

Q #	Reference	Question	Government Response
39	General question regarding RFP	Were any significant issues identified during the site visit that might change the scope of the mission and if so, would the Gov't be able to provide those changes or issues to bidders prior to the final RFP to give them time to establish a new pursuit strategy?	No; however, the minimum FLC1 hours will change with the release of the final RFP.
40	Section M.5.2.8(c) (ii)	As a follow up to the above question, will the AADV PP Relevancy requirements change if the scope of the mission is changed? Industry needs to know any new requirements as soon as possible so we can decide on a final pursuit strategy.	The Government will consider changing the relevancy criteria. See L.5.4.1.3 regarding workload.
41	Section M.5.2.8(c) (i) 1	Will the Govt remove the OCONUS requirement? As written, there are very few other contracts that meet this requirement (coupled with the AADVs and specific Maintenance requirements). Many otherwise qualified large and small EAGLE prime BOA holders who have relevant CONUS work will be prevented from submitting a competitive bid.	The Government will consider changing the relevancy criteria.
42	Section M.5.2.8(c) (i) 1	Will the Govt consider the evaluation of CONUS references that meet all of the other relevance requirements currently identified?	The Government will only consider references determined relevant IAW M5.2.8 (c)
43	Section M.5.2.8(c) (i) 2 and 5.2.9	Must a prime contractor have at least one past performance performing wheeled, tracked and combatant Army Tactical Maintenance on a contract that also meets the minimum AADV and OCONUS requirements for prime contracts for the team to receive a substantial confidence rating?	The Government cannot answer hypothetical scenarios, however, the totality of all recent and relevant references, to include those for the Prime and those for major subcontractors and teammates, will be evaluated.
44	Section M.5.2.8(c) (i) 2 and 5.2.9	Will past performances by one or more major subcontractors that meet all of the relevancy requirements including AADVs, OCONUS and Maintenance be evaluated and weighed the same as that of a prime in terms of the team receiving a substantial confidence rating?	The totality of recent and relevant references is reviewed.
45	Section M. 5.2.9	To arrive at a substantial confidence rating, will the Government consider a cumulative evaluation approach to weighing past performance references if between the prime and the major subcontractors all requirements are met?	Please see response to question #43.
46	Section M. 5.2.9	If a prime contractor has a reference (s) that meets only SOME of the relevance requirements as currently defined, but one or more of its major subcontractors have references that meet ALL of the relevance requirements, will the team still be able to receive a substantial confidence rating?	The totality of all recent and relevant contract references, whether from the Prime or those for major subcontractors and teammates, will be evaluated
47	Section M.5.2.8(c) (ii)	Can the Gov't provide the equation to calculate the Annual Average Dollar Value (AADV) as identified in the Draft RFP?	The AADV formula was provided to each Offeror in its Sep 2015 EAGLE BOA Annual Review letter under paragraph 3 labeled Instructions.
48	Section M.5.2.8(c) (ii)	Will the Gov't remove the AADV requirements as identified in the RFP? There are very few other contracts that can meet the minimum value requirements by functional area, much less total (when considering the additional OCONUS and specific Maintenance requirements). These minimums will severely restrict competition and many otherwise qualified large and small EAGLE prime BOA holders will be prevented from submitting a bid.	Please see response to question #41.

49	Section M.5.2.8(c) (ii)	<p>If not willing to remove the AADV requirements, will the Gov't consider significantly reducing the minimum AADV requirements as identified in the RFP? There are very few other contracts that can meet the minimum value requirements by functional area, much less total (when considering the additional OCONUS and specific Maintenance requirements) These minimums will severely restrict competition and many otherwise qualified large and small EAGLE prime BOA holders will be prevented from submitting a bid.</p>	Please see response to question #41.
