

ATTACHMENT JL-1
WRITTEN QUESTION FORM
SOLICITATION NO. N62742-19-R-1199

Question/Comment#	Question(s)/Comments	Question/Comment in Reference To:	RFP Section(s)	PWS Section(s)	Governerment Response
1	Rows 10 and 11 on # of contracts with Security Clearances. Please confirm that is for the past 5 years also. Also, we believe the weight for these two lines are too high. We have been performing Aircraft modification work for DoD customers without any clearance requirements.	Attachment_6_HTRO_Self_Scoring_Matrix+(DRAFT)	Attachment 6	N/A	The requirement is the number of current contracts with Security Clearances however, the Government will take into consideration a recency cutoff and the weight.
2	Would you set a different points threshold for small business awards versus unrestricted?	General	All	N/A	The points threshold has not been finalized, however the Government does not intend to have separate points thresholds for Small and Large Businesses. The Government may consider seperate MTTRs before final RFP release.
3	Paragraph 2.2.2 is missing from the Section L Instructions.	Is this paragraph reserved or will the paragraphs be renumbered?	L.2.2.2		All corresponding paragraph numbers will be updated before final RFP release.
4	Paragraph 2.2.5 is missing from the Section L Instructions.	Is this paragraph reserved or will the paragraphs be renumbered?	L.2.2.5		All corresponding paragraph numbers will be updated before final RFP release.
5	There are disconnects between Table 2.3 Proposal Organization and the Section L instructions.	What is the name of Volume I? Will the government update Table 2.3 to match the Section L instructions?	L.3.0		The name of Volume 1 is unidentified at this time. Section L will be updated and all corresponding tables will match the instructions for the final RFP Release.
6	Volume III clarification	Paragraph 5.1.1 is not titled in the instructions. Is it CPARS as shown in Table 2.3?	L.5.1.1		The Government has updated paragraph 5.1.1.
7	Volume III clarification	Paragraph 5.1.2 is Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQ) in Table 2.3 but is Organizational Structure Change History in the Section L instructions. Will the government add PPQ instructions to Section L and add the Organizational Structure Change History to Table 2.3?	L.5.1.2		The Governmen has corrected table 2.3 to match the instructions.
8	Paragraph 1.8 is missing from the Section M Instructions.	Is this paragraph reserved or will the paragraphs be renumbered?	M.1.8		All corresponding paragraph numbers will be updated before final RFP release.
9	Paragraph 2.4.3 is missing from the Section M Instructions.	Is this paragraph reserved or will the paragraphs be renumbered?	M.2.4.3		All corresponding paragraph numbers will be updated before final RFP release.
10	Paragraph 2.4.4 is missing from the Section M Instructions.	Is this paragraph reserved or will the paragraphs be renumbered?	M.2.4.4		All corresponding paragraph numbers will be updated before final RFP release.
11	Section L.2.3.2 of the RFP states: The following limitation only applies to the Technical Volume. Text intended for evaluation within all figures, charts, tables, and graphs, to include imbedded images, shall be no less than Arial 8-pt.	Will the Government allow Arial 8-pt font for figures, charts, tables, and graphs in all volumes of the proposal to ensure graphics are sized suitably for the required page sizes?	L.2.3.2		The Government will take this into consideration and will allow Arial 8-pt font for figures, charts, tables and graphs in all volumes.
12	Is the Government willing to adjust the calendar day of the month from 10th to 15th day to support accurate accounting processes/practices?	The Contractor shall submit a Contract Funds Status Report (CFSR) IAW Contract Data Requirements List (CDRL) A006 and PWS paragraph 6.2.6. Due to site CFT PMO and COR monthly, 10th calendar day of the month.	N/A	4.1.1 Cost Tracking	The Government has changed the due date to the 15th.
13	Please clarify what the Government means by "The Contractor will <u>NOT</u> certify training provided to task order user personnel."	The Contractor can conduct on the job training of user personnel on a non-interference basis with the task order performance and/or schedule metrics. The Contractor will NOT certify training provided to task order user personnel. All training will be coordinated at least 72 hours in advance between Contractor site leadership and site COR.	N/A	5.8.1 Training	The intent of para 5.8.1 is since contract personnel may have significant weapon system experience and expertise, the government personnel may gain knowledge by observing the contractor performing a given task. HOWEVER , due to the CFT effort is for labor and not training, the contractor will not be signing off training records of government personel or certifying personnel as a result of the training observation.
14	This appears to be in conflict with 5.8.1 "The Contractor will <u>NOT</u> certify training provided to task order user personnel." Can the Government please provide clarity as to what certifications the contractor is authorized to perform?	DoD Contractor employees assigned to operate either Government-owned/Government-leased equipment in performance of their contract shall be certified, by the Contractor and at the Contractor's expense, as being fully qualified to operate the vehicles/equipment to which they are assigned.	N/A	5.17 Contractor Vehicle/Equipment Operations	The contractor is responsible for training and certifying their personnel on vehicle/Equipment Operations. This is separate and distinct to the observational training opportunites.

ATTACHMENT JL-1
WRITTEN QUESTION FORM
SOLICITATION NO. N62742-19-R-1199

15	The Government states, "The Government is not evaluating price as part of this source selection as authorized by FAR 15.304(c)(1)(ii)(A)." However, para 1.9 Discussions states that: "The Government intends to award without discussions but reserves the right to conduct discussions if necessary. Therefore, it is imperative that the initial offer contain the Offeror's best terms from a price and technical standpoint." Will the Government clarify that pricing will not be part of the evaluation process?	Best value is defined as the Offerors that demonstrate Past Technical Experience within the Government-validated HTRO Minimum Technical Threshold Rating (MTTR) with Acceptable Past Performance and Acceptable Small Business Commitment. The Government is not evaluating price as part of this source selection as authorized by FAR 15.304(c)(1)(ii)(A). Therefore, the Government is not selecting a lowest priced technically acceptable proposal, nor will it conduct a subjective tradeoff.	Attach 5, Section M, Para1.1, (B)	N/A	The Government confirms that pricing will not be included as part of the evaluation process for basic awards. Pricing will be done at individual task order evaluation.
16	Will the government consider providing a separate CLIN for the shift differential costs to keep consistency?	Multiply pay rates due to shift differentials and actual hours worked vs approved leave, holidays etc.	Attachment 2 H Clauses para H-3 (a) (4)	N/A	The Government will take this into consideration but does not intend to change the CLIN structure at this time.
17	Are there any instance where the Government will require the Contactor to provide any of the items listed by Government as may? If the Contractor is required to provide any of the may items it will be a cost impact.	The use of [may] as utilized at least four times in H-4 (B)	Attachment 2 H Clause H-4 (b)	N/A	The PWS and individual task order solicitations will provide guidance in these instances. See clause H-4
18	CDLR A006 block 5 list a PWS paragraph reference of 6.5, however the PWS ends at 6.2	CDRL references	CDRL A006 Block 5	PWS 4.1.1 and 6.2	The Government has updated the references
19	CDLR A008 block 16 list a PWS paragraph reference of 6.7, however the PWS ends at 6.2	CDRL references	CDRL A006 Block	PWS 4.2.1 and 6.2	The Government has updated the references
20	CDLR A010 block 16 list a PWS paragraph reference of 6.10, however the PWS ends at 6.2	CDRL references	CDRL A006 Block	PWS 4.2.1 and 6.2	The Government has updated the references
21	Will the government consider adding labor categories in order to support the workflow package development required?	Workbook/maintenance development	Workbook/Maintenance	PWS 4.6.3.3	The Government anticipates no changes. Workbook development is a contractor process to ensure contractor actions meet technical requirements
22	Will digital format be required for Workbook/Maintenance documentation?	Workbook/maintenance development	Workbook/Maintenance	PWS 4.6.3.3	Readable Contractor format is acceptable to provide to the COR.
23	Can the Government please provide potential bidders a copy of form CFT 104?	Metric Performance Data Collection	Metric Performance Data Collection	PWS 4.9.3	We can provide a "representative" 104. NOTE: 104s are tailored to individual task order specific requirements
24	The HTRO scoring matrix has two factors referenced to 8210.1D for GOPs and FOPS, with the timeline of 5 years. Can the 8210 revision level be changed to include 8210.1C.?	Scoring Matrix	Scoring Matrix	Scoring Matrix	After consideration, the Government will accept activities IAW 8210.1C for evaluation purposes and have adjusted the scoring matrix to reflect that. 8210.1D will be required standard in task order awards.
25	Please confirm the Government intent on Scoring Matrix question "# of current contracts with Top Secret Clearances (Prime Only)" deals with personnel and not contracts.	# of current contracts with Top Secret Clearances (Prime Only).	Scoring Matrix	Scoring Matrix	The Government is requesting the number of contracts the offeror currently is performing on that requires Top Secret Clearance to indicate TS Clearance ability however, the Government may consider changes to this evaluation category.
26	Please confirm the Government intent on Scoring Matrix question "# of current contracts with Secret Clearances (Prime Only)" deals with personnel and not contracts.	# of current contracts with Secret Clearances (Prime Only).	Scoring Matrix	Scoring Matrix	The Government is requesting the number of contracts the offeror currently is performing on that requires Secret Clearance to indicate Secret Clearance ability however, the Government may consider changes to this evaluation category.
27	Has an Ombudsman Been assigned to these soliciations. I.e. Small and Large Business	Assignment of Ombudsman	52.216-32 Task-Order and Delivery-Order Ombudsman		An Ombudsman is assigned and solicitation documentation will be updated to reflect that before final RFP release.
28	Is there an established rate for the Interest Penalty?	(4) Interest penalty. The designated payment office will pay an interest penalty automatically, without request from the Contractor, if payment is not made by the due date and the conditions listed in paragraphs (a)(4)(i) through (a)(4)(iii) of this clause are met, if applicable. H	52.232-25 Prompt Payment.		Established rates are available at the Bureau of Fiscal Services and change every 6 months. The Government will apply the most current interest rate at the time.
29	Will there be an update to the previous Expiring Task Orders list and will Location Names be updated as many have changed?	Updates to Expiring Orders list.			The Government does not have a list of expiring task orders. Location names will be updated with each task order.
30	Is It the Government's intent to apply FAR Subpart 3.5 in determing Task Order Price Realism evaluations which defines buy-ins as an "Imprpoer business practice"?	Competitive Range Determination	Section M - Evaluation Factors for Award, 1.7 Competitive Range Determination		Task Order awards will be competed in accordance with FAR 16.5. Offerors will be required to meet the terms of conditions of individual task order solicitations.
31	Will the Government add additonal requirements for skills and qualifications that exceed those described in the DOL's Services Contract Act Directory of Occupations to avoid the use of Specialty Rates and assumed higher cost?	Specialty Rates for requirements exceeding those defined in the DOL's Services Contract Act Directory of Occupations			Skill and qualifications required are contained within Attachment "A" found within the PWS document.

