

Attachment J-4
ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
(Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

Question Number	Page Number	Section	Paragraph	Question / Comment	Government Response
1	74	L.11.1	4	On page 74, section L.11.1 discusses the requirements of the Executive Summary letter, which seems to be a transmittal letter versus an Executive Summary letter that summarizes the technical proposal. Can NOAA please clarify that in the Executive Summary it does not want to see a summary of Volumes II, III, and IV?	The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP.
2	74	L	L.11 Table	What is the intent of the Capability Matrix in Volume IV Past Performance?	Referenced matrix identifies relative Past Performance relative to SOW sub-elements.
3	74	L.8	1	Does NOAA intend to have a 30 day proposal cycle? There are conflicting dates/schedules within the draft. The dates on the SF33 on page 6 suggests a release of July 21st and a due date of August 21st. On page 74, the due date is August 31st.	Upon issuance of the Solicitation (Final RFP), offeror is provide at a minimum 30 calendar days. The final RFP terms take precedence over any previous draft versions.
4	74	L.8.1	1	How many days will NOAA provide offeror's to review the Final RFP and submit questions from the time of Final RFP issuance?	Refer to response to question 3.
5	74	L.8	1	Would NOAA kindly allow offeror's a minimum of a 30 day proposal response timeline from the date that all Questions and Modifications have been issued?	Refer to response to question 3.
6	74	L	L.11	Background: For the ProTech Oceans, Fisheries, and Satellite RFPs there was a 25 page limit on the corporate capability volume. Fisheries had 36 domain subtasks, Oceans had 50 domain subtasks, and Satellite had 90 domain subtasks to address in those 25 pages. Question: Due to the significantly higher number of 128 domain subtasks to address in the Corporate Capability volume for Enterprise Operations, would the Government consider increasing the page limit to 50 from the 30 pages indicated in the draft solicitation?	The Final RFP will reflect revisions to the page count limitation.
7	74	L.11	0	Would you consider expanding Vol III to 25 pages consistent with Fisheries and Oceans?	Refer to response to question 6.
8	74	L	11	The page limit for the Management Approach Volume is 10 pages. Previous ProTech RFP's allowed 25. Will the page limit be increased to 25?	Refer to response to question 6.

Attachment J-4
ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
(Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

9	74	L.11	Format and Instructions for Proposal Submission	Given there are 164 requirements, the 2 page limit for each past performance in Section II (Contract Performance), may limit the offeror's ability to fully address the relevancy of the past performance across so many requirements. Will the Government consider expanding the page count in Section II to 3 pages per reference?	Refer to response to question 6.
10	74	L.11	0	FORMAT AND INSTRUCTIONS FOR PROPOSAL SUBMISSION Table. Section IV – Past Performance. Please confirm that the 4-page limit for Contract Description is per project. We recommend that the Contract Description and the Contract Performance be presented together for easier evaluation.	The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP.
11	74	L	11	The content for Volume IV- Past Performance in the Box D diagram differs from that given in the text on PGE 78? I am assuming that the text is right?	The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP.
12	74	L	L.11	Regarding the page limits for Section IV: The 4 page limit for Section I appears high based on L.11.4.1 while the 2 page limit for Section II may not be adequate to fully address the requirements of L.11.4.2. Can the page limits for these two sections be combined for a maximum of 6 pages? For Section II, what is the meaning of 2 page limit "per reference?"	Refer to response to question #6.
13	74	L.11	2	It states that "Exceptions to page limits are, if required: ... key personnel resume...." Is there a page limit specific to the key personnel resume?	No
14	75	L.11 (L.11.4.1, L.11.4.2)	Table	Volume IV Past Performance specifies a 4-page limit for "Section I Contract Description" and a 2-page limit per reference for "Section II Contract Performance." What is being asked for Section I (L.11.4.1) could fit on 1 page "per reference," so 11 pages would be needed for Section I if 11 references were provided. Also, the content for Section II (L.11.4.2) could be very lengthy, requiring more than 2 pages. QUESTION: Could the government please clarify the allocated page count for these 2 sections?	Refer to response to question #6.

Attachment J-4
ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
(Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

15	75	L.11	1	There is a capability matrix for the Past Performance volume shown in the L.11 table. However, there are no instructions as to its content. Do the instructions for the capability matrix for the Corporate Experience and Commitment volume apply to the Past Performance capability matrix?	The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP.
16	75	L.11.1	1	Previous ProTech Domain RFPs removed the words "signed and completed" and "letter" from the Volume I Section I instructions because they caused confusion as to whether the intent was for offeror's to provide a cover letter in addition to the Executive Summary. Can the government address this issue in a revision of the Enterprise Operations RFP?	The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP.
17	75	L.11	2	Would the government consider excluding a cover letter from the page count?	The Government will update in impending final RFP.
18	75	L.11.1	Section III	Regarding the financial statements, are there any minimum requirements that the offeror needs to have in order to be eligible for award?	All offerors are to submit required information at a minimum.
19	75	L.11.1	Section III	In order to be eligible for the award, is the offeror required to have a credit line with a minimum dollar amount?	RFP will ne changed to indicate certified line of credit if required.
20	75	L	L.11	Due to the significantly large volume of this proposal, would the Government consider increasing the page limit for the Management Volume from 10 pages to 25 pages?	Refer to response to question #6.
21	75	L.11.1	Section III	It is a requirement "offeror's will submit financial statements to include a Balance Sheet, Income Statement, ..." For a newly formed unpopulated Joint Venture, is it acceptable for both members of the JV to submit their individual companies required documents in addition to the JV documents?	Yes

Attachment J-4
 ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
 Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
 (Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

22	75	L.11.1	10	It states that an offeror "may still be eligible for award" even if it does not have an adequate accounting system. There is a requirement to provide certification of an approved accounting system; however, this statement contradicts the need to even show this information to the government. Can an approved accounting system be made a mandatory requirement hence the need to provide all of the documentation?	Per Section L.11.2, Section III: "The Offeror shall provide evidence of an adequate accounting system that would include a written opinion or other statement from the cognizant federal auditor (CFA) or the cognizant federal agency official (CFAO)...If the Contractor does not have an accounting system that has been determined adequate by the CFA or CFAO, but believes its accounting system is adequate, the Contractor shall so state in its proposal as well as a rationale...If the Offeror does not have an adequate accounting system it may still be eligible for award."
23	76	L.11.2	2	Section L.11.2, second paragraph states, "The Offeror must clearly demonstrate its knowledge of environmental intelligence, NOAA, and the scope of requirements in this Domain and its corporate commitment to investing in solutions relevant to these areas." Please define "environmental intelligence" and "corporate commitment to investing in solutions."	Corporate commitment in this context represents willingness to partner with NOAA. The Government is still formulating a complete response for impending final RFP.
24	76	L.11.2	1	Page 76, section L.11.2 states, "The Offeror shall describe its breadth and depth of experience and qualifications working within the requirements of the SOW contained in Section C." Page 77, section L.11.2 states, "... No single offeror or Team is required to address every area of the SOW." Can NOAA please clarify how it will evaluate the technical expertise of each offeror fairly and consistently, given that each offeror will be presenting their expertise in each SOW area within Enterprise Operations Domain?	The award will not be based on specific line items; therefore, an Offeror need not provide capability for the entire array of effort set forth in the Statement of Work (SOW) to be considered for award. Offerors with limited capability may obtain a contract if they are the only firm or highly beneficial for a part of the Enterprise Operations domain. The Final Solicitation will reflect accordingly.
25	76	L.11.1, Section 2	1	Can the government confirm that solicitation documents (e.g., SF-30, SF-33) referenced in this section will be provided with the final RFP for offeror's to complete and sign?	Yes.

Attachment J-4
ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
(Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

26	76	L.11.1, Section 3	1	As a private limited liability partnership, our firm does not distribute our financial statements to parties other than our partners, principals and lenders. Would the government consider the provision of an alternative statement that provides evidence of our firm's financial strength (e.g., total annual revenue, credit rating)?	All offerors shall submit required information.
27	76	L.11.2	1	"This description includes subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement." Recommendation. Given that this is an IDIQ with unknown Task Orders, we recommend that all subcontractors be specified as major or critical.	The Government is not considering this.
28	76	L.11.2	2	"The Offeror must clearly demonstrate its knowledge of environmental intelligence, NOAA, and the scope of requirements in this Domain and its corporate commitment to investing in solutions relevant to these areas." • Recommendation: We suggest that the requirement to demonstrate knowledge of environmental intelligence be removed. While this may be directly relevant for the other four ProTech domains that are highly technical in nature, the performance areas of the Enterprise domain are strictly back office functions that have impact on the NOAA mission in only an indirect or tangential manner.	The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP.
29	76	L.11.2	2	"The Offeror must clearly demonstrate its knowledge of environmental intelligence, NOAA, and the scope of requirements in this Domain and its corporate commitment to investing in solutions relevant to these areas." • Can the government please define "investment in solutions" for performance areas under this domain? In addition, since this Domain contains more than 130 different component areas of performance, how many investments in solutions need to be presented to receive full credit on this criteria?	In this context, "investment in solutions" represents a willingness to partner with NOAA.
30	76	L	11.1 Section VI	The language in the referenced section does not recognize the SBA All Small Mentor Protégé/JV program. Please update the requirements to align with the All Small MPP HUB Zone JV (similar sections for SDVO and WOSB) 13CFR 126.616 which refers to 13 CFR 125.9	The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP.