50	PWS: para 1.3.2.1.2 –	<p>The USG Makes reference to Technical Expert Status Accreditation (TESA) in the PWS but never addresses how many/which positions in the attachment (TE 1G-001 Key and Specified Non-Key Positions) are required to be or will be considered for TESA? When will we know that TESA positions are approved? What if TESA positions are not approved?</p> <p>For the purpose of this proposal, industry suggest that Gov't assume TESA approval for all Key positions where a us citizen is required to establish a baseline for labor cost. This will provide for a standard evaluation and will reduce the chance of the government receiving multiple price scenarios that may not be reasonable or can not be substantiated.</p>	The Government will indicate which positions are going to be presented to DoD Contractor Personnel Office (DOCPER) for TESA consideration on the final Key and Specified Non-Key position listing. Final TESA approval will not be granted until some time after award; therefore, offerors must assume TESA approval for all positions indicated for proposal purposes.
51	TE 1G-001 and TE 1G-002 PWS: para 1.3.2.1.2 –	<p>The USG states that “The contractor is responsible for creating position descriptions for submittal to DOCPER, Germany, for all positions that require TESA accreditation.”.</p> <p>Is the USG defaulting to the contractor to draft requirements/job descriptions to DOCPER for consideration/approval and to determine which positions should be TESA? Our understanding is that it's the Gov'ts responsibility to determine TESA requirement and the contractor is responsible to provide resumes that support the requirement? Please clarify. It would be beneficial if the Gov't provided the TESA approval procedures for those task that the contractor is responsible for.</p>	<p>As indicated at USAREUR's site http://www.eur.army.mil/g1/content/CPD/docper.html, the bilateral process requires the Government to initiate the approval process (Phase I) by submitting the online AE 715-9A and uploading documents for review and approval. Once DOCPER approves the contract, Phase II requires individual applicant approval. During Phase II, the contractor's job description, which is based on the Government's requirement as identified in the contract, is presented with the applicant's information for review and approval.</p> <p>The TESA approval process is complex and requires the successful offeror to assist the ASC COR in providing the required documentation.</p>
52	TE 1G-001 and TE 1G-002	Key and Specified Non-Key Positions states that the “Contracts Manager / Accounting Manager – APS-2 European Activity Set – Key Position”. Where does the USG anticipate this individual being located; and is it possible that this individual be stationed at a corporate location?	The Contracts Manager / Accounting Manager – APS-2 European Activity Set is a key position on the EAS Project Management staff that will be located with the main effort (currently Coleman (Mannheim) Worksite). The Contracts Manager / Accounting Manager – APS-2 European Activity Set may not be assigned to a corporate location.
53	TE 1G-001 and TE 1G-002	Key personnel have to be replaced in 24 hours. Will the Gov't consider allowing industry to dual-hat some of those key personnel until the position is replaced?	The interpretation of the requirement is incorrect. Key positions must have a replacement identified within 24 hours as a temporary fill. This would normally be an existing employee (dual hatted) until a permanent replacement is identified, which must occur within 30 calendar days of the vacancy.
54	TE 1G-001 and TE 1G-002	As written, the Alternate PM is NOT considered a separate position, rather a designation of an existing employee. However, according to the way the Gov't has written the minimum qualifications for the Key and Non Key positions, there is no other category that meets the minimum qualifications required of the PM. Please confirm the Gov't's intent for contractors to dual-hat someone with lesser qualifications to fill that Alternate position. The same applies for the other alternate positions. Will the Gov't adjust one or more of the other LCAT positions to have similar qualifications as the PM or allow someone with lesser qualifications to fill that position in the interim. Increasing requirements of other positions will also have an impact on cost.	Acknowledged. The inconsistency will be corrected for the final RFP.

55	TE 1G-001 and TE 1G-002	There appears to be an error in the last two sentences in the description for the Supply Data and Reports Manager for Graf and Coleman in which there are references to requirements for the Readiness Reporting Managers. We believe this is an error.	The TE's will be updated.