ATTACHMENT JL-1
WRITTEN QUESTION FORM
SOLICITATION NO. N62742-19-R-1199

32	Recommend the small business be competed under NCAIS 488190 as small businesses typically provide services, not aircraft manufacturing.	FAR Clauses Incorporated by Full Text 52.204-8 Annual Representations and Certifications. (Mar 2023) As prescribed in 4.1202(a), insert the following provision: Annual Representations and Certifications (Mar 2023) (a) (1) The North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code for this acquisition is 336411. Companies in this category include Boeing, Sikorsky, Gulfstream, General Dynamics, etc.	FAR Clauses Incorporated by Full Text 52.204-8 Annual Representations and Certifications. (Mar 2023) As prescribed in 4.1202(a), insert the following provision: Annual Representations and Certifications (Mar 2023) (a) (1) The North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code for this acquisition is 336411		The Government will not be changing the NAICS code at this time.
33	When will the government's release a Draft Section L & M and HTRO documents tailored for Small Businesses to review and ask questions?		Attachment 4, 5, and 6 (Section L, M & HTRO Scoring Matrix)		The Government intends to issue a solicitation suited for both large and small businesses. There will not be separate solicitations for small and large businesses at this time.
34	When will the government be releasing the Minimum Technical Rating Threshold (MTTR) minimum score for Small Businesses to review and go through the exercise and or drill for self scoring ahead of Final RFP release? This is necessary as it would assist Small Businesses determine if they need a subcontractor/partner to boost their score.		Attachment 6 HTRO Self Scoring Matrix		The current draft MTTR is for both large and small businesses. Separate MTTRs are not anticipated at this time.
35	4.5 Work Samples - Will the government consider raising the maximum number of work samples from five to seven? While the MTTR is unknown for small businesses, this maximum number of five work samples is very restrictive and prohibitive for small businesses to get a seat on the IDIQ.		Attachment 4 (Section L)		The Government is still reviewing and adjusting the evaluation criteria and will take this into consideration.
36	Factor 3 Past Performance (5.1.1) - Will the government consider including a Prime Offeror's subcontractor/partner work sample if they are a critical subcontractor with more than 20% workshare?		Attachment 4 (Section L)		The Government is still reviewing and adjusting the evaluation criteria and will take this into consideration.
37	Factor 3 Past Performance (5.1.1) - Will the Past Performance requirements for Small Businesses be the same as those for Large Businesses?		Attachment 4 (Section L)		The Government is still reviewing and adjusting evaluation criteria and does not anticipate different requirements. However, the Government may consider separate requirements before final RFP release.
38	Assuming the government will allow a Prime Offeror's subcontractor/partner work sample, will the government install a cap of three prime work samples to be evaluated outside of the five required from the Prime Offeror?		Attachment 4 (Section L)		The Government will take this into consideration.
39	When does the government plan to release a Final Large Business RFP?				The Government anticipates release of the final RFP in March/April 2024. It is anticipated to be one solicitation for both small and large businesses.
40	When does the government plan to release a Final Small Business RFP?				The Government anticipates release of the final RFP in March/April 2024. It is anticipated to be one solicitation for both small and large businesses.
41	Rows 26-36 are hidden on the provided excel sheet containing CPAR related point information. Would the Government confirm that CPARs will be a part of the scoring matrix?	Attachment_6_HTRO_Self_Scoring_Matrix (DRAFT).xlsx	"HTRO Scoring Matrix" Tab Rows 26-36	N/A	This was an error in the HTRO scoring matrix and has been updated. Only rows 5-25 are used for scoring at this time.
42	Rows 26-36 are not currently linked to the scoring formula in cell J38. Will this be updated to account for CPAR scoring information?	Attachment_6_HTRO_Self_Scoring_Matrix (DRAFT).xlsx	"HTRO Scoring Matrix" Tab Rows 26-36	N/A	This was an error in the HTRO scoring matrix and has been updated. Only rows 5-25 are used for scoring at this time.
43	To create a more competitive environment for small businesses, would the Government consider a separate, less restrictive scoring matrix for the Small Business pool?	Attachment_6_HTRO_Self_Scoring_Matrix (DRAFT).xlsx	N/A	N/A	The Government does not intend to have separate matrices however, the Government is still reviewing and adjusting the scoring matrix and will take this into consideration.
44	If there will be separate scoring matrices for the small and large pools, will the thresholds and weighting of evaluation criteria differ between the two or only the MTTR score?	Attachment_6_HTRO_Self_Scoring_Matrix (DRAFT).xlsx	N/A	N/A	The Government does not intend to have separate matrices however, the Government is still reviewing and adjusting the scoring matrix and will take this into consideration.
45	The scoring matrix notes various evaluation criteria in which evaluation is made based on number of contracts/task orders within x years. Can clarification be provided as to when the period of recency begins (e.g. draft release, solicitation release, a specific date, etc.)? Would the Government please consider a recency criteria of 7 years from the date of solicitation release?	Attachment_6_HTRO_Self_Scoring_Matrix (DRAFT).xlsx	N/A	N/A	The period of recency is defined as performance within the last 5 years from date of solicitation release. For example, an offeror may have a task order/contract with a period of performance that began 9 years ago and the offeror is still performing on that task order/contract. This would be acceptable due to the offeror meeting the criteria of performing in the last 5 years.
46	To reduce the risk of unsuccessful performance, will the Government consider adding language similar to rows 10-11 in which the evaluation is made based on Prime experience only?	Attachment_6_HTRO_Self_Scoring_Matrix (DRAFT).xlsx	Rows 12-25	N/A	The Government is still reviewing and adjusting the evaluation criteria and will take this into consideration.

ATTACHMENT JL-1
WRITTEN QUESTION FORM
SOLICITATION NO. N62742-19-R-1199

47	Further, to ensure Prime's ability to manage this contract, would the Government consider removing the subcontractor FTE count from the evaluation criteria of this row?	Attachment_6_HTRO_Self_Scoring_Matrix (DRAFT).xlsx	Row 5	N/A	The Government is still reviewing and adjusting the evaluation criteria and will take this into consideration.
48	It is noted that the work samples are 5 pages per contract, for a total of 5 contracts, which results in 25 pages. But below it is noted that "" The page limit for the entire technical volume is 75 for all factors." Can clarification be provided as to what else would be included in the technical volume that would result in 75 pages, as the other unlimited sections would likely result in minimal pages?	Attachment_4_Section_L (DRAFT).pdf	2.2.3. Proposal Organization Table	N/A	The Government intends to adjust the page limitations to to reflect what is requested in the technical volume. This may result in changing the number of work samples or pages per contract for each work sample.
49	Will the Government please confirm that Self Scoring Matrix Evidence Artifacts should be submitted along with Volume II Technical?	Attachment_6_HTRO_Self_Scoring_Matrix (DRAFT).xlsx	N/A	N/A	The Government confirms that artifacts should be submitted with Volume II.
50	Will the Government please confirm that the Self Scoring Matrix Evidence Artifacts will be evaluated outside of page count?	Attachment_6_HTRO_Self_Scoring_Matrix (DRAFT).xlsx	N/A	N/A	The Government intends for Work Samples to be evaluated outside of the page count for the Work Sample Narratives. Work Sample narratives are limited to 5 pages however this is subject to change before final RFP release.
51	"The Offeror shall only provide relevant pages of documents used to fully validate Offeror Self-Scores. Using the instructions provided below, the Offeror shall provide, as specifically as possible, the actual evidence used to substantiate the Offeror's HTRO Score." To minimize administrative burden to our Government clients, would the Government accept a variety of artifacts to substantiate evidence, including FPDS, SOW, and other contract documentation?	Attachment_4_Section_L (DRAFT).pdf	4.4 Factor 2 HTRO Self Scoring Matrix	N/A	Substantive evidence should be official contract documentation as instructed in Section L, paragraph 4.5
52	"This solicitation is subject to a Partial Set-Aside of task orders that the Government estimates will require the contractor to provide up to 100 full-time equivalents (FTEs) of personnel per task order in the CONUS or up to 50 FTEs OCONUS. Only qualifying small businesses will be eligible to compete for set-aside task orders. Task orders larger than the partial set-aside will be available for competition among contractors (large or small) who successfully compete under the non-set-aside portion of this solicitation for the Full and Open Competition Pool" Does the Government anticipate issuing a separate instructions to offerors attachment for each pool?	Attachment_4_Section_L (DRAFT).pdf	1.0 Program Structure and Objective	N/A	The Government intends to use the same instructions to offerors for both pools.
53	"The Prime contractor must demonstrate that the affiliate will perform significant and critical aspects of the contract if awarded." Would the Government confirm that the Prime may determine which aspects of subcontract support are critical and significant, e.g., providing administrative support services?	Attachment_4_Section_L (DRAFT).pdf	5.1.1	The Government confirms that the offeror may determine and demonstrate examples of significant and critical aspects.	The Government has removed
54	"The ceiling of the IDIQ is \$7.08B. The total value of all task orders (TOs) awarded under the IDIQ will not exceed this amount" Given the decreased ceiling value for this contract, would the Government confirm our assumption that this amount reflects \$7.08B for each respective pool?	Attachment_5_Section_M (DRAFT).pdf	1.3	N/A	This ceiling is reflective of the entirety of the IDIQ to include both pools.
55	Section L: Paragraph 4.4 Factor 2 - HTRO Self Scoring Matrix states: "The Offeror's proposal will be evaluated utilizing the HTRO Scoring Matrix (Attachment 6)". This requirement appears to differ from Section M: Evaluation Factor for Awards Paragrapgh 2.3 Factor 2 HTRO Self Scoring Matrix which states that the "Scoring Matrix (Attachment 12) ...". Will the governmentnt please validate and clarify which Attachment is applicable to HTRO Self Scoring Matrix?	Conflict in langage beeten Sections L and M	Attachment 4 Section L Instruction to Offerors (ITO) paragraph 4.4 Page 8 and Attachment 5 Section M Evaluation for Award. Paragraph 2.3 Page 5		At the current time, the HTRO Scoring Matrix is Attachment 6 but that is subject to change at final RFP release.

ATTACHMENT JL-1
WRITTEN QUESTION FORM
SOLICITATION NO. N62742-19-R-1199

56	Understanding that Line/Row Numbers 5-11 of Attachment 6, HTRO Self Scoring Matrix, are specific to "Prime" only performance, are composit team (Prime/Sub) entries allowed for line/Row numbers 12 - 25 in Column "I" and entrys in these line/Rows are not restricted and applicable only to the Prime's contract/TO Performance?	Clarification to compliance for Attachment 6 HTRO Self Scoring Matrix	Attachment 6 HTRO Self Scoring Matrix		At the current time, rows 12-25 in the HTRO Self-Scoring Matrix are not restricted and may include performance either as the Prime or as a Subcontractor.
57	In order to be complaint with Factor 1 must the Prime have the AS9100D Quality Cetification, or can the requirment be met if a Subcontractor on Offorer's team has the certification?	Clarification of Ccompliance to Factor 1 AS9100D Certification	Section L, Table 2.3; 4.2.1.(5); 4.3; Section M, 2.1(1)Factor (1); 2.1.1(a)(b); ITO Attachment 2.2	Para 4.6.3;	The Government confirms that the AS100D certification needs to be met by the Prime contractor.
58	Could the Government clarify the following in-reference-to Total System Performance Responsibility (TSPR)?	2.2 Limitations: Total System Performance Responsibility (TSPR).	Attachment 1 - PWS	2.2 Limitations	The CFT Contract is for labor augmentation. Contractors will NOT be tasked with TSPR or other listed support concepts in PWS para 2.2.
59	With the instruction reading series, is it the intent of the Government to use the most recent version of the DCMAI 8210.1 at all times, or use the current series the contract is awarded under?	3.1 Technical references speaks to DCMAI 8210.1 series.	Attachment 1 - PWS	3.1 Technical References	The Government has updated PWS to indicate the intent to use the most recent version.
60	If it is the Governments intent to use DCMAI 8210.1 series at all times, will the Government provide any updates to the 8210.1 series to the contracfor through modifications, or is it the contractors responsibility to procure a copy of the most recent version of DCMAI 8210.1 series?	3.1 Technical references speaks to DCMAI 8210.1 series.	Attachment 1 - PWS	3.1 Technical References	The intent is to adhere to the most recent 8210.1 series requiremenst as they change. These items are readily availble via DCMA website.
61	Could the Governement clarify the statement concerning "shall not supervise, direct or control the activities of Government personnel or the employees of any other Contractor" when the Government has insufficient man-power to perform the task and is requesting the contractor to perfom certain skillsets which require dierect control and supervision concerning the activities of Government personnel?	4.2 Contractor Personnel: The Contractor and its employees shall not supervise, direct or control the activities of Government personnel or the employees of any other Contractor.	Attachment 1 - PWS	4.2 Contractor Personnel	No clarification needed. The PWS accurately states the requirement.
62	Could the Government clarify the paragraph number in reference to CDRL A003 with regards to references provided?	There are conflicting references regarding CDRL A003 between 4.2.1 Task Order Manning, 6.2 Required CDRLS, 6.2.3, and 6.2.4	Ex. A - CDRLs	4.6.2, 6.2, 6.2.3, 6.2.4, Exhibit A -CDRL A003	The Government has updated the CDRLs to correct references
63	Could the Government verify No later than date of delivery between references provided?	4.2.3 Personnel Report/Seniority List The Contractor shall provide the Procurement Contracting Officer (PCO) a Personnel Report/Seniority List NLT 30 calendar days prior to the end of the final performance period. Reference CDRL A012.	Ex. A - CDRLs	4.2.3, 6.2, 6.2.12, and Exhibit A - CDRL A012	The Government has updated the CDRLs to correct references