Attachment J-4
ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
(Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

31	76	L	Paragraph L.11.1.1 Section III	<p>Is the same Financial Responsibility and Accounting System documentation/information required for Subcontractors that is required of the Prime Contractors?</p> <p>If the information is required for Subcontractors, is there a separate or "sealed package" submittal process available? Certain of that information is proprietary financial information that may be provided to Government, but not shared with other contractors.</p> <p>If such information is required for only "Major" subcontractors, what criteria makes a subcontractor "major"?</p>	Prime contractor.
32	76	L.11.2	L.11.2	The government will consider past performance from subcontractors performing "major or critical aspects of the requirement"? How is "major or critical" defined?	Majority of performance or criticality of performance.
33	76	L.11.2	0	As this Domain is one of five Domains under an overall umbrella contract that shares the same mission to support NOAA, the solicitations have remained relatively uniform with respect to instructions; however we noticed several changes in this iteration. Once such change from previous solicitations under this umbrella program is the removal of the Section L RFP Requirement to provide 'any unique competencies that could provide additional benefit to the Government'. This has been in every Domain solicitation to date (Satellite, Fisheries, and Oceans).	The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP.
34	76	L.11.1	2	It states that we need to include a signed and completed solicitation/contract form and any subsequent amendments. Is there a form that we need to reference and sign that will be provided with the RFP submission?	Under Section A of the Final RFP, Standard Form (SF) 33, "Solicitation/Offer and Award" must be signed, along with each SF 30, "Amendment of Solicitation/Modification of Contract" if there are any Amendments to the RFP .
35	77	L.11.1	2	The solicitation states all proposal submission documents must be in the name of the JV, not individual partners of the JV. QUESTION: Please confirm that individual past performance submissions can be in the names of the JV members.	Yes.

Attachment J-4
ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
(Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

36	77	L.11.2	3	Please clarify if this is a Section L requirement or a Section M evaluation factor?	The first two paragraphs on page 78 of the RFP are provided as supplemental information to assist offeror's in responding to the evaluation factor. The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP.
37	77	L	L.11.2	If an offeror chooses to bid a single domain (Example: Enterprise Services), must that offeror address every requirement within that domain?	No. The award will not be based on specific line items; therefore, an Offeror need not provide capability for the entire array of efforts or the entire task as set forth in the Statement of Work (SOW) to be considered for award. offeror's with limited capability, such as providing only for diverse elements of the task, may still be awarded a contract.
38	77	L.11.2	4	Will an offeror who does successfully address every area of the SOW be scored higher?	The award will not be based on specific line items; therefore, an Offeror need not provide capability for the entire array of efforts set forth in the Statement of Work (SOW) to be considered for award. Offerors with limited capability may obtain a contract if they are the only firm or highly beneficial for a part of the Enterprise Operations domain. The proposals will be evaluated in accordance with Solicitation.
39	77	L	L.11.2	How should an offeror propose to discrete domain services if not proposing to every area of the SOW?	Refer to response to question #39
40	77	L	L.11.2	How should an offeror indicate which domain services are not included in the proposal?	Offeror's should clearly state which areas/services are not addressed in their proposal.
41	77	L.11.3	0	Each of the 5 component areas of this Factor II are substantial. Our assessment is an offeror cannot respond thoroughly in all 5 areas with a credible response given the tight 10 page limit. As such, we request that the page count be increased to 30 pages.	Refer to response to question #6
42	77	L.11.3	3	Is the resume for PM required at proposal submission? H.14 (page 48) is in conflict with this section and states that the name of the PM is to be included at time of award. If the PM resume is included, would the government please consider excluding it from the page count?	Yes, a resume for the Program Manager is required in the proposal, per Section L.11.3.3. H.14 Key Personnel will be filled in by the Government at award with the name of the PM proposed by the offeror with its proposal and accepted by the Government. Per L.11, "Exceptions to the page limitations are, if required: cover pages, key personnel resume, lists of acronyms, lists of tables, lists of figures, and indices/tables of contents."

Attachment J-4
ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
(Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

43	77	L.11.3	L.11.3.3	Can offeror's provide resumes for key personnel in addition to the Program Manager?	No. Per Section H.14 (a), the only key personnel for the IDIQ is the Program Manager.
44	77	L.11.2	Volume II – Corporate Experience and Commitment (Factor I)	We understand that you don't have to respond to all requirements in the SOW, but can the Government please confirm if a vendor needs to address all requirements under a specific element (e.g., Strategic Planning Services, Business Management Services, etc.) to be technically acceptable or can you address only some of the requirements under those sections. For example, under Strategic Planning, if we address 3.1.1 - 3.1.6 but don't address 3.1.7 and 3.1.8 is that acceptable?	Yes. The award will not be based on specific line items; therefore, an Offeror need not provide capability for the entire array of efforts or the entire task as set forth in the Statement of Work (SOW) to be considered for award. offeror's with limited capability, such as providing only for diverse elements of the task, may still be awarded a contract.
45	77	L.11.2	Volume II – Corporate Experience and Commitment (Factor I)	It is understood that offeror's may choose to address only certain elements within the SOW and are not required to respond to every requirement in the SOW in order to be technically acceptable. However, in scenarios where a requirement has sub-elements, must the offeror address all sub-elements to be compliant? For example, C.3.2.30 has six sub-elements, so must an offeror address all 6 sub-elements to be considered technically acceptable with C.3.2.30?	No. The award will not be based on specific line items; therefore, an Offeror need not provide capability for the entire array of efforts or the entire task as set forth in the Statement of Work (SOW) to be considered for award. offeror's with limited capability, such as providing only for diverse elements of the task, may still be awarded a contract.
46	77	L.11.2	Volume II – Corporate Experience and Commitment (Factor I)	In the Q&As for Fisheries and Oceans, there are varying responses to the question pertaining to whether an offeror must meet all requirements for a specific element. For example, please see C.3.9.2. There are a number of requirements within that specific element that range from mission analysis to regulatory compliance support. Must an offeror address all the requirements within that specific element to be technically acceptable?	No. The award will not be based on specific line items; therefore, an Offeror need not provide capability for the entire array of efforts or the entire task as set forth in the Statement of Work (SOW) to be considered for award. offeror's with limited capability, such as providing only for diverse elements of the task, may still be awarded a contract.
47	77	L.11.2	4	It states that "no single Offeror or Team is required to address every area of the SOW". If this is the case, does an offeror need to state a reason why they are not addressing a particular SOW task area or will the capabilities matrix serve as the roadmap for why or why not an offeror is or isn't responding to a task area?	No. The award will not be based on specific line items; therefore, an Offeror need not provide capability for the entire array of efforts or the entire task as set forth in the Statement of Work (SOW) to be considered for award. offeror's with limited capability, such as providing only for diverse elements of the task, may still be awarded a contract.

Attachment J-4
 ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
 Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
 (Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

48	77	L.11.3.1	0	<p>Rationale for Section L RFP requirement to describe, 'authority to make programmatic decisions and implement design solutions'. This could be interpreted by contractors many different ways. Clarification regarding the intent for this request will benefit the government in ensuring responses appropriately address the request.</p>	The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP.
49	77	L.11.2	3	<p>RFP Text: "Consistent with previously publicized Q&As for the ProTech Domains, and in vendor communication events, no single Offeror or Team is required to address every area of the SOW. If an Offeror does state that it can address every area of the SOW, and evaluation of the proposal reveals significant weaknesses or deficiencies in the response, this could lead to the Offeror being found ineligible for award."</p> <p>Question: If an Offeror responds to more/all of the work areas in the Enterprise Operations Domain, will there be a scoring benefit/advantage in their evaluation?</p> <p>If an offeror does not address a particular work area in their IDIQ proposal response, will the Offeror be ineligible to compete on task orders for that work area if they are awarded a spot on the IDIQ contract?</p> <p>The situation that we're trying to understand is if an Offeror is still able to propose on task orders post-IDIQ award under all the Domain's work areas without responding to each one in their IDIQ proposal response, what is the incentive/advantage to responding to more than the minimum number of Domain work areas?</p> <p>Additionally, due to the universal 30-page limit, there is an advantage to responding to fewer Domain work areas to be able to use more pages to demonstrate significant depth in the selected work areas.</p>	Refer to responses to questions #6 and 24.
50	78	L.11.4	1	L.11.4 states, "offeror's shall submit past performance information for	

Attachment J-4
ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
(Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

51	78	L.11.3.6	0	SB Subcontracting Plan: Are there minimum small business/socio-economic goals that NOAA needs offeror's to target and/or support in terms of subcontracting to SBs and socio-economic categories to be met in this plan?	No minimum set forth within draft RFP.
52	78	L.11.3.6	ALL	Does NOAA have a template or format they recommend to be used for this?	No, the Government is not providing a template.
53	78	L.11.4, L.11.4.1	1, L.11.4.1e	A contract may be a relevant Past Performance reference at the contract (Program) level since it demonstrates the ability to manage a variety of tasks and subcontractors. Additionally, individual task orders issued under that contract may be separately relevant since any given task order may address one or more different SOW elements. Will NOAA allow offeror's to both submit a past performance at the IDIQ/Contract level and individual task orders as examples of past performance?	A task order request or definitized work is currently not available.
54	78	L	L.11.4	Does the Past Performance of a partner of the Prime count towards the minimum of three Past Performances?	Past Performance submission from Joint Venture -- Individually or as entity are allowable
55	78	L.11.4	1	Section L.11.4 states, "offeror's shall submit past performance information for up to eleven (11) contracts (no fewer than three for the Prime or Joint Venture and/or partners of the Joint Venture) having performance within the past five years from the release date of the ProTech Enterprise Operations Solicitation (RFP), which are relevant to the efforts required by this solicitation." Is the expectation that up to 11 contracts reflect all subelements (C.3.1.1, C.3.1.2, etc.) of the PWS that the respondent covers in Volume II – Corporate Experience and Commitment?	The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP.
56	78	L.11.3.4	1	Can the government please describe in more detail what is meant by the phrase "the requiring activities?"	"Requiring activities" refers to organizations within DOC and NOAA.
57	78	L.11.4	N/A	Can all sections of Volume IV: Past Performance be organized in table format?	Yes.

