

AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT			1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES	
			S	1	12
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 0002	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 08-Jul-2005	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. HQ0013DNAR60001		5. PROJECT NO.(If applicable)	
6. ISSUED BY CODE DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY (DC) 201 12TH STREET SOUTH SUITE 203 ARLINGTON VA 22202-5408		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than item 6) CODE		See Item 6	
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., Street, County, State and Zip Code)			X	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. HQ0013-05-R-0019	
			X	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 23-Jun-2005	
				10A. MOD. OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.	
				10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)	
CODE	FACILITY CODE				
11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS					
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offer <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> is extended, <input type="checkbox"/> is not extended.					
Offer must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning <u>2</u> copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.					
12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)					
13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.					
A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.					
B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(B).					
C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:					
D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)					
E. IMPORTANT: Contractor <input type="checkbox"/> is not, <input type="checkbox"/> is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.					
14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)					
This solicitation is hereby extended until July 20, 2005 at 10:00 A.M. EST. No further questions will be entertained upon posting of this amendment.					
Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.					
15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)			16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print)		
			TEL: _____ EMAIL: _____		
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA		16C. DATE SIGNED	
_____ (Signature of person authorized to sign)		BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)		08-Jul-2005	

SECTION SF 30 BLOCK 14 CONTINUATION PAGE

SUMMARY OF CHANGES

SECTION SF 1449 - CONTINUATION SHEET

The following were previously included by reference and are now included by full text:

52.212-2 EVALUATION--COMMERCIAL ITEMS (JAN 1999)

(a) The Government will award a contract resulting from this solicitation to the responsible offeror whose offer conforming to the solicitation will be most advantageous to the Government, price and other factors considered. The following factors shall be used to evaluate offers:

1. Technical Approach
2. Past Performance
3. Price
4. Subcontracting/Small Business

a. Factor 1, Technical Approach: The Government will evaluate the Offeror's technical capability to determine the degree to which the information provided by the offeror in its proposal demonstrates the offeror's ability to manage, supervise, and perform in accordance with the contract requirements and the sub factors listed below

(1) Sub-Factor A, Understanding of the Work: Demonstrated knowledge and understanding of the required services.

(2) Sub-Factor B: Management of Operations: The contractor must describe how the Contractor intends to meet the performance objectives identified in the PWS, and should also identify those areas the Contractor sees as critical to the customers for this contract, how it will monitor quality performance in those areas, and how it will maintain or exceed customer expectations, including identification and correction of problems.

(3) Sub-Factor C: Quality Control (QCP): The QCP must demonstrate the contractor's ability to provide oversight, measurements, and reporting processes to ensure compliance with all contract requirements. The Quality Control Plan must include all elements in the PWS and Performance Requirements Summary; to include a comprehensive and effective Safety and Security programs that complies with all contract safety and security requirements

All subfactors for technical capability will be of equal importance.

b. Factor 2, Past Performance: Describe a minimum of **three (3) projects** your firm has or is working on that address the kinds and types of requirements specifically called out in the SOW. Direct experience with the specific systems of the client identified in the SOW should be called out as well as experience with similar systems of other agencies.

- (a) Quality of Service: Will be evaluated for the offeror's record of conforming to specifications and providing quality services
- (b) Timeliness of Performance: Will be evaluated for the offeror's ability to meet contractual performance schedules.
- (c) Business Practices/Customer Satisfaction: Will be evaluated for the Conduciveness of offeror's business practices to ensure a cooperative and frictionless relationship with its customers.

All factors for Past Performance will be of equal importance.

c. Factor 3, Price: The price for each CLIN will be evaluated separately. Price will be evaluated for price reasonableness in accordance with FAR 15.305(a)(1) based on the total proposed price for the base period of performance and all option periods together. The determination that the total price is reasonable will be made by a comparison of other offers received. If only one offer is received, the determination may be based on a comparison to the Independent Government Cost Estimate (IGCE) or by any other reasonable basis.

d. Factor 4, Small Business Subcontracting Plan: The Government will evaluate subcontracting plans to ensure its compliance with the requirements of FAR 19.704. Past Performance of contractor's goals and plans may also be evaluated for compliance. All SUBCONTRACTING PLANS WILL BE RATED ON A PASS/FAIL BASIS.