ATTACHMENT JL-1
WRITTEN QUESTION FORM
SOLICITATION NO. N62742-19-R-1199

64	Can the Government clarify how Paragraph 4.4.1 will relate to the MTC turnover metric?	4.4.1 FFP MTC Minimum Standard: (a) MTC is defined as “the required minimum level of staffing as stated by the Government on each task order”. The minimum standard for FFP MTC measured against the Basic contract shall be met when the FFP MTCs for all task orders are fully manned on day one (1) of task order PoP and when no task order with a FFP MTC discrepancy in any given month has a repeated discrepancy for the same task order in consecutive months. Measurements of the FFP MTC being met by day one (1) of task order PoP will only apply when the award is made thirty (30) calendar days prior to PoP start OR if the task order PWS requires a set required transition time. The Government considers only Contractor personnel who are on-site and working as countable towards the MTC. Additionally, the Government is entitled to a minimum of 1912 productive hours per year per each person making up the MTC.	Ex. A - CDRLs	4.4.1 FFP MTC Minimum Standard	MTC turnover metric is scored at task order level. The MTC minimum standard is for the Basic Contract and accounts for total manning on day 1 of each individual task order being 100% manned.
65	Could the Government clarify due date for CDRL A009 with regards to references provided?	4.6.2 Quality Control Plan CDRL A009 Due dates do not match PWS references.	Ex. A - CDRLs	4.6.2, 6.2, 6.2.9, Exhibit A - CDRL A009	The Government has updated the CDRLs to correct references
66	Could the Government clarify references for CDRL A004 with regards to references provided?	There are conflicting references regarding CDRL A004 between 4.6.3.1.2 SOPs – Task Order, 6.2 Required CDRLs, 6.2.4, and CDRL A004.	Ex. A - CDRLs	4.6.3.1.2, 6.2, 6.2.4, Exhibit A - CDRL A004	The Government has updated the CDRLs to correct references
67	Could the Government clarify references for CDRL A010 with regards to references provided?	There are conflicting references regarding CDRL A010 between 4.6.3.2 Local Operating Instructions, 6.2 Required CDRLs, 6.2.10, and CDRL A010.	Ex. A - CDRLs	4.6.3.2, 6.2, 6.2.10, Exhibit A - CDRL A010	The Government has updated the CDRLs to correct references
68	Could the Government clarify AS9100 vice AS9100D with regards to references provided?	There are conflicting references regarding AS9100 between Table of Contents,(4.6.3), 4.6.3 AS9100D Compliant Procedures, 4.6.3.2 Local Operating Instructions, and 6.2.10 CDRL A010 – Contractor’s Standard Operations Procedures-Local Operating Instructions – Task Order.		TOC, 4.6.3, 4.6.3.2, and 6.2.10	The Government's requirement is to have AS9100D certification. References have been revised in the PWS to clarify AS9100D certification.
69	Could the Governement clarify paragapgh 4.6.4 of the PWS concerning maintaining inspection records documenting inspection results due to the Government provides Maintenance Data Systems which store this information and is readily avaiable to the Government?	4.6.4 Inspection: The Contractor shall maintain inspection records documenting inspection results. These shall be traceable to the specific work task and inspection process used as well as providing evidence that the work task being inspected conforms to all technical requirements.	Attachment 1 - PWS	4.6.4 Inspection	These are the Contractor records and system of records, not government systems. Records keeping is required for tracability of actions.
70	Could the Government clarify references for CDRL A011 with regards to references provided?	There are conflicting references regarding CDRL A011 between 4.7.1 Flight Operations Procedures/Ground Operations Procedures, 4.7.1.1 FOPSS/GOPs Minimum Standard, 5.1.4.1, 6.2 Required CDRLs, 6.2.11, and CDRL A011.	Ex. A - CDRLs	4.7.1, 6.2, 6.2.11, Exhibit A - CDRL A011	The Government has aligned CDRLs and PWS references.
71	Could the Government clarify due date for CDRL A011 with regards to references provided?	4.7.1 Flight Operations Procedures/Ground Operations Procedures, 4.7.1.1 FOPSS/GOPs Minimum Standard, CDRL A011 due dates are conflicting.	Ex. A - CDRLs	4.7.1, 4.7.1.1, 6.2, 6.2.11, Exhibit A - CDRL A011	The Government has aligned CDRLs and PWS references.
72	Could the Government clarify references for CDRL A002 with regards to references provided?	There are conflicting references regarding CDRL A002 between 4.8 Small Business Reporting/Measurement, 6.2 Required CDRLs, 6.2.2, and CDRL A002.	Ex. A - CDRLs	4.8, 6.2, 6.2.2, Exhibit A - CDRL A002	The Government has aligned CDRLs and PWS references.

ATTACHMENT JL-1
WRITTEN QUESTION FORM
SOLICITATION NO. N62742-19-R-1199

73	Could the Governemnt clarify which Safety Program takes precedence due a conflict with requirements with the agencies/prograsms/instruction concerning required physicals, reporting data, required training etc., to include service requirements?	5.1 Safety: The Contractor shall complete all work tasks IAW contract terms and conditions while complying with the Safety program, host base safety requirements, Environmental Protective Agency (EPA) instructions and Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) Public Law 91-596 and OSHA 29 CFR 1910.	Attachment 1 - PWS	5.1 Safety	Recommend no change at the Basic. The Contractor shall adhere to requirements and in event conflicts are demonstrated the government will advise at task order level
74	Could the Government clarify CDRL A015 vice A019?	5.5 Travel requires, CDRL A019, however listed in 6.2 Required CDRLS, 6.2.15 and included in Exhibit-A as A015.	Ex. A - CDRLs	5.5, 6.2, 6.2.15, Exhibit A - CDRL A015	The Government has aligned CDRLs and PWS references.
75	Could the Governemnt clarify GP that the contractor is required to secure?	5.6.3 Emergencies/Closures/Weather Days ...The Contractor shall promptly secure all GP appropriately and evacuate in an expedient but safe manner.	Attachment 1 - PWS	5.6.3 Emergencies/Closures/Weather Days	The Government is indicating GP under offerors control at the time. Secure aircraft, close hatches, support equipment being used, etc.
76	According to CDRL document CDRL A017 note 8 in block 16 this document is to be sent electronically. Can the Government clarify the delivery instructions with PII information being sent over an unsecured network?	5.11 Mission Essential Services: The Contractor shall prepare for the continuation of essential DoD services during crisis IAW DFARS SUBPART 252.237.7023 "Continuation of Essential Contractor Services." In a state of emergency, if the Government deems necessary, the Contractor shall continue to provide all services necessary to ensure mission accomplishment. IAW the task order PWS, the Contractor shall provide a written plan IAW DFARS 252.237-7024, "Notice of Continuation of Essential Contractor Services". Mission Essential: All contractor personnel hired to fill skill positions listed in Attachment A shall be designated Mission Essential (ME). A Roster of Mission Essential Personnel (CDRL A017) shall be submitted by the Site Supervisor for each site where work is performed. That Mission Essential Roster shall include: each employee's name; the employee's CAC ID number and driver's license number and the state that issued the license. The Roster shall be updated when personnel changes occur.	Ex. A - CDRLs	5.11 Mission Essential Services	The Government clarified the Contractor is to deliver the roster in a manner to protect PII, per the individual Taks Order PWS
77	Could the Government clarify references for CDRL A013 with regards to references provided?	There are conflicting references regarding CDRL A013 between 5.13 Strike Plan, 6.2 Required CDRLS, 6.2.13, and CDRL A013.	Ex. A - CDRLs	5.13, 6.2, 6.2.13, Exhibit A - CDRL A013	The Government has aligned CDRLs and PWS references.
78	Could the Government clarify references for CDRL A014 with regards to references provided?	There are conflicting references regarding CDRL A013 between 5.14 Contractor Labor Dispute Plan/Unrepresented Employees, 6.2 Required CDRLS, 6.2.14, and CDRL A014.	Ex. A - CDRLs	5.13, 6.2, 6.2.14, Exhibit A - CDRL A014	The Government has aligned CDRLs and PWS references.
79	Could the Government clarify CDRL A016 vice A017?	5.17 Contractor Vehicle/Equipment Operation rquires CDRL A017, however listed in 6.2 Required CDRLS, 6.2.16 and included in Exhibit-A as A016.	Ex. A - CDRLs	5.17, 6.2, 6.2.16, Exhibit A - CDRL A016	The Government has aligned CDRLs and PWS references.
80	Could the Government clarify recipients for CDRL distirbution with regards to references provided?	6.2 Required CDRLs Recipient column does not match recipients listed in references listed in reference column and in Exhibit-A CDRL documents for CDRLS A006, A007, A008, A016	Ex. A - CDRLs	6.2 and Exhibit-A	The Government has aligned CDRLs and PWS references. Recipients clarified and specified

ATTACHMENT JL-1
WRITTEN QUESTION FORM
SOLICITATION NO. N62742-19-R-1199

81	Could the Government Clarify and list ALL required Methods of required NDT for individual Task Orders? Refer to the following: 1. Eddy Current 2. Liquid Penetrant a. Method A – Water Washable b. Method B – Post-Emulsifiable, Lipophilic c. Method C – Solvent Removable d. Method D – Post-Emulsifiable, Hydrophilic 3. Magnetic Particle a. Wet Magnetic Particle Testing b. Dry Magnetic Particle 4. Radiographic 5. Thermographic 6. Ultrasonic	Attachment A - A.52, A.53, A.54 -Additional Qualifications: Must be trained and certified in accordance with NAS 410 - NAS Certification & Qualification of Nondestructive Test Personnel. Required Methods/Disciplines and job description is not fully clarified.		Attachment A-A.52, A.53, A.54 -Additional Qualifications	Requirements are based on task order specific requirements. The intent of the verbiage is regardless of actual NDT method required, the individual performing the task is trained in accordance with NAS 410
82	Could the Government clarify Factor 2 since the Contractor (last 5 years) based on the Basic Contract was only required to perform Ground Operating Procedures in accordance with the 8210.1C not the 8210.1D?	Factor 2 HTRO Self-Scoring Matrix: Number of DoD Contracts/TOs administered in last 5 years that included ground operating procedures (GOP) development activities IAW 8210.1D	Attachment 6 - HTRO Self-Scoring Matrix		After consideration, the Government will accept activities IAW 8210.1C for evaluation purposes. 8210.1D will be required standard in task order awards.
83	Could the Government clarify Factor 2 since the Contractor (last 5 years) based on the Basic Contract was only required to perform Flight Operating Procedures in accordance with the 8210.1C not the 8210.1D?	Factor 2 HTRO Self-Scoring Matrix: Number of DoD Contracts/TOs administered in last 5 years that included flight operating procedures (FOP) development activities IAW 8210.1D.	Attachment 6 - HTRO Self-Scoring Matrix		After consideration, the Government will accept activities IAW 8210.1C for evaluation purposes. 8210.1D will be required standard in task order awards.
84	Will the Government provide the Estimated Quantity and Unit values for the Table on pages 3 thru 5.	Section B	FA810824RB001 - Section B		Estimated quantities and values will be filled at the task order level. However, the period of performance is estimated to be 10 years (5-Year Basic Period + 1 5-Year Option Period)
85	There is a conflict between H-1(6) and the LASR in the treatment of FMLA, Temporary Military Duty and Standard Backfill. Will the Government modify the H-1(6) language to equal the LASR language, which would then equal the language under the current CFT contract?	H-1(6), LASR (Proposal Submission Process – a.2/a.3)	Attachment 2 - H Clause		The language in the H-Clause and PWS will be reviewed before the final RFP release and should not conflict. However, the Government confirms that the language may not be the same as the current CFT contract. The Government stresses that offerors be aware of all potential changes to the LASR requirement.
86	Will the Government provide the Labor Category Rate Matrix identified in the H-1(8) paragraph?	H-1(8), Labor Category Rate Matrix	Attachment 2 - H Clause		The Labor Category Rate Matrix is applicable at the task order level. The Government may be provided at a later time before or at RFP release.
87	How will the Government use past performance to determine “Best Value”? Will there be a formula?	H-1(13)	Attachment 2 - H Clause		The Government may utilize past performance at the task order level. Instructions for how the Government will determine best value will be provided within the task order solicitation.
88	What is a surge hour? Is a surge hour different than hours associated with MTC increases in H-10?	H-5	Attachment 2 - H Clause		Correct. Surge Hour refers to DFARS 252.217-7001 Surge Option whereas the 25% increase/decrease is a separate condition in the H-Clause.
89	Please confirm that the “Pre-Determined” increase would be noted in the TOS competition.	H-10, Example 2	Attachment 2 - H Clause		Pre-determined increases would be stated at the task order competition level.
90	Please confirm that the 25% increase/decrease in FTE would not be anticipated in the TOS, but would be required after contract award.	H-10, Example 2	Attachment 2 - H Clause		A 25% increase would be required after task-order award.
91	Are Fixed Wing aircraft purposely left out of the Organizational (O)-Level section?		Attachment 3 - Ordering Guide		Ordering guide states: "... including, but not limited to..." The Government has inserted fixed wing to clarify.
92	Can you give an example of how relative weights will be utilized in the FOPR process?		Attachment 5 - Section M		FAR 16.5 Fair Opportunity will be used at the task order level and relative importance of factors/subfactors will be determined with each individual task order solicitation. Please refer to Section M Section 2.1.1 for the relative importance of factors for the overall IDIQ competition.
93	Is a contractor allowed to share a Site Supervisor between 2 Task Orders that require a Site Supervisor?	Adequate Site Supervision	Attachment 3 - Ordering Guide		The intent is not share site supervisors across multiple sites.
94	Is there a formula that will be used and shared with Contractors when the Government uses Quality of Service evaluations to impact TO Awards?	Selection Criteria for TO Award	Attachment 3 - Ordering Guide		Task order competitions utilizing quality of service as evaluation criteria in best value awards will have instructions as to how quality of service will be utilized IAW the Ordering Guide.
95	Please confirm that a Cost Proposal is not required.		Attachment 4 - Section L		Price is not being evaluated, thus a cost proposal is not required.
96	Is the MTTR minimum score requirement the same for both Competition Pools (Full and Open & Small Business)?	Minimum Score Requirement	Attachment 6 - HTRO Self Scoring Matrix		The MTTR is currently the same for both competition pools however, this is subject to change before the final RFP release.

