**Questions & Answers as of 04/12/2017**

1. **Question:** Section L(F) File 5: Past Performance and Relevant Experience states: "For each of the referenced contracts, the Offeror and all Prime Participants shall submit the Past Performance Reference Information Form provided in Part III, Section J. The Offeror and Prime Participants may attach additional pages, if necessary."J.14 ATTACHMENT I – PAST PERFORMANCE REFERENCE INFORMATION FORMS, states: "Attach additional sheet if necessary (one additional sheet maximum) "Will the Government confirm that since. "Relevant experience and past performance information are not included in the page limitation" that multiple additional pages may be included in the form in Section J.14?

**Answer:** L.8 indicates that past performance is not included in the specific page limitation for the technical proposal. However, only one additional page per form is allowed for submitting information regarding past performance. The form and the additional page are not included in the 80 page limitation for this volume.

1. **Question:** Reference Paragraphs L.9 A (5) and (9). Please confirm that a Prime Participant, who does not participate on a cost-plus activity, is required to show a cost build-up at the same level of detail as the Offeror (indirect rates, etc.).

**Answer:** No, Exhibits C1 though C3 are only associated with the work under the cost reimbursement CLIN.

1. **Question:** Reference Section J.3 - 5.2.4 Activity 2 - Infrastructure Operations Services [Service Desk Support]. What is the number of tickets per day? What is the average resolution time for a ticket? Will the Government provide a list (including the quantities of each) of the equipment, hardware, software, and versions being supported?

**Answer:** The additional documents located on the NETL electronic were intended to provide additional information relates to response times and types of tickets. There are also documents located there that provide information on types of equipment, operating environment, etc. to aide offerors in fully understanding the requirement.

1. **Question:** Section H.19 references Section J, Attachment E. Can you please confirm that it should reference Section J, Attachment D?

**Answer:** Yes, it should reference Section J, Attachment D.

1. **Question:** The RFP references a CBA in Sections H.19 and J.9, however only three Wage Determinations have been included in Attachment D. Please confirm that no CBAs apply to this RFP.

**Answer:** The reference is to CBA, if any. This confirms that there are no CBAs associated with this requirement.

1. **Question:** Section L.9.A(7) references Section J, Attachment E. Can you please confirm that it should reference Section J, Attachment D?

**Answer:** Yes, it should reference Section J, Attachment D.

1. **Question:** Clause I.37 52.246-20 Warranty of Services has a Paragraph (b) which includes a fill-in that should be provided as part of the RFP. This fill-in has not been completed. Please provide the Contracting Officer fill-ins for this section.

**Answer:** This should be “60 days from date of acceptance by the Government”.

1. **Question:** Clause 1.43, 952-209-72 Organizational Conflict of Interest includes Paragraph (b)(1)(i) which has not been completed. Please provide the Contracting Officer fill-ins for this section.

**Answer:** This clause should have been filled-in with a “2-years after completion of the contract”.

1. **Question:** Please confirm that Offerors do not have to provide 0010408 OrgChart with our proposal?

**Answer:** That is correct, the Org Chart referenced in the reporting requirements section of the RFP is a template provided to give the Offeror an understanding of the level of reporting that is required after award.

1. **Question:** In Section L.8.B., the Government indicates that offerors shall describe their approach to creating the work breakdown structure (WBS), including the definition and implementation of the WBS elements. Will the government please confirm offers can provide the full WBS as an Appendix outside page count?

**Answer:** It is not required to have the complete WBS proposed and delivered as a appendix to the proposal. You will be evaluated on the approach to developing the WBS, not an actual WBS.

1. **Question:** The penalties in the referenced section contradict with Section L.8(a)(E) Commitment Letters, which only requires key personnel to commit to the contract for twelve months. Will the Government revise Section H.10.D.1 and H.10.D.2 to clarify that the reductions will only apply if the Contractor requests changes to the Key Personnel within their first 12 months of performance on the resultant contract?

**Answer:** It is not the Government’s intent to have a correlation between the two. Commitment letters need to reflect a commitment from Key Personnel for at least 12 months of the contract. Should they elect to leave at any time during the contract (before or after 12 months), then a penalty may be assessed.

1. **Question:** We request that the Government remove the penalties referenced in Section L.8(a)(E) Commitment Letters given that this is a small business set-aside with the majority of the work being performed at a firm fixed price.

**Answer:** The price reduction related to the change out of Key Personnel is not in Section L.8 it is covered in the H clause for Key Personnel. Section L.8 requires a letter of commitment from Key Personnel indicating their availability for the first 12 months of contract performance and will be used to determine the level of commitment proposed and availability of Key Personnel during evaluation. The H Clause reflects a price reduction that will be assessed during actual contract performance in the event a Key Personnel leaves. This is directly related to learning curves and additional effort that the Government will have as it relates to the change in Key Personnel. Therefore, this requirement will not be removed.

