



**DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
HEADQUARTERS AIR COMBAT COMMAND
ACQUISITION MANAGEMENT AND INTEGRATION CENTER (AMIC)
DET 2 OL C, TINKER AIR FORCE BASE OKLAHOMA**

Questions & Answers for RFP # 3 – Enterprise Cyber Capabilities

Q1: 2.4.3.2. Will the date of the RFP be determined by the date shown in initial Final RFP or the last amendment?

A1: Last amendment

Q2: 1.13. Page Format: Are the page limitations identified in the scoring matrix attachment nine supposed to be an attachment to the Government's Attachment 8 referenced or part of it?

A2: The cross-reference matrix has been separated from the self-scoring matrix. A final list of attachments will be provided.

Q3: 2.3.3 OTHER INFORMATION: Government states to be determined responsible, an Offeror shall meet the general standards described in FAR 9.104-1. All Offeror documentation related to responsibility shall be included in Appendix 1 of Volume I. To further assist the Contracting Officer in making the responsibility determination prior to contract award (in accordance with FAR 9.1, Responsible Prospective Contractors, as supplemented by the DFARS 209.1), the following additional information is requested and shall be included in Appendix 1 of Volume I. Is there going to be a template Attachment provided by the Government to be filled in?

A3: The Government does not expect to require a specific template for collecting the information needed to make responsibility determinations and will identify the exact information needed by Offerors and request this information in the RFP. The Government expects Section L, Other Information to be updated as follows: The Contracting Officer will make a responsibility determination prior to contract award (in accordance with FAR 9.1, Responsible Prospective Contractors, as supplemented by the DFARS 209.1). No award shall be made to an Offeror unless the Contracting Officer determines them to be responsible. To be determined responsible, an Offeror shall meet the general standards described in FAR 9.104-1. The Contracting Officer may consider any other information provided within any volume of the proposal when making the determination of responsibility.

Q4: 1.13 Page Format: Please confirm that the margins for all submitted documents is ¾ inch for left and right margins and 1 inch for top and bottom on all submitted pages including pages with tables and graphics.

A4: All references to page format in Section L will be reviewed to ensure consistency. Generally, the use of 1 inch top and bottom and ½ inch side margins is acceptable.

Q5: 2.4.4, page 10 Section 2.4.3: The Offeror shall provide a Cross Reference Matrix which clearly identifies the exact location of the substantiating data within the work samples. In Lieu of the Cross Reference Matrix, would the government consider allowing the contractor to annotate the documents containing the substantiating data to ensure clarity and ease of scoring?

A5: Cross Reference Matrix will be provided IAW Section L & M

Q6: Draft Section L, Table 1 – Proposal Organization – Volume III Past Performance Paragraph 2.5.2 has no page limit for the Past Performance Submissions but 2.5.3 Subcontractor/Teaming Member Consent Letter section has a 30 page limit. Is this correct? Should the Past Performance Submissions page limit be 30 pages? If so, is there a specific page limit per past performance reference?

A6: All page limitations referenced in Section L, including Proposal Organization Table, will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q7: Draft Section L, Paragraph 2.3.3.1 Financial/Other Resources. Evidence submitted may include official letter(s) from financial institutions demonstrating the Offeror has the financial resources required to cover all financial commitment. Is there a specific line of credit that is required for small business entities and for large business entities?

A7: The Government does not expect to require a specific line of credit and expects this requirement will be substantially changed or eliminated in the draft RFP. Sections L & M will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q8: Section L - On page 3, Paragraph 1.5 states ...the Offeror is reminded that the Government intends to award this effort without discussion.... However, this is not stated in other areas of Section L or Section M.

A8: Please see 1.9 of Section M. Sections L & M will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q9: Section L - Page 4 Section 1.11 states...no earlier than 14 days prior to the proposal due date, and no later than 1 day prior to the proposal due date. The Offeror will receive an email from DoD Safe with a link...Confirming that the sentence beginning with The Offeror is part of the former sentence.

A9: Sections L & M will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency. The final solicitation is expected to be posted using the PIEE Solicitation Module, (not DoD Safe) and this will require that all electronic proposals will be submitted via PIEE. PIEE Solicitation Module instructions will be provided.

Q10: Section L - Page 6 Proposal Organization Chart --The ITO Sections do not align with the Sections stated in Section M. For instance, in Volume 1 Chart names: 2.3/2.3.2/2.3.3/2.3.3.1/2.3.3.2/2.3.4 Vice Pages 6- 8 names: 2.3/2.3.1/2.3.2/2.3.2.1/2.3.2.2/2.3.3/2.3.3.1/2.3.3.2/2.3.4 Volume II Chart Sections:2.4/2.4.1/2.4.2/blank/2.4.4/2.4.4

Whereas Page 8-13:

2.4/2.4.1/2.4.1.1/2.4.1.1.1/2.4.1.1.2/2.4.1.2/2.4.1.3/2.4.2/2.4.3/2.4.3.1/2.4.3.2/2.4.3.3/2.4.3.3.1/2.4.3.3.2/2.4.3.3.3/2.4.4/2.4.4.1/2.4.4.2/2.4.4.3/2.4.5/2.4.5.1/ETC

A10: The numbering has been updated in Section L&M to align and Sections L & M will be further reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q11: Section L - Page 8, Paragraph 2.3.3.2 states that ...If the prime does not currently have an accounting system...then the prime shall submit (BLANK SPACE) and state that it will work...What should be in the BLANK SPACE?

A11: Section L has been updated:

Accounting System. IAW FAR 16.301, no cost reimbursement contract may be awarded unless the limitations in FAR 16.301-3 are met. One of the limitations cited under FAR 16.301-3 requires that “the Contractor’s accounting system is adequate for determining costs applicable to the contract or order.” Unless exempt, the prime shall provide a current (within three (3) years prior to date of proposal submittal) letter or report from Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA)/ Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA) that the Offeror’s accounting system has been approved or is adequate for cost-reimbursement contracts. If the prime does not have a letter or report from DCAA/DCMA from within 3 years, the Offeror shall provide the latest letter or report received and shall provide a statement that the accounting system has not changed since being reviewed. If the accounting system has changed, the Offeror shall provide a DCAA/DCMA certification indicating that the changes have not impacted the approval or adequacy of the accounting system. If the prime does not currently have an accounting system determined as adequate for determining costs applicable to the contract or order, then the prime shall complete and submit Attachment 16 – DCAA Contractor Accounting System Pre-Award Survey, and state that it will work with DCAA/DCMA to obtain the appropriate accounting system approval.

Q12: Section L - Page 13, Section 2.5.1 states shall be organized according to ERROR! Reference source not found. Can the government correct?

A12: This reference and Table 1–Proposal Organization links will be corrected. We will release the corrected documents in pdf in the final RFP.

Q13: Recommend including instructions in L.2.4 for where Offerors are to provide/organize the documentation (excluded from page count) that demonstrates each work sample meets the recency and relevancy minimum requirements to be a work sample.

A13: The Government has provided organization instructions in section 1.11 where Offerors are to provide their proposals and section 2.2 for how to organize the documentation. The Government appreciates your suggestion and will update the criteria needed for Offerors to demonstrate that each work sample meets the recency and relevancy minimum requirements. Please note these criteria will primary be addressed in section M.

Q14: There is a disconnect with Table 1, Proposal Organization, associated paragraphs, and the Attachment 9 Self Scoring Matrix. Please clarify/cross reference Table 1 Proposal Organizational Table ITO Sections with Page Limits and paragraphs associated with 2.5.2 through 2.5.8 as well as the Attachment 9 Self Scoring Matrix.

A14: All page limitations referenced in Section L, including Proposal Organization Table, will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q15: Since 1.13.4 states “Offerors shall provide each work sample as a single separate electronic file” means that each work sample would almost certainly result in use of partial pages for substantiation information and ultimately loss of available total page count, are each of the page limited sections of work sample substantiation information associated with individual functional areas and PWS requirement references to start at the top of a page?

A15: All page limitations referenced in Section L, including Proposal Organization Table, will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q16: Per Section L paragraph 2.4.6, “The Offeror shall clearly identify the exact location of substantiating data within the work samples using the “Work Sample Cross-Reference” column of the Self Scoring Matrix”. This suggests cross reference for individual functional and sub-functional areas could point to the same substantiation data. However, work sample information must be provided in separate, individual files. Does this mean that bidders can provide cross reference across files? If not, please clarify the instructions?

A16: Cross Reference Matrix will be provided IAW Section L & M

Q17: There is a disconnect between Table 1 Proposal Organization section 2.5.5 Specific Content which has a 5-page limit and Section L Paragraph 2.5.5 which is Contractor Performance Assessment Reports (CPARS). Request clarification of page limit and correlation to the correct Section L requirement.

A17: The Government does not expect to require Offerors to submit CPARS. All page limitations referenced in Section L, including Proposal Organization Table, will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q18: 2.5.5 of Table 1 – Proposal Organization states the information associated with section 2.5.5 Specific Content is limited to 5 pages. This section includes CPARs which are often more than 5 pages each. As multiple work samples may be required along with associated CPARs, will the Government consider making the page limit as No Page Limit?

A18: The Government does not expect to require Offerors to submit CPARS. All page limitations referenced in Section L, including Proposal Organization Table, will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q19: Recommend to remove page limits. Allow Offerors room to provide sufficient information to support relevance/performance in task areas. For example, Offerors may provide work samples with multiple PWS areas touched across a single contract or TO. Because of the substantiation documentation requirements – the RFP language will require Offerors to provide excerpts of the contract documentation. This may hinder the evaluation and limit Offeror’s ability to fully demonstrate their performance capabilities.

A19: All page limitations referenced in Section L, including Proposal Organization Table, will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q20: If multiple pages are allowed for a functional area and/or PWS requirement reference but only a small amount of space is needed for substantiation and/or a cross reference statement is needed for reuse of substantiation information, are all pages considered used from the total Volume page count or may the pages be added to another functional area/PWS requirement reference area? Would the Government consider eliminating page count for work sample submissions?

A20: All page limitations referenced in Section L, including Proposal Organization Table, will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q21: Separate electronic files for work samples, defined at the functional area level (such as 2.1 Operate and Maintain (O&M)), are used to provide associated data for proof of substantiation. But page allocation is defined at the sub level. If cross reference is used to point where relevant substantiation is located in the file, how are bidders to use the one or more page allowances at the sub-functional area level defined on the self-scoring sheet such as 2.2.2 Data Administration which has a 2 page limit, when information may only be a pointer to location of work sample information provided in files for each functional area?

