

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Sol-02	L.1.5	An Offeror is defined as the prime BOA Holder approved in Step Two who has the capability to provide all required maintenance, supply and transportation support services. Comment: This makes it sound that the BOA holder must be capable to provide all M,S&T services – as opposed to the BOA holder and its proposed subcontractors/teammates. Suggest a revision to clarify.	Changing language to read "An Offeror is defined as the prime BOA Holder submitting a proposal under this RFP."
Sol-08	L.1 8	Do we need to provide POC Name and Offeror Name for each question or comment submitted?	Attachment 0011 has been eliminated from the Section L and M requirements.
Sol-10	L.2.1	RFP states "Standard Form (SF) 33 and all certifications requiring original signature." This is an electronic submittal, how do we provide "original" signatures.	The following sentence has been added to the subject paragraph: "Electronic signatures are acceptable."
Sol-11	L.2.1	RFP states "provide proof that the person signing the proposal is authorized to do so." What kind of proof is acceptable?	The following sentence will be removed "Offerors that consist of teams or joint venture partners may be required to provide proof that the person signing the proposal is authorized to do so."
Sol-14	L.3 3	RFP states "up to five files can be uploaded at one time." Is it possible to have each volume submitted as one volume as opposed to multiple files per volume? Volume 1 alone is 10 files. So many files creates the opportunity for an omission in the submittal.	The Government requires these files to be submitted in accordance with the naming conventions outlined in Section L as to ensure accountability for all documents in the submittal process.
Sol-18	L.5 2.1.1(a)(3)(iii)	RFP states "font must be visually easy to read (12 point font or larger is preferred)." Does this include font for graphics, charts and tables?	The language has been changed to clarify the font requirements. It now reads: "The font size shall be no less than 10 point font and no more than 14 point font for all documents; however, for charts and diagrams, font size shall be no less than 8 point font and no more than 14 point font."
Sol-20	L.5.1.6	Attachment 0015 shall include a list of proposed teammates/subcontractors/managing partners that will require a SECRET Facility Clearance. Use of the word "will" leaves open to interpretation that they do not need to have a SECRET Facility Clearance at the time of the RFP closing. Comment1: This wording should be tightened up to match the USG intent. Comment2: If this is the USG intent, suggest adding a clause: "Failure to possess a SECRET Facility Clearance as of the RFP closing date shall render the Offeror's proposal non-compliant. The proposal will not be further evaluated and will not be further considered for award." I know there have been protests – or complaints upon elimination surrounding this.	Changed language to "Attachment 0015 shall include a list of proposed teammates/subcontractors/managing partner that shall require a SECRET Facility Clearance in accordance with the PWS Paragraph 1.3.12."
Sol-23	L.5.1.8	USG should define or reference how "Percent of Participation" is calculated; and what options there are to describe "Basis of Selection"	Added language to subject paragraph to define percent of participation (based on the dollar value of performance divided by the total estimated dollar value) and basis of selection (competitive/non-competitive).
Sol-24	L.5 2	The Numbering Convention used, at times as many as eight (8) levels is confusing and will result in many questions.	Noted; however, for accountability reasons, all paragraphs must be numbered.
Sol-25	L.5 2.1.1(a)(3)(iii)	"12 point font or larger is reserved" - Per the last BOA Holder's Meeting, Ms. Nielsen indicated the smaller font size (8 point) would be allowed for Tables and diagrams. The Government needs to discuss the limitations for tables, chart, and diagrams and be consistent with Ms. Nielsen's guidance to BOA Holders.	Please refer to SOL-18
Sol-26	L.5 2.1.1(c)(2)	Should the naming convention be "Offeror's Name Vol 2 Att000 2?"	Yes; change has been made to Section L.
Sol-27	L.5 2.1.2(a)(2)(i)	RFP states "page limit excludes cover page, table of contents, and glossary of abbreviations and acronyms." Do you require a table of contents and glossary of abbreviations and acronyms for a two page document?	A table of contents and glossary of abbreviations and acronyms are not required. However, if an Offeror chooses to include a table of contents and glossary of abbreviations and acronyms it will not be counted towards the page limit.
Sol-28	L.5 2.1.3(a)(3)(i)	RFP states "page limit excludes cover page, table of contents, and glossary of abbreviations and acronyms." Do you require a table of contents and glossary of abbreviations and acronyms for a four page document that will be comprised of organizational diagrams?	Please refer to SOL-27.
Sol-29	L.5 2.1.3(a)(3)(iii)	RFP states "font must be visually easy to read (12 point font or larger is preferred)." This will be extremely difficult in organizational diagrams. Especially for the larger tasks; too much detail.	Please refer to SOL-18
Sol-30	L.5 3.1	Offerors no longer are required to show additional Past Performance if PP for BOA Step fits the requirement. Comment: This is a good step in reducing redundancy, but it may not allow for companies to update their Past Performance for new awards.	The Government is currently conducting a past performance datacall allowing BOA Holders the opportunity to provide additional references. In addition, all future Annual Reviews and the BOA RFP Addition/Revision processes will also allow BOA Holders with the opportunity to provide additional references.

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Sol-31	L.5 3.5.1 through L.5 3.5.1	"Offerors are hereby put on notice that this is the single opportunity to adequately address any negative past performance submitted in response to this RFP. The Government will not be giving the Offeror and additional opportunity to address negative past performance information during evaluations." Delete - This statement is both illogical and unreasonable, as the Government can get past performance information through other sources and Past Performance Questionnaires, which may or may not reflect CPARS and/or PIPRS entries. As the Government can obtain past performance information from any sources and that information may include issues regarding subcontractors/team members, the Offeror must be allowed the opportunity to respond. Failure for the Government to allow a Offeror to respond to past performance information/questionnaires will likely slow the current EAGLE proposal process, as BOA Holders exercise their options if eliminated from competition based on not being allowed to respond to possible past performance issues.	Changed language to "The Government will not give the Offeror an opportunity to address adverse past performance information contained in this questionnaire during evaluations."
Sol-37	L.5.4.2.7.1	If our subcontractors were selected on a non-competitive basis do we include this file and just state N/A?	No. Only teammates/subcontractors that were selected on a competitive basis shall submit file.
Sol-48	M.3.1	Value of Past Performance is significantly more than Cost/Price factor. Comment: This will give the USG the capability to focus more on best value. Awards will go the lowest price with Substantial Confidence in Past Performance. But, this is incongruous with the elimination of additional Past Performance information in L.5.3.1.	Please refer to Sol-30.
Sol-56	M.3.4.1	M.3.4.1 uses the terminology "Highly Rated" in reference to Offeror Technical Proposals. As per EAGLE BOA Solicitation and M.3.1, Technical Proposals are evaluated "...on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis." As such, the use of the term "Highly Rated" is not appropriate and needs to be deleted from M.3.4.1.	Language will not be changed. The definition of "highly rated" can be found in M.4.4.1.
Sol-64	M.4.2.7	Issue: Ref Section L, par L.5.3.1, it states "The Government will consider the past performance references that were provided with the offeror's BOA proposal, task order proposals to date, and the BOA annual review, as well as references obtained from sources other than those identified by the Offeror. Offers are not required or allowed to provide additional past performance contract references for itself, proposed teammates, and/or major subcontractors for use in this task order evaluation. The Government will not evaluate any new past performance references provided by the Offeror in its proposal with the exception of the information requested in L.5.3.5.1 thru L.5 3.5.4 below. Section L, par L.5.3.1 seems to be in direct conflict with Section M guidance noted in the last sentence of par M.4.2.7, i.e.: "For the purpose of this requirement recency is any contract under which performance, delivery, or correction action has occurred within the following time standards: three (3) years prior to the RFP closing date, even if the award date is outside this three (3) year window. Recommended Change and Reasoning for Change: [Contractor] was awarded a BOA based on EAGLE's initial solicitation guidance of having specified relevant past performance to the EAGLE requirements which were within the specified five (5) year specified timeline. Since the award of BOAs, it seems inappropriate to ultimately change the specified past performance requirements to three years from closing date of a particular RFP. This new specified criteria has circumvented numerous companies from being able to continue to pursue EAGLE RFP solicitations. What was the purpose of issuing a BOA under one criteria to ultimately change that criteria cutting out BOA holders from participating? [Contractor] along with other companies who had expectations of competing are now totally cut out of any chance of participation based on these recent changes. We respectfully request that AAC-RI reconsider the draft Section M, par M.4.2.7 criteria to agree with the draft Section L, par L.5.3.1 guidance which agrees with the original BOA award criteria.	Please refer to Sol-30.
Sol-66	M.4.2 8(b)(ii)	Relevancy Comment: How will the USG determine whether an Installation is Large, Medium or Small. Thinking about Ft. Bliss for example, which was SBSA but could be considered a Large Installation, the competition may be extremely narrow (or nil) if you are looking for a SB with \$6M average annual past performance...	The magnitude and complexity determination is based off of the annual dollar value of the effort.

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Sol-68	M.4.2 9	Past Performance Confidence ratings are: Substantial Confidence; Satisfactory Confidence; Limited Confidence; No Confidence; and Unknown Confidence. Question: If the evaluation does not result in any offerors with a Substantial Confidence rating, will the award then go to the lowest price offeror with a Satisfactory Confidence rating?	M.4.1 Step 4 states "As stated in M.1.1, the Government will make an award to the responsible Offeror (in accordance with FAR 9.1) whose proposal complies with the RFP requirements and is determined to be the lowest total evaluated (fair and responsible) priced proposal that is determined to be Technically Acceptable with Substantial Confidence in past performance. However, if all Offerors were assessed to have other than Substantial Confidence in past performance, the Government reserves the right to award to an Offeror with other than a Substantial Confidence rating in past performance. In that event, the Source Selection Authority will consider all factors and make a best value award decision."
Sol-72	NA	Sections L and M eliminate the current requirement for Unrestricted Suite BOA Holders to provide a Small Business Plan as part of their task order response. This appears to be a mistake, as this clearly eliminates the requirement for Unrestricted Suite Holders to meet the SB Participation requirements identified in the EAGLE Solicitation and supported by the Small Business elements of Section I of the BOA.	The Small Business Participation will be included as an evaluation factor in future unrestricted requirements. The instructions and evaluation criteria will be included within future unrestricted Task Order RFPs. Additionally, draft RFPs will be issued for those efforts at which time offerors can provide questions or comments on the language.
Sol-73	NA	The elimination of the Small Business Utilizations elements of the Unrestricted Suite L and M appears to indicate that the EAGLE Program Office is moving away from ALL Unrestricted Suite Task Orders.	Please refer to Sol-72
Sol-74	NA	The numbering logic for Section L, Technical Proposal is very confusing and begs more questions that it resolves.	Please refer to SOL-24
Sol-85	L.5 2.1.3(a)(3)(iii)	"12 point font or larger is reserved" - Per the last BOA Holder's Meeting, Ms. Nielsen indicated the smaller font size (8 point) would be allowed for Tables and diagrams. The Government needs to discuss the limitations for tables, chart, and diagrams and be consistent with Ms. Nielsen's guidance to BOA Holders.	Please refer to SOL-18
Sol-86	NA	i. OMISSION: The Government has failed to include the requirement for Unrestricted Suite BOA Holders to provide a Small Business (SB) Utilization Plan which demonstrates how they will meet EAGLE SB utilization goals, which was an original requirement. This needs to be re-instated to ensure consistency with EAGLE Solicitation requirements. This has and should remain a requirement for all Unrestricted Suite Task Orders, or Unrestricted Suite BOA Holders will perform all the work themselves and NOT include Small Business Team Members or Subcontractors in their EAGLE Proposals.	Please refer to Sol-72.
Sol-87	M.3	The Government has eliminated the requirement for Unrestricted Suite BOA Holders to submit a Small Business Utilization Plan. This needs to be reinstated in M.3 and throughout M as an evaluated requirement for all Unrestricted Suite Proposals.	Please rer to Sol-72.
Sol-88	L.1.7	Section I.1.7 states that "Updates related to this Task Order RFP, to include the RFP, amendments, notices, and other information, will be made available on the EAGLE website at: http://www.aschq.army.mil/ac/aaisdus/EAGLE.aspx ." However, on the majority of previous EAGLE Step 3 Task Orders, updates were posted to Army Single Face to Industry (ASFI) and via email prior to information posted to the EAGLE Website, sometimes as much as a few days before. Recommend revising this language to reflect monitoring ASFI and ensuring appropriate Company Points of Contact are current and correct.	Noted; however, the language will not be changed at this time.
Sol-89	L.1.7	"Offerors are advised to continuously monitor the EAGLE website for new information."----The website is not a valid source of information regarding EAGLE as it is not updated regularly. For example, we are now in amendment 13 for Detroit and somewhere around there for Huachuca as well. The last check to the EAGLE website, did not list anything past Amendment 4 or 5. Recommend updating the website more frequently and/or emailing all BOA Holders with updates.	Noted.

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Sol-90	L.2.1	Believes this below statement is subjective and would ask the Government to reevaluate the word "practical" in the sentence "The proposal shall be prepared in a clear, legible, parctical manner" located in L.2.1.	Changed language to read "The proposal shall be prepared in a clear and legible manner."
Sol-91	L.4.1.2	"In the event of a conflict between the Offeror's proposal and the RFP..." Is "offer's proposal" the correct terminology? Should this read "...conflict between the solicitation and the PWS..."? In a conflict between the PWS and Section L, which takes precedence?	Changed language to read "If the Offeror's proposal fails to meet the terms and conditions of the RFP or takes exception to any of the terms of the RFP, it shall render the Offeror's proposal non-compliant. The proposal will not be evaluated and will not be further considered for award."
Sol-92	L.5.1.6	"SECRET Facility Clearance: In order for an Offeror/teammate/subcontractor/managing partner to request and sponsor an individual employee's SECRET Security Clearance to perform the functions identified in the PWS Paragraph 1.3.12, the Offeror/teammate/subcontractor/managing partner shall have a SECRET Facility Clearance prior to this RFP closing date". This requirement could hinder a small business. Based on the possible impact upon a small business, can the statement be revised to say the Prime must have a clearance and subs must be able to receive the clearance?	Language will not be changed. Please review the EAGLE website for document titled Facility Clearance Announcement for additional information located at the following path: STEP 2/EAGLE BOA Holder Announcement/Facility Clearance Announcement.
Sol-93	L.5.1.7.1	Accounting system status requires small businesses to verify their accounting system. Will the Government initiate an audit if an audit is not currently on file?	Yes, if necessary the Government will request an audit.
Sol-94	L.5.1.8	Section L.5.1.8 states that "The Offeror shall provide the full company name, CAGE code, role of participant, proposed functional area(s) to perform, total estimated dollar value for the total period of performance of 5 years, percent of participation , basis of selection and teammate's/subcontractor's cost proposal submittal method." However, Attachment 0010 - Teaming Matrix does not have columns to provide basis of selection and teammate's/subcontractor's cost proposal submittal method.	Attachment 0010 was updated accordingly.
Sol-95	L.5.1.8	Section L.5.1.8 states that "The Offeror shall provide the full company name, CAGE code, role of participant, proposed functional area(s) to perform, total estimated dollar value for the total period of performance of <u>5 years</u> , percent of participation , basis of selection and teammate's/subcontractor's cost proposal submittal method.... Note: the total estimated dollar value provided on Attachment 0010 should be equal to the total evaluated price found on Attachment 0005 - Cost/Price Matrix." Total evaluated price in Attachment 0005 is based on 5 year + 6-month option to extend. Please confirm that total estimated dollar value should be for the total period of performance of 5 years + 6-month option to extend.	Confirmed.
Sol-96	L.5.2.1.1(c)(2)	Naming convention is "offeror's_name_Vol_2_Att02-----Recommend consistent naming conventions. All other Attachments are named AttXXXX (with 4 digits-the 1st two digits being 00 and the last two digits being the attachment number). Using consistent naming conventions and using Att0002 would alleviate the need to ask if this naming convention is correct or a typo.	Please reference SOL-26.
Sol-97	L.5.3	L.5.3.1 currently reads " <i>The Government will consider the past performance references that were provided with the Offeror's BOA proposal, task order proposals to date, and the BOA annual review, as well as references obtained from sources other than those identified by the Offeror. Offerors are not required or allowed to provide additional past performance contract references for itself, proposed teammates, and/or major subcontractors for use in this task order evaluation. The Government will not evaluate any new past performance references provided by the Offeror in its proposal.....</i> " Question: Does this restriction also apply to unrestricted Task order for Services other than installation LRC support services? If so, can the Government provide guidance on how BOA holders can update current past performances or add additional past performance references to their team capability?	Please refer to Sol-30.

