18. Question: In the Draft RFP, cross-reference matrices were explicitly excluded from page limits. In the Final RFP, cross-reference matrices were deleted from the list of sections excluded from page limits but are required where cross-referencing to other volumes is necessary. Please clarify that cross-reference matrices included to show cross-references to other volumes as well as assist evaluators in identifying locations in the proposal where requirements are addressed are excluded from page limits.

Reference: FRFP dated 7/10/2018, Section L.9(c) and L.13(b)(2)

Answer: Cross-reference matrices are not required because Cover Letter, Volume I, Mission Suitability (Written Proposal and Oral Presentation), Volume II, Past Performance (Oral Presentation), and Volume III, Cost/Price supporting narrative, shall be submitted in Text Searchable Adobe Acrobat PDF. The statement “Where necessary, a cross-reference sheet to other volumes shall be included.” in Section L.13(b)(2) will be deleted as per RFP Amendment P000001.

19. Question: The Draft RFP allowed foldouts in the Written Proposal, counting them as 2 pages each. The Final RFP deletes reference to foldouts. Request the Government amend the RFP to allow foldouts for tables, figures, and other illustrations where a foldout presentation provides completeness and clarity.

Reference: FRFP dated 7/10/2018, Section L.9

Answer: All proposal components shall be submitted electronically through the FedBizOpps (FBO.gov) system. Therefore, foldouts are not applicable.

20. Question: Will the Government set a deadline for submittal of questions regarding the RFP and associated attachments?

Reference: N/A

Answer: August 10, 2018 is the deadline for submittal of questions regarding the final RFP and its attachments.

21. Question:
Background

• The Draft RFP section L paragraph B.1 stated that:
For Statement of Work (SOW Sections 3.2 and 3.3 only, the Offeror’s approach shall address the following:
  o Understanding of the Technical Requirements
  o How best practices, innovative technologies, and industry standards would be infused into the requirements
  o Potential risk areas and recommended approaches to minimize the probability and impact of these Risks.
• The Final RFP section L paragraph B.1:
  o Retained the title Understanding of the Statement of Work
But
  o Deleted the first bullet “Understanding of the Technical Requirements”
And
  o Modified the second bullet to read “How Best practices, innovative technologies, and industry standards would be infused into the requirements that will be used to enhance contract performance to meet the requirements in these SOW areas

Specific questions

21.1. Has the requirement to explicitly show “Understanding” of SOW Sections 3.2 and 3.3 been deleted from Section L proposal instructions and the associated evaluation criteria even though the section title is still “Understanding the Statement of Work”?

Reference: FRFP dated 7/10/2018, Section L.17(a)(B)(I)

Answer: No, the final RFP still explicitly states: “For Statement of Work (SOW) Sections 3.2 and 3.3 only,”

21.2. Are we correct in assuming that the Government is looking for a response that accomplishes the 2 items listed below:
• Describes the “Best Practices, innovative technologies and industry Standards” that the offeror will bring to ISRDS-3 to enhance contract performance
• How these “Best Practices, Innovative techniques and Industry Standards” will specifically enhance our approach to contract performance in SOW sections 3.2 and 3.3

Reference: FRFP dated 7/10/2018, Section L.17(a)(B)(I)

Answer: No, as stated in the final RFP, the Offeror shall address best practices, innovative technologies, and industry standards that will be used to enhance contract performance to meet the requirements in SOW Sections 3.2 and 3.3.
22. Question: The RFP states: "I. As a minimum, the Past Performance Volume shall include the following: (1) For the Prime Contractor and each Major Subcontractor, a list of not more than three (3) recent and relevant contracts (government and/or industry contracts)." Will the Government allow no more than three recent and relevant contracts for the Prime, and no more than three recent and relevant contracts for each Major Subcontractor?
Reference: FRFP dated 7/10/2018, Section L.17(b)

Answer: Yes, the final RFP states: "For the Prime Contractor and each Major Subcontractor, a list of not more than three (3) recent and relevant contracts (government and/or industry contracts)."

23. Question: The language states "The evaluation will be based primarily on the information presented in the written proposal. The proposal shall specifically address each listed evaluation factor and subfactor." Please clarify to include material provided in the Orals presentation and slides will be included in the evaluation.
Reference: FRFP dated 7/10/2018, Section L.9(c) and L.13(b)(6)

Answer: In accordance with Section M.2, Evaluation Approach, evaluation will be on the basis of material presented and substantiated in the Offeror's proposal, including written proposals and oral presentation. This information will be clarified in the RFP Amendment P000001, and the statement "The evaluation will be based primarily on the information presented in the written proposal" in Section L.13(b)(6) will be deleted as per RFP Amendment P000001.
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