PIMS Peer Review 16PBGC23Q0028 Solicitation Questions and Answers				
No.	Offeror Question	RFP Cross Reference	Page or Paragraph number	PBGC Response
1	The RFQ states: " The criteria to establish what prior performance is recent and relevant shall be unique to each source selection and shall be stated in the solicitation. Common aspects of relevancy include, but are not limited to, the following: Similarity of product/service/support; Complexity; Dollar value; Contract type; Use of key personnel (for services); and Extent of subcontracting/teaming." This language appears to have been inserted accidentally, as it gives an illustrative list of criteria that the solicitation should include, but does not specify which will be evaluated in this solicitation. **Please confirm that criteria for relevancy are only those stated in RFQ 4.III.F: Quality of Services; Cost Control; Timeliness of Performance; Business relations including problem responsiveness; and Customer Satisfaction.**	RFQ 4.VI; RFQ 4.III.Factor [F] 4	Page 23	PD replaced the list on page of page 23 with Quality of Services; Cost Control; Timeliness of Performance; Business relations including problem responsiveness; and Customer Satisfaction.
2	The RFQ states: "Recency is past performance information that is within three (3) years of the completion of performance." **Please confirm that this means past performance examples must have been completed within 3 years of proposal submission date, NOT RFQ release date?**	RFQ 4.VI.1	Page 23	Recency is from the RFQ Original Published Date on SAM.gov.
3	Please confirm that offerors are to provide client point of contact information, but are not required to provide completed past performance questionnaires, for evaluation of "customer satisfaction" under evaluation factor 4?	RFQ 3.VI.F4	Page 17	The instructions have been revised to reflect that past performance questionnaires and point of contact information for past performance are not required.
4	Please confirm that the required cross reference matrix does not count against the page limit.	RFQ 3.IV	Page 15	No, the Cross reference matrix does not count against the page limit.
5	The RFQ states that offerors shall demonstrate: "(a)Meets or exceeds the requirements described in the Statement of Objectives (SOS)." No specific requirements regarding the offeror's experience are described. **Please confirm that this section is intended to be a technical approach describing how the offeror will complete the SOO objectives?**	RFQ 3.VI.F2.a	Page 16	Subparagraph (a) has been removed.
6	Referencing the previous question: If Item a is intended to be a technical approach to all SOO objectives, then Item d seems duplicative, as it asks offerors to once again describe their approach to specific SOO tasks. **Please clarify what is required in the responses to Items a and d respectively. Is Item a intended to be an overall approach to all SOO items, and Item d a technical deep-dive into the specific questions listed?**	RFQ 3.VI.F2.a; 3.VI.F2.d	Page 16	Subparagraph (a) has been removed.
7	Given the volume of material to be covered, will PBCG please consider expanding the page limit of the technical volume from 30 pages to 50 pages?	General	General	Yes, the page limit has been increased to 50.
8	Please confirm that the SF1449 does not count against page limits	General	General	The SF1449 does not count against page limits.
9	The SF1449 states that the proposal is due at 12PM PT (i.e., 3PM ET). Please confirm that this is correct, since the contracting office is on the East Coast?	SF 1449	Page 1	This was a clerical error. The proposal due date time has been changed to Eastern Time.
10	Given the proximity of the Questions deadline to the proposal due date, and the potential for these questions to have significant effects on the proposal structure, will PBCG please extend the proposal due date by two weeks to allow offerors sufficient time to adjust their proposals in accordance with Q&A responses?	General	General	Yes, PBGC will extend the RFQ due date by 2 weeks. Please see Block 14 of the SF-30 for the new due date and time.

11	Please confirm that the proposal should be submitted via email to Contracting Officer Sierra Villanueva, at villanueva.sierra@pbgc.gov, and Contract Specialist (CS) Tia Ragsdale, at ragsdale.tia@pbgc.gov?	General	General	Confirmed.
12	The RFQ states that "offerors shall including pricing in their quotes regarding the exercise of FAR 52.217-8" but Attachment 1 does not include a section for this pricing. **Should offerors modify Attachment 1 to include this pricing? If the Government prefers that this be provided in a different manner, please confirm how this information should be included in the price quote.**	RFQ 3.VII.F5	Page 17	Attachment 1 has been modified to include a section for the FAR 52.217-8 pricing.
13	How many models are in scope of this effort? Is the scope focused on the two models referenced in the description (Single-Employer (SE) Pension Insurance Modeling System (PIMS) and Multi-Employer (ME)-PIMS)?	RFQ Section 2 - Statement of Objectives	Page 7	Yes, both SE and ME PIMS are in scope.
14	Please share additional details on the depth of the review requested for the models (e.g., pressure-testing of existing assumptions vs. detailed sensitvity and scenario analysis across multiple scenarios)	RFQ Section 2 - Statement of Objectives	Page 7	As set forth in items 4(a) and 4(b) of the Statement of Objectives, the vendor's effort in model validation/testing is a "high level" one, focusing effort on an "assessment" of PBGC's existing internal approaches to such validation and testing as well as to whether extreme tail events are appropriately being captured. The vendor is not requested to perform testing themselves. 4(c) asks the vendor to assess the reasonableness/effectiveness/appropriateness of modeled macro-economic (Not Actuarial) outcomes both retrospectively and prospectively (e.g. is the model effectively capturing the appropriate level of bankruptcies, both at the median as well as at the tails). The vendor's efforts in regard to liability testing is in an advisory capacity as already set forth in tem 4(c).
15	Is PBCG looking for guidance or assessment of its existing model review framework, or is that framework fully established?	RFQ Section 2 - Statement of Objectives	Page 7	PBGC would like a review and assessment of the PBGC's internal framework and processes used to maintain, review, and enhance the model over time. This may include commentary about the annual review process whereby PBGC engages external contractors to review aspects of the model, in accordance with statutory requirements under the MAP-21 law.
16	Are there any specific milestones or constraints that are driving the 9-month performance period? Are there any interim milestones PBCG is aiming to meet within the 9-month performance period?	RFQ Section 2 - Statement of Objectives	Page 13	Milestones are set forth in the "Schedule of Deliverables" section of the Statement of Objectives. E.g. Interim presentation to Board of Representatives at the 6-month point of the engagment.
17	What software/platform was used to implement these models?	RFQ Section 2 - Statement of Objectives	Page 10	SE-PIMS is housed in C++ and uses Microsoft Azure SQL Database, while ME-PIMS uses Microsoft Excel/Visual Basic. Please refer to the most recent Projections Report (https://www.pbgc.gov/sites/default/files/documents/fy-2021-projections-report.pdf) for additional information about the models.

18	Does the scope of *'The Operations of the Models'* include implementation testing and independent code review of the models?	RFQ Section 2 - Statement of Objectives	Page 10	No, the scope doesn't include implementation testing or independent code review of the models. The Statement of Objectives describes the review as "high-level" in nature. (Please reference SOO (2)a-b, and (4)a-b).
19	Will PBCG please share a 3-4 line summary of the inputs, methodology / approach and outputs of each model?	RFQ Section 2 - Statement of Objectives	Page 8	Detailed information in connection with model inputs, outputs and methodologies (including historical Contractor peer-review reports) are available on line at: https://www.pbgc.gov/about/projections-report/pension-insurance-modeling-system.
20	Are the vendors expected to co-locate to PBCG's premises or will the vendors be provided laptops/system access to work remotely?	General	General	Vendors are not expected to co-locate to PBGC's premises. They will not be provided PBGC laptops, but will be granted system access to work remotely/attend meeting/present project materials.