A21: The final RFP may contain page limitation per work sample. To avoid confusion, the terms Functional and Program Areas are replaced with Categories and Specialty Areas moving forward. Specialty Areas will require cross-reference. All page limitations referenced in Section L, including Proposal Organization Table, will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q22: Attachment 9 - Self Scoring Worksheet Column H titled Maximum Work Sample Pages indicates the total work sample response is limited to 85 pages with some nested Functional Areas only allowed 1 page for work sample proof. As SOWs, CDRLs, and other official documents are generally much larger or often written with high level requirements only, responses may span multiple pages of the documents (page breaks, etc.) or require more than one document to prove performance, it may be difficult to provide single page responses. Would the Government consider expanding or eliminating the page count to allow for page breaks and other document structural considerations?

A22: The final RFP may contain page limitation per work sample. To avoid confusion, the terms Functional and Program Areas are replaced with Categories and Specialty Areas moving forward. Specialty Areas will require cross-reference. All page limitations referenced in Section L, including Proposal Organization Table, will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q23: The scoring spreadsheet page limits for work samples at the functional and sub-functional area level assumes some insight into how much substantiation information is available from contract documentation, i.e. Performance Work Statements (PWS), Statements of Work (SOW), or Contract Data Requirement Lists (CDRLs). To ensure compliance and quality of input, provide insight into expectations of how bidders are expected to utilize page allowances that are driven by contract documentation and not by information generated by the bidder.

A23: The final RFP may contain page limitation per work sample. To avoid confusion, the terms Functional and Program Areas are replaced with Categories and Specialty Areas moving forward. Specialty Areas will require cross-reference. All page limitations referenced in Section L, including Proposal Organization Table, will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q24: Section L & M are in conflict regard the definition of Past Performance. Attachment 5 Section L, paragraph 2.4.3.2 indicates work sample shall have been within the past 5 years. Attach 5, Section L paragraph 2.5.5 indicates sample work CPARS must be provide for the past 5 years. Attachment 6 Section M, paragraph 4.3.2 states recent past Performance shall have been within the past 3 years

A24: The Government expects to require at least six months of active performance and that performance shall have been completed within the last *three* years, from the date of that the RFP is issued. The Government intends to make this change due to the speed at which the Cyber environment changes/evolves.

Q25: Attachment 5, Paragraph 2.4.3.2 states the performance for work samples "shall have been within the last five years", Attachment 5 paragraph 2.5.2 states "Offerors shall only utilize contract references from submitted work sample pool", and Attachment 6, Paragraph 4.3.2 states that for Past Performance to be Recent the performance "shall have been within the last three years"

A25: The Government expects to require at least six months of active performance and that performance shall have been completed within the last *three* years, from the date of that the RFP is issued. The Government intends to make this change due to the speed at which the Cyber environment changes/evolves.

Q26: Is it the government's intention to allow work samples and past performance to be for up to five years, but only that performance within the last three years shall be considered recent in scoring?

A26: The Government expects to require at least six months of active performance and that performance shall have been completed within the last *three* years, from the date of that the RFP is issued. The Government intends to make this change due to the speed at which the Cyber environment changes/evolves.

Q27: EC2_Update_8_Attachment_5_Section_L_(03NOV2021), page 4, Section 1.13.1: Please clarify whether table(s) of figures or tables shall also be included in the pages that shall NOT be counted.

A27: Figures and Tables will be counted.

Q28: EC2_Update_8_Attachment_5_Section_L_(03NOV2021), page 6, table: Please provide page limit for Vol I, ITO Section 2.3 Executive Summary AND ITO Section 2.3.3 Other Information.

A28: All page limitations referenced in Section L, including Proposal Organization Table, will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q29: Please clarify Vol II 2.4.1 Work Samples page limitation, specifically "1.2 Limits are in Self Scoring Matrix, Attachment 9". Please clarify whether the work samples are to be included as separate attachments, titled, labeled and identified individually and included within the Vol II folder or if each sample is to be pasted into the section itself.

A29: The final RFP may contain page limitation per work sample. To avoid confusion, the terms Functional and Program Areas are replaced with Categories and Specialty Areas moving forward. Specialty Areas will require cross-reference. All page limitations referenced in Section L, including Proposal Organization Table, will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency. The Government will clarify the submission requirements in Sections L & M of the draft RFP.

Q30: Please clarify Vol II 2.4.1 Work Samples page limitation, specifically "1.2 Limits are in Self Scoring Matrix, Attachment 9". Please clarify whether the work samples are to be included as separate attachments, titled, labeled and identified individually and included within the Vol II folder or if each sample is to be pasted into the section itself.

A30: The final RFP may contain page limitation per work sample. To avoid confusion, the terms Functional and Program Areas are replaced with Categories and Specialty Areas moving forward. Specialty Areas will require cross-reference. All page limitations referenced in Section L, including Proposal Organization Table, will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency. The Government will clarify the submission requirements in Sections L & M of the draft RFP.

Q31: Attachment 5, Table 1 (Proposal Organization) - In Volume II, the Self-Scoring Matrix is only allowed 1 page. In a printing orientation, this matrix runs to 4 pages or so. Suggest removal of page limit for self-scoring matrix or otherwise note that this should be a separate attachment (Excel file) to Vol. II.

A31: All page limitations referenced in Section L, including Proposal Organization Table, will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q32: Attachment 5 (Section 1.13.2 and 1.13.3) - There appears to be a discrepancy on margin sizes between 1.13.2 (1" top/bot, 3/4" side) and 1.13.3 (1/2" top/bot and side). Please clarify.

A32: All references to page format in Section L will be reviewed to ensure consistency. Generally, the use of 1 inch top and bottom and ½ inch side margins is acceptable.

Q33: Attachment 5 (Section 1.13.7) - Please provide further clarification on TOC requirements (1.13.7), specifically around what is meant by "delineating the subparagraphs within that volume".

A33: Each Volume must also have its own TOC in order to identify subparagraphs in each volume.

Q34: In L- 2.4.4, it states, "The Offeror shall fill in the Columns D "Offeror Proposed Self-Score Points" and G "Work Sample Cross-Reference" of the Self-Scoring Matrix." It is unclear the method/and format we are to use to fill in the cells under Column G, Work Sample Cross-Reference. Can the Government please clarify how it wants information presented/referenced in Column G?

A34: The cross-reference matrix has been separated from the self-scoring matrix. A final list of attachments will be provided. Column G has been deleted from the Self-Scoring Matrix.

Q35: Atch 8, Section L, para 2.4.4 "Work Sample Cross-Reference". Will the Government please provide specific guidance/direction/acceptable example.

A36: Sections L & M will be reviewed and revised as necessary to provide specific guidance/direction/acceptability criteria.

Q36: Atch 8, Section L, para 1.12: The size of the proposals are expected to be very large with the numerous PWS's, SOWs, CDRLs, etc. included in Volume II. Is DoD SAFE capable of accepting files this large for submission?

A37: Sections L & M will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency. The final solicitation is expected to be posted using the PEE Solicitation Module, (not DoD Safe) and this will require that all electronic proposals will be submitted via PEE. PEE Solicitation Module instructions will be provided.

Q38: Atch 8, Section L, para 2.4.1.2: Will the Government accept highlights and comments within the contract documentation to identify EC2 Functional Areas?

A38: Cross Reference Matrix will be provided IAW Section L & M

Q39: In reference to "2.4.1.2. The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation which may include Performance Work Statements (PWS), Statements of Work (SOW), or Contract Data Requirement Lists (CDRLs). When contracts are used for work samples, the Offeror shall, also include the signed cover page associated with the contract (not counted against page limits). If a work sample substantiates multiple EC2 Functional Areas, each Functional Area must be identified within the work sample. Offerors shall only provide official contract documentation." We recommend the government extend contractual documents to include Task Order PWS, LCAT Descriptions, and Contract Deliverables (as long as these are signed off by a CO, COR, ACOR, or a GTM).

A39: Thank you for your recommendation. The Government intends on reviewing and updating the list of documentation(s) that are acceptable. Sections L & M will be revised to ensure clarity and consistency. The updated list of acceptable work same documents will be the maximum options for Offerors while maintaining maximum efficiency for the Government to validate that the Offerors possess the background, experience, and past performance needed to receive an IDIQ award in accordance with the RFP.

Q40: Section M 1.6 IDIQ Ceiling. In this section, the Government states that ...the overall ceiling of the IDIQ is estimated at >\$5.3B throughout the ten (10) years contract.... In the Q&A, the Government states in Question 52 that the contract will likely be a 5-year base with one or two two-year options. We recommend the Government align Section 1.6 to the same timeframe.

A40: The IDIQ will have a five-year base and one, five-year option. Language in Sections L & M will be reviewed and revised to ensure consistency.

Q41: Section M 3.1 Evaluation Methodology. In this section, the Government states that it intends to ...utilize a Highest Technically Rated Offeror (HTRO) methodology; however, cost will not be considered at the IDIQ level. We recommend to the Government to remove ...however, cost will not be considered at the IDIQ level from this sentence AND then move the following sentence from Section 4.1 into this paragraph: In accordance with 10 U.S.C. 2305(a)(3)(C)(i), Cost/Price will not be evaluated during this source selection; Cost/Price will be evaluated for each individual task order. By doing so, this paragraph will be explicitly clear that cost is NOT a factor of the evaluation methodology.

A41: The Government appreciates your suggestion and will consider this verbiage. Sections L & M will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q42: How many and what portion of IDIQ awards are anticipated as set-aside for Small Business and set-aside for Other Than Small Business?

A42: The Government expects references to “pools” to be removed from the solicitation. The Government expects to issue an IDIQ award to all “Highly Qualified Offeror’s.”

Q43: Does the Government anticipate awarding to all Offerors whose substantiated Past Experience and Past Performance meet a minimum threshold for the Highest Technically Rated Offeror(s)?

A43: Yes, the Government expects to issue an IDIQ award to all Highly Qualified Offeror’s.

Q44: If a Small Business offeror’s ratings are at or above award of Other Than Small Business offers, will Small Business replace a position potentially held by an Other Than Small Business Offeror?

A44: No

Q45: If a prime contractor is awarded a contract as a Small Business set-aside, is that contractor able to pursue Other Than Small Business orders under the IDIQ?

A45: Yes

Q46: 3.1 Will only the specific items listed in 2.1-2.5 and method(s) be used by the Government to determine the proposal to be responsive? (Basically, are you looking for the proposal to be complete and compliant prior to evaluating Factor 1 and Factor 2?)

A46: Responsiveness will be determined IAW FAR 9.104-1, to include items listed in Section L&M to be considered a complete and compliant proposal.

