

ACC-RSA Services Industry Communications Event
Questions from 7/28/2016

Question	Response
1 The ESS Division B Quad Charts contain the line "Total Estimated Value with Options" as the first line of the Strategy Section. * Will this information be provided for all TO competitions in the future? * Is this estimate the Independent Government Estimate (IGE)? * If this is not the IGE what is it? The prior award?	The total estimated value was added to the Quad Charts in error.
2 At the meeting with the Presidents of AMCOM EXPRESS BPA Holders, we heard Ms. Weirick say that Labor Mix will no longer be provided. Other commands (e.g. MDA, TACOM) provided detailed labor mix instructions in order to 1) get exactly what they want, and 2) provide a common basis for price evaluation. Will you reconsider charging Government Personnel to detail their requirements when they specify what they want?	This office will provide the historical information for the previous task order(s) not the anticipated labor mix for new requirements. In accordance with the DOD Performance Based Contracting guide, performance based contracts should describe performance results which require us to focus on the relationship between what needs to be done and how well it must be accomplished. We will work with the CORs and Requirements Teams to provide as much information as possible concerning the requirement. The criteria template will be amended to allow the KO the discretion to provide the total number of anticipated hours for the effort if deemed necessary. As always, if you have question concerning the requirement, please ensure you submit the question during the Q&A period for the TORFQ.
3 At the meeting with the Presidents of AMCOM EXPRESS BPA Holders, we heard Ms. Weirick say that the Government is still behind on evaluating TORFQs that were submitted under the old evaluation criteria. Is there a plan to expedite completion of those TORFQs?	Every effort is being made to expedite completion of those TORFQs. The latest information is reflected in the QUAD charts posted on the EXPRESS website.
4 CCAM-CAB-B ITSS-III: This is currently a small business set aside. What is the reason for moving to full & open?	The current contract is not a small business set aside. The current contract is with SAIC and was competed as a task order under CHESS.
5 TORFQ: 2015P-05 AMRDEC: Based on the RFI it seems that this current TO is a combination of other existing AMRDEC TOs. Please state the other TOs included in the current 2015P-05 and current incumbents.	No, it is not a combination. All chart information is accurate.
6 TORFQ: 2016P-TBD: The listed dates for RFI release (15 Sep) and TORFQ release (29 Sep) are not in line with the recently published sequence which has around two months separation from RFI release to TORFQ release. Will the published dates be adjusted to align with the recently published Programmatic TORFQ Milestone Schedule?	No, the recently published schedule is for Programmatic requirements that were upheld due to litigation; 2016P-TBD should and will be released on a normal schedule.
7 It appears that TORFQs 2016P-TBD and 2016T-TBD were separated from the current LTPO Services Contract. Please confirm.	Yes, TORFQs 2016P-TBD and 2016T-TBD were separated.
8 TORFQ 2016T-12: the listed dates for RFI release (19 Jul) and TOFRQ release (1 Aug) are not in line with the recently published sequence which has around two months separation from RFI release to TORFQ release. Will the published dates be adjusted to align with the recently published Programmatic TORFQ Milestone Schedule?	TORFQ 2016T-12 is a Technical requirement and will be released on a normal schedule. The TORFQ was issued August 31, 2016.
9 UAS Technical TORFQ is not listed in the published slides. Can you provide an update on the TORFQ and projected dates for RFI and TORFQ release dates?	Estimated dates are as follows: TORFQ 30 Sep 2016; Proposals Due 31 Oct 2016; Award 31 Jan 2017
10 TORFQ 2015T-19 Tech Data: The chart today says it was awarded 7/7/16 but a stop work order was issued to the prime today. No other bidders were advised of the award. What is the issue and are the proposals going to be reevaluated?	The Contracting Officer, Ms. Detra Battle-Blue, provided the Prime (INTUITIVE) with a Stop Work Notification Letter on 27 JUL 2016 advising them of an administrative error during he evaluation process. The two other offeror's were provided with a Stop work Explanation Letter on 27 JUL 2016 that advised them of the error. ACC-RSA is currently taking corrective action and following completion of the evaluation process, the SSA will then fully consider all offers as required by FAR 8.405-3(b)(2)(vi) and make a best value decision based on fair consideration of all offeror's. At that time, it will be determined if this award will need to be terminated and reawarded, or the stop-work order cancelled.
11 TORFQ 2016T-15: What was the previous TORFQ? Who is the incumbent?	W31P4Q-09-A-0023/0056 is the previous Task Order and it belongs to Aviation & Missile Solutions (AMS). The previous TORFQ was 2012T-6.