1. **Question:** The referenced section of the RFP indicates that access to classified material may be required, but no DD254 has been included. Please clarify what level of security clearances, agency background checks, etc. will be required, the method for obtaining them and provide the applicable DD254.

**Answer:** There is no requirement for working with classified material at this time. Working with classified material may be a requirement at some point during the potential 5-year contract. If it is determined that classified material will become part of the contract then specific information will be provided on the level of security associated with that material.

1. **Question:** This section allows for a downward adjustment in fee or price if the Contractor does not follow the QA Management Plan and/or a deliverable or service provided by the Contractor requires rework. This language is contradictory to the CIO-SP3 Section E Inspection clauses for each respective CLIN type. Respectfully request the Government remove item H.25 in its entirety and defer to the respective CIO-SP3 Section Inspection clauses for efforts that may require rework.

**Answer:** Clause H.25 does not contradict the Inspection clause for specific types of CLINs. The H.25 clause puts a contractor on notice that failure to follow the submitted QA Plan or re-work of a deliverable provided under this contract constitutes a “non-conformance” of the contract and therefore a price reduction or fee reduction (depending on type of CLIN) may be assessed.

1. **Question:** Please clarify how the Government plans to implement the downward adjustment in fee or price under clause H.25.

**Answer:** The actual price or fee reduction will be done in accordance with the appropriate inspection clause for that specific type CLIN.

1. **Question:** Clause H.3, Government Property appears to require an independent group to validate the results of the physical inventory. Please confirm that the cost of this independent validation will be an allowable direct charge to the resultant task order.

**Answer:** Independent validation is done by the Government or through one of the Government support contractors who provide property support.

1. **Question:** Section L.9.10. The government states the estimated date of contract performance is July 27, 2017. Please confirm the contract will be awarded NLT 45 days prior to July 27, 2017.

**Answer:** The intent is to have the contract awarded to allow for transition to occur and the contractor to assume operational performance on July 27, 2017. This is subject to change should proposal evaluations take longer than anticipated. However, Offeror’s should propose with the assumption provided.

1. **Question:** Reference Section L.8.D.3: The Government asks for contractors to provide an approach to assume control of incumbent contractors subcontracts and other agreements and commitments. Will the government please provide a list of current subcontractors and other agreements and commitments held by the incumbent contractor? Without this information, contractors are unable to adequately price these commitments in a firm fixed price contract structure.

**Answer:** The proposed fixed-price should include all cost associated with the work required. Subcontracts would only be assumed, if the selected Offeror determined them necessary to continue performance. The Offeror should propose its fixed-price based on its approach to fulfilling the work. A listing of current subcontracts is not necessary for determining a fixed-price and would only be provided to the successful offeror for them to determine the appropriate manner to assume the work that the subcontractor may have been performing.

1. **Question:** Reference Section L.8.E, Key Personnel Requirements. The Government requires two key personnel (Program Manager and Chief Engineer); however, the Government leaves open the opportunity to provide additional "critical" personnel that it considers critical and that meet the requirements of Key Personnel. Two part question: Will the Government please confirm that these additional key resources will not be subject to the same fee pool deduction requirements for the two Government-mandated key roles?

**Answer:** All Key Personnel identified on the contract are subject to the same

deductions/penalties.

1. **Question:** Reference Section L.9.B, Exhibits B1 through B4, Work Migration to Federal Resources, and Section H.10.E., Key Personnel for This Contract. The Government, per Section L.9.B, intends to migrate the chief architect/engineering functions to the Governments control at the beginning of contract performance year 2. Will the Government please conform that the Chief Engineer will not be a mandated KEY role at the start of Year 2?

**Answer:** The specific functions identified are those that will migrate. Each Offeror will need to determine if a Chief Engineer will still be required and how those migrations of work functions affect their specific proposal to completion of the work that will continue.

1. **Question:** Reference Section L.9: Technical execution of Development, Modernization, and Enhancement (DME) associated with “Data Center hosting/System Administration” services. Is it the governments intent that NETL staff will take over the entire data center hosting / system administration responsibilities?

**Answer:** No, the administration of those areas including technical execution of the specific area identified will migrate to federal functions. This is not an all-inclusive functions of the data center hosting support.

1. **Question:** Due to the complexity and volume of the questions submitted and the importance of the answers for us to complete our comprehensive solution to the government, we request the government provide a two week extension to the submission due date from the day questions are answered.

**Answer:** The Government feels that the questions asked under this RFP to date do not warrant an extension. The due date remains the same.

1. **Question:** Reference Section L.6, (A) Overall Arrangement of Proposal, Page 154. The Page Limitation for Volume II – Technical Proposal is 80 pages divided between File 1: Technical Approach (40 pages), File 2: Management/Organizational Approach Plan (25 pages), File 3: Transition Approach (15 pages). Will the government confirm the remaining 2 files (File 4: Key Personnel and File 5: Past Performance and Relevant Experience) included in Volume II do not have page limitations?

