

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT			1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES 1 17
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0002	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 19-Jul-2005	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. W81W3G-0A76-0001		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY USAED - BALTIMORE 10 SOUTH HOWARD STREET BALTIMORE MD 21201	CODE W912DR	7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6) See Item 6		
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code)		X	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. W912DR-05-R-0001	
		X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 28-Jun-2005	
			10A. MOD. OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
			10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
CODE	FACILITY CODE			
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offer <input type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is not extended.				
Offer must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning _____ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.				
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)				
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.				
A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.				
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(B).				
C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:				
D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)				
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.				
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.) The solicitation for the Public-Private A76 Competition for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Information Management/ Information Technology is hereby amended as indicated on the attached page entitled, "Summary of Changes". Further, a second set of Q&A's generated from the website comment form is attached. Data on this set is highlighted in BOLD print. As a result of this amendment, the proposal due date of 23 September 2005 at 1600 hours (4:00pm) is not extended.				
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.				
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)		
		TEL: _____ EMAIL: _____		
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR (Signature of person authorized to sign)	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)	16C. DATE SIGNED 20-Jul-2005	

EXCEPTION TO SF 30
APPROVED BY OIRM 11-84

30-105-04

STANDARD FORM 30 (Rev. 10-83)
Prescribed by GSA
FAR (48 CFR) 53.243

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

Section G – Contract Administration Data:

- Paragraph regarding the Continuing Government Organization (CGO) is hereby added as follows:

CONTINUING GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION

The Directorate of Corporate Information (DCI) will provide the Information Management/Information Technology (IMIT) vision, policy, guidance and leadership for managing information resources and information technology within the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. This national organization will serve as the Continuing Government Organization (CGO) responsible for oversight and governance of IMIT investments and activities throughout the organization. DCI CGO staff will be located at approximately 28 locations. CGO staff will serve as Contracting Officer Technical Representatives (COTR) and may serve as Contracting Officers Representatives (COR) to the ITIM Service Provider. The Directorate's primary mission is to ensuring that the mandates of the Clinger-Cohen Act are implemented to include ensuring that IT investments:

- Support core mission functions and support work processes that have been redesigned or otherwise improved;
- Are consistent with the Corps Enterprise Architecture that integrates work processes and information flows with technology to achieve the Agency's mission and strategic plan;
- Reflect a portfolio management approach where decisions on whether to invest in IT are based on potential return, and decisions to terminate or make additional investments are based on performance;
- Reduce risk and enhance manageability by discouraging "grand" information system projects and encouraging incremental, phased approaches; and
- Reduce risk and enhance manageability of IM/IT projects.

The CGO and SP will establish an IM/IT partnership that focuses on providing an effective net-centric architecture, governance, portfolio management, strategy, acquisition oversight and operational capabilities.

Section H – Special Contract Requirements:

- The Agency Tender is exempt from the requirements of the special text, "REQUIRED INSURANCE" listed on page 17.

Section I – Contract Clauses:

- FAR Clause 52.248-1, Value Engineering (Feb 2000) is hereby added to the solicitation by reference.
- DFARS Clause 252.209-7000, Acquisition for Subcontractors Subject to On-Site Inspection Under the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty is hereby deleted.

Section J – List of Documents, Exhibits, and Other Attachments:

- Award Fee Plan is added as an attachment
- Department of Labor Service Contract Act Wage Decision, 94-2153 REV (35), dated 05/23/2005 for Hawaii is hereby added to the website and this solicitation.

Section K – Representations, Certifications, and Other Statements of Offerors

- FAR Provision 52.219-23, Notice of Price Evaluation Adjustment for Small Disadvantaged Business

Conerns is hereby deleted.

Section L – Instructions, Conditions, and Notice to Offerors (changes are in BOLD):

- L.3 - Advisors are revised to delete BAE Systems and add “b. **Cline-Morin Associates, 11 Stockton Street, Huntsville, AL, POC: Denise M. Cline, 256-679-6703**”.
- L.4 – Staffing matrices are excluded from the page count for Vol II, Management.
- L.4.5 – “**staffing matrices**” are added to the first sentence for “Page Limit Does Not Include”.
- L.5.1 – The wording “Section K” in the first sentence applies to offerors and does not apply to the Agency Tender, as indicated in the last sentence.
- L.5.1.5 – Sentence is corrected to read “Award Fee will be entered in CLIN 0006. The Agency Tender is excluded from completing this line item (Reference AR 5-20 paragraph 6-1k (20 April 05)) **as the award fee will not apply to the ATO. The Award Fee does not apply to the phase-in period.**”
- L.5.1.6, TAB G, Cost Information, Section 3 – Cost Substantiation Section is revised to remove the reference to A, B, C, and D and add **0001, 0002, 0003, 0004, and 0005**.
- L.8.2.1 Paragraph is revised to read:

