

Design, Integration, Communication and Construction Engineering 2

Questions and Answers Posted to FedConnect on February 1, 2016

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY DICCE2 INDUSTRY DAY ATTENDEES on 9/23/15

1. The sample task is Vietnam. Is either of the incumbent contractor's currently working there? Conflict?
 - a. The Vietnam project is not a sample task, it is a real project that will be awarded as a Task Order. Neither incumbents are currently working in Vietnam under any NSDD contract.

2. If required to go to a High Risk site, will security and life support be a contractor responsibility?
 - a. Each contractor makes a safety plan for each country including an evacuation plan and communications plan for any situation. Keeping in touch with Embassy is required and Country Clearance requests provide contact information and itinerary to Embassy. Evacuation insurance is allowable. NSDD does not deploy to war zones.

3. Please provide the Industry Day presentation slides.
 - a. The slides are provided on FedConnect.

4. Please provide the Industry Day attendee list.
 - a. The attendee list is provided on FedConnect.

5. To which cities/countries are the 9 forward deployed personnel assigned?
 - a. Baku, Azerbaijan
 - b. Bangkok, Thailand
 - c. London, England
 - d. Astana, Kazakhstan
 - e. Sofia, Bulgaria
 - f. Ispa, Italy
 - g. Vienna, Austria
 - h. Tblisi, Georgia
 - i. Lyon, France

6. If each team must propose a single communications system and it must be one of the four listed, will contact information for each of the four be provided to all interested vendors?
 - a. No.
7. How many awards do you anticipate?
 - a. Per the Request for Proposal (RFP) the Government anticipates no more than two (2) under a Multiple Award Contract.
8. With only 4 approved software system providers to choose from, do you anticipate one award per software provider?
 - a. No
9. Will competition occur on countries with established software providers?
 - a. This is determined on a case-by-case basis.
10. Will the solicitation result in a single or multiple team awards?
 - a. Per the Request for Proposal (RFP) the Government anticipates no more than two (2) under a Multiple Award Contract.
11. Can one COMMS provider be on multiple DICCE contractor teams?
 - a. Yes
12. Will proposals be due 45 or 60 days after RFP release date? Is there a notional RFP release date?
 - a. 45 days
13. Are the DICCE2 contractors required to manage FAR 52-219-14, Limitation on subcontracting requirements on a Task Order by Task Order basis, or on the overall Contract basis?
 - a. On the overall Contract basis
14. What will be the basis for selection on FFP Task Orders, best value or lowest price?
 - a. This is determined on a case-by-case basis.
15. What will be the basis for selection on cost Reimbursable Task Orders, best value or lowest price?
 - a. This is determined on a case-by-case basis.

16. With 2 incumbent contractors and the Government's intention to only award 2 MAC type contracts, is there room for new contractors?
- a. This competition will be full and open with a small business set-aside
17. Please explain the rationale for NNSA's selection of the NAICs code stipulated in the draft RFP, (e.g. 237990), as this contract seems to be a hybrid contract that includes engineering, PM services, studies, and only construction management.
- a. Construction is the primary function of this contract. The Product Service Code for this requirement will be Y1PZ - Construction of Other Non-Building Facilities and the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) code for this Contract will be 237990 - Other heavy and civil engineering construction. The Product Service Code Y1PZ, Construction of Other Non-Building Facilities, was chosen as the construction installations under this contract cannot be identified under any of the other construction codes. The NAICS code cited above for this acquisition was obtained from the NAICS website:
<http://www.census.gov/epcd/www/naics.html>.
18. Please provide information on the applicability of FAR 52.219.14, Limitations of Subcontracting Clause. If it applies, is it considered a 1) Service Contract with the SB having to perform 50% of labor, 2) General Construction with the SB having to perform 15% of the labor, or 3) Specialty construction with the SB having to perform 25% of the labor.
- a. General Construction with the Small Business performing 15% of work requirement.