ATTACHMENT JL-1
WRITTEN QUESTION FORM
SOLICITATION NO. N62742-19-R-1199

97	<p>The evaluation criteria re; direct fixed wing scheduled and unscheduled aircraft maintenance for aircraft under 19,000 lbs. unduly prejudices the small business providers.</p> <p>Note: After reviewing over 180 task orders competed on the current CFT Small Business vehicle, we cannot identify any opportunities contracted for fixed wing aircraft under 19,000 lbs.</p> <p>Accordingly, this requirement seems illusory for small business participants.</p>	Fixed-Wing under 19,000 lbs requirement	Attachment 6 - HTRO Self Scoring Matrix		The Government will take this into consideration
98	<p>The requirement for past performance on contracts with "at least 3 OCONUS Geographic Locations" is extremely restrictive, as few United States Government contracts qualify under this classification. It favors incumbent contractors on CFT-Large, where the majority of these types of programs are supported. Will Government reconsider the Past Performance requirement for "Contracts/Tos administered... with at least 3 OCONUS Geographic Locations?"</p>	OCONUS Multiple Locations requirement	Attachment 6 - HTRO Self Scoring Matrix		The Government will take this into consideration
99	<p>The requirement for past performance on contracts that included "RADAR/Radio equipment Ground Stations" is extremely restrictive and favors incumbent contractors on CFT-Large, where the majority of these types of programs are supported. Will Government reconsider the Past Performance requirement for "Contracts..... that included direct scheduled and unscheduled maintenance of RADAR/Radio equipment Ground stations"?</p>	RADAR/Radio equipment Ground Stations requirement	Attachment 6 - HTRO Self Scoring Matrix		Currently no CFT efforts of this type so no favor is being shown. This is to indicate a future task order possibility to support via CFT task order
100	<p>The Government weighting for DoD Contracts/Task orders that included flight operating Procedures (FOP) development activities IAW 8210.1D seem excessive as Small Business Contractors have been provided limited opportunity to satisfy this requirement over the last 10 years.</p> <p>Will the Government reconsider and extend the window to 15 years? This will prove at least that the contractor has indeed done it in the past on a CFT contract vehicle?</p>	Flight Operating Procedures (FOP) requirement	Attachment 6 - HTRO Self Scoring Matrix		The Government will take this into consideration.
101	<p>The scoring and valuation references quantity of current contracts/task orders with Secret or Top Secret unduly prejudices contractors who are currently performing on the CFT Small Business IDIQ. Accordingly; Is it the Government's intention to measure the number of task orders or FTE's with the respective clearances?</p>	Secret/Top-Secret requirement	Attachment 6 - HTRO Self Scoring Matrix		Task Orders. However, the Government is still reviewing the evaluation criteria. Evaluation criteria will not be finalized until RFP release.
102	<p>The scoring and valuation references quantity of current contracts/task orders with Secret or Top Secret unduly prejudices contractors who are currently performing on the CFT Small Business IDIQ. Accordingly; Is it the Government's intention to over weight Top Secret Experience over Secret (5,000 points vs 3,000 point maximum), even though there have been a de minimis level of Task Orders awarded on the Small Business IDIQ over the past 15 years?</p>	Secret/Top-Secret requirement	Attachment 6 - HTRO Self Scoring Matrix		Currently, the Government believes that there is added value for offeror's with Top Secret clearance. However, evaluation criteria including weighting is still being reviewed and will not be finalized until RFP release.
103	<p>The evaluation criteria re; contracts that included direct scheduled and unscheduled maintenance of weapons and munitions unduly prejudices the small business providers.</p> <p>Accordingly, this requirement seems illusory for small business participants.</p>	Weapons/Munitions Maintenance requirement	Attachment 6 - HTRO Self Scoring Matrix		The Government anticipates work related to evaluation criteria however, evaluation criteria is still being reviewed and will not be finalized until RFP release.
104	<p>Will there be a different HTRO_Self_Scoring_Matrix (i.e. Work Sample categories, Scoring, Weighting, etc.) for Full & Open and Small Business competition?</p>	HTRO Scoring	2.3.1 HTRO Self-Scoring Matrix & Work Sample Categories; Attachment_6-HTRO_Self_Scoring_Matrix (DRAFT).xlsx		At this time, the Government does not anticipate different HTRO Scoring for Full & Open and Small Business Competition.

ATTACHMENT JL-1
WRITTEN QUESTION FORM
SOLICITATION NO. N62742-19-R-1199

105	Will there be different Minimum Technical Threshold Ratings (MTTR) for Full & Open or Small Business competition?	HTRO Scoring	2.3 Factor 2 – HTRO Self-Scoring Matrix; Attachment_6-HTRO_Self_Scoring_Matrix (DRAFT).xlsx		At this time, the Government does not anticipate a different MTTR for Full & Open and Small Business Competition.
106	Is the MTTR identified on Attachment_6-HTRO_Self_Scoring_Matrix (DRAFT).xlsx the threshold for Full & Open or Small Business?	HTRO Scoring	2.3 Factor 2 – HTRO Self-Scoring Matrix; Attachment_6-HTRO_Self_Scoring_Matrix (DRAFT).xlsx		Confirmed that the MTTR identified in Attachment 6 is for both Full & Open and Small Business.
107	CME's that will require security clearance, will there be authorization for the CME's to work during the interim of the approval process?	PWS	5.2 Security Requirements - Section J, Attachment 1 - Performance Work Statement		Typically work is permitted to continue with a Favorable Tier 3 investigation, without actual access to Classified
108	What percentage of work requires a S or TS?	PWS	5.2 Security Requirements - Section J, Attachment 1 - Performance Work Statement		The government is unable to state what percentages, However a significant portion of the work does require a Secret Clearance
109	How many locations have Collective Bargaining Agreements in place?				Currently Approx 2/3 of all task orders have a CBA in place.
110	Can you provide a list of the 8 OCONUS sites and a list of the CONUS sites?				The list of sites is of limited value at this time due to CONUS/OCONUS sites changing frequently. There is not a definitive list of sites that can be predicted in the future.
111	What percentage of task orders will be set-aside for the small business pool?				There is no percentage associated with the number of task orders that will be set aside for Small Business. The requirements for whether or not a task order is set-aside strictly depends on the number of FTEs needed for the requirement. Please refer to Section 1.0, paragraph 3 of the Instructions to Offerors for specifics regarding requirements that will be set-aside.
112	In the large business pool, will there be small business goals?				The Government anticipates small business goals within the large pool at this time however, this is subject to change before final RFP release.
113	Will the government provide clarification on the AS9100D requirements? "The Offeror's proposal will first be evaluated by their ability to meet an initial technical standard by providing the required AS9100D certification." Companies cannot provide an AS9100D certificate for work they have not done or work they will do; they can only provide an AS9100D certificate for work that has already been certified. Is the government requesting a certificate demonstrating previous AS9100D certification on similar work?	AS9100D Certification	Section L, para 4.3		The government's intent is for the company to demonstrate AS9100D capability.
114	We understand the government's intent to develop a pool of diverse companies to meet the demands of the CFT PWS, however the HTRO matrix as currently scored will dramatically limit competition, both for large and small businesses by eliminating companies that don't meet the MTTR. For example, if a company has done primarily aircraft maintenance work on aircraft under 19,000 lbs, to include scheduling, support equipment, etc, but does not do rotary wing, drone, or low observable work, they will most likely fail to meet the MTTR, even though they have multiple contracts or task orders. Additionally, if a company meets the minimum in each category demonstrating broad experience in all areas, they also will not meet the MTTR. Both examples potentially lead to eliminating good companies from the competition. Additionally, the current HTRO would eliminate companies that specialize in certain areas, like low observable work or radar maintenance. The current HTRO matrix requires companies to have very broad and very deep experience but eliminates good companies that provide exceptional support in certain areas. We recommend reducing the MTTR to 42000 to expand the number of companies that qualify or restructure the HTRO to account for companies that are very proficient in one or two specific areas.	HTRO Matrix	Section L, para 4.4		The Government has not yet finalized the MTTR for this acquisition and will consider changes to the MTTR before the final RFP release.

ATTACHMENT JL-1
WRITTEN QUESTION FORM
SOLICITATION NO. N62742-19-R-1199

115	Discussion: The Attachment 6 HTRO establishes a Minimum Technical Threshold Rating (MTTR) that is identical for both Unrestricted and Restricted pools, based on self-scoring criteria that is identical regardless of the offeror's pool. While we support the 80% minimum score threshold as a standard for risk management, the criteria should be adjusted for small businesses. (For example, the score generated by numbers of FTEs transitioned in both CONUS and OCONUS are heavily weighted and constitute a large percentage of the maximum score, with FTE counts that would make most small businesses large. At the same time, the concept of execution of the contract distinguishes between unrestricted task orders and restricted task orders on the basis of FTE count). The current MTTR, while logical for Full and Open competition on unrestricted task orders, will be unnecessarily restrictive and exclusionary to small business offerors. Question: Will the government adjust the evaluation criteria to include a lower MTTR for restricted pool offerors?	Section L.1.0, L.4.4; Attachment 6 - HTRO	Section L.1.0, L.4.4; Attachment 6 - HTRO		The Government does not anticipate separate MTTR's for the Small Business and Full and Open Pools. The Government will consider changes to the MTTR before the final RFP is released.
116	Discussion: The Attachment 6 HTRO establishes a Minimum Technical Threshold Rating (MTTR) that is identical for both Unrestricted and Restricted pools, based on self-scoring criteria that is identical regardless of the offeror's pool. The MTTR is a function of Maximum Score criteria in column A through F that are targeted toward large businesses. While we support the 80% minimum score threshold as a standard for risk management, the criteria should be adjusted for small businesses. Question: Will the government provide a separate HTRO for Restricted Pool offerors that include criteria scaled to be appropriate for small business?	Section L.1.0, L.4.4; Attachment 6 - HTRO	Section L.1.0, L.4.4; Attachment 6 - HTRO		The Government does not anticipate separate HTRO Scoring Matrices for the Small Business and Full and Open Pools. The Government will consider changes to the HTRO Scoring Matrix before the final RFP is released.
117	Discussion: The reference establishes a recency determination for those contracts that have been performed during the past five (5) years from the date of issuance of this solicitation. For companies competing for the small business restricted pool, the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and resulting acquisition disruptions have impacted new business in the 2020 thru 2022 period. As the CFT solicitation has been delayed, pre-pandemic work that is most reflective of the experience and capabilities of restricted pool offeror capabilities has begun to age out within the 5 year window. Extending the period of recency to six (6) years will account for the solicitation release delay (the starting line for recency determination) while addressing the issue of COVID-impact to small bidders. Question: Will the government extend the recency determination period for Past Performance and HTRO calculations for restricted pool bidders to six (6) years from the date of solicitation release?	Section M.2.4.1; Attachment 6 - HTRO	Section M.2.4.1; Attachment 6 - HTRO		The period of recency is defined as performance within the last 5 years from date of solicitation release. For example, an offeror may have a task order/contract with a period of performance that began 9 years ago and the offeror is still performing on that task order/contract. This would be acceptable due to the offeror meeting the criteria of performing in the last 5 years. The Government is still reviewing and adjusting the HTRO scoring matrix and will take this into consideration.
118	There are no instructions for completing the pricing in Section B. Section L does not provide any direction on how to complete Section B. How is Section B supposed to be completed?	Draft Solicitation	Section B		The Government is not seeking pricing for basic contract award. Section B does not need to be filled in by the offeror. Please see Section L, 1.1, (b).
119	There are no instructions for completing the fields in Section F. How is Section F supposed to be completed?	Draft Solicitation	Section F		Section F is not required for offerors to fill in. Section F will be applicable at the task order level.
120	Will the Government add additional CDRLs, e.g. Production Reports, at the individual task order level? If so, recommend the Government include a complete numbering sequence of all possible "additional" CDRLs to ensure consistency of reporting.	Exhibit A - CDRLs			The Government will request additional/different CDRLs at the task order level. Additional CDRLs will be identified in the task order PWS, and depend upon end user requirements, Some examples include but are not limited to: Completed work packages for AFTO95 updates, QDR reports for defective items recieved for engine installation, Engine production reports, Aircraft servicing reports, Engine test cell results and reports,Weekly status reports and progress of work