Q47: 4.3.5. Please define Positive Findings

A47: Anything satisfactory or above.

Q49: 4.3.6 Please define pool in the statement each pool. Is the Government planning on making separate small business pool such as WOSB, HUBZone, SDVOSB, Small Business pools?

A49: The Government expects references to “pools” to be removed from the solicitation. The Government anticipates to issue an IDIQ award to all “Highly Qualified Offeror’s.”

Q50: If a combination of small businesses resulting in two or more that collectively can cover all program and function areas, is there a need for the unrestricted pool?

A50: The Government expects references to “pools” to be removed from the solicitation. The Government does not expect to restrict Offerors whose proposal includes multiple business entities.

Q51: Section M, Paragraph 4.3.1 Past Performance Evaluation. The Government will assess Past Performance of Offerors with a qualifying Government-validated score within. IAW ITO 2.5.2, Offerors shall only submit a Past Performance Information Sheet (Attachment 12) for work samples used in self-scoring matrix. Paragraph 4.3.2 states Past Performance information will either be determined Recent or Not Recent. In order for the Past Performance materials to be determined Recent, at least six months of performance shall have been within the last three years, as of the date on the RFP Letter. In reviewing Section L paragraph 2.4.3 and 2.4.3.2, states Work Sample Qualifications. Work samples shall meet these minimum qualifications. At least six months of active performance shall have been within the last five years, as of the date of this RFP. To pose a question about this issue we do not have the ITO to see if it clarifies the two different time frames. Is the Government going to issue a draft ITO before the December 16th date for the RFI response.

A51: The Government is working diligently to issue the draft RFP in a timely manner but is not publishing timelines or expected issuance dates at this time. The Government expects to require at least six months of active performance and that performance shall have been completed within the last *three* years, from the date of that the RFP is issued. The Government intends to make this change due to the speed at which the Cyber environment changes/evolves.

Q52: 4.3.2, page 5, we recommend that the more recent the program, the more weight in grading the program deserves. This is due to staffing challenges and work difficulties that arose during the COVID-19 pandemic.

A52: The Government has considered your recommendation; however, we do not believe the additional complexity in evaluation is warranted. Please see revised Sections L&M released in the draft RFP.

Q53: Also, with regard to the above, will the government consider awarding to an Offeror that does not have an approved accounting system – with the understanding/term that they will not be able to propose on Task Orders with cost reimbursement CLINS?

A53: Award(s) will be made in accordance with section L & M.

Q54: Attachment 6; 1.5; Offeror would recommend a low threshold for off-ramping industry from the vehicle. Responding to RFIs, RFPs, etc. costs industry money and time - especially if the unrestricted pool has many vendors; the amount of opportunity for responses and "wins" may not be enough for everyone on the vehicle to remain.

A54: The Government will take this recommendation into consideration when drafting ordering procedures.

Q55: Attachment 6; 1.7; Will the Post Award Conference award (\$3,000) apply to the unrestricted pool as well?

A55: The Government expects references to "pools" to be removed from the solicitation. Minimum guarantee applies to all awardees; however, minimum award amount is subject to change.

Q56: Attachment 6; 4.3.5: Adverse Findings. Will Industry have a chance to provide a response in the event any unanticipated adverse findings are identified? Or do these need to be addressed in advanced in the "Specific Content" sections referenced in Attachment 5; 2.5.8?

A56: Yes. Industry will have the opportunity to address adverse findings that have not previously been addressed.

Q57: Attachment 6, Section 4.0 - What is the weighting differentiation between Factor 1 (Past Experience) and Factor 2 (Past Performance)?

A57: The Government does not intend on using weighted values between Factor 1 & 2. The Government will utilize a Highest Technically Rated Offeror (HTRO) methodology intends on reviewing and updating instructions and evaluation criteria provided in Sections L & M of the RFP to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q58: 2.4.7 (4) Team Structure: Government states Provide verification of prime status for proposed team members. Offeror's shall provide contract reference(s) that illustrate the team member acting as a prime. Can the Government be more specific as to what documentation they are requesting? What is a teammate has not held a prime contract? Are they automatically eliminated for this opportunity?

A58: The Government will clarify the documentation and submission requirements in Sections L & M of the draft RFP. The Government expects that Primes will be permitted to submit as subcontractors or team members; teaming arrangements are not expected to be restricted.

Q59: 2.5.7 Organizational Structure Change History: Is this section applicable for a company who only made a name change but no mergers or having been acquired? For example company ABC, LLC now doing business as (dba) company XYZ, LLC?

A59: Now expected to be section 2.5.6. Yes, and all historical changes to structure to include name changes must be provided in order to clearly communicate the relationships among entities included as part of the Offerors proposal.

Q60: 2.5.5 Language Analysis - is this narrative or machine?

A60: Machine language, please see the Attachment 17 - EC2_Labor_Cats: i. AN-LNG-001

Q61: Teaming Arrangements. Offerors submitting a proposal as the prime Offeror in response to this solicitation are not permitted to submit a separate proposal under which they would be a Subcontractor, or team member to another prime. Subcontractors are permitted to support multiple primes.

A61: The Government expects that Primes will be permitted to submit as subcontractors or team members; teaming arrangements are not expected to be restricted.

Q62: Can EC2 Offerors bid as a subcontractor in the small business pool AND as a sub or prime in the unrestricted pool? See paragraph 1.13.9: Teaming Arrangements. Offerors submitting a proposal as the prime Offeror in response to this solicitation are not permitted to submit a separate proposal under which they would be a Subcontractor, or team member to another prime. Subcontractors are permitted to support multiple primes.

A62: The Government expects references to "pools" to be removed from the solicitation. The Government expects to issue an IDIQ award to all Highly Qualified Offeror's. The Government expects that Primes will be permitted to submit as subcontractors or team members; teaming arrangements are not expected to be restricted.

Q63: Draft Section L 1.13.9 Teaming Arrangements. Draft Section L verbiage states: Offerors submitting a proposal as the prime Offeror in response to this solicitation are not permitted to submit a separate proposal under which they would be a Subcontractor, or team member to another prime. Subcontractors are permitted to support multiple primes. Please clarify if Prime Offerors under the Small Business Pool are able to propose as a team member or subcontractor under the unrestricted pool of EC2?

A63: The Government no longer expects to have separate unrestricted and small business pools and expects that primes will be permitted to submit as subcontractors or team members; teaming arrangements are not expected to be restricted.

Q64: Draft Section L Paragraph 1.13.9 states prime Offeror in response to this solicitation are not permitted to submit a separate proposal under which they would be a Subcontractor. Because Small Businesses and Unrestricted Business are not in the same group. May a Large Prime subcontract to a Small Business and/or a Small Business prime subcontract to an Unrestricted Business.

A64: The Government no longer expects to have separate unrestricted and small business pools and expects that primes will be permitted to submit as subcontractors or team members; teaming arrangements are not expected to be restricted.

Q65: Update 8 Attachment 5 Section L Item 1.13.9: Can the government confirm that the limitation of submitting a prime proposal and subcontracting to another bidder is only within the pool? That is, a Small Business cannot submit as a Prime contractor on the Small Business Set Aside solicitation and subcontract to another Small Business. But a Small Business could submit a proposal as a prime on the Small Business Set Aside and subcontract to a Large Business who submits a proposal as a prime on the Full & Open solicitation. And conversely a Large Business could submit a proposal as a prime on the Full & Open solicitation and subcontract to a Small Business who submits a proposal as a prime on the Small Business Set Aside.

A65: The Government expects references to “pools” to be removed from the solicitation. The Government expects that Primes will be permitted to submit as subcontractors or team members; teaming arrangements are not expected to be restricted.

Q66: Attachment 5 Section L, Paragraph 1.13.9, Teaming Arrangements. This paragraph prohibits submitting as a Prime and a Subcontractor on another team. Does this apply to only the Small Business procurement or does it include the unrestricted procurement as well? Can you submit as a Prime under the small business procurement and as a Subcontractor to a large Prime under the Unrestricted contract? Conversely can a Large submit as an unrestricted Prime and as a subcontractor to a Small Business Prime? The Q&A from 20OCT21 does not assist in clarifying this paragraph.

A66: The Government expects references to “pools” to be removed from the solicitation. The Government expects to issue an IDIQ award to all Highly Qualified Offeror’s. The Government expects that Primes will be permitted to submit as subcontractors or team members; teaming arrangements are not expected to be restricted.

Q67: Attachment 5, Section L, Paragraph 2.4.7.1 stipulates "The teaming agreement summary shall detail the responsibilities of each teaming partner with consideration to the acquisition and identify the percentage of work to be performed in each EC2 Functional Area by each teaming partner." Whereas this is an IDIQ contract spanning 10 years it is impossible to accurately predict the forthcoming work over the next 10 years by each functional area with sufficient detail to allocate workshare to teammates. Recommend this be deleted.

A67: The Government no longer expects to distinguish between teaming partners, subcontractors, or partners. All entities and the agreements therein will be evaluated in the same manner as prime contractors such that the entity is capable of meeting criteria that will be clarified in the draft RFP.

Q68: Reference: Update 8, Attachment 5, Section L, Para 1.13.9, states, "Teaming Arrangements. Offerors submitting a proposal as the prime Offeror in response to this solicitation are not permitted to submit a separate proposal under which they would be a Subcontractor, or team member to another prime. Subcontractors are permitted to support multiple primes. Question: This statement limits small businesses from access to and involvement in the EC2 contract. As a qualified subcontractor and possibly a prime contractor, the Government is limiting our ability to grow and propose as a prime contractor. Will the Government consider removing this limitation from the solicitation and allow SB prime contractors to subcontract on UNR bids?

A68: The Government expects references to "pools" to be removed from the solicitation. The Government expects to issue an IDIQ award to all Highly Qualified Offerors. The Government expects that Primes will be permitted to submit as subcontractors or team members; teaming arrangements are not expected to be restricted.

Q69: Section L, Para 2.4.7, "2.4.7. Team Structure. The Offeror shall identify the team structure it will use to meet Government requirements. The Offeror shall identify the team structure within Attachment 11 – Team Structure. The Offeror shall:

- 1) Identify the team member's name, address, CAGE code, and DUNS number.
- (2) Identify the relationship between the prime, each team member.
- (3) Identify EC2 Functional Area(s) in which the prime intends on utilizing team member(s) for performance.
- (4) Provide verification of prime status for proposed team members. Offeror's shall provide contract reference(s) that illustrate the team member acting as a prime."