Questions submitted after the DICCE2 Industry Day:

19. Are more rigorous standards and requirements going to be enforced by the NSDD program for LMPs than was seen with some sites under DICCE-1?
- a. The requirements for LMPs are not dependent on the terms and conditions of the DICCE or DICCE2 contracts. LMPs are typically contracted by others.
20. What are the options for when partner countries have varying levels of cooperation with the NSDD mission after installation, and what can we do to help when that takes place?
- a. DICCE2 is not envisioned to have a significant role in post-installation activities. However, there may be cases when DICCE2 contractors are tasked to return to a site or a country after installation to support program efforts. Those tasks will be awarded in under a Task Order.

21. The four (4) relevancy aspects for Corporate Experience, and the fact that Corporate Experience is the most heavily weighted evaluation criteria, seemingly restrict “competition” to only incumbent contractors. While this draft solicitation is ostensibly for small businesses, no small business can meet the relevancy requirements other than the Alaskan Native incumbent contractors. We recommend revising the relevancy requirements and evaluation criteria to allow otherwise capable small businesses to compete.

- a. Corporate Experience is critical for success under DICCE2. Market research including responses to the Sources Sought Notice indicate that more than two small business can meet the relevancy requirements. Neither of the incumbent contractors are Alaskan Native.

22. Are any of the three (3) Corporate Experiences required to come from the Prime Contractor?

- a. No. See Section L, NNS-L-2002 (b)(1)(i) where the RFP states “At a minimum the offeror shall include experience of the team members providing the critical DICCE2 SOW elements...”

23. Must each individual Corporate Experience be inclusive of all four (4) relevancy aspects (A, B, C & D), or must all four (4) relevancy aspects be reflected across the Corporate Experience in aggregate? That is, can Corporate Experience #1 include Relevancy A and B, while Corporate Experience #2 includes only Relevancy C and Corporate Experience 3 include only Relevancy D?

- a. See Section L, NNS-L-2002 (b)(1)(i) where the RFP states “multiple projects can demonstrate experience and capability for multiple indicators or a single project can demonstrate multiple indicators.”

24. The Draft RFP states, “Relevance to indicator C. is defined as management and logistics for simultaneous deployment of design, construction, and IT systems where the total value of multiple deployments is \$100M to \$200M...” Since this is a small-business set-aside with a \$36.5M threshold, how can a small business under this size limitation hold a \$100M+ contract? Only a large business can meet this requirement, but they can’t bid due to the small business set-aside restriction. Only an Alaskan Native company could have a \$100M+ contract and still bid as a small business. We suggest revising the value downwards to a level appropriate for small businesses and allow for competition.

- a. There is no requirement for the experience to be restricted to the Prime Offeror. Additionally, Attachment L-2a and L-2b have been revised.

25. Will the Government provide contract information for any NNSA or other USG contract that has provision, installation, integration, testing, and troubleshooting of CAS software that has passed CONUS level testing or been evaluated and approved for the NSDD installations outside of the current DICCE contract? It appears that only the current incumbent contractors performing work on DICCE would be able to satisfy this indicator as it is currently written.
- a. The contractors with this experience are Schneider, Serco, Siemens, and Rapiscan. This work was not performed under direct NNSA or USG contracts.
26. Page M-1 Rating Definition provides definitions for Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, and Less than Satisfactory. Will the Government please describe what constitutes a “significant strength”, “strength”, and “weakness”?
- a. The RFP has been revised for clarification.
27. The Section M Past Performance adjectival ratings do not seem to describe the “degree to which the Offeror's past performance demonstrates the Offeror's ability to successfully perform the DICCE2 Statement of Work.” Rather they appear to be adjectival ratings of the contractors past performance on cited contracts. More appropriate descriptions of the degree to which past performance demonstrates ability to successfully perform the DICCE2 SOW would be “High” “Moderate” “Low” and “Neutral” for no past performance data.
- a. The RFP has been revised for clarification.
28. NNS-L-2000 Instructions for Proposal Preparation - General (Tailored) (Jul 2015) Subsection (b). (2) Instructions on Page Limit, Volume II, Tab 1, Criteria 1 and Page L-11 of 24 TAB 1 Criteria 1. - RELEVANT CORPORATE EXPERIENCE L-8 of 24 and L-11 of 24 Comment/Recommendation: It is recommended the Offeror be allowed to provide not more than 1 introductory page to the Relevant Corporate Experience Section in addition to the up to 9 pages (3 for each project) of Relevant Corporate Experience forms for a total of 10 pages for this Criteria 1 section of the proposal. Page count would remain at 45 with the sample problem reduced by one page to 34 pages Rationale: The introductory page will provide the reviewer with an overview of the selected relevant experience projects and how at a summary level they meet the requirements of project relevance as set forth by the RFP SOW, section L, and section M.
- a. The RFP has been revised to allow for the inclusion of an introductory page.

