submitted: one with a copy of Volume 1 Technical, one with a copy of Volume 2 Past Performance, and one with a copy of Volume 3 Price, as shown in the table?		
Response:  a. Technical, Past Performance, and Price proposals should be submitted on separate CD-ROMs in accordance with the table on page 31. One CD-ROM copy per volume.  b. No.  c. Yes.  Also, the cited Section L language above had previously been updated in Amendment 02 to require “spreadsheets unprotected.”		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 21**

Subject: Formatting		
Reference: RFP, Section L, Part A	Paragraph: 4.0	Page 30
Question/Comment:  The RFP states in para 4.0 that “for information not supported by Microsoft Office products, the offeror must also provide the latest Adobe Acrobat reader on the CD-ROM.”  a. While Adobe Acrobat Reader is freeware, it is still proprietary and we are apprehensive about redistributing the software without the owner’s permission. Would the Government reconsider this requirement?  b. Can offerors submit .pdf versions of their proposal to ensure formatting and content remain intact, as intended, for evaluators?		
Response:  a. Yes. The requirement has been removed from Section L, as the Government already has the appropriate software to open .pdf files.  b. No. In accordance with L.A.4.0, the offeror will provide separate copies of the proposal volumes fully compatible with Microsoft Office 2007. Only requirements in L.B.1.2 shall be submitted as a .pdf file.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 22**

Subject: IMS Requirements		
Reference: RFP, Section L, Part B	Paragraph: Schedule, 1.2.1	Page 34
Question/Comment:  Because it is necessary to insert the IMS as a .pdf in the Technical Volume, is it permitted to include the IMS as an appendix to the Technical Volume?		
Response:  Yes, but the Integrated Master Schedules will still be included in the 30 page limit, and are only required in .pdf formats. RFP L.B.1.2 has been updated.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 23**

Subject: SOWs & Management Requirements		
Reference: RFP, Section L, Part B	Paragraph: 1.0.c	Page 34
Question/Comment:  RFP, Section L Technical requires responding to all of SOW 150026 section 3 and SOW 150025 section 3. Those SOWs each include a section 3.2 for Management Requirements. Responding to those requirements will consume a significant amount of the 20 pages allotted for the technical response.  In light of the fact that a specific management response was not included in the proposal requirements, would the Government consider removing the requirement to respond to section 3.2 in each SOW?		
Response:  RFP L.B.1.0(c) will not be revised. Offeror's proposals will be evaluated in accordance with evaluation criteria, as stated in Section M.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 24**

Subject: CDRLs Exhibits		
Reference: Exhibit 1 MQ-8C Mx F CDRLs Exhibit 1 MQ-8C Op F CDRLs	Paragraph: Please reference table below	Page Please reference table below

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 25**

Question/Comment:

As shown in the below table, we believe that certain blocks in the CDRLs exhibits are incorrect. Will the Government please verify the content of the blocks and CDRLs as indicated in the table?