L.8.2.1 The Past Performance Questionnaire attached in Section J shall be **completed and submitted**. This questionnaire shall be forwarded to a minimum of three (3) agencies/companies for which the offeror has performed similar services **on contracts of similar size, scope, and complexity in the areas of** Information Management and Information Technology, Automation Services and Systems Support, Communications, Information Assurance, Records Management and Record Keeping Systems, Printing and Publications, and Visual Information **and** related operations. **The offeror shall submit past performance on tracts that were in effect within 36 months of this solicitation date.** Each significant subcontractor (subcontracts of **\$2,000,000** or more) proposed for this effort shall also provide the past performance questionnaire from a minimum of **one (1)** reference. The offeror shall inform each evaluator that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District shall use their response in the evaluation of Past Performance for solicitation W912DR-05-R-0001

- L.9.2.4 The sentence starting with “Significant” is removed.
- New L.9.3 is added to indicate: “**Information required in the above paragraphs shall be provided for each proposed subcontractor who will perform a significant portion of the effort. Significant is defined for these purposes in terms of estimated dollar amount of the subcontract (e.g., \$2,000,000 or more).**”
- Current L.9.3 is renumbered to L.9.4
- L.10.3 Paragraph is revised to include the following sentence: “**The USACE strongly encourages maximum utilization of small business to include those sub-categories of small business identified below at L.10.4. A subcontracting plan participation goal of at least 25% of the total contract value is a contractual requirement and submission of a goal less than 25% will result in an unacceptable rating for that evaluation factor.**”

Section M – Evaluation Factors for Award (Changes are in BOLD):

- Factors to be Evaluated (3) Past Performance paragraph is revised to read:

(3) Past Performance - Does the offeror’s relevant past performance history indicate a pattern of conformance to contract requirements and demonstrate satisfactory performance of contracts of similar services **on contracts of similar size, scope, and complexity** and related operations for work specified in the solicitation? Does the offeror’s significant subcontractor(s) (**\$2,000,000 or more**), if any, provide relevant past performance history on similar services and related operations for work specified in the solicitation? Does the offeror demonstrate cost control experience under contracts similar in size, **scope**, and complexity to that contemplated by this solicitation?
- Factors to be Evaluated (4) Experience paragraph is revised to read:

(4) Experience - Does the offeror's experience, as a prime or major subcontractor demonstrate that they have the relevant experience on a minimum of three projects **that were in effect within 36 months of this solicitation date**? The projects must be of relevant scope, size and complexity as a prime or as a major subcontractor. Proposed significant subcontractors must also meet this minimum acceptability requirement. "Significant" is defined for these purposes in terms of estimated dollar amount of the subcontract (e.g., **\$2,000,000 or more**).

**AWARD FEE PLAN
W912DR-05-R-0001**

1.0 Introduction

This Award Fee Plan establishes an incentive system by which the service provider can earn additional profit for exceptional performance under the IMIT Support Services contract. This plan defines the criteria used to determine the amount of award fee points earned based on the assessments of the specified performance criteria. The contracting officer shall provide for any award fees earned by the contractor through unilateral contract modification. The award fee only applies to CLIN 0006.

IMIT is a complex grouping of services that continually requires balancing competing resources of time, cost, and quality. Successful performance results from the service provider effectively managing its resources to accommodate these competing demands. The USACE intends to use the award fee to focus the service provider's attention on specific IMIT performance priorities. In support of this objective the award fee criteria is divided into three (3) general areas: Customer Support, Performance Effectiveness, and USACE Mission Support. Each area is defined in general terms with associated general criteria. The USACE Award Fee Determining Official (AFDO) may add specific target areas of interests within each general category prior to the start of any award fee period.

2.0 ORGANIZATION AND RESPONSIBILITIES

2.1. Award Fee Review Board (AFRB): The AFRB and the Fee

Determining Official (FDO) constitute the award fee organizational body. The AFRB consists of a Chairperson, the Contracting Officer, a Recorder, Performance Monitors, and if necessary, other functional area participants or advisor members. Attachment 1 identifies these members. AFRB members review the performance monitor's evaluations of the service provider's performance, consider all information from pertinent sources, and arrive at an earned award fee point recommendation to be presented to the FDO. The AFRB will also recommend any changes to the award fee plan.

