

Industry Comment/Question	Government Response/Action	RFP Document Change?
1. It seems that a process needs to be worked out for interaction between the government and each team to promote rapid progress and guide developments during the base year without giving unfair advantage to one team or the other.	See revised PWS Section 4.1.2, Technical Interchange Meetings and CDRL A027 and A028. Revised PWS and CDRL will be available with RFP release.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PWS Section 4.1.2 • CDRL A027 & A028 • Down Select Guide
2. If both teams develop all ten of the CBRN hazard modeling capabilities listed in Section 4.2.1 h), there may be wasteful duplication of effort, particularly for capabilities where one team or the other has significant advantage because of past experience. It might make sense to divide the ten tasks equally between the two teams based on their proposed task-by-task approaches to allow each team to focus competitively on the remaining requirements a) through g).	Contractors are not expected to develop new modeling capability. The majority of modeling capability is provided in the Technical Data Package (TDP). Where the Contractor has a more mature, superior model that better meets the needs of an operational user than those included in the TDP, the model may be integrated, but should already be TRL 6. The majority of the development activity should be focused on providing a robust end user architecture and graphical user interface that meets JEM Incr 1 and Incr 2 requirements and provides a substantial improvement over the existing JEM Incr 1 product.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PWS Section 1
3. Do you plan to publish any of the Q&A from other contractors during the draft RFP phase?	Yes.	
4. FAR 52.249-14 Excusable Delays clause was not included in the draft. Was that intentional or an accidental omission?	Clause will be included in the final RFP.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section I of the RFP
5. At the Industry Day meeting, the solicitor indicated that some of the base year tasks already have models in place, but that offerors could use their own models if they believed these models were superior to existing Government models. We did not see any reference to this issue in the draft RFP. If the Government is still planning to provide this latitude, we recommend that the existing models be specified in the RFP. This will allow offerors to conduct a timely comparative analysis between those models and offeror-owned models, to determine any potential technical and/or cost benefits for the Government.	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.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RFP Attachment 10 (new)

<p>6. It is our understanding that, during the base year of the contract, two contractors will be competing with each other to provide the JPM-IS program with solutions. In the final RFP, we request that the Government elaborate on what formal firewall measures are contemplated to safeguard information about the respective solutions being developed by the two contractors during the competition.</p>	<p>Final RFP will include a revised Section H to address this concern.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RFP Section H
<p>7. Based on the reference guidance and the extensive information required, we recommend that the Government increase the page limit for Factor 1.</p>	<p>Page limit will be increased from 30 pages to 35 pages.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RFP Section L and M • SSP
<p>8. Page 11 of the draft RFP states: “[t]he work to be performed under this contract as delineated in the DD Form 254, Attachment No. 5 involves access to and handling of classified material up to and including TOP SECRET,” and that “[a]ll or a portion of the effort under this contract will be performed on a Government installation.” Will the winning contractors and/or subcontractors be required to have and maintain TOP SECRET Safeguarding Storage at the contractor’s facility, or will all access to and handling of classified material take place at the Government’s facility? We request that the Government clarify if contractors will be required to store TOP SECRET material at their facilities.</p>	<p>See Sections 1, 10, and 11 of the DD-254</p>	<p>No Change</p>
<p>9. Page 12 of the draft RFP states: “Contractors who do not have a NCACS or Common Access Card (CAC) must be issued a one-day pass daily at the Badge and Pass Office. Issuance of a CAC requires the need for physical access to the installation and logical access to government owned computer systems.” Is it the Government’s intent to serve as the CAC/NCACS sponsor for contractor personnel? Will contractor personnel with interim TOP SECRET Clearances be cleared to perform work for this contract?</p>	<p>CAC sponsorship may be provided for Contractors who need to access government facilities.</p> <p>Personnel with interim TS could perform on the effort but would not be allowed SCI access until they received final SCI eligibility.</p>	<p>No Change</p>