<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>CDRL</b>	<b>Block</b>	<b>Block Indicates</b>	<b>Should Indicate</b>
Exhibit 1 MQ-8C Mx F CDRLs.pdf	F003	A	CLIN0002, CLIN0003	CLIN0003, CLIN0004
Exhibit 1 MQ-8C Mx F CDRLs.pdf	F005	A	CLIN0002, CLIN0003	CLIN0003, CLIN0004
Exhibit 1 MQ-8C Mx F CDRLs.pdf	F004	1	F004	F006
Exhibit 1 MQ-8C Mx F CDRLs.pdf	F004	A	CLIN0002, CLIN0003	CLIN0003, CLIN0004
Exhibit 1 MQ-8C Mx F CDRLs.pdf	F007	A	CLIN0002, CLIN0003	CLIN0003, CLIN0004
Exhibit 1 MQ-8C Mx F CDRLs.pdf	F008	A	CLIN0002, CLIN0003	CLIN0003, CLIN0004
Exhibit 1 MQ-8C Mx F CDRLs.pdf	F009	A	CLIN0002, CLIN0003	CLIN0003, CLIN0004
Exhibit 1 MQ-8C Mx F CDRLs.pdf	F00A	A	CLIN0002, CLIN0003	CLIN0003, CLIN0004
Exhibit 1 MQ-8C Mx F CDRLs.pdf	F00B	A	CLIN0002, CLIN0003	CLIN0003, CLIN0004
Exhibit 1 MQ-8C Mx F CDRLs.pdf	F00C	A	CLIN0002, CLIN0003	CLIN0003, CLIN0004
Exhibit 1 MQ-8C Op F CDRLs.pdf	F003	A	CLIN0004	CLIN0002
Exhibit 1 MQ-8C Op F CDRLs.pdf	F005	A	CLIN0004	CLIN0002
Exhibit 1 MQ-8C Op F CDRLs.pdf	F004	A	CLIN0004	CLIN0002
Exhibit 1 MQ-8C Op F CDRLs.pdf	F004	A	CLIN0004	CLIN0002
Exhibit 1 MQ-8C Op F CDRLs.pdf	F007	A	CLIN0004	CLIN0002
Exhibit 1 MQ-8C Op F CDRLs.pdf	F008	A	CLIN0004	CLIN0002
Exhibit 1 MQ-8C Op F CDRLs.pdf	F009	A	CLIN0004	CLIN0002
Exhibit 1 MQ-8C Op F CDRLs.pdf	F00A	A	CLIN0004	CLIN0002
Exhibit 1 MQ-8C Op F CDRLs.pdf	F00B	A	CLIN0004	CLIN0002
Exhibit 1 MQ-8C Op F CDRLs.pdf	F00C	A	CLIN0004	CLIN0002

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 26**

Response:

Changes have been made to Exhibit 1 Table to reflect correction for all CLINs and all F CDRLs identified in the question.

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 27**

Subject: Past Performance Questionnaires		
Reference: RFP, Section L, Part B	Paragraph: 2.1.f	Page 35
Question/Comment:  Paragraph 2.1.f instructs offerors to “Forward a copy of the Past Performance Questionnaire (Attachment 6) to the past performance contract customer's Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO), Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO), Program Manager and Point of Contact”  Please confirm that the Government desires a total of four (4) Past Performance Questionnaires to be filled out and submitted for each Past Performance citation?  If this is the case, we would like to recommend that one (1) Questionnaire per citation be sufficient. In many cases, the PCO and ACO are one and the same; and the POC we will provide is most often times the PM or PCO/ACO.		
Response:  Attachment 6 should be forwarded to the customer’s Procuring Contracting Officer (PCO), Administrative Contracting Officer (ACO), Program Manager and Point of Contact, as applicable to allow for the maximum number of PPQ’s submitted for evaluation.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 28**

Subject:  Past Performance Format		
Reference:  RFP Section L Part B Section 2	Paragraph:  Section 2.2 to 2.4	Page  36 to 38
Question/Comment:  Does the Offeror have the flexibility on how the required Past Performance information is provided? For example:  Method 1: Present each contract individually and address all requirements for that PP contract (Contract info, Relevancy (2.3), Demonstrated Info (2.4) and then move to the next contract and provide the same info, etc.  Method 2: Present the contract info for all three contracts, then present the Relevancy information for all three contracts, and then provide the Demonstrated Performance information for all three contracts.  The first method keeps the discussion contract centric while the second method keeps it topic (i.e. Relevancy or Demonstrated info) centric.		
Response:  The information shall be submitted as one separate table for each past performance contract. RFP L.B.2.2 has been updated.  Please note, in accordance with L.B.2.1.a, the offeror shall identify up to three (3) of the prime offeror's most relevant government or commercial past performance contracts, and up to two (2) of the most relevant government or commercial past performance contracts for each principal team member.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 29**