2.2. Fee Determining Official (FDO): The FDO approves the award fee plan and any significant changes to it. The FDO reviews the recommendation(s) of the AFRB, considers all pertinent data, and determines the award fee for each evaluation period. The FDO forwards the award fee determination to the contracting officer.

2.3. Award Fee Review Board (AFRB) Chairperson: The Chairperson chairs the AFRB meetings. The AFRB Chairperson briefs the FDO on the service provider's overall performance, the recommended award fee points for the period under review, and recommendations on award fee plan changes. The briefings will also include any data indicating the service provider's weaknesses, areas for corrective action, and examples of exemplary performance. The chairperson ensures the performance review is thorough and covers all areas required to support the award fee recommendations.

2.4. Contracting Officer: The contracting officer is the liaison between service provider and government personnel. The contracting officer reviews the award fee recommendation prior to the FDO decision. The purpose of this review is to ensure "alignment" between the recommended award fee and the service provider's performance as documented in monthly contracting officer's representative (COR) reports. Disagreements, if any, will be resolved within the AFRB before the chairperson briefs the FDO. The contracting officer will ensure the

contract file contains documentation substantiating the Award Fee Decision and will modify the contract, if necessary, to reflect the determination.

2.5. AFRB Recorder: The AFRB recorder is responsible for coordinating the administrative actions required by the performance monitors, the AFRB and the FDO. The recorder will also schedule and notify the AFRB members of the interim and end-of-period evaluation meetings.

2.6. Performance Monitors: Performance monitors are the quality assurance personnel that will evaluate and document the contractor's performance. They will maintain written records of their evaluations so a fair and accurate evaluation is obtained. Interim and end-of-period evaluation reports will be prepared and briefed to the AFRB.

3.0 AWARD FEE PROCESS

3.1. Available Award Fee Point Amount: The earned award fee points will be based on the service provider's performance during the evaluation period. There are 100 points available for each evaluation period. Up to ten additional points can be earned for each evaluation period based on process improvements identified by the service provider and accepted by the government.

3.2. Evaluation Periods: The evaluation period is 6 months. The first evaluation period will begin on the effective date of the base year performance in the contract and extend for 6 months. All subsequent award fee evaluation periods will be for the same 6-month period. After the Base Year Period the FDO may elect to change each award fee period to 12-month periods.

3.3. Interim Evaluations: During the Base Year Period interim evaluations will occur at the midpoint of each evaluation period. The AFRB recorder will notify each AFRB member and the performance monitors 21 calendar days before the interim period is complete. Performance monitors will submit their evaluation reports to the contracting officer not later than 10 calendar days after the end of the interim period. The contracting officer will review the evaluation reports for completeness and forward them to the AFRB chairperson. The AFRB will convene at the time; date and place established by the chairperson and will review available information to assess the service provider's strengths and weaknesses for the interim period. The contracting officer will provide the service provider with the interim evaluation assessment, including areas of strength and weakness.

3.4. End-of-Period Evaluations: End-of-period evaluations will occur at the end of each evaluation period. The AFRB recorder will notify each AFRB member and performance monitor 21 calendar days before the end of the evaluation period. Performance monitors will submit their evaluation reports to the contracting officer not later than 10 calendar days after the evaluation period ends. The contracting officer will review the evaluation reports for completeness and forward them to the AFRB chairperson. The AFRB will convene at the time, date and place established by the chairperson and will consider the information submitted by the following sources before making a recommendation to the FDO:

- (1) Performance monitor's evaluation reports;
- (2) Assessments or inputs from the contracting office representative, other functional area participants or advisor members; and

(3) Service Provider's self-assessment.

The service provider's self-assessment must be submitted not later than 10 calendar days after the evaluation period ends. The self-assessment shall be no more than a total 15 pages in length. After receiving the performance monitors' evaluations and reviewing all available information, each voting member shall assess a rating and point total for each of the evaluation criteria. The evaluation criteria are outlined in Attachment 2. The total number of points assessed for each criterion will be divided by the number of voting AFRB members to determine the average. The average for each criterion will then be adjusted according to its weighted percentage of the total, identified in Attachment 2. The sum of these totals will then equate to the final number of award fee points that will be recommended to the FDO for consideration. The recommendation of the AFRB shall be briefed to the FDO within 30 calendar days after the end of the evaluation period. The FDO will make a determination of the earned award fee points within 45 calendar days after the end of the evaluation period. The contracting officer will notify the service provider in writing of the FDO's determination, and if necessary, issue a unilateral modification to provide the award fee in accordance with this plan.