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Sol-98	L.5.3.1 and L.5.3.5	There seems to be contradicting between Sections L.5.3.1 and L.5.3.5, Section L.5.3.1 states: "Offerors are not required or allowed to provide additional past performance contract references for itself, proposed teammates, and/or major subcontractors for use in this task order evaluation." However, Section L.5.3.5 states: "The Offeror shall complete Attachment 0003 - Performance Questionnaire. A separate questionnaire shall be provided for the Offeror, each proposed teammate expected to perform 20% or more of the total proposed price, and/or each proposed major subcontractor as identified on Attachment 0010 - Teaming Matrix." Can the Government please clarify who is required/allowed to submit additional past performances?	No one is allowed to submit additional past performance contract references. Offerors, major subcontractors (expected to perform 20% or more of the total proposed price), and teammates (expected to perform 20% or more of the total proposed price) must submit Attachment 0003.
Sol-99	L.5.3.1	L.5.3.1 states "The Government will consider the past performance references that were provided with the Offeror's BOA proposal, task order proposals to date, and the BOA annual review, as well as references obtained from sources other than those identified by the Offeror. Offerors are not required or allowed to provide additional past performance contract references for itself, proposed teammates, and/or major subcontractors for use in this task order evaluation. The Government will not evaluate any new past performance references provided by the Offeror in its proposal with the exception of the information requested in L.5.3.5.1 thru L.5.3.5.4 below." If the Government does not intend to allow additional past performance references, how can an offeror demonstrate new capability or new successful performance that may be relevant to a step 3 Task Order? Further, the language in this paragraph seems to indicate that previously submitted past performance citations that were reviewed as part of step 3 responses will be considered during evaluation, if this is the case does it include Task Orders that were canceled such as the Fort Lee Task Order?	The Government is currently conducting a past performance datacall allowing BOA Holders the opportunity to provide additional references. In addition, all future Annual Reviews and the BOA RFP Addition/Revision processes will also allow BOA Holders with the opportunity to provide additional references. The Government will consider all references that it has received which has undergone an evaluation under the BOA RFP, a task order proposal, the BOA Annual Review, data call or the BOA RFP Addition/Revision processes.
Sol-100	L.5.3.1	Comment: Contractors will want to know what these "other sources" are and what they may say. Recommend Government make this statement more specific (i.e., CPARS, PPIRS, SAM, etc.) or drop altogether.	Noted; however, the language will not be changed at this time.
Sol-101	L.5.4 Cost/Price Factor:	Throughout the subparagraphs under L.5.4 the Government makes reference to cost/pricing submission requirements for teammates and subcontractors. In some paragraphs reporting requirements are required for ".....teammate/subcontractor proposal(s) who will be performing in any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation).....". This implies that if a teammate or subcontractor is performing any tasks under a functional area they fall under this requirement. However; other subparagraphs read "..... <i>If a teammate/subcontractor who will be performing any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation).....</i> ". This implies that a teammate or subcontractor would have to be performing the entire functional area to fall under this requirement. Question: Is it the Government's intent that there be a differentiation between teammates/subcontractors performing any tasks in a functional area vs. performing an entire functional area? If not, can the Government clarify which qualifier is correct?	The language has been changed to be consistent throughout Section L.5.4 to state "...teammate/subcontractor proposal(s) who will be performing IN any functional area."
Sol-102	L.5.4.2.2 and L.5.4.2.4	Can the Government please confirm that subcontractors/teammates are not required to submit Attachment 0005 - Cost/price Matrix and DCAA information as part of their submission.	Confirmed that the subcontractors/teammates are not required to submit Attachment 0005 - Cost/price Matrix and DCAA information as part of their submission per Section L.5.4.2 of the solicitation.
Sol-103	L.5.4.2.7	Suggest Government define what constitutes selection on a competitive basis (i.e.. minimum 3 bids?). Does that mean you have to choose the cheapest bidder? Furthermore, Government should make clear that subcontractors who are chosen on a competitive basis are not desired by the Government to submit Cost and Pricing data in order to prevent Prime's offerors from requiring such information from subcontractors unnecessarily in the hopes that providing extra information will make a good impression on the Government, when it only increases the workload for everyone.	L.5.4.2.7.1 details the requirements for competitive selection of a subcontractor. Competitor is more than one offer received; the basis for selection must be discussed in a source selection document. If a selection to other than low offeror is made the trade off decisions must be discussed.

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol-xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Sol-104	L.5.4.2.7 (b) and L.5.4.2.7 (c)	Both sections, Indirect Expense Rates and Budgetary Data, request the same information - offeror shall provide the pools and base costs for all proposed indirect expense rates. Please confirm/clarify that the intent of the Indirect Expense Rates section is to include description of offerors cost elements (Fringe, Overhead and G&A) and how these proposed indirect rates have been applied in the offerors proposal. Similarly, please confirm/clarify that the intent of the Budgetary Data section is to include the detailed buildup of each of the indirect cost elements, inclusive of their cost pool and indirect cost allocation base.	L.5.4.2.7.5; subparagraph (b) is a descriptive narrative of the various indirect rates describing the costs that are included in each pool and cost base. Subparagraph (c) is the specific details of the costs that make up the pool and base for each indirect rate for forward budget purposes and subparagraph (d) is the specific details of the costs that make up the pool and base for each indirect rate for previous periods. The indirect cost data should be based on the contractors total business for the applicable division or segment and not be contract specific.
Sol-105	L.5.4.2.7.5(a)(3)	Refers to providing wage survey data to support direct labor positions. Is there a list of Government approved/accepted wage surveys since many of them require a subscription cost?	Wage surveys are a basis for support of the exempt labor rate. Most published wage survey providers would be considered acceptable as long as the specific information within that survey is provided with how that information was used to determine the proposed rate.
Sol-106	L.5.4.2.7.5(c)	Which FAR clause(s) is/are applicable to the data requested in these subparagraphs in order to get more clarity on these requirements?	Paragraph L.5.4.2.7.2(a) requires cost proposals to be prepared in accordance with FAR 15.408, Table 15-2. Within table 15-2 narrative it states the following: "C. Indirect Costs. Indicate how you have computed and applied your indirect costs, including cost breakdowns. Show trends and budgetary data to provide a basis for evaluating the reasonableness of proposed rates. Indicate the rates used and provide an appropriate explanation."
Sol-107	L.5.4.2.7.5(c)(1)	Refers to budgetary data. What are examples of acceptable reasons why budgetary data cannot be provided?	Forward price rate information is not routinely prepared as part of our estimating procedure. If this is the reason, you need to provide detailed pool and base data for the instant year and historic rate information as required by L.5.4.2.7.5(d). If the proposed rate deviates from the supporting data then a detailed discussion why the proposed rates were determined is reasonable and confirmation that you are willing to agree to capped rates for the life of the contract.
Sol-108	M3.1. b	There is no mention of using non approved small businesses (SB) to fill small business requirements. Is it your intent to not allow non approved small businesses to be added to teams or is this an oversight? If an oversight, recommend adding language that states offerors can add non approved small businesses to fill SB requirements. If your intent is to limit teammates to the approved teammates on the BOA, recommend language that addresses SB requirements.	Please Refer to Sol-72
Sol-109	M.3.1-b.	M.3.1-B. states "If an Offeror is required to propose itself and/or approved teammates in any of the three functional areas (Maintenance, Supply, or Transportation) and it lists a company that is not an approved teammate as of the closing date of this RFP, its proposal shall be rendered noncompliant. Non-compliant proposals will not be evaluated and will not be further considered for award." Is this paragraph meant to apply to large businesses that add Teammates to meet small business subcontracting goals? Previously large businesses were permitted to add small business Teammates for step 3 Task Order, not on their EAGLE Step 2 BOA specifically to meet small business subcontracting objectives.	Please Refer to SOL-72. Additionally, please note that this version of Sections L and M did not include a Small Business evaluation factor. That language is currently being drafted and will be released for comment at a later date.
Sol-110	M.4.2.7	If recency is limited to three years prior to the Task Order RFP closing date, does this imply that past performance provided during the BOA step 2 process that may fall outside the RFP date defined by three years will not be considered or is it your intent to consider the past performance provided during the BOA step 2 process still meets the recency definition. Recommend language that clarifies how BOA step 2 past performance will be used or not used. Recommend you provide some guidance as to what industry needs to do to handle situations where past performance meeting the BOA step 2 process but that falls outside the recency requirements of the task order will be addressed.	Only references that meet the recent and relevant criteria of the task order RFP will be considered in the task order evaluation. Therefore, it is likely that some references that were submitted under the BOA may not meet specific task order RFP recent and relevant criteria. Please refer to SOL-30 which addresses when offerors will have additional opportunities to submit more past performance references.

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Sol-111	M.4.2 8(b)(ii)	The Government has provided additional constraints on what references are determined to be similar in scope stating that "Annual Average Dollar value must meet or exceed the minimum level of relevant experience". This language seems to further restrict small business participation from competing on full and open Step 3 Task Orders. It would also seem to place restrictions on emerging minority owned 8a firms, as opposed to Alaskan Native 8a firms, that have different past performance parameters and allowances.	No, that is not the Government's intent. Please reference Sol-66 for rationale of the magnitude and complexity determination.
Sol-112	Sections L&M	It is your intent to not evaluate SB participation at the task order level or was this an oversight? If SB participation is no longer being evaluated does this mean that large business opportunities will no longer have SB requirements. Recommend some language that addresses this major revision to sections L & M.	Please refer to SOL-72
Sol-113	Throughout	File naming conventions are unclear for subcontractor files, whether they should include both sub and prime's name. Also, if both are required, character limitations of ASFI make this difficult. Recommend the Government provide direction on sub file names.	The naming conventions have been updated to allow the Offerors up to 40 characters in which to provide its names and its applicable subcontractors' names. As stated in L.3.4, the Offeror is permitted to abbreviate the Name of the Company field within the file name to facilitate proposal upload into ASFI BRS.
Sol-114	NA	The only comment we have to offer your office for consideration is that changes to the technical section of the proposal will increase the level of effort required by small businesses, which therefore will increase small business costs of doing business. Ultimately, the proposed changes could reduce the amount of small business participation, reducing the competition for each individual task order.	Noted
Sol-115	NA	Question: Does the Government desire or expect EAGLE BOA Holders to update their past performance submission (Attachment 2) in order to delete past performance which exceeds three years of relevancy and add new past performance experience which it has gained since the original BOA submission.	The Government does not desire or expect EAGLE BOA Holders to delete past performance which exceeds three years of relevancy. Please reference Sol-30 regarding new past performance submission.
Sol-116	NA	_____ feels that the presented 35.5M Small Business threshold severely limits Large Business's participation in Army Logistics Services Work under EAGLE. Would the Government consider re-evaluating this threshold to ensure Large Business participation?	The stated threshold was approved as a part of the EAGLE Acquisition Strategy.
Sol-117	NA	Will the Government be providing a specific breakdown of what volumes will be required for Task Orders issued under EAGLE? Additional, will a description of each volumes' requirements, for example page limits, be provided as well?	Each task order RFP will include the applicable submittal requirements in Section L of the RFP.
Sol-118	L.1.1	Section L.1.1 states that it is the Government's intent to award a Firm Fixed Price (transition in)/CPFF contract, but the CLIN structure in Section A for both APS-4 Korea and APS-4 Japan states the transition in/phase in will be CPFF, and the base contract (except ODCs and travel) will be CPFF. Will the transition in be FFP or CPFF?	The Draft L & M was only a template. Please refer to task order RFPs for transition requirements that are specific to the task order.
Sol-119	L.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion: Basis of Selection and teammate's/subcontractor's cost proposal submittal method. This items was added but not sure what the value (also L.5.4.2.7.1. thru L.5.4.2.7.2(b)). Previously, BOA holders added subs or teammates to perform on contracts which were listed on the attachment 002. In the staffing plan we explain how and why our team is comprised of the companies that are proposed. • Comment/questions: Can you provide clarification as to rationale or value added in adding the basis of selection methods to this volume as the attachment 002 has already been approved and established? 	The Government needs to ensure that the proposed price is fair and reasonable. In order to make this determination it needs to have a full understanding of the offeror's basis for selection of its teammates/subcontractors for the task order effort in order to ensure that it was selected in the best interest of the Government at a fair and reasonable price.
Sol-120	L.5.1.6	Section L.5.1.6 references Attachment 0015 for the Secret Facility Clearance Information; it is Attachment 0011 that contains this, not 0015.	Correct, the attachment for Secret Facility Clearance Information is Attachment 0015.

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Sol-121	L.5.1.7.1 and L.5.1.7.2	<p>Discussion: At the request of the Contracting Pricing Division Chief, Dept of the Army, Army Contracting Command – Rock Island, DCAA performed a pre-award Accounting System Audit in 12/2012. Previous EAGLE T.O. have included the requirement at FAR 9.104-5(b), Certification Regarding Responsibility Matters, by completing the certification at FAR 52.209-5 – Certification Regarding Responsibility Matters. Short of meeting these requirements, most small businesses have nothing to document the status of their Purchasing System and/or Business System. While it is highly improbable that such actions takes place, the solicitation implies that DCMA routinely performs Business Systems Audits of small businesses. The fact that Contracting Pricing Division, Dept of the Army Contracting Command – Rock Island requested the pre-award audit, and DCAA conducted the audit, and provided you with the results, begs the logic that small businesses do not have access to this information, and cannot produce such documentation.</p> <p>Question: Since this is a Government 2 Government function, e.g., Contracting Officer requests either DCAA/DCMA conduct the audit and provides feedback to the Requesting Official, please consider removing this requirement from the solicitation. Otherwise, how and who should small businesses contact to obtain the documentation you require?</p>	No, this requirement will not be removed. If the offeror does not currently have a current audit on file with DCAA, there are other alternatives that it may submit per L.5.1.7.1.
Sol-122	L.5.1.7.2	Paragraph L.5.1.7.2 [page 6] states the Offeror shall provide its current Government approval status for various business systems. This paragraph also states that if the Offeror does not have official Government approval for any of these business systems, they are to provide a statement of such and a brief explanation as to why these systems have not been approved. What office is the Government’s official approving body for contractor business systems and what is the process for requesting this approval.	Business system is not required for task order award. Will need to coordinate approval of business system with task order PCO after task order contract award, however, Business System approvals are typically provided by the Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA).
Sol-123	L.5.1.8	<p>Teaming Matrix (Attachment 0010) The Offeror shall provide the full company name, CAGE code, role of participant, proposed functional area(s) to perform, total estimated dollar value for the total period of performance of 5 years, percent of participation , basis of selection and teammate’s/subcontractor’s cost proposal submittal method. The Offeror shall populate every column using the instructed fill-ins on the Attachment 0010 for itself, proposed teammates and proposed subcontractors. Note: the total estimated dollar value provided on Attachment 0010 should be equal to the total evaluated price found on Attachment 0005 - Cost/Price Matrix.</p> <p>- Teammate/Subcontractor Utilization: Offeror’s proposing the use of Teammate(s)/Subcontractor(s) shall do so in accordance with Section H, paragraphs 1-H (d and e) of this RFP. The Government will verify that the Offeror's proposal includes approved teammates by comparing the Offeror's Attachment 0010 to the Offeror’s BOA Attachment 0002 - Team Arrangement as of the closing date of the RFP.</p> <p>Comment/Question:</p> <p>1. Is the government going to release an updated Attachment 0010 that provides the requirements listed in the first paragraph?</p>	Please Refer to SOL-94
Sol-124	L.5.1.8	2. What business is it of the governments on how a business makes its selection of teammates/subcontractors to perform the work on Task Orders?	Please refer to SOL-119
Sol-125	L.5.1.8	3. Is this going to be part of the evaluation process for making a selection on who wins the Task Order. If so, where are the evaluation criteria the government will use to determine if we have selected the right teammate for a Task Order? We need to know the government’s criteria for evaluating our selection of a teammate/subcontractor so we can ensure we are using a process the government will approve and give us a technically acceptable rating so we can continue in the selection process?	Please refer to SOL-119
Sol-126	L.5.1.8	4. The Section H reference does not cover a Primes basis of selection of teammate/subcontractor criteria to perform work on a Task Order?	Noted; however, the language will not be changed at this time.
Sol-127	L.5.1.8	Section L.5.1.8 references Attachment 0010 for the Teaming Matrix; it is Attachment 0007 that contains the Teaming Matrix.	The Teaming Matrix is contained in Attachment 0010.

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol-xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Sol-128	L.5.1.8	Does this include approved teammates added "after" Step 2?	Yes.
Sol-129	L.5 2.1.1	This section states that fonts must be legible, no smaller than 12 pt. font. Does the "no smaller than 12 point" refer to graphics and tables as well? Suggest offerors be allowed to submit font for graphics of smaller size, as long as it is legible.	Please refer to SOL-18
Sol-130	L.5 2.1.1(a)(3)(i)	Does the Government expect a cover page, TOC, and acronym/abbreviation list for each electronic submittal, or one for the overall volume?	Please refer to Sol-27.
Sol-131	L.5 2.1.1.(a)(3)(iii)	Previous solicitations released amendments allowing for the use of font size 8 in charts and graphs. By using font size 12 in response to requirements it will require more pages in response to answer all government requirements. Because the government is not allowing any font size smaller than 12 will the government increase the page count to allow offerors to answer all the governments requirements?	Please refer to SOL-18
Sol-132	L.5 2.1.3(a)(3)ii	12 point fonts in organization diagrams incroaches on industries ability to stay within the four page organizational diagram limit. Can the government consider 10 point fonts on organization charts?	Please refer to SOL-18
Sol-133	L.5 2.1.3(a)(3)(iii)	Paragraph L.5 2.1.3(a)(3)(iii) [page 12] requires the font for the Organizational Diagram to be 12 point or larger. In many RFPs the font size for charts, graphs and diagrams is allowed to be smaller (such as 8 point or 9 point) as long as it is still legible. Please consider allowing smaller size font for charts, graphs and diagrams.	Please refer to SOL-18
Sol-134	L.5 2.1.3(a)(3)(iii)	We were told at the last EAGLE meeting that the 12 point font rule would not apply to the organizational diagram, an amendment was issued making the change only stating the font must be visually easy to read. Why the reversal of the latest change?	Please refer to SOL-18
Sol-135	L.5 3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion: In this section, the government states that "offerors are not required or allowed to provide additional past performance contract references for itself, proposed teammates, and/or major subcontractors for use in this task order evaluation. The Government will not evaluate any new past performance references provided by the Offeror in its proposal with the exception of the information requested in L.5.3.5.1 thru L.5.3.5.4 below. • Comment: Many Small businesses have a need to add additional past performance in order to meet the dollar thresholds (M.4.2.8(b) (ii), p. 32-33) placed upon some contracts. By eliminating the addition of pertinent additional past performance, this will effectively lesson small businesses' ability to compete on EAGLE TOs. This also seems contradictory to efforts to increase small business participation. Recommend one, that if this is the final direction of future TOs that the annual window to add additional pertinent past performance be opened as to allow the addition of past performance in order to maintain the level of small business participation. Two, that for evaluation purpose that the totality of the team be considered in determining whether an organization, especially a small business provides the level of comfort to perform on an order. • Recommendation: Allow additional past performance if it affects relevancy. 	Refer to Sol-30.
Sol-136	L.5 3.1	Since no additional past performance is "required or allowed," will the offeror be allowed to update their BOA submission for past performance more often than annually to maintain "relevant" and "recent" past performance?	Refer to Sol-30.
Sol-137	L.5 3.1	If the offeror submits additional past performance in response to the recent EAGLE – Fort Irwin solicitation, does the government have that past performance to review for future contracts?	Refer to Sol-99.
Sol-138	L.5 3.1	Per the draft solicitation, all that is to be reviewed for past performance is the past performance included in the Offeror's BOA proposal, task order proposals to date and the BOA annual review. What if teammates that were used to gain approval for the BOA in specific areas that have to be covered do not participate? How is the Offeror to show proficiency and past performance from another teammate, major subcontractor or themselves as prime?	Technical acceptability will be determined based on the technical proposal submitted in response to the task order RFP. Past performance will be based on available information. Please refer to Sol-30 and Sol-99.