<p>Subject:</p> <p>Past Performance Contract Information</p>		
<p>Reference:</p> <p>Section L Part B</p>	<p>Paragraph:</p> <p>2.2 Past Performance Contract Information</p>	<p>Page</p> <p>36</p>
<p>Question/Comment:</p> <p>In the chart provided in Section L Part B 2.2 Past Performance Contract Information, Line 14 requests “If CPARS exist, state the number”.</p> <p>Our CPARS do not have a separate CPARS number. They do contain our contract number.</p> <p>Question: Is the contract number sufficient for identification? Otherwise request clarification on what the CPARS number is that is being referenced.</p>		
<p>Response:</p> <p>This requirement is for the number of CPARS records that exist, not a numbering system.</p>		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 30**

<p>Subject:</p> <p>Level I Training Device Events</p>		
<p>Reference:</p> <p>SOW 150026</p>	<p>Paragraph:</p> <p>B1.1 Courseware Dev C1.1 Asynchronous</p>	<p>Page</p> <p>27 44</p>
<p>Question/Comment:</p> <p>Per the Maintenance SOW Appendices B.1.1 and C.1.1, contractors are to provide Level I Training Device events.</p> <p>Question 1: Is this requirement media type (1) asynchronous self-paced IMI, or (2) paper-based supporting documentation, or (3) both?</p> <p>Question 2: If the Training Device events are not IMI, what is the IMI product referred to in the Maintenance SOW 150026, specifically Sections 1. Table 1 and 3.2.3.1?</p>		
<p>Response:</p> <p>Question 1. The requirement is for paper-based supporting documentation IAW CNATT requirements (i.e., Job Sheets) for ILT/CAI instruction. SOW paragraphs B.1.1 and C.1.1 have been updated to reflect this requirement.</p> <p>Question 2. The IMI product referred to in SOW 150026 Table 1 and Section 3.2.3.1 is the ILT/CAI, specifically the CAI portion of the requirements. Section B.2.1.3 and C.2.1.3 provide further requirements related to IMI prototype development for all media types per CNATT requirements.</p>		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 31**

Subject: SOW 150026, Appendix C Course Media Breakdown		
Reference: Maintenance SOW 150026, Appendix C and GFI Fire Scout MQ-8C FEA IMRD (F00C)_v2	Paragraph: Table 3 and Table 11	Page 44 and 42
Question/Comment:  In Maintenance SOW 150026, Appendix C, Table 3 on page 44, the Media Hours indicated in the table do not add up to the total shown. It appears the ICW2 (2.5 hours) that is reflected in the GFI Maintenance IMRD (Table 11, p. 42) is not included. Will the Government please clarify?		
Response:  SOW 150026, Appendix C, Table 3 is correct and corresponds to the revised Media Report provided as GFI titled "MQ-8C MECH Media Report_revised 07 10 15_final." The IMRD is incorrect and was only provided for reference.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 32**

Subject: SOW 150026, Appendix C, Training Devices		
Reference: Maintenance SOW 150026	Paragraph: C.1.1, Table 3	Page 44
Question/Comment:  Per Attachment 1_SOW_Maintenance.docx, page 44, C.1.1, Table 3, the Government requests 223.75 hours of LOI 1 Training Device events. Given the nature of Training Devices, their definition within NAVEDTRA 138, it would seem that such media should be of LOI 2. <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Will the Government please confirm whether "Training Device events" are to be designed as LOI 1 or LOI 2?</li><li>b. Will the Government please provide its definition of a "Training Device event" for an MQ-8C course?</li><li>c. Will the Government please clarify what products/deliverables are expected from the contractor for a training device event?</li><li>d. Do operator training devices differ from maintenance training devices as far as media, support requirements, etc.?</li></ol>		
Response:  Question a. Table 3 identified LOI I for Training Device events, which is correct. Question b. Training Device events, for this effort, refer to practical application of the tasks, by students on the applicable training device using CNATT job sheets. See updated SOW sections B.3.6.1.1.1 and C.3.6.1.1.1. Question c. Products/Deliverables related to Training Device events are found within the Instructor-Led Curriculum Package, specifically part of the Lesson Materials (PowerPoint presentations, job sheets, handouts, etc.). Question d. Yes, operator Training Devices differ from maintenance training devices as far as media, support requirements, etc. are concerned.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 33**