Attachment J-4
ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
(Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

58	78	L.11.4	3	Section L.11.4 para 3 states "Previous CPARS ratings and questionnaires will be used in the proposal evaluations as available." Can the requirement in L.11.4.3 for a Past Performance Questionnaire be waived if there is a CPARS for a qualified cited contract? A primary purpose of CPARS is to negate the need for the government to assess performance multiple times.	No waiver of solicitation requirement.
59	78	L	11.3.6	Regarding the SBSP: If a company qualifies in both SDVOSB and Veteran Owned categories, does this satisfy both criteria?	Small Business Subcontracting Plans are not required from firms that are small businesses under the NAICS code.
60	78	L.11.2	4	The RFP states that "no single Offeror or Team is required to address every area of the SOW". However, the RFP also states on p. 81, section L.11.5.2, paragraph 4 that "Failure to offer ceiling hourly rates for all labor categories and all contract periods may result in the Offeror being ineligible for award." Would the government consider removing the eligibility requirement that offeror's provide rates for labor categories associated with SOW areas that the Offeror is not addressing?	The government is not considering removing solicitation requirement.
61	78	L.11.4	0	The RFP states that "CPARS will be used in the proposal evaluations as available." Can CPARS be used in place of PPQs, when available?	Refer to response to question #58
62	78	L.11.4	2	Can the Government clarify what it defines as "program phase" in terms of relevancy of past performance?	The RFP will be amended to remove "program phase."
63	78	L.11.4	2	In terms of past performance relevancy of contract dollar value/size, since the size of task orders are TBD, what dollar value/size does the Government consider relevant?	Past and current professional, scientific and technical task orders range from \$1M to \$20M. The Government considers this range relevant.
64	78	L	L.11.2	Background: Work can be expected at any location worldwide. Question: What are the unique security clearances that may be required of our staff?	Security Clearance requirements will be determined by the requirements of individual Task Orders.

Attachment J-4
 ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
 Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
 (Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

65	78	L.11.4	Volume IV- Past Performance (Factor III)	In the previous solicitation for ProTech Oceans Domain it was stated that "offeror's shall submit past performance information for up to eight contracts, preferably representing both Government and the private sectors." However, in the draft ProTech Enterprise RFP the phrase "Government and private sectors" has been removed. Can the Government clarify if this means it prefers Government only or possibly NOAA only past performance?	The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP.
66	78	L	11.4	Please clarify whether the government requires that each subcontractor is to provide past performance.	Past Performance information may be submitted regarding predecessor companies, key personnel who have relevant experience, or subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement when such information is relevant to the solicitation. However, data concerning the prime Offeror shall be provided first, followed by each proposed subcontractor, in alphabetical order. Joint Ventures shall submit past performance information for the JV. In accordance with FAR 15.305(2)(iv), offeror's with no recent or relevant past performance will result in assignment of a neutral rating, indicating either a favorable nor unfavorable evaluation rating.
67	78	L.11.4	3	FAR Rule changes that took effect in August 2016 change the eligibility requirements for JV past performance evaluations expanding it to not just past performance of the JV but also past performance of the individual JV partners. The language in this paragraph should be updated to reflect the 2016 FAR Rule changes regarding what is to be considered as past performance for the JV. For reference 13 CFR 125.8 (e) now states: " Past performance and experience. When evaluating the past performance and experience of an entity submitting an offer for a contract set aside or reserved for small business as a joint venture established pursuant to this section, a procuring activity must consider work done individually by each partner to the joint venture as well as any work done by the joint venture itself previously."	The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP.

Attachment J-4
ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
(Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

68	79	L.11.4	3	The solicitation states: "Previous CPARS ratings and questionnaires will be used in the proposal evaluations as available". QUESTION: Can CPARS, if available, be submitted for past performance references in place of the Past Performance Assessment Questionnaire (Attachment J-5)? This would save the government and prime bidders a tremendous amount of time and effort.	Past Performance information may be submitted regarding predecessor companies, key personnel who have relevant experience, or subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement when such information is relevant to the solicitation. However, data concerning the prime Offeror shall be provided first, followed by each proposed subcontractor, in alphabetical order. Joint Ventures shall submit past performance information for the JV. In accordance with FAR 15.305(2)(iv), offeror's with no recent or relevant past performance will result in assignment of a neutral rating, indicating either a favorable nor unfavorable evaluation rating.
69	79	L.11.5	3	Should Volume V, Cost/Price, be submitted as both Excel (J-6) and MS Word to include a detailed explanation in the explanatory portion of the cost/price proposal?	Yes.
70	79	L.11.4.3	3	To provide enough time for the questionnaires to be prepared and completed, will the Government permit questionnaires to be emailed to ProTech.Enterprise@noaa.gov by the due date of the proposal, instead of no less than 10 calendar days prior to the proposal due date?	Language remains unchanged.
71	79	L.11.4	1	Can we include an introduction in the Past Performance volume provided we do not exceed the total page limit? For example, if we have ten references can we also have a two page introduction?	Offerors are to adhere to the terms of the final RFP
72	79	L.11.4.3	1	Can the final RFP include language addressing the consequence of untimely submission of the Past Performance Questionnaire by the reference agency? The offeror has limited control in the process described.	Offerors are to adhere to the terms of the final RFP
73	79	L.11.4.3	1	Will the Government consider extending the PPQ submission deadline to five (5) business days prior to the original receipt of proposals date (TBD/OA 31 August 2017) to allow offeror's and their subcontractors time to coordinate around customers' vacation schedules to ensure complete and timely submission?	Refer to response to question #70

Attachment J-4
ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
(Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

74	79	L.11.4	0	In the case of an IDIQ or BPA contract, will the government consider individual Task Orders issued under the main vehicle as separate past performance references?	Yes.
75	79	L	11.4.3	Small typo in Section 11.4.3, references "L.10.4.1" we believe it should be "L.11.4.1."	Correction will be made to the final RFP
76	79	L.11.4.3	1	Past performance references are requested "no less than 10 calendar days prior to the original receipt of proposals date established in the solicitation." Question: Since the total number of past performance questionnaires was increased to 11 in the latest draft, will the government consider changing the due date of the PPQs to the original receipt of proposals date established in the solicitation. The additional ten days would be beneficial for offeror's to coordinate, identify, and execute submission for additional past performance references.	Refer to response to question #70
77	79	L.11.5.1	2	Will the Government please allow offeror's to present the required component cost element detail rounded to the nearest cent? For offeror's who apply component cost elements as an indirect percentage of the associated direct cost base, rounding to the nearest dollar will create significant multiplicative rounding distortions in the hourly labor rates proposed in Attachment J-6.	No. offeror's are to propose rates rounded to the nearest dollar.
78	79	L.11.4.3	Section III	States that the questionnaires must be submitted no less than 10 calendar days prior to the original receipt of proposals date. Are you saying that questionnaires are due at least 10 calendar days before the proposal is due?	Yes.
79	79	L.11.4 Volume IV- Past Performance (Factor III)		Would the government consider both commercial and government past performance references?	Yes
80	79	L.11.4	1	Is it correct that there is no contract dollar level minimum for the up to 11 Past Performances submitted by the Prime and/or the others from the Subs, if used?	Yes

Attachment J-4
 ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
 Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
 (Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

81	79	L	L.11.4.3	The RFP states that "the past performance reference shall be instructed to complete Section B of the questionnaire and email the entire questionnaire to ProTech.Enterprise@noaa.gov no less than 10 calendar days prior to the original receipt of proposals date established in the solicitation." Despite including these instructions in the past performance surveys, offeror's cannot guarantee that contracting officers will return the questionnaires 10 days prior to the RFP due date. Will the government accept past performance questionnaires if they are received after 10 days prior to the RFP due date?	The Government will exercise discretion in accepting Past Performance Questionnaires submitted past the due date.
82	79	L.11.5.1, Att J-6)	N/A	Please confirm that all pricing data is for primes only. No pricing data is required from subcontractors.	That is correct. Subcontractors are not required to provide ceiling prices.
83	79	L.11.4.3	Section III	In the case where past performance is submitted as a subcontractor, can the past performance questionnaire be directed to the prime or must it be directed to the government?	All Past Performance Questionnaires are to be submitted to the Government.
84	79	L.11.4.3	1	The Government is requiring that Past Performance Questionnaire be completed and sent 10 days prior to when proposals are due. This could cause some challenges when either working with customers for submittal, or if a change of past performance citations is warranted. Can the Government make the due date the same date as when the proposals are due?	Refer to response to question #70.
85	79	L.11.5.1	1	The Government is asking that fully burdened hourly rates be rounded to the nearest dollar. This approach could cause wide variations in pricing and may create challenges when comparing price. Also, comparable rates on other schedules or IDIQ contracts are not rounded to the nearest dollar. Recommend that offeror's provide rates rounded to nearest 10th of a dollar.	Offeror's are to propose rates rounded to the nearest dollar.
86	79	L.11.4.3	0	Section III – Past Performance Assessment Questionnaire: please	Confirmed.