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Sol-139	L.5 3.1	In the past, the Offeror/Prime was required to give any teammate or major subcontractor 20% of the workshare in order to use their past performance (additional). Is the Offeror/Prime still required to give up 20% to a teammate or major subcontractor since no additional past performance is allowed?	An Offeror is not required to have its teammate or major subcontractor perform 20% of the effort. If an Offeror would like its teammate or major subcontractor's past performance evaluated, IAW M.5.2.1, the Government will only be evaluating the prime and any major subcontractor's (teammate or subcontractor that is expected to perform 20% or more of the Offeror's total proposed price) past performance information. Please refer to M.5.2.1.
Sol-140	L.5 3.1	Is there any need for a major subcontractor if we can't use their additional past performance to demonstrate that we can perform the work?	It is the BOA Holder's decision as to whether or not it needs a major subcontractor/teammate in order to successfully perform the effort.
Sol-141	L.5 3.1.2	Does this mean that Small Business BOA Holders must assign teammates at least 20% of total proposed price, or the government will not evaluate their past performance for this Task Order? If this is the case the government has now relegated SB to using Max 2 teammates to cover all three functional areas (Maintenance, Supply and Transportation) since the SB Prime has to retain 51%. Q: Request the government remove this "teammate" requirement as it limits the SB from using the right number of approved Attachment 002 teammates needed to cover all Task Areas of Task Order, and have their past performances count (evaluated).	Language will not be changed. The Government will only evaluate past performance for an Offeror and each major subcontractor and teammate expected to perform more than 20% of the total proposed price. However, it is not a requirement that the Offeror must assign 20% or more of the work to teammates and major subcontractors.
Sol-142	L.5 3.5	Will contract references of only those teammates performing 20% or more of total proposed price be evaluated? If so, SB BOA holders who require more than two teammates past performances to cover all task areas need not bid, because mathematical they can't give up more than 40% of the total proposed price and still remain the SB Prime?	Refer to Sol-141.
Sol-143	L.5.4.2.5	Is paragraph L.5.4.2.5 stating that we have to provide our basis of estimate (BOE) now?	No
Sol-144	L.5.4.2.7.1	This section details the offerors requirements in support of its proposed subcontractors. However, the last sentence states that....."the Offeror shall, at a minimum, provide details of proposed direct labor rates to include Service Contract Act (SCA) or Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) labor rates and the adders used to calculate its total subcontractor proposed amount." The subcontractor direct labor rates would be considered proprietary and the prime contractor would not have insight into that level of detail. The prime contractor can, however, discuss/detail the adders applied to the subcontractor's proposed cost. Will the Government considered revising this requirement so that the subcontractor is responsible for providing the direct labor detail in their sealed package to the government?	The intent of this paragraph is only related to a subcontractor who was selected through adequate price competition. The subcontractor may provide the specific information. The required information is verification that the base direct labor rates are in accordance with the applicable SCA or CBA rates and the fully loaded rates for each applicable labor category. If proposing a competitively selected subcontractor the requirement to provide details of the indirect cost adders as specified in L.5.4 2.7.5 - Indirect Expense Rates is eliminated.
Sol-145	L.5.4.2.7.1(a)	The naming convention for this section (Offeror's_Name_Basis_of_Selection_Sub/Team_Name_Vol_4) defies the convention established for other file submittals. We suggest this be named "Offeror's_Name_Vol_4_Basis_of_Selection_Sub/Team_Name."	Please refer to changes made in L.5.4.2.7.1(a)

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Sol-146	L.5.4.2.7.2(a)(b) Naming Convention: Offeror's_Name_Sub_Name_Vol_4_Cost_Proposal File Format: MS Excel Page Limit: none The Ft Huachuca Cost Proposal contains (3) functional areas that would require a booklet containing a minimum of (36) tabs. We foresee the Ft Bliss requirement being rather complicated in that an Excel booklet would require a minimum of (50) tabs to provide proper response.	Discussion: For future LRC requirements that necessitate (3) functional areas, it seems feasible that the Government would separate the requirement for each functional area into its own Excel file. Question: Would the Government consider revising the requirements to stipulate the following? For example: Naming Convention of Offer: Offer's_Name_Vol_4_Cost_Proposal_Supply; or Naming Convention of Teammates/Subcontractors: Offer's_Name_Sub_Name_Vol_4_Cost_Proposal_Supply File Format: MS Excel Page Limit: none Naming Convention: TEAM_Name_Vol_4_Cost_Proposal_Maintenance; or Naming Convention of Teammates/Subcontractors: Offer's_Name_Sub_Name_Vol_4_Cost_Proposal_Maintenance File Format: MS Excel Page Limit: none Naming Convention: TEAM_Name_Vol_4_Cost_Proposal_Transportation; or Naming Convention of Teammates/Subcontractors: Offer's_Name_Sub_Name_Vol_4_Cost_Proposal_Transportation File Format: MS Excel Page Limit: none	Noted; however, the language will not be changed at this time.
Sol-147	L.5.4.2.7.5(a)(3)	There is a request for supporting data for Direct Labor costs for personnel not covered by the SCA or CBA. Our assumption is that this would apply only to Cost Plus CLINs, and would not apply in Firm Fixed Price CLINs. Please clarify our assumption as to its accuracy.	That assumption is accurate. Typically, the only FFP CLIN is for transition which is a very small portion of the EAGLE task order contracts. This is related to all position stated to be exempt from SCA/CBA within the cost type CLINs; however, if a labor category is the same for both a FFP and cost CLIN those rates should be consistent.
Sol-148	L.5.4.2.7.5(b)(1)	This section requires submission of the pool and base costs for each proposed indirect rate. This detailed information is provided to DCAA for audit. Will the Government considered removing this requirement if the offeror can provide a Forward Price Rate Submission; Forward Price Rate Agreement or Provisional Rate Agreement?	If an offeror routinely prepares and submits Forward Pricing Rates to DCMA or DCAA that information is acceptable. The Offeror must provide the letter of submission or the DCMA letter for Forward Pricing Rate recommendation or agreement, the specific rate schedule associated with that submission, the specific rates used and how applied within the Offeror's cost proposal.
Sol-149	L.5.4.2.7.5(c)(1)	This section requires submission of the pool and base costs for each indirect rate for a yet to be determined time frame (assuming a forward looking timeframe). This detailed information is provided to DCAA for audit. Will the Government considered removing this requirement if the offeror can provide a Forward Price Rate Submission; Forward Price Rate Agreement or Provisional Rate Agreement?	Please refer to SOL-148

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Sol-150	M.1.1, M.2 and M.3	Paragraph M.1.1 states "Government expects to award a single combination Cost Plus Fixed Fee/Firm-Fixed Price task order...then goes on to state the Government will make an award to responsible Offeror whose proposal complies with RFP requirements and is determined to be lowest total evaluated(reasonable/realistic) priced...and M2 states Government reserves the right to limit the competitive range...and M3 states "Cost/Price will be an evaluated factor; however will not be rated". If Cost/Price is evaluated and not rated how can the Government state they will make an award of Cost Plus Fixed Fee/Firm-Fixed Price, when in reality all of the proposals submitted are being evaluated as LPTA?	Per M.5.3, the Firm Fixed Price and Cost Proposals will be evaluated for cost realism and reasonableness in accordance with FAR 15.404-1, Proposal Analysis Techniques.
Sol-151	M.3	Based on the requirements listed in paragraph M.3. the government has increased from a previously stated 3 phase 2 step evaluation process to a 5 Step with over 50 subordinate evaluation processes. Is it the governments intention to continue to tighten down the evaluation criteria to drive out competition within the Small Business community, given most SB's have limited proposal development assets unlike Large Businesses?	No, that is not the Government's intention. The Government will continue to adhere to the approved EAGLE acquisition strategy to conduct its task order competitions.
Sol-153	M.3.1	If past performance is so important, how is it that the government will only look at 5 or 20% for past performance and price and technical come first?	Please reference Sol-154
Sol-154	M.3.1	M.3.1 states that "the Past Performance Factor is significantly more important than the Cost/Price Factor." However, M.3.1, Step 3 states that "the Government will evaluate the Technical proposals against the technical evaluation criteria, from the lowest total proposed priced offer to the highest total proposed priced offer, until five (5) or 20% of the proposals (whichever is greater) are determined to be technically acceptable, or if necessary, until all proposals are evaluated. Note that only five (5) or 20% (whichever is greater) of the technically acceptable proposals will move to Step 4," which is the Past Performance evaluation step. If Past Performance is the most important factor and not the Cost/Price factor, how can potentially 80% of the Offerors be eliminated on the basis of Cost/Price and only 5 or 20% of the Offerors (whichever is greater) proceed to the Past Performance evaluation in Step 4?	The revised evaluation process is designed to streamline the evaluation process while simultaneously allowing the Government to award to the offeror whose proposal complies with the RFP requirements and is determined to be the lowest total evaluated (fair and reasonable) priced proposal that is determined to be Technically Acceptable with Substantial Confidence in past performance.
Sol-155	M.3.1, Step 3; M.3.1; M.3.4.1	M.3.1 states that The Government will evaluate the Technical Factor on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis and that "technical tradeoffs will not be made and no additional credit will be given for exceeding acceptability." Step 3 also states that technical is only acceptable or unacceptable, with no other rating. This being said, M.3.4.1 states that "no more than five (5) or 20% (whichever is greater) of the Offerors having the lowest total proposed priced, and have highly rated Technical proposals will remain in the initial competitive range." Are proposals technically evaluated on an acceptable or unacceptable basis, or are there other levels of technically acceptable such as "highly?"	The Government will evaluate the Technical Factor on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis.
Sol-156	M.3.1, Step 1, d. and M.3.4.1.	Paragraph d. states that only Offerors whose proposals are determined complete and compliant will move to Step 3, however, in M.3.4.1 it states that Technically Unacceptable proposals that do not require major revision and/or do not possess significant informational deficiencies. This is in direct conflict with the statement made in d on page 26. Which statement is incorrect?	The determination of whether or not an Offeror meets the requirements of the solicitation (compliance review) is a separate element than the determination of whether or not an Offeror is Technically Acceptable/Unacceptable (Technical Evaluation Factor).
Sol-157	M.3.1 (b)	What about those teammates that were later approved as additions/enhancements to Offer's BOA Attachment 0002 does this include them?	Please reference SOL-128
Sol-158	M.4.2.1	This supports our earlier question concerning SB not being able to use more than two teammates at 20% each to cover all task areas of a TO if they want their past performance to be evaluated. Some teammates were chosen in Step 2 because a specific niche, and the government is not going to include their expertise in its evaluation unless it is at least equal to 20% of total contract price is not fair. We ask the government to only use this 20% criterion for "Major Subcontractors" and not approved "Teammates" of Small Businesses.	Please reference Sol-141.

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Sol-159	M.4.2.7	We believe the government will agree that Five (5) years is more reasonable with all of the delays we are experiencing is Task Order Release dates, cancellation and etc. Moreover, the first Period of Performance for the EAGLE BOA is only five years which means the contract references used to win a BOA are already at the point of not meeting the time standards if the government stick with 3 years. We ask the government to change time standard to five (5) years. Otherwise, the government will receive a flood of new past performances to evaluate for relevancy which takes a lot longer than those only assessed for recency.	Please reference Sol-30.
Sol-160	M.4.2 8 (b) (ii)	It is obvious that the Government doesn't intend for 8(a)s or SBs to participate in many of these Task Orders because the requirement for "similar" magnitude and complexity requirement. The following is a definition of "Similar" - showing resemblance in qualities, characteristics, or appearance; alike but not identical. Therefore based on this definition many of our Task Orders that we currently perform work on meet the definition of "Similar". Will the Government provide their definition of "Similar" using known educational references, since it is obvious that Offerors understanding of "Similar" and the Governments appear to be at extreme ends of the meaning of the word.	This is not the Government's intent. The definition of Relevancy can be found in the RFP. Please see M.5.2.8. Please also reference Sol-66 for rationale of the magnitude determination.
Sol-161	M.4.2 8 (b) (ii)	By putting the \$5m-\$6m Dollar requirement on Small Businesses contract references to prove similarity in magnitude and complexity, the Government is eliminating Small Businesses from competing for Large Installations Task Orders with LB teammates. This effectively eliminates SBs Primes from competing because they fail to meet the dollar threshold and only allows SBs to compete for Medium and Small Installations which have the potential of being part of the next round of BRACs. Is it the Governments intent to not allow SBs to bid with LB on the Large Installation DOLs?	No, that is not the Government's intent. Please reference Sol-66 for rationale of the magnitude and complexity determination.
Sol-162	M.4.2 8(b)(ii)	<p>Recommendation to Reconsider M.4.2.8(b)(ii): By putting the \$5m-\$6m Dollar requirement on Small Businesses contract references to prove similarity in magnitude and complexity, the Government will effectively eliminate most, if not all, true Small Businesses from competing for Large Installations Task Orders even with large business teammates. We are now being relegated to only competing for Medium and Small Installations which some are at risk of making the new round of BRAC.</p> <p>Some of us Small Businesses are managing multiple Projects worth twice, if not three times, the average Annual Dollar Value of one EAGLE Task Order with no issues. This should prove that our Management Approach is solid enough to service one Large Installation if we able to management several in multiple locations.</p> <p>Lastly, EAGLE was marketed as THE vehicle to grow Small Business and now the government is saying all we can pursue are the smaller contracts we pursued 3-5 years ago even if we have the reach-back of Large Businesses as teammates. The government understands most small businesses can't cover all three functional areas without teammates, yet you are now requiring small businesses to have past performances averaging \$17m annually. If we have contract references totalling an average \$17m annually, we would not qualify as small business anymore (e.g. a three year contract would average \$51m, and a five year contract would average \$85m).</p> <p>Request the government reconsider and eliminate this annual dollar threshold and go back to evaluating the totality of the team's make-up, experience, dollar value, and previous performance assessments when assessing confidence level to perform on a Task Order; or at least cut this requirement for Large Installations significantly...remember similar doesn't mean "same" but having a "likeness in a general way"</p>	The Government will not be changing its thresholds at this time.
Sol-163	New Section L and M, all pages	Based on the requirements listed in paragraphs L and M is the government going to be held to the same high standard, zero defect proposal requirements the Government is expecting from Industry?	The Government will continue to strive to provide high quality products to Offerors.

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Sol-164	New Section L and M, all pages	If the government adheres to the new stated requirements in Sections L & M for industry, will the government be held to the same high standard as is expected by the contractor industry and not release numerous amendments (some in excess of 20) on solicitations because the government has all of the information it requires, has performed their own quality control checks (spelling, grammar, paragraph, page, and section numbering) and can incorporate all requirements into its solicitations?	Please reference Sol-163.
Sol-166	New Section L and M, all pages	Will the government just allow contractors to submit a cost proposal for an estimated number of personnel to perform the work requested?	Offerors should submit proposals IAW the applicable Task Order RFP terms and conditions.
Sol-167	New Section L and M, all pages	Is it the governments intent to drive out competition by incorporating these containing stringent changes on proposal submission requirements?	No, this is not the Government's intention.
Sol-168	L and M	Throughout this draft Section L and M there are many references to Attachments by number and title and discussion for how to complete those. The Attachment numbers/titles and columns referenced in this draft document do not align with the draft Attachments issued with the draft RFP W52P1J-14-R-0031 (ASP-4 Japan) and W52P1J-14-R-0032 (APS-4 Korea). Will the approved version of this document apply to those RFPs? Will the Attachments for those two draft RFPs be re-numbered/named and re-issued to align with this Section L and M?	Please reference the final released language and corresponding attachments for the applicable Task Order RFP.
Sol-169	L and M	The draft Sections L and M provide instructions for preparation and submission of the data elements identified in a through d below, to include a file naming convention for each document. Must these be submitted as separate documents or can they be consolidated into one group of documents and submitted under one name? a) Contractor Points of Contact for responding to ENs through ASSIST [page 5] b) Proof of Facility Clearance [page 5] c) Official Government approval documents for any systems that have been approved by the Government [page 6] d) DCAA office address information [page 8]	Please reference Sol-14
Sol-170	L.1 2	"L.1 2 In accordance with FAR Clause 52.215-1, Instructions to Offerors - Competitive Acquisition (Jan 2004) the Government intends to award a contract without discussions. Comment/Question: Recommend that the Government not close the door on this issue of discussions but reword it to say that any discussions will be at the discretion of the Government based on complexity of opportunity. An offeror may have a valid or unforeseen reason that might prevent them from being eliminated. Discussions also provide clarity that may also help to minimize protests.	The Government reserves the right to conduct discussions if deemed necessary.
Sol-171	L.1 2	Language in previous versions stated the Government intended to award with discussions. New language states without discussions. Is the new language correct?	Yes, please reference SOL-170
Sol-172	L.1 3	Section L.1.3 states that the proposal will be valid for 180 days from the required submission date. However, some of the EAGLE TOR Award timelines (Government estimates) are in excess of 180 days from submission. Will ACC-RI revalidate with offerors on a regular basis, or will they determine the validity based on individual TOR timelines and provide specificity in the RFP (L.1.3)?	The Government will revalidate if necessary.
Sol-174	L.2 2	Question: Reference page 2, para L.2.2 .."all info pertaining to particular volume shall be confined to that volume. For example, no cost/price info will be presented except in Cost/Price Volume..." Does this requirement apply to Attachment 0002, staffing and manning chart? Example, can it (Att. 002) be included in Volume #4 - Cost/Price Proposal, as long as it is also included in Volume #2 -Technical?	Per the provided example, if the Offeror chooses to provide its Attachment 0002 within the Cost/Price Proposal, it may do so; however, the Offeror must follow the instructions of the RFP, specifically providing the document with the naming convention strictly identified in the RFP.
Sol-175	L.2.7	L.2.7 Compressed files (e.g. *.zip) will be accepted only through Army Single Face to Industry (ASFI) and Acquisition Source Selection Interactive Support Tool (ASSIST). Compressed files (e.g. *.zip) will not be accepted via e-mail. Comment: ASSIST/ASFI are not always reliable. Recommend verbiage that allows offerors and teammates to use another format, e.g. email, in extreme situations when ASSIST/ASFI is down or when an Offeror/teammate is unable to access ASSIST or ASFI.	ASSIST and ASFI will continue to be the method used for proposal submission. However, in the event that these tools are not available, an alternate method will be communicated to all BOA Holders. However, this will be conducted on a case-by-case basis.