Subject: Pricing Spreadsheet		
Reference: RFP, Section L, Part A	Paragraph: 4.0	Page 30
Question/Comment:  Section L, Part A, 4.0 of the RFP states that, "The offeror will ensure that the Price Volume is provided on a separate CD-ROM in Microsoft Office 2007 Excel format, with spreadsheets unprotected." a. It is our understanding that the only pricing submission required is a populated copy of the Section B CLINs. Does the Government also require an Excel pricing spreadsheet? b. If a pricing spreadsheet is required, is Microsoft Excel 2010 an acceptable format?		
Response:  Excel pricing spreadsheet is not required. If Microsoft Office 2007 or later is used, spreadsheets shall be unprotected. RFP L.A.4.0 has been updated.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 34**

Subject:  Volume 1 – Technical Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) Submission		
Reference:  RFP Section L	Paragraph:  Part B 1.0 (c) 1.2	Page  34
Question/Comment:  <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Per Section L, Part B, 1.2.1. The Offeror shall provide an Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) in Microsoft Office Project 2010 and .pdf format. Question - Is the .pdf file a separate file from the Volume 1 Technical?</li><li>2. Per the Q&amp;A response, the IMS counts towards the Volume 1 total page count. Question - Is this based on the page count of the separately submitted .pdf file or just the page count of the IMS content embedded in the Volume 1 Technical?</li><li>3. Given the RFP requirement to submit the IMS as separate MS Project 2010 and .pdf files, may the offeror show a high level IMS in the Technical Volume (with many tasks collapsed), and reference the included files (MS Project and Adobe pdf versions) as they are the full and expanded IMS?</li></ol>		
Response:  Question 1: The RFP has been amended to only require IMS's in a .pdf file, which should be included in Volume 1.  Question 2: Only a .pdf file is required for the IMS, which will be counted against the 30 page limit for Volume 1.  Question 3: No, the fully expanded IMS must be provided as part of Volume 1.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 35**

Subject: Contractor Design Meetings		
Reference: Attachment 1; Attachment 2	Paragraph: 3.2.3	Page 18, 12
Question/Comment: Is all travel to support the required CDMs Cost Reimbursable or does this need to be included as part of our pricing for this effort?		
Response: Costs for travel should be built into the proposed prices for FFP CLINs 0001 through 0004, for each effort, respectively.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 36**

Subject: Clarification on Notional Schedule		
Reference: Section F – Deliveries of Performance	Paragraph: F.1 – Notional Schedule	Page: 9
Question/Comment:  Page 9 of the RFP MQ-8C Operator Content Design Meetings and MQ-8C Operator Data Gathering Tips show CLIN 2 in column 1 but CLIN 0004 in column 5.  Page 9 of the RFP MQ-8C TECH Content Design Meetings and MQ-8C TECH Data Gathering Tips show CLIN 4 in column 1 but CLIN 0002 in column 5.  Please verify the correct CLIN for each.		
Response:  The CLIN structure is identified below. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• CLIN 0001 – 8C Mx Gap Analysis</li><li>• CLIN 0002 – 8C Op CW</li><li>• CLIN 0003 – 8C Mx MECH</li><li>• CLIN 0004 – 8C Mx TECH</li></ul> Notional schedule in Section F has been updated.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 37**