ATTACHMENT JL-1
WRITTEN QUESTION FORM
SOLICITATION NO. N62742-19-R-1199

121	Recommend PWS be amended to incorporate the Note in CDRL A003, specifically: "THIS CDRL COMBINES ALL TASK ORDERS AND IS SUBMITTED AS ONE CDRL UNDER THE BASIC CONTRACT. SUBMITTALS ARE NOT DUE IF THERE ARE NO ACTIVE TASK ORDERS." The reason for the clarification is that the current CFT Vehicle says the same thing, but each Task Order requires the submission of a A003 CDRL each month ONLY for that task order. We have asked for clarification and get different answers from different CFT Contracting Officers.	CDRL A003	Exhibit A	4.2.1	This Revised CDRL 3 is to include ALL task orders active the month of submission. CDRL verbiage is correct as written. New CDRL A003 is for the CFT PMO/PCO review.
122	PWS Paragraph 4.4.1 contradicts itself. The first sentence defines MTC "on each task order", then the second sentence states the "minimum standard" is when FFP MTC for "all task orders are fully manned on day one...." As task orders are evaluated monthly on the CFT 104, MTC standards needs to be measured at the task order level.	MTC Minimum Standard	Attachment 1	4.4.1	This is for measurement of two different items. One at task order level fill and turnover, the other is measured as a point in time for overall fill rate based on 100% filled on day 1 of each task order. This statement is correct in that it explains the overall MTC minimum standard.
123	PWS Paragraph 4.4.1 concludes with the statement "Additionally, the Government is entitled to a minimum of 1912 productive hours per year per each person making up the MTC." Recommend changing to read "...productive hours per year per each person making up the MTC in accordance with the governing Wage Determination or Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA)." The specification of 1912 hours assumes that all MTC personnel have been working on the task order for less than five (5) years, a situation that is frequently not the case as CFT Task Orders have frequently been in place for many years and there are large numbers of employees who are entitled, IAW Department of Labor directives, to more than 80 hours of vacation. By specifying 1912 hours, the Government is penalizing contractors who must, by law, comply with DOL requirements.	Productive Manhours	Attachment 1	4.4.1, 5.6.9	PWS Paragraph 4.4.1 has been updated with new language.
124	The measurement of site supervision is, currently, a task order level requirement and scored as such on the monthly CFT 104 reports and a specific metric for each task order. 4.5.1 seems to be establishing another standard/metric on top of the current set of CDRLs required for each awarded task order. Recommend the Government not create another level of reporting and continue to score Site Supervision at the task order level.	Measurement of Site Supervision	Attachment 1	4.5.1	This is the same verbiage as the current Basic. While not a metric, it is a stated requirement in the PWS, and will continue to be a 104 reporting requirement
125	PWS 4.6.3 is confusing as titles, because, to qualify for contract award, a Company has to be AS 9100D Registered. As such compliance is not relevant as currently written. Recommend merging 4.6.3 and 4.6.3.1 and titling the paragraph AS 9100D Compliant Standard Operating Procedures.	AS 9100D Compliance	Attachment 1	4.6.3	The PWS is correct as written. 4.6.3 indicates AS9100 procedures and subsequent paras. 4.6.3.1 - 4.6.3.1.2 provide guidance on individual documents and CDRL requirements
126	PWS 4.6.3.3, as written, is problematic in that it states "It shall include detailed instructions for component removal, in-process inspections, and reinstallation, as well as all appropriate warning/caution notes." This statement appears to require the Contractor to superseded the Equipment Technical Instructions/Publications provided by the Government. It also assumes the Government provides the Contractor with specific technical publications/Time Compliant Technical Orders (TCTO) that are complete and current immediately upon task order award - usually Workbooks, in our experience must reflect the governing Government Technical documentation and are used, primarily to document TCTO modifications one each aircraft modified. Recommend changing the second sentence to "Workbooks shall reflect governing Government Technical Publications for component removal, inspections,"	Workbook Instructions	Attachment 1	4.6.3.3	The Government has included additional verbiage to the PWS indicating how workbooks are used for clarification.

ATTACHMENT JL-1
WRITTEN QUESTION FORM
SOLICITATION NO. N62742-19-R-1199

127	PWS 4.10. Please identify the Government Personnel empowered to determine situations beyond contractor control and the appeal process.	Government Decision Makers for circumstances/external influences beyond Contractor Control	Attachment 1	4.1	The Government has revised Section 4.10 in the PWS to state that the Government will consider.
128	PWS 6.2, CDRL A002. Please clarify if Prime Contractors on the Small Business Suite are required to submit CDRL A002. All work performed under the Small Business Suite is, by definition, counted toward Small Business Goals.	Clarification of CDRL Reporting	Attachment 1	6.2	The Government has updated both the PWS and CDRL
129	PWS 6.2.3 To ensure consistency, recommend modifying the first sentence as follows: "The Contractor shall electronically submit <u>one</u> monthly manning level report <u>which consolidates staffing for all awarded CFT Task Orders</u> IAW PWS paragraph 4.2.1. and CDRL A003. and	Clarification of CDRL Reporting	Attachment 1	6.2.3	The Government has updated both the PWS and CDRL
130	PWS 6.2.7 requires contractor to submit CDRL A007, as well as multiple other CDRLs for COR/GGFR Approval during the transition period. Recommend the Government add that the names of the COR/GGFR and contact information shall be provided to the Contractor concurrent with Task Order Award.	Clarification of CDRL Reporting	Attachment 1	6.2.7, 6.2.9,, 6.2.10, etc.	The Government has updated PWS to Insert verbaige after table 6.2 on contact information
131	H-1 (6) (b) includes the statement "Additionally, the Government is entitled to a minimum of 1912 productive hours per year per each person making up the MTC." Recommend changing to read "...productive hours per year per each person making up the MTC in accordance with the governing Wage Determination or Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA)." The specification of 1912 hours assumes that all MTC personnel have been working on the task order for less than five (5) years, a situation that is frequently not the case as CFT Task Orders have frequently been in place for many years and there are large numbers of employees who are entitled, IAW Department of Labor directives, to more than 80 hours of vacation. By specifying 1912 hours, the Government is penalizing contractors who must, by law, comply with DOL requirements and contradicting the 3rd sentence in the paragraph, which states "This constructively accounts for expected absences such as "Annual Leave."	Productive Manhours	Attachment 2	H-1 (6)(b)	The Government has updated clause H-1 with new language.
132	H-1 (7) (b) The definition of Site Supervisors as indirect positions that are not directly billed to the task order is not consistent with PWS Paragraph 4.5 and 4.11, which require and grade Site Supervisor staffing as both IDIQ and task order requirements which are evaluated/scored on the monthly CFT 104 reports. The definition is also not consistent with FAR Part 32.2, Indirect Costs, which defines an Indirect Cost as <u>any cost not directly identified with a single, final cost objective</u> (e.g. Dedicated Task Order Management Requirement), but <u>identified with two or more final cost objectives (e.g. Multiple Contracts/Task Orders) or an intermediate cost objective</u> . <u>As CFT requires Site Supervisors to be dedicated to a single task order, they are, as per FAR 31.2, direct costs to the task order.</u> As such, they are part of the MTC and need to be included as a separate line in each CFT Cost Proposal. This will ensure the Government gets the required task order management support for each task order and ensures compliance with both the FAR and CFT Task Order Evaluation criteria.	Site Supervisors Classification and Pricing as Direct Task Order Employees.	Attachment 2	H-1 (7) (b)	The Government will take this into consideration

ATTACHMENT JL-1
WRITTEN QUESTION FORM
SOLICITATION NO. N62742-19-R-1199

133	H-1 (9) References CFT Ceiling Rates. There is no information in Section L or other draft solicitation documentation requirements that addresses CFT IDIQ Pricing	Ceiling Rates	Attachment 2	H-1 (9)	Price is being evaluated at the task order level. Task order solicitations will include pricing instructions.
134	H-1 (20) (a) and (b). As written, contractor may enter negotiations with either the PCO or ACO. Recommend the Government identify one source for said negotiations to ensure clarity - PCO.	Who Contractors Negotiate with - PCO or ACO.	Attachment 2	H-1 (20)	The Government will take this into consideration.
135	<p><u><i>Adequate Site Supervision (1) and (2)</i></u>: The definition of Site Supervisors as indirect positions that are not directly billed to the task order is not consistent with PWS Paragraph 4.5 and 4.11, which require and grade Site Supervisor staffing as both IDIQ and task order requirements which are evaluated/scored on the monthly CFT 104 reports. The definition is also not consistent with the FAR, which defines an Indirect Cost as <u><i>any cost not directly identified with a single, final cost objective</i></u> (e.g. Dedicated Task Order Management Requirement), but <u><i>identified with two or more final cost objectives (e.g. Multiple Contracts/Task Orders) or an intermediate cost objective</i></u> .</p> <p><u><i>As CFT requires Site Supervisors to be dedicated to a single task order, they are, as per FAR 32.2, direct costs to the task order.</i></u> As such, they are part of the MTC and need to be included as a separate line in each CFT Cost Proposal. This will ensure the Government gets the required task order management support for each task order and ensures compliance with both the FAR and CFT Task Order Evaluation criteria.</p>	Site Supervisors Classification and Pricing as Direct Task Order Employees.	Attachment 3	Proposal Submission Process (Page 5), Adequate Site Supervision	The Government will take this into consideration.
136	c. Transition (2) Transition Basis of Estimate. This is the first and only reference to a requirement for the TBOE at the task order level. Recommended the Government being consistent with the requirement throughout all Solicitation documentation	Transition Basis of Estimate (TBOE) is not required outside of the Ordering Guide.	Attachment 3	Proposal Submission Process (Page 5), Adequate Site Supervision	This is a task order requirement that will be applicable at the task order level. The Ordering Guide is a tool to help offerors understand how to adhere to task order solicitations. Price is not being evaluated at the basic contract, however that is subject to change before final RFP release.
137	Section L, Paragraph 4.5: An Offeror is limited to five (5) contracts/task orders to demonstrate technical performance over twenty scored areas with up to twelve different levels of maintenance activity/aircraft/equipment supported. This means that a given citation must cover all twelve technical requirements (Attachment 6 Lines 12-23) in order to get a maximum score for those fields, which represent 63.4% (33,000)of the 62,000 total possible points. There are few, if any contracts, large or small that have scopes that cover support of this depth and breadth. The draft scoring criteria makes it next to impossible for any except the very largest businesses (Amentum, M-1, etc.) to qualify for an award. Recommend the Government revise scoring criteria to enable fair competition for award at both the Full and Open and Small Business Suites. Recommended changes will be provided in Attachment 6 Comments/Questions.	Draft Scoring Criteria effectively restricts nearly every Small Business and most Large Businesses from winning a CFT IDIQ award.	Attachment 4	Section L, Paragraph 4.5	The Government does not anticipate separate HTRO Scoring Matrices for the Small Business and Full and Open Pools. The Government will consider changes to the HTRO Scoring Matrix before the final RFP is released.
138	Section L, Paragraph 6 Requires Small Business Suite Prime Contractors to submit a full set of Small Business Participation documentation, even though they qualify as Small Businesses as documented through the company reps and certs. Recommend Small Businesses be exempt from this requirement, which is consistent with most IDIQs with Full and Open and Small Business Suites	Small Business Subcontracting Plan applicability for Small Business Suite Primes	Attachment 4	Section L, Paragraph 6.0	The Government has not yet finalized Small Business Participation and will take this into consideration.
139	The ITO Attachment 2.2 Cross Reference Matrix does not align with the PWS - specifically, none of the Factor 2 Self Scoring Matrix 21 elements map to PWS requirements.	ITO Attachment 2.2 does not map to PWS Requirements.	Attachment 4	Section L, Attachment 2.2	The Government has yet to finalize the Cross Reference Matrix and will take the comment into consideration