56	H.2 Contract Performance Management Review PWS 5.7.2.1	What if we are the lead for certain missions where there are Gov't positions (LNs) also providing support to that mission. What will the Gov't provide in terms of oversight and support in each of these locations?	The Government will ensure any delays or issues outside the control of the awardee are not reflected in that contractor's performance reports. However, close coordination between all parties is required and expected to ensure the success of the effort.
57	L.5.4.1.2	There is a cost risk associated with Bidding on a European contract in US dollars. We understand that this is a risk of doing business, however can the Government confirm its intent to negotiate cost correctness should the value of the Euro against the dollar change over the period of performance?	In accordance with FAR 52.214-35, all offers submitted must be in terms of U.S. dollars. Offers must be based on the current rate. The Government acknowledges that currency fluctuations may affect costs, however. Cost over-runs due to exchange rates should be negotiated with the Contracting Officer via Requests for Equitable Adjustment as necessary during contract administration.
58	L.5.4.1.3; TE 1G-001 and TE 1G-002	How many production control supervisor(s) and Quality Control Specialist(s) are required? Will the Gov't please provide the numbers historically required for each of those positions to help to level the playing field?	The Government cannot provide the current contractors staffing; however, please refer to the PWS and workload data for additional information.
59	L.5.1.7.3	There is a requirement to provide a detailed property management plan and yet there is no key personnel identified to manage and implement such a plan. Will the Gov't please identify which of the key personnel will be tasked with managing and executing such a plan?	The contractors property management plan is required by the FAR; this is in addition to the minimum requirements stated and is at the discretion of the offeror as to how it will address the requirement.
60	PWS 5.10.3	What are the local purchase Program procedures? How does that work in Germany? Is contractor responsible to set this up?	Yes, the contractor must be able to provide local purchases and must be able to ensure the Government is not charged Value Added Tax (VAT) on those purchases. The Government is exempt from this tax as indicated in the RFP at A.23 which references FAR Clause 252.229-7001 Tax Relief (SEP 2014)--Alternate I (SEP 2014).
61	Cost Question. ODCs	If a contractor is deployed as part of a contingency what are the provisions for Hazardous Duty Pay?	There are no locations that are considered hazardous or a combat zone at this time. Forward locations are not technically a deployment but rather forward support to ensure continuity and accountability, if needed. Should this change, the appropriate modification will be made by the Contracting Officer.
62	PWS 5.15	Cost/Schedule Status Report (C/SSR) "Fixed Core Capability (FCC) resources that are specifically associated with an AWRDS work order for a specific asset will be charged to the appropriate mission. All other FCC resources will be charged to the FCC. The Government shall have "view only" access to this cost accounting system. Contractor shall provide Government personnel access instructions, as required. Contractor shall develop standard data queries and provide access to the Government." Is there a separate CLIN for FCC resources? How should the bidders capture these costs?	There is no separate CLIN for Fixed Core Capability (FCC) resources. All FCC resources should be charged under the appropriate mission. All FCC costs must, however, be reported separately as required on the Fixed Fore Capability Cost Reporting CDRL PM-33.
63	PWS, Section C-3 Page 6, Paragraph 3.8	Will the Gov't obtain and provide Item Unique Identification (IUID) tags to the contractor if equipment isn't already tagged? How is EAS currently doing this?	Yes, the Government will provide IUID labels/tags as needed.
64	PWS, Section C-5 Page 18, Paragraph 5.10.8	Paragraph 5.10.8 appears to be imbedded with Paragraph 5.10.7 instead of separated out.	The PWS will be corrected.