Attachment J-4
ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
(Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

87	79	L.11.5.1	1	There is a potential for unbalanced evaluation of pricing without the government explicitly stating the location from which to base its pricing. For example if the government were to evaluate a price proposal for Seattle Washington, where the vendor utilized that location as its basis, how is the government able to reasonably make a determination against a company who utilized Washington DC, Hawaii, or Boulder CO. Will the government consider naming Washington, DC Metro area as the basis of location for pricing?	No. Work performance may be at in various locations both within the Continental United States and Outside the Continental United States.
88	79	L	L.11.5.1	Might some worked be performed in Alaska, Hawaii, or other countries? If yes, how will offers price this for submission with their proposal, and/or on task orders?	Rates proposed at the IDIQ level are to be used as ceiling rates in the event that there is no competition for T&M or Labor Hour Task Orders. Individual Task Orders that may require work in OCONUS locations will be proposed separately.
89	79	L.11.5.1	0	The RFP requests that the component cost elements be rounded to the nearest dollar. Does the Government want each element such as fringe, overhead, G&A, profit rounded to the whole dollar (no cents) or should only the yearly total be rounded to the whole dollar?	Ceiling rates to be rounded to the nearest dollar in each year.
90	79	L.11.4	1	The paragraph indicates requirements for the past performances of the prime and JV and/or partners of the JV. Does partners infer subcontractors? Will government accept past performance from subcontractors? If so, is there a required number of past performances for a subcontractor?	Refer to response to question #54
91	79	L.11.4	3	It notes that previous CPARS ratings and questionnaires will be used in the proposal evaluation. Does the Government want a copy of the CPARS to be submitted in the proposal or will the PPQ responses suffice?	Refer to response to question #58

Attachment J-4
ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
(Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

92	79	L.11.4.3	N/A	<p>RFP Text: The past performance reference shall be instructed to complete Section B of the questionnaire and e-mail the entire questionnaire to ProTech.Enterprise@noaa.gov no less than 10 calendar days prior to the original receipt of proposals date established in the solicitation.</p> <p>Question: Will the Government consider making the due date for questionnaires the same as the proposal due date? With potentially up to 11 past performance references being submitted, and the required coordination with Government client POCs, it may be difficult to ensure that all questionnaires are submitted as required 10 days prior to the proposal due date.</p>	Refer to response to question #70
93	80	L.11.5.2	4	Reference "Failure to offer ceiling hourly rates for all labor categories and all contract periods may result in the Offeror being ineligible for award." For those Firms that are bidding to only a portion of the statement of work, are we required to offer ceiling hourly rates for all labor categories, or for only those categories that map to the statement of work areas we intend to execute against?	Offeror's are to propose rates for all labor categories.
94	80	L.11.4.3	1	It appears that the reference to L.10.4.1 should be L.11.4.1. Is that correct?	Correction will be made to the final RFP
95	80	L.11.5.2	5	Page 80, section L.11.5.2 states that failure to offer ceiling hourly rates for all labor categories and all contract periods may result in the Offeror being ineligible for award. If offeror's are only responding to one or two elements of the SOW and have for example no experience in facility management services, please clarify how offeror's are to propose labor rates for an unknown technical area?	Although the award will not be based on specific line items and that a Prospective Offeror need not provide capability for the entire array of efforts set forth in the Statement of Work (SOW) to be considered for award, the Government maintains that Prospective Offerors should still include the ceiling hourly rates for all labor categories and all contract periods. Prospective Offerors may find the rates based on the market, even if Prospective Offerors do not have the staff in house at this time, so long as the basis of the rates are fair and reasonable.
96	80	L.11.4.3	1	Would the government consider extending the due date for receipt of past performance questionnaires from 10 calendar days prior to the original receipt of propoals date to 5 calendar days prior to this date?	Refer to response to question #70

Attachment J-4
ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
(Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

97	80	L.11.5.2	2	Where the Government states that "offeror's shall describe comprehensively and in detail how the rates and their component cost elements were developed in order to eliminate, or at least minimize, the need for clarification questions by the Government as it reviews the price proposals", does this require that offeror's justify the direct labor/salary rates that are being bid? If so, will demonstrating that an offeror utilized a generally accepted industry standard salary survey satisfy the Government's requirement that offeror's support the reasonableness of proposed rates?	Consistent with the draft RFP verbiage. Basis for estimated ceiling rates.
98	80	L	L.11.5.1	Is a single price matrix to be provided of the maximum anyone on the team could charge, or separate matrices for Prime and its Subcontractors? AT Page 9, B.4.2, the RFP states that "The Contractor may provide separate and/or blended loaded hourly labor rates at the task order level for Prime Contractor, each Subcontractor, and/or each Division, Subsidiary, or Affiliate..." but its not clear what is desired at the IDIQ proposal level.	A single pricing matrix/table (see Attachment J-6) is requested at the IDIQ proposal level.
99	80	L.11.5.2	4	If it is NOAA's intent to competitively award contracts to highly qualified niche providers, please provide guidance for how niche providers can avoid being ineligible, and comply with Section L.11.5.2, page 80, "Failure to offer ceiling hourly rates for all labor categories and all contract periods may result in the Offeror being ineligible for award,"	To avoid being deemed ineligible, offeror's should propose rates for all labor categories.
100	80	L	L.11.5	Failure to offer ceiling hourly rates for all labor categories and all contract periods may result in the Offeror being ineligible for award. If an Offeror is unable to address each of the areas of the SOW, will Ceiling Rates for areas not addressed be accepted from such offeror's?	Yes, the offeror is to propose a ceiling rate for each labor category in the IDIQ RFP.

Attachment J-4
ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
(Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

101	81	L	L.11.5.2	<p>Is the full supporting information described to also be provided for the Subcontractors?</p> <p>If the information is required for Subcontractors, is there a separate or "sealed package" submittal process available? Certain of that information is proprietary financial information that may be provided to Government, but not shared with other contractors.</p>	The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP.
102	81	L.11.5.1	1	Will the Government consider onsite and offsite pricing?	Only one set of rates is to be provided at the IDIQ level, to be established as ceiling rates. Offeror's should base the rates on the most highly qualified employee or class of employees within a category working in the highest cost locations, considering the higher cost of performance at a Government or Contractor Site.
103	83	L.11.4.3	1	Would NOAA kindly modify the due date for Past performance questionnaires such that questionnaires are due by client references 10 days after the solicitation close date? We ask for this consideration given that Section A, including a project description, must be completed first by the offeror and then provided to the client reference.	Refer to response to question #70
104	72, 11	L.10, C.3.1.1	0	The SOW presented in C.3 not only contains numerous sub-areas in each main performance area, but in many of the sub-areas, there are numerous components to these sub-areas. How many of the component areas of an individual sub-area do we have to have capability and experience in to be evaluated as experienced and capable within that specific area? For example, for the first one C.3.1.1, the RFP states "The contractor shall develop draft Strategic Business Plans/Business Processes, organizational assessments, service delivery models, change management, reengineering processes, and recommendations for execution". There are 6 component areas to this sub-area. How many of these 6 areas do we have to have capability and experience in to claim (and be evaluated) that we are capable for the sub-area?	Contract awards will not be based on specific line items; therefore, an Offeror need not provide capability for the entire array of efforts or the entire task as set forth in the Statement of Work (SOW) to be considered for award. offeror's with limited capability, such as providing only for diverse elements of the task, may still be awarded a contract.

Attachment J-4
 ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
 Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
 (Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

105	72, 73	L.10, L.11	0	<p>The RFP specifies a 3 page limit for the Capability Matrix and 30 page limit for Experience and Commitment. Since offeror's are not required to propose in all areas, this may create an unfair or non-competitive situation. Bidders that propose in only 1-2 areas have a lot of flexibility in their approach to addressing all aspects of the specific performance areas while bidders that propose in more than 5 areas (nevertheless all 11) have incredibly tight constraints where it is not clear how/if we could address all areas properly or even fit a capability matrix in 3 pages based on the number of performance areas and teammates.</p> <p>Recommendation: We recommend that the page count for both the capability matrix and the corporate experience and commitment sections be based directly on the number of areas that the offeror is bidding against. Specifically, we recommend a 3 page limit for each capability matrix and an 15 page limit per each Corporate Experience and Commitment section. We would also recommend that the commitment to environmental intelligence have a separate page count requirement (2 pages maximum recommended).</p>	Refer to resposne to question #6
106	72-74	L	L.10, L.11	<p>Will the government please clarify where the capabilities matrix can be included in the proposal? Section L.10 states that: "The Government will allow offeror's to submit a 3-page Capability Matrix at the beginning of Volume II - Corporate Experience and Commitment, detailing which elements the SOW the offeror is proposing and capable of doing, and where within Volume II the offeror's approach for completing that specific work is addressed;" however, the format instructions in the table in section L.11 show the Capabilities Matrix at the beginning of both Volume II, and Volume IV. Will the government allow the offeror to include the capabilities matrix in both Volume II and Volume IV?</p>	Refer to response to question #6

Attachment J-4
 ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
 Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
 (Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

107	73, 74	L.11	0	Instructions are provided for the Capability Matrix to be provided as part of Volume II. "The Government will allow offeror's to submit a 3-page Capability Matrix at the beginning of Volume II - Corporate Experience and Commitment, detailing which elements the SOW the offeror is proposing and capable of doing, and where within Volume II the offeror's approach for completing that specific work is addressed." However, similar guidance for the Capability Matrix to be provided as part of Volume IV, Past Performance, as shown on the table on page 74; is not provided. Can the government provide guidance on the purpose/content of the Capability Matrix to be provided as part of Volume IV?	The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP.
108	73, 74 & 75	L.11	Table	In the Table on pages 74-75 both Volumes II & IV indicate a Capability Matrix is required. However, the capability matrix is only discussed on page 73 as part of Volume II. QUESTION: a) Is a Capability Matrix being requested for both Volumes II & IV? b) If the answer to a) is yes, is the format and page limitation of the Volume IV Capability Matrix different from the Volume II Matrix or is it the same (duplicate) matrix? c) If Capability Matrices are required for both the Experience and Past Performance Volumes, what is the difference in the information required?	The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP. A requirement for both volumes.
109	73-74	L.11	Table	In the page limitation table in Section L.11, the 3 page capability matrix appears both in Volumes II and IV. Please clarify the matrix is only required in Volume II.	The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP. A requirement for both volumes.