3.5. Evaluation Criteria: The evaluation criteria, their associated percentage of the total maximum number of points, and a summarization example for the basis of each rating factor is presented in Attachment 2.

3.5. Conversion Table: The correlation of rating to range of award points and to award fee is detailed in Attachment 3.

3.7. Points & Percentage Calculation: An example of the award fee points and percentage calculation is provided in Attachment 4.

4.0 AWARD FEE PLAN CHANGE PROCEDURES

The FDO has unilateral authority to make changes to this plan prior to the beginning of any new evaluation period that will become effective in the next evaluation period. Any change that will affect a current evaluation period must be agreed to bilaterally. Changes to this plan must be incorporated by contract modification.

5.0 ATTACHMENTS

- Attachment 1: Award Fee Organization
- Attachment 2: Evaluation Criteria
- Attachment 3: Award Fee Conversion Table
- Attachment 4: Award Fee Points & Percentage Calculation Example

Attachment 1

AWARD FEE ORGANIZATION

1. Fee Determining Official:

TBD

2. Award Fee Review Board:

a. Chairperson:

TBD

(Votes only in cases of a tie.)

b. Award Fee Review Board Members:

Voting Members:

TBD

Non-Voting Members:

- Performance Monitors
- Recorder
- Staff Judge Advocate Representative
- Other Functional Advisory Personnel (as determined necessary)

3. All voting members of the Award Fee Organization are government employees.

Attachment 2

EVALUATION CRITERIA

The evaluation criteria and their respective weightings toward the possible 100 evaluation points are as follows:

<u>Evaluation Criteria</u>	<u>Weighting Factors</u>
----------------------------	--------------------------

Comment [DM
percentages chang
shown at the end s

Customer Satisfaction	35%
Performance Effectiveness	45%
USACE Mission Support.....	20%

An additional 10 points maybe earned through process improvements:

Process Improvements Up to 15 points

Total maximum score is 110 points. Total award point scores from 100 to 110 will earn the contractor 100% of the award fee for the evaluation period. See Attachment 3, Award Fee Conversion Table.

1. **Customer Satisfaction:** The government will evaluate the service provider's customer satisfaction survey system and resultant customer survey analysis. The service provider's process of measuring customer satisfaction should be distinguish between the levels of satisfaction, with the mid level rating set to correspond to the level of acceptable/satisfactory service as measured by user expectations. A total rating should be able to be calculated monthly by taking the average of the ratings for each service area's customer satisfaction and a community-wide customer satisfaction. An annual customer satisfaction rating would be the average of the monthly ratings for 6 months. The "User Expectations" baseline will be established with the survey accomplished during the Phase-In period.

Unsatisfactory: The service provider has demonstrated a level of performance that is deficient in significant areas and received a total customer satisfaction rating below the customer's expected acceptable level. The service provider's customer satisfaction survey system and resultant analysis reports are inadequate. Immediate improvement is required.

Satisfactory: The service provider has performed in a manner that conforms to the requirements. The customer survey process being utilized is providing reliable results. Areas of good performance usually offset areas of deficiency and the service provider has received a "satisfactory" total customer satisfaction rating.

Good: The service provider has performed in a manner that meets or exceeds requirements. Areas of deficiency are few and are offset by areas of good or excellent performance. The service provider provides uninterrupted and adequate support with minimal disruption. A total customer satisfaction rating is above the satisfactory level.

Excellent: The service provider's performance clearly exceeds requirements. Deficiencies are very few and low in importance and are offset by excellent performance in other areas. The service provider actively provides follow up seeking process improvements that will increase mission support, readiness and overall customer satisfaction. Customer satisfaction is well above the good level.

Superior: The service provider's performance is truly superior and customer satisfaction clearly exceeds the excellent level with ratings at the upper limits.

2. **Performance Effectiveness:** The government will evaluate how well the service provider is meeting the identified outcomes and performance standards of the contract and quality of service. In addition, the government will assess the service provider's overall management approach and responsiveness.

Unsatisfactory: Performance of contract is inadequate and inconsistent; requiring attention and constant surveillance to ensure the mission is not affected. Fails to adapt to changing program and schedule requirements resulting in significant adverse impact. Fails to proactively manage workload and take imitative to resolve problems before the government points them out. Areas of deficiency tend to be recurring. The standard of performance is not met.