65	Page 45 SECTION L - INSTRUCTIONS, CONDITIONS, AND NOTICES TO OFFERORS	The USG issued an email notification on 23 October 2015 in which he states that "All EAGLE solicitations from the 23 October date forward would use the new standardized Section L, M and Attachment 0005" that were attached to this email. The DRAFT RFP for APS-2 EAS has deviated from this standard language. In terms of proposal preparation and compliance, please confirm that BOA Holders who choose to propose on the APS-2 EAS requirement are required to propose in accordance with the terms and conditions of solicitation W52P1J-15-R-0195 and that this solicitation takes precedence over the information provided by the EAGLE BOA Team on 23 October 2015.	The final RFP does include the new standardized language Section L, M and Attachment 0005. However, yes, all BOA Holders who choose to propose on the APS-2 EAS requirement are required to propose in accordance with the terms and conditions of solicitation W52P1J-15-R-0195.
66	RFP, Section 1.3.12	Secret clearances required for assigned employees and key personnel. However this section states that the Govt will not sponsor interim clearances. However, interim clearances are a matter of routine in the DoD personnel security world. So is the Govt stating that only personnel with final secret clearances can work on this contract?	There are two types of Secret Clearances (1) IAW L.5.1.6 a Secret Facility Clearance and (2) IAW PWS 1.3.12 Personnel Secret Clearance. (1) is allowed a interim IAW L.5.1.6 Note. (2) IAW PWS 1.3.12 the Government will not sponsor personnel interim clearances.
67	PWS 5.2	We would appreciate some elaboration on the FCC mission. How can the FCC be required to provide the minimum staffing and the be able to deploy at the same time? Who will backfill if they deploy? Recommend being more specific with the FCC requirements and identify positions that should be FCC. Which positions will be designated as FCC?	The FCC concept is in place to allow for a retraction of the effort to the minimum staffing required as well as provide an element that may be used forward, if needed. The Government will clarify the FCC requirement in the PWS for the final RFP.
68	NON-RFP	Are there any skill sets that you feel are currently lacking to adequately support this effort? If so, please add details to the PWS.	Acknowledged.
69	NON-RFP	What changes, if any, do you see to your mission requirements in the next year? If any, please add details to the PWS.	Acknowledged.
70	NON-RFP	Are there any automation capabilities you would like to have that you currently don't? If so, please add details to the PWS.	Acknowledged; however, automation requires a Goal 1 waiver which is not contemplated at this time.
71	TE 1G-001 and TE 1G-002	Some of the key positions do not require a security clearance so we recommend that the Gov't reword the last sentence in this attachment to read, "Contractor personnel that are in or expected to fill a key position that require a SECRET security clearance at time of notice to proceed unless otherwise noted below.	The PWS will be updated.
72	PWS 5.32.12	Spell out first usage of acronyms such as ACAMS!	The PWS will be updated.
73	PWS 5.10.3	The Production Control Numbering is incorrect in this section	The PWS will be corrected.
74	PWS 5.20.6	Please note the word "days" appears to be missing in the following: "The contractor shall submit a Retail Supply Management Plan to the COR for approval within 90 after notice to proceed."	The PWS will be corrected.
75	PWS 5.8.1.1	Recommend defining Accord Dangereux Routier (ADR) Certification.	ADR definition, in part, will be added to the PWS.
76	TE 1G-004 M-S-T Minimum Functional Labor Category 1 Hours by Functional Area	According to the Site Visit - there were several areas that were identified that are not required to be supported by the APS-2 EAS effort. Question: Please confirm the Offeror is to bid all functional areas that have productive hours provided in TE1G-004 (e.g. Paint and COSIS)	Correct. Offeror's <u>MUST</u> meet the minimum hours provided in the Exhibit TE 1-M-S-T.
77	TE 1G-002 Key and Specified Non-Key Positions Grafenwoehr, Page 1, Operations Manager paragraph	The Operations Manager position location is listed as the Coleman Worksite and is listed in an embedded document, TE 1 G-013. Question: Please confirm the Operations Manager listed in TE 1G-002 Key and Specified Non-Key Positions Grafenwoehr works at the Grafenwoehr training area?	The effort requires: 1 each Chief of Operations - APS-2 European Activity Set working on site at Coleman(Mannheim); 1 each Operations Manager - Coleman (Mannheim), working on site; 1 each Operations Manager - Grafenwoehr, working on site.