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Sol-176	L.3.4	How should the filename be constructed if the company's abbreviated name and the government's required filename exceeds the 40-character limit? On previous BRS uploads, we abbreviated the company name to 3 letters, but when combined with the government's required filename, exceeded the 40-character limit.	Please reference SOL-113
Sol-177	L.3.4	While this paragraph allows us to abbreviate our company's name, we have found with previous submittals we have needed to abbreviate more than the company name to fit within the 40 character limit. Please allow additional abbreviations as necessary.	The Government requires these files to be submitted in accordance with the naming conventions outlined in Section L as to ensure accountability for all documents in the submittal process. The naming conventions have been updated to allow the Offerors up to 40 characters in which to provide its names and its applicable subcontractors' names. As stated in L.3.4, the Offeror is permitted to abbreviate the Name of the Company field within the file name to facilitate proposal upload into ASFI BRS.
Sol-178	L.4.1.3	The paragraph identifies the offeror shall provide "validity of all stated assertions", and "convincing documentary evidence of how contract requirements will be met". Q: In addition to past performance, is it the governments intent that bidding companies provide additional/separate documentation to satisfy the requirement for "convincing documentary evidence"?	This instruction is to ensure Offerors provide sufficient detail to demonstrate the completeness of their proposal.
Sol-179	L.5.1	It appears Att0016 Teammate(s)/Subcontractor(s) Proposal Submittal Crosswalk was deleted. Will the Government confirm this attachment will no longer be required? This information is a duplicate of information provided in Att0010.	Confirmed that the Attachment 0016 was deleted.
Sol-180	L.5.1.6	The wording of L.5.1.6 is confusing. We believe the Government is stating that contractor personnel assigned or designated "key positions" that require Secret clearances must possess them prior to the start of work (PWS 1.3.12). However, previous PWSes (e.g. For Bliss) also have discussion of key position security clearances (PWS 1.3.2.1), with L.5.1.6 being expressly a discussion about facility clearances. As written in the draft L.5.1.6, the discussion begins with individual clearances but evolves into a requirement for the Prime/Sub/Teammate having a secret facility clearance. If this is the right paragraph to identify the requirements for both, the language should be clarified.	Language has been added in Section A of the solicitation to clarify the requirement.
Sol-181	L.5.1.7.2	The Offeror shall provide its current Government approval status of the following business systems: billing (internal controls), estimating, budget and financial control, purchasing, quality assurance, and property control systems. The Offeror shall provide official Government approval documentation for any systems that have Government approval. The approval status and approval documentation will not be evaluated and is for Government reference only. If approval of any of these business systems is not available, provide a statement of such and a brief rationale as to why these systems have not been approved. Comment/Question: What approval is the Government looking for with quality assurance and property control systems? Will not having a system in these areas preclude a company from receiving an award? Recommend that the Government provide an example of what they are looking for in the statement or rationale if the business system is not available.	Please reference Sol-122.
Sol-182	L.5.1.8	After contract award, how will the Government verify that the offeror is using teammates and subcontractors as the dictated in the proposal and IAW Attach 10 and 2? What is the consequence if the Offeror fails to assign workload IAW what they proposed? Recommend that the Government address this issue within this documentation.	The Government may use numerous methods to review contract performance. Consequences for not following proposals will be reviewed on a case by case basis. Language will not be changed.
Sol-183	L.5.2.1.1(a)(3)(iii)	For L.5.2.1.1(a)(3)(iii), the "visually easy to read" instruction addition is appreciated. However, specific language for body type as 12 point or larger and header, footer and graphic type as 10 point or larger would provide more clarity, stay with established norms and meet the "easy to read" test.	Refer to Sol-18
Sol-184	L.5.2.1.1(a)(3-4)	We also recommend that you standardize font type (e.g. Arial Bold or times Roman) because it levels the playing field for all offerors. Government should mitigate factors such as proposal appearance that might influence source selection whenever possible.	Refer to SOL-18

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol-xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Sol-185	L.5 2.1.2(a)(2)	L.5 2.1.2(a)(2) states that the MECS page limit will not exceed two pages, however if the font cannot be less than 12 point, would the Government change the MECS page count to three pages?	Refer to SOL-18. The page count for the MECS will remain the same.
Sol-186	L.5 2.1.2(a)(2)(iii)	L.5 2.1.2(a)(2)(iii) states that font size for all proposals must be 12 point or larger. However this section further states that font must be "Visually easy to read", therefore will the Government allow 10 point font on pictures, charts, and graphs?	Refer to SOL-18
Sol-187	L.5 2.1.3(a)(3)(iii)	L.5 2.1.3(a)(3)(iii) states that font size for all proposals must be 12 point or larger. However this section further states that font must be "Visually easy to read", therefore will the Government allow 10 point font on pictures, charts, and graphs?	Refer to SOL-18
Sol-188	L.5 2.1.3(a)(3)(iii)	The reference to "12 point font or large is preferred". Will Offerors who use less than 12 point font within the ORG Diagram be non-compliant based 12 point font format preference?	Refer to SOL-18
Sol-189	L.5 2.1.3(a)(4)	In L.5 2.1.3(a)(3)(iii), where it states, "12 point font is 'preferred,'" this leads into a discussion of L.5 2.1.3(a)(4), which states that "failure to provide the Organizational Diagram in the format...shall render the Offeror's proposal non-compliant." This further necessitates that the Government not leave the font size as "preferred."	Refer to SOL-18
Sol-190	L.5 3 and M.4.2	May offerors reference Teammate per performance that the teammate submitted on either its own BOA submission or on other BOA's it may be on if they have multiple prime teammates?	The Government does not understand this question.
Sol-191	L.5 3 and M.4.3	May offerors refresh the BOA past performance attachment with current information and/or changes about its own past performance citations in the BOA (the offeror's) during the Annual BOA Update submission? If so, what is the process/procedure?	Refer to Sol-30.
Sol-192	L.5 3 and M.4.4	May offerors refresh/update teammates past performance for the BOA annual update submission?	Yes.
Sol-193	L.5 3 and M.4.5	May offerors substitute Teammates past performance for specific EAGLE PWS paragraphs in place of its own past performance on its BOA annual update submission?	The Government does not understand this question.
Sol-194	L.5 3.1	How and when can a BOA holder prime submit new and more recent past performance that can be associated to the BOA. It is clear that in Section L 5.3.1 that the offeror cannot submit new past performances at the Task Order level. Is it with the annual Team Change Submissions?	Refer to Sol-30.
Sol-195	L.5 3.1	Question: Will the government please clarify their position for cross-teaming conflicts since the government's intent is to not evaluate any new past performance references in situations where the teammate/subcontractor whose past performance was used for the EAGLE BOA but is not on the Task Order team. What is the impact, if any, when the teammate/subcontractor who is on the EAGLE BOA team with a specific capability but is not on the Task Order because they are leading their own team?	A teammate not proposed at a Step 3 task order competition will not be considered for evaluation purposes. Only the Offeror, major subcontractors or teammates performing 20% or more of the effort will have their past performance evaluated.
Sol-196	L.5 3.1	The Government will consider past performance references that were provided with the Offerors BOA proposal task order proposals to date, and the BOA annual review, as well as references obtained from sources other than those identified by the Offeror. Offerors are not required or allowed to provide additional past performance contract references for itself, proposed teammates, and/or major subcontractors for use in this task order evaluation. The Government will not evaluate any new past performance references provided by the Offeror in its proposal with the exception of the information requested in L.5.3.5.1 thru L.5.3.5.4 below. Comment/Question: We understand that offerors have opportunities to update their Past Performance references; however, there will be circumstances that may prevent an offeror from submitting a new Past Performance reference in time for a solicitation which may eliminate them from competing due to relevancy or other reasons. We recommend that the Government allow additional past performance references in general. We also recommend that the Government increase the number of years for past performance recency from 3 to 5 years based on the fact that it's taking more time, over a year in some cases, for the Government to issue an award.	Noted; however, the language will not be changed at this time.

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Sol-197	L.5 3.1	L.5 3.1 States that "offerors are not required or allowed to provide additional past performance contract references for itself, proposed teammates, and/or major subcontractors for use in this task order evaluation". By the government having previously allowed additional past performances to be submitted with task order proposals, and now prohibiting it, this potentially gives those contractors that have submitted multiple bids early in the EAGLE process a material advantage. Please either delete the review of prior task order proposal past performance submittals, or allow offerors the opportunity to submit additional past performance references with each new task order proposal.	Please reference SOL-30.
Sol-198	L.5 3.1.1	In paragraph L.5.3.1.1, it states "A major subcontractor is defined as a proposed subcontractor expected to perform 20% or more of the Offeror's total proposed price (for the base period and all option periods). For purposes of this Task Order RFP, major subcontractors are not considered those teammates identified in the Offeror's BOA Attachment 0002 – Team Arrangement." Does this only apply when the prime BOA holder is able to provide services in an area (Supply, Transportation or Maintenance) without the use of a subcontract as per BOA Attachment 0002 – Team Arrangement?	Yes.
Sol-199	L.5 3.5	L.5 3.5 states that the offeror shall provide a separate questionnaire to each proposed teammate that will be performing 20% or more of the total proposed price and/or each proposed major subcontractor as identified on Attachment 0010. Furthermore, will a new performance questionnaire be required in submittance of each new proposal even though these were provided at the original BOA?	Yes.
Sol-200	L.5 3.5 through L.5 3.5.2	Comment: This section of the draft RFP states that the Government is providing the offeror an opportunity to address negative performance on contracts that have received "cure notices" or "show cause letters". However, the Government also states "any" negative past performance that is not addressed at the time of submittal will not be given an opportunity to address. Even if a company has not received cure notices or show cause letters for their contracts, they may receive negative past performance in the form of a marginal CPAR, or adverse comments in an Award Fee letter or Past Performance Questionnaire. In that case, the offeror would not have received a "cure notice" or "show cause letter" to address. We have noticed on past EAGLE efforts, "negative" past performance was received by the Government in the form of a negative CPAR, Award Fee Letter, or PPQ and the offeror was permitted the opportunity to dispute this information. Establishing an RFP requirement precluding the offeror sufficient opportunity to address "any" negative past performance after proposal submittal, appears to be contradictory to the spirit and intent of the competitive acquisition process and is inconsistent with FAR Part 15 305(a)(2)(ii), which states that the Contracting Officer shall "authorize offerors to provide information on problems encountered on the identified contracts and the offeror corrective actions." It appears this draft language could lead to subjective proposal ratings during the Government evaluation process and result in an offeror being unfairly eliminated from the competition.	Please reference SOL-31
Sol-201	L.5 3.5 through L.5 3.5.2	Can the Government please define/clarify exactly what will be considered "Negative" past performance in addition to the stated cure notices or show cause letters?	Additional adverse past performance includes Level III Corrective Action Reports (CARs), Terminations for Default and Terminations for Cause.
Sol-202	L.5 3.5 through L.5 3.5.2	Also, please clarify how the Government intends to ensure the acquisition process remains fair in situations when the offeror is not provided the opportunity to respond to ANY negative past performance received during the evaluation process.	Please reference SOL-31
Sol-203	L.5 3.5 through L.5 3.5.2	Please clarify whether any negative past performance will reference ONLY submitted past performance citations for the task order / RFP; and that any other negative past performance discovered during evaluation on other contracts not used as a reference for past performance for the RFP will not be used by the Government during the in evaluation of the offerors proposal.	No, as stated in L.5 3.1 "The Government will consider the recent and relevant past performance references that were provided with the Offeror's BOA proposal, task order proposals to date, and the BOA annual review, as well as references obtained from sources other than those identified by the Offeror."
Sol-204	L.5 3.5 through L.5 3.5.2	Please define "ANY" as related to this section of the draft RFP.	"ANY" is defined as all Level III CARs. The language will be changed to state "ALL" in lieu of "ANY".

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Sol-205	L.5 3.5.1	In L.5.3.5.1, a limit is placed on addressing negative past performance. From our experience, ENs have been used to address perceived negative performance that occurred prior to our original BOA RFP Step 2 proposal. These involved performance occurring within five years prior to the closing of the respective RFP. We assume this practice will continue.	Confirmed, however, the Government will only evaluate past performance that occurred within three years prior to the closing date of the RFP.
Sol-206	L.5 3.5.1 and L.5 3.5.2	Comment: Reference L.5.3.5.1 & L.5 3.5.2. Offerors are hereby put on notice that this is the single opportunity to adequately address any negative past performance submitted in response to this RFP. The Government will not be giving the Offeror an additional opportunity to address negative past performance information during evaluations. Observation - These references seem to conflict with FAR 15.306 & M 2.1 Offerors are cautioned to submit sufficient information and in the format specified in Section L. Offerors may be asked to clarify certain aspects of their proposals (for example, the relevance of past performance information) or respond to adverse past performance information to which the Offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond.	Please reference SOL-31.
Sol-207	L.5.4.2.3	Many of the required pricing files may be combined into a single file although the Government indicates multiple pricing file names. Is the offeror allowed to combine mutple files and indicate on the TOC the location of such files or does the Government prefer the individual file names as indicated in the PWS?	Please reference SOL-14.
Sol-208	L.5.4.2.7.1	If the Offeror selected a proposed teammate/subcontractor who will be performing any functional area (i.e. Maintenance, Supply, Transportation) based on competition, proof of the following shall be submitted in order to adequately document the competition: the basis for the competitive selection and that the basis was in accordance with the Offeror's purchasing system; the contract type that was used; that the competition was specifically conducted to support this requirement; and, that the competition was a cost/price competition. The Offeror shall include the letter request for quotation to the teammate/subcontractor, the response from the teammate/subcontractor and the basis for establishing the source and determination of reasonableness of price (price analysis and/or cost realism analysis). In addition, the Offeror shall, at a minimum, provide details of proposed direct labor rates to include Service Contract Act (SCA) or Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) labor rates and the adders used to calculate its total subcontractor proposed amount. Comment/Questions: We respectfully request that the Government provide their rationale for including a basis of selection requirement. We do not see the value added in including this information as the Attachment 0002 has already been approved. Additionally, much of the teammate slection process will be discussed in other areas of the document. does the Government have a particular format or will an example be provided?	Paragraph L.5.4.2.7.2(a) requires cost proposals to be prepared in accordance with FAR 15.408, Table 15-2. As related to subcontractor costs table 15-2 states the following: "(1) Adequate Price Competition. Provide data showing the degree of competition and the basis for establishing the source and reasonableness of price for those acquisitions (such as subcontracts, purchase orders, material order, etc.) exceeding, or expected to exceed, the appropriate threshold set forth at FAR 15.403-4 priced on the basis of adequate price competition. For interorganizational transfers priced at other than the cost of comparable competitive commercial work of the division, subsidiary, or affiliate of the contractor, explain the pricing method (see FAR 31.205-26(e))."
Sol-209	L.5.4.2.7.1	Question: Reference to "adders" (various, L.5.4.2.7.1). Please define and explain how these will be evaluated (e.g., no Sect. M reference).	The key to L.5.4.2.7.1 is competitive selection of subcontractors based on price/cost competition. Competition is 2 or more offers received. The adders would be the element added to get from the base rate to the fully loaded rates. Section M evalaution includes cost realism analysis.
Sol-210	L.5.4.2.7.5 (a)(1)	Is the offeror's response to L.5.4.2.7.5 (a)(1) be included in the pricing narrative/ assumption?	This could be included in the pricing narrative/rationale or detailed within a separate tab within the cost proposal spreadsheet.
Sol-211	L.5.4.2.7.5(a)(2)	Will the Government provide a detailed expected POP for each Solicitation? As the choice of dates used by each contractor can create significant differences in the proposed labor dollars (especially for CBA positions), this is of utmost importance. Selecting different dates can create a 3% to 5% swing each year between wages and fringe benefits. Upon award, the awardee would request an equitable adjustment regardless of whether the dates were provided or not, but providing the dates would aid in leveling the competition.	The Government provides the latest, most accurate information available for the period of performance for each solicitation. Please be advised the EAGLE website provides each solicitation's projected award dates.