Attachment J-4
ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
(Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

110	74, 78	L.11, L.11.4	0	For a thorough explanation of past performance explaining "service similarity, complexity, contract type, contract dollar value/size, program phase, division of company, major or critical subcontractors, teaming partners and joint venture", we must have room to explain the relevance of each reference to each of the performance areas of the SOW. It will be difficult to impossible to do this for references with significant depth and breadth (spanning multiple service areas). Question: Will the government extend the page limit for "IV - Past Performance, Section II: Contract Performance" to 5 pages per reference?	Refer to response to question #6
111	74-75	L.11 FORMAT AND INSTRUCTIO NS FOR PROPOSAL SUBMISSION TABLE	0	This table asks for a 3-page Capability Matrix for Volume IV, Past Performance. However, it appears that no instructions for this matrix are provided in the draft RFP. Could the Government provide guidance for the format and contents of the Past Performance Capability Matrix? For example, vendors could present a table/chart with checkmarks indicating how their past performance references individually relate to the 11 main SOW task areas (that is, the "C.3.x" tasks). We believe that mapping each past performance reference to each individual "C.3.x.x" task in the SOW would make the table complicated and somewhat hard to follow.	The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP. A requirement for both volumes.
112	75, 80	L.11, L.11.4.3	Table, 1	What content should offeror's include in Volume IV, Section III, Past Performance Assessment? Should offeror's include copies of the Attachment J5 forms sent to their customers/references or should the offeror's include a table that lists and acknowledges the forms sent?	Refer to Sections L and M for instructions and evaluation criteria for corresponding volumes
113	75/81	L.10/L.11.5.2	42737	L.10. page 75 asks offeror's to complete the pricing Excel file, etc. L.11.5.2 Page 81, states "Information on how the rates and their component cost elements in Attachment J-6 were developed and rationale why the Offeror considers them to be reasonable. " are bidders to assume that this information should be included in a separate worksheet in the Excel file, or are bidders to submit a Word document Volume V with pricing narrative information?	Bidders are to submit a Word Document as Volume V with pricing narrative information in addition to the Attachment J-6 Excel worksheet showing the fully burdened ceiling rates proposed.

Attachment J-4
 ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
 Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
 (Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

114	76 & 84	L.11.2 & M5.1	4 & 8	<p>RFP Section L 11.2 states "The Offeror shall describe its breadth and depth of experience and qualifications working within the requirements of the SOW contained in Section C. For purposes of this solicitation, breadth is defined as the extent to which the Offeror's experience and qualifications correspond to the array of efforts set forth in the SOW. Depth is defined as the extent to which the proposed experience and qualifications fully address an individual type of effort set forth in the SOW." Then REF Section M 5.1 states 'The Government will evaluate the extent to which the Offeror has shown commitment to the pursuit of environmental intelligence and investment in innovative business solutions to achieving NOAA's vision in this Domain.'" Please clarify how the government will fairly evaluate non-NOAA relevant experience compared to NOAA relevant experience?. Will non-NOAA experience be evaluated at a lower rating which the statement implies? If yes, this limits competition to only current or recent NOAA prime contractors. Contractor recommends you remove " to achieving NOAA's vision in this domain" statement and allow evaluators to consider relevant non-NOAA experience and qualifications equally.</p>	<p>The award will not be based on specific line items; therefore, an Offeror need not provide capability for the entire array of effort set forth in the Statement of Work (SOW) to be considered for award. Offerors with limited capability may obtain a contract if they are the only firm or highly beneficial for a part of the Enterprise Operations domain. The Final Solicitation will reflect accordingly.</p>
-----	---------	---------------	-------	--	---

Attachment J-4
 ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
 Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
 (Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

115	76, 84	L.11.2, M.5.1	0	<p>L.11.2 states "no single Offeror or Team is required to address every area of the SOW" and M.4 states "An Offeror need not provide capability for the entire array of efforts set forth in the SOW to be considered for award." Further, L.11.2 states "If an Offeror does state that it can address every area of the SOW, and evaluation of the proposal reveals significant weaknesses or deficiencies in the response, this could lead to the Offeror being found ineligible for award." This combination would seem to strongly indicate the government does not want offeror's to put together large teams that can perform in all areas, rather smaller teams with strong emphasis on particular niches of the procurement. However, L.11.2 also requires the offeror to describe not just depth in some areas but also breadth across the whole SOW and M.5.1 states "The Government will evaluate the extent to which the Offeror has demonstrated the qualifications and corporate experience in performing work of the same or similar nature as that of the requirements of the SOW, including those items stated in Section L.11.2. The evaluation will include any subcontractors that will perform major aspects of the requirement." Further, it was stated at the last NOAA Industry Day that breadth and depth would be weighted equally when evaluating this Factor. These statements seem in conflict. If the government does not want large, fully capable teams (even \$1B+ companies will have to build large teams for this breadth of service areas), why would we be graded on breadth at all? If it does want large, fully capable teams, why the potential for being found ineligible for award instead of a scoring system that just discounts that specific performance area? Please provide clarity on the desires of the government on team size and capability as well as the specifics of the</p>	<p>The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP.</p>
116	76-77	L.11.2	0	<p>In view of this, how will "breadth" be judged for niche providers that address limited portions of the SOW, so that they are not disadvantaged by the selection criteria?</p>	<p>The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP.</p>

Attachment J-4
ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
(Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

117	77 vs 79-80	L.11.2 vs. L.11.5.1	3	The last sentence of the paragraph states "Evaluation of professional and technical experience will also be based on proposed methods for establishing, organizing and performing logistics related aspects of this requirement, including some for which personnel are working in various locations both within the Continental United States (CONUS) and Outside the Continental United States (OCONUS)." This appears to be in conflict with the pricing instructions of L.11.5.1 which states that "rates are only applicable to work performed in the United States (including Alaska and Hawaii)." Can the government clarify which is correct?	The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP
118	78 84	L.11.2M.4	45	Please confirm it is NOAA's intent to provide for niche providers by the statements, "no single Offeror or Team is required to address every area of the SOW" (RFP Section L.11.2, page 77); and, "An Offeror need not provide capability for the entire array of efforts set forth in the SOW" (RFP Section M4, page 84).	This unrestricted requirement specifies that no single Offeror or Team to address every area of the SOW.
119	79 - 80	L	L.11.5	The Section referenced at left, as well as Attachment J-6, appear to require only one Ceiling Rate per Prime Offeror Team for each Labor Category (and associated Level and Performance Period). Is this a correct interpretation, or will each Subcontractor also provide the information required Section L.11.5 and Attachment J-6? (Section B.4.2 identifies that "The Contractor may provide separate and/or blended loaded hourly labor rates at the task order level for Prime Contractor labor, each Subcontractor," -- this Section implies that Subcontractors will provide Ceiling Rates, as well). Please clarify.	This correct, only one ceiling rate per Prime Offeror team per Labor Category is requested.
120	79 & 85	L.11.4.2 & M.5.3	1 & 2	Would you clarify which statement is correct: L.11.4.2, 1) Conforming to Contract Specifications to include timely supply of personnel resources, AND M.5.3, 1) Conforming to specifications and standards of good performance?	Both are correct. L.11.4.2 provides instructions providing a narrative description to include in part the referenced information. While, M.5.3.1 describes the methodology used for Past Performance assessment.
121	79 & 85	L.11.4.2 & M.5.3	1 & 2	Would you clarify which statement is correct: L.11.4.2, 4) Ability to resolve technical problems quickly and effectively, AND M.5.3 4) Ability to resolve technical and management problems quickly and effectively?	Refer to the response to question 120 identifying similar manner.

Attachment J-4
ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
(Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

122	79-80	L.11.5.1	1	Can NOAA give more clarification on where the preponderance of work will take place CONUS and OCONUS? Given that Alaska and Hawaii have distinct wage profiles, to provide reasonable US blended ceiling rates, we need to assess what percentage of work may occur in Alaska and Hawaii?	The exact location of work will be determined by the requirements of individual future Task Orders.
123	80/84	L.11.5.2/M.4	4,5	Section L.11.5.2 states "Failure to offer ceiling hourly rates for all labor categories and all contract periods may result in the Offeror being ineligible for award" but Section M.4 states "An offeror need not provide capability for the entire array of efforts set forth in the SOW to be considered for award. " Can the government please clarify as to whether or not rates must be submitted for all labor categories?	Offeror's are to propose rates for all labor categories.
124	RFP 73	L.11	1	Please confirm that the 30 page limit for "Corporate Experience and Commitment" is a fixed page limit, regardless of the number of scope areas on which an offeror bids?	Confirmed.
125	RFP 77	L.11.2	4	Please confirm that if an offeror bids on a subset of components of the SOW, the offeror will not be prohibited from bidding on future task orders which may include scope areas not bid on in the offer.	Confirmed.
126	RFP p. 72-74	L.10-L.11	L.10 - 5th paragraph, L.11 - Volume IV row in table	Section L.10 states: "The Government will allow offeror's to submit a 3-page Capability Matrix at the beginning of Volume II - Corporate Experience and Commitment...". However, in the table in L.11 , the row describing Volume IV requirements lists a Capability Matrix as well. Are Capability Matrices required for both Volumes II and IV?	The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP.
127	81	M.2	B	(b) The Government intends to award multiple contracts in response to the solicitation. - How many awards are anticipated?	The number of awards will be determined by the competitive process.
128	82	M.2	(b)	Does the Government have a minimum and/or maximum number of awards it will make?	No, the number of awards will be determined by the competitive process and leveraged amongst the various service contract needs.
129	82	M.2	a, b	The RFP in paragraph (a) refers to the "offerOR" singular, but paragraph (b) specifies multiple awards. Please confirm that there will be multiple awards under this RFP.	Yes. Section M.2(b) states: "The Government intends to award multiple contracts in response to the solicitation."