78	Att 0002 Staffing Labor Mix.xlsx	The formatting of the Excel worksheets does not readily support the insertion of headers and footers as specified under L.4.1.1: For all MS Word or MS Excel documents, each page shall include the complete Offeror's name, volume number, file name, date, and solicitation number in a header and/or footer. Under the current format settings, the insertion of headers/footers skews the datasheet view. In addition, the headers/footers contain information that does not appear to relate to this solicitation. Question: Will the Government consider reformatting the document to enable insertion of headers and footers into a format that does not impact how the datasheets are displayed?	The reference to another solicitation has been removed for the final RFP. The Attachment 0002 does not need to be reformatted. Switching between "normal" and "page layout" view will allow for insertion of the required header while persevering the formatting.
79	Att 0001, Draft PWS, Section C-1 Page 5, paragraph 1.3.2.1.2.	Question: Will the Government please provide a copy of the Supplementary Agreement (SA) to the NATO Status of Forces Agreement and the NATO Status of Forces Agreement for offerors use?	The SA is available at http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/111621.pdf and supporting information can be found at the DCOPER website: http://www.eur.army.mil/g1/content/CPD/docper/docper_germanyLinks.html?tab=5&framepage=tesa.html
80	Att 0001, Draft PWS, Section C-1, Page 4, paragraph 1.3.2.1 and Page 8, paragraph 1.3.12.	PWS paragraph 1.3.2.1 states, "Contractor personnel that are in, or expected to fill, a key position will have a SECRET security clearance at the time of the notice to proceed unless otherwise noted." PWS paragraph 1.3.12 states, "All contractor employees assigned or designated for key positions that require a Secret security clearance will obtain it prior to start of work." Question: Please clarify: Do <u>all</u> Key Personnel require a Secret Clearance IAW paragraph 1.3.2.1 or only those key positions identified as requiring a Secret clearance in TE 1G-001 or 002?	Not all Key Positions require a secret clearance. The PWS will be updated to reflect this.
81	TE 1G-002 Key and Specified Non-Key Positions Grafenwoehr, page 2, top of page.	The Position Description for Operations Manager states, "Must be quality processes and property management procedures.)" Question: Please clarify the incomplete sentence/thought?	The extra words will be removed from the TE.
82	Att 0001, Draft PWS, Section C-1, Page 8, paragraph 1.3.12.	The PWS paragraph makes reference to a TE 1G-005, yet no such TE is provided with the Draft RFP files. Question: Will the Government please provide TE 1G-005 to offerors?	All numbering will be reviewed for consistency prior to the release of the final RFP.
83	Att 0001, Draft PWS, Section C-5 Page 20, paragraph 5.12.2.	During the site visit, Government officials stated that there was no welding requirement in Allied Trades, yet PWS paragraph 5.12.2 states that the contractor shall perform welding and welding inspection operations. Question: Please clarify whether welding is a requirement of Allied Trades under APS-2 EAS and if so at which locations (Mannheim, Grafenwoehr, or both)?	PWS 5.12.2 provides the welding standards and requirement should the need arise. Currently there is not a separate welding 'shop' required. Please refer to the minimum FLC1 hours for those areas that must be staffed. Additional clarifying language will be added to the PWS.
84	Att 0001, Draft PWS, Section C-5 Page 8, paragraph 5.2.2.5.	The PWS requirement seems to imply that the contractor is responsible for readiness reporting of "deployed" equipment, yet that equipment has been transferred to a deployed unit's property book. Question: Will the Government please clarify what the contractors responsibilities are for readiness reporting of deployed equipment that has been transferred onto the property books of another organizations care?	Equipment, while deployed for an exercise, remains in the wholesale system and is reported by the contractor for purposes of USR. The using Unit does not accept the equipment as a lateral transfer.