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Sol-212	L.5.4.2.7.5(a)(3)	Question: Reference page 22, para L.5.4.2.7.5(a)(3) "Supporting Data shall also be provided for Direct Labor costs for personnel not covered by the SCA or a CBA. At a minimum, this support should consist of current payroll records and/or current wage surveys and will be provided as "screen shots" for each applicable labor category from the payroll records or from the wage survey data." Request that the Government remove/reconsider this requirement as it increases the size of volumes which can be problematic when uploading files to the Govt. site. It also is not always a black & white solution to the salaries proposed. Often, salaries for Exempt employees are based on the incumbent workforce and/or pay rates reflected in the applicable WD and/or CBA or even incumbent salaries.	Exempt personnel would be those that are not covered by either a SCA or CBA requirement; therefore, if a SCA or CBA rates has anything to do with the basis for a specific exempt rate that needs to be discussed. The requirement is to provide detailed support for the basis for the direct rate of any exempt personnel to include payroll data, survey data, etc. and how that specific information was used to support the rate proposed.
Sol-213	L.5.4.2.7.5(d)	Please provide additional detail as to the historical cost data required in Section L.5.4.2.7.5(d).	As stated in the referenced paragraph - The historical data shall be provided in the same format as proposed rates and include detailed actual pool and base costs. The actual pool and base information should include all the items that make up the pool and base and the actual incurred costs for each or those items.
Sol-214	L.5.4.2.7.5(e)	In previous solicitations, we have been approved to submit this data in separate workbooks and provide the detailed names in the table of contents (i.e., Offeror's_Name_Vol_4_Rate_Data_HST_2010, Offeror's_Name_Vol_4_Rate_Data_HST_2011). Will the Government continue to allow for this? If so, would the Government please include this option in the language of Section L?	Please refer to the revised L.5.4.2.7.5(e)
Sol-215	L.5.4.2.7.6	Section L.5.4.2.7.6 states that the the Offeror shall prepare and provide a document (MS Word table or Excel spreadsheet) that cross-walks all proposed labor categories subject to the SCA to the corresponding labor categories and/or occupation codes in either the Section J Attachment 0007 - Department of Labor Wage Determination (DOL WD) or the Attachment 0008 Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). Therefore, if a task order has all SCA Labor Categories would an offeror be exempted from providing this crosswalk information?	There is no exemption from this requirement. The proposed job title may not be a direct match to the SCA category, this requirement is to provide the SCA category for the proposed job title. Example: Supply Clerk might be SCA, General Clerk III, code 01113 because there is no WD with the title Supply Clerk.
Sol-216	M.1	This section is not clear as to whether this is LPTA or Best Value. Some of the statements are contradictory. In M.1.1 the government states that they will make an award to the responsible Offeror whose proposal complies with the RFP requirements and is determined to be the lowest total evaluated priced proposal that is determined to be Technical Acceptable 9LPTA) with Substantial Confidence in past performance.", however, in M.3.1 Evaluation Methodology, the Government states that this is a competitive Best Value source selection, etc and that past performance is significantly more important than Cost/Price Factor. We recommend that this is rewritten to clarify whether it is LPTA or Best Value.	Paragraph M.3.1 has been removed from the language. This is a "modified" Best Value approach as the Government intends to award to an Offeror whose proposal is determined Technically Acceptable, has the lowest total evaluated price (determined to be fair and reasonable) with "Substantial Confidence" in past performance.
Sol-217	M.1.2	Recommend rewriting this paragraph to read, "The Government intends to award one task order consisting of a base year period and 4 option year periods, however, the Government reserves the right to NOT award a task order at all, depending on the quality of the proposals, prices submitted, and the availability of funds. An award under this RFP in no way requires the Government to obligate additional dollars or additional option year periods."	Noted. Please refer to the updated language in M.1.2.
Sol-218	M.1.1	The paragraph states, [Applies to 8(a) set-asides only: The Government will only evaluate proposals from Offerors that are certified by the Small Business Administration (SBA) for participation in the 8(a) program at the time of RFP closing. Prior to award, the SBA will confirm the eligibility of the apparent successful Offeror to receive the contract award.] It is our understanding that 8(a) Participants are eligible for 8(a) Set-Aside awards as long as the 8(a) firm was an eligible participant on the Initial Offer's Due Date not at the time of RFP closing. This rule is similar to small business set-asides. The rationale is based on the fact that the government oftentimes extend offer due dates and additionally, the government may take months to award a contract. Question: Will the government explain its rationale for this requirement for only the 8(a) set-asides?	Noted. Please refer to the updated language in M.1.1.

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Sol-219	M.2.1	In M.2.1, it states that offerors may be asked to respond to “adverse past performance information to which the offeror has not previously had a chance to respond.” As we have responded to the same adverse past performance information on different Eagle solicitations, a qualifying statement here may be helpful.	Noted; however, the language will not be changed at this time.
Sol-221	M.3.1	<p>• Discussion: In M.1.1 p 25 the government states, “The Government will make an award to the responsible Offeror (in accordance with FAR 9.1) whose proposal complies with the RFP requirements and is determined to be the lowest total evaluated (reasonable/realistic) priced proposal that is determined to be Technical Acceptable with Substantial Confidence in past performance.” But in M.3.1 Evaluation Methodology, page 26 the Government states “This is a competitive best Value source selection.....Award will be made to the responsible Offeror with the Lowest evaluated (reasonable and realistic) priced proposal that is determined Technically Acceptable with Substantial Confidence in past performance.....Government will pursue the following evaluation approach in support of an award decision: Step 1 – Compliance Check, Step 2 – Total Evaluated Price, Step 3 – Technical Factor Evaluations, Step 4 – Past Performance, Step 5 – Award In M3.4.1 – the Draft states if discussions are conducted, the Government will make an initial competitive range determination, in accordance with FAR 15.306(c), based on the ratings of each Technical proposal against the Technical Factor Evaluation Criteria. No more than (5) or 20% (whichever is greater) of the Offerors having the lowest technical proposed priced, and have highly rated Technical Proposal will remain in the initial competitive range. Highly rated Technical proposals will include all proposal rated Technically Acceptable, and may also include technically Unacceptable proposals that do not require a major revision and/or do not possess significant informational deficiencies. Technically Unacceptable proposals with the following deficiencies may be excluded from the initial competitive range at this phase:</p> <p>(Question continued below)</p>	Please refer to SOL-156

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Sol-221 Cont'd	M.3.1	<p>(Question Cont'd from above)</p> <p>M.3.4.1(a) Failure to provide an adequate Staffing and Management Plan (SMP) (M.4.1.2)</p> <p>M.2.4.1(b) Failure to properly identify or functionally align each of the primary tasks identified in C-5 of the PWS within the Organizational Diagram (M.4.1.4)</p> <p>M.3.4.1(c) Any other issues that would require a major revision and/or indicate significant informational deficiencies of the requirement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment: If the intent is to make award based on LPTA, then there should not be any proposal that are technically unacceptable remaining at this point in the evaluation due to the instructions and notices included within section L that renders a proposal Non-compliant and thereby stopping the evaluation of that proposal that point. These are listed below: • There are several items in this section that will make a proposal noncompliant (I,5.1.1(d), L.5.1.6(d),L.5.1.8(d) L.5.1.8(d) L.5.2.1.1(a)(4), L.5.2.1.1(c)(4), L.5.2.1.1(c)(9)(ii), L.5.2.1.2(a)(3), L.5.2.1.3(a)(4), L.5.3.1.2(d), L.5.3.5(c), L.5.4.1.1 (b)(4), L.5.4.2.1(d), L.5.4.2.2(d), L.5.4.2.3(d), L.5.4.2.5(d), L.5.4.2.7.1(d), L.5.4.2.7(d), L.5.4.2.7.3, L.5.4.2.7.3.1(d), L.5.4.2.7.5(h), L.5.4.2.7.6(d) <p>The evaluation process would seem to be flawed or contradictory to the instruction and/or notices provided to the offeror, based on the evaluative s position of the initial competitive range determination by taking no more than 5 or 20% (whichever is greater) based on pricing which would possibly include noncompliant or technically unaccepted proposal is contrary to the Step 1 process (compliance Review) which states that any offeror's proposal determined non-compliant per the terms noted in Section L or determined noncompliant per paragraphs a. through c. below will not be evaluated and will not be further considered for award. Further stated is paragraph d. Only offerors whose proposals are determined to be complete and compliant will move to Step 2 (Total Evaluated Price).</p>	Please refer to SOL-156
Sol-222	M.3.1	Section M.3.1 (page 26) states that award will be made on a best value basis but then it says using a lowest-priced technically acceptable (LPTA) means. These processes seems contradictory. LPTA processes usually state that the Government will begin with the lowest-priced proposal and will read that proposal. If that proposal is technically acceptable, then the award is made to that offeror and none of the other proposals are reviewed. In LPTA there is typically no trade-off analysis conducted. A best value award decision necessitates the use of trade-off analysis. Will the Government please explain how these two processes can be blended?	Please refer to Sol-216
Sol-223	M.3.1, Step 1 b	M.3.1, Step 1 b - Does not address exceptions for subcontractors to meet socio-economic goals. Please add the language allowing this exception.	Please note that this version of Sections L and M did not include a Small Business evaluation factor. That language is currently being drafted and will be released for comment at a later date.
Sol-224	M.3.1, Step 1 b	Under what circumstances is an offeror required to propose itself and/or approved teammates in any of the three functional area. Two illustrative questions: if a proposed teammate was included in the functional area of Maintenance, but was not originally included in Supply, can they be proposed in Supply and not Maintenance; if a teammate was bid to provide property accountability, but the prime decides to fill this requirement themselves and not include the teammate for this function is that acceptable?	An Offeror's proposal must be in accordance with its BOA Attachment 0002. It is at the Offeror's discretion which requirements it determines it can perform itself and/or which functional areas that its approved teammates perform.
Sol-225	M.3.1 Step 3	Question: Is the USG performing a Past Performance Evaluation in Step 3? If so, can the USG clarify as to the source(s) being used, e.g., CPARs/PPIRS, PPQs, etc.?	Yes. Please refer to FAR 15.305 regarding sources of past performance information. Please reference Sol-100.
Sol-226	M.4	Can the Government classify Section M.4 into a major deficiency and minor deficiency? Will Offerors be permitted to address and correct and technical deficiencies prior to being removed from the competitive range?	Please refer to paragraphs M.4.4.1.(a), (b), and (c). IF AND ONLY IF discussions are conducted, the Government will make a competitive range determination IAW FAR 15.306(c).

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol-xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Sol-227	M.4.2.1	In M.4.2.1, the government sets a threshold of 20 percent or more of the proposed price for inclusion of teammates, subcontractors, etc., in past performance evaluations. In paragraphs following (in particular M.4.2.2), statements indicate that the past performance of teammates, subcontractors, etc., will be reviewed regardless of the percentage.	Please reference the revised language at M.5.2.2.
Sol-228	M.4.2.7	In paragraph M.4.2.7, it states "Recency, as it pertains to past performance information, is a measure of the time that has elapsed since the past performance reference occurred. Recency is generally expressed as a time period during which past performance references are considered relevant. For the purpose of this requirement recency is any contract under which any performance, delivery, or corrective action has occurred within the following time standards: three (3) years prior to the RFP closing date, even if the award date is outside this three (3) year window." We have several questions regarding the way this paragraph is written.	Noted; however, no question was submitted for the Government to provide a response.
Sol-230	M.4.2 8(b)(ii)	Section M.4.2.8(b)(ii) provides annual average dollar values offerors must meet or exceed for past performance citations to be considered relevant based on installation size. Will the government define each of the 3 categories, i.e. what makes an installation a large installation?	Please reference Sol-66.
Sol-231	M.4.2.8(b)(ii)	In paragraph M.4.2.8(b)(ii), it states "In order to determine if a reference is similar in magnitude and complexity to the Ft. XXXX Task Order, the Annual Average Dollar value must meet or exceed the minimum level of relevant experience identified" later in the paragraph. We strongly encourage that each Task Order RFP clearly state the size of proposal location, small, medium or large installation. Secondly, for the APS locations do the same size standards apply? If so, we strongly encourage that each Task Order RFP clearly state the size of proposal location.	Please reference Sol-66 for rationale of the magnitude determination. Each Task Order RFP will clearly state the magnitude determination and the dollar values that apply.
Sol-232	M.4.2 8(b)(ii)	In paragraph M.4.2.8(b)(ii), it states "In order to determine if a reference is similar in magnitude and complexity to the Ft. XXXX Task Order, the Annual Average Dollar value must meet or exceed the minimum level of relevant experience identified" later in the paragraph. If the past performance does not have a specific value for the areas (supply, transportation and maintenance) does the offeror assume the total value is relevant? If not, how is dollar value for relevancy determined?	Please reference M.5.2.8(c)(iii)
Sol-233	M.4.3 2	Is Section M.4.3.2 Evaluation of Option to extend services only applicable to Cost Plus work?	The Government will evaluate the Option to extend services IAW M.5.3.2.
Sol-234	M.4.3.4	Section M.4.3.4 appears to allow greater flexibility for the KO to reject a potential Offer if our proposal is "unbalanced". How does the Government define "unbalanced"?	FAR 15.404-1(g) provides the following - Unbalanced pricing exists when, despite an acceptable total evaluated price, the price of one or more contract line items is significantly over or understated as indicated by the application of cost or price analysis techniques. In this instance an example might be unexplained reduction in direct labor rate for outyear period; Base year \$20.00/hr and option yr 2 rate of \$18.00/hr.
Sol-235	L and M	Will this Section L and Section M be applicable for all Tasks issued under Eagle? Will this be applicable only to the CONUS DOL Tasks? Will there be any deviations to Section L&M?	It is the Government's intent that this language will be the standard for all EAGLE task orders with some minor unique additions for OCONUS and CONUS Unrestricted task order requirements.
Sol-236	L and M	Question: please confirm that this new L&M will be implemented on a go-forward basis vice those currently in-process of evaluation?	Confirmed.
Sol-237	L and M	When does the government plan to finalize L&M language? When is the new Section L & M go into effect?	The Government has finalized the L&M lanague and has currently used it in the task order RFPS which have recently been issued.
Sol-238	NA	The draft L&M sections provide significant insight into the solicitation process and will prove helpful in making future bid decisions.	Noted
Sol-239	NA	Evaluation criteria in Section M are clear, objective and significantly assist in communicating the BOA concept of operations.	Noted
Sol-240	NA	Recognizing the need for flexibility and the subsequent need for generality, Section L instructions provide very useful insight into Government expectations regarding proposals.	Noted.

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Sol-241	NA	Given the changes that have occurred during the life of the EAGLE program, it appears the full and open opportunities are limited. Given these limited opportunities, the annual average dollar value requirements, specifically for large installations that are being set aside seem unrealistic for small business to meet. Please identify the opportunities that will meet the large installation criteria and the government's procurement strategy for these installations?	Future procurements are presented at APBIs, the EAGLE website and upcoming BOA RFPs.
Sol-242	NA	When the Government initially releases a Task Order RFP and when it finally closes can take over a year. Look at Fort Lee and Detroit Arsenal as examples. We believe that the recency date should be when the Task Order RFP was initially released. Given the extensive time gaps, a firm may have great past performance that becomes no longer recent enough after spending significant resources because of Government delays.	Noted, however, the Recency definition will not change at this time.
Sol-243	NA	We suggest that the Government prepare a matrix that identifies the Volume Name and page limitation at the beginning of Section L. It appears in the Draft that there will be 4 separate Volumes. Is this correct?	Yes, that is correct. The draft language requires 4 volumes.
Sol-244	NA	Is an Offeror required to use its teammates when bidding task orders?	Reference SOL-224
Sol-245	NA	Can an offeror update its organizational capability to show an ability to perform without the use of subs in any or all functional areas? Is this done through the same process used to add teammates?	BOA holders who wish to have a new approach evaluated, including adding or changing teammates, may do so during the annual review of the BOA or in response to a special/emergent requirement BOA RFP.
Sol-246	NA	Can offers update or add past performance references to their BOA during the Open Season period?	Please reference Sol-30.
Sol-247	NA	How does the Government calculate transition-in/-out costs relative to award? For example, an incumbent's pricing will typically be lower than another offeror's because of lower transition-in costs? How does the Government maintain a best value determination if there is such a price difference?	An Offeror's cost proposal is evaluated IAW FAR 15.404-1, Proposal Analysis Techniques.
Sol-248	NA	In several places throughout Section L, the Government indicates its preference for offerors to use font sizes of 12 or larger. a) Does the same preference apply to graphics where the offeror has no control over font size? b) Does this font-size preference apply to graphics and tables? Can the offeror use small fonts for table footnotes and the like? c) Does this font size requirement apply to the required headers and footers (company name, volume name/number, date, etc.)? d) Where the Government does not indicate a preference for font size, is there a font size requirement (i.e. Volume 1)?	Please Reference Sol-18
Sol-249	NA	Comment: font size requirements for Organizational Diagram. Please consider adjusting the font size/page requirements. This is especially true considering the requirements for same, e.g., level of detail. Suggestion/recommendation - no smaller than 8-point font assuming the page limit remains at four/4.	Please Reference Sol-18
Sol-250	NA	Does the evaluation as "the lowest evaluated (reasonable and realistic) priced proposal that is determined Technically Acceptable with Substantial Confidence in past performance" mean that this is Low Price Technical Acceptable (LPTA) evaluation?	Please reference SOL-216
Sol-251	NA	Will substantial confidence be determined at the Task Order level?	Yes.
Sol-252	NA	If the BOA holder chooses not to submit additional past performance, but rely on the past performance submitted in the EAGLE STEP 2 proposal, the Government will need to provide this confidence rating. Will this be provided to each offer now?	Past performance evaluations will be conducted IAW the applicable Task Order RFP and confidence ratings will be determined at that time.
Sol-253	NA	Does every BOA holder have substantial confidence in the past performance citations submitted under BOA Step 2?	The BOA Past Performance Evaluations were conducted on an Acceptable/Unacceptable basis and was not assigned a Confidence Rating. Please reference Sol-252.