**Answer:** Correct. These files are not a part of the 80 page limitation. Some areas such as past performance have other page limitations such as one additional page to the form required.

1. **Question:** Reference Section L.6, (A) Overall Arrangement of Proposal and (B) Electronic Submission, Page 154. The proposal instructs offerors to submit 3 separate volumes with each volume containing individual files. eGOS does not permit folders to be uploaded; rather, it only permits individual files. To ensure the files for each volume are easily distinguished, will the Government permit us to save files as COMPANY NAME\_VOL\_#\_FILE NAME.\*\*\*?

**Answer:** Yes, files can be saved with the specific volume identified in the title.

1. **Question:** RFP Page 158, Section L.8.B.3 - The instruction for responses related to “Reliability” requests information related to topic areas of service measurement, continuous improvement, proven technologies, service implementation, work control processes, root cause analysis, and work backlogs. Reliability from a CMMI or ITIL perspective is defined to mean time between failures or service incidents, or number of service breaks. In providing an approach to this instruction, is the government expecting responses to be oriented to how the contractor response achieves higher reliability or just an approach to the specific topic areas.

**Answer:** The Government is requesting an approach to the specific topic for evaluation purposes for our determination on effectiveness and efficiency.

1. **Question:** RFP Page 161, Section L.8.F - Past performance limited to the last 3 years would preclude past performance at the NETL by IT contractors other than the incumbent. Would the government consider past performance within the last 5 years to enable contractors to cite experience supporting the NETL?

**Answer:** No, specific experience with NETL is not a requirement for past performance. You should be proposing relevant, recent past performance not just that specific to performance at NETL

1. **Question:** PWS 5.4.7, Page 109 - Section 5.4.7 of the PWS states “Historically the Enterprise Application Operations, Maintenance and Integration effort consisted on average of 12 full time resources spread across the tasks defined in PWS-Enterprise Application Maintenance and PWS-Enterprise Application Engineering. Resources were in both PGH and MGN. Specific skills sets included: Software Developers, SharePoint Developers, Software Engineers, Database Administrators, Application Administrators, SharePoint Administrators, Business/Systems Analysts, Application Architect, and IT Project Manager.” This section 5.4.7 indicates 12 Full Time Equivalent (FTE) labor resources for a) PWS-Enterprise Application Maintenance and b) PWS-Enterprise Application Engineering.  PWS-Enterprise Application Engineering is Section 5.4 of the PWS however, no PWS-Enterprise Application Maintenance section is found.  At the same time, the PWS Section 5.2, Infrastructure Operations Services, identifies in PWS Section 5.2.7 over 9 FTE in the areas of Applications Development, Business Systems Analysis, Database administration, programming, etc.Questions:

1)Is the 12 FTE identified in PWS Section 5.4.7 in addition to the 9+ applications development related resources in PWS 5.2.7?a.If yes, 1.can the government clarify which PWS 5.2 work requirements apply to the following IOS resources that are related to applications engineering. Site Incumbent Position Title FTEs  Morgantown, WV Applications Developer Int I1.05Morgantown, WV Applications Developer Int II1Morgantown, WV Applications Developer-Int I0.55Morgantown, WVDBA Int I0.65Morgantown, WVDBA Int II0.42Morgantown, WVDBA Sr0.5Pittsburgh, PA Application Developer Int I (Sharepoint)0.5Pittsburgh, PA Application Developer Sr0.5Pittsburgh, PA  Applications Administrator Int II0.5Pittsburgh, PA Applications Developer Int I-Cognos0.5Pittsburgh, PA Applications Developer/DBA Int I0.5Pittsburgh, PA Business Analyst Int I2.05Pittsburgh, PA Computer Programmer III12. Can the government clarify the difference between Activity 2 fixed price applications development and maintenance versus applications development and maintenance performed under Activity 4 as CPFF?  It is unclear which types of enterprise applications development and maintenance is part of Activity 2 or Activity 4. b. If no,  which of the applications engineering related resources in PWS 5.2.7 are part of the 12 FTE performing work per PWS 5.4?

2)Please clarify the reference to “PWS-Enterprise Application Maintenance”  in 5.4.7.   Is work associated with “PWS-Enterprise Application Maintenance” part of PWS 5.2 or 5.4?

**Answer:**

1. The historical information is provided to gain an understanding of the volume of work required in each section as well as the skill sets that have been previously required to accomplish work requirements.  It is not intended that each offeror must propose the same number of FTEs in your proposals.  Your proposal should include the number of FTEs, and labor categories, necessary to fulfill how you plan to approach the work.  Having said that, the numbers associated with each section are based on the Government’s historical information for the work as identified in this requirement.  Work has shifted under this requirement and is aligned based on new areas and the separation between fixed-price and cost-reimbursement.  A direct comparison to the current contract, which was entirely cost-reimbursement, is not intended.  Please use the historical numbers as provided for each section of the PWS in determining the volume and skill sets that would have been used if the current work was divided in a similar manner.
2. “PWS-Enterprise Application Maintenance” as referenced in section 5.4.7 of the PWS (Resource Load Information for Enterprise Application Engineering) refers to the type of work now required under PWS 5.2 and is only in this section to provide the Offeror with the knowledge that these skill sets were shared between two areas previously (partial FTEs in each area).  The portion moved to 5.2 is related specifically to integration work.
3. **Question:** RFP Page 158, Section L.8.B - The RFP asks for the contractor “… approach to work control processes using a computerized maintenance management system …”.  Does the NETL have a computerized maintenance management system available for use by the IT contractor?  If so, what system?