Satisfactory: Support is adequate with minimal disruption. Performance conforms to the requirements of the contract. The contractor is responsive to changing program and schedule requirements. Although there are

deficiencies these are worked with a proactive management approach and are usually offset by areas of good performance.

Good: Performance consistently meets the standards and outcomes of the contract. There are established programs and processes that identify and prevent deficiencies resulting in a quality of service at or above the minimum standard required. Minor discrepancies are offset by excellent performance in other areas. The contractor has a sound teaming approach with subcontractors to include organizational relationships and responsibilities.

Excellent: Performance is consistently at or above the standards and outcomes of the contract. Support is uninterrupted and discrepancies are resolved in an effective and timely manner. Effective performance metrics have been established, are tracked, and reported on time. Very little performance surveillance is required because of the contractor's own quality control plan. There are not recurring problems.

Superior: Performance is truly superior. Proactive management is used to identify and anticipate problems prior to any adverse impacts. Program effectively and efficiently safeguards government property, personnel and the environment. Line of communication are well defined, clearly understood, and always facilitate rapid exchanges of information.

3. USACE Mission Support: The government will assess the service provider's overall performance and responsiveness to supporting the overall USACE Mission.

Unsatisfactory: Performance of contract is inadequate and inconsistent; requiring attention and constant surveillance to ensure the mission is not affected. Fails to adapt to changing program and schedule requirements resulting in significant adverse impact. Fails to proactively manage workload and take initiative to resolve problems before the government points them out. Areas of deficiency tend to be recurring. The standard of performance is not met.

Satisfactory: Support is adequate with minimal disruption. Performance meets necessary USACE mission requirements. The contractor is responsive to changing program and schedule requirements. Although there are deficiencies these are worked with a proactive management approach and are usually offset by areas of good performance.

Good: Performance consistently meets the standards and outcomes of the contract. Minor discrepancies are offset by excellent performance in other areas. The service provider has a sound teaming approach with subcontractors to include organizational relationships and responsibilities.

Excellent: Performance is consistently at or above the standards and facilitates USACE employees effectively meeting its missions. There are not recurring problems.

Superior: Performance is truly superior. Proactive management is used to identify and anticipate problems prior to any adverse impacts to IMIT affect on USACE mission.

4. Process Improvements: The service provider may earn up to an additional 10 points per evaluation period for process improvements/recommendations that result in tangible or intangible benefits to the government. Here the service provider initiates an approach for continuous process improvement relating to improved quality, reduced costs, timeliness, etc.

Attachment 3

AWARD FEE CONVERSION TABLE

RATING	AWARD POINTS	AWARD FEE PERCENTAGE
Unsatisfactory	Not Applicable	Not Applicable
Satisfactory	0 to 73	0%
Good	74	23%
	75	26%
	76	29%
	77	32%
	78	35%
	79	38%
	80	41%
	81	44%
	82	47%
	83	50%
	84	53%
Excellent	85	56%
	86	59%
	87	62%
	88	65%
	89	68%
	90	71%
	91	74%
	92	77%
	93	80%
Superior	94	83%
	95	86%
	96	89%
	97	92%
	98	95%
	99	98%
	100-110	100%

Attachment 4

AWARD FEE POINTS & PERCENTAGE CALCULATION EXAMPLE

<u>CRITERIA</u>	Average Points Earned	<u>Weighting Factors</u>	<u>Weighted Points Earned</u>	<u>Award Fee Percentage</u>
Customer Satisfaction	79	35%	27.65	
Performance Effectiveness	83	45%	37.35	
USACE Mission Support	93	20%	18.60	
Process Improvements	2		2.00	
Total Points Earned for Evaluation Period			85.60 or 86.00	59%

Note: Points of "X.01" through "X.49" will be rounded down to "X".
Points of "X.50" through "X.99" will be rounded up to "X+1".