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Sol-254	NA	Section L & M reference contract type as FFP (transition in) and CPFF. Are all future task orders going to be competed as this contract type structure?	Contract Type and CLIN Structure will be determinant on each Task Order RFP. Offerors should reference the actual language and corresponding attachments for the applicable Task Order RFP.
Sol-255	NA	Can the Government better define substantial confidence?	The definition for Substantial Confidence was obtained from the DOD Source Selection Guide.
Sol-256	NA	Will all potential subcontractors have access to ASFI BRS?	Please refer to the ASFI BRS Vendor Guide for system requirements.
Sol-257	NA	Suggestion/Recommendation - in furtherance of the USG's primary goals/objectives (e.g., ease of administration, i.e., no. of BOA Holders, increase competition & reduce no. of protests and realize Customer cost-savings) respectfully request the USG seriously consider scrapping their subject requirements and streamline the acquisition/evaluation process, e.g., make all TORFPs LPTA requiring all offerors to price the IGE and evaluate same as their Total Evaluated Price. Another example/possibility would be a PPT (Price Performance Tradeoff) IAW FAR 15.101-1 eliminating the need for a technical proposal. Additionally, there are other more viable options/alternatives based on adjustment of the type/kind of contract vehicle IAW FAR Part 16, e.g., Labor Hour IAW FAR Part 16.6.	Noted
Sol-258	NA	"(USE ONLY WHEN APPLICABLE. IF REMOVED, RE-NUMBER PARAGRAPHS ACCORDINGLY.)". Please consider just putting "N/A" or "Reserved" vice renumbering - saves a lot of time.	Noted - The Government will not be renumbering the paragraphs as originally planned. It will be placing an N/A in the paragraphs that are not applicable to the specific task order.
Sol-259	NA	Respectfully request that subject/above feedback be a Major Agenda Item @ the 06-May BOA Holder's Meeting.	Noted
Sol-260	M.4.2 8(b)(ii)	<p>LARGE INSTALLATION: Maintenance: Offeror Reference - \$6M average annually; Major Subcontractor/ Teammate performing 20% or more of the total value of the contract – \$1.2M average annually Supply: Offeror Reference - \$6M average annually; Major Subcontractor/ Teammate performing 20% or more of the total value of the contract – \$1.2M average annually Transportation: Offeror Reference - \$5M average annually; Major Subcontractor/ Teammate performing 20% or more of the total value of the contract – \$1M average annually Total \$17M average annually</p> <p>Comment/Question: Request the government consider remove or reduce the dollar value relevancy test for the Prime contractor's Past Performance. The annual dollar value relevancy test limits competition and will restrict many credible Unrestricted and Small Business BOA Holders from competing for this Task Order. There is no reason to further restrict competition for a Task Order that is limited to BOA holders who have already proven that their Past Performance is relevant. If these Past Performance relevancy requirements remain in effect, many small and large business BOA holders will not be able to bid any EAGLE Large Installation opportunities. We believe this limits competition by imposing uniform, blanket dollar-based past performance thresholds across all Large Installation opportunities released under EAGLE. This action to limit competition to a few extremely large vendors is prejudicial and expressly prohibited under subsection 48 CFR 16.703(d)(ii).</p>	This is not the Government's intent. Please reference Sol-66 for rationale of the magnitude and complexity determination.
Sol-260	NA	Does the USG have an anticipated posting date for responses to questions to the EAGLE Website, e.g., advance of 06-May BOA Holder's Meeting?	Responses will be posted as soon as possible.

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Tech-01	L.5 2.1.1(b)(1)	“Ability” to properly staff/organize the required effort by providing... Comment: A contractor will describe its ability (i.e., corporate capability) and will not provide the specific plan for this contract. USG should clarify to represent what it is actually looking for.	Acknowledged. The intent is for the offeror to describe the effort being solicited. Section L has been updated accordingly.
Tech-02	L.5 2.1.1(b)(2)	Skill Level Rationale by Functional Area Comment: This could be a lengthy narrative to explain staffing rationale by functional area in the level of detail requested. Page limit would have to be significant as this is the type of requirement that equals Basis of Estimate narratives. This will be a burdensome exercise for an LRC proposal.	Acknowledged. The intent is for the offeror to provide its overarching methodology. Section L has been updated accordingly.
Tech-03	L.5 2.1.1(b)(2)	This is confusing and should be deleted. The Government’s assumption that there is a simple logic that can be applied at the functional (e.g. supply, maintenance, transportation) level that explains the selection of why the Offeror proposes a certain level of labor categories is flawed, as these are made specific to individual technical requirements. To provide this level of information will require the addition of a significant number of pages (5 or more) to the technical proposal page limitations.	Acknowledged. The intent is for the offeror to provide its overarching methodology. Section L has been updated accordingly.
Tech-04	L.5 2.1.1(c)(4)	Need to spell out FLC1/FLC2 and reference the subparagraphs on the following page. It is also important that the Government understand that how a BOA holder opts to use SCA, CBA, and/or Exempt Positions is part of the Offeror’s Technical Solution, so the Government needs to honor and evaluate that solution rather than attempt or define all proposed exempt positions as FLC2. Such a position is not consistent with either best business practices or Army MTOE/TOEs.	Exempt positions are not 'automatically' FLC2. Offerors must determine the functional labor category and must also determine the applicability of the FLSA / CBA. L.5.2.1.1(c)(5)(ii) and L.5.2.1.1(c)(5)(iii) have been updated to reflect this.
Tech-05	L.5 2.1.1(c)(5)	Question: Can the USG provide additional guidance for indirect hours (i.e. Production Control, Technical Inspection, Allied Trades and Shop Supply)?	The term 'indirect' is no longer in use. If employees meet the definition of: <i>... employees that are specifically identified to directly accomplish the tasks / functions ...</i> then those employees are FLC1. Please see updated L.5.2.1.1(c)(5).
Tech-06	L.5 2.1.1(c)(9)(iv)	Non-concur. This paragraph does not reflect L.5.2.1.1(c)(5)(ii); contradicts L.5.2.1.1(b)(2), L.5 2.1.1(c)(4), and L.5 2.1.1(c)(9)(x); as well as best business practices and Army staffing documents/logic. As written, this does not allow for working leads (Level III as per L.5.2.1.1(b)(2)) or allocation of work between FLRC1 and FLRC2 as per the example in draft Attachment 0002. Additionally, L.5.2.1.1(c)(9)(iv): i. Does not allow the Offeror to Propose the best possible technical solution based on their experience and technical expertise, ii. Is not consistent with Army staffing documentation, iii. Forces the Offeror to use a top heavy management structure, iv. Will significantly increase the proposed and actual costs to the Government v. Is not in keeping with Best Business Practices, and vi. Completely invalidates the solid logic the Government developed by creating the FLC1 and FLC 2 position coding for use on Attachment 0002. Recommendation: Revise L.5 2.1.1(c)(9)(iv) as follows: L.5 2.1.1(c)(9)(iv) The Offeror must insert FLC1 or FLC2 for all proposed positions. Please note that the Offeror may opt to allocate part of the man-hours for management/supervisory personnel between FLC1 and FLC2 as supported by their technical approach based on functional task requirements. Attachment 0002 must reflect such allocation by identifying by FLC less than a full position (e.g. 0.45 FTE). Non-direct support employees, defined as managers, supervisors and other employees required supporting the requirement but not specifically performing direct workload man-hours shall not be identified as FLC1. The hours associated with FLC2 Employees, in whole or part, will not count toward the total minimum hours specified in L.5.2.1.1(c)(7).	Acknowledged. Leads may be productive and Section L has been updated accordingly. Please refer the updated language now located at L.5.2.1.1(c)(6)(vii).

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol-xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Tech-08	L.5 2.1.1	The staffing and management plan within the Technical Volume appears to be the only place in the RFP where a basis of estimate is requested. This document is to be in Word or Adobe PDF Format. Does this mean that the Government does not expect to see a Basis of Estimate at the PWS level, but merely at the functional area level (i.e. maintenance, supply and transportation) instead? Does this top-level explanation give the Government everything it needs to determine whether a bid is Technically acceptable or not? If a more detailed BOE is expected or desired, where should it be presented and in what format? Should offerors not include any sort of BOE in their cost narratives? Does it benefit the evaluation in any way if the offeror provides a basis of estimate at a lower level (e.g. 2nd level PWS)? What is the Government looking for by way of a BOE?	A formal BOE is not requested or required. Section L has been updated to reflect this. The requirement is for the offeror to supply its <u>overarching</u> methodology for determining its proposed skill set(s) / skill level(s) determination by Functional Area.
Tech-09	L.5 2.1.1(a)(1) and L.5 2.1.3(a)(1)	Are the staffing and management plan (L.5.2.1.1.a.1.) and the organization diagram (L.5 2.1.3(a)(1)) supposed to be separate documents? It seems that as standalone documents, neither document would make much sense. If the documents are in the same file together (with a narrative of capabilities), then the documents support the proposal assertion of the ability to perform the work.	The staffing and management plan and org diagram are separate documents. Offeror's are allowed to reference the OD or Attachment 0002 in the Staffing and Management Plan, if they so choose.
Tech-10	L.5 2.1.1(b)(2)	The Government requires the Offeror's proposed skill set/skill level determination by Functional area which adequately describes the Offeror's methodology for determining skill level required in order to ensure proper execution of the effort. In other words, describe how the Offeror determines whether to propose a SCA Level III vs. a SCA Level II. Comment: The above requirement is addressed under paragraph L.5.2.1.1(b)(2), which addresses the Offeror's Staffing and Management Plan. It does not indicate any specific page count or format. Recommend the Government provide the level of detail for the requirement and provide adequate page count.	The draft document provided to industry did not include page counts as specific page counts will be provided with each RFP. Page counts will be based on complexity of the requirement. The file format has been provided at L.5.2.1.1(a)(2); L.5 2.1.1(b)(2) has been updated addressing the methodology.
Tech-11	L.5 2.1.1(b)(4)	Transition in Approach: According to Page 8, L.5.2.1.1, the Transition in plan is to be part of the Staffing and Management Plan, which, according to Page 8, L.5.2.1.1(a)(3), will have a specific page requirement. We recommend the transition-in plan be considered a separate sub paragraph of the staffing and management plan with its own page count limitations allowing for a more detailed approach.	There will not be a change to the transition plan requirement at this time.
Tech-12	L.5 2.1.1(c) Staffing/Labor Mix (Attachment 0002 – Staffing/Labor Mix)	Paragraph L.5 2.1.1(c) reads: " <i>The Offerors must provide its proposed staffing/labor mix in relation to the PWS requirements and the provided workload data (see applicable Technical Exhibits; specifically Exhibit X TE 5-001 M-S-T) for both the base period and option periods (fully operational capable 12-month periods.) The Offeror's proposed approach must present a staffing approach which demonstrates an understanding of this effort and provides its expected skill level, to include level of responsibility, to properly perform all of the PWS requirements.</i> " Comment: In the past the workload data provided for the maintenance functional has consistently not been aligned to the maintenance tasks as presented in the PWS. With the exception of the workload data provided for the Fort Huachuca LRC Task Order, maintenance workload provided to offerors on all other Task Orders only reflects "direct Labor hours" for man-hours supporting shop operations/direct wrench turning. While this is consistent with how labor is reported in SAMS, it does not reflect/address the FLC1 man-hours associated with the other maintenance tasks in the PWS; specifically PWS Tasks 5.5 -Allied Trades, 5.6 -Technical Inspections, 5.7 - Repair Parts & Material Mgmt, 5.8 - Production Control, 5.9 - Indirect Supporting Functions/Tasks, and 5.10 - Maintenance Operations Funds Mgmt. Because no productive man-hours are allocated to these tasks in the "Technical Exhibits" there is no way for an offeror to accurately address workload and assign substantiated staffing to these tasks as required under this Section L Paragraph. Broad statements provided with workload exhibits such as "Man-hours below include other indirect requirements including technical inspections, tool and parts mgmt.....etc.,. do not adequately address the requirements for these tasks.	The Government provides the best data available at the time of RFP issuance and will take the workload data suggestion under advisement.

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Tech-13	L.5 2.1.1(c)(5)(i)	Appears this section contains a typographical error - "Full Time Equivalents (FTEs Full Time Equivalents (FTEs):"	Thank you. Corrected. Please see updated L.5.2.1.1(c)(5)(i).
Tech-14	L.5 2.1.1(c)(5)(i)	Recommend the Government consider the use of the term "Hours per Period" in lieu of "Hours per Year" for these titles/descriptions on both Attachment 0002 worksheets. This change would appear to provide more flexibility/accuracy.	The comment is noted; however, the Attachment 0002 is based on one year. Therefore the data is required to be one year. With the base period being less than one year, offerors must adjust the FTE count accordingly.
Tech-15	L.5 2.1.1(c)(5)(ii) and L.5 2.1.1(c)(5)(iii)	In an effort to clearly define FLC1 vs. FLC2 employees, request confirm that all personnel assigned to the Project Management Office are FLC2 employees.	The precise status of Project Management Office Employees cannot be confirmed. Employees that meet the definition of FLC2 will be considered as such. Please see the updated definition at L.5.2.1.1(c)(5)(iii).
Tech-16	L.5 2.1.1(c)(5)(ii) and L.5 2.1.1(c)(5)(iii)	<p>In an effort to clearly define FLC1 vs. FLC2 employees in the Maintenance functional area, request the Government provide clarification on the status of the following Maintenance positions/LCATs:</p> <p>Workload is typically listed by repair shop/work center and includes only estimates for direct maintenance personnel (only personnel loading their man- hours into SAMS-IE work order data IAW AR 750-1). Request the Government clarify if this is true for the workload being provided under this requirement?</p> <p>Please confirm that working Leads are considered FLC1 positions by the Government.</p> <p>Please confirm that Technical Inspectors are FLC1 positions and Quality Control personnel are considered FLC2 positions by the Government.</p> <p>Please confirm that personnel assigned to the Maintenance management staff (Managers, Supervisors, Administrative Assistance) are considered FLC2 ions by the Government.</p> <p>Please confirm that SAMS-IE operators, production control personnel, shop/bench stock personnel, and property accountability personnel are considered FLC2 ions by the Government.</p>	The Government confirms that leads and technical inspectors (maintenance) may be proposed as FLC1. For all other labor categories in question, please see L.5.2.1.1(c)(5)(ii) and L.5.2.1.1(c)(5)(iii) as the definitions have been updated.
Tech-17	L.5 2.1.1(c)(5)(ii) and L.5 2.1.1(c)(5)(iii)	<p>In an effort to clearly define FLC1 vs. FLC2 employees in the Supply & Transportation functional areas, request the Government provide clarification on the status of the following Supply & Transportation positions/LCATs:</p> <p>Workload is typically listed by work center and includes minimum direct hours, supported with transactional activity data.</p> <p>Please confirm that personnel assigned to the Supply & Transportation management staff (Managers, Supervisors, Administrative Assistance) are considered FLC2 positions by the Government.</p> <p>Please confirm that all other personnel are considered FLC1 positions by the Government.</p>	The Government cannot confirm that 'all other' employees are either FLC1 or FLC2. Please see the updated definitions at L.5.2.1.1(c)(5)(ii) and L.5.2.1.1(c)(5)(iii).
Tech-18	L.5 2.1.1(c)(5)(ii) and L.5 2.1.1(c)(5)(iii)	The Government has the best knowledge of the total staffing requirements (i.e., combine FLC1 and FLC2), followed by the incumbent contractor. Providing minimum hour requirements for FLC1 employees assists the Government in obtaining the minimum required workforce and minimizes the number of Evaluation Notice (EN) to resolve any staffing level inconsistencies. This also helps partially offset the institutional knowledge advantage of incumbent contractors, who know the requirements based on several years of execution, while allowing all offerors to propose their most efficient and effective skill mix for that labor force. Under a Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee (CPFF) contract type, that FLC1 workforce and its associated costs will fluctuate based on the actual requirements in execution. That same methodology can be applied to encompass FLC1 and FLC2 employees. Request the Government consider providing minimum hours for the TOTAL FTE staffing (or separate FLC1 and FLC2 if desired) for proposal evaluation purposes. This would establish the CPFF ceiling amount for labor, eliminate the need for interpreting the FLC1/FLC2 status of position (as previously noted) and ensure the Government gets the staffing they desire to meet the each requirement.	The recommendation is noted; however, there will be no change at this time.

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Tech-19	L.5 2.1.1(c)(5)(ii), L.5 2.1.1(c)(5)(iii) and L.5.2.1.1(c)(6)	In many of the past requirements, Exhibit "X" TE 5-001-M-S-T has been accompanied by separate Technical Exhibits (TEs) containing FY workload data by functional area. This has caused confusion regarding the workload requirements since the workload in these separate TEs has often varied from the Exhibit "X" TE 5-001-M-S-T. Since offerors must propose the minimum hours provided in Exhibit "X" TE 5-001-M-S-T, request the Government eliminate other workload TEs from the solicitation package.	Issue noted. The Government provides the best workload data available at the time of issue of the RFP and will begin providing updated formats to the data and align the data with TE 05-001.
Tech-20	L.5 2.1.1(c)(5)(ii & iii), L.5 2.1.1(c)(9) Staffing/Labor Mix (Attachment 0002 – Staffing/Labor Mix), and EAGLE Attachment 0002 - Staffing Labor Mix Final 25Mar14.xlsx	L.5 2.1.1(c)(5)(ii) and (iii) define Functional Labor Category 1 (FLC1) FTEs as "Contract or task order level employees that are specifically identified in direct support of the workload provided in Exhibit X TE 5-001-M-S-T. (e.g. mechanic in support of the maintenance effort)"; and Functional Labor Category 2 (FLC2) FTEs as "Contract or task order level employees required for the completion of RFP requirements, but do not directly perform the tasks / functions of the workload provided in Exhibit X TE 5-001-M-S-T. FLC2 employees may be required by the RFP, regulation, or the Offeror's business practices, but are not directly supporting the workload (e.g. project manager, administrative assistant)". Per the example provided in the EAGLE Attachment 0002 - Staffing Labor Mix Final 24Mar14 the Government is implying that all Exempt positions would fall under FLC2. This may not be the case. Comment: There is at least one example so far in an EAGLE Task Order where an exempt position would have to be considered an FLC1 FTE. The Detroit Arsenal PEWS established an requirements for as application Database Manager the PWS paragraph (5.16.2) specifically stated: "The contractor shall provide a full time on-site, properly qualified, Application Database Manager (ADBM) to utilize a Government provided automated system, Hazardous Material Management System (HMMS) to track, control, report usage by quantity, customer and dates, and disposition/disposal information and dates. The ADBM must have not less than 7 years specific experience and applicable education that supports this position. This is not an SCA position. ". Since this position is required by the PWS and is in direct support of the workload, it would qualify as an FLC1, even though the PWS specifically says it requires a greater level of qualification and education than under the SCA.	Please see Tech-04.