A69: The Government will clarify the documentation and submission requirements in Sections L & M of the draft RFP. The Government does not expect to request entire copies of Statements of Work or Performance Work Statements. Additionally, the requirement for prime status is expected to change such that primes will be permitted to submit as subcontractors or team members; teaming arrangements are not expected to be restricted.

Q70: Recommend to remove page limits. Allow Offerors room to provide sufficient information to support relevance/performance in task areas. For example, Offerors may provide work samples with multiple PWS areas touched across a single contract or TO. Because of the substantiation documentation requirements – the RFP language will require Offerors to provide excerpts of the contract documentation. This may hinder the evaluation and limit Offeror's ability to fully demonstrate their performance capabilities.

A70: All page limitations referenced in Section L, including Proposal Organization Table, will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q71: L1.13.9 Subcontractors are permitted to support multiple primes. Will the government please clarify if team members on a SB pool team have to be small businesses can only use a work sample one time if they are on multiple teams can be a sub on the unrestricted pool?

A71: The Government expects references to “pools” to be removed from the solicitation. The Government expects to issue an IDIQ award to all Highly Qualified Offeror’s. The Government expects that Primes will be permitted to submit as subcontractors or team members; teaming arrangements are not expected to be restricted.

Q72: Attachment 5 Section L, Paragraph 1.13.9, Teaming Arrangements. This paragraph prohibits submitting as a Prime and a Subcontractor on another team. Does this apply to only the Small Business procurement or does it include the unrestricted procurement as well? Can you submit as a Prime under the small business procurement and as a Subcontractor to a large Prime under the Unrestricted contract? Conversely can a Large submit as an unrestricted Prime and as a subcontractor to a Small Business Prime?

A72: The Government expects references to “pools” to be removed from the solicitation. The Government expects to issue an IDIQ award to all Highly Qualified Offeror’s. The Government expects that Primes will be permitted to submit as subcontractors or team members; teaming arrangements are not expected to be restricted.

Q73: Attachment 5, Section L, Paragraph 2.4.7.1 stipulates "The teaming agreement summary shall detail the responsibilities of each teaming partner with consideration to the acquisition and identify the percentage of work to be performed in each EC2 Functional Area by each teaming partner." Whereas this is an IDIQ contract spanning 10 years it is impossible to accurately predict the forthcoming work over the next 10 years by each functional area with sufficient detail to allocate workshare to teammates. Recommend this be deleted.

A73: The Government no longer expects to distinguish between teaming partners, significant subcontractors, or partners. All entities and the agreements therein will be evaluated in the same manner as prime contractors such that the entity is capable of meeting criteria that will be clarified in the draft RFP.

Q74: Attachment 5, Section L, Paragraph 1.13.9, Teaming Arrangements. If Subcontractors can join as many teams as they wish, the source selection evaluation will be arduous to perform as there will be hundreds of small businesses that team with everyone in hopes of being on a winning team(s). The Source Selection team will need to review many qualified proposals with the same past performance references. To encourage vendors to choose teams wisely and reduce the evaluation burden we recommend that each vendor can only submit a past performance reference once as a subcontractor. Hence, if a subcontractor wants to participate on multiple teams, they will have to submit a different past performance reference for each team they joined. They would not be able to be a subcontractor to everyone and provide the same past performance to everyone.

A74: The Government has considered this scenario; however, teaming will not be restricted.

Q75: Attachment 5; 2.4.7.1; The Offeror shall provide signed teaming agreement summary between the Prime Offeror and each team member. The teaming agreement summary shall detail the responsibilities of each teaming partner with consideration to this acquisition and identify the percentage of work to be performed in each EC2 Functional Area by each teaming partner. XXX has a variety of different subcontract/teammate vehicles. We do not always execute teaming agreements with every partner. Would submissions of NDAs/PIAs be acceptable vs official Teaming Agreements?

A75: The Government no longer expects to distinguish between teaming partners, significant subcontractors, or partners. All entities and the agreements therein will be evaluated in the same manner as prime contractors such that the entity is capable of meeting criteria that will be clarified in the draft RFP. The Government expects to revise the requirement to provide percentages of work to be performed.

Q76: Attachment 5, Paragraph 1.13.9 states "Offerors submitting a proposal as the prime Offeror in response to this solicitation are not permitted to submit a separate proposal under which they would be a Subcontractor, or team member to another prime" Question: Would the government consider relaxing this requirement to allow Other Than Small Businesses to subcontract to a Small Business for the Small Business Set Aside? And also to allow for Small Businesses to be a subcontractor on the Other than Small Businesses set-Aside? This would have the advantage of fostering more small business interest and support to this opportunity and allow Other Than Small Businesses to meet small business subcontracting goals.

A76: The Government expects references to "pools" to be removed from the solicitation. The Government expects to issue an IDIQ award to all Highly Qualified Offeror's. The anticipated approach is to issue the RFP on an unrestricted basis and set-aside task orders for small business concerns to the maximum extent practicable. The Government expects that Primes will be permitted to submit as subcontractors or team members; teaming arrangements are not expected to be restricted.

Q77: Attachment 5, Paragraphs 2.4.2 and 2.4.3.3 would appear to conflict. Section 2.4.2 allows projects performed as a subcontractor to be provided toward Past Performance projects. However, scenarios where projects performed as a subcontractor (provided by the Prime Offeror or one of its subcontractors) is not specified in Section 2.4.3.3. As Attachment 5 Section L stands, it is not clear whether Offerors may put forward projects that are relevant and performed as a subcontractor.

A77: The Government will clarify the documentation and submission requirements for Offerors to include clarification on acceptable entity/team structures and the associated past performance information being requested in Sections L & M of the draft RFP. The Government expects that Primes will be permitted to submit as subcontractors or team members; teaming arrangements are not expected to be restricted.

Q78: Section L, paragraph 1.13.9 states, "Teaming Arrangements. Offerors submitting a proposal as the prime Offeror in response to this solicitation are not permitted to submit a separate proposal under which they would be a Subcontractor, or team member to another prime. Subcontractors are permitted to support multiple primes." Question: Can an Offeror submit a proposal as a prime in the unrestricted pool and as a subcontractor in the small business pool?

A78: The Government expects references to “pools” to be removed from the solicitation. The Government expects to issue an IDIQ award to all Highly Qualified Offeror’s. The Government expects that Primes will be permitted to submit as subcontractors or team members; teaming arrangements are not expected to be restricted.

Q79: Section L, paragraph 2.4.3.3.2 states, "The Offeror may submit work samples performed by their proposed subcontractors and teaming partners." Question: In the small business pool, do the work samples have to be those of other small businesses, or can an Offeror propose work samples from a large business subcontractor?

A79: The Government expects references to “pools” to be removed from the solicitation. The Government expects to issue an IDIQ award to all Highly Qualified Offeror’s. The Government expects that Primes will be permitted to submit as subcontractors or team members; teaming arrangements are not expected to be restricted.

Work samples can be from any sized teaming partner.

Q80: Section L, paragraph 1.13.9 states, "Teaming Arrangements. Offerors submitting a proposal as the prime Offeror in response to this solicitation are not permitted to submit a separate proposal under which they would be a Subcontractor, or team member to another prime. Subcontractors are permitted to support multiple primes." Question: Can an Offeror submit a proposal as a prime in the unrestricted pool and as a subcontractor in the small business pool?

A80: The Government expects references to “pools” to be removed from the solicitation. The Government expects to issue an IDIQ award to all Highly Qualified Offeror’s. The Government expects that Primes will be permitted to submit as subcontractors or team members; teaming arrangements are not expected to be restricted.

Q81: Atch 8, Section L, para 1.13.9: Please confirm that if you Prime, you cannot subcontract to another Prime. "No over/under"

A81: The Government expects that Primes will be permitted to submit as subcontractors or team members; teaming arrangements are not expected to be restricted.

Q82: Atch 8, Section L, para 2.4.3.3.2: Is it necessary for a subcontractor to have performed as a prime contractor a federal contract? Suggest making this a requirement for the prime only.

A82: Verbiage has been deleted. Offerors may submit proposal, past experience, and past performance information from inside and/or outside of the Federal Government. The Government expects that primes will be permitted to submit as subcontractors or team members; teaming arrangements are not expected to be restricted. The Government will clarify the documentation and submission requirements in Sections L & M of the draft RFP.

Q83: Requiring three POCs from the prime vendor for qualifications where the bidder is a subcontractor could restrict the ability to provide qualifications as a subcontractor. Additionally, primes/subs on a work sample being submitted could be competitors on the EC2 solicitation. We recommend that the government only require bidders to disclose whether they were primes/subs on a project and limit POCs provided to government only.

A83: The Government expects to revise Section L requirement to two POCs. The “POCs” may be from inside and/or outside of the Federal Government.

Q84: Can the government clarify the statement "Offerors submitting a proposal as the prime Offeror in response to this solicitation are not permitted to submit a separate proposal under which they would be a Subcontractor, or team member to another prime

A84: The Government expects that Primes will be permitted to submit as subcontractors or team members; teaming arrangements are not expected to be restricted.

Q85: Is a subcontractor on a small business track able to Prime on the Unrestricted track?

A85: The Government expects references to “pools” to be removed from the solicitation. The Government expects to issue an IDIQ award to all Highly Qualified Offeror’s.

Q86: Is a company allowed to submit a Prime proposal in the Unrestricted pool and sub to multiple primes on the Small Business pool?

A86: The Government expects references to “pools” to be removed from the solicitation. The Government expects to issue an IDIQ award to all Highly Qualified Offeror’s. The Government expects that Primes will be permitted to submit as subcontractors or team members; teaming arrangements are not expected to be restricted.

Q87: Section M 1.3. This paragraph includes four (4) criteria for a company to be considered qualified to include the fourth criteria being ...and (4) the Contracting Officer has no reason to believe the Offeror would be likely to offer other than fair and reasonable pricing (price will not be evaluated for contract award). The Government has stated in both Sections L & M that cost will not be evaluated at the IDIQ level and with this submission. So, it is our recommendation that the Government remove ... and (4) the Contracting Officer has no reason to believe the Offeror would be likely to offer other than fair and reasonable pricing (price will not be evaluated for contract award), as it is a subjective assessment based on no cost information and opens the Government to protest.

A87: The Government expects to update this language and the criteria and procedures provided in Sections L & M.

Q88: Section L.2.4.1.2 states: The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation which may include Performance Work Statements (PWS), Statements of Work (SOW), or Contract Data Requirement Lists (CDRLs). We request that work samples from CPARs, Monthly Status Reports and other deliverables be allowed to

substantiate experience.