ATTACHMENT JL-1
WRITTEN QUESTION FORM
SOLICITATION NO. N62742-19-R-1199

140	<p>The Proposal Organization Table at Paragraph 2.2.3 identifies the Offeror shall include CPARS information and Past Performance Questionnaires and references ITO Paragraphs 5.1.1 and 5.1.2.</p> <p>ITO Paragraphs 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 provide NO guidance or formats for addressing the two HIGHLY RELEVANT topics of CPARS and Past Performance Questionnaires. Recommend the Government revise Paragraphs 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 to address submission requirements outlined in Table 2.2.3 and include Past Performance Questionnaires Offerors can send out to customers.</p> <p>Also recommend that Past Performance Questionnaire be returned directly to the Government, rather than be included in the Past Performance Volume.</p>	Proposal Outline requirements do not align with Section 5.0, Past Performance Submission requirements	Attachment 4	Section L, Paragraphs 2.2.3 and 5.0	The Government will take the information provided into consideration.
141	<p>The Government's Minimum Technical Threshold Rating (MTTR) of 52,000 points is unattainable by nearly all small businesses and most large businesses. As such, the establish threshold restricts competition by encouraging companies <i>NOT TO BID</i>, as it is impossible to win, especially as an offeror only has five (5), five page references to demonstrate the twenty one evaluation criteria necessary to achieve 52,000 points. As the scoring system is clearly defined in the solicitation, the end result will be there will be few, and perhaps no proposals submitted, as the Offeror cannot meet the MTTR and will not spend bid and proposal dollars on an effort they cannot win.</p> <p>The Government needs to completely revise the scoring criteria into something that is attainable for small and large business firms. Failure to do so will result in a lack of participation, multiple GSA protests upon solicitation release, or both. Recommend the Government completely revise the scoring criteria, including different sets for the Full and Open Suite and the Small Business Suite, criteria that is attainable and provides offerors a fair opportunity to win a CFT Contract Award.</p>	The CFT MTTR is unachievable for most, except very large businesses, effectively restricts/eliminates competition and actively discourages businesses for submitting a proposal for something they cannot win.	Attachment 5	Section M, Paragraph 2.3	The Government has not yet finalized the MTTR for this acquisition and will consider changes to the MTTR before the final RFP release.
142	The 21 work sample categories selected by the Government for evaluation do not align with the task order requirements released, to date on the current CFT Contract. Highly recommend the Government review all task orders by pool and develop new categories that align with actual requirements.	Alignment of scoring criteria with actual CFT Task Order requirements	Attachment 5	Section M, Paragraph 2.3.1	The Government will take this into consideration.
143	Please review and revise 2.3.1. Unclear what the Government is trying to say: "...the Government will evaluate the Offeror's evaluate according to the methodology set in Section L."	Unclear language	Attachment 5	Section M, Paragraph 2.3.1	The Government will review and update for futher clarification.
144	<p>Paragraph 2.4 states: "For the work samples/efforts provided IAW Section L paragraphs 4.5 and 4.5.1, the Government will assess Past Performance based on the Government-validated score for each offeror IAW Section M paragraph 2.3." Based on this statement, the extent of the Past Performance assessment will be nothing more that determining if the offeror's score meets or exceeds the 52,000 point floor of the highly flawed scoring criteria.</p> <p>Additionally, it does not align the Factor 3, Past Performance Proposal Requirements in Section L, Paragraphs 2.2.3 and 5.0, as there is no assessment of CPARS or Past Performance Questionnaires addressed in Section M.</p>	Past Performance evaluation appears to be a review of MTTR scoring and does not assess actual past performance	Attachment 5	Section M, Paragraph 2.4	The Government will take this into consideration.

ATTACHMENT JL-1
WRITTEN QUESTION FORM
SOLICITATION NO. N62742-19-R-1199

145	The Evaluation Category for FTE is not consistent with CFT Small Business Awards, which are 100 FTE or less. Most contracts with more than 100 FTE are won by large businesses. The current criteria make it likely a Small Business will only score 2000, maybe 3000 points if they are lucky. This evaluation element only speaks to the size of awarded requirement. It is not indicative of a company's ability to staff and execute the requirement. Recommend this evaluation criteria be realigned with actual CFT task order requirements by award suite in order to provide for fair competition.	Evaluation criteria is not consistent with CFT Pool Task Order structure and represents a significant barrier to Small Businesses winning an award.	Attachment 6	1st Evaluation Category - # FTE	The Government will take this into consideration.
146	The Evaluation Category for contracts/task orders with multiple sites is not consistent with CFT Task Order Awards and most other contracts, which usually support a single sites. Based on CFT awards over the past five years, there are only a handful that have multiple site requirements, which raises a question about the applicability of the criteria to CFT contract/task order performance. Most offerors will struggle to score more than two contracts which each has three or more locations	Evaluation criteria is not consistent with CFT Task Orders or other contracts/task orders, only a few of which support multiple sites. Recommend the Government revise to make consistent with actual customer requirements, as the relevancy of the number of sites to the work performed is questionable at best.	Attachment 6	2nd Evaluation Category - # of contracts/TO with three or more CONUS Sites	The Government will take this into consideration.
147	The Evaluation Category for contracts/task orders with three or more OCONUS Sites is not relevant to 100% of the current CFT Small Business OCONUS contract/task order requirements. There are no more than five Small Business OCONUS requirements and all are single site. Large businesses may have some contracts/task orders with more than three OCONUS sites, but they are likely few and far between. Given the number of CFT OCONUS Task Orders and the fact that no Small Business Task Orders have more than one OCONUS Site, this evaluation criteria is not relevant and needs to be deleted.	Evaluation criteria is not consistent with actual CFT OCONUS task order requirements. Difficult for most businesses to meet evaluation criteria.	Attachment 6	3rd Evaluation Category - # of contracts/TO with three or more OCONUS Sites	The Government will take this into consideration.
148	The number of CONUS personnel transitioned in 30 days does not account for the total FTEs that can be awarded to a CFT Small Business Prime is 100. That effectively makes a maximum score impossible for small business prime contractors. This criteria is somewhat valuable, but does not factor in whether or not there is an incumbent workforce or the depth of the labor pool. Unclear what 'multiple contracts/TOs allowed" means.	Evaluation criteria tied to size of effort, not CFT execution requirements. Value is subjective at best. Next to impossible for a Small Business to get a maximum score.	Attachment 6	4th Evaluation Category - # CONUS FTE transitioned in 30 days	The Government will take this into consideration.
149	Maximum number of OCONUS personnel transitioned in 90 days is not relevant to CFT work, which has only a few OCONUS task orders. Small Business Pool OCONUS takes orders are always less than 50 FTE, so the maximum score a Small Business can get is 2,000.	Evaluation criteria is not relevant to actual CFT task orders, especially considering the maximum number of FTEs a Small Business can have on and OCONUS task order is 50. This criteria is competition restrictive. Recommend it be eliminated.	Attachment 6	5th Evaluation Category - # OCONUS FTE transitioned in 90 days	The Government will take this into consideration.
150	Number of Contracts with Top Secret Clearances. This criteria wants to know if a company has between 1 and 50+ contracts/TO with Top Secret DD 254s. This is not relevant at all to CFT, which has only one known requirement (Presidential Helicopter) with a Top Secret DD254. In fact, a firm must have a Top Secret DD 254 to even qualify for a Top Secret Facility Clearance. Highly unlikely even the largest business has over 50 Top Secret contracts/TOs.	Evaluation criteria unrealistic as few, if any companies will be able to get more than 1000 points. The 4000 lost points represents 40% of the 10000 points a company can lose before falling below the 52,000 point threshold. Not relevant to CFT TOs - recommend delete.	Attachment 6	6th Evaluation Category - # Top Secret Contracts/Task Orders	The Government will take this into consideration.
151	Number of Contracts with Secret Clearances. This criteria wants to know if a company has between 1 and 50+ contracts/TO with Secret DD 254s. Roughly half of all CFT task orders have DD254s that require a company to have a Secret Facility Clearance. Historically, this has bee a requirement to bid the CFT IDIQ. Most companies will have a Secret Facility Clearance. The number of contracts/TOs with Secret DD 254s no real relevance to CFT TO performance, as the requirements to obtain a Facility Clearance must be met. A Small Business that won every CFT task order over a five year period would be only able to score 1800 points.	Evaluation criteria not relevant to CFT performance. Facility Clearances are issued based on need by DSS. Number required to score well is an obstacle to Small Business. Recommend making Secret Facility Clearance a requirement to submit a CFT Proposal, like the current CFT Contract Vehicle.	Attachment 6	7th Evaluation Category - # Secret Contracts/Task Orders	The Government will take this into consideration.

ATTACHMENT JL-1
WRITTEN QUESTION FORM
SOLICITATION NO. N62742-19-R-1199

152	Fixed Wing scheduled and unscheduled maintenance. Why is 19,000 lbs. relevant? Schedule and unscheduled fixed wing experience is not a function of aircraft weight. If weight means something, why are there not two levels of rotary wing maintenance? Recommend consolidation into a single fixed wing evaluation criteria. Note: Most CFT Task Orders support fixed wing aircraft.	No logic to dividing aircraft maintenance by weight of aircraft. Adds another opportunity to lose points, which present a barrier to fair competition. Recommend consolidating into one criteria and remove aircraft weight.	Attachment 6	8th and 9th Evaluation Category - Fixed wing scheduled/unscheduled maintenance.	The Government has considerd and HTRO evaluation categories have been adjusted based on research and input provided.
153	Recommend the Government relook weighting of the point value based on the number of CFT Task Orders that actually support rotary wing aircraft.	Relook criteria weight verse number of CFT rotary-wing TOs vs. Fixed Wing TOs.	Attachment 6	10th Evaluation Category - Rotary-Wing Aircraft	The Government has considerd and HTRO evaluation categories have been adjusted based on research and input provided.
154	There are currently no know CFT Small Business TOs that support piloted/unmanned drone aircraft. As such, this does not make sense to be an evaluation criteria. Represents another 1,000 points that can not be claimed by an offeror.	No current CFT Small Business requirements to support drone aircraft. Presents another obstacle to competition. Recommend delete.	Attachment 6	11th Evaluation Category - Drone Maintenance	The Government is not limiting to ONLY existing CFT task orders.A separate stand alone effort (NOT CFT) is creditable. The Government is looking for examples of having performed the requirement not just through CFT efforts.
155	There are currently only a few CFT Small Business TOs that support aircraft modifications, which makes it extremely difficult for any company to score well in this category. Recommend reducing weight and reducing the number of instances for each level to be consistent with actual CFT requirements. If the number of instances cannot be reduced, recommend deletion.	Few aircraft modification task orders, which makes it difficult to score well. Revise or delete.	Attachment 6	12th Evaluation Category - Aircraft Modifications	The Government has considerd and HTRO evaluation categories have been adjusted based on research and input provided.
156	There are currently 5-7 Small Business Task Orders that support the scheduled/unscheduled maintenance of aircraft engines/modules, etc. To score the maximum number of points requires a contractor to have won nearly every one of these efforts. While relevant, the requirements appears to be weighted too high, as the current weight will likely result in the loss of 2,000 - 3,000 possible points. Added to the decremented points previously identified, a notional offeror has equal to or less than 52,000 points with 8 remaining evaluation criteria.	Evaluation criteria not aligned with actual CFT TOs requiring identified services. Recommend review and reduction in weight of Evaluation Category.	Attachment 6	13th Evaluation Category - Aircraft Engine/Modules	The Government has considerd and HTRO evaluation categories have been adjusted based on research and input provided.
157	There are very few, if any, CFT Small Business Task Order requiring wheeled/tracked vehicle support. Need to reassess based on actual number of TOs supported. Recommend delete criteria.	Few, if any, current CFT Small Business requirements to support wheeled/tracked vehicles. Presents another obstacle to competition. Recommend delete.	Attachment 6	14th Evaluation Category - Wheeled and Tracked Vehicles	The Government has considerd and HTRO evaluation categories have been adjusted based on research and input provided.
158	There are very few, if any, CFT Small Business Task Orders supporting RADAR/Radio Ground Stations. Need to reassess based on actual number of TOs supported. Recommend delete criteria.	Few, if any, current CFT Small Business requirements to support RADAR/Radio Ground Stations. Presents another obstacle to competition. Recommend delete.	Attachment 6	16th Evaluation Category - RADAR/Radio Ground Stations	The Government has considerd and HTRO evaluation categories have been adjusted based on research and input provided.
159	There are very few, if any, CFT Small Business Task Orders supporting Low Observable/Other Coatings. Need to reassess based on actual number of TOs supported. Recommend delete criteria.	Few, if any, current CFT Small Business requirements to support Low Observable/Other Coatings. Presents another obstacle to competition. Recommend delete.	Attachment 6	17th Evaluation Category - Low Observable/Other Coatings	The Government has considerd and HTRO evaluation categories have been adjusted based on research and input provided.
160	There are very few, if any, CFT Small Business Task Orders supporting weapons and munitions/related equipment. Need to reassess based on actual number of TOs supported. Recommend delete criteria.	Few, if any, current CFT Small Business requirements to support weapons and munitions/related equipment. Presents another obstacle to competition. Recommend delete.	Attachment 6	18th Evaluation Category - Weapons/Munitions	The Government has considerd and HTRO evaluation categories have been adjusted based on research and input provided.
161	Few CFT Task Orders include Flight Operations and require FOPs (the requirement is usually for GOPs). As such, at the very least the weight for this evaluation category is too high. Recommend the Government reassess and revise the evaluation category to be consistent with actual PWS requirements, by suite for FOPs and reduce weight accordingly.	FOP evaluation criteria not consistent with actual CFT TO requirements. Number of FOPs needs to be consistent with actual task order FOP requirements. Recommend Revision.	Attachment 6	21st Evaluation Category - # FOP	The Government has considerd and HTRO evaluation categories have been adjusted based on research and input provided.