Subject: Prototype Development		
Reference: Attachment 2: Operator Courseware Development SOW	Paragraph: 3.4.1.2	Page 24
Question/Comment:  The prototype requirements listed in paragraph 3.4.1.2 of the Operator SOW are different than the requirements listed in Operator IMDP CDRL F003 Remarks Item #9.  The Operator SOW requires a fully-functional prototype lesson for each media type and LOI that does not exceed one hour in length. Additionally, an applicable LDS shall be provided with each prototype lesson.  Operator IMDP CDRL F003 Remarks Item #9 requires identifying one ELO from each media type and developing a prototype to demonstrate conventions, standards, interfaces and functionality of ICW for review at the Post Award Conference (PAC).  Are these two different requirements? Does the government expect to see three fully functioning one-hour lessons (ICW-2, ICW-3, and CAI) and their applicable LDS's at the PAC? Or, does the government expect to see samples as outlined in the Operator IMDP CDRL F003 Item #9 at the PAC and three fully functioning one-hour lessons (ICW-2, ICW-3, and CAI) and their applicable LDS's NLT 3 months after contract award as stated in Operator IMDP CDRL F003 Item #3?  Developing three lessons and their applicable LDS's for review at the PAC (within 10 working days of contract award) would require extensive effort on the part of the contractor prior to contract award. Also, the contractor would have to be provided with the current version of the MQ-8 Fire Scout Style Guide/DIG as GFI prior to contract award.		
Response:  The Government expects to see samples as outlined in the Operator IMDP CDRL F003 Item #9 at the PAC and three (one ELO from each media type) fully functioning one-hour lessons (ICW-2, ICW-3, and CAI) demonstrating conventions, standards, and interfaces, and their applicable LDS's NLT 3 months after contract award as stated in Operator IMDP CDRL F003 Item #3.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 38**

Subject: Training System Support Document CDRL		
Reference: Operator TSSD CDRL F00A	Paragraph: 16. Remarks #8	Page
Question/Comment:  Remarks item #8 is a repeat of Item #8 in the TCCD CDRL F009 and discusses the TCCD and its DID.  Is there an applicable item #8 for the TSSD that should be here?		
Response:  The CDRL F00A has been updated with new language related to item #8 as shown below.  THE TRAINING SYSTEM SUPPORT DOCUMENT SHALL, IN ADDITION TO REQUIREMENTS OUTLINED IN DI-SESS-81521B, PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF THE TRAINING SYSTEM SUCH AS AN OUTLINE OF TRAINING EXERCISES, TRAINING EXERCISES CONDITIONS AND LENGTH, AND EXPLANATION ON MODIFYING TRAINING EXERCISES.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 39**

Subject: Training System Support Document CDRL		
Reference: Maintenance TSSD CDRL F00A	Paragraph: 16. Remarks #8	Page
Question/Comment:  Remarks item #8 is a repeat of Item #8 in the TCCD CDRL F009 and discusses the TCCD and its DID.  Is there an applicable item #8 for the TSSD that should be here?		
Response:  The CDRL F00A has been updated with new language related to item #8 as shown below.  THE TRAINING SYSTEM SUPPORT DOCUMENT SHALL, IN ADDITION TO REQUIREMENTS OUTLINED IN DI-SESS-81521B, PROVIDE A DESCRIPTION OF THE TRAINING SYSTEM SUCH AS AN OUTLINE OF TRAINING EXERCISES, TRAINING EXERCISES CONDITIONS AND LENGTH, AND EXPLANATION ON MODIFYING TRAINING EXERCISES.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 40**

Subject: RFP Exhibit 1 (MQ-8 CDRL Listing)		
Reference: RFP N61340-16—009, Amend 02 Conformed Copy	Paragraph: Section J	Page 22
Question/Comment:  Exhibit 1 lists the CLIN 3 and 4 CDRLs for Instructional Media Package – Final CD-ROM/DVD Inspection/Acceptance as F00A. The CDRLs show F00C in the CLIN 2 Column.  Please verify the F00A's in the CLIN 3 and CLIN 4 Columns of Exhibit 1 are typos?		
Response:  Yes. Exhibit 1 has been updated to correct typographical error.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 41**

Subject: Instructional Media Package On-Screen Lessons CDRL		
Reference: Maintenance IMP OSL CDRL F004	Paragraph: Block 1	Page
Question/Comment:  Block 1 of the CDRL states this is CDRL F004 while the RFP Exhibit 1 on page 22 lists the CDRL as F006.  Is F004 in Block 1 of the CDRL a typo?		
Response:  Yes. CDRL F004 has been updated to correct typographical error.		