**Answer:**  No computerized maintenance management system is currently utilized.  NETL does utilize the HEAT system as a work control system, however is not currently using any maintenance management-type modules within HEAT.

1. **Question:** RFP Page 158, Section L.8.B - The instruction for responses related to “Availability” requests information related to topic areas of skills/labor levels, resource accountability, processes and tools, system/application/data interfaces management, and travel, training, and overtime. Availability is generally the extent to which (usually a percentage) a system or service is able to be used. In providing an approach to this instruction, is the government expecting responses to be oriented to how the contractor response achieves higher availability or just an approach to the specific topic areas, e.g., approach to determining appropriate skills, management of travel, training, and overtime, etc.

**Answer:** The Government is requesting an approach to the specific topic for evaluation purposes for our determination on effectiveness and efficiency.

1. **Question:** RFP Page 178, Section M.5 - When evaluating Technical Criterion in Files 1 through 5, will the government allow proposals to direct the evaluator to review material provided in another file. For example, will a technical response in File 1 allow the evaluator to evaluate material in File 2 if the File 1 response refers to material provided in File 2?

**Answer:** The Government may evaluate information in any file for any criterion. However, the Offeror is not to propose in such a manner that circumvents the specific page limitations set forth in the RFP. Therefore, you should NOT be making references to other Files in a manner to appear to circumvent the page limitations.

1. **Question:** RFP Page 158, Section L.8.B.7 - The topic of Accountability requests the contractor “Approach to inventory tracking and management of NETL IT assets (including personal property, software, configuration management of hardware and software, problem resolution as the integrator of solutions from multiple providers, integration safety and quality of work processes)”.  It is clear that personal property, software, and hardware are assets for which inventory tracking can be performed. It is not clear what assets information.  The requirement to track inventory for assets “… problem resolution as the integrator …, integration and safety and quality of work processes” is unclear. Is the instruction simply to provide an approach to a) “problem resolution as the integrator of solutions from multiple providers,” b) “integration” (of something), and c) “safety and quality of work processes” rather than the tracking of assets related to these topics? Would an instruction written as follows better reflect the response requirement?:“Approach to inventory tracking and management of NETL IT assets (including personal property, software, configuration management of hardware and software), problem resolution as the integrator of solutions from multiple providers, integration, and  safety and quality of work processes”.  Also, please clarify the “integration” requirement.  For example, is it to mean integration of systems, or work processes, or asset tracking, etc.

**Answer:**  The instruction is to provide an approach to the problem resolution as the integrator of solutions from multiple providers, the integration of systems in general that may be provided by the Government or during performance of this contract, and the safety and quality of work processes to ensure a safe work environment with a high level of quality assurance.  The word “integration” in this context is referring to the integration of systems/software.

1. **Question:** RFP Section L Corp Org Plan "The plan shall include the flow down of authorities from the parent organization to the Program Manager and how the corporate resources will be assessed, if needed." Question: Will the Government please confirm the word "assessed" is really intended to read "accessed"?

**Answer:** Yes, this should have been accessed.

1. **Question:** Can the Government consider reducing the font size requirement for only tables from 12pt to 10pt font?

**Answer:** As stated in previous answers and in the RFP. The Offeror can elect to use a smaller font size; however, readability is at the risk of the Offeror and graphics with less than 12 point font may not be considered in evaluation of the proposal if they are not legible and clear to the evaluator.

1. **Question:** H.38, Page 35, Required Contractor Certification. The government states “Key Personnel with assigned responsibilities encompassed by the CMMI-SVC or CMMI-DEV must have experience working in a CMMI level 3 or higher environment.” Can the government please clarify what is meant by a “experience working in a CMMI Level 3 or higher environment?” Do the Key Personnel need to have experience on another contract that required CMMI level 3 or higher? Could the Key Personnel have worked on a corporate project where the company held a CMMI Level 3 or higher certification and used CMMI on the project work?

**Answer:** The experience should be related to their specific involvement working with CMMI level 3 or higher projects. Not just working for a company who held the certification when their work performed had nothing or little to do with CMMI.

1. **Question:** Reference:(A) FILE 5, ADMINISTRATIVE DISCUSSION (Administrative.---)The Offeror’s administrative discussion shall address the following: NIH CIO-SP3 SB GWAC - The Offeror shall provide a copy of the NIH CIO-SP3 SB GWAC including all modifications. The above is 89 Megabytes. Is there a limit on the file size we should send? Is just sending the Standard Forms 30 and 33 sufficient?