85	Att 0001, Draft PWS, Section C-1 Page 4, paragraph 1.3.2.1, third line and 1.3.2.1.1., fifth and seventh line.	PWS paragraph 1.3.2.1 and 1.3.2.1.1 identified TE 1G-005 as Key and Specified Non-Key Positions and PWS paragraph 1.3.2.1.1 requires <i>offerors</i> to provide a TE 1G-002 Contractor Employee Information List. Draft solicitation files included TE 1G-001 and 002 as Key and Specified Non-Key Positions for Mannheim and Grafenwoehr, respectively, without a Contractor Employee Information List technical exhibit. Question: Will the Government please clarify the technical exhibit for Key and Specified Non-Key Positions in the PWS and whether the Contractor Employee Information List referenced as technical exhibit 1G-002 in the PWS is meant to be referenced as a CDRL?	This error will be corrected. The Contractor Employee Information List should be a CDRL, not a TE.

86	<p>Draft RFP, Page 35, Exhibit AZ RESERVED FOR CDRL SD-06 COSIS MANAGEMENT PLAN; Draft RFP, Page 50, L.5.2.1.1(b)(3); PWS Section C-2 Page 11, Surveillance; Draft PWS Section C-5, Page 7, paragraph 5.2.2.3; Draft PWS Section C-5 Page 14, paragraph 5.8.1.1; Draft PWS Section C-5 Page 15, paragraph 5.8.1.3.2; Draft PWS Section C-5 Page 16, paragraph 5.9.1 and 5.9.4; PRS Table Section C-5 Page 26; Draft PWS Section C-5 Page 29, paragraph 5.18.5 and 5.18.7; Draft PWS Section C-5 Page 30, paragraph 5.19.2; Draft PWS Section C-5 Page 34, paragraph 5.23.3; Draft PWS Section C-5 Page 35, paragraph 5.24.13 and Section C-5 Page 36, paragraph 5.25 et al.</p>	<p>During the site visit, Government officials stated that COSIS (and Low Use Maintenance Program) requirements would not apply to APS-2 EAS in light of equipment use in theater. However, the RFP, CDRLs, and PWS stipulate COSIS requirements for compliance by the contractor (See References). Question: Will the Government please clarify whether offerors are responsible for COSIS given the disconnect between the Government provided information during the site visit and the draft solicitation files?</p>	<p>COSIS only applies to equipment not issued, if any.</p>
87	<p>Draft RFP, Page 35, Exhibit AZ RESERVED FOR CDRL SD-06 COSIS MANAGEMENT PLAN; Draft RFP, Page 50, L.5.2.1.1(b)(3); PWS Section C-2 Page 11, Surveillance; Draft PWS Section C-5, Page 7, paragraph 5.2.2.3; Draft PWS Section C-5 Page 14, paragraph 5.8.1.1; Draft PWS Section C-5 Page 15, paragraph 5.8.1.3.2; Draft PWS Section C-5 Page 16, paragraph 5.9.1 and 5.9.4; PRS Table Section C-5 Page 26; Draft PWS Section C-5 Page 29, paragraph 5.18.5 and 5.18.7; Draft PWS Section C-5 Page 30, paragraph 5.19.2; Draft PWS Section C-5 Page 34, paragraph 5.23.3; Draft PWS Section C-5 Page 35, paragraph 5.24.13 and Section C-5 Page 36, paragraph 5.25 et al.</p>	<p>During the site visit, Government officials stated that COSIS (and Low Use Maintenance Program) requirements would not apply to APS-2 EAS in light of equipment use in theater. However, the RFP, CDRLs, and PWS stipulate COSIS requirements for compliance by the contractor (See References). Question: If COSIS requirements are included in APS-2 EAS, will the Government please provide a list of items and quantities subject to a contractors COSIS plan?</p>	<p>COSIS only applies to equipment not issued, if any. There is not an available listing of non-deployed equipment requiring COSIS at this time.</p>

88	Att 0001, Draft PWS, Section C-5 Page 9, 5.2.3 and Draft CDRLs, PM-xx FCC Surge Plan.	The PWS stipulates that contractor shall be prepared to reduce its staffing requirement to minimal manning levels to support reduced or no work period mission essential tasks which would imply a corresponding drop in labor pricing from the contractor to the Government; however, German Labor Law Section 613A requires retention payments to staff whether they are or are not working and separation payments if they are not to be retained. Question: How many times each year and for what duration should offerors plan to reduce staffing during no work periods?	The expected reduction in staffing is not projected on an annual basis, but rather if there is a requirement change causing a protracted reduction in workload.
