

CIO-SP4 Draft RFP Questions

Questions submitted by Coalition members mostly fall into five categories:

1. **Contract Structure:** Can NITAAC elaborate on the decision to utilize one contract vehicle, rather than separate small and other than small vehicles?
2. **Self-Scoring:** Can NITAAC provide a draft scorecard and elaborate on how the scores will be verified and evaluated?
3. **Teaming:** How will teaming work on CIO SP4? Are there limitations on teaming?
4. **Labor Categories:** Will CIO SP4 have flexibilities to adjust to new technology over the life of the contract, particularly non-labor IT services like managed services and cloud?
5. **Next Steps:** Can NITAAC release a second draft RFP for industry?

Question	Page	Section	Question
1		General	Can NITAAC elaborate on the decision to utilize one contract vehicle, rather than separate small and other than small vehicles?
2		General	Can NITAAC release a second draft RFP for industry? Additionally, gathering the back-up documentation for a self-scoring sheet is a labor intensive and time-consuming effort for offerors. Would the government consider issuing a draft self-scoring sheet soon in order to get specific industry feedback in time before issuing the final? This will give vendors the understanding and the time they need to make rational bid/no-bid decisions, teaming plans, and to gather back-up documentation.
3		General	Would the government consider removing written content in consideration of an "All Self Scoring" proposal response? Including both a traditional written evaluation and a self-scoring evaluation significantly increases the burden for industry and raises concerns about protests.
4		General	What non-price factors will be included in the scorecard?
5		General	Will the scoring model be based on narrative write-ups or contractual documents (ex. award documents with scoring elements highlighted)?
6		General	Will NITAAC consider one-on-one live feedback sessions with vendors about the draft RFP? Private discussions might benefit the RFP. Given the number of interested vendors, NITAAC could limit participation based on a lottery or some other mechanism to limit the discussions to a manageable number. Alternatively, could NITAAC consider hosting a formal industry day with interested vendors to discuss these issues?
7		General	Will NITAAC consider making explicit allowance for non-labor category IT services (<i>Managed Services, units of cloud purchases</i>) in order to keep CIO-SP4 relevant over the life of the contract?

8		General	Is teaming allowed on CIO SP4? If it is allowed, can references, experience or past performance be submitted from a team member? Can teams be formed to bid on CIO SP4? Can joint ventures be formed to bid on CIO SP4?
9		General	Will NITAAC address their position regarding mergers and acquisitions of an existing CIO-SP4 contract holder by a subsequent CIO-SP4 contract holder?
10		General	Will all CIO-SP4 primes be allowed to bid on unrestricted solicitations and will all the socio-economic categories be allowed to bid on total small business solicitations, similar to how the CMS SPARC IDIQ works? If this is not the case, what are the proposed tracks/categories/lanes that awardees will have to stay in?
11		General	How many Past Performance will be allowed for each sub-contractor being proposed as members of a team?
12		General	Will NITAAC allow for third party reviews of Business Systems to satisfy the related point-scoring requirements found in the solicitation?
13	4	B.4.1 Rate Refresher/H.1 Labor Categories	The provisions associated with the renewal of the rates (B.4.1 Rate Refresher) and the labor categories themselves (H.1 Labor Categories) of the CIO-SP4 rate schedule are similar to the language in CIO-SP3. This could lead to a static labor category structure and rate schedule over the 10-year life despite dramatic changes to the IT services marketplace. To facilitate customer agency access to these changing market capabilities, could CIO- SP4 include a mechanism for updating the labor categories and rates on contract at regular intervals?
14	30	F.2, F.2.1	For the development of the price schedule labor rates, will the Government provide the estimated start date for Year 1?
15	31	G.3.2 Contractor Personnel - Key Personnel	Since the Contracts Manager is listed as key personnel, what are the official duties of the Contracts Manager?
16	37	G.5.4 Service Contract Act	As the “preponderance of the GWAC’s labor categories are considered bona fide executive, administrative....and generally exempt from the Service Contract Act (SCA)”, in the event SCA labor categories are to be used at the task order, will NITAAC clarify NTE percentage of SCA labor to be used at the IDIQ level?
17	38	Article G.6 NIH Contract Access Fee and Fee Remittance	Will NITAAC please clarify if the NIH Contract Access Fee (NCAF) will be the same fixed percentage for both CIO-SP4 unrestricted and small business contract holders?
18	120	L.1.2	L.1.2.d.1 (below) implies offerors are to mark the cover sheet (meaning cover letter). Please clarify if this is intended.