**Answer:** Unless there is a specific file size limitation within the e-GOS system, the actual complete contract should be submitted. It is suggested that you may want to zip or compress the file to comply with any e-GOS submission requirements.

1. **Question:** Reference: Section 5.4.7 and Government Cost Template.

Due to the uncertainty of the level of effort and type of application support personnel required for Activity 4, would the government consider providing evaluation hours per labor category and level (Entry(Junior)/Intermediate/Senior levels) for price evaluations purposes? With this approach, each vendor would provide CPFF rates for each labor category and level to provide for proper evaluation of the Cost-Plus Fixed Fee CLIN of this proposal. Or would the government prefer vendors submit their distribution of labor based on the 12 FTE historical average workforce.

**Answer:** The Government will not provide a pre-set level of effort. Historical information has been provided and each Offeror must propose the level of effort necessary to fulfill their proposed approach to the work required.

1. **Question:** Reference: Section 5.4.7 and Government Cost Template.

For the cost estimation for Activity 4 (Cost-Plus Fixed Fee), it appears that the government is stipulating that respondents bid 12 FTEs based on the historical staffing estimates. Can the government confirm its desire for vendors to distribute the 12 FTEs across all levels and labor categories identified in Section 5.4.7?

**Answer:** The resource load information is provided as a historical basis for use by the Offerors. The Government is not stipulating that the respondents specifically use the FTEs identified as historical information. Each Offeror must propose the necessary resources to accomplish the work in the manner to which they proposed from a technical approach. Align the proposed FTEs to the technical approach proposed not to the historical information.

**Questions & Answers as of 04/07/2017**

**1. Question:** Can the government please confirm that the historical labor chart for the Infrastructure Operations Systems located in Section 5.2.7 Resource Load Information consists of the labor inclusive of support of EDx system?

**Answer:** The resource load information is derived from historical information for the requirement anticipated in this solicitation. The resource load information accounts for the labor required to fulfill the EDx system requirements as outlined in the PWS. The labor associated with work previously completed may have been different from what is anticipated to be provided under the requirements of this PWS/solicitation due to the requirement being different.

**2. Question:** For the government to have the ability to evaluate the offeror proposals on the technical solution, the government submitted 29 pages of requirements for a solution for the Technical Proposal. Offerors need addition space in the technical proposal to clearly define the solution for each of the activities for the ITSS proposal. We would like to recommend an increase to from 40 pages to 60 pages for the Technical Section of the Proposal.

**Answer:** The Government feels that 40 pages to discuss the technical approach is sufficient.

**3. Question:** If I have already re-certified, with NITAAC am I still eligible?

**Answer:** If you have already recertified and you are no longer a small business on this contract then you are not eligible to participate. Those who have not recertified yet, and may be considered a large business in the future when they do recertify are still eligible to participate as long as they have not recertified prior to the due date for proposals.

**4. Question:** Who is the incumbent?

**Answer:** A FOIA released copy of the current contract, including the contract holder’s name, has been included in the NETL Electronic Reading Room (<https://www.netl.doe.gov/business/site-support>) please refer to this location for information on the current provider.

**5. Question:** What is the current contract number?

**Answer:** A FOIA released copy of the current contract, including the contract holder’s name, has been included in the NETL Electronic Reading Room (<https://www.netl.doe.gov/business/site-support>) please refer to this location for information on the current contract.

**6. Question:** Can the Government please identify unions/Collective Bargaining Agreements (CBA) specific to each location. In addition, please identify labor categories covered under SCA and identify labor categories covered by CBAs.

**Answer:** There are no current CBAs at any of the locations. Information Technology labor categories, such as those required for this solicitation, can often be either SCA covered or considered professional in nature depending on salary, benefits, and an organization’s manner to which they classify their employees. Therefore, the current SCA WD for each location has been included and the organization will need to determine how they classify their proposed employees to determine whether they are SCA covered or professional in nature and exempt from the SCA.

**7. Question:** Reference: L.8(C) last sentence para 4. states "Describe how the staff will be encouraged to achieve knowledge transfer to the Government. In addition, L.8(D) Transition Approach Plan (pg 160) states "transition plan shall also include a knowledge transfer plan associated with the migration of work from contractor back to the Government for work identified to be re-federalized during the period of performance of this contract. "Question: Is it the Governments intent to transition contractor staff positions to government employees? Or is it the intent to transfer only the knowledge from contractor staff to designed government employees.

**Answer:** It is the Government’s intent to transfer the knowledge from the contractor to the federal staff. The Government will follow its normal hiring practice of competing the open positions for the federal positions created. As such, contractor staff will be encouraged to apply for any such positions, but will not be automatically selected. They will need to compete with any other candidates who apply for the open federal vacancy.