89	Att 0001, Draft PWS, Section C-5 Page 9, 5.2.3 and Draft CDRLs, PM-xx FCC Surge Plan.	The PWS stipulates that contractor shall be prepared to reduce its staffing requirement to minimal manning levels to support reduced or no work period mission essential tasks which would imply a corresponding drop in labor pricing from the contractor to the Government; however, German Labor Law Section 613A requires retention payments to staff whether they are or are not working and separation payments if they are not to be retained. Question: Does the Government anticipate a corresponding drop in an offerors labor dollar pricing during periods of no work?	Please see response to question 88.
90	H.7 CCE 204-4000 U.S. and Host Nation Holidays	The statement for US Holiday's states: Work shall be performed on U.S. holidays occurring during the normal workweek. When a U.S holiday occurs on a Saturday or a Sunday, the holiday is observed on the preceding Friday or following Monday, respectively. Host Nation Holidays: Work Shall be performed on local Host Nation* holidays occurring during the normal workweek. Question: Will the Government please clarify the statement about the US and local holidays being workdays?	Local Clause CCE 204-4000 should read Shall NOT be performed on US Holidays; however, the need to work on a federal holiday may arise if directed by the contracting officer, if the need to work a holiday exists. Section H of the final RFP will be updated to reflect the correction. Further, the PWS has been updated to reflect this as well.
91	Att 0001, Draft PWS, Section C-1 Page 9, paragraph 1.3.15	The PWS states the Contractor will need to obtain a Technical Assistance Agreement (TAA). Question: Will the Government release an Equipment Listing of the EAS equipment to ensure the Offeror covers all ITAR requirements?	The equipment density has been provided with the draft RFP and will be reviewed and provided with the final RFP as well.
92	Att 0001, Draft PWS, Section C-3 Page 1, paragraph 3.1.5 and Att 0001, Draft PWS, Section C-5 page 9 paragraph 5.3.1	The Draft PWS Section C-3 states "All GFP shall be accounted for and properly entered into PBUSE." and Section 5 states " Additionally, the Logistics Modernization Program (LMP) is the system used for accountability of Government property rather than the Property Book Unit Supply Enhanced (PBUSE) system." Question: Will the Government clarify which LIS will the Offeror use to maintain accountability and support all GFP for the EAGLE APS-2 EAS effort?	PBUSE will be used for accountability of all GFP and AWRDS will be used for all other support requirements (maintenance/supply).
93	Draft Solicitation, page 2, para A.7	Para A.7 identified two contracts W564KV-15-D-0004 and W564KV-15-D-0005. This question is related to the HN Labor force. The Government made a statement during the Industry Day that the HN Labor force that currently conducts maintenance on tracks and wheeled vehicles is a separate contract from this solicitation. Will the Government please confirm the negotiations and compliance with HN Labor force is not part of this solicitation?	Maintenance is not a separate contract but rather Government-provided through the 21st TSC.
94	Draft PWS, Section C, page 5, para 1.3.2.1.2	This question is related to Technical Expert Status Accreditation (TESA). Is there a requirement in keeping with German Works Council that necessitates hiring incumbent work force personnel who may be EU nationals and are currently filling non-TESA positions?	Compliance with Host Nation employment requirements are the responsibility of the contractor.