A88: The Government intends on reviewing and updating the list of documentation(s) that are acceptable. Sections L & M will be revised to ensure clarity and consistency. The updated list of acceptable work same documents will be the maximum options for Offerors while maintaining maximum efficiency for the Government to validate that the Offerors possess the background, experience, and past performance needed to receive an IDIQ award in accordance with the RFP.

Q89: L.2.4.2, page 9. Work Sample Cover Sheet. Line 6 states ...For subcontractors' work samples, the Offeror shall provide at least three (3) POCs for the prime company. The prime company's POCs usually consist of their Program Manager and a Contracts/Subcontracts Lead, and it is likely the person who will know the most about the subcontractor and their performance will be the Program Manager. We'd recommend that the Government consider going with at least two (2) POCs as stated on Lines 4 and 5 in the same section.

A89: The Government expects to revise Section L requirement to two POCs. The "POCs" may be from inside and/or outside of the Federal Government.

Q90: L.2.4.4 states, The Offeror shall fill in the Columns D Offeror Proposed Self-Score Points and G Work Sample Cross-Reference of the Self-Scoring Matrix. It is unclear the method and format we are to use to fill in the cells under Column G, Work Sample Cross-Reference. Will the Government please clarify how it wants information presented/referenced in Column G?

A90: The cross-reference matrix has been separated from the self-scoring matrix. A final list of attachments (and clear instructions) will be provided in the draft RFP. Column G has been deleted from the Self-Scoring Matrix.

Q91: Paragraph 2.4.3 in Section L states 2.4.3. Work Sample Qualifications. Work samples shall meet these minimum qualifications. 2.4.3.2. -- Recency criteria -- At least six months of active performance shall have been within the last five years, as of the date of this RFP. Paragraph 4.3.2 of Section M states in order for the Past Performance materials to be determined Recent, at least six months of performance shall have been within the last three years, as of the date on the RFP Letter. Respectfully request the Government establish the recency criteria to be At least six months of active performance shall have been within the last five years, as of the date of this RFP.

A91: The Government expects to require at least six months of active performance and that performance shall have been completed within the last *three* years, from the date of that the RFP is issued. The Government intends to make this change due to the speed at which the Cyber environment changes/evolves.

Q92: 2.4.1 WORK SAMPLES: Is the following assumption correct? Section L, 2.4.5.2.1 through 2.4.5.2.9 identifies 33 Functional Areas (FA), Attachment nine (9) identifies the response page count for each FA. Is each assigned page count meant to be used for submitting extracts from Offeror awarded contract PWS, SOWs, etc. to show proof of having performed the task identified in Attachment 2, LCATS? Each FA has to have an Attachment 8 so there will be a requirement for 33 Attachment 8s. Is the Attachment 8 standalone document with the FA work sample pages

attach to it? Also, each work sample is to have a work sample identifier (WSI) (e.g. WS1) assigned to it, so on the page response if more than one awarded contract is referenced then each contract will have the corresponding WSI identified. Will all WSI used be required to be identified on the Attachment 8 for each FA?

A92: This no longer applies, please see revised Sections L&M.

Q93: 2.4.1.2 Can one Attachment 8 be used for more than I FA if the WSIs are annotated on the Attachment 8? Have not been provided a draft Attachment 8 to know what it contains yet.

A93: This no longer applies, please see revised Sections L&M.

Q94: 2.4.3.2 is the assumption that all Work Sample contract documentation has to be not older than five years from the date of the formal RFP release?

A94: The Government expects to require at least six months of active performance and that performance shall have been completed within the last *three* years, from the date of that the RFP is issued. The Government intends to make this change due to the speed at which the Cyber environment changes/evolves.

Q95: 2.4.1.3 Work Samples: The Government's stated identifier convention suggests that Offerors should submit a separate Work Sample for each Functional Area. Please confirm that Offerors can submit one copy of a Work Sample and refer, in that copy, to multiple Functional Areas.

A95: That is correct. Please note to avoid confusion, the terms Functional and Program Areas are replaced with Categories and Specialty Areas moving forward.

Q96: 2.4.1.2 Work Samples: Please confirm that a Work Reference can be used for multiple Program Areas as well as multiple Functional Areas.

A96: That is correct. Please note to avoid confusion, the terms Functional and Program Areas are replaced with Categories and Specialty Areas moving forward.

Q97: How likely is it the government would consider allowing commercial (non-government) past performance/experience/work samples? As you know, technology-based needs for the government are often met using commercial best practices. See paragraph 2.4.3: Work Sample Qualifications. Work samples shall meet these minimum qualifications: Shall be a United States Government Department or Agency contract.

A97: A commercial work sample is allowed, and will be evaluated IAW the revised Section M.

Q98: Draft Section L Paragraph 2.4.3.3.1 Prime Offeror work samples. Draft Section L verbiage states: The Offeror

acted as the Prime Contractor. This statement leads us to believe Prime Offeror work samples must be prime contract examples only. However, paragraph 2.4.2 Work Sample Cover Sheet states: For subcontractor work samples, the Offeror shall provide at least three POCs for the prime company. Please clarify if Prime Offerors are allowed to submit subcontract examples as part of their Past Experience?

A98: Yes, Offerors can submit subcontractor samples. The Government expects to revise Section L requirement to two POCs. The “POCs” may be from inside and/or outside of the Federal Government.

Q99: Attachment 5 - 2.4.1.2 - Recommend allowing any Government-produced documents, such as CPARs, to also be allowed for work samples. In preparing proposals for similar IDIQs, we have been able to validate performance through Government-produced documents when the PWS or SOW have been too general or vague to clearly reflect the work performed.

A99: The Government intends on reviewing and updating the list of documentation(s) that are acceptable. Sections L & M will be revised to ensure clarity and consistency. The updated list of acceptable work same documents will be the maximum options for Offerors while maintaining maximum efficiency for the Government to validate that the Offerors possess the background, experience, and past performance needed to receive an IDIQ award in accordance with the RFP.

Q100: Reference Section L: 2.4.3.3.1 – please clarify if work samples submitted by the Prime Offeror can be work samples when the Prime Offeror acted as a sub-contractor? Limiting work samples to only prime contracts severely limits the breadth of work samples that can be provided and put an undue burden on small businesses.

A100: Yes, Offerors can submit subcontractor samples. The Government expects to revise Section L requirement to two POCs. The “POCs” may be from inside and/or outside of the Federal Government.

Q101: Reference Section L: 2.4.3.3.2 – please clarify if work samples submitted by a subcontractor/teaming partner can be work samples when the subcontractor acted as a subcontractor?

A101: The Government expects that Offerors will be permitted to submit proposals as prime contractors, subcontractors, team members or other entities that fulfilled the requirements of the work sample; teaming arrangements are not expected to be restricted.

Q102: Please clarify qualification criteria “(2) have previously acted as the Prime Contractor on federal contract(s)” – does this mean that the subcontractor must have performed work as a prime contractor on any federal contract OR that the submitted work sample must be from a federal contract where the proposed subcontractor acted as a prime?

A102: Offerors may submit proposal, past experience, and past performance information from inside and/or outside of the Federal Government. The Government expects that Offerors will be permitted to submit proposals as prime contractors, subcontractors, team members or other entities that fulfilled the requirements of the work sample;

teaming arrangements are not expected to be restricted. The Government will clarify the documentation and submission requirements in Sections L & M of the draft RFP.

Q103: Per Section L, paragraph 2.4.3.1. A work sample is defined as “a United States Government Department or Agency contract”. Separate electronic files are required for each work sample, i.e. the contract substantiation for proof of self-claimed score. But page allocations in the self-scoring spreadsheet are defined for each functional area and PWS requirement reference. Please clarify how page limits are to be used for individual functional areas and lower level requirements when there is ambiguity regarding these page limits and the substantiation data from contract documentation to be provided as a single electronic file.

A103: All page limitations referenced in Section L, including Proposal Organization Table, will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q104: Section L, paragraph 1.13.1 states that work sample contract cover page (the signed cover page associated with the contract for each work sample) does not count towards page count. However, paragraph 2.4.2 states there is also a requirement to include Work Sample Cover Sheet with POC information for each work sample. Section L does not clearly state that the Work Sample Cover Sheet will not be counted against page limits. Please confirm both a cover page and cover sheet are required for each work sample and that neither will count against page limits.

A104: Cover sheets are not counted in page count on any part of the Offeror’s proposal. All page limitations referenced in Section L, including Proposal Organization Table, will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q105: The government states that a maximum of three task orders from an IDIQ can be combined as a work sample. Can other task orders on that same IDIQ also be used as work samples, as long as for any work sample, only up to three are combined?

A105: The Government now expects to reduce the number of task orders from an IDIQ to be combined to only two work samples for each Specialty Area. Specialty Areas will require cross-reference. Offerors may use work samples from the same IDIQ on other specialty areas also but not to exceed two for each work sample.

Q106: L2.4.1 Work Samples. The Offeror shall submit work sample for each scored EC2 Functional Area. Is this “a” work sample for each or work samples for each? Will the government clarify what is the maximum number of work samples that can be submitted per each functional area?

A106: Up to two work samples may be submitted for each specialty area in order to obtain maximum allowed points. The terms Functional and Program Areas are replaced with Categories and Specialty Areas moving forward.

Q107: Attachment 5; 2; Will there be a limit on how many contracts/work scope examples can be provided/referenced in each section? Or will that remain unlimited?

A107: Up to two work samples may be submitted for each specialty area in order to obtain maximum allowed points. The terms Functional and Program Areas are replaced with Categories and Specialty Areas moving forward. Specialty Areas will require cross-reference.

Q108: Attachment 5; 2.4.8: "The burden of proof for substantiating points in the self-score system rests with the Offeror." Will criteria be established in the instructions for providing work scope to determine what will meet the "burden of proof"?

A108: The onerous to provide proposal information compliant with sections L&M is the Offerors responsibility. Section M will explain the evaluation criteria and procedures which will be used to substantiate the information provided. The Government will clarify the documentation and submission requirements in Sections L & M of the draft RFP.

Q109: Section L 2.4.1 Work Samples Page 9 of 16 reads in part "...shall submit work sample for each scored EC2 Functional Area (e.g., row 7 of the Self-Scoring Matrix)..." Is the indefinite article "a" missing from this phrase, meaning that an Offeror can submit only one work sample per PWS area (e.g., 2.1.1) or is "work sample" meant to be plural, meaning that an Offeror can provide more than one work sample per PWS area?

A109: Up to two work samples may be submitted for each specialty area in order to obtain maximum allowed points. The terms Functional and Program Areas are replaced with Categories and Specialty Areas moving forward. Specialty Areas will require cross-reference.