			In addition, the Offeror must mark each page of data it wishes to restrict with the following statement: "Use or disclosure of data contained on this page is subject to the restriction on the cover sheet of this proposal or quotation."
19	128	L.2.12.a) Organization and Page Limitations and L.3.1 Section 1 (General)	The two (2) referenced sections have differences in the order of material submission. Can NITAAC clarify the desired order of material submission?
20	129	L.2.12 a)1)(a)	The draft RFP says, "Self-Scoring Sheet - (pricing is provided expansion is not allowed)." How does pricing relate to the score sheet?
21	131	L.3.1 (General) b)	NITAAC states that beyond the scoring sheets " [n]o other documentation will be required." Where should offerors include the documentation that verifies the claims made on the score-sheet?
22	131	L.3.1 (General) b)	What type of documentation verifying the claims made on the score-sheet will be considered acceptable for verification purposes?
23	131	L.3.1 (General) f) Contracting Team Arrangements	Will NITAAC consider addressing in the RFP the CIO-SP4 status of a CTA where the 'leading firm' is acquired by "other than small" business?
24	131	L.3.1 (General) f) Contracting Team Arrangements	Will NITAAC address the CIO-SP4 status of a firm SB CTA member that graduates SB status during the life of the GWAC?
25	131	L.3.1 (General) f) Contracting Team Arrangements	Will NITAAC address the CIO-SP4 status of a firm CTA member that is acquired by an "other than small" business during the life of the GWAC?
26	132	L.3.1 (General) f) Contracting Team Arrangements	Will NITAAC address the CIO-SP4 status of a firm CTA member that goes out of business during the life of the GWAC?
27	133	L.3.1 (General) f) Contracting Team Arrangements	Is prior performance as a CTA a requirement for bidding CIO-SP4 as a CTA?
28	134	L.3.1.f, a) Individual Small Business Subcontracting Plan	In reference to the "Individual Small Business Subcontracting Plan (Required for Other than Small Business Offerors)," can the Government provide the minimum small business goals (as a percentage of total subcontracted dollars) that offerors must commit to?
29	134	L.3.1.f, a) Individual Small Business Subcontracting Plan	Why is the Individual Small Business Subcontracting Plan addressed in the draft RFP under the CTA section? Does this requirement only apply to offerors proposing as a CTA?

30	134	L.3.1.f, a) Individual Small Business Subcontracting Plan	Under what criteria will the Government evaluate the Individual Small Business Subcontracting Plan?
31	138	L.3.3 Section 3 - Factor 2 Relevant Corporate Experience	NITAAC is allowing for private sector experience. What standard documents will be used to verify experience claimed? This could present problems with evaluations
32	138	L.3.4 Section 4 - Factor 3 2)1)b	Item b states to "Identify Contract Administrators to effectively and efficiently administer the GWAC with a focus on quality;" Should this be "Contracts Manager"? What are the required items that should be submitted to meet this item?
33	138	L.3.4.1, Subfactor 1 - Domain-Specific Capability in a Health-Related Mission	Please clarify whether Factor 3, Subfactor 1 (Domain-Specific Capability in a Health-Related Mission), is a Go/No-Go Requirement (Phase 1 evaluation) or part of Phase 2 of the evaluation.
34	140	L.3.5 Section 5 - Factor 4 (Past Performance)	There is no timeframe referenced in L.3.5 as to past performances being active to be allowed for use as a reference. Section M, pg. 152, c. states that "only past performance data regarding IT efforts completed within the last three years, or work that is on-going, will be evaluated." Is the specified timeframe these references must be active within the last 5 years?
35	140	L.3.5 Section 5 - Factor 4 (Past Performance)	Please verify that only a total of three past performances are to be used cumulatively to cover all 10 task areas?
36	140	L.3.5 Section 5 - Factor 4 (Past Performance)	As many of our customers comply with the mandated Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) regulations and have submitted their contract performance evaluations to the system, they do not feel they should be required to fill out an additional survey or questionnaire. In appreciation of their compliance and very busy schedules, and in that the evaluation question areas are basically the same ones as in CPARS, may we submit a copy of their most recent CPARS/PPIRS evaluation in place of the J.4 Customer Survey Questionnaire?
37	140	L.3.5 Section 5 - Factor 4 (Past Performance)	Will the J.4 Questionnaire form be automatically populated with the information from the on-line submitted J.3 form to save the client's time looking up and entering the same information?
38	140	L.3.5 Section 5 - Factor 4 (Past Performance)	How will the offeror be able to view whether the J.4 Questionnaires have been completed/submitted by the clients?
39	143	M.1.1 Source Selection Process	We see reference to multiple Evaluation Methodologies in the Draft Solicitation including Best Value and Highest Rated Technical with Fair and Reasonable Pricing. Based on the information provided we assume the Go/ No Go will be treated as a Pass/Fail requirement in Phase One that will eliminate bidders and a Scoring Model in Phase 2 that will allow NITAAC to rank the bidders and determine a threshold score for award. Please confirm if this is accurate and if there