Attachment J-4
ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
(Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

130	82	M.2	b	Please supply a rough estimate of the total number of awards expected.	The number of awards will be determined by the competitive process.
131	82	M.2	2	“(2) Discussions/Final Proposal Revisions” – please describe this step and the timeline (eg, “NOAA will provide clarifying questions a week in advance. The firm will develop answers in a PowerPoint and come in to present/discuss their answers within a half-hour time-block. The firm will prepare an updated proposal with these revisions and clarifications to NOAA within two weeks”)	FAR 15.306 - Exchanges with offeror's after receipt of proposals', describe the process the Government would use, if required. Timelines associated with this process would be TBD, and established as required.
132	82	M.1	N/A	RFP Text: 52.215-5 Evaluation of Options (JUL 1990) Question: This clause is no longer in the FAR, please remove reference.	The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP.
133	83	M	3	Can the government provide a definition of the ratings (whether adjectival or numerical scoring) used in evaluation of the non-price factors?	The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP.
134	83	M.4	N/A	If an offeror is among the highest technically rated, but has a small percentage of rates that are not considered fair/reasonable, would the government conduct discussions to move those rates within the fair/reasonable range?	Yes
135	84	M.4	4	Can an offeror having multiple socio-economic status, e.g., WOSB, SVOSB be scored in both categories? Does the offeror have to indicate a preferred socio-economic status at the time of proposal submission?	An offeror with multiple socio-economic status will be considered and identified with categories.
136	84	M.4	2	Regarding the statement "The Government anticipates awarding at least two contracts to each socio-economic category. " Can the Government confirm how many socio-economic categories? (i.e., SDVOSB, 8(a), WOSB, HUBZone, HBCU, SDB)	Within the reserve for small business the socio-economic categories referred to in M.2 will include service-disabled veteran-owned small business, women-owned small business, and HubZone small business concerns.
137	84	M.5.1	2	What does the Government consider as a reasonable "investment in innovative business solutions"?	The Government will use adjectival ratings to evaluate an offeror's investment in innovative business solutions in the performance of the proposed contract.
138	84	M.5.1	2	Will NOAA experience and commitment be rated any higher than experience and commitment at other Federal agencies, and if so, how great will the difference in weighting be?	Individual elements are not weighted.

Attachment J-4
 ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
 Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
 (Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

139	84	M.4	4	The Government would like to award to 2 vendors in each socio-economic category, can the Government provide the list of socio economic categories they are focused on?	Within the reserve for small business the socio-economic categories referred to in M.2 will include service-disabled veteran-owned small business, women-owned small business, and HubZone small business concerns.
140	84	M.5	2	Will the government provide an adjectival or numerical rating scale so that vendors can know exactly how we will be evaluated as "Highly Technically Rated" is not clearly defined?	The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP.
141	84	M	M.4	The Draft RFP states the following in Section M.4 Basis for Awards: "An Offeror need not provide capability for the entire array of efforts set forth in the SOW to be considered for award." This Section also states the following: "offeror's with limited capability may obtain a contract if they are the only firm or is determined highly beneficial for a part of the domain." Will offeror's who provide capability for the entire array of efforts set forth in the SOW be given additional consideration in evaluation given overall capabilities, or will each area be evaluated independently?	The evaluation will be conducted per Section M.3 of the RFP.
142	84	M.5.1	N/A	Can the Government provide additional clarification on how the Corporate Experience and Commitment Factor will be scored. For example, will offeror's who are able demonstrate qualifications and experience in all 11 task areas be evaluated more highly than an offeror who does not propose against all task areas?	The Government will evaluate the offeror's corporate approach to support NOAA's mission. Individual task areas are not weighted.
143	85	M.5.3	2	Are small businesses required to address item number 7) Ability to comply with past performance small business subcontracting goals, in their response?	No
144	85	M.5.3	1	Will NOAA past performance be rated any higher than past performance at other Federal agencies, and if so, how great will the difference in weighting be?	Per Section L.11.4, the Government will consider recent and relevant past performance submissions and "will evaluate the extent to which the past performance examples proffered are relevant to the requirements of this solicitation. Note: Relevancy includes such things as service similarity, complexity, contract type, contract dollar value/size, program phase, division of company, major or critical subcontractors, teaming partners and joint venture."

Attachment J-4
 ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
 Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
 (Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

145	85	M.5.3	1	<p>Only 11 past performance references are allowed and there are 11 tasks identified; however, due to past performances with narrow scopes, 11 past performances may not provide the government with comprehensive past performance coverage for all sub-tasks of a task area. Will the government consider this a risk or provide an unacceptable evaluation rating for the lack of comprehensive coverage? If so, please provide further guidance to offeror's on how the best approach for handling the potential gap in coverage for all sub-tasks from a past performance perspective?</p>	<p>Per Section L.11.4, the Government will consider recent and relevant past performance submissions and "will evaluate the extent to which the past performance examples proffered are relevant to the requirements of this solicitation. Note: Relevancy includes such things as service similarity, complexity, contract type, contract dollar value/size, program phase, division of company, major or critical subcontractors, teaming partners and joint venture."</p>
146	85	M.5.3	N/A	<p>Can the Government provide additional clarification on how the Past Performance Factor will be scored. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will the Government be evaluating and scoring each past performance individually, and average the scores, or will the Government evaluate the combined past performance as a whole? - Will the Government focus more on depth or breadth of experience. e.g., will a past performance that provides in-depth detail for a few tasks areas, but does not go into a significant level of detail on each task, be scored higher than a past performance that covers all 11 task areas but not in a high level of detail? As offeror's are limited to two pages for each past performance, this will impact how they should approach the write-up for each past performance reference being submitted. - Will past performance as a prime contractor be evaluated more highly than past performance as a subcontractor? 	<p>Per Section L.11.4, the Government will consider recent and relevant past performance submissions and "will evaluate the extent to which the past performance examples proffered are relevant to the requirements of this solicitation. Note: Relevancy includes such things as service similarity, complexity, contract type, contract dollar value/size, program phase, division of company, major or critical subcontractors, teaming partners and joint venture."</p>
147	85	M.5.3	3	<p>RFP Text: "7) Ability to comply with past performance small business subcontracting goals"</p> <p>Question: Section L for earlier ProTech Domain solicitations included a requirement to address "Compliance with small business subcontracting goals". This requirement was not included in Section L of the Enterprise Operations Draft RFP. Can the Government confirm that the requirement 7 noted above in Section M should also be removed?</p>	<p>This requirement will not be removed.</p>

Attachment J-4
ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
(Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

148	86	M.6	1	Should offeror's assume that all labor categories are required to comply with the Service Contract Act?	No
149	86	M.6 Cost Price	0	Are subcontractors required to submit sealed bids for their indirect rates? Or will the the Attachment J-6 suffice at the prime level?	Only the prime's financial information is required.
150	86	M.6	N/A	Please clarify which price evaluation techniques under 15.404-1 are likely to be used in the price evaluation? For example, will the government compare labor rates across all offeror's and determine an acceptable range of rates per labor category, based on standard deviation?	The Government may use one or more techniques defined under FAR 15.404-1(b)(2).
151	86	M.6	N/A	Will the government provide more insight into how an offeror's explanation / justification of their fair and reasonable pricing will be considered during the price evaluation?	The Government will only make award to offeror's whose individual rates are determined reasonable, since at this point it is unclear which individual rates will actually come into play at the task order level. If upon initial evaluation, the Government has concerns about the reasonableness of particular rates, the Government may request clarifications or enter into discussions with the offeror.
152	86	M.6	N/A	Is the assessment of fair and reasonable pricing binary, e.g. an offeror's price is fair/reasonable or not fair/reasonable?	Yes
153	86	M.6	N/A	Will fair/reasonable be assessed against an overall price or for each individual labor rate?	The Government may use one or more techniques defined under FAR 15.404-1(b)(2).
154	82,83	M.2,M.3,M.4	N/A	Best Value Evaluation. Please confirm: NOAA will determine whether offeror's' prices are "fair and reasonable" on a pass/fail basis, correct? In other words, offeror's' prices will not be compared as part of proposal evaluation?	The Government may use one or more techniques defined under FAR 15.404-1(b)(2).
155	83-84	M-4	1-7	Basis for Awards: The SOW states that "An Offeror need not provide capability for the entire array of efforts set forth in the SOW to be considered for award." How will this impact NOAA's award strategy and how will NOAA evaluate teams who provide depth and breadth capabilities in most or all of the SOW areas be compared to an offeror who offers depth and breadth in only one area? Is it to the offeror's advantage to limit their SOW focus for a more favorable evaluation? Industry Day charts indicated from 12 - 36 potential awards with 75% of the awards going to small business concerns.	Contract awards will not be based on specific line items; therefore, an Offeror need not provide capability for the entire array of efforts or the entire task as set forth in the Statement of Work (SOW) to be considered for award. offeror's with limited capability, such as providing only for diverse elements of the task, may still be awarded a contract.