Q110: Can an Offeror provide a relevant work sample for work performed where it was a subcontractor? "The Offeror acted as the Prime Contractor"... On Page 9 of the same document, Section 2.4.2 reads in part, "For subcontractor work samples, the Offeror shall provide at least three (3) POCs for the prime company." This implies that work performed by the Offeror as a subcontractor can be used as a work sample

A110: Offerors may submit proposal, past experience, and past performance information from inside and/or outside of the Federal Government. The Government expects that Offerors will be permitted to submit proposals as prime contractors, subcontractors, team members or other entities that fulfilled the requirements of the work sample; teaming arrangements are not expected to be restricted. The Government will clarify the documentation and submission requirements in Sections L & M of the draft RFP. The Government expects to revise Section L requirement to two POCs. The "POCs" may be from inside and/or outside of the Federal Government.

Q111: Section L, paragraph 2.4.1.2 states, "The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation which may include Performance Work Statements (PWS), Statements of Work (SOW), or Contract Data Requirement Lists (CDRLs)." Question: Request work samples from CPARs also be allowed.

A111: The Government intends on reviewing and updating the list of documentation(s) that are acceptable. Sections L & M will be revised to ensure clarity and consistency. The updated list of acceptable work same documents will be the maximum options for Offerors while maintaining maximum efficiency for the Government to validate that the Offerors possess the background, experience, and past performance needed to receive an IDIQ award in accordance with the RFP.

Q112: Can the government provide a draft of the Work Sample Cover Sheet (Attachment 8) so that bidders can understand the nature of write-ups required for past performance submissions?

A112: The Government will consider providing a draft/template coversheet. The conclusion will be explained in the draft RFP and revised sections L & M.

Q113: 2.5.8 Specific Content: Government states Additional information may be included to discuss the Offeror's efforts to resolve recent contract performance problems encountered on prior contracts as well as past efforts to identify and manage program risk. This is a broad statement. Question is are you talking about any contract used for providing work share examples or any contract vehicle where an Offeror overcame problems and resolved the issue?

A113: 2.5.7. Specific Content. This section is designed to allow the Offeror the opportunity (at their sole discretion) to provide explanations or rationale for past performance ratings are or may be lower than what is desired by the Offeror.

Q114: 2.5 Past Performance: Is there a required number of Past Performance references that must be submitted?

A114: Yes. At least one (1) past performance reference will need to be submitted for each work sample and in accordance with the Cross Reference Matrix. Please see the draft RFP and revised sections L & M.

Q115: 2.4.3.3.2, page 10 how will significant Sub participation be measured in order for their past performance to be graded?

A115: The Government does not expect to distinguish between subcontractors or partners. All entities and the agreements therein will be evaluated in the same manner as prime contractors such that the entity is capable of meeting criteria stated in the draft RFP.

Q116: Update 8 Attachment 6 Section L Item 2.5: Can the government clarify which contracts should be used in the Past Performance volume? Do the bidders need to submit a Past Performance citation for each and every Past Experience artifact in the Past Experience volume?

A116: The contracts (or task orders) used in the Offerors past performance in Volume III should match the contracts used to compose the Offerors past experience proposal in Volume II. The Offeror may choose to cite "each and every past experience artifact" at their discretion (and if they believe it to be in their best interest) in order to clearly assign/attach each artifact with the desired work sample. An Offeror may support their best interests by reinforcing their proposals (within the limitations of the Sections L & M) as needed to enable the Government to verify/validate past performance information and assign the highest possible ratings. Section 2.5 Past Performance will be updated and clarified within the draft RFP.

Q117: Section L - Page 9 – Section 2.4.1.1.2 states that Offerors using single award IDIQ contract numbers as a contract reference ...a maximum of three task orders can be combined and counted as one contract reference...Can the government explain why a single award IDIQ can combine task orders as one contract reference whereas task orders issued against a multiple award IDIQ cannot be combined and counted as one contract reference?

A117: Section 2.4.1.1.2 will be updated and clarified within the draft RFP to address this concern. It's the Government's intention to allow single award IDIQs with multiple task orders to be used as stand-alone references meaning each task order is one contract reference. Additionally, we expect that task orders under a single award IDIQ can be used in different Categories or Specialty Areas. Section 2.4.1.1.2 will be updated and clarified within the draft RFP.

Q118: Section L - Page 13, Section 2.5.2 states that ...A Past Performance Submission consists of a PPI Sheet, CPAR and PPQ, when applicable. Is it true that all three of these are required or should it just be either a PPI, CPAR

or PPQ per contract reference? (As per 2.5.4)

A118: The RFI Section L para. 2.5.4 does not require submission of CPARS by the Offeror. Additionally, the Government does not expect to require Offerors to submit CPARS as part of their proposal. RFP paragraph numbers have been revised and will be further revised in the draft RFP. It's the Government's intention to update and clarify the draft RFP and provide Offerors w/ the opportunity to obtain the highest possible past performance rating(s) with maximum efficiency.

Q119: Recommend to remove page limits. Allow Offerors room to provide sufficient information to support relevance/performance in task areas. For example, Offerors may provide work samples with multiple PWS areas touched across a single contract or TO. Because of the substantiation documentation requirements – the RFP language will require Offerors to provide excerpts of the contract documentation. This may hinder the evaluation and limit Offerors' ability to fully demonstrate their performance capabilities.

A119: All page limitations referenced in Section L, including Proposal Organization Table, will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q120: Attachment 5; 2.5.4: Given the requirement for a Past Performance Questionnaire to be completed, recommending a 60 day turn around to provide ample time for our customers to receive and review and approve PP requests.

A120: The Government will consider this recommendation but expects to determine 60 days is too long of a turnaround time. It may be in Offerors best interest to coordinate with past performance references in advance or as soon as possible after RFP issuance.

Q121: Please clarify whether each PPQ shall be titled and labeled individually and submitted as individual files within the Vol III Past Performance folder.

A121: The PPQ contains all of the title and labeling information needed. The Government does not expect that PPQs will be submitted as individual files. Section L 2.5.4 will be updated and clarified within the draft RFP.

Q122: Please clarify whether there is a page limit for each PPQ submitted.

A122: All page limitations referenced in Section L, including Proposal Organization Table, will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q123: Section L –2.4.1.1.2 states: "A method of quality assessment i.e. CPAR/PPQ shall be provided to the Government for each contract Reference." This quality assessment relates to past performance and should be addressed in that section and not included in the Past Experience section. Currently it appears that the Government is attempting to evaluate quality in both areas. If this is not the intent then quality should only be addressed in the area it is being evaluated.

A123: Section 2.4.1.1.2 will be updated and clarified within the draft RFP. It's the Government's intention to provide Offerors w/ the opportunity to obtain the highest possible past experience ratings while receiving the most efficient amount of past experience information that is necessary to adjudicate the rating.

Q124: In L-2.4.1.1.2, it states, "A method of quality assessment, i.e. CPAR/PPQ, shall be provided to the Government for each contract reference." It is unclear what "method of quality assessment" will be levied against CPARS and PPQs. Can the Government please detail the method of "quality assessment" for CPARS and PPQs?

A124: Section 2.4.1.1.2 will be updated and clarified within the draft RFP. It's the Government's intention to provide Offerors w/ the opportunity to obtain the highest possible past experience ratings while receiving the most efficient amount of past experience information that is necessary to adjudicate the rating.

Q125: Atch 8, Section L, para 2.5: Is there a minimum and maximum number of past performance references that can be submitted for Volume 3?

A125: The Government will clarify the documentation and submission requirements in Sections L & M of the draft RFP.

Q126: Atch 8, Section L, para 2.5: Do the past performance references provided in Volume 3 have the same performance requirements as Volume 2 (at least 6 months of active performance within the last 5 years)?

A126: The Government expects to require at least six months of active performance and that performance shall have been completed within the last *three* years, from the date of that the RFP is issued. The Government intends to make this change due to the speed at which the Cyber environment changes/evolves.

Q127: Attachment 6, Section M, paragraph 4.3.3 Relevancy Assessment. Given the Relevancy assessment is based upon the same scope, magnitude, and complexities of the EC2 procurement. How will relevancy ratings be determined for each Present/Past Performance sample? Will each Functional Area receive a relevancy rating?

A127: The Government will assign relevancy ratings by evaluating and assessing the Offerors compliance with the RFP including the completeness and accuracy of its proposal and the quality of the past performance information provided in accordance with Sections L & M. Yes. The Government expects to assign each Specialty Area a relevancy and relevancy rating and ultimately one single [final] Past Performance confidence rating.

Q128: Will they be weighted the same as the score sheet rating to arrive at the overall Relevancy rating or is some other method going to be used?

A128: The Government does not expect to add weighted values to the Categories or Specialty Areas at this time however the Government reserves the right to update the evaluation procedures (and the answer to this question) as deemed to be in the best interest of the Government.

Q129: Will each past performance reference be measured against all program/functional areas in total, or just against the specific program/functional area for which it is specifically identified?

A129: The Government expects that each Specialty Area will receive a relevancy rating *and* the Government intends to assign a single Past Performance confidence rating. Sections L & M are being revised Sections L & M will be revised to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q130: Attachment 6, Section M, paragraph 4.3.3 Relevancy Assessment. Given the Relevancy assessment is based upon the same scope, magnitude, and complexities of the EC2 procurement. How will relevancy ratings be determined for each Present/Past Performance sample? Will each Functional Area receive a relevancy rating? Will they be weighted the same as the score sheet rating to arrive at the overall Relevancy rating or is some other method going to be used?

A130: The procedures and criteria that the Government will use to assign relevancy ratings to each past performance sample will explained in Section M of the draft RFP. To avoid confusion, the terms Functional and Program Areas are replaced with Categories and Specialty Areas moving forward. The Government expects that each Specialty Area will receive a relevancy rating *and* the Government intends to assign a single Past Performance confidence rating. The Government will consider the value of adding weighted values to each Specialty Area and the conclusion of this

consideration will be evident in the draft RFP. Sections L & M are being revised to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q131: Attachment 6, Paragraph 4.3.1, "Offerors shall only submit a Past Performance Information Sheet (Attachment 12) for work samples used in self-scoring matrix." Question: Will the Offeror be required to submit a Past Performance Information Sheet (Attachment 12) for all contracts identified/referenced in the self-scoring matrix? Or, can Attachment 12 be a subset of those contracts referred to under Past Experience?

A131: The Offeror will be required to submit a PPI Sheet (Attachment 12) and other documents to support the work samples used in the self-scoring matrix. The exact proposal requirements for Past Performance Information will be clarified at time of draft RFP issuance. Please note that the Government still intends to require separate Past Experience and Past Performance proposal requirements and will strive to achieve maximum efficiency without requiring duplicate submittal information from Offerors.