<p>10. Please clarify the meaning of this statement, which is the last sentence in the only paragraph under Factor 3: Small Business Subcontracting on page 67 of the draft RFP: “The evaluation of an Offeror’s history of meeting subcontracting goals on prior contracts/orders will not also be evaluated under the past performance Factor 2 above.” Please clarify if the evaluation of demonstrated history under Factor 3 will be scored only on the projects identified in Factor 2, or if the Factor 3 score will be based on all of contractors’ prior contracts/orders.</p>	<p>The evaluation of demonstrated small business subcontracting history under Factor 3 is not limited to the Past Performance references provided under Factor 2. Factor 3 will be scored based on any and all information of contractors’ prior contracts/orders available.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
<p>11. Section L-328 on pages 61–62 lists 13 labor categories. The General Instructions included in Volume II, Section 2.2 (page 60) require detailed pricing, to include both direct and indirect rates. Please clarify if multiple labor rates should be submitted for each labor category, or if contractors can submit blended labor rates for all teammates and personnel.</p>	<p>If there is more than one individual proposed for a particular labor category, and the proposed individuals have different direct labor rates, then multiple rates should be proposed under that labor category accordingly. The use of a blended rate is allowable if the proposed blended rate is included in an offeror's approved FPRA, or is otherwise approved by DCMA/DCAA. If the offeror does not have an approved FRPA, and is using a blended rate to propose a "TBD" individual(s), then the basis of the proposed blended rate shall be described in detail. If specific named individuals are proposed, then a blended rate is not allowed.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section M • SSP
<p>12. In section L of the RFP the government has requested that the offeror provide solutions addressing the three sample scenarios and for the offeror to describe solutions with specific reference to the government Technical Data Package (TDP). In the JEM Incr 2 PWS section 4.2.1 the government request specific work to be performed to integrate section “ 4.2.1. h.) The software demonstrates the following CBRN hazard modeling capabilities” Where does the government want the offeror to address 4.2.1 development efforts in the Technical Proposal, Cost Proposal or both?</p>	<p>PWS to be addressed in SDP and the Cost Proposal. The scenarios should not be specifically addressed in the Cost Proposals, except to the extent that portions of the scenarios overlap with the Offeror’s proposed software development plan.</p>	<p>No Change</p>

<p>13. Are the sample development and integration scenarios provided in Section L of the RFP to be implemented and demonstrated during the base period of this effort? How do they relate to the PWS?</p>	<p>While the Section L Sample Scenarios are not requirements, the Government acknowledges that solutions to the scenarios may arise within an Offeror’s proposed Software Development Plan.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
<p>14. Is the CWBS, IMS and SDP to describe planned work with the PWS Section 4.2.1 or is it to address work that would be required to solve the sample scenarios?</p>	<p>The scenarios should not be specifically addressed in those documents, except to the extent that portions of the scenarios overlap with the Offeror’s proposed software development plan.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
<p>15. Does the government want us to develop a CWBS, Data Dictionary and IMS for option years 1-4? If so, what specific work does the government expect to be accomplished during the options years?</p>	<p>No. See PWS Sections 5-8 for Option Period work.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
<p>16. By “usability” do you mean: HSI checklist, adherence to Command & Control or JEM Interface guidelines, or something else? Please provide examples and the appropriate MILSPEC.</p>	<p>See Down-Select Guide, “Assessment Criterion #2: Usability”.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
<p>17. In regards to the end of Year 1 Demonstration, what platform is expected? Is it PC Standalone, a PC networked (web based), Solaris Unix, GCCS-J, all of the above or something else?</p>	<p>PC Standalone, with the ability to demonstrate the effectiveness and backward-compatibility of the web-services interface.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Down Select Guide Section 3
<p>18. In regards to the PWS section 4.2.1., Are items a) and b) a restatement of the same requirement or this there a difference between the meaning of “execute in the CCMI test environment” and the “run within the CCMI Autogenerated Test Tool”?</p>	<p>No, items (a) and (b) are not restatements of the same requirement.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
<p>19. Please define the JWARN to JEM interface. What aspects need to be backward compatible?</p>	<p>a) See the JEM Interface Design Document (IDD) within the TDP. b) See JEM Incr 1 Modified System Performance Specification contained within the TDP.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
<p>20. a) What is the list of capabilities currently implemented in CCMI? b) What is the list of capabilities expected at the end of Year One? c) Does JEM RRP Installer include the source code for the currently implemented CCMI capabilities?</p>	<p>a) and b) 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. c) See updated TDP ProjectForge Access Instructions (RFP Attachment 4)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a) and b) RFP Attachment 10 (new) • c) RFP Attachment 4