Relative Order of Importance: Technical Approach is most important. Past Performance is significantly less important than technical approach. Subcontracting/ Small Business will be on a pass/fail basis. When combined, all non-priced factors are significantly more important than price.

Related Definitions.

(1) Deficiency. A material failure of a proposal to meet a Government or a combination of significant weaknesses in a proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance to an unacceptable level. Examples of deficiencies include a statement by the offeror that it cannot or will not meet a requirement, an approach that clearly does not meet a requirement, or omission of data required to assess compliance with the requirement.

(2) Weakness. A flaw in the proposal that increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. A "significant weakness" in the proposal is a flaw that appreciably increases the risk of unsuccessful contract performance.

(3) Advantage/Enhancement. An advantage/enhancement describes some element of a response that notably enhances an aspect of the offeror's ability to perform the effort or that represents a significant benefit to the Government.

(4) Clarifications. Limited exchanges, between the Government and offerors that may occur when award without discussions is contemplated. These limited exchanges may be used to clarify certain aspects of proposals (e.g., the relevance of an offeror's past performance information and adverse past performance information to which the offeror has not previously had an opportunity to respond) or to resolve minor or clerical errors.

(5) Risk. The degree of probability that an offeror will not perform contract requirements as promised. The level of uncertainties that exist in the proposal will jeopardize successful execution of an approach or plan.

Proposal Ratings.

1. To ensure a thorough and fair evaluation, it is imperative that the ratings be consistently applied across proposals. The following adjectival ratings will be used to rate each proposal, less the price factor.

(1) Excellent: To receive this rating, proposed offer demonstrates a thorough understanding of the requirements. The Offeror has a very high probability of success in completing the requirements. All factors/sub factors must have received a rating of Excellent/Low Risk.

(2) Good: To receive this rating, proposed offer demonstrates a good understanding of the requirements. The Offer has a high probability of success in completing the requirements. All factors/sub factors must have received a rating of at least Good/Medium Risk.

(3) Satisfactory: To receive this rating, proposed offer demonstrates an acceptable understanding of the requirements. The Offeror has a moderate probability of success in completing the requirements. All factor/sub factors must have received a rating of at least Satisfactory/Medium Risk.

(4) Unsatisfactory: To receive this rating, the proposed offer has received an Unsatisfactory/High Risk rating in one of the non-price factors/sub factors.

(5) High Performance Risk: Likely to cause significant disruption to schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Risk may be unacceptable even with special contractor emphasis and close government monitoring.

(6) Moderate Performance Risk: Can potentially cause some disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Special contractor emphasis and close Government monitoring will probably be able to overcome difficulties.

(7) Low Performance Risk: Has little potential to cause disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Normal contractor effort and normal Government monitoring will probably be able to overcome difficulties.

(8) Neutral: Insufficient relevant past performance information available.

2. Options. Except when determined not to be in the Government's best interest (FAR Part 52.212.2(b)), the Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. The Government may determine that an offer is unacceptable if the option prices are significantly unbalanced. Evaluation of options shall not obligate the Government to exercise the option(s).

3. Award on Initial proposals. The Contracting Officer retains the right to evaluate offers and make award without discussions with offerors. Therefore offerors are encouraged to insure that initial proposals contain the offeror's most favorable terms and reflect its best possible performance potential.

4. The offer will be considered acceptable if, and only if, the offeror submits the information as required in the Instructions to Offerors, FAR 52.212-1, and Addendum to FAR 52.212-1, and manifests the offeror's unconditional assent to the terms and conditions of the solicitation, including the Performance Work Statement.