29. NNS-L-2002 Proposal Preparation Instructions: Volume II--Technical and Management Information (July 2015) Subsection (b) (1) (i) Lines 11-12 TAB 1 Criteria 1. - RELEVANT CORPORATE EXPERIENCE L-11 of 24 Reference: At line 11-12 the provisions read in part "The experience cited must have ended within the last six (6) years of the RFP release date and must have been in place for at least nine (9) months" Comment: Offerors may have experience to cite that meets the test of relevancy; has been performed in the six year period of the RFP; and meets the 9 month minimum duration test; however the project may not yet be "ended" as described by the DRFP but for which Past Performance interim ratings have been performed and are in government data bases. Recommendation: It is recommended RFP language be modified to allow Offerors to cite relevant experience for projects/task order that have been on-going for at least 9 months and have interim performance ratings that are in government data bases like Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS) or Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS). Suggested language change is as follows: The experience cited must be on-going or have ended within the last six (6) years If cited experience is still on-going enough relevant work shall have been completed to enable the client to provide a performance rating in the cited areas of relevancy. Rationale: The suggested language change allows Offerors to cite relevant on-going corporate experience for which interim and/or final performance ratings are available. It requires Offerors to still meet the other tests of project duration (9 months) and the timeliness test (i.e. 6 years from RFP date). It also provides Offerors the opportunity to demonstrate lessons learned from previous relevant experience as it applies to more recent on-going projects.

a. Section L, NNS-L-2002 has been revised for clarification.

30. Attachment L-2a Instruction for completing the Relevant Corporate Experience Form Page 2 Item 7 Reference: See discussion in comment # 2 above. The form states "date on which the customer agreed the work was satisfactorily completed (including substantial completion) ... Recommendation: Modify or clarify language to include acceptance, or the last date an interim performance evaluation by the client was performed and is referenceable, (e.g. interim project CPAR). Rationale: Provides consistency if language is modified as suggested in comment 2 above. Incorporation of the recommended language enables an Offeror to utilize on-going project corporate relevant experience that can be evaluated by the government based on interim CP ARs or other approved and relevant performance evaluation/rating systems.

a. Attachment L-2a has been revised for clarification.

31. NNS-L-2002 Proposal Preparation Instructions: Volume II --Technical and Management Information (July 2015) Subsection (b)(6)(i) TAB-5: Criterion 5 - Past Performance L-13 Reference: ... The Offeror shall provide the Past Performance Questionnaire at Attachment L-4 to each Project Owner Point of contact for a maximum of five projects. At a minimum the Offeror shall include Past Performance Questionnaires for each experience identified at Attachment L-2a Comment: Some Offerors may choose to cite I relevant experience and past performance performed for NNSA/NSDD to address the requirements of the DRFP provisions at TAB 5. In such cases it appears redundant for NNSA/NSDD officials to respond to the Past Performance Questionnaires when government data bases are known to contain data on the Offeror's performance of the cited experience, contracts/projects. Such an action may result in conflicting data or inconsistencies between past CPAR or PPIRS data and the execution of a Past Performance Questionnaire for the same project/experience that would be filled out by NNSA/NSDD personnel in response to the Offeror's request as required by the DRFP. Recommendation: It is recommended that Past Performance Questionnaire forms not be submitted for Past Performance and Project experience where the Offeror and NNSA/NSDD know that government project performance data bases can provide project performance information that can be used in the evaluation of the Offeror's Corporate Relevant Experience and Past Performance. Suggested language is provided below for consideration in the RFP:

"The Offeror shall provide the Past Performance Questionnaire at Attachment L-4 to each Project Owner Point of Contact for a maximum of five projects, not performed for the DOE Office of National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) Nuclear Smuggling Detection and Deterrence (NSDD) or for which no contractor performance data is available in the Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PP/RS)".