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS TO SOLICITATION

PWS REFERENCE	PARAGRAPH TITLE	COMMENT/QUESTION	CONTRACTING OFFICER'S DIRECT RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FURNISHED TO ALL OFFERORS VIA AN AMENDMENT NOT JUST THROUGH CHANGES IN RFP
C.1 2005:Jul:7:04:21:51	C.1	<p>What is the total expected budget for this effort? I am not looking for an exact amount, a ball park figure such as \$1 million, \$10 million, \$100 million, etc. will suffice.</p> <p>Knowing the size of the budget will help us assign the appropriate corporate resources to the effort.</p>	<p>This information, which can be found in Technical Exhibit 15, Section II, indicated in FY03 USACE expended approximately \$423,459,370 in IM/TT cost. This figure was broken out as \$121,466,930 for reimbursable, \$216,128,147 for in-house cost, and \$85,864,320 for contract cost.</p>
RFP 2005:Jul:7:15:50:48	252.242-7001	Is MEO exempt from contract clause requirements?	The MEO is not exempt from the requirements of DFARS 252.242-7001, Notice of Earned Value Management System
RFP 2005:Jul:7:15:52:23	Required Insurance	MEO is exempt from insurance requirements	A statement will be added to the pre-amble that the MEO is exempt from the Insurance Requirements.
RFP 2005:Jul:7:16:29:03	Sec H Informational text	End Items of Small Business provision seems to apply to Small Business Set-aside solicitations. Please explain the provision's application to the instant solicitation, if any.	As indicated in this clause, "If a small business assembles the system or equipment (even though the components are from large businesses), the small business can certify that it will furnish all end items which are manufactured or produced by a small business concern in the United States". The clause is intended to aid firms in correct certification of FAR Clause 52.219-1 Alt I, included in the solicitation.
RFP 2005:Jul:7:16:30:52	252.209-7000	Subject clause is marked "Reserved" in DFARS.	DFARS Clause 252.209-7000, Acquisition for Subcontractors Subject to On-Site Inspection Under the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, was removed from the regulations on 21 June 2005. This clause will be deleted from the RFP via an amendment.
RFP 2005:Jul:7:16:33:30	52.219-23	Reference D. Lee memorandum (DPAP), evaluation adjustment has been suspended.	FAR Clause 52.219-23, Notice of Price Evaluation Adjustment for Small Disadvantaged Business Concerns, will be deleted from Section K in an amendment.

RFP 2005:Jul:7:16:41:44	top para and L.6.5	4 hours of oral presentation will be videotaped. The 4 hours does not include SSEB requests for clarifications/questions.	The entire process, introductions, oral presentations, and questions and answers will be videotaped.
RFP 2005:Jul:7:16:55:01	L.6.2	"CO and other Contracting Office staff as necessary and members of the SSEB. ONLY members of the SSEB should attend oral presentations.	The Contracting Officer will make the decision on who attends the Oral Presentation.
RFP 2005:Jul:7:17:00:45	L.6.1	The Government will videotape each offeror's/tender's presentation. Who is this individual and what is his/her relationship to the SSEB? Even if automated videotaping, a person is required to change tapes during presentation.	The person video taping the presentation will be a government employee.
RFP 2005:Jul:7:18:25:44	CLIN 0003	Under "CLIN 0003 Notes", it states services that will be added to the contract after contract award. Please specify the determining factors for whether it will be cost reimbursable or fixed price? If it is cost reimbursable, please specify the cost reimbursable contract type – i.e., CPFF, CPAF, etc.	All services in a through m, on page 2 of the bid schedule are excluded from the bid and may be executed on a Cost Reimbursable basis or a Fixed Price modification as determined by the Contracting Officer.
RFP 2005:Jul:7:19:32:50	Site Visit Information	The schedule for the site visits is too late in July to allow Offerors to gather data and incorporate it into our response. Request that the site visits to the Western Processing Center and Central Processing Center be given priority and moved to early July prior to the Preproposal Conference.	Due to USACE's mission requirements and the complexity and variety of sites to be visited, the schedule can not be changed. However, the proposal due date is being extended until 23 September 2005 at 1600 hrs (4:00pm)
RFP 2005:Jul:7:19:40:11	L.5.1.6 Section 2 (Estimating System Survey)	RFP states "Submit organization charts depicting the functional areas responsible for the processing of estimating related data." Does this pertain to the people performing estimating for the proposal or for the people that will estimate during the performance of this contract?	It applies to all. This is a Corporate level system information request.
RFP 2005:Jul:7:19:44:54	Section L.7.1	The RFP requires "total number of productive man-hours and associated full-time equivalent (FTE) positions for each proposed labor category crosswalk to each third-level PWS paragraph in the PWS." We estimate this will require an excessive amount of the 150 pages allocated for the technical volume. It will be difficult to provide a comprehensive response to the requirements of this RFP to enable USACE to evaluate our understanding of capability and approaches to accomplish the stated requirements with the remaining pages. We recommend the staffing matrices be excluded from the page count.	Staffing Matrices shall be excluded in the Technical Volume page count. Change will be made via an amendment.