5. Discussion/Negotiations: The Contracting Officer may clarify all information submitted in response to the solicitation as necessary to evaluate the proposals, and notwithstanding these clarifications, the Contracting Officer still retains the right to award without discussions.

(End of clause)

(End of Summary of Changes)

The following items are applicable to this modification:

RESPONSES TO INDUSTRY

The following items are applicable to this amendment:

RESPONSES TO INDUSTRY QUESTION

1. The following are questions received from industry and below are the Government responses. The closing date for this solicitation is July 15, 2005 at 10:00 A.M. No electronic proposals will be accepted. All offerors should mail proposals to the address in the solicitation or drop off all proposals at DSCA, 201 12th Street, Ste 203, Arlington, VA 22202-5408. No further telephone inquiries or written inquiries will be accepted once this amendment is posted. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.

QUESTION 1:

What is the estimated effort in terms of labor hours per year or full time equivalent under the following expertise categories? Analytic? Technical? Total?

RESPONSE:

The Government cannot tell offerors how many labor hours it will take to accomplish the work.

QUESTION 2:

Does DSCA anticipate having any contractor staff onsite on an ongoing basis? If so, how many persons?

RESPONSE:

See SOW Section 4.1.4, Place of Performance.

QUESTION 3:

Is the contractor expected to house the PBCIS infrastructure off site?

RESPONSE:

Yes, the contractor is expected to host a development and production server environment.

QUESTION 4:

If so, are dedicated communication links required between the PBCIS infrastructure and other locations?

RESPONSE:

No dedicated linkage is required.

QUESTION 5:

How many average and peak concurrent users does the PBCIS system need to support?

RESPONSE:

Each application has a different user base. The maximum number of concurrent users is estimated at 200.

QUESTION 6:

Does the DSCA expect to move its headquarters outside the general Pentagon/Crystal City area within the duration of this effort? If so, are there any indications as to where DSCA might move?

RESPONSE:

No.

QUESTION 7:

What is the current status of the PBCIS production infrastructure?

RESPONSE:

Fully Operational.

QUESTION 8:

Has all hardware, software, and network equipment been acquired, installed, and configured? Where is this equipment located now, and does DSCA intend to keep it there?

RESPONSE:

Yes. All hardware, software, and network equipment has been acquired, installed, and configured. The development environment is located at the contractor's facility. The production environment is hosted at the contractor's managed services facility. We expect the contractor to provide similar accommodation. Physical location isn't as important as access and availability.

QUESTION 9:

Has DSCA completed the ABC/M definition process, including identifying the data elements/categories and processes to be monitored?

RESPONSE:

ABC models has been fully implemented since 2003, and are updated quarterly. Model, dictionary, and cost driver changes are accomplished as required.

QUESTION 10:

Is there a report describing ABC/M definitions as they currently exist, and if so can a copy of it be provided to aid in proposal preparation?

RESPONSE:

The question is too broad for a response.

QUESTION 11:

What security policies will apply to PBCIS infrastructure?

RESPONSE:

All DoD IT policies apply, as appropriate and required.

QUESTION 12:

How much travel outside the Washington, DC area should be budgeted for?

RESPONSE:

The Government cannot instruct offerors on how much to budget for line items.

QUESTION 13:

Is there an incumbent for this solicitation? If yes, how many FTEs are required to provide the support?

RESPONSE:

Yes. The number of existing FTEs is not relevant to requirement itself and should be determined by the contractor and provided in your technical approach.

QUESTION 14:

How will the new PBCIS effort fit in with the existing HQ LAN operations and the existing HQ network infrastructure?

RESPONSE:

The PBCIS infrastructure and applications are not hosted within DSCA's LAN Operations, and there are no plans to integrate it into the HQ LAN.

QUESTION 15:

Is a security clearance required for all personnel? If so, is it acceptable to submit resumes with secret clearances in progress, for non-key personnel?

RESPONSE:

Yes.