**8. Question:** Section H.10.D, Page 22, Contract Reductions for Changes to Key Personnel. The government states that anytime the Program Manager or a Key Person is changed for any reason after being placed in the position, the contract price may be permanently reduced. If the departure of the Program Manager or a Key Person is beyond the control of the Contractor, will the government approve a request by the Contractor to waive the entire price reduction?

**Answer:** As outlined in H.10.D, part 3, the Contractor may request, in writing to the Contracting Officer, a waiver of all or part of the reduction. The Contracting Officer will make a determine on whether a waiver will be granted or not.

**9. Question:** J.8, Page 132, Attachment C – Position Qualifications. The Minimum Qualifications for the Chief Engineer/Enterprise Architect list “Experience with financial sector.” Can the government please provide amplifying information about the type of financial sector experience desired?

**Answer:** For the Chief Engineer/Enterprise Architect, “Experience with financial sector” refers to having experience with budgets, finance, accounting, or marketing.

**10. Question:** L.8(E), Page 160, FILE 4: KEY PERSONNEL, 2nd Paragraph. “Resumes (File 3) should reflect…” Should this read “(File 4)” instead of “(File 3)”?

**Answer:** Yes

**11. Question:** L.8(E), Page 160, FILE 4: KEY PERSONNEL, 2nd Paragraph. “The Offeror shall provide documented background of the past five years of work experience…” Can the government please clarify what it means by “provide documented background?” Does the government want additional documentation of work experience in the Key Personnel File in addition to the experience listed in the resume for the Key Personnel?

**Answer:** Resumes are part of the information included in the response to Key Personnel so information included in the resume does not need repeated. Resumes were identified as “Qualification Resumes” which may not focus on the past five years of experience, if they do then the information should not be repeated. However, resumes should be reviewed closely by the Offeror to ensure that it does include information on the past five-years work experience in areas relevant to that required by this PWS and an explanation on how this experience will be used to support NETL (the second part of this is not typically in the resume).

**12. Question:** L.8(E), Page 160, FILE 4: KEY PERSONNEL, 2nd Paragraph. “The Offeror shall provide documented background of the past five years of work experience…” Does the government only want Key Personnel resumes to list the last five years of work experience? We recommend the Government consider at least the last fifteen years since the minimum qualification for the Program Manager and Chief Engineer, as outlined in Attachment C – Position Qualifications, is fourteen years of related work experience if the key personnel do not have a degree.

**Answer:** Resumes were requested to be Qualification Resumes which may include much more information than just the past five-year work history. The narrative provided by each Offeror should describe how the past five-year work experience is relevant to the PWS and how this experience will be used to support NETL (more than what typically would be included in the resume).

**13. Question:** RFP Page 155, Section L.7, Section (E) FILE 4, FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY, In paragraph (a), the Government asked for published financial statements for the three prior annual accounting periods. If our tax year ends on 12/31, and our tax for 2016 won’t be finalized until the June timeframe of 2017, can we submit the financial statements for 2013, 2014, and 2015?

**Answer:** Yes

**14. Question:** RFP, Page 166, Section Exhibit B4 - The Government stated “Exhibit B4 is required to be prepared and submitted by the Offeror and all Prime Participants.” If the Prime Participant is not participated in the Cost Plus Fixed Fee CLIN, we assume that the Prime Participant is not required to prepare and submit Exhibit B4. Is our assumption correct?

**Answer:** That is correct, only the prime participants that are planned to be included in that CLIN would be required to submit Exhibit B4.

**15. Question:** RFP Page 167, Exhibit B5 - The Government stated “…each Offeror shall use the estimated numbers provided by NETL in the cost exhibits for this activity.” We assume that no entry is needed for this Exhibit. Is our assumption correct?

**Answer:** Yes, still submit the exhibit but the numbers have already been pre-loaded for you.

**16. Question:** RFP Page 167, Exhibit C1 through C3 - If the Prime Participants only participate in the FFP CLIN, do they have to fill out Exhibit C1 through C3?

**Answer:** No, Exhibits C1 though C3 are only associated with the work under the cost reimbursement CLIN.

**17. Question:** RFP Page 168, File 3 - Cost Discussion - The Government stated “The Offeror and Prime Participants shall submit a brief discussion on the following…” The information requested in this section contains company sensitive information. May the Prime Participant submit this information, via email, directly to the Contracting Officer? If yes, should the file name be <company name><primeparticipant>.CostDiscussion.XXX?

**Answer:** The acceptability for a prime participant to provide their information directly to NETL is only in the event that the prime participant is concerned about providing their information to the offeror. In these instances, the prime participant is authorized to provide the information directly to the contract specialist via email. However, as stated in the instructions it must be very clear as to which proposal (offeror) the prime participant is providing information for and the offeror is responsible for ensuring that the rolled-up loaded information is consistent with the prime participants separate full-detailed submission.