Q132: 2.4.5.3. Is the demonstrated minimum combined 90% overall experience score to be assessed within each program area or collectively for all program areas?

A132: 2.4.4.3. The Government expects to update this verbiage to state: "An Offeror must achieve at least a 90% overall score to be determined Technically Acceptable and advance to Past Performance evaluations."

Q133: 2.4.5.2.6, page 12, 2.5.4 Targets - Is this offensive targets?

A133: Targets can be defensive or offensive, please see LCAT reference below.

a. ANSWER: Please see the Attachment 17 - EC2_Labor_Cats:

- i. AN-TGT-001
 - ii. AN-TGT-002
-

Q134: Draft Section L, Volume II – Past Experience – How many work sample submissions will be required to be compliant?

A134: Maximum of 2 per Specialty Area, which will earn an Offeror a 10-point score on the revised Attachment 9 - Self-Scoring Matrix.

Q135: Draft Section L, Volume II - Past Experience Paragraph 2.4.1.1.2 – Single Award IDIQ contracts are allowed to be used with a maximum of three task orders issued against the single award IDIQ as a single reference. If the single award IDIQ has more than 3 task orders issued against the contract can we use the single award IDIQ as a second reference with additional task orders?

A135: Yes. Single award IDIQs with multiple task orders can be used as stand-alone references. Additionally, task orders under a single award IDIQ can be used in different Categories or Specialty Areas. Section 2.4.1.1.2 will be updated and clarified within the draft RFP. It's the Government's intention to provide Offerors w/ the opportunity to obtain the highest possible past experience ratings while receiving the most efficient amount of past experience information that is necessary to adjudicate the rating.

Q136: Update 8 Attachment 6 Section L Item 1.9: Can the government clarify how the competitive range will be established given that pricing information is not required? Will the competitive range use the Past Experience points?

A136: The Government intends to make an award without discussion, however reserves the right to conduct discussions if it is determined to be in the best interest of the Government. If Government decides to conduct discussions, with the concurrence of the CO, the SSA will make a Competitive Range determination. If a

Competitive Range is conducted, it will consider the ratings of proposals based on the stated evaluation criteria, comprised of all of the most highly related proposals, and may be reduced for purposes of efficiency IAW FAR 15.306(c). Sections L & M may be further revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q137: Section L - Page 11, Section 2.4.4.3 states that "the proposal shall include evidence supporting each proposed self-score. Can the government elaborate on what constitutes acceptable "evidence?"

A137: A Work Sample with an associated cross-reference using Attachment 10 - Cross-Reference Matrix will be used. The government expects a combination of various documents currently listed and updated guidance to be issued with the draft RFP. Sections L & M will be revised to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q138: Consider breaking out the acquisition into Pools across PWS areas to increase competition. Current scoring does not contemplate that Offerors may be able to demonstrate a depth of coverage across the PWS in multiple areas, and page limitation do not allow Offerors to provide documentation that shows the extent of their experience across multiple work samples for a PWS area. It seems like this could be an added benefit to the Government. The Air Force has utilized this type of scoring approach in the EPASS acquisitions, and you might consider some of the lessons learned/scoring model and cross reference matrix model used by EPASS and ASTRO in the development of this acquisition.

A138: The Government considered your suggestion and has considered other historical information as part of market research; however, it will not be using Pools for this acquisition. Please refer to the draft RFP for the updates to the solicitation.

Q139: If the same substantiation information is used for different functional area and/or PWS requirement references, is an entire page to be used for such cross reference?

A139: Attachment 10 - Cross Reference Matrix will be used for this purpose and the draft RFP will describe the scoring methodology. Sections L & M will be revised to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q140: The Instructions, Conditions, and Notices to Offerors or Respondents states that the "proposal shall be clear, concise, and shall include sufficient detail for effective evaluation and for substantiating the validity of stated claims." Yet, the proposal is based entirely on statements from existing PWS documentation. Thus, the Offeror does not have a means to present an offering tailored to the IDIQ requirement.

A140: Sections L & M will be revised to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q141: Attachment 5, Paragraph 2.4.1.2 states, "The work samples shall consist of only official contract documentation which may include Performance Work Statements (PWS), Statements of Work (SOW), or Contract Data Requirement Lists (CDRLs)." Should projects performed as a subcontractor be allowed, recommend updating this language to include "subcontracts", "invoices" or other official documentation between Prime and Subcontractor.

A141: The Government intends on reviewing and updating the list of documentation(s) that are acceptable. Sections L & M will be revised to ensure clarity and consistency. The updated list of acceptable work same documents will be the maximum options for Offerors while maintaining maximum efficiency for the Government to validate that the Offerors possess the background, experience, and past performance needed to receive an IDIQ award in accordance with the RFP.

Q142: Atch 8, Section L, para 2.4.3.3.2: Is there a specific percentage of workshare guarantee in order to use a subcontractor's past experience reference?

A142: No. Percentage will not be defined by the Government.

Q143: 4.2.1 Past Experience. Will the Government consider removing the page requirements on the scoring matrix and make it unlimited since pulling work samples from various Government sources to cover the Tasks current provided may require more space than one page can facilitate?

A143: All page limitations referenced in Section L, including Proposal Organization Table, will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q144: 4.1, page 4, First evaluation, Factor 1: Past Experience, is quantitative while the second evaluation, Factor 2: Past Performance, is qualitative. The order in which these evaluations are conducted should be reversed. Very Relevant present/past performance should reinforce self-assessment grades, while somewhat/not relevant present/past performance should reduce self-assessment grades.

A144: The Government acknowledges and considered the Offeror's recommendation and refers to the stated provisions in the solicitation regarding the factors. The Government intends to award utilizing the HTRO evaluation methodology, in the methodology order as delineated. Sections L & M may be further revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q145: 2.4.3.3.3 Self Scoring Matrix: Can the Government further expound on the statement Note that some elements, within Attachment 9, contain category restrictions? In review of the attachment did not see any restriction annotated on it.

A145: This language has been removed. Please refer to the revised draft RFP. All cells within Attachment 9 that do not require Offeror input will be locked.

Q146: On the Self-Scoring Matrix, the maximum pages allowed under Maximum Work Sample Pages section constrains a company's ability to adequately address sections with high-point/example requirements. For instance, under section 2.6.2 Cyber Operational Planning, we are given five pages total to address 122 Cyber Operational Planning examples. Can the Government please remove the page limit requirement to enable us to adequately address required sections?

A146: All page limitations referenced in Section L, including Proposal Organization Table, will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q147: On the Self-Scoring Matrix, we are required to provide Work Samples. Work samples can include various artifacts. Will the Government please address how we are to handle classified PWS/PPQ artifacts?

A147: The Government does not anticipate any requirement for classified document submissions. However, the Government will work with an Offeror on a one-on-one basis if the Offeror feels classified information is required to satisfy the Past Experience or Past Performance factors.

Q148: Instruction 7 in Self-Scoring Directions, assessing knowledge, Skills and Abilities against Tasks seems arbitrary. There doesn't seem to be levels of knowledge or required certifications/education/training.

A148: Education and certification requirements will be addressed at the Task Order level.

Q149: Attachment 9 Self Scoring Matrix: Are there going to be any points associated with 2.2.8 and 2.2.9 added?

A149: This content was removed from Attachment 9. The draft RFP will describe the scoring methodology and all page limitations.

Q150: Attachment 9 Self Scoring Matrix - Column H - Strongly recommend removing page limits from work samples. Because we are providing documents produced by the Government (not by contractors), there is no way to

guarantee we could fully substantiate relevance to a work area within a certain number of pages.

A150: All page limitations referenced in Section L, including Proposal Organization Table, will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q151: On the Self Scoring Matrix (Maximum Work Sample Pages (H)) we recommend increasing the page limit to 5 pages per task area because the contract documentation has to be included as stated in Section L (2.4).

A151: All page limitations referenced in Section L, including Proposal Organization Table, will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q152: On the Self-Scoring Matrix, the maximum pages allowed under “Maximum Work Sample Pages” section, constrains a company’s ability to adequately address sections with high point/example requirements. For instance, under section 2.6.2 Cyber Operational Planning we are given 5 pages total to address 122 Cyber Operational Planning examples. Can the Government please remove the page limit requirement to enable adequate address of required sections?

A152: All page limitations referenced in Section L, including Proposal Organization Table, will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency.

Q153: 2.4.3.3.3 Self Scoring Matrix calculates a percentage score based on the Tasks for the different FAs. Paragraph 2.4.5.3 Scoring states the Offerors must demonstrate a minimum combined 90% overall experience score in the EC2 Program Areas. The way the current scoring matrix is set up you need to score 1,098 Task points out of 1220 to achieve 90% on the spreadsheet. There are 8 PAs. Hypothetically, you could score zero points under section 2.2 Training and 2.4 Protect and Defend and achieve a score over 90%. However, to get a total of 90% just taking the 8 PAs you have to have points in all FAs. 8 out of 8 PAs is 100% and 7 out of 8 PAs is only 87.5%. Given the aforementioned, is it correct to assume you must hit the 1098 Task points and have points in all PA areas to achieve the 90% referenced in Section L 2.4.5.3? If 90% is not achieved, is it correct that you do not meet the criteria for proposal submission?

A153: The Government expects that past experience will be scored using the Attachment 9 - Self Scoring Matrix and a 90% overall score will deem an Offeror "Qualified".

Q154: L.2.4.3.2, page 10. The Government states ...performance shall have been within the last five (5) years, as of the date of this RFP. However, in the Q&A released with the DRAFT Sections L and M, Question 60 is answered that the Government anticipates using three (3) years. We recommend to the Government that using five (5) years for experience and past performance will provide more relevancy for determining qualified companies in both the Unrestricted and Small Business Pools.

A154: The Government will consider this recommendation but no longer expects to have separate unrestricted and small business pools. The anticipated approach is to issue the RFP on an unrestricted basis and set-aside task orders for small business concerns to the maximum extent practicable. The Government will clarify the PPQ and CPARS submission requirements in Sections L & M of the draft RFP. The Government expects to require at least six months of active performance and that performance shall have been completed within the last *three* years, from the date of that the RFP is issued. The Government intends to make this change due to the speed at which the Cyber environment changes/evolves.

Q155: 2.4.3.2 Work Samples: Please confirm that Past Experience and Past Performance references must have at

least six months of active performance within the last five (5) years.