RFP 2005:Jul:7:19:46:27	L.9.2	The two-page limit per contract makes it difficult to adequately discuss complexities of required elements (e.g., similar transition experiences and subcontractor management) which are very important to the relevance of prime contractor contract citations. We suggest the Government increase the page limit per contract to three pages. At a minimum, we suggest that the three-page limit apply to prime offeror contracts, where these additional elements are essential to showing successes parallel to those desired on the USACE IMIT contract.	The page limit shall be increased from 2 pages to 3 pages for responses per contract. Change will be made via an amendment.
RFP 2005:Jul:7:19:47:48	L.9.2.1	The paragraph outlining relevant contracts for experience includes the following sentence: "Non-Government contracts are not available." We believe that non-Government contracts have high relevance to this procurement, particularly in the parallels between commercial outsourcing activities and the nature of A-76 bids. Does the Government intend to rate the relevance of non-Government contracts lower than those of Government contracts?	The Government will rate the relevance of non government and government contract experience equally.
C.5.5 2005:Jul:8:18:24:15	c5.5.2.3	CLIN 0004 section C.5.5.2.3 Official Mail Preparation. Postage only. Is "Postage only" defined as the cost to ship freight without labor or overhead costs. Will the government provide historical postage cost? Will the government provide cost modeling inputs (weight per shipment, average length of haul per shipment, average transit times per shipment, and average shipment dimensions)?	Freight services are outside of the scope of the PWS mail and distribution services requirement and are accomplished by the USACE Logistics Directorate. Postage Costs including Stamps, Metered postage, and Private Carrier fees: FY03 \$ 4,564,295.59 FY04 \$ 4,313,489.97 FY05 \$ 4,600,000.00 (projected)
C.12005:Jul:11:19:36:39	c.1	An excluded AIS is listed as DIMS. Is this meant to be the Laboratory Information Management System (LIMS)? If not, please identify the DIMS AIS.	Concur. Document will be changed to LIMS.
RFP 2005:Jul:14:11:00:13	RFP	Will the answers to questions provided at the site visits be posted on the website?	Yes, all questions and answers received will be posted from the one preproposal conference and each of the site visits. Additionally, all questions and answers received via the comment form for the RFP and PWS will also be posted to the website.
RFP 2005:Jul:14:11:01:02	Section B	CLIN 0006 covers the Base Period and Options but does not cover Phase-In. Please clarify.	The award fee does not cover the phase-in period. This fee starts with the Base Period, to begin on 24 February 2007

RFP 2005:Jul:14:11:11:11	L - Small Business Subcontracting Plan	Are Historically Black Colleges and Universities/Minority Institutions counted as small businesses for purposes of the Small Business Subcontracting Plan? What are the requirements/percentages/goals for subcontracting to Historically Black Colleges and Universities/Minority Institutions for the USACE procurement?	As indicated in Section L.10.4, Offerors shall indicate in their Small Business Subcontracting Plan their proposed percentages for all of the small business categories. These categories include: Small Business, Small Disadvantaged Business, Woman-Owned Small Business, HUBZone Small Business, Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business, Veteran Owned Small Business, and Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Minority Institutions.
C.5.1 2005:Jul:14:14:15:43	C.5.1.3.2	Please discuss SP "generation" of delivery orders.	SP will assist customers by performing the background research for the generation of delivery orders. It will remain the responsibility of the Contracting Office to execute delivery orders
C.5.1 2005:Jul:14:14:30:48	C.5.1.11	Please discuss SP "processing" of BPA's.	SP shall perform the administrative tracking of the requesting and receiving of funds to perform the IM/IT mission
RFP 2005:Jul:14:15:01:15	RFP	The performance period shall not end 23 February 2012 if the contract starts late.	If the contract period starts late, the performance period will be adjusted, as indicated in Section F, Special Text "Contract Performance Period". This text indicates that the dates are inclusive. Hence, they will be adjusted if the performance period does not start on 24 February 2006.
RFP 2005:Jul:14:15:04:03	RFP	In this section that states "any equipment proposed..." (requires) "a modification to the contract shall be executed", does this apply to refresh equipment that is outlined in para. 4.1? Should the Offeror's FFP for CLINs 001, 0003 and 004 not include the cost of refresh equipment, since the cost of refresh equipment would instead be funded by the govt thru contract mods?	CLIN 0004 is Government Furnished Equipment CLIN 0005 is for Service Provider Furnished Property The text on page 17 is REPLACEMENT OF GOVERNMENT FURNISHED PROPERTY Equipment is property. Government Furnished is not Service Provider Furnished. We used specific nomenclature for these items so as to distinguish them
RFP 2005:Jul:14:15:15:53	L.7.5, QCP, 2nd sentence	Should include "preventive measures."	Concur. Wording will be added to Section L.7.5.
C.1 2005:Jul:14:15:24:20	First para., collaboration will be "required"	Define "collaboration" Do they mean "consultation" IAW C.5.1.3? Not addressed as EOR, is this FP, CR, negotiated mod?	The SP will develop professional working relationships with those excluded sites that will still require certain support for the enterprise services provided by the SP. Examples would be for enterprise network