Attachment J-4
 ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
 Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
 (Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

156	84-85	M.5	ALL	Please clarify if the government will use an adjectival or other rating scheme to evaluate the Section M.5 Factors (I, II, III) and what that will be? Recommend the government include the rating scheme in the Final RFP.	The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP.
157	85 and 77	M.5.3 and L.11.2	4	Page 85, section M.5.3 states, "When assessing past performance relevancy and quality level, the Government will focus its inquiry on the past performance of the Offeror and its proposed team members as it relates to all solicitation requirements." Page 77, section L.11.2 states, "Consistent with previously published Q&As for the ProTech Domains, and in vendor communication events, no single Offeror or Team is required to address every area of the SOW." Can NOAA please clarify if past performance is going to be evaluated as it relates to all the solicitation requirements or just the areas that the team selects to address?	Sections M.5 - M.5.3 define how past performance will be evaluated.
158	RFP 84	M.5.1	All	Section L states that offeror's are not required to address every area of the SOW, and further, that offers may be ineligible if offeror's address areas for which they cannot demonstrate sufficient experience. Can the government confirm that it will evaluate the different components of the SOW separately within each offer, as opposed to Volume II in its entirety (since, when offeror's inevitably bid on different components, their respective proposals in whole are not comparable)?	Contract awards will not be based on specific line items; therefore, an Offeror need not provide capability for the entire array of efforts or the entire task as set forth in the Statement of Work (SOW) to be considered for award. offeror's with limited capability, such as providing only for diverse elements of the task, may still be awarded a contract.
159	0	0	0	What is the government's estimation on Task Order award percentages for Small Business?	The Government may compete any orders solely amongst all of the small business concerns if the "rule of two" has been met. If there is only one contract award to any one type of small business concern the Government may issue orders directly to that concern for work that it can perform.
160	0	0	0	Is the acquisition of technical support services for NOAA's Data Centers and/or systems integration services in support of NOAA's R&D HPCC infrastructure anticipated to be issued via this procurement vehicle?	No

Attachment J-4
ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
(Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

161	0	0	0	Due to the amount of SOW elements included in the DRFP, will the Government consider increasing the page count for Volume II?	Government will consider this for the final RFP.
162	0	0	0	Regarding depth and breadth of experience, if the offeror has relevant experience in each area of the SOW element, but for a customer other than NOAA, will that experience satisfy the depth and breadth requirement, or will it be deemed as weak or insufficient? An example would be C.3.2.4: "The contractor shall provide outreach and engagement mechanisms and materials to educate and improve public understanding and involvement in NOAA's mission and programs; organize meetings, seminars, and workshops; prepare content for routine industry newsletters; and, prepare minutes of meetings."	Relevant experience direct/indirect will be evaluated based on relevancy and quality regardless of customer.
163	0	General	0	Confirmation that if a firm, particularly large business firm, does not address all SOW areas, the firm (potentially with support from more specialized team members) can still submit Task Order proposals on any Task issued under the Domain?	Yes. While there is a 75% reserve for small business on ProTech, there is no work at the IDIQ level that has been set-aside for small business, and no Government preference for how a large business proposes. All offeror's will be evaluated exactly based on the evaluation criteria stipulated in Section M of the RFP. In addition, the RFP allows for companies with a niche expertise in one area/element to propose solely based off their skills in that area.
164	0	General	0	What is the Government's plan, if based on proposal responses to certain requirements, no awardee firms can demonstrate capability to perform in certain SOW areas?	The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP.
165	0	General	0	What is the government planning to do to differentiate contractors during task order competition? Is it going to be up to the each line office using the Domain or will there be a template?	Evaluation criteria will be specified at the task order level.
166	0	0	0	The date for submittal of the questions differed between the date indicated on the FBOGOV Solicitation and the Date in the SOW Section L. which was August 14th 2017.	Industry will be provided additional opportunities for Q&As upon release of the final RFP. Interested parties are encouraged to register for FBO's 'Watch Opportunity' feature for status updates.

Attachment J-4
ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
(Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

167	2	0	0	Index: Leaves out Category 12: Incidental IT - Web Designing, but it was included in the J-2_EnterpriseOps_Labor_Category_Descriptions.pdf	Correct. Category 12, which should have been listed as Section C.3.12 will be included in the final Enterprise Domain RFP
168	3	Standard Level Definitions	0	In Attachment J-2, Standard Level Definitions, please confirm that the MASTERS and associates degrees are equivalent to two years of education-related experience; BACHELORS and doctoral degrees are equivalent to four years of relevant experience.	Yes. The number of years may be cumulative. For example, if an individual has a bachelors and masters degree then the total would be equivalent to 6 years of experience. If an individual had a bachelor's and a doctoral degree, then it would be equivalent to 8 years experience.
169	7	Schedule	0	Can the Government confirm that offeror's are not required to complete the Schedule of Services as part of the proposal submission?	Confirmed.
170	7	Schedule	0	Schedule requires a unit price and amount for each Item. However, level of effort and extended pricing is not part of the proposal. Is this schedule to be provided/completed as part of the proposal or does this area fall under paragraph L.12?	Confirmed.
171	11	0	0	What is the rationale for significant (~30 areas) increase in number of truly new scope areas from the DSOW issued in December 2016 for ProTech Enterprise.	The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP.
172	52	52.219-14	1	For task orders that are set aside or reserved for small business, will	Yes
173	52	52.219-14	1	Will Limitations in Subcontracting be evaluated at the Task Order or IDIQ level?	The number of awards will be determined by the competitive process.
174	76	VI	all	Prior to the release of the Draft RFP, ProTech Staff stated that Contractor Team Arrangements (CTAs) are permitted to respond the ProTech Enterprise Operations RFP. As a result, small businesses that fit the size standard formed CTAs to respond to this RFP. This section only discusses Joint Ventures (JV). Would you confirm in writing that CTAs are permitted and the small businesses that form a CTA are treated collectively as the prime contractor?	The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP.

Attachment J-4
ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
(Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

175	80	0	1	The RFP states that the Offeror should base rates on highest cost location in the US, including Alaska and Hawaii. Will you please provide a list of all possible worksite locations to which contractors may be assigned as part of support to NOAA under the IDIQ/task orders? Or, will you please confirm that offeror's should take into account all 421 existing NOAA sites within the U.S.	Contractor work locations will be defined upon issuance of individual Task Order proposal request. See Section F.4.
176	6 & 70	SF33 & L.8.1	0	The SF33 identifies 8/21 as the due date and Section L identifies 8/31. Please clarify the discrepancy in due date in the final RFP.	Final RFP due dates are TBD, but will be included in the final Enterprise Domain RFP. In the final RFP the date on the SF33 should match the Date in Section L
177	Attachment J-2	Category 12.	al IT - Web D	Please clarify the reference as Category 12 is not listed in Section C of the Statement of work.	Correct. Category 12, which should have been listed as Section C.3.12 will be included in the final Enterprise Domain RFP Note: There's no C.3.12. Incidental IT is referenced in C.3.2.9.
178	Attachment J-6	EOD tab	EOD tab	Attachment J-6 identifies indirect rates and profit markup, but that only supports the first year. Is it the Government's intention that industry only provides visibility into the labor rate build-up for the first year, and then simply escalates the rates for the out years?	The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP.
179	General	General	General	The overall 541611 NAICS has a size standard of \$15M, however, the 11 service areas cover a wide array of subsequent NAICS codes and size standards. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will different NAICS codes be selected at the TO level, based on the predominance of work to be performed, or will the 541611 NAICS be designated for all TOs based on the IDIQ competition? • If different NAICS codes will be used at the TO level, please confirm that "large-IDIQ awardees", particularly mid-sized businesses, may be eligible to bid as small and socioeconomic businesses, if applicable per reps & certs, under "other" selected NAICS (i.e. in the event the procurement utilizes NAICS with size standards at \$32.5M, \$38.5M, etc.). 	The exception does not apply for this procurement. The size standard is \$15M.

Attachment J-4
 ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
 Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
 (Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

180	General	General	General	Given the anticipated 75/25 percent split between small and large business awards at the IDIQ level, what is the government's plan for determining acquisition strategy (i.e. full and open vs. set-aside solicitations) at the TO level?	Any set-asides for small business will be determined at the task order level.
181	General	0	0	We understand that if an offeror wins a BPA they will then be invited to bid on TO's that align with their socio economic category regardless of the scope of the TO and whether they prepared a technical response to all areas. Given that a prime may add companies to its team that offer additional capabilities beyond those originally outlined in their proposal response how will NOAA determine what companies qualify technically for each TO?	The Government is still formulating a response and will update in impending final RFP.
182	General	-	-	If writing to multiple task areas, is it possible to win and lose specific task areas, or will it be a win-all/lose-all situation? For example, if bidding on Tasks 1-3, is it possible to win Tasks 1 & 2 and lose Task 3?	Evaluation results may vary within proposed sub-element task area response
183	J-2	All	All	The requirements of this opportunity and the specific service areas are expansive. Please confirm that in the response to task order requests the government will allow for multiple rates, representing multiple discounts for a single labor category in each area. For example, could two separate rates be provided for Category 3, Level 1 to represent significant differences between staff members required by specific task orders?	Only one set of rates is to be provided at the IDIQ level, to be established as ceiling rates. Offeror's should base the rates on the most highly qualified employee or class of employees within a category working in the highest cost locations, considering the higher cost of performance at a Government or Contractor Site.
184	J-2	All	All	Does the government expect to add additional labor categories for service areas requiring diverse skill sets for individual task order requests? For example, will general categories for Professional Staff, Trades Staff, Support Staff, and Management Staff be allowed, as these four labor categories could capture the many different labor categories required to successfully perform in the functional areas?	Reference Section B.4 Task Order Pricing: "Some task orders may require services that do not correspond to the labor categories included in ProTech Enterprise Operations. Accordingly, if permitted by the task order solicitation, the contractor may propose appropriate labor categories and labor rates necessary to meet the requirements of the solicitation despite their not being included in ProTech Enterprise Operations as awarded."