A155: The Government will clarify the PPQ and CPARS submission requirements in Sections L & M of the draft RFP. The Government expects to require at least six months of active performance and that performance shall have been completed within the last *three* years, from the date of that the RFP is issued. The Government intends to make this change due to the speed at which the Cyber environment changes/evolves.

Q156: Draft Section L, Paragraph 2.4.3.2 states each work sample shall have at least six months of active performance within the last 5 years of this RFP. Draft Section M, Paragraph 4.3.2 Recency Assessment states in order for the Past Performance to be determined Recent at last six months of performance shall have been within the last three years as of the date on the RFP Letter. This seems to be in disagreement with work sample criteria. Since Offerors are required to use the same contract examples for both Past Experience and Past Performance, can the Government clarify the recency criteria, five or three years?

A156: The Government will clarify submission requirements in Sections L & M of the draft RFP. The Government expects to require at least six months of active performance and that performance shall have been completed within the last *three* years, from the date of that the RFP is issued. The Government intends to make this change due to the speed at which the Cyber environment changes/evolves.

Q157: Section L & M are in conflict regard the definition of Past Performance. Attachment 5 Section L, paragraph 2.4.3.2 indicates work sample shall have been within the past 5 years. Attach 5, Section L paragraph 2.5.5 indicates sample work CPARS must be provide for the past 5 years. Attachment 6 Section M, paragraph 4.3.2 states recent past Performance shall have been within the past 3 years.

A157: The Government will clarify past performance submission requirements in Sections L & M of the draft RFP. The Government does not intend to require Offerors to submit CPARS. The Government expects to require at least six months of active performance and that performance shall have been completed within the last *three* years, from the date of that the RFP is issued. The Government intends to make this change due to the speed at which the Cyber environment changes/evolves.

Q158: Attachment 5, Paragraph 2.4.3.2 and Attachment 6 Paragraph 4.3.2 show recency different requirements and evaluation. Attachment 5 reads 5 years while Attachment 6 reads 3 years. Recommend 5 years for recency for Past Performance and Past Experience to standardize projects used by Offerors.

A158: The Government expects to require at least six months of active performance and that performance shall have been completed within the last *three* years, from the date of that the RFP is issued. The Government intends to make this change due to the speed at which the Cyber environment changes/evolves.

Q159: Section L, paragraph 2.4.1.1.2 states, "A maximum of three (3) task orders issued against a single-award IDIQ can be combined and counted as one (1) contract reference to address the criteria." Question: How will the period of performance for the combined three task orders be determined? For instance, if five years is used for recency, does the end date for all three orders have to be within the past five years, or will the period of performance for the single-award IDIQ vehicle be used?

A159: The Government will clarify the past performance recency and relevancy evaluation and rating criteria in Sections M of the draft RFP. The Government expects to require at least six months of active performance and that performance shall have been completed within the last *three* years, from the date of that the RFP is issued. The Government intends to make this change due to the speed at which the Cyber environment changes/evolves.

Q160: Section L, paragraph 2.4.3.2 states, "At least six months of active performance shall have been within the last five years, as of the date of this RFP." Section M, paragraph 4.3.2 states, "In order for the Past Performance materials to be determined "Recent," at least six months of performance shall have been within the last three years, as of the date on the RFP Letter." Question: Request Section M be updated to reflect five years.

A160: The Government expects to require at least six months of active performance and that performance shall have been completed within the last *three* years, from the date of that the RFP is issued. The Government intends to make this change due to the speed at which the Cyber environment changes/evolves.

Q162: L.2.4.1.1.2 states a method of quality assessment, i.e., CPAR/PPQ, shall be provided to the Government for each contract reference. It is unclear what method of quality assessment will be levied against CPARS and PPQs. Will the Government please detail the method of quality assessment for CPARS and PPQs?

A162: The Government will clarify the PPQ and CPARS submission requirements in Sections L & M of the draft RFP. The Government does not intend to require Offerors to submit CPARS.

Q163: L.2.5.5 page 14. Contractor Performance Assessment Reports (CPARS). The Government states that ...the Offeror shall provide all CPARS reports that were completed within the last five (5) years. We recommend to the Government that using five (5) years for experience and past performance and associated CPARS will provide more relevancy for determining qualified companies in both the Unrestricted and Small Business Pools.

A163: Thank you for your recommendation. The Government will clarify the experience, past performance, and CPARS submission requirements in Sections L & M of the draft RFP. The Government does not intend to require Offerors to submit CPARS.

Q164: 2.5.5. If a multi-year contract or task order is missing a CPARS, is a PPQ required for the missing period?

A164: The Government does not intend to require Offerors to submit CPARS. PPQ submission will be at the discretion of the contractor to support their proposal. PPQ submission should be accomplished in accordance with the Instructions to Offerors in Section L of the RFP. The Government will clarify the CPARS & PPQ submission requirements in Sections L & M of the draft RFP.

Q165: Per Section L paragraph 2.5.5, Contractor Performance Assessment Reports (CPARS), "For each work sample, the Offeror shall provide all CPARS reports that were completed within the last five years, as of the date of this RFP." Are bidders to interpret this to mean all pages of every report within the last five years should be submitted? Second, since CPARS spans up to five years of performance, is there any specific guidance regarding PPQ input to designate periods of performance or whether a summary level assessment is acceptable?

A165: The Government will clarify the CPARS submission requirements in Sections L & M of the draft RFP. The Government does not intend to request Offerors submit CPARS.

Q166: While a single CPARS over up to a 5-year period may have a lower assessment, a composite assessment may only show a high rating. Should a summary level PPQ be provided when a CPARS is not available, a short period of lower assessment would not necessary be evident which would give PPQ preferable confidence. Would the government consider use of CPARS or PPQ to level the confidence assessment?

A166: The Government will clarify the PPQ and CPARS submission requirements in Sections L & M of the draft

RFP. The Government does not intend to require Offerors to submit CPARS.

Q167: As CPARS required for work samples are considered FOUO and contain company proprietary information, it is critical this information not be made available to Primes/Subcontractors/Team Members/JV Partners. Will the Government allow CPARS to be delivered directly to the Government by sealed package instead of included in VOL III Past Performance?

A167: The Government requires that the proposal be complete submitted IAW Section L & M.

Q168: Attachment 5; Will industry be unable to provide ANY graphics in their responses? What qualifies as "detailed artwork"?

A168: Graphics are not encouraged but are allowed if deemed necessary by the Offeror. Please note they will count against page limitations.

Q169: Attachment 5; 1.6; Minor Update - Points to section 1.10 for e-mail of CO...but the CO's e-mail is in section 1.11 and 1.12 on page 4.

A169: Draft RFP will be released with PDFs rather than Word, to eliminate broken links.

Q170: Attachment 5 - Please provide further clarification of Appendix 1 of Vol. I - (pg. count limits? information requested/required? Appendix 1 is not shown in Table 1 - Proposal Organization). Does it consist solely of Financial/ Other Resources (2.3.3.1) and Accounting System (2.3.3.2)? Does all this information get placed in Appendix 1 as opposed to Vol. I proper? Does OCI Statement/Mitigation Plan go in Vol. I proper?

A170: The appendix is used to supplement the main areas of the Volume. It can be whatever is needed to substantiate what is requested in the Volume. OCI Statement/Mitigation Plans go in Vol I. No page limit applies.

Q171: Attachment 5 - Will the Government confirm that Att. 16 referenced will be a SF1408?

A171: The SF-1408 will not be used.

Q172: Attachment 5 (Section 2.4.2) - Regarding work performed as a subcontractor to a Prime - will the Government reduce the Prime POCs requirement from 3 to 2?

A172: The Government expects to revise Section L requirement to two POCs.

Q173: Per 2.3.2.1, "A JV without its own FCL will not have access to classified information and all access will solely be through the cleared JV members. Therefore, a JV without its own FCL is required to submit, as part of its proposal, a Security Plan/Standard Operating Procedure". However, 2.3.2.2 states that "Offerors that are unpopulated Joint Ventures may meet the FCL requirement by each member of the JV possessing a Top Secret facility clearance". Please clarify these requirements to mean that 1) an unpopulated JV can access classified information via cleared JV members and a security plan/standard operating procedure is required as part of the proposal for such a bidding entity OR 2) that in order to be awarded a TO with a TS facility clearance requirement, each member of the JV must possess a TS facility clearance."

A173: We are no longer requiring FCLs at the IDIQ level; however, an FCL will be required at the appropriate clearance level in order to bid on Task Orders

Q174: In Attachment 5 on Page 7, paragraph 2.3.2 reads: If none, the Offeror must obtain a Top-Secret Facility Clearance to be eligible to propose on a task order under the resultant IDIQ.

A174: We are no longer requiring FCLs at the IDIQ level; however, an FCL will be required at the appropriate clearance level in order to bid on Task Orders

Q175: We commend the procurement team on finally addressing the challenge of facility clearance (the "chicken and egg") blocker for small businesses that ultimately has restricted access to a wide range of top contracting firms for the missions.

A175: ANSWER: We are no longer requiring FCLs at the IDIQ level; however, an FCL will be required at the appropriate clearance level in order to bid on Task Orders.

Q176: Attachment 9; would recommend going down one more layer in each of the Functional Areas. If scoring is being done at the specific LCAT level (i.e.: OM DTA -001; OM DTA-002 under Data Administration) those should be separated to eliminate room for error. Overall scoring percentage could still count at the higher level (i.e.: 37 points) and that percentage but adding additional lines to show that break out of 14 Tasks in OM DTA-001 vs 23 Tasks in OM DTA-002.

A176: The Government has considered your recommendation. The draft RFP contains revisions to Sections L&M, please refer to the revised Draft RFP for evaluation methodology.

Q177: The Government has provided the LCAT's they feel are appropriate for each of the Functional Areas under EC2. There is a high probability that submitted work samples LCATS will not be a 100% match to the Government assessment. Will the Government require a crosswalk between and work sample LCATS and Government provided LCATS? If so, how will Offerors provide that crosswalk and how will the Government evaluate the crosswalk?

A177: The LCATS were provided as examples and are informational only.

Q178: Update 6 Attachment 2 LCATS: The tasks for TR-TEA-002 do not show as there is a formula in the cells. Can you provide an updated LCAT listing?

A178: The broken link has been corrected, please see the revised LCAT document released during the draft RFP.

Q179: EC2_Update_8_Attachment_5_Section_L_ (03NOV2021), page 9, 2.4.1.2: Page limits are not sufficient to provide required documentation. Please increase page limit(s) significantly or adjust the required amount of documentation.

A179: All page limitations referenced in Section L, including Proposal Organization Table, will be reviewed and revised as necessary to ensure clarity and consistency.