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 42**

Subject:  
MQ-8C Fire Scout Airframes and Powerplants Organizational Maintenance Course Development

Reference:  
SOW 150026, Dated 11 Sep 15

Paragraph:  
C.1.1

Page  
44

Question/Comment:  
Table 3 of the Mx SOW states:

**Table 3. C-690-0040-12K3 MQ-8C Airframes and Powerplants Organizational Maintenance Course Media Breakdown.**

Media Type	LOI	Media Hours
ILT/CAI	Level I	28.75
Training Device	Level I	223.75
<b>Total</b>		<b>255</b>

However, Table 11 of the Mx IMRD states:

**Table 11: Total Media Resources per MQ-8C MECH Course Student**

Media Type	Media Hours	Percent of Total Training
ILT/CAI	28.75	11
ICW2	2.5	1
ICW3	24.5	10
PTT	6.75	3
TD	192.5	75
<b>Total</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>100</b>

Which Table should be used to develop our manning/staffing plan to determine planned labor category mix?

Response:

Table 3 in the SOW is correct and corresponds to the total media identified in the revised Media Report for the Maintenance efforts provided as GFI. The IMRD is incorrect and was only provided for reference.

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 43**

Subject:  
MQ-8C Fire Scout Avionics and Electrical Organizational Maintenance Course Development

Reference:  
SOW 150026, Dated 11 Sep 15

Paragraph:  
C.1.1

Page  
27

Question/Comment:  
Table 2 of the Mx SOW states:

**Table 2. C-690-0041-12K4: MQ-8C Avionics and Electrical Organizational Maintenance Course Media Breakdown.**

Media Type	LOI	Media Hours
ILT/CAI	Level I	45.25
Training Device	Level I	240
<b>Total</b>		<b>285.5</b>

However, Table 12 of the Mx IMRD states:

**Table 12: Total Media Resources per MQ-8C TECH Course Student**

Media Type	Media Hours	Percent of Total Training
ILT/CAI	50	16
ICW2	2.5	<1
ICW3	82	26
TD	184.5	58
<b>Total</b>	<b>319</b>	<b>100</b>

Which Table should be used to develop our manning/staffing plan to determine planned labor category mix?

Response:

Table 2 in the SOW is correct and corresponds to the total media identified in the revised Media Report for the Maintenance efforts provided as GFI. The IMRD is incorrect and was only provided for reference.

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 44**

Subject:  
MQ-8C Fire Scout Operator Courseware Development

Reference:  
SOW 150025, Dated 11 Sep 15

Paragraph:  
3.3.1

Page  
17

Question/Comment:

Table 2 (Media Type, LOI, and TTT Breakdown) on page 17 of the **Operator SOW** shows:

Media Type	LOI	Media Hours
ILT/CAI/IGR	I	28
ICW	II	29
	III	80
MST	I	20
<b>Total</b>		<b>157</b>

Table 4 (MQ-8C Fire Scout Media Type, LOI, LOs, and TTT Breakdown) on page 9 of the **Operator IMRD** (GFI CD\Op\FEA\MQ-8C FEA) shows:

Media Type	LOI	LOs	TTT
CAI	1	8	3
	2	58	25
	3	20	11
ICW	1	6	1
	2	117	44
	3	157	114
SIM	1	49	34
<b>Total</b>		<b>415</b>	<b>232</b>

Which Table should be used to develop our manning/staffing plan to determine planned labor category mix?

Response:

Table 2 in the SOW is correct and corresponds to the total media identified in the revised Media Report for the Operator effort provided as GFI. The IMRD is incorrect and was only provided for reference.

**MQ-8 FIRE SCOUT COURSEWARE DEVELOPMENT  
SOLICITATION N61340-16-R-0009**

**QUESTION/COMMENT FORM 45**

Subject: Minimum font in Tables		
Reference: RFP N61340-16—009, Amend 02 Conformed Copy	Paragraph: 3.0 Proposal Format	Page 30
Question/Comment: Paragraph directs 12 point font. Graphs can be 10 point font.  Will the Government allow 10 point font in tables?		
Response:  No, the requirement remains unchanged.		