12 Chart shows TORFQ 2014T-14 with an award in Q4 FY16. Can you provide a narrower time frame such as week or month?	September 2016 is the forecasted date.
13 2016T-2 (UAS Technical Services) is not shown in the slide deck; however the current POP ends 31 January 2017. Given this timeframe, and what it takes from RFI to contract award as far as months, this POP end date will be tough to meet unless the RFI is released next month. Please advise projected RFI date.	Estimated dates are as follows: TORFQ 30 September 2016; Proposals Due 31 October 2016; Award 31 January 2017
14 Regarding the LITES contract, it appears that the Government is about to execute a 3rd Contract Modification. What are the Government's plans to finalize the acquisition strategy and when can industry expect a draft solicitation (i.e. Draft RFP)?	The Goal is to have a Draft RFP, 2nd Qtr. FY-17 and Final RFP, late 2nd Qtr/early 3rd Qtr FY-17. The RFP will be for the labor portion only and will not include the Data Center operations.
15 What is the projected timeline for LOGSA Lites? RFI? Industry Day? DRFP? FRFR?	See answer to #14 above. Industry day TBD to coincide with draft RFP.
16 Has the LOGSA Lites Acquisition Strategy been approved? If not, when do you anticipate approval?	No. Approval is anticipated to occur during the 2nd Qtr. FY-17
17 What contract vehicle is being considered for LOGSA Lites now that the data center portion has been removed?	Possible contract vehicle will be CHESS and/or GSA Alliant.
18 Is it anticipated that current SED SCRS tasks will have funding increases and POP extensions?	Yes, we are currently staffing a LSJ requesting PoP Extension and funding increase.

Question	Response
19 FOR ITSS your chart indicates a POP in December this year, and a draft RFP within the next two months, with a final RFP in 1st Qtr. It also states the status to be in acquisition planning and plan not approved. Is a December award realistic? What is plan B?	December 2016 is not currently a realistic award date. A no-cost period of performance extension is in process and will be issued through 1 Jun 2017.
20 Is SETAC 10 going to be extended? If so, when can we expect to see a new POP?	The SETAC ordering period will not be extended. The SETAC basic contracts are currently being modified to allow for the PoP to extend 12 months beyond the last day of the ordering period, which is 20 Dec 2017.
21 At the meeting with the Presidents of AMCOM EXPRESS BPA Holders, we heard Ms. Weirick say that OASIS will continue to be used as an alternative to AMCOM EXPRESS; however, as you may already know, there are a number of AMCOM EXPRESS Primes that are not OASIS Contract Holders. According to the OASIS PM, the next on ramp isn't until 2019. Since the Army has entered into an agreement to use OASIS, would you consider requesting the OASIS PM to accelerate the timetable for OASIS in order to increase the number of AMCOM EXPRESS Primes that can bid on EXPRESS tasks that move to OASIS.	The decision to conduct an on-ramp rests solely with the GSA OASIS program office. They have indicated that on-ramps will only be conducted if they are not getting good competition within a pool(s). To date, competition has been robust within each pool and GSA does not plan to conduct on-ramping until the option exercise in 2019. There is a planned on-ramp for Pool 2(SB) due to the low number of contractors within the pool; however, at this time EXPRESS does not anticipate any requirements to be competed under this pool. OASIS is a national program and will not conduct an on-ramp to satisfy individual agency or specific geographic requirements.
22 Will AMCOM ESS use OASIS or a stand-alone contract?	ESS will use OASIS and/or stand-alone contracts as needed when work is outside the EXPRESS PWS.
23 Can you provide a forecast on ACC Redstone requirements that will be procured on OASIS?	Our QUAD charts reflect all known upcoming actions for ESS (EXPRESS, OASIS, OTHER). Requirements that fall outside of the EXPRESS program are evaluated individually. OASIS and other contract vehicles are considered, therefore a forecast can't be provided for unknown requirements.
24 GSA E-buy requires us to state how long our price offer is valid. The default value is 90 days from the submission date. There is nothing in the TORFQ documents that indicates how long our offers should be valid. Will the Government include how long offers should be valid in future TORFQ documents?	The TORFQ letter has been updated to specify a validity period of at least 120 days .