ATTACHMENT JL-1
WRITTEN QUESTION FORM
SOLICITATION NO. N62742-19-R-1199

162	<p>As presented in the draft Solicitation, the HTRO scoring matrix is:</p> <p>(1) Designed so that only very large businesses can generate the required number of points,</p> <p>(2) Presents significant barriers to competition to potential Small and Large Business Offerors,</p> <p>(3) Scores/Weights are not aligned with actual CFT Task Order Requirements, and</p> <p>(4) Between 8 and 10 of the 21 Evaluation Criteria are not directly relevant to the performance of the vast majority of CFT TOs.</p> <p>Highly recommend the Government evaluate the requirements of all current CFT Task Orders, many of which have been recompeted multiple times, determining appropriate evaluation categories and weights based on that assessment, then establish appropriate MTTRs for both the Small and Large Business Suite in order to encourage competition, rather than discourage it, as the draft document does.</p>	<p>Evaluation Criteria, Scoring, Weighting Revision to encourage competition. The current Attachment 6 and established MTTR effectively make it impossible for Small Businesses and many Large Businesses to win a CFT award, which will significantly reduce Industry support of the vehicle and negatively impact the readiness of Customer Organizations.</p>	Attachment 6	HTRO Scoring Matrix.	<p>The Government does not anticipate separate HTRO Scoring Matrices for the Small Business and Full and Open Pools. The Government will consider changes to the HTRO Scoring Matrix before the final RFP is released.</p>
163	<p>Section L instructions paragraph 1.0 defines Set-Aside as equaling "up to 100 full-time equivalents (FTEs) of personnel per task order in the CONUS or up to 50 FTEs OCONUS." Section M instructions paragraph 1.1(d)(1) defines Set-Aside as equaling "less than one hundred (100) FTEs CONUS and less than fifty (50) FTEs OCONUS." Please clarify which section is correct.</p>	Draft Solicitation	Attachment 4 - Section L & Attachment 5 - Section M	N/A	<p>The Government confirms that Section L is the correct language and Section M will be corrected to match.</p>
164	<p>Section L instructions paragraph 6 inadvertently skips subparagraph 6.2. Please clarify.</p>	Draft Solicitation	Attachment 4 - Section L	N/A	<p>The Government has updated Section L paragraph numbers.</p>
165	<p>Section L instructions paragraph 4.5 – Work Samples states, "The Offerors shall submit a maximum of five (5) work samples(contracts/orders) which demonstrate their past technical experience in the required elements listed within the HTRO Scoring Matrix." Is it the government's expectation that all bidders must provide only 5 past performance samples and those 5 tasks must somehow demonstrate up to maximum ability in all 21 evaluation categories required in Attachment 6? Or, are bidders to provide 5 past performances demonstrating successful performance of the PWS requirements, while self-scoring in Attachment 6 based on a company wide depth of experience regardless of the 5 past performances submitted?</p>	Draft Solicitation	Attachment 4 - Section L	N/A	<p>Offerors are permitted to submit up to five (5) work samples for each evaluation category demonstrating company wide experience.</p>
166	<p>What portion of CFT task orders are expected to be issued for aircraft under 19,000 lbs.? What portion of CFT task orders are expected to be issued for aircraft over 19,000 lbs.?</p>		Attachment 6	8th and 9th Evaluation Category - Fixed wing scheduled/unscheduled maintenance.	<p>There is no expectation of number of efforts above or below the weight. This was merely to demonstrate expertise working on smaller fighter as well as larger cargo/bomber airframes.</p>

ATTACHMENT JL-1
WRITTEN QUESTION FORM
SOLICITATION NO. N62742-19-R-1199

167	<p>Section H-1(7) requires bidders to propose Site Supervisors as indirect labor. However, Site Supervisors being proposed as indirect labor conflicts with multiple FAR Parts and definitions framing requirements for Indirect and Direct Costs.</p> <p>The FAR defines Indirect Cost as, "...any cost not directly identified with a single final cost objective, but identified with two or more final cost objectives..." This means indirect cost must support two or more CFT task awards.</p> <p>Furthermore, the FAR states, "The contractor shall determine each grouping so as to permit use of an allocation base that is common to all cost objectives to which the grouping is to be allocated." Indirect Costs are pooled in various categories, such as Overhead, Fringe Benefits, and G&A to determine indirect rates against the company's revenue (allocation base).</p> <p>Alternatively, according to the FAR, "Direct cost means any cost that is identified specifically with a particular final cost objective" and that "Costs identified specifically with a contract are direct costs of that contract. All costs identified specifically with other final cost objectives of the contractor are direct costs of those cost objectives," meaning each respective CFT task award. Here, the FAR is very clear, "Direct Cost of the contract shall be charged directly to the contract."</p>	<p>Finally, we believe the FAR classifies Site Supervision on any CFT task as an employee in support of the contract. The FAR says, "An employee is not considered to be directly performing work under a contract if the employee-</p> <p>(1) Normally performs support work, such as indirect or overhead functions; and</p> <p>(2) Does not perform any substantial duties applicable to the contract."</p> <p>We request the government consider realigning H-1 requirements with the above FAR based requirements and allow bidders to propose Site Supervision as direct billable position in support of CFT task orders.</p>	Attachment 2 - Section H	PWS 4.5	The Government will take this into consideration.
168	<p>Interesting that the government requires evaluation Factor 4 from all bidders, yet the HTRO scoring matrix does not align with H-2(a) set aside requirements to support small business participation. Since none of the current CFT awards have 100 or more FTEs, any HTRO Evaluation Category requiring a minimum range of ≥100 FTEs past performance technical experience instantly penalizes small business bidders. Similarly, Evaluation Categories requiring a higher number of task awards than achievable on the current CFT contract will likely reduce small business (possibly even large business) participation. These inflated scoring requirements prevent small businesses from obtaining up to maximum points possible and in some cases small business bidders cannot even reach 50% of the maximum possible score, even though they may be highly qualified performers. We request the government revise the scoring scale to levels supportive to small business participation.</p>	H-2(a) vs HTRO	Attachment 2 - Section H & Attachment 6 - HTRO Self Scoring Matrix	N/A	The Government will consider changes to the HTRO Scoring Matrix before the final RFP is released. There are currently several CFT efforts above the 100 FTE level, including at least 1 with over 300 FTEs.

ATTACHMENT JL-1
WRITTEN QUESTION FORM
SOLICITATION NO. N62742-19-R-1199

169	<p>In Attachment 6, two of the Evaluation Categories are for fixed wing aircraft, one for aircraft below 19,000 pounds and the other above 19,000 pounds.</p> <p>(1) What is the significance of 19,000 pounds? (2) Why are there two categories for fixed wing aircraft maintenance?</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> Based on discussions with our Senior Aviation Maintenance Professionals (Retired USAF and USN Senior, with the exception of a few training aircraft (T-6 and T-38), all fixed wing aircraft weight in excess of 19,000 pounds (e.g. the smallest fighter, F-16, weighs 21,000 pounds). They have further stated that their is no appreciable difference in the skills and experience required to maintain any aircraft, though a few of the smaller aircraft do not have hydrolic assisted flight controls. In their experience there is no difference in the skills and experience to repair, maintain or modify any aircraft based on the weight of the aircraft at the Organizational, Intermediate, or Depot level.</p> <p><u>Recommendation:</u> Recommend the Government eliminate the above/below 19,000 pound requirements and consolidate the two Evaluation Categories into a single Evaluation Category for Fixed Wing Aircraft Maintenance.</p>	Fixed Wing Aircraft Weight	Attachment 6	8th and 9th Evaluation Category - Fixed wing scheduled/unscheduled maintenance.	The Government has adjusted these HTRO evaluation categories based on research and input provided.
170	<p>Can the Government provide an estimate the annual number of CFT Task Orders for:</p> <p>(1) The Full and Open Suite, and (2) The Small Business Suite?</p>	Annual Number of Full and Open and Small Business Set-aside Task Orders	Solicitation	N/A	At this time, the Government cannot anticipate or provide an estimate for the number of future CFT task orders for this requirement.
171	<p>H-1(6)(c) states that the PCO shall seek consideration when the MTC is not met. It then goes on to empower the PCO to execute a "unilateral reduction of FFP monthly payments." Is the Government seeking to divest contractors of their rights under the Contracts Disputes Act by requiring the contractor to sign up, in advance, for unilateral reductions when the specific circumstances giving rise to any reduction are not currently known? In other words, is there any appeal process if a contractor disagrees with the requested consideration and/or unilateral reduction?</p>	H-1	Attachment 2 H Clause Draft		The H-1 clause has been updated with language that specifies the Government's intent when offerors are not meeting the MTC.
172	<p>H-1 (6)(b) states the "PCO shall request consideration that considers the hourly rate of the vacant skill set for the length of time the MTC productive hours standard has not been met". The term hourly rate is commonly used in Time and Materials contracts and is actually defined in FAR 16.601 (a) Time and Materials Contracts. Why is the Government considering hourly rates on a firm fixed price contract when an FFP is a lump sum paid out over a certain period of time?</p>	H-1	Attachment 2 H Clause Draft		IAW FAR 16.601(c) "A time-and-materials contract may be used only when it is not possible at the time of placing the contract to estimate accurately the extent or duration of the work or to anticipate costs with any reasonable degree of confidence." While there are rare instances where this is the case, CFT task orders are typically awarded on a FFP basis due to the extent of the work that is known. The Government considers the hourly rate of the vacant position as fair and equitable consideration when the MTC is not met.
173	<p>How did the Government determine the 25% range?</p>	H-10	Attachment 2 H Clause Draft		25 % scope range is to reasonably limit changes to an existing task order without a complete new re-competed action.
174	<p>In example 2, the originally awarded MTC is 20. The Government increased the originally awarded MTC by 4 to a new total MTC of 24. The example states the government can increase the 24 MTC by 6 up to 30 because the "new" baseline MTC is 24. However, 30 would be a 50% increase from the originally awarded 20 MTC. Does this mean the Government can perpetually increase the MTC by 25% because it deems the revised MTC as the starting point for the 25% clause?</p>	H-10	Attachment 2 H Clause Draft		The Government confirms that this is correct. The example explains that Options 1 and 2 can either retain or increase the MTC to 24 personnel. This is pre-identified part and parcel to the particular Option and a part of the task order award. The 25% scope change would then apply to the exercised option.