			and AIS access.
C.1 2005:Jul:14:15:26:42	C.1	Clarify and define "Infrastructure Support."	The SP will continue to operate and maintain the enterprise platforms and IT systems that support the AIS's that are considered excluded from this competition.
C.1 2005:Jul:14:15:28:19	C.1.3	SP shall accept responsibility for operational support of AISs.. Please clarify what operational support consists of	The SP will continue operational support for all existing AIS's, including those on the excluded list. This support includes insuring continuous operations of the hardware, software and communications platforms, applying security patches, loading operating system patches and upgrades, installing database system patches and upgrades, etc.
C.1 2005:Jul:14:15:32:41	C.1.4	There are references to non US work in some of the TEs including work in Kwajelin, Puerto Rico and Guam. Does this imply that these entities are exempt and as such are excluded from the fixed price base level support.?	The SP is to perform all work within the United States, unless specifically requested or required by the Government based on natural or man-made extenuating circumstances to support missions outside of the United States. It is expected that when this occurs, that an equitable compensation will be negotiated.
C.5.3 2005:Jul:14:15:53:04	C.5.3.5.2.2	Second sentence states: "The SP shall gather and compile radio equipment inventories and contract requirements, develop radio contract solicitations, and evaluate solicitation bids." Please discuss "developing" radio contract solicitations, and "evaluating" solicitation bids.	The SP will be required to develop solicitation/Request For Proposal (RFP) documentation for radio contracts and evaluate incoming bids/proposals to perform those contracts.
C.4 2005:Jul:14:17:13:12	C.4.3	Buy Out Terms does not seem to acknowledge that the agency tender may include an industry partner. It states that the agency tender is excluded however there could be buy-out issues associated with the agency tender.	The last sentence of section C.4.3 will be changed from "This requirement does not apply to the Most Efficient Organization (MEO)." To: "The Most Efficient Organization (MEO) is relieved from performing this requirement as it relates to the agency tender private sector partners."

C.5.7 2005:Jul:14:17:44:32	C.5.7	VI support may be required at Haz waste sites. This increases the liability of SP. Need to provide for health screenings, special insurance coverage, etc. Same applies to entire contract, for especially unsafe/hazardous locations where SP may be required to perform.	Required insurance and safety issues are covered in the RFP, pages 17, 18, 20, and 21 under Required Insurance, Safety and Accident Prevention and Required Insurance for Work on a Government Installation.
C.5.7 2005:Jul:14:17:45:48	C.5.7	Archiving and or question--what does this mean?????	SP will be required to maintain existing photo and video archives.
C.5.7 2005:Jul:14:17:50:02	media conversions	Define media conversions. Current usage too broad, electronic only? Not slides to electronic? etc.	This requirement covers all types of VI products and VI media, not just electronic, such as, scanning hardcopy to PDF, VHS to DVD, PowerPoint to .JPG, etc.
C.5.7 2005:Jul:14:17:58:19	C.5.7.8 Desktop publishing - reproducing low volume, mission unique	What is mission-unique? Mission is a very broad term? Please clarify and provide definition.	Low volume, mission unique projects are priority jobs that cannot be procured from DAPS, GPO, or GPO approved vendors within the given time limits and comply with AR 25-30
TE-1 2005:Jul:14:18:00:03	TE-1	TE-1 Heading states: The SP is not relieved of the responsibilities for deficiencies and failures to meet the contract requirements for services not included in this PRS. What does this mean?	The Service Provider is responsible for all requirements listed in the solicitation package, not just those items listed in the Performance Requirements Summary
C.1 2005:Jul:14:18:17:23	C.1	What does collaboration mean? It appears that all currently provided "enterprise services" such as WAN, enterprise eMail, CEFMS, SPS are excluded as this statement is written. Strategic collaboration used again in C.5.6 P&P, and C.5.7 VI.	The SP will develop professional working relationships with those excluded sites that will still require certain support for the enterprise services provided by the SP. Examples would be for enterprise network and AIS access