

Q1. The Q&A document SPAWAR released during the draft RFP period says that the government intends to release “Attachment 10,” which will include “a complete breakdown of the models and the required work associated with their successful integration into the JEM Incr 2 software deliverable.” Is this attachment still forthcoming? If so, would you please indicate when that document will be published?

A1. See A3 below.

Q2. After reading through the final RFP document, I was unable to locate instructions for submitting requests for clarification. Does the government intend to field such questions for this solicitation? If so, when and to whom should we submit them?

A2. The Government will continue to accept questions/clarifications during the Solicitation Phase. All questions should be submitted to Lindsay Taelman at lindsay.taelman@navy.mil. Questions submitted close to the proposal due date may not receive a timely response.

Q3. The answer to JEM questions 5 and 20 states, “The Government is preparing a complete breakdown of the models and the required work associated with their successful integration into the JEM Incr 2 software deliverable. This document will be an attachment to the RFP.” The Document Change Column for questions 5 and 20 states, “RFP Attachment 10 (New)”. Attachment 10 was not included on the SPAWAR Business Opportunity webpage. Request this attachment be posted.

A3. Attachment 10 was determined to be unnecessary in light of the PWS and TDP content released with the RFP. Specifically, § 4.2.1 of the PWS identifies which components need to be integrated into the JEM Incr. 2 baseline. It also identifies which S&T components should be the functional referents. Additionally, within the TDP, the file “CATT Version 1.3.0 Contents.xls” describes the contents of the CATT source code distribution. Inside the CATT 1.3.0 source code distribution, there are System Version Description (SVD) files for many of the components. Each component SVD contains a list of the known Problem Change Requests (PCRs). Additional details on a specific PCR can be found within the CCMi PCR database snapshot, which is also contained within the TDP.

Q4. The PWS paragraph 4.5.2 states “Within 10 business days (2 weeks) following the Contractor’s final delivery of the JEM Incr 2 System Allocated Baseline Software and at least 30 business days (6 weeks) prior to end of the base period, the Contractor shall demonstrate their delivered software...” Attachment 8-JEMIncr2-DownSelectProcessGuide paragraph 4.1 states, “The final demonstration shall occur within 2 weeks of the Contractor’s final JEM software delivery and at least 30 days prior to end of base period.” The graphic embedded within paragraph 4.1 has a box that reads “FINAL DEMO: held w/in 2 weeks of SW delivery and 4 weeks prior to end of Base PoP.” Please clarify which of these statements is correct.

A4. PWS § 4.5.2 is correct. The Down-Select Process Guide § 4.1 will be revised to state, “The final demonstration shall occur within 2 weeks of the Contractor’s final JEM software delivery and at least 30 business days prior to end of base period.” Likewise, the graphic contained on page 9 of the Down-Select Process Guide will be revised to reflect 6 weeks prior to the end of base PoP, as opposed to 4. See Amendment 0001.

Q5. JEM PWS paragraph 3.1 has following sentence: “Throughout the base period, the Contractor shall be responsible for maintaining the configuration management and information assurance posture of the existing JEM baseline”. Question 26 in the Q&A asks following “To what degree does the Government see the two base year competitors working together on configuration management of the existing JEM increment 1 baseline? The draft RFP documents do not discuss a transition process. Dual management of a single baseline seems inefficient.” The government response to this question was “The base year competitors will not be working together on configuration management. JEM Incr 1 will be maintained

as a fielded baseline under a different task order". The PWS sentence and government response appear in conflict; request clarification.

A5. PWS § 3.1 has been revised to remove this sentence. See PWS §§ 4.3-4.4 for controlling language regarding CM and IA requirements associated with the base period. See Amendment 0001.

Q6. We request, in order to thoroughly address sample scenario 3, that the government provide access to DISA's current GCCS-J developer's guidance document. Current GCCS-J performers will have access to this document, which potentially creates an unbalanced competition.

A6. GCCS-J DoN-COE Developer Integration Guide v. 3.3.1 has been added to the Technical Data Package (TDP). The TDP Table of Contents document has been revised to reflect this addition to the TDP. See Amendment 0001.

Q7. The government has provided estimated hours for the option years. We request that the government also provide the estimated hours for the base year.