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Tech-21	L.5 2.1.1(c)(5)(ii & iii), L.5 2.1.1(c)(9) Staffing/Labor Mix (Attachment 0002 – Staffing/Labor Mix), and EAGLE Attachment 0002 - Staffing Labor Mix Final 25Mar14.xlsx	<p>L.5 2.1.1(c)(9)(x) The Offeror must clearly identify all FTEs that are cross utilized FTEs, or, in other words, when a portion of an FTE is applicable to an FLC1 labor category and a portion of the same FTE is also applicable to an FLC2 labor category. These employees must be listed on the Attachment 0002 – Staffing/Labor Mix in all applicable locations (e.g. part time worker (FLC1) and part time manager (FLC2)) with the appropriate percentage of hours applicable to each labor category expressed as a decimal (not to exceed two decimal places to the right of the whole number). (See ‘Example Tab’ contained in Attachment 0002 – Staffing / Labor Mix.) EAGLE Attachment 0002 provides an example of how to propose a split FLC1 and FLC2 employee. Under this example the FLC1 fractional FTE is shown against a CBA/SCA position (Supply Technician (Lead)) and the FLC2 fractional FTE against an exempt position (Supply Supervisor (Medical)).</p> <p>Comment: This example requires the offeror to mix an FTE between exempt and non-exempt labor categories. Not only does this further imply that exempt labor categories do not perform FLC1 work, but also complicates the staffing and pricing solution. There are offerors who have been using working supervisors in their workforce as a good business practice for a long time. These employees do not punch a clock when they start performing FLC1 type tasks at an hourly wage and then punch out when they perform FLC2 type tasks as a salaried exempt employee. They are exempt employees who are paid and draw benefits as exempt employees. Of particular concern is how an offeror is to split an employee, as stated in the above example, between FLC1 hours as CBA position and FLC2 hours as an exempt employee. CBAs have significantly differing annual productive hours, and fees that are not an element in an exempt overhead pricing model.</p>	Please see Tech-04.
Tech-22	L.5 2.1.1(c)(5)(ii & iii), L.5 2.1.1(c)(9) Staffing/Labor Mix (Attachment 0002 – Staffing/Labor Mix), and EAGLE Attachment 0002 - Staffing Labor Mix Final 25Mar14.xlsx	<p>Recommendation: Request the Government consider not requiring offerors to split positions for employees who are generate both FLC1 and FLC2 man-hours between exempt and non-exempt labor categories. Request that they allowed to position and price these positions as exempt positions with one line entry reflecting the proposed FLC1 man-hours and a second line reflecting the proposed FLC2 man-hours. Also to facilitate the Government desire to capture the FLC1 hours proposed in the Attachment 0002 Staffing Labor Mix) file, recommend that each staffing worksheets be split into two sections Section 1(with rows x to n) will contain all the FLC1 FTEs (to the nearest 100th) with a sum row at row n+1. Section 2 would begin at row n+3 and go to row z reflecting all the FLC2 position FTEs with a sum row at row z+1 and a Total FTE row at row z+2 that adds the totals from row n=1 and z+1 to give the total FTE count. Under this model you would use the same columns as before so totals would be provided for each shop/PWS task area as currently required.</p> <p>Question: If the Government does not accept the above recommendation regarding the identification of employees contributing under both FLC1 and FLC2, will the Government provide specific instructions in Section L Paragraph L.5.4 on how to price these positions.</p>	Please see Tech-04.
Tech-23	L.5 2.1.1 (c) (9) (iv)	To cut cost and build in efficiencies some Lead Positions may be "Working Leads" and should be considered as FLC1.	Acknowledged. Working leads may be FLC1. Section L has been updated, information now located at L.5.2.1.1(c)(6)(vii).
Tech-24	L.5 2.1.1(c)(9)(iv)	Suggest that Government further clarify definition of FLC1 vs. FLC2 labor categories by supplying a list of acceptable FLC1 labor categories. Any labor categories not on the list should be classified as FLC2 unless offeror obtains advance approval via Q&A in advance of submission, which all offerors can see, to add additional specific LCATS and treat them as FLC1. This will eliminate confusion with regard to which categories count towards the minimum and which don't.	FLC1 and FLC2 classification must be provided by the offeror. The definitions supplied have been updated following industry comment. Offerors may pose specific questions during the draft RFP if necessary.
Tech-25	L.5 2.1.1(c)(9)(iv)	Suggest that Government level the playing field with regard to indirect labor by treating such expenses as fixed. This would prevent offerors from deliberately underestimating indirect expenses in order to keep price artificially low.	Suggestion noted; however, there will not be a change at this time.

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Tech-26	L.5.2.1.1(c)(9)(iv)	<p>The Offeror must insert FLC1 or FLC2 for all proposed positions. Please note: In accordance with L.5.2.1.1 (c) (5) (ii), management (e.g. managers, supervisors, and leads) and other indirect support employees are not considered FLC1: therefore, employees incorrectly identified as FLC1 will not count toward the total minimum hours specified in L.5.2.1 (C) (7).</p> <p>According to Sample Attachment 0003 Joint Base Langford-Wahl, it depicts a supply technician lead performing both direct and indirect functions. Can we assume that leads can perform direct functions and those labor hours may count toward the FLC1 proposed hours?</p>	Working leads may be FLC1. Section L has been updated, information now located at L.5.2.1.1(c)(6)(vii).
Tech-27	L.5.2.1.1(c)(9)(iv); EAGLE Attachment 0002 - Staffing Labor Mix Final 25MAR14	<p>"Lead" employees are normally working leads. The "Lead" designation merely denoting the assignment of primary responsibility for team leadership or assignment of complex tasks requiring more than one employee of the same category, or minor amounts of work performed in the capacity as union shop steward. In most CBAs, "Lead" positions are clearly spelled out within the terms of the CBA as workers with minor responsibilities beyond the workload (e.g., assignment of work from shops to himself and/or other employees, encompassing less than 5 percent of the employee's daily time). The Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), which guides SCA wage determinations and provisions such as exempt v. non-exempt, terms "executive" positions as those whose MAIN function is to supervise a department, and in addition, have authority to effect employment status including hiring, terminating, demoting, promoting, reassigning employees. The Government's attempt to split some workers into "management" and "productive" will result in all offerors being required to make arbitrary judgements as to when a "lead" worker is "productive" and "administrative" (e.g., does the mere act of handing a work order to a shop employee to assign a repair action make the employee handing off the paper an "administrator" or "supervisor")? This will unquestionably yield an extremely wide range of results amongst all offerors, and the Government may have to make a judgement on the actual percentage of time required for "administrative" duties such as this, which would undoubtedly be questioned and perhaps protested by one or more losing offerors. In addition, the terms of CBAs make it unlikely that ANY union would agree that part of a bargaining unit employee's time would be considered as "exempt" and having the authority to affect the employment status of other CBA employees including hiring, terminating, demoting, and promoting them. In addition, employees themselves would at some point contest these terms, taking both the contractor and the Government into a long and possibly costly arbitration action to resolve employment disputes with the contention that an employee cannot be both exempt and non-exempt. A host of other issues regarding classifying employees as both exempt and non-exempt are also affected by this clause, including the payment of CBA/SCA health and welfare money, conflicts between holiday, vacation, and PTO allowances of union agreements and contractor corporate policies; worker's compensation laws of many states, which may hold that ALL hours of the employee are subject to the highest premium rate worked; etc. Divorcing "lead" employees from productive work would have the direct effect of forcing offerors to staff each and every department and shop with a non-working employee directly required to supervise and oversee work in that department or shop. This will significantly drive up costs to the Government in the form of excessive non-productive hours to satisfy the Government's determination of "lead" positions as management, while conforming to union agreements restricting non-bargaining unit employees from performing productive work. To this end, will the Government remove the word "lead" from L.5.2.1.1(c)(9)(iv), thus allowing offerors to provide organizational and employment structures that currently exist within the union agreements? If it is the desire of the Government that each and every department, shop or major function be supervised and administered by an exempt employee, would it so state within the Statement of Work and verify how such requirements may be fulfilled with minimal added cost to the Government (i.e., percentage of full-time exempt employee required to manage physically separated functions)?</p>	Working leads may be FLC1. Section L has been updated, information now located at L.5.2.1.1(c)(6)(vii).
Tech-28	L.5.2.1.2 Mission Essential Contractor Services:	Comment: There is currently no file format provided for this Section L Requirement.	Thank you. Corrected. Please see updated L.5.2.1.2.
Tech-29	L.5.2.1.2(b)	Will the Government provide more specific information for what elements should be addressed in the Mission Essential Contractor Services plan? The MECS list included in Task Order release is often inclusive of the majority of the Performance Work Statement (PWS) task areas and many of the PWS tasks are very complex and require detailed on-site analysis to develop adequate contingency plans that cannot be addressed within a 2 page document.	Offerors must provide, at a minimum, what is required by the RFP. The final MECS will be required from the successful offeror following award.

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Tech-30	L.5.4.2.5	Section L.5.4.2.5 - Table of Full time Equivalents states that offeror shall provide references for the calculations of FTEs and associated pricing for those FTEs. Since pricing information is already provided as part of the cost proposal (Section L.5.4.2.7), please confirm that table of FTEs should be inclusive only of total hours and FTEs by primary task areas and labor category for prime and each of the proposed subcontractors.	The consolidated FTE table is required to assist in the validation that the staffing in the technical proposal and cost proposal match. The consolidation is to ensure the staffing for prime and for all subs are in one place. The Table of FTEs is only to detail hours and FTEs by position title.
Tech-31	L.5.4.2.5(a) Naming Convention: Offeror's_Name_Vol_4_FTEtable	Suggest eliminating requirement for FTE table since all of this information is already required in Attachment 002 and offerors are required to make sure the FTE table matches Attachment 002. The extra file provides no additional value.	Please reference Tech-30
Tech-32	Pages 32 and 33, M.4.2 8 - Relevancy	<p>Paragraph M.4.2.8(b)(ii) states "<i>In order to determine if a reference is similar in magnitude and complexity to the Ft. XXXX Task Order, the Annual Average Dollar value must meet or exceed the minimum level of relevant experience identified below:</i></p> <p>LARGE INSTALLATION: <i>Maintenance: Offeror Reference - \$6M average annually; Major Subcontractor/ Teammate performing 20% or more of the total value of the contract – \$1.2M average annually</i> <i>Supply: Offeror Reference - \$6M average annually; Major Subcontractor/ Teammate performing 20% or more of the total value of the contract – \$1.2M average annually</i> <i>Transportation: Offeror Reference - \$5M average annually; Major Subcontractor/ Teammate performing 20% or more of the total value of the contract – \$1M average annually</i> Total \$17M average annually</p> <p>MEDIUM INSTALLATION: <i>Maintenance: Offeror Reference - \$1M average annually; Major Subcontractor/ Teammate performing 20% or more of the total value of the contract – \$200K average annually</i> <i>Supply: Offeror Reference - \$1.2M average annually; Major Subcontractor/ Teammate performing 20% or more of the total value of the contract – \$240K average annually</i> <i>Transportation: Offeror Reference - \$1M average annually; Major Subcontractor/ Teammate performing 20% or more of the total value of the contract – \$200K average annually</i> Total \$3.2M average annually</p> <p>SMALL INSTALLATION: <i>Maintenance: Offeror Reference - \$0.5M average annually; Major Subcontractor/ Teammate performing 20% or more of the total value of the contract – \$100K average annually</i> <i>Supply: Offeror Reference - \$0.6M average annually; Major Subcontractor/ Teammate performing 20% or more of the total value of the contract – \$120K average annually</i> <i>Transportation: Offeror Reference - \$0.5M average annually; Major Subcontractor/ Teammate performing 20% or more of the total value of the contract – \$100K average annually</i> Total \$1.6M average annually</p> <p>Question: Can SB BOA holders assume that based on the above relevancy requirements, that an SB Set-a-Side for installation support would always be for a Medium or Small installation?</p>	Please reference SOL-66 for rationale of the magnitude determination. Each Task Order RFP will clearly state the magnitude determination and the dollar values that apply.
Tech-33	M.4.1.4	Suggest Government state clearly whether the organizational diagram should include FTEs or not. It has been expressed in Q&A on certain bids that FTEs were not required for this table, but this was not consistently represented on other EAGLE bids to offerors.	FTEs are not required on the organizational diagram at this time. L.5.2.1.3(b)(2) has been updated accordingly.
Tech-34	Attachment 2- Staffing Labor Matrix	Per DRFP, FLC1 labor categories are to be considered direct and FLC2 labor categories are to be considered indirect. Only FLC1 LCATs count toward minimum FTEs/hour required per exhibits. Suggest that Attachment 2 be designed in such a way that upon entry offeror and Government can easily ascertain whether or not minimum hours/FTEs have been met instantaneously for each functional area. That means incorporating the minimum total hours by functional area (e.g., maintenance, supply, transportation) in the model and separating FLC2 hours in a separate section. Suggest separate tab for each functional area and a summary tab.	The Government will consider this suggestion for future requirements; however, Attachment 0002 has been updated to include an offeror supplied total of FLC1 that is calculated against the minimum required FLC1 hours. Please see updated Attachment 0002.

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Tech-35	Attachment 0002	The Government has indicated that in their evaluation of Step 3 Task Orders that the Technical and Price and General volume reviews are separate and that Technical evaluators do not see any part of the Price or General volume. Assumptions not addressed in Recommend the Government add a Tab to the Attachment 0002 that will allow offerors to include narrative text and staffing assumptions to accompany their staffing matrix. This will allow Technical reviewers to see assumptions, explanation, and rationale specifically for staffing.	Acknowledged. L.5.2.1.1(b)(2) has been updated to incorporate this concept. Please see updated language in Section L.
Tech-36	Attachment 0002	Please clearly define what CBA1 and CBA2 are to be used for.	The '1' and '2' denote separate CBAs should more than one CBA exist at a site.
Tech-37	Attachment 0002, Rows 42 to 45	Reference item states that "In accordance with Section L.5.2.1.1(iii)(r) the above labor in BOLD RED Font is meant to provide an example of how to propose a 'split' FLC1/FLC2 employee." The cited Section L paragraph appears to be omitted from the Draft Section L document, however Section L.5.2.1.1(c)(9)(x) appears to address this requirement. Please clarify.	Thank you, citation corrected.
Tech-38	Attachment 0002, Rows 42 to 45	It would appear that the identification of cross-utilized FTEs (i.e., "split" FTE) adds little value to the Staffing Matrix and that the current method (i.e., Bolded Red Text) for identifying these employees has the potential for confusion during evaluation. Cross-utilization within all elements of the workforce is paramount to the successful operation of a lean and effective solution. If a Fractional FTE requirement exists for a FCL1 labor category (LCAT), then that separate row entry should be included on the Attachment at the requisite level of effort (LOE). Similarly, if a Fractional FTE requirement exists for a FCL2 LCAT, then that separate row entry should be included on the Attachment at the requisite LOE. This should be true regardless of whether these two requirements are being met by the same or different employees. Further, if there are multiple "split" FTEs in Bolded Red Text on the worksheet, then it may result in confusion associating/evaluating the intended portions of each "Split" FTE. Request the Government consider elimination of the "split" FTE concept/requirement.	The presence of the bold red font was intended to highlight the example and was not intended for use by the offerors. The bold red font has been removed from the example to prevent confusion.
Tech-39	Attachment 0002, Labor Category, Columns A-C	Request the Government consider adding a NEW column for "Position Title" to allow for the identification of the employee's position between the current "CBA/SCA/Exempt" (Column B) and the current "Description" (Column C). The "Description" would include the mapped LCAT based on the Exempt/SCA/CBA position type and position requirements. For example, there may be a requirement for Senior Radio Repairmen, Electronic Technicians (LEAD) and COMMEL System Security Specialist all mapped to Electronic Technician Maintenance III. Identification of the different Position Titles appears appropriate in reflecting an understanding of the PWS requirements, while the proper mapping of these positions establishes the basis for pricing these FTEs.	Acknowledged. Please see updated Attachment 0002 with the updated Labor area that includes an offeror provided position title.
Tech-40	Attachment 0002, Cells D3 & F3 and Draft Section L (Global)	Recommend the Government consider the use of terms such as "per period" and "Hours per Period" consistently in lieu of "per year" and "Hours per Year" to more flexibly and accurately align with the varying periods of performance.	Please see Tech-14.
Tech-41	L.5.2.1.1.(a)(3)	Staffing and Management Plan. Based on the new requirements listed in the following sub-paragraphs will the government increase the page count to include all the requirements?	Page counts will be adjusted and determined based on the complexity of the requirement for each specific task order RFP.
Tech-42	L.5.2.1.1(b)(1)	Is it the government's expectation that we determine a percentage of time supervisors manage their time between direct and indirect operations?	Offerors must meet the requirements of the solicitation contained in sections L and M.
Tech-43	L.5.2.1.1(b)(1)	Paragraph L.5.2.1.1(b)(1) [page 8] indicates the Offeror's Staffing and Management Plan is to detail an approach for delivering services required by the RFP and PWS and is to contain an "ISO procedural integration for problem resolution." Is this requirement to be interpreted that ISO certification, such as ISO 9001:2008, will be required of Offerors for future TOs? Or is it asking for ISO equivalent procedures be integrated into the management processes?	Acknowledged. ISO certification requirements are defined in the solicitation. For efforts requiring ISO compliance (not certification) the term ISO has been removed. Please see updated L.5.2.1.1(b)(1) and M.5.1.2(a) [formerly M.4.1.2(a)].
Tech-44	L.5.2.1.1.(b)(2)	Why does the government require this information? Most of the rationale for determining a skill level requirement is based on personal and corporate knowledge of job requirements.	Rationale for skill level determination is required in order to provide a more complete 'picture' of the staffing approach.