25 The Government PMs who we have discussed the new Evaluation Criteria with do not understand why a BOE is being requested for a services contract. Have CORs and the Government PMs been instructed on how to evaluate BOEs? For example, is it totally subjective evaluation?	The evaluation teams are given guidance on how to utilize the BOEs in the evaluation. The intention of the BOEs is to help the Evaluation Team to understand the management plan, the labor mix proposed and to give the offeror a place to explain their proposed solution.
26 At the meeting with the Presidents of AMCOM EXPRESS BPA Holders, we heard Ms. Weirick say that future TORFQs will be limited to 20 pages. In light of the fact that PWS requirements can vary greatly for TORFQs, would you reconsider establishing this "one size fits all" for TORFQ requirements and instead allow for increase of page count based on PWS requirements? For example, TORFQ 2015T-16 had two pages of specific PWS requirements, while 2016T-16 had two pages of specific PWS requirements, while 2016T-6 had six pages of PWS requirements plus two Technical Instructions to address.	Ms. Weirick said the 20 pages was the starting point. The requirements team determines prior to release of the TORFQ how many pages are needed. At any time during the Draft or Q&A phase of the TORFQ, potential offerors may request additional pages. The request should have enough information to justify why additional pages are needed. The requirements office and contracting office will determine if the request will be approved.
27 How does the Government intend to evaluate price proposals? Will BOEs be evaluated first for reasonableness, and then a comparison made of price versus a "reasonable" BOE proposal? If so, then how are companies with prices that compare reasonably to their respective BOE compared? For example, is it a comparison of the composite rate or is it simply a comparison of the total cost of each?	Price will be evaluated in accordance with the instructions in the evaluation criteria. This includes ensuring rates do not exceed the GSA schedule awarded rates and ensuring the quote is competitive based upon market conditions at the task order level. The BOE is provided to the evaluation team with all dollar values redacted. The intent of the BOE is a narrative description of the basis for determining the labor mix and hours for the offeror's approach to ensure price realism.
28 On some TORFQs, the Government includes Technical Instructions (TIs) in addition to the PWS. How are TIs evaluated, since it isn't addressed in the evaluation criteria? When TIs are included in a TORFQ, will the Government publish how they plan to evaluate them? For example, will they be included as part of the Technical Evaluation, or will they be scored separately?	The evaluation criteria has been updated to allow the KO to insert language regarding how the TD will be evaluated. Example: The Government will evaluate the technical approach provided for the Base TD effort. The evaluation will assess the offeror's understanding of the Base TD effort including a technically sound approach and consistency with the proposed overarching PWS approach. Actions currently in evaluation will be assessed on a case-by-case basis and amended if necessary.
29 TORFQ BOE Question: What information is the Government anticipating from the offeror? Does the Government want to know the offeror's rationale for their proposed labor categories and hours? Or is the Government interested in a cost narrative?	The Government is looking for a narrative description of the basis for determining the labor mix and hours for the offeror's approach.
30 Reference the Historical Information in TORFQ Letter: Slide said you use last CDRL as basis of information provided in TORFQ letter. Generally the last CDRL hasn't been submitted when the follow on procurement is initiated. How does ACC project the remaining requirement that hasn't happened yet in their calculations? Generally the historical information appears to be low compared to information obtained as result of capture efforts.	SEE ANSWER TO QUESTION # 2 ABOVE
31 Will you consider suspending releasing new TORFQs until you are able to adequately address all of the questions year are tabling on the new evaluation criteria?	All known issues with the new evaluation criteria have been minor and have been resolved. However, if an issue arises TORFQs will be extended or suspended as necessary.
32 Will the Government consider going back to the previous ESS projections that included important data such as historical TORFQ number and incumbent?	Yes, we will provide that information.
33 Some task orders have been awarded with large ceilings. Teams were formed and proposals submitted according to Government requirements. What is the Government doing to help ensure the workload required in the TORFQ is actually the workload given to the contractor? A lot of work and team inputs are required to bid these efforts. Industry should at least get this work requested in the TORFQ.	Task orders are awarded based on the customers best guess of the work they need. We will ask the Contracting officers to verify that requirements are realistic when potential for large ceilings are involved.
34 This is the third ICE event I attended. How can a new person receive some education on this process? Each of these events were different and as a new entrant to the market environment, we need some assistance on "how this works."	The ICE event was started as an EXPRESS only event and has grown to include CAMO service requirements. The changes that have taken place are the result of comments and questions from industry. Our goal is to provide data with as much consistency as possible. New participants should also consider utilizing the AMCOM Small Business Office for "One on One" assistance as well as the AMCOM Ombudsman, Mr. Tom Kallam.