**18.** **Question:** RFP Page 107, Section 5.3.7, For Morgantown site, the Government listed the Incumbent Position Title “Information Assurance Analyst Int I” twice. Please confirm that this is the Government’s intention.

**Answer:** Yes

**19. Question:** RFP Page 11, Section F.2, The Government states that “the principal places of performance under this contract shall be at the National Energy Technology Laboratory various locations.” Is it the Government’s intention that the Offeror have staff continuously located at all four sites referenced?

**Answer:** Yes

**20. Question:** RFP Page 20, Section H.4, The Government stated that the Offeror shall have access to “Other associated Government furnished items for the on-site personnel include: office space, office furniture, local area network services, parking facilities, and other services as described in the clause entitled “Government Provided Services”.” Will the Government provide computers for staff on this contract as well?

**Answer:** Reference the Government Furnished Property List in the Electronic Reading Room (<https://www.netl.doe.gov/business/site-support/de-sol-0010408>).

**21. Question:** RFP Page 102, Section J.3, 5.2.7, 5.3.7, 5.4.7 - Does resource loading information in PWS 5.2.7, 5.3.7, and 5.4.7 include the indirect staff, i.e., Program Manager, Chief Engineer, and Program administration positions?

**Answer:** No

**22. Question:** RFP Page 35, Section H.39, The title of this set of clauses indicated that the EVMS is only applicable to “Procurement of Capital Assets”. Please confirm that the EVMS is not required for the service aspect of this procurement—many of which are fixed price?

**Answer:** No. EVMS is only applicable to procurement of capital assets.

**23. Question:** RFP Page 162, 3rd paragraph - The Government stated “The Offeror and all Prime Participants shall forward the Past Performance Information Questionnaire as shown in Part III, Section J, for each contract or project cited above to the appropriate point of contact for that contract or project…. The point of contact for each contract or project should complete and submit the questionnaire directly to the Contracting Officer identified in the cover letter, prior to the closing date of the RFP”. Some Government agencies that we work with provided us with an annual assessment in the Contractor Performance Assessment Reports System (CPARS) and they prefer that we use this system for the Past Performance Questionnaire. Would the Government allow us to submit the CPARS instead of requiring our Clients to submit the questionnaire directly to the Contracting Officer?

**Answer:** No, the Government has access to the CPARs assessments. Our intent is to gather additional information directly from the client. As indicated in the solicitation, the Government may use the CPARs information in addition to what is provided by the offeror and their clients as well as any other information readily available in Government records.

**24. Question:** NITAAC requires a separate CLIN for the NITAAC fee. However, in the Cost Exhibit spreadsheet, we didn’t see a CLIN for the NITAAC fee. Would the Government include an additional CLIN for the NITAAC fee?

**Answer:** There is no known requirement for a separate CLIN for the NITAAC fee. The NITAAC fee must be included in the proposed fixed-price and may be a separate cost element in the cost-reimbursement CLIN (add a line to the template if needed). NITAAC reviewed the solicitation prior to its release and has provided guidance to NETL in its development of the solicitation, so a separate CLIN is not included for capture of the fee.

**25. Question:** Section J.12 Attachment G - Past Performance Information Questionnaire Cover Letter directs the offeror to fill in the address for the US Department of Energy (DOE). This implies DOE is expecting the Past Performance Information Questionnaire (PPIQ) to be submitted via regular mail. Will and electronic submission of the PPIQs via e-mail be acceptable?

**Answer:** Yes. Submit the PPIQ via email to the DOE Contracting Officer or Contract Specialist. Submission via regular mail is not required.

**26. Question:** Reference: Amendment 002 Solicitation pg 165. states: File 1 – CONTRACT PRICING PROPOSAL COVER SHEET (<company name>Cover Sheet.---)The Contract Pricing Proposal Cover Sheet (NETL F 534.1-1) is available for downloading on NETL’s homepage at: http://www.netl.doe.gov/business/forms/534\_1-1.doc. When we attempt to click on the link it gives an error message " Sorry, there is no www.netl.doe.gov web page that matches your request. It may be possible that you typed the address incorrectly. "Question: Please provide the proper link, or the documents via the e-Gos portal.

**Answer:** The correct link is [http://netl.doe.gov/business/business-forms#acquisition](http://netl.doe.gov/business/business-forms" \l "acquisition) and then scroll to the form number.

**27. Question:** Reference Section L.8.10. Quality Assurance and Integrated Safety Management Plans. Will the Government please confirm the QAP and ISMP can be included as an Appendix outside of page count?

**Answer:** The RFP should have included a requirement for how the offeror proposes to develop the QAP and ISMP. As such, this has been corrected in an amendment to the solicitation.