QUESTION 16:

Is DSCA willing to act as a sponsor for the clearance process? What are the security requirements at the host facility?

RESPONSE:

No. The hosting environment must comply with applicable DoD policy for unclassified networks.

QUESTION 17:

Should any of the software licensing costs be reflected in the proposal?

RESPONSE:

Yes.

QUESTION 18:

Task #1: "The contractor will provide a consolidated hosting architecture". Does this task provide the design for an architecture or does it provide the implemented architecture (hardware and software)? If the task provides hardware and software, what differentiates Task #1 from Task #2?

RESPONSE:

The design for the architecture as it exists today is in the PWS.

QUESTION 19:

Task #2 calls for the contractor to provide hosting services. Does this mean that the contractor will provide the hardware/software environment and that the government will pay for its use through the Hosting Service

Agreement? Page 12 state the “hardware, software, applications, and websites will be hosted and maintained at an agreed upon contractor facility. When will this be determined? Are there any restrictions on location?

On Page 4, there is a reference to the “government servers, applications, and or network.” This seems to imply that the computing environment is owned by the government and not the contractor as implied in Task #2. Which is correct?

RESPONSE:

Yes, the contractor will provide hardware and software for the hosting environment and the government will pay a fee through a hosting agreement. The hosting site and agreement will be determined after contract award. The site must be assessable/limited by/to .mil and .gov, and must be located within CONUS.

The government owns hardware and software to run its applications, not the hosting environment.

QUESTION 20:

Task #1: What is the configuration of the current hosting environment? What hardware and software is in use? How much processing and storage capacity is provided and what is the availability of the current system (as defined in the performance standard for Task #2). Is any significant increase in capacity requirements anticipated in the future?

RESPONSE:

The offerors needs to provide their approach to a hosting environment. The existing configuration is not germane to the requirement. Processing and storage requirements need to be determined and provided as part of the contractors approach through their proposal. No significant increases in capacity are anticipated.

QUESTION 21:

Tasks #1, #2: How many system users will there be? Where will the users be located? During what hours will the system most often be in use? What is the peak number of concurrent users? Are there any metrics on usage of current applications or database?

RESPONSE:

The largest software user base is 3,000, which supports WorkBrain. All other applications are significantly smaller. Systems are in use typically from 0800-1700. Peak usage is during the same hours. No metrics are available.

QUESTION 22:

Task #3, Task #4: What is the size of the database? How many tables comprise the current database?

RESPONSE:

There are multiple databases, some for multiple applications.

QUESTION 23:

Task #3: This task provides support for support for some applications that do not appear to be COTS packages. In what languages are the PASS, ATOMS, and WorkBrain systems implemented? Do these applications reside within the same hardware environment as the COTS products? What are these systems used for?

RESPONSE:

PASS and ATOMS are SQL based applications. WorkBrain is a COTS application. These applications are used to collect labor hour accounting information and reside in the development and production environment.

QUESTION 24:

Task #3: “The contractor shall utilize Oros Software Suite, version 5.5 Task #5: “SAS Activity Based Management Suite (previously Oros ABC/M, version 5.5) Which package is required, Oros or SAS?

RESPONSE:

Oros, version 5.5

QUESTION 25:

For Tasks #1, #3, #4, #5, are there performance standards as defined in Task #2 and Task #6?

RESPONSE:

Standards are provided on each task.

QUESTION 26:

Task #5: Does this contract require the purchase of the required COTS packages, or simply the renewal of licenses for the software currently in use by this system?

RESPONSE:

Renewal and maintenance for existing applications.

QUESTION 27:

Is there a warranty with respect to the outgoing system?

RESPONSE:

No.

QUESTION 28:

Task 4: The task calls for support 8:00am – 5:00pm EST. Is it true that there are no users requiring critical support outside of this period? Will there be critical periods during the year when the critical support window is expanded?

RESPONSE:

There may be rare occasions when critical support is required outside 0800-1700, which cannot be defined.