35 Recently we were asked to provide the balances for obligated but unexpended hours and dollars for expired SLINs in anticipation of returning these to the "ceiling pool." Do we anticipate that these hours and dollars will be returned to the pool?	Yes, our hope is to utilize those hours as needed.
36 What in the primary mode for receiving information concerning the AMCOM EXPRESS vehicle? Email, interact site, ACC-RSA website or other?	You can visit our website http://acc.army.mil/contractingcenters/acc-rsa/Express.html or email cynthia.m.cross2.civ@mail.mil
37 What are the anticipated changes for this Open Season and will the domains be staggered?	No changes are planned at this time.
38 What is the confidence level for the award dates for these TORFQs listed in the quad charts?	These dates are forecasted based on established timelines for each stage of the acquisition process. Slips in schedule are common and every attempt is made to minimize the impact on the final award date.
39 Where can we find the slides scrolling behind you on the screen?	EXPRESS Public website http://acc.army.mil/contractingcenters/acc-rsa/Express.html
40 You have discussed a more robust projection list at past ICE events. Does this new projections list exist and if so where is it being posted or how is it distributed?	All ACC-R competitive requirements are shown at http://acc.army.mil/contractingcenters/acc-rsa

Question	Response
41 While we understand and appreciate 1) the turnover among Government Contracting Personnel, and 2) what goes into evaluating a proposal, we are not as confident that the Government appreciates what Companies go through in responding to what the Government hands out. As such, have you or would you consider looking at "training with industry" option where you would send your personnel out to observe the procedures a company goes through in preparing a response to an AMCOM EXPRESS TORFQ?	Yes, we are considering this option.
42 In many cases, GOVT COTrs/Technical POCs have not received notice of Ms. Becky Weirick's guidance that BPA Primes should be afforded the opportunities to have technical meetings on upcoming proposals. Requests to meet with the GOVT Team to discuss tools, processes, and unique technical needs are not being accepted. This stymies competition and sets the stage only for the incumbent. Will you ensure that Technical POCs for projected EXPRESS requirements allow Contractor personnel to meet with them?	Yes, we will distribute guidance to our customers and provide details to our Contracting Officers to assure this exchange is facilitated.
43 Will you be distributing the slides from Ms. Weirick's meeting with the Presidents of AMCOM EXPRESS BPA Holders?	The slides have been released by the office of the Executive Director.
44 Is it still your desire that, before we consider lodging a protest with GAQ over a TORFQ award, that we first protest to the AMCOM Contracting Office?	Yes
45 Many Task Orders are two or three years delinquent on CPAR completion by the CORs and/or KO (assessing officials). What are the plans to complete those overdue and to keep current on future CPARs?	We are working to clear delinquent CPARS and have prioritized them. ACC-R is responsible for assuring that metrics for this activity is tracked on a quarterly basis.
46 Why are ICE presentation slides not posted on ACC Redstone website? The last ones posted are from Jan 2016 ICE. It is difficult to take notes on the slides as they are presented during the meeting.	The ICE slides will be posted at http://acc.army.mil/contractingcenters/acc-rsa/Express.html
47 Will you post the questions and answers "tabled" or wait for the next ICE? Answers are needed soonest for contractors to provide confident proposals.	All IPT questions are answered in this document. If you believe that any questions/answers have been omitted, please notify us ASAP.
48 When are via what forum/means will tabled questions be answered?	An Email will be sent to all EXPRESS contractors
49 Will you post the answers to the questions on Eval Criteria or must we wait until next PACT?	An Email will be sent to all EXPRESS contractors
50 First, from what I've read on GSA's website the term "Contractor Team Arrangement" (CTA) is just GSA's/FAR's version of what we refer to as a "Teaming Agreement" (TA) with some additional language requirements differentiating between what they define as Team Members (TM) and Subs and spells out how the "arrangement" with the TM addresses issues like responsibilities, pricing and IFF. I understand the difference and our modified "TA" makes the distinctions. We just didn't change the title to say "Contractor Team Arrangement". My first question is are the terms interchangeable as long as the language covers the GSA CTA requirements? Do we have to go back and modify all the agreements just to call them CTAs instead of TAs? I believe it's just a semantics thing.	In keeping with GSA's guidance, ACC-R prefers the title of "Contractor Team Arrangement" and should be used on all such agreements. However, we will accept the term "Teaming Agreement" on any current agreements you have in place as long as the substance of the agreement meets the government's needs under EXPRESS, all relevant issues addressed, and they comply with GSA's guidance for teaming. Please re-title any new agreements going forward and update the title if you make changes to any existing agreements.