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Tech-45	L.5 2.1.1.(b)(2)	Since the majority of the decisions on skill levels rationale and methodology is based off of gut feeling and knowledge of job requirements and should be accepted as a selection criteria. Will the government accept personal knowledge of job requirements as rationale and methodology for selecting skills levels required to perform the required tasks for various functional areas?	Offeror's may propose in accordance with it's company policies; however, failure to provide the information required in the solicitation may result in an unacceptable rating.
Tech-46	L.5 2.1.1(b)(2)	Does the government require industry to clarify skill level to justify all experience labor areas that progress from skill levels I , II to III? Will industry have to justify all skill level determinations in all functional categories when you have a logical progression of skills that are capable of performing skills at that particular level?	The government is unclear as to the exact question being posed. However, please see L.5.2.1.1(b)(2) as it has been updated following industry comments.
Tech-47	L.5 2.1.1(b)(2)	Will the government consider re-introducing a basis of estimate pages on all areas in functional areas to further articulate labor/staffing approach?	A basis of estimate will not be required at this time.
Tech-48	L.5 2.1.1.(b)(3)	Since the government is asking for all safety, training and certification requirements the government will need to provide Offerors a list of all local safety, training and certification requirements at Task Order execution level. Will the government provide this information so we can address all of these new requirements.	The Government provides the best information available with the RFP; however, please see updated language at L.5.2.1.1.(b)(3) and M.5.1 2(c).
Tech-49	L.5 2.1.1(b)(3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion: The government is requiring an adequate discussion on offeror's approach to cross Utilization, temporarily reallocate, and rapidly increase and decrease it workforce (page 8). As there are no page limits listed in this section of the draft, the assumption is made that it will follow the predecessor – (Mission Capability Narrative) of 11 Pages. If this is the intent, the previous page limit of 11 pages will not be adequate to provide the cross utilization approach in a way that would effectively articulate offerors' approach (which would include safety, training and certification). • Question: Will there be an increase (no more than 15 no less than 7) in the page limit for the staffing Plan to accommodate a detail approach that covers all areas requested. 	Page counts will be adjusted and determined based on the complexity of the requirement.
Tech-50	L.5 2.1.1.(b)(4)(iv)	Is the government expecting a list of all of the requirement associated with Joint inventories as provided in AR 710-2, AR 735-5, DA Pam 25-30 & 710-2-2?	Please refer to L.5.2.1.1(b)(4)(iv) for the specific requirement which requires the offeror's approach, not a regurgitation of the applicable ARs.
Tech-51	L.5 2.1.1(b)(4)(iv)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion: (page 9), The government added " .. action up to and including reconciliation completed prior to the end of transition-in." as a part of the approach to account for Government Furnished Equipment (GFE). Articulating in detail all that is encompassed in a joint inventory would require additional page limits on this section. This addition would allow the offeror to demonstrate not only their understanding of this requirements but also provide a detail approach to meet this requirement. • Question: Will there be additional pages added to the page count for the Approach to assuming accountability of Government Furnished Property (GFP) in order to write more details (2 additional pages). 	Please refer to L.5.2.1.1(b)(4)(iv) for the specific requirement which requires the offeror's approach, not a regurgitation of the applicable ARs.
Tech-52	L.5 2.1.1.(c)	This entire discussion is very confusing. The description provided by the government is not clear. Will the government provide a better explanation and better examples of how to fill out this chart and examples of these different categories than is currently provided?	Attachment 0002 and the associated section L contain the instructions and an example for the offeror's use.
Tech-53	L.5 2.1.1.(c)	For the attachment 0002 is the government expecting a list of FTEs and Fractional FTEs within each Functional Area.	Offeror's determine how to propose FTEs in order to meet the requirement(s) of the solicitation.
Tech-54	L.5 2.1.1(c)(4)	Will the government provide more expansive information and examples in this area since its new to the proposal and pricing process so that its clear to all who bid?	Additional examples are not available at this time. However, offeror's may pose additional questions during the draft RFP.
Tech-55	L.5 2.1.1(c).(5).(ii); L.5 2.1.1.(c).(5).(iii); L.5 2.1.1.(c).(9).(iv)	Will the government provide/designate the labor categories for FLC1 and FLC2, or is the contractor supposed make a determination as to what the government will consider FLC1 and FLC2?	Offerors must determine employees as either FLC1 or FLC2 based on the language contained in sections L and M.

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Tech-56	L.5 2.1.1(c).(5).(ii); L.5 2.1.1.(c).(5).(iii); L.5 2.1.1.(c).(9).(iv)	The Production Control and Inspection Sections are required activities in the performance of maintenance operations. However, these workers do not physically repair equipment. Are the Production Control and Inspection activities considered FLC1 or FLC2?	Please refer to L.5.2.1.1(c)(5)(ii) which indicates ... <i>Contract or task order level employees that are specifically identified to directly accomplish the tasks/functions of the workload provided in Exhibit X TE 5-001-M-S-T (e.g. mechanic in support of the maintenance effort).</i> If production control and inspections, as required by the maintenance process, are directly accomplishing the effort of maintenance as indicated on TE 5-001 then those are FLC1 positions.
Tech-57	L.5 2.1.1.(c)(5)(iii)	Is the government telling the Offeror they can not plan on using their PMO management personnel to support task order requirements if required?	Please review updated FLC1 and FLC2 language at L.5.2.1.1.(c)(5)(ii) and L.5.2.1.1.(c)(5)(iii)
Tech-58	L.5 2.1.1.(c)(5)(iii)	How is an Offeror suppose to show use of FLC2 personnel if required to meet potential/differences in projected workload data not requiring a FTE?	The government is unclear as to the exact question being posed. However, please see L.5.2.1.1(b)(2) as it has been updated following industry comments.
Tech-59	L.5 2.1.1.(c)(8)	Is the government telling Offerors they can not use Exempt Management personnel to cover down on proposed shortages of workload hours?	Please review updated FLC1 and FLC2 language at L.5.2.1.1.(c)(5)(ii) and L.5.2.1.1.(c)(5)(iii)
Tech-60	L.5 2.1.1.(c)(8) and L.5 2.1.1.(c)(9)(x)	The two referenced paragraphs provide conflicting guidance, page 8 says not to count these FLC2 employees and page 12 states to list the FLC2 labor category and appropriate applicable percentage of hours. Because of the conflicting guidance does the government want Offerors to account for projected FLC2 work in the appropriate area or not?	The paragraphs are not in conflict. Offeror's may, at their discretion and in accordance with the solicitation, propose certain FLC2 employees as both FLC2 and FLC1. However, please note that hours associated with FLC2 employees, in whole or part, will not count toward the total minimum hours and that employees incorrectly identified as FLC1 will also not count toward the minimum requirement either.
Tech-61	L.5 2.1.1.(c)(8)	Why can Offerors not use FLC2 personnel to cover down on proposed workload hours, since our managers are required to be able to perform all the same tasks as their employees?	Management is not considered FLC1 and will not be used toward meeting the minimum hours required in TE 5-001.
Tech-62	L.5 2.1.1(c)(9)(ii)	Section L.5.2.1.1(c)(9)(ii) states that no tabs are to be added to or deleted from Attachment 0002, but L.5 2.1.1(c)(3)(ii) states that the offeror shall remove no tab except the sample tab. Are offerors allowed to remove the sample tab?	Thank you. Yes, offerors are allowed to remove the example tab. The citation has been corrected.
Tech-63	L.5 2.1.1.(c)(9)(iv)	Is the government now telling Offerors how to conduct business by not allowing or having management (e.g. managers, supervisors and leads) being able to provide direct support to working requirement, when it is our business practice to do so?	Offeror's may propose in accordance with it's company policies; however, failure to provide the information required and follow the solicitation requirements, may result in an unacceptable rating.
Tech-64	L.5 2.1.2(a)(2)	L.5 2.1.2(a)(2) states that the MECS submission is limited to 2 pages, in which the offeror will demonstrate a realistic approach as to how it will continue to perform the essential contractor services listed in Attachment 0013, Mission Essential Contractor Services. We suggest that 2 pages are not sufficient to provide a realistic approach, and request this be expanded to 5 pages.	Please see Tech-29.
Tech-65	M.3.4.1., M.3.4.1(a), (b) and (c)	How is it possible to have Technically Unacceptable proposal in Step 3 that is outside of the criteria listed in a-c?	The government cannot comment on a "hypthetical" question. However, please see M.4.4.1 which states "Highly rated Technical proposals will include all proposals rated Technically Acceptable, and may also include Technically Unacceptable proposals that do not require a major revision and/or do not possess significant informational deficiencies."
Tech-66	Eagle Attachment 0002 - Staffing and Labor Mix FINAL 25 Mar 13	There is not place on the new Attachment 0002 to show where or how our proposed management team can or will provide support to meet projected workload requirements. Will the government provide a place for this or is the government telling Offerors they can not use management personnel plug in for shortage workload hours?	Section L provides the instructions for offerors on how to propose the effort. Please see Section L for specific instructions.
Tech-67	L.5 2.1.(c)	In L.5.2.1(c), we assume the inclusion of "Organizational Diagram" implies it will be a requirement that will be assessed on all future TOR RFPs. We concur this is a good idea.	Correct. The OD will be included.
Tech-68	L.5 2.1.1	Comment: there is an unidentified page count on the Staffing and Management Plan (SMP). This provides no context for which to determine/comment on completeness, realism & reasonableness.	Acknowledged. The government did not provide a page count with the draft for comment. Page counts will be provided with each RFP and will be determined based on the complexity of the requirement.
Tech-69	L.5 2.1.1	Question: will the SMP page count be fixed or will it change per TORFP?	Please see Tech-68

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol-xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Tech-70	L.5 2.1.1(a)(3-4)	Recommend limiting number of pages to more than 7 but less than 15 to account for larger font size and additional requirements such as Staff Management Plan.	Please see Tech-68
Tech-71	L.5 2.1.1(b)(1)	Question: Reference page 8, para L.5.2.1.1(b)(1) .."This approach must include adequate details of chain of command structures.. And ISO procedural integration for problem resolution." Please confirm/verify that ISO-certified firms will not be evaluated higher than non-certified firms? If not, respectfully consider removing reference to "ISO procedural integration" and change to internal processes, etc.	Acknowledged. Please see Tech-43
Tech-72	L.5 2.1.1(b)(2)	Rationale. Other than being found technically acceptable, we have been unable to determine whether or not the rationale we are providing is being done to a high standard. We further perceive (based on peer conversations) that not all competitors are developing the Assumptions and Rationale narrative in the same ways. Given that the Section L language states, "describe[ing] the Offeror's methodology for determining the skill level required..." it confuses even more. We could contend that our "methodology" is the same for every skill level determination we make; it does not change from position to position. Perhaps the language in this paragraph is acceptable, but it points to an issue (Rationale) that requires an updated discussion from the Government based on source selection findings. The language in this paragraph could be clearer as well.	Please see Tech-02
Tech-73	L.5 2.1.1(b)(2)	Question: Reference page 8, para L.5.2.1.1.(b)(2) .."describe how the Offeror determines whether to propose an SCA Level III vs an SCA Level II." This requirement seems redundant and unnecessary based on other requirements throughout Section L that demonstrate the staffing positions, hierarchy, identification, etc. For example, Attach 0002 which indicates Exempt, CBA, SCA and now, possible new identification of FLC1 and FLC2 for direct and indirect labor; detailed Staffing and Management Plan which "must include adequate details of chain of command structure"; FTE Table which provides FTE/headcounts by task area, labor category and SCA codes for all proposed labor; and lastly, the cross-walk (side-by-side) required in the Cost/Price Volume, providing the position titles, occupational codes, pay rates, etc.	Please see Tech-02
Tech-74	L.5 2.1.1(b)(2)	Is the rationale proposed by the offer for the skill set / skill level apply only to the SCA labor categories used for staffing? In not what other types of labor categories requires rationale for methodology used for staffing?	Please see Tech-02
Tech-75	L.5 2.1.1(b)(2)	Where a SCA title is used to describe an exempt position, is the rational proposed by the offer for the skill set/skill level apply to the those labor categories bid as exempt?	Please see Tech-39
Tech-76	L.5 2.1.1(b)(3)	The Government encourages cross utilization in order for the offeror to successfully implement a flexible staffing approach. However, cross utilization must address safety, training, and certification requirements. What, if any, training and safety courses will the Government reimburse the offeror?	The definition of reimbursable items included within Other Direct Costs can be found in the Performance Work Statement (PWS) for each individual task order.
Tech-77	L.5 2.1.1(c)(5)(iii)	Contract or task order level employees required for the completion of RFP requirements, but do not directly perform the tasks/functions of the workload provided in Exhibit X TE 5-001-M-S-T. FLC2 employees may be required by the RFP, regulation, or the Offeror's business practices, but are not directly supporting the workload (e.g. project manager, administrative assistant). Comment: Concur with the addition of the Staff Management Plan but we recommend that the Government provide examples of each category, especially FLC2 where there could be some confusion.	Additional examples are not available at this time.
Tech-80	L.5 2.1.1(c)(9)(iv)	An employee in an SCA labor category with an uplift for lead duties is expected to provide direct labor as well as provide guidance and assign work to other employees. As such, site leads with a specific labor category and job description that describes primary duties in direct labor tasks should not be excluded from direct productive hours. Would the Government please remove reference to leads not being considered FCL1 in accordance with this rationale and provide clarification in the instructions on lead positions?	Please see Tech-06

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Tech-81	L.5 2.1.1(c)(9)(iv)	Question: Reference page 11, para. L.5.2.1.1(c)(9)(iv) The Offeror must insert FLC1 or FLC2 for all proposed positions. Please note: In accordance with L.5.2.1.1(c)(5)(ii), management (e.g. managers, supervisors, and leads) and other nondirect support employees are not considered FLC1; therefore, employees incorrectly identified as FLC1 will not count toward the total minimum hours specified in L.5.2.1.1(c)(7). Please confirm that this reference eliminates Offerors proposing Working Leads?	Working leads may be FLC1. Section L has been updated, information now located at L.5.2.1.1(c)(6)(vii). Please see Tech-06
Tech-82	L.5 2.1.1(c)(9)(vi)	Requires that we insert the labor category descriptions. For SCA categories, are we required to use the Directory of Occupation labor category descriptions (which are very generic) or can we use a description specific to the tasking required by the PWS?	Acknowledged. Attachment 0002 has been updated. Please see Tech-39
Tech-83	L.5 2.1.1(c)(9)(viii)	L.5 2.1.1(c)(9)(viii) states that the offeror must insert the corresponding Shop Requirement or PWS requirement in the cells labeled "Shop Requirements" or "PWS Requirements". Will all of the functional areas be labeled with the proper correspondence workload data to ensure that the offeror is able to map correctly?	The suggestion will be considered for future RFPs.
Tech-84	L.5 2.1.3(b)(3)	Recommend rewriting this to read, "Identification of an independent quality control section."	Acknowledged. L.5.2.1.3(b)(3) has been updated to reflect this change.
Tech-85	L.5.4.2.6	In previous solicitations, it has been difficult to discern what was included in the Government's plug number for ODCs and what the contractor is expected to price. Will the Government include more detailed guidance in the appropriate PWS paragraphs?	The government will review the ODC definition.
Tech-86	M.4.1 2(b)	This brings up the same issue as referenced above for L.5.2.1.1(b)(2). *L.5 2.1.1(b)(2) Rationale. Other than being found technically acceptable, we have been unable to determine whether or not the rationale we are providing is being done to a high standard. We further perceive (based on peer conversations) that not all competitors are developing the Assumptions and Rationale narrative in the same ways. Given that the Section L language states, "describe[ing] the Offeror's methodology for determining the skill level required..." it confuses even more. We could contend that our "methodology" is the same for every skill level determination we make; it does not change from position to position. Perhaps the language in this paragraph is acceptable, but it points to an issue (Rationale) that requires an updated discussion from the Government based on source selection findings. The language in this paragraph could be clearer as well.	Please see Tech-02
Tech-87	Attachment 0002	In the Transportation section, why is the "Ship's Captain" an Exempt position included in the total "FLC1 Proposed" hours?	The example is meant to show that exempt positions may be FLC1.
Tech-88	NA	Consider prescribing labor where the labor requirements are well understood.	Noted; the government will consider this for future requirements.
Tech-89	NA	The workload provided to date has been problematic for both the government and industry. Given the format provided previously, it is difficult for industry to identify a proper skill mix for the work to be performed. Will the government provide additional detail to allow industry to better identify the proper skill mix required? For example, the government has provided projected hours for each functional area, but has not provided the detail of what activities are done to constitute the hours. Efforts expected to be accomplished are of equal or greater importance as the projected hours of performance to the contractor and enable us to find efficiencies, apply best practices and develop concepts of operation that optimize performance and deliver the best opportunities to responsibly reduce overall costs.	The government provides the best workload data available for proposal purposes. Future solicitations will contain an updated workload format.
Tech-90	NA	Will the Government be providing labor category descriptions for the CBA categories? If the Government is dictating minimum hours requirements that offerors will propose to these CBA descriptions are important.	The government does not provide this detail. Offeror's are advised to contact the collective bargaining union to obtain additional details needed.
Tech-100	NA	Why is the Government requiring offerors to bid to the minimum hours provided for maintenance, transportation and supply? Offerors may have creative solutions that would allow fewer hours to be utilized and provide lower costs to the Government. By requiring offerors to bid to the minimum hours, the Government is driving the costs up and rendering capable offerors of not being able to receive an award.	The Government has determined that in order to mitigate risk and to better ensure successful performance the core requirements must be met. The minimum hours provided represent the 'core' of the projected workload and are not complete staffing solutions. The final staffing solution is at the sole discretion of the offeror.

**Draft L and M
Questions and Answers**

Question Number (Tech - xx); (Sol - xx)	Document, Page #, Paragraph #	Question	Response
Tech-101	NA	Question: Reference to "wage survey/s" (various). Please: - Delineate which surveys are acceptable, e.g., USDOL, etc...? - Clarify if this/these requirement/s apply/ies to Exempt personnel?	Wage survey are a basis for support of the exempt labor rate. Most published wage survey providers would be considered acceptable as long as the specific information within that survey is provided with how that information was used to determine the proposed rate.