			are any additional variations of the Phased and Scoring approach that could be included in the Solicitation.
40	144	M.1.1, (g) and L.2.4 Rejection of Multiple or Alternate Offers	Regarding the statement: "g. Multiple or alternate offers from the same Prime Contractor constitutes a material nonconformity and may result in all of its offers being rejected." Please confirm that a company may submit an offer as a prime contractor for an Other Than Small Business award, while also competing as a member of a Joint Venture that will serve as the prime contractor for a Small Business award.
41	145	M.2.a Phase 1: Go/No- Go Requirements	Are there Go/No-Go Requirements beyond Self-Scoring Sheet and Required Documents (only adequate cost accounting system is listed)?
42	146	M.2 Phase 1: Go/No- Go Requirements 1)	Since the government has labeled the self-scoring sheet as a go/no-go requirement, will the government explain how many "top proposals" of each business category (OTSB, SB, 8(a), etc.) will be accepted?
43	146	M.2 Phase 1: Go/No- Go Requirements 1)	Two great benefits to the government of purely self-scoring sheet proposals are protection against successful protest and easier evaluation of a large number of proposals. The inclusion of subjective evaluation criteria diminishes the first advantage, especially considering that the subjective criteria include many of the criteria usually used to build out the objective scoring criteria. Would the government consider the following alternatives? a) Dropping the subjective portion of the evaluation putting scores on what is to be subjectively evaluated according to the current draft? b) issuing a draft scorecard for industry comment? c) Dropping the self-scoring sheet from the solicitation?
44	147	M.3, b, Phase 2: Non- Price Factors Evaluation Criteria	Table 20 indicates that the Technical Factor will be rated "based on the offeror's performance record..., Sources of information are consistently firm in stating that the Offeror's performance was ...". What will be used as the source for the "performance record" or "sources of information" for the information provided in the Technical Section since only "examples of experience" are to be submitted in that section and not client POC information or contract numbers?
45	150	M.2 Phase 1: Go/No- Go Requirements 1)	The draft solicitation says, "During Phase 1, the Government will evaluate proposals using the following four (4) Go/No-Go Requirements:" but only lists two the self-scoring sheet and go/ no go requirements. Can the government clarify that these are the only two go/ no go requirements?

46	150	M.2 Phase 1: Go/No-Go Requirements 1)	For the self-scoring sheet can the government confirm that this will only be relevant to the go/ no go requirements in phase 1?
47	150	M.3.2, Factor 2 - Corporate Experience	There are no evaluation factors shown for this Section. Can you please provide the evaluation factors and if there are any factors that would be viewed/rated more favorably than others?
48	153	M.4 Phase 2 - Factor 5 Price Evaluation	Paragraph M.4.1.a.2) states that the Government may determine reasonableness through the "Comparison of proposed loaded hourly labor rates against an independent Government price estimate." Would the Government please elaborate on specifics of how price will be evaluated?
49	155	M.3.3 Factor 3 - Management Approach 2)a)	Item (a) states "Offerors that propose Contract Administrators with proven expertise in applying the FAR when administering contracts similar to CIO-SP3 Small Business will be evaluated more favorably." Should this be Contracts Manager?