95	Draft PWS, Section C, page 9, para 1.3.15	This question is related to Technical Expert Status Accreditation (TESA). Are there non-SOFA positions currently performing work on work that falls under this solicitation? Are there any HN performing on work that falls under this solicitation?	The Government does not understand this question.
96	Draft PWS, Section C, page 17, para 5.10.1	This question is related to painting vehicles. The Government stated during the Industry Day that the intent is to paint all vehicles currently painted desert to woodland camouflage. Please confirm that the offeror is responsible for scheduling painting and conducting minor spot painting not responsible for staffing the paint booth or ensuring the paint booth is compliant with HN environmental requirements.	Correct. The painting workload present within the minimum FLC1 hours is not for operation of the paint facility. See response #17.

97	General	Will the Government provide offerors with back ground information and reports related to previous environmental violations and plans for remediation that exist today related to work areas offerors are to use in support of this task?	If available, the Government will provide.
98	Labor	Will the govt release a wage determination sheet for the EAS 2 opportunity?	No, mandatory SCA rates are not applicable OCONUS.
99	Draft PWS Page 5, Para 1.3.2.1.2 Technical Expert Status Accreditation in Germany Contractor employees hired for positions in Germany as Technical Experts must be accredited by host nation authorities Technical Expert Status Accreditation (TESA) in accordance with procedures established in Article 73 of the Supplementary Agreement (SA) to the NATO Status of Forces Agreement, managed by the Department of Defense Contractor Personnel Office, Hammonds Barracks, Seckenheim, Germany.	Will the Government identify which positions are covered under TESA in order for Offeror's to accurately estimate the costs and not overcharge the Gov't?	Please see response to question #1, 16, 51 and 79.
100	Draft PWS Page 5, Para 1.3.2.1.2 Technical Expert Status Accreditation in Germany Contractor employees hired for positions in Germany as Technical Experts must be accredited by host nation authorities Technical Expert Status Accreditation (TESA) in accordance with procedures established in Article 73 of the Supplementary Agreement (SA) to the NATO Status of Forces Agreement, managed by the Department of Defense Contractor Personnel Office, Hammonds Barracks, Seckenheim, Germany.	How many TESA covered positions are currently associated with the effort?	Due to the change in requirement from the previous effort to this, the number of TESA positions has changed. Please see the updated Key positions TE for the required TESA positions under this solicitation.

101	<p>Draft PWS Page 5, Para 1.3.2.1.2 Technical Expert Status Accreditation in Germany Contractor employees hired for positions in Germany as Technical Experts must be accredited by host nation authorities Technical Expert Status Accreditation (TESA) in accordance with procedures established in Article 73 of the Supplementary Agreement (SA) to the NATO Status of Forces Agreement, managed by the Department of Defense Contractor Personnel Office, Hammonds Barracks, Seckenheim, Germany.</p>	<p>How will TESA requests be handled during execution?</p>	<p>Please see response to question #51 and 79.</p>
102	<p>APS-2 European Activity Set - TE 1 M- S-T Minimum Functional Labor Category 1 Hours</p>	<p>The total MAINTENANCE hours for Mannheim Coleman worksite reflected in exhibit is 461,760 FLC1 minimum hours, but when all maintenance sub elements are added the actual total equals 469,440, a difference of 7680 hours. Please verify the total hours under Mannheim maintenance total hours?</p>	<p>Both TEs have been updated and checked for accuracy. As indicated the hours have changed from the original amount provided with the draft RFP.</p>
103	<p>- TE 1 M-S-T Minimum Functional Labor Category 1 Hours APS-2 European Activity Set</p>	<p>The total MAINTENANCE hours for Grafenwoehr worksite reflected in exhibit is 113,280 FLC1 minimum hours, but when all maintenance sub elements are added the actual total equals 120,690, a difference of 7680 hours. Please verify the total hours under Grafenwoehr maintenance total hours?</p>	<p>Please see response to question 102.</p>