QUESTION 29:

Does the offeror have the freedom to offer pricing from any contract vehicle to which it is a party in support of the pricing proposed for this solicitation?

RESPONSE:

Yes.

QUESTION 30:

On page 1 of the RFP under block 10, DSCA has noted that this RFP is Unrestricted, yet in viewing the Reqs and Certs sections, the following sections on page 57 of the RFP seem to contradict that assertion. These would seem to apply when a proposed contract is other than unrestricted. If this is an incorrect interpretation please advise us?

RESPONSE:

Paragraphs such as #2 thru #5 are for small businesses.

QUESTION 31:

In Section Under section 2.8 "Key Personnel", the contractor is required to submit resumes of all proposed personnel and note those personnel who are considered "Key Personnel". We have the following questions about this aspect:

- a. In which volume should the resumes be submitted?
- b. If they are required in Volume I, will those pages be applied against the 50-page limit mandated by the DSCA for Volume I?
- c. Is it correct that, even though DSCA has requested resumes on all of an offeror's proposed personnel, the offeror is to designate "key" personnel as defined by the FAR?

RESPONSE:

- (a) The Government cannot instruct offerors which volume to submit resumes.
- (b) Yes
- (c) Yes

QUESTION 32:

Please clarify what is meant by the following under section 1.3.2 PRODUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT HOSTING ENVIRONMENT SERVICE LEVEL (TASK #2)

Government Grace Period - During each fiscal year (1 October through 30 September) of service, the Government is permitted one (1) incident in which an unscheduled change is made to the infrastructure that negatively affects the contractors ability to monitor or manage the governments servers, applications, and/or network. The contractor shall re-establish the monitoring or management service for the government's infrastructure.

RESPONSE:

The Government cannot clarify this statement any further than what is stated in the SOW.

QUESTION 33:

Regarding the Addendum to FAR 52.212-1 Instructions to Offerors (page 39) we have the following questions:

- a. Is it the intent of DSCA that there be separate CD's for each volume or merely separation of the cost/price data?
- b. If not, does DSCA have any preferences as to how the files for each volume are labeled on the common CD?
- c. If there are to be separate CD's would it be correct that they would put in the binder for each original copy of that volume?

RESPONSE:

Please re-read the Addendum to FAR 52.212-1, Instruction to Offerors for your response.

QUESTION 34:

Is it the DSCA's intent that the award will be made to lowest priced of the technically acceptable offers as is typical of the procurement of commercial items? If so, is there a need to consider a technical approach, schedule, and associated costs for transition if there is an incumbent? If so, can DSCA provide any guidance as to the relative weight of the technical and past performance evaluation versus price?

Further, what evaluation weight will be given to the expertise of the proposed staff?

RESPONSE:

See 52.212-1, Instructions to Offerors paragraph (g) Contract Award.

QUESTION 35:

Does the DSCA envision the possibility of awarding multiple contracts, each encompassing separate groups of the 8 tasks in the solicitation?

RESPONSE:

See 52.212-1, Instructions to Offerors paragraph (h) Multiple Awards.

QUESTION 36:

In tasks 7 and 8 one of the important requirements is transfer of knowledge to government personnel. Is DSCA able to be more definitive about these requirements in light of the fact that there are performance objective and performance standards tied to achievement of this goal?

RESPONSE:

No, see SOW.

QUESTION 37:

Since such factors as prior knowledge of government personnel, availability of government personnel to attend focused training, defined performance measurement incentives for government students, numbers of potential students, location of potential training, etc. all have cost implications is it possible that DSCA could be more specific as to the minimums it would like to see?

RESPONSE:

No.

QUESTION 38:

Please explain how DSCA will collect the necessary data to measure the contractor's achievement of the performance standards associated with each task?

RESPONSE:

See SOW.

QUESTION 39:

Please explain what the ramifications are of a contractor not meeting a performance standard for measurement period during the contract?

RESPONSE:

See FAR Part 37.102.

2. All other terms and conditions remain unchanged.