51 Second, at the ICE event you mentioned CTAs at the BPA level. One of the questions on GSA's website under FAQs about CTAs asks "When should a CTA be set up?" The answer says you can create one in advance of any known requirement (which I interpret to be at the BPA stage) or after requirements are defined and the RFQ is issued (which I interpret to mean at the TORFQ stage). My second question is GSA appears to give you the option of creating a BPA level CTA or just wait for a TORFQ so is it really necessary to create a BPA CTA? We currently have them at both the BPA and TORFQ levels but was the BPA version necessary? Is that just an AMCOM Express requirement?	GSA's guidance, as you stated, means that companies can form partnerships and establish CTAs in order to work together when requirements are solicited from any source. e.g. Company A and Company B may establish a CTA to provide certain services under the Professional Services Schedule and work together to respond to solicitations with any customer they choose. For EXPRESS, Teams are evaluated at the BPA level to ensure they can meet the government's requirements. Therefore, we expect that Primes would have an overarching CTA at the BPA level for each Team Member. In the past we have not requested this information. It is our intent to ask for BPA level CTAs at open season since those team members may only be changed during the annual open season. The bulk of true requirements exist at the TO level, and team roles would be more defined. We would expect each requirement to have some kind of addendum to address specific TOs.

Additional Pricing Questions & Answers

PRICING QUESTIONS – AMCOM EXPRESS

<p>1 Pricing Templates - Where should the <u>date range</u> for rates be displayed? There is a blank space on the Detailed Pricing page beneath the Option period label where we could put a date range.</p>	<p>ANSWER: The pricing templates have been updated to clarify the date range.</p>
<p>2 Pricing Templates - How should mid-option rate changes be shown? There is no place to show a date range for the rates, and no place to show a mid-year rate change.</p>	<p>ANSWER: In this situation you should spread the option hours across the two rate periods as applicable and show the applicable labor rates for each labor category. The pricing templates have been updated to add two rows; one for the Period of Performance of the Task Order and one for the BPA Rate Period.</p>
<p>3 Pricing Templates - Labor categories – there is only one column for labor category to be displayed. Is that for the BPA labor category, or the schedule labor category? And, either way, how do they want the mapping from the BPA labor category to the schedule labor category to be displayed?</p>	<p>ANSWER: BPA labor category and Schedule labor category are technically the same. The mapping goes on the Crosswalk tab. All other labor categories should be the offerors’ BPA/GSA categories.</p>
<p>4 Pricing Templates - On the Pricing Detail, the company name is at the top of the page. Are we supposed to do a separate pricing detail tab for each company?</p>	<p>ANSWER: No, each contractor can be displayed on the same sheet. Please separate them and identify them. Do not do a separate tab for each company.</p>
<p>5 Pricing Template - On the pass-through how does the Govt want it displayed? We do not do it the same way most other companies do. We pay the subcontractor at the same rate we bill the customer. We invoice the subcontractor quarterly for the management fee.</p>	<p>ANSWER: Please annotate in the notes at the bottom of the template.</p>
<p>6 TORFQ Letter Para 5g states “Offerors shall submit a separate Task Order Rate Table in a separate Excel spreadsheet for incorporation into any resultant task order.” Is this spreadsheet in addition to the Govt provided templates or does the Govt template serve this purpose?</p>	<p>ANSWER: There is a separate template for the Task Order Rate Table.</p>
<p>7 The Socioeconomic Template does not have a category for Large Business. Do we need to show \$/Hours allocated to a large business?</p>	<p>ANSWER: No, this is for small business only.</p>
<p>8 TORFQ Letter Para 7a requires a table of Socioeconomic status. Should the table be in the Technical section or in the pricing section or in both?</p>	<p>ANSWER: The pricing template contains a Tab for the Socio-economic table.</p>
<p>9 TORFQ Letter Para 5h Pricing states that the “basis of estimate (BOE) shall be no longer than 5 pages. In the Evaluation Criteria Para 3d it states that “the offeror will provide a written basis of estimate with the pricing volume.” At the GSA E-Buy training on 8/17 it was mentioned that the BOE was part of the Technical volume because that is why it had a page limit. Please clarify in which volume it belongs.</p>	<p>ANSWER: The BOE should be provided as a separate attachment to the Pricing Volume.</p>