ATTACHMENT JL-1
WRITTEN QUESTION FORM
SOLICITATION NO. N62742-19-R-1199

175	In example 3, the originally awarded MTC is 20. The Government decreased the originally awarded MTC by 4 to a new total MTC of 16. The example states the government can decrease the 16 MTC by 4 down to 12 because the "new" baseline MTC is 16. However, 12 would be a 40% decrease from the originally awarded 20 MTC. Does this mean the Government can perpetually decrease the MTC by 25% because it deems the revised MTC as the starting point for the 25% clause?	H-10	Attachment 2 H Clause Draft		The Government confirms that this is correct.The example explains that Options 1 and 2 can either retain or increase the MTC to 24 personnel. This is pre-identified part and parcel to the particular Option and a part of the task order award. The 25% scope would then apply to the exercised option.
176	There are a variety of circumstances under which a task may not be able to be rescheduled within a contractor's pay period. For example, what if a task was scheduled for the last day of the pay period and then needs to be rescheduled last minute? What if the cause of the delay (e.g. bad weather or a delayed aircraft delivery) spans multiple days beyond a pay period?	Rescheduling	PWS	5.6.5	The Government has revised PWS paragraph 5.6.5 to or read "... or timeline determined by the PCO".
177	PWS 5.7 states "If manning levels must be decreased due to unanticipated workload reduction, the task order may be de-scoped as a resuly of Government/Contractor negotiations". Clause H-10 contradicts this language by stating "The Government reserves the right to increase or decrease the total MTC by up to 25%. Clause H-10 does not mention such Government/Contractor operational negotiations regarding MTC decrease. In the event of a decrease in MTC due to unanticipated workload reduction, which contract language takes precedence?	Attachment 1 PWS Draft	Attachment 1 PWS Draft	5.7	The Government has revised PWS section 5.7 to clarify descope actions are not the 25 % adjustments.
178	How will the Government evaluate submitted surveillance data for completeness/accuracy?	Attachment 1 PWS Draft	Attachment 1 PWS Draft	4.9.3	Please see PWS paragraph 4.11 Services Summary at task order level.
179	After the CFT104 is submitted into the CFT Control Panel Plus Database by the COR, will the CFT 104 be altered in any way by the Government after the Government evaluation?	Attachment 1 PWS Draft	Attachment 1 PWS Draft	4.9.3	Please see PWS paragraph 4.9.4 for CFT Form 104 disputes.
180	Does the Government communicate with the COR about the CFT 104 prior to the COR submission of the CFT 104 into the CFT Control Panel Plus Database?	Attachment 1 PWS Draft	Attachment 1 PWS Draft	4.9.3	The COR is the PCOs representative on site doing the evaluation for the 104.
181	Will the Government communicate with the Contractor about the CFT 104 prior to the COR submission of the CFT 104 into the CFT Control Panel Plus Database?	Attachment 1 PWS Draft	Attachment 1 PWS Draft	4.9.3	As a practice the COR should communicate with the Contractor through the Site supervisor or site lead on a routine basis such that there would be no surprises on the 104.
182	Will this contract only have task orders that are labor augmentation?	Attachment 4 Section L	Attachment 4 Section L		The scope of the contract is only for labor augmentation and will only have task orders for labor augmentation.
183	Contractors who are not currently awarded a CFT IDIQ MAC or who have not been awarded task orders under their current CFT IDIQ MAC are at a disadvantage under Section 1.10. How will the Government address this issue?	Attachment 5 Section M	Attachment 5 Section M		Offerors are NOT limited to only citing performance under the existing CFT IDIQ MAC.
184	Will there be any other metrics other than augmentation related metrics?	Attachment 3 Ordering Guide	Attachment 3 Ordering Guide		Please refer to Section 4.11 "Services Summary" within the PWS. As noted in this section, there will be task order and performance metrics for individual task orders that will be included in task order performance work statements.
185	Will the government define "augmentation"?	Attachment 3 Ordering Guide	Attachment 3 Ordering Guide		As it relates the requirement, augment is defined as "increasing", or the government requires additional resources beyond "Uniformed Service" personnel.
186	What is the difference between "augmentation" and "performance based" efforts?	Attachment 3 Ordering Guide	Attachment 3 Ordering Guide		Augmentation is simply a term that means "increasing" as it pertains to the Government needing additional labor. The requirement is for Government labor support. Meeting the minimum team compliment and having satisfactory performance are measured differently.
187	Will contractors be allowed more than the usual seven days to respond to a FOPR on the new IDIQ?	Attachment 3 Ordering Guide	Attachment 3 Ordering Guide		The Government anticipates a longer response time for the IDIQ however, response time to task order solicitations are to be determined.
188	Will the task orders be awarded based on LPTA?	Attachment 4 Section L/ Attachment 5 Section M	Attachment 4 Section L/ Attachment 5 Section M		Task orders will be awarded in accordance with task order solicitation instructions. Please refer to paragraph 13 under clause H-1.
189	In light of workload fluctuations, additional MTC language, consideration language, and a 25% rule, has the government considered using a T&M CLIN type?	Attachment 3 Ordering Guide	Attachment 3 Ordering Guide		Please refer to the CLIN structure in FA810824RB001 on pages 3 and 4. T&M CLINs are present and may be used in certain situations.
190	Will task orders be FFP?	Attachment 4 Section L/ Attachment 5 Section M	Attachment 4 Section L/ Attachment 5 Section M		Task orders will be in accordance with the CLIN structure in FA810824RB001. This may result in a variety of different CLIN types under a task order.

ATTACHMENT JL-1
WRITTEN QUESTION FORM
SOLICITATION NO. N62742-19-R-1199

191	Will operational fluctuations, that were not considered when the original FFP price was submitted, be handled as T&M or cost plus?	H-10	Attachment 2 H Clause Draft		The Government will address fluctuations at a task order level. Offerors are encouraged to submit FFP task order proposals that properly reflect the requirement.
192	In Section B, CLIN X002 is identified as Overtime FFP. Can the Government clarify how this CLIN will be used? If both Labor (CLIN X001) and OT are proposed on a task order, will the OT be broken out onto CLIN X002?	CLIN Structure	Draft RFP FA810824RB001, Section B	N/A	The Government confirms that this is the intent.
193	In Section E, FAR 52.246-11 requires compliance with AS9100D. CFT task orders accomplish depot, field and organizational level inspection, maintenance, modification, and repair at operational Government locations worldwide. This scope falls more in line with AS9110C and not AS9100D. Can AS9110C be substituted for AS9100D based on the applicability of the standard to task order operations?	Higher-Level Contract Quality Requirements	Draft RFP FA810824RB001, Section E	N/A	The Government does not anticipate considering alternative forms of certifications for this requirement.
194	In Section L Attachment 4, Para 4.3 requires AS9100D. This requirement will limit competition significantly without the ability to provide alternative high-quality certifications such as AS9110C. Will the Government considering also allowing AS9110C certification as part of Factor 1?	Technical Factor 1	Draft RFP FA810824RB001, Section L	N/A	The Government does not anticipate considering alternative forms of certifications for this requirement.
195	In Section L, Para 6.1.1 a Small Business Commitment Document is required. Does the Government have a template to be used by bidders to provide this information?	Small Business	Draft RFP FA810824RB001, Section L	N/A	An example can be found at: https://www.dau.edu/sites/default/files/Migrated/ToolAttachments/SBPCD%20sample%20template.pdf
196	In Section L, Para 6.1.1(i) the Small Business Commitment Document requires "the extent to which small businesses are specifically identified in proposals." Is it correct that the Government is only looking for a narrative as to <u>how</u> a Contractor will identify small businesses in task order proposal and <u>not</u> the names of small businesses that might be used in, for now, unknown task order scopes?	Small Business	Draft RFP FA810824RB001, Section L	N/A	The Government confirms that is the intent however, small business commitment requirements are still being reviewed and are subject to change before final RFP release.
197	In Section L, Para 6.1.1(iv) the Small Business Commitment Document requires "the extent of participation of such small businesses as a percentage and dollar value of total contract dollars." What dollar value are Contractors to use to comply with 6.1.1(iv)?	Small Business	Draft RFP FA810824RB001, Section L	N/A	The Government is still reviewing small business commitment for final RFP release. Currently, the Government anticipates Offerors providing estimates but this is subject to change.
198	Discussion: It is understood and acknowledged that the CFT Contract has primarily been to provide maintenance touch labor to augment, replace, or create a maintenance capability. It is also understood that CMMARS, KRACEN, ACES, and AFICA enable more than pure maintenance touch labor support. Certain platforms, especially those emerging, often require more than pure maintenance support. Examples would be an Engineer for systems engineering, system evaluation, fault isolation, and initial system triage; a logistician that manages unique requirements, processes, and supply chain interface. A customer may not need or no longer requires a CLS type support contract, but still needs more than pure maintenance. Question: Would the gov't consider inserting any verbiage that would allow a customer to add support personnel for anything other than pure maintenance support, but short of a CLS effort?	1.0 Introduction: The Contractor Field Team (CFT) Program Office provides Department of Defense (DoD) entities and other federal agency customers the ability to rapidly augment existing organic maintenance efforts with contract maintenance services using the CFT Indefinite Demand Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Services Contract. This services contract provides CFT Program Office customers the ability to obtain the flexible and rapid deployment of teams of skilled maintenance technicians that are tailored to provide the specific skills needed to fulfill the customer's defined requirement.		1.0 Introduction	The Government does not anticipate changing the current scope of the CFT LASR effort. However some logistics support is permitted in conjunction with actual maintenance augmentation. Attachments to the PWS that describe labor skills will be included for final RFP release. Clarification included in the PWS
199	Can the customer request work be performed at Contractor facility if in the best interest of the gov't?	2.1 Scope: ...maintenance support at customer (government-owned or government-leased) facilities located both in the continental United States (CONUS) and outside the continental United States (OCONUS).		2.0 Scope & Limitations	The Government does not anticipate changing the current scope of the CFT LASR effort.
200	Can the customer request support for vehicles, systems, or equipment, that requires Contractor or OEM data, or the ability to acquire data (as an option for expanded support)?	2.1 Scope: All weapon systems supported under the CFT contract will be non-commercial and must have Government-owned technical data.		2.0 Scope & Limitations	The Government does not anticipate changing the current scope of the CFT LASR effort. However there are some limited instances providing support for these, however in all instances the government must own or have the technical data to support the requisite maintenance. The Government has updated the language accordingly.

ATTACHMENT JL-1
WRITTEN QUESTION FORM
SOLICITATION NO. N62742-19-R-1199

201	Can the customer request some forms of logistical and/or supply chain support in conjunction with maint support efforts?	2.2.1 Limitations: The CFT contract does not provide for...logistics-only support operations.		2.0 Scope & Limitations	The Government does not anticipate changing the current scope of the CFT LASR effort. However some logistics support is permitted in conjunction with actual maintenance augmentation. Attachments to the PWS that describe labor skills will be included for final RFP release, clarification inserted in the PWS.
202	Can the Gov't expand RPA to include Unmanned Autonomous Vehicles, which may require more than pure maintenance support, such as Engineering, Mission Payload, and Supply Chain Logistical Support?	CFT LASR Ordering Guide. Pg 3: A/C & Mission Equip Maint Services		Reasoning: Many DOD customers are, or are getting involved in UAS platforms that at times require more than pure maint support.	The Government does not anticipate changing the current scope of the CFT LASR effort. However some logistics support is permitted in conjunction with actual maintenance augmentation. Attachments to the PWS that describe labor skills will be included for final RFP release. However this does not include engineering or mission payload support.
203	Would the government accept performance in Non-DOD contracts or TOs performed in commercial work (MSAs) as applicable for lines 12-25 of the Attachment 6 - HTRO self-assessment matrix?	Attachment 6 HTRO Self Scoring Matrix; Lines 12-25	Section L 4.4; Section M, 2.1(2); 2.1.2; 2.3;		The Government has taken this into consideration and updated lines 12-25 of the HTRO Matrix accordingly.
204	Would the government accept Sub-contract performance in Non-DOD contracts or TOs performed in commercial settings (for Primes)\) as applicable for lines 12-25 of the Attachment 6 - HTRO self- assessment matrix?	Attachment 6 HTRO Self Scoring Matrix; Lines 12-25	Section L 4.4; Section M, 2.1(2); 2.1.2; 2.3;		The Government has taken this into consideration and updated lines 12-25 of the HTRO Matrix accordingly.