Rationale: The suggested language allows Offerors to use relevant NNSA/NSDD past performance experience or cite corporate relevant experience using past performance data that is in the government's data base and is readily available to the proposal reviewers. It also reduces the potential need to resolve conflicting past performance data in the data bases with a new past performance questionnaire for the same project submitted in responses to this RFP. Note: A similar set of provisions as recommended above were provided in the final RFP for DOE (EM)'s Idaho Clean-Up Project Solicitation No. DE-SOL-0007097. Reference Section L, page L-16 Paragraph (ii).

a. Remains as is.

32. NNS-L-2002 Proposal Preparation Instructions: Volume II--Technical and Management Information (July 2015) Subsections: (b) (b)(I) (b)(2) (b) Content of

Technical Volume II TAB 1 Criteria 1. - RELEVANT CORPORATE EXPERIENCE TAB 2 Criterion 2- Organizational Structure and Key Personnel- 11 and L-8 Comment: There appears to be an inconsistency in maximum page count requirements for Volume II. Page L-8 clearly disseminates the page count by section and builds up to the required 45 page limit for counted pages. Page L-11 at three points references an 80 page maximum for volume II, please clarify.

- a. **Section L, Volume II--Technical and Management Information page number count requirement has been revised.**

33. Attachment L-2B Relevant Corporate Experience Summary Matrix Instructions for attachment L-2b Reference: At the note at the top of the page it states: "Note: Attachment L-1 a is limited to one (1) 8 Y2 x 11 page limit. "Comment: No Attachment L-1 a was provided in the draft RFP package. Please clarify or revise the reference to which the "Note" pertains to, (i.e. L-1 a).

- a. **Attachment L-2b has been revised for clarification.**

34. Section M NNS-M-1001 Evaluation of Proposals A. DOE AND NNSA SOLICITATION PROVISIONS IN FULL TEXT NNS-M-1001 EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS (NOV 2009) (TAILORED) M-1 of 5 Reference: (i) An overall rating of unsatisfactory in one evaluation criterion may result in elimination of the proposal from further consideration regardless of the rating of the other criteria or subcriteria. An overall criterion rating of unsatisfactory may result from one subcriterion within a criterion being rated unsatisfactory, or from more than one subcriterion within a criterion being rated marginal. Comment: As written, this provision is difficult to understand in terms of how it can be applied, given the current drafting of the evaluation criteria. For example, Criterion 1 specifically states that its individual indicators are not "subfactors." The use of terms like factors, subfactors and indicators within a criterion causes confusion. Presumably if something is not a subfactor then it is not a subcriterion for purposes of NNS-M-1001 (i). To apply NNS-M-1001 (i) to criteria 1-4 is problematic, in any event, because the rating definitions for criteria 1-4 do not include a rating of unsatisfactory. In addition, even if one or more of the criteria 1-4 has subcriteria, there is no marginal rating included in the rating definitions and therefore rendering the last half of the second sentence of NNS-M-1001 (i) unusable. Unless it is NNSA's intent that NNS-M-1001 (i) apply only to criterion 5, then NNSA is respectfully requested to clarify and resolve the confusion described above.

- a. **NNS-M-1002 BASIS OF CONTRACT AWARD has been revised for clarification.**

35. PART I-THE SCHEDULE SECTION F - DELIVERIES OR PERFORMANCE

DOE-F-2005 Notice of Shipment 9 of 50 Reference: "10 work days prior to shipping items, the Contractor shall furnish the anticipated shipment date, bill of lading number (if applicable), and carrier identity of the COR and the Contracting Officer." Comments/Question: Such a requirement will significantly increase the cost and work load associated with government notifications of shipments being made in support of projects. It is requested the government clarify if this "10 work day notification requirement" is for all shipments under the contract or only those classified as Sensitive Equipment?

- a. Clause DOE-F-2005 NOTICE OF SHIPMENT (DEC 2015) has been revised for clarification.