Attachment J-4
ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
(Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

185	J-2, p2	Category 7	N/A	The description of work in the SOW is very broad, ranging from warehouse management (C.3.7.15) to Facility Vulnerability Analysis (C.3.7.9). As a result the price range for the resources required to perform this work will vary greatly. How does the government intend to take this into consideration during the price evaluation	Only one set of rates is to be provided at the IDIQ level, to be established as ceiling rates. Offeror's should base the rates on the most highly qualified employee or class of employees within a category working in the highest cost locations, considering the higher cost of performance at a Government or Contractor Site.
186	J-2, Page 3	Category 12	All	Attachment J-2 contains labor categories for "Incidental IT -Web Designing" but no other types of incidental IT services. Page 17, C.3.3.7 - C.3.3.9 of the RFP contains items such as information security assessments, assessing potential security risks, and audit, implement, and manage systems. Such tasks will likely require expertise outside of what is intended in the existing Incidental IT labor categories. Recommend including a separate set of "Incidental IT" labor categories around information security.	Correct. Category 12, which should have been listed as Section C.3.12 will be included in the final Enterprise Domain RFP
187	J-6	NA	NA	Cells C9:G9 are missing formulas	A corrected template will be submitted as part of the Final RFP
188	J-6	0	0	Some of formulas on the Cost and Price Template are not complete. Should we complete these or will the template be reissued?	A corrected template will be submitted as part of the Final RFP
189	J-6	0	0	The template is setup to show how labor rates for our employees are burdened, but does not provide a mechanism to factor the costs of subcontracted labor into the derivation of the rate. Will labor rates for positions subcontracted out be subject to the ceiling rate developed on this sheet? If so, may we provide an additional tab in the workbook showing how the burdened rate for our employees and the projected costs for positions subcontracted to others were combined to develop a composite ceiling rate for bidding purposes?	Yes. Rationale shall be provided in support documentation as outlined within the draft RFP.
190	N/A	N/A	N/A	Given the organizational structure of NOAA and its various line offices, can NOAA provide clarification as to which offices will be seeking services under this IDIQ? If various offices, can NOAA provide further clarification as to the structure for managing the RFTOPs and TOs under the IDIQ?	No, the ProTech IDIQ contracts will be available to all NOAA line and staff offices as well as DOC.
191	n/a	n/a	n/a	Is there any penalty for teams primed by small businesses to have large business subcontractors?	Small business prime contractors must comply with FAR 52.219-14 when applicable. See also 81 FR 34243.

Attachment J-4
ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
(Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

192	n/a	n/a	n/a	How important is past performance specifically at NOAA vs. past performance with other Agencies?	Per Section L.11.4, the Government will consider recent and relevant past performance submissions and "will evaluate the extent to which the past performance examples proffered are relevant to the requirements of this solicitation. Note: Relevancy includes such things as service similarity, complexity, contract type, contract dollar value/size, program phase, division of company, major or critical subcontractors, teaming partners and joint venture."
193				Are there any updates to the release date for the final RFP?	No major updates to provide at this time, but interested parties are encouraged to register for FBO's Watch Opportunity feature for status updates.
194				Our understanding is that this IDIQ will absorb certain existing NOAA contracts. Are there specific challenges/obstacles that NOAA has encountered in the administration or performance of those contracts that have created the impetus for this solicitation?	No
195				Industry Day indicated that this opportunity would be full and open with SB set aside reserves in the amount of 75%. Is that still the government's intent? What is the government's goal/strategy in having such a high reserve? Given the high reserve, what is the likelihood that the opportunity, when final, will be 100% SB set aside?	The number of awards per Domain will be determined by the competitive process. It is anticipated that a sufficient number of awards will be made to facilitate competition at the Task Order level. There is no predetermined number of awards by domain.
196				The Program Description released through GovWin identified 12 task areas/service categories within the Domain. It appears that the task area, "Scientific and Technical Support" has been eliminated in the Draft RFP, which has 11 task areas. HOWEVER, attachment J2 (Labor Categories) identifies 12 Labor Categories, the twelfth of which is for "Incidental IT – Web Designing." Is there a corresponding description of services for this Labor Category that will appear in Section C Statement of Work? If so, what is included in those services?	Category 12, which should have been listed as Section C.3.12 will be included in the final Enterprise Domain RFP
197				Information obtained during Industry Day and the associated Q&A indicated that offeror's could submit proposals as part of a team as a prime, AND as part of a team (or TEAMS) as a subcontractor. Is this correct?	Yes

Attachment J-4
ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
(Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

198				Are there particular Task Areas that you see as better-suited for small businesses versus large, or better suited for large businesses versus small?	No
199				What level of contractor corporate oversight is NOAA seeking? There is reference in Sec. L.11.3 (Vol. III – Management Approach (Factor II)) to Project Oversight and the offeror’s approach to QC/QA, etc. Would an offeror significantly benefit, in the evaluation of its proposal, from having a teammate with a PMO?	The Government will not dictate an approach for an offeror.
200				As a small business, we may not go after all eleven task areas; is the page count still the same as stated in the proposal structure?	Yes
201				It has been stated that for Small Business’ only go after your strongest category. If we don’t go after all 11 task area’s, how is NOAA going to award task area to small business?	Refer to response to question #114
202				Companies can have up to eleven Past Performances. If a company goes after less than the eleven task areas, how does that change the number of Past Performance?	Past Performance information may be submitted regarding predecessor companies, key personnel who have relevant experience, or subcontractors that will perform major or critical aspects of the requirement when such information is relevant to the solicitation. However, data concerning the prime Offeror shall be provided first, followed by each proposed subcontractor, in alphabetical order. Joint Ventures shall submit past performance information for the JV. In accordance with FAR 15.305(2)(iv), offeror's with no recent or relevant past performance will result in assignment of a neutral rating, indicating either a favorable nor unfavorable evaluation rating.
203	Not Referenced	Not Referenced	Not Referenced	As a small business, we may not go after all eleven task areas; is the page count still the same as stated in the proposal structure?	Refer to response to question #114
204	Not Referenced	Not Referenced	Not Referenced	It has been stated that for Small Business’ only go after your strongest category. If we don’t go after all 11 task arears, how is NOAA going to award task area to small business?	Refer to response to question #114
205	Not Referenced	Not Referenced	Not Referenced	Companies can have up to eleven Past Performances. If a company goes after less than the eleven task area, how does that change the number of Past Performance?	Limitation is established. The Government will not dictate an approach for an offeror.

Attachment J-4
ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
(Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

206				Are there any updates to the release date for the final RFP?	Industry is reminded to watch the FBO opportunity listing for updates
207				Our understanding is that this IDIQ will absorb certain existing NOAA contracts. Are there specific challenges/obstacles that NOAA has encountered in the administration or performance of those contracts that have created the impetus for this solicitation?	Refer to the NOAA ProTech Enterprise Operations Industry Day Event material posted on FBO under same solicitation number.
208				Industry Day indicated that this opportunity would be full and open with SB set aside reserves in the amount of 75%. Is that still the government's intent? What is the government's goal/strategy in having such a high reserve? Given the high reserve, what is the likelihood that the opportunity, when final, will be 100% SB set aside?	Yes. Rule of Two at Task Order Request level Evaluated on a Task Order Request basis as requirements are definitized.
209				The Program Description released through GovWin identified 12 task areas/service categories within the Domain. It appears that the task area, "Scientific and Technical Support" has been eliminated in the Draft RFP, which has 11 task areas. HOWEVER, attachment J2 (Labor Categories) identifies 12 Labor Categories, the twelfth of which is for "Incidental IT – Web Designing." Is there a corresponding description of services for this Labor Category that will appear in Section C Statement of Work? If so, what is included in those services?	Incidental or ancillary IT is contemplated for the domain. Major IT acquisitions will most likely fall under NOAALink as screened prior to soliciting task order proposals.
210				Information obtained during Industry Day and the associated Q&A indicated that offeror's could submit proposals as part of a team as a prime, AND as part of a team (or TEAMS) as a subcontractor. Is this correct?	And/or. The Government will not dictate an approach for an offeror.
211				Are there particular Task Areas that you see as better-suited for small businesses versus large, or better suited for large businesses versus small?	The Government will not dictate an approach for an offeror. Performance of requirements can be accomplished using multiple approaches.
212		L	L.11.3	What level of contractor corporate oversight is NOAA seeking? There is reference in Sec. L.11.3 (Vol. III – Management Approach (Factor II)) to Project Oversight and the offeror's approach to QC/QA, etc. Would an offeror significantly benefit, in the evaluation of its proposal, from having a teammate with a PMO?	Refer to response to (similar) question #199

Attachment J-4
 ProTech DRAFT Request for Proposal ST-1330-17-RP-0007
 Responses to Industry Questions Received by the 07/14/2017 Cut-Off
 (Release #3 (Final) - 11/13/2017)

213	77	L	L.11.2	Please confirm it is NOAA's intent to provide for niche providers by the statements, "no single Offeror or Team is required to address every area of the SOW" (RFP Section L.11.2, page 77); and, "An Offeror need not provide capability for the entire array of efforts set forth in the SOW" (RFP Section M4, page 84).	This unrestricted requirement specifies that no single Offeror or Team to address every area of the SOW.
214	80	L	L.11.5.2	If it is NOAA's intent to competitively award contracts to highly qualified niche providers, please provide guidance for how niche providers can avoid being ineligible, and comply with Section L.11.5.2, page 80, "Failure to offer ceiling hourly rates for all labor categories and all contract periods may result in the Offeror being ineligible for award,"	Similarly to response to Question #213 -- issued for unrestricted competition. Compliance with the terms of the Final RFP is expected.