A7. Estimated hours or budget projections will not be provided for the base period because the base period represents a completion-type effort. Unlike the level-of-effort structure contained throughout the option periods, the base period requires an end-product deliverable based on the specific technical approach and associated cost proposal of the Offerors.

Q8. We request that the government provide the total base year budget available to be divided between the two competitors. This total budget is typically made known in other fly-off competitions.

A8. See A7 above.

Q9. CDRL A001-Self Assessment Report: This CDRL does not include a DID or sample deliverable; however the language in the RFP suggest that there are sample scorecards and such. Was this data inadvertently omitted from the solicitation?

A9. The Self-Assessment Scorecard Template has been uploaded as Attachment 8B. See Amendment 0001.

Q10. Is there a hardware specification available for the equipment to be used during the mid-term and final demonstrations?

A10. Yes, see the Appendix included within the updated JEM Incr 2 Down-Select Process Guide. See Amendment 0001.

Q11. Per paragraph L-349, a paper version of Offeror's proposal is to be submitted to SPAWAR. Please advise who the point of contact is for this submittal in conjunction with the address in Block 7 of the SF33.

A11. See SF33, Block 10.

Q12. Does the Government require bidders to include the resumes of key personnel? If so, should those resumes appear in an appendix to the Technical Proposal?

A12. Resumes are not required, nor will they be accepted for evaluation.

Q13. Section L-349 on page 53 of the RFP instructs that “Offerors shall submit one original signed paper version of their proposal” in addition to electronic submission via SPAWAR E-Commerce Central. However, instructions for submitting the Cost Volume indicate the Government wants an Excel file with formulas and computations intact. Does the Government require printed versions of all three volumes of the proposal, or only signed paper versions of the Technical and Contract Volumes?

A13. Provision L-349 will be revised to clarify that a paper copy of only Volume I is required. See Amendment 0001.

Q14. In Section L-329 on page 51, the RFP provides the “Government’s best estimate of Other Direct Cost (ODC).” Does the Government consider travel an ODC, and are travel costs included in the “Total Estimated Amount” column on page 51?

A14. ODC estimates are inclusive of travel costs.

Q15. On page 49, Section 2.2, volume II – Cost, under General Instructions, the “Subcontractor costs” section states “the prime’s proposal should include and itemize the cost of each subcontractor.” Instructions later in that same paragraph indicate “a fully disclosed cost proposal should be submitted for each subcontractor.” Since subcontractors are required to submit a fully itemized estimate directly to the prime or the Government, is it also necessary that subcontractor information be itemized within the prime’s proposal, or is it sufficient for the subcontractor information to be presented within the prime’s proposal as a summarized total with reference to the associated fully itemized subcontractor submission?

A15. If the prime has a DCMA approved Purchasing System, the cost proposal should contain documentation of the prime’s evaluation of the sub’s cost/technical proposal. In this case, only the total cost of each subcontractor proposed need be listed in the prime’s cost proposal. If the prime does not have an approved Purchasing System, or does not submit the aforementioned evaluation, a fully-disclosed cost proposal should be submitted for each subcontractor proposed by the prime. See Amendment 0001.

Q16. FFP CLIN 0003 (Data-CDRLs) is labeled "Not Separately Priced." Should bidders be pricing their efforts for CDRL development and delivery within CPFF CLIN 0001 (Software Development) or is the CLIN 0003 "Not Separately Priced" label incorrect?

A16. CLIN X003 (Data-CDRLs) is correctly labeled "Not Separately Priced." Costs associated with CDRL development and delivery should be included within CPFF CLIN X001 of each performance period.

Q17. *On page 49, Section 2.2, the RFP states, “All subcontractors with an unapproved or inadequate accounting system as determined by DCAA should be proposed as an FFP or T&M proposal.”* In FFP and T&M rates, the basis to which the indirect rates are applied is unidentifiable and not directly linked to a specific individual. If the subcontractor does not have a DCAA-approved accounting system, is the requirement that the subcontractor submit a fully-disclosed estimate with the basis identified still valid?

A17. No. However, if the prime has a DCMA approved Purchasing System; the cost proposal should still contain documentation of the prime’s evaluation of the sub’s cost/technical proposal. See Amendment 0001.