36. Attachment L-7c Vietnam Mobilization Plan DE-SOL-0008449 Section 2.0

Requirements Reference: The plan shall include (1) a resource-loaded project scheduleComment: It is not clear at what level the resources should be loaded. Are you requesting costs over time or resources broken out by labor category and expense? How is this consistent with the NOTE on the same page that states: The Offeror 's estimated cost, fixed fee, and all supporting pricing information for this mobilization plan shall only be included in Volume III of the Offeror 's proposal. Recommendations: Please clarify that the resource load schedule is to include only team member labor categories. And we suggest the forms required in the Mobilization Plan NOT be included in the Tab 4 page count. Rationale: It is unclear if DOE expects the mobilization plan to identify all the resources required to execute the work or if the plan is to include only the labor resources scheduled to execute the work with the resources identified in Volume III.

- a. Section L, Attachment L-7c Vietnam Mobilization Plan: The resources included in Attachment 7c should only consist of labor categories and hours. No pricing should be included in Volume II-- Technical and Management Information, Tab 4. Attachment L-7c is not included in the Volume II page count. The Offeror's estimated cost, fixed fee, and all supporting pricing information for the Vietnam Mobilization plan shall only be included in Volume III – Cost Proposal of the Offeror's submittal. Care should be taken to ensure that the Offeror's cost and technical proposals are consistent and sufficiently cross-referenced.

37. Section L, Multiple Paragraphs/Pages: Please clarify the page limit for Volume II.

Page L-8, Paragraph (b)(2) and Page L-9, Paragraph (8) both specify a page limit of 45 pages for Volume II; however, Page L- 11 Paragraphs (b)(1) and (b)(2)

and Page L-12 Paragraph (2)(ii)(B) each state that Volume II is allowed 80 pages.

a. Section L, Volume II--Technical and Management Information page number count requirement has been revised.

38. Attachment L-2b, Second Page, Note in bold under the Instructions: This note states that Attachment L-1a is limited to one 8 ½ X 11 page; however, there does not appear to be an Attachment L-1a. Should this instruction be referring to "Attachment L-2b"?

a. Yes, typo has been corrected.

39. Section L, Page L-11, Paragraph (b)(1)(i) and Page L-8 Tab 1 page count: The requirement on Page L-8 states that Tab 1 is not included in the page count. However, L-11 states that the page limitation for the submission for Tab 1 is three pages, exclusive of Attachment L-2a and should include an expansion of the offeror's response to block 13. Please clarify the page count limitations for Tab 1, as well as the requirements stated on Page L-11. Is the intent that the offerors are allowed to provide up to three pages of narrative in addition to the three Attachment L-2a forms (up to 3 pages for each form)?

a. Section L, Volume II--Technical and Management Information page number count requirement has been revised.

40. Section L, Page L-13, Paragraph (6)(i): The requirement states that the questionnaire(s) should be submitted 10 business days prior to the date for receipt of proposals. Please clarify "submitted." Does this mean submitted by the points of contact to NNSA or does this mean the offeror shall have submitted the forms to the points of contact 10 days prior to date for receipt of proposals?

a. Section L, NNS-L-2002 has been revised for clarification.

41. Section L, Volume III Instructions, Multiple Pages: a. The submission requirements for Volume III state that all subcontractors must basically provide an entire cost volume with all of the same requirements that are in the Prime contractor's Cost/Price proposal. Is this correct or should only confidential information, such as indirect rates, financial information, etc. be submitted separately? Please clarify this requirement.

a. Refer to Section L - NNS-L-2003 (a)(6) for instruction.

42. Section H, DOE-H-2058 designates the CAS Communications Software subcontractor as a major/critical subcontractor. Section L Volume III instructions states that all subcontractors must submit a separate cost volume. Is the CAS

subcontractor also required to provide a separate cost proposal? Please clarify this requirement.

a. Yes, the subcontractor is required to provide a separate cost proposal.

43. Section L, Page L-11, Paragraph (b)(1)(i): The draft solicitation states “Do not submit a group of related jobs as one project unless all the work was done under the same contract, or for indefinite delivery contracts, under one task order.” Please clarify what is intended by “related jobs...unless all the work was done under the same contract.” Wouldn’t Indefinite Delivery Contracts also be considered related projects under the same contract?

a. Section L has been revised for clarification.