<p>21. In regards to the PWS section 4.2.1. Item f) iii., please elaborate on what is meant by “facilitate initiatives” and provide examples (e.g., propose improvements to the CCMI specification?).</p>	<p>See revised PWS Section 4.2.1(f)(iii).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PWS Section 4.2.1(f)(iii)
<p>22. We are assuming that if selected as the team to perform the option years after the down select the government would expect our current staff to transition at the option years, is that a correct assumption?</p>	<p>This is a reasonable assumption; however, such decisions are within the discretion of the developer.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
<p>23. The government is already familiar with the incumbent team; to further level the playing field will the government consider allowing Oral Presentations, so that the government can get a better appreciation of our management and technical teams as well as more insight into our technical approach?</p>	<p>No oral presentations are planned at this time.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
<p>24. Will the government consider requiring the offeror to utilize the PMW-150 approved RITE Collaborative Software Development Environment and their associated tools for this effort?</p>	<p>No.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
<p>25. The documentation received to date seems to place a heavy reliance on previously funded efforts, such as the SCIPUFF model and the JP2UI prototype.</p> <p>a. Does the government anticipate that the developers of these efforts will have OCI concerns with respect to bidding this procurement?</p> <p>b. Would the government entertain funding these developers separately to support the two base year participants?</p> <p>We believe the focus of the competitive prototyping process should be to provide CBR-N analysts with enhanced approaches for rapid analytics and accurate decision making. Placing businesses that develop core JEM model functions in a non-exclusive status allows the evaluation to more closely consider innovative solutions from mission planning software teams outside of the traditional CBR-N field.</p>	<p>a. No.</p> <p>b. We don't have any plans to fund any S&T developers to support the competitors. The Incr. 2 contract is for integration and the ability to modify the software so that it can be integrated (and updated) easily. We are going to be giving the competitors the S&T software. They should be able to understand legacy software which could be written in FORTRAN, C, and C++.</p>	<p>No Change</p>

<p>26. 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.</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
<p>27. One of the mid-term demonstration assessment categories is "Execution of CONOPS". Will the GOVT make the CONOPS for CBR-N analysts available to industry?</p>	<p>Until the JEM Incr 2 draft CDD becomes available, refer to the JEM Incr 1 CPD, which contains the current CONOPS.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
<p>28. Does government require the use of the JP2UI framework? Our ongoing examination of this prototype suggests a number of concerns with JP2UI, such as the use of proprietary licenses.</p>	<p>Government does not require the use of JP2UI framework.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
<p>29. Can the Government provide the current integration status of JEM Increment 1 with GCCS-J Block V? Has JEM actually been deployed with GCCS-J 4.X? If so, which builds and which Increment 1 capabilities have been fielded? Can you identify the GCCS-J operator workstations that use JEM?</p>	<p>In the past, JEM has been fielded with GCCS-J 4.1.1 and 4.2. Currently, JEM is fielded with/on GCCS-J 4.2.0.x systems at the different COCOMs.</p>	<p>No Change</p>
<p>30. Can DISA's GCCS-J 4.2 / Block V developer guide be made available to bidders so that required interfaces, platforms, and build components can be assessed?</p>	<p>The JEM Program Office is inquiring into whether this documentation can be distributed. If so, it will be made available as part of the final TDP.</p>	<p>*Possible to the TDP, assuming right to distribute is granted by the document owners.</p>
<p>31. Can the Government specify the required list of C2 platforms that JEM must support in more detail? C2PC and GCCS-J are mentioned as examples in the draft RFP.</p>	<p>See revised PWS Section 5.6</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PWS Section 5.6
<p>32. Given the cancellation of NECC and the still undefined roadmap for JC2, the sustainment schedule of GCCS-J 4.2 beyond 2014 is in flux. The draft RFP documents focus heavily on GCCS-J. Does the Government also consider C2RPC, MTC2 and JC2 as potential destinations for JEM Increment 2 deployment?</p>	<p>While possible at some future date (well beyond the base period), the specific platforms mentioned are not in the program office's immediate integration plans.</p>	<p>No Change</p>

<p>33. Are the following references available to industry:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">A. JEM Increment 1 CPDB. JPM IS Software Deliveries Process, SOP 31 (24 March 2010)C. JEM IA Strategy	<p>Yes, the references (as well as JPM IS SOP 10) will be added to the TDP at the projectforge.mil website no later than the date of RFP release.</p>	<p>TDP</p>
--	---	------------