44. Please confirm that the only Communications subcontractors that have previously passed SLD CONUS testing, or been evaluated and approved, and are available for DICCE 2 teaming are Siemens, Schneider Electric, Serco, and Rapiscan Systems.

a. Yes.

45. Are there any other Communications subcontractors currently undergoing formal CONUS testing that may be available for DICCE 2 teaming that are not included in the list above?

a. No.

46. Section H – Special Contract Requirements DOE-H-2070 Key Personnel (October 2014) (Tailored) 19 of 50 Reference: DOE-H-2070 Key Personnel (Oct 2014) (Tailored) “(a) Pursuant to the clause at DEAR 952.215-70, Key Personnel, the Key Personnel for this contract are identified below: NAMES * TITLES Implementation and Sustainability Manager Contracts Manager Program Manager *Note Key Personnel are listed in order of importance and are to be proposed by the offeror. Clause to be completed by the Contracting Officer prior to the award. Comment: The order of importance is unusual as the Program Manager is usually the most important person on the program. Recommendation: We request “*Note Key Personnel are listed in order of importance and are to be proposed by the offeror.” be deleted in its entirety.

a. Section H – Special Contract Requirements DOE-H-2070 Key Personnel has been revised.

47. Following compliance with the Instructions for Proposal Preparation in section NNS-L-2000, can an 11 x 17 page be used (counted as 2 pages) in Attachment L-2a for Tab 1 – Criteria 1?

- a. Yes, an 11X 17 can be used in Attachment L-2a and will be counted as 2 pages.

48. NNS-L-2002 Proposal Preparation Instructions: Volume II-Technical and Management Information (July 2015) Attachment L-2a Corporate Experience Form – Relevance to Indicators Instructions (2.A) Reference: A. Relevance to indicator A. is defined as management of international projects with project size of \$1M to \$25M per project, on sites that are not owned or operated by the U.S. Government (such as U.S. Embassies or military bases) or by the host country beneficiary entity or government. More relevant sites are remote and lack infrastructure. Comment: Sites owned or operated by the host country beneficiary entity or government can be interpreted to include border crossings which could exclude most remote locations that lack infrastructure. We believe experience managing projects at international locations owned and operated by foreign stakeholders should be considered very relevant corporate experience. Recommendation: It is recommended the RFP language be modified by striking “or by the host country beneficiary entity or government.” Relevance to Indicator A would read as follows: Relevance to indicator A. is defined as management of international projects with project size of \$1M to \$25M per project, on sites that are not owned or operated by the U.S. Government (such as U.S. Embassies or military bases). More relevant sites are remote and lack infrastructure. Rationale: The suggested language change allows Offerors to cite relevant sites that are remote and lack infrastructure.

- a. Attachment L-2a has been revised.

49. Reference Attachment L-2a 2.C states, “Relevance to indicator C. is defined as management and logistics for simultaneous deployment of design, construction, and IT systems where the total value of multiple deployments is \$100M to \$200M...” Question: Since the average annual volume of work performed under the largest incumbent contractor on DICCE was only \$41,622,707 and since the DICCE II contract is anticipated to be of smaller size volume than the original DICCE contract, shouldn't the maximum threshold for past performance of multiple contracts be no more than \$41,622,707 and perhaps even less than that, especially considering that the dollar revenue threshold for this procurement is only \$36.5M?

- a. Attachment L-2a has been revised.

50. Reference pg. 11 of Section L paragraph (b)(1)(i) states: “Any experience submitted that occurred more than seven (6) years prior to the date of RFP release will not be considered.” Question: Please clarify the correct number of

years of experience that the government is requesting (seven or six?) for past performance experience. Question: Why is the Government requesting a number of years of experience that is less than the number of years that the incumbent contractors have been performing under the DICCE contract? The use of fewer years results in a higher average annual volume of work performed (\$44.1M if seven years, \$47.0M if six years) v. \$41.6M if eight years) which may impact the answer to the previous question.

a. Section L has been revised for clarification.

51. Can we advocate for more than two awards in order to promote more competition for the contract?

a. For mission critical reasons, the competition is expected to result in no more than two awards.