**28. Question:** The government states in Section L instructions, conditions, and notices to bidders Part (B) File 1: Technical Approach, 10. "Quality Assurance and Integrated Safety Management - The Offeror shall also provide a quality assurance plan that meets NETL Order 414.1, Quality Assurance and an Integrated Safety Management Plan (ISMP) that meets the requirements of NETL Order 450.4, Integrated Safety Management Program". NETL Order 414.1 is not included as a reference document in the RFP, the reading room, or within the NETL Focused Standards List; however this documents is material to providing a compliant response to the RFP. Will the Government please provide NETL Order 414.1? Given the importance of this document to compliance and our approach to Quality Assurance, we respectfully request a 2-week extension from the proposal due date to facilitate review and response by Offerors.

**Answer:** The RFP should have included a requirement for how the offeror proposes to develop the QAP and ISMP. As such, this has been corrected in an amendment to the solicitation.

**29. Question:** The government states in Section L instructions, conditions, and notices to bidders Part (B) File 1: Technical Approach, 10. "Quality Assurance and Integrated Safety Management - The Offeror shall also provide a quality assurance plan that meets NETL Order 414.1, Quality Assurance and an Integrated Safety Management Plan (ISMP) that meets the requirements of NETL Order 450.4, Integrated Safety Management Program". NETL Order 450.4 is not included as a reference document in the RFP, the reading room, or within the NETL Focused Standards List; however this document is material to providing a compliant response to the RFP. Will the Government please provide NETL Order 450.4? Given the importance of this document to compliance and our approach to Integrated Safety, we respectfully request a 2-week extension from the proposal due date to facilitate review and response by Offerors.

**Answer:** The RFP should have included a requirement for how the offeror proposes to develop the QAP and ISMP. As such, this has been corrected in an amendment to the solicitation.

**30. Question:** RFP, Page 166, PWS Page 82 - The Government stated "The Contractor shall provide a Program Manager to serve as the Contractors authorized supervisor for technical and administrative performance of all work. The Program Manager shall receive and execute, on behalf of the Contractor, such technical directions as the DOE Contracting Officers Representative (COR) may issue within the terms and conditions of the contract. The Government will not exercise any supervision over Contractor employees performing services under this contract. The Contractors employees are accountable solely to the Contractors management, who in turn is responsible for performance to the Government.".If the contractor employees are supervised by the contractor and the leadership team transitions to the government, how will the contractor maintain a leadership structure for employee supervision? Please clarify whether the government or the contractor will direct and supervise the technical staff given that most contractor leadership/supervisors will be transitioned to the government. Please clarify whether the government or contractor will provide the following types of supervision and leadership of work and technical staff whose leadership function is transitioned to the government: 1) assignment of work to technical staff, 2) determination of skill/training needs, 3) development of hiring requisitions, 4) establishing performance expectations, 5) evaluating performance, 6) establishing work schedules and operational coverage, 7) coordinating efforts that cross functional areas, 8) establishing estimates for effort and schedule required, 9) reviewing and approving solution designs, and 10) accountability for performance relative to PWS performance expectations and SLAs.

**Answer:** The contractor is responsible for its supervision of its employees. While the functions of work are intended to migrate to the Government over the life of this contract for specified portions of work, the Government will not become supervisors of the contractor’s employees. The offeror’s proposal should be developed within this intent and ensure that adequate supervision remains even after those functions of work have migrated. Also, keep in mind that the individuals who perform those functions as contractor employees may not be the same individuals selected for Government positions when the work migrates. The Government will follow its normal competitive process for selecting federal employees.

**31. Question:** Early in 2017, the NETL posted to their site support contractor business opportunities web page that the NETL would use CIOSP-3 and that eligible contractors would be required to have either CMMI-DEV L3 or CMMI-SVC L3. This initiated the complex process of contractor teaming to construct legally binding teaming agreements for teaming partner work scope, solution development responsibility, and overall solution integration and optimization under the Prime contractors IT services approach/framework. The Draft RFP subsequently excluded contractors with CMMI DEV L3. This was considered perhaps an error for which questions were asked. When the final RFP was released, CMMI DEV L3 was in fact excluded. This had the effect of causing immediate termination of corporate contractual teaming agreements under the prime who did not have CMMI SVC L3, reconstitution of the team under a new prime contractor and re-structuring of team work scope, roles, bid responsibilities, and solution integration according to the eligible prime contractor’s IT services approach. These contractual agreements, team re-structuring, and solution re-integration require additional effort and time. Amendment 2 to the RFP making CMMI DEV L3 contractors eligible was released after reconstitution of the team occurred under a new prime with CMMI SVC L3 capability under new contractual teaming agreements. These new agreements preclude returning to the original team and the Prime with CMMI DEV L3 only capability. Ultimately, as a result of confusion regarding the eligibility of the Prime, certain teams have not been afforded equal time to integrate a solution according to the IT service methods and framework of the Prime contractor. As a result of this prime contractor eligibility issue, would the government consider extending the proposal due date by two weeks? This is not unreasonable considering that some prime contractor teams organized according to the early 2017 advertised acquisition approach have had many months to develop solutions for this requirement.

**Answer:** The Government will not extend the due date for proposals for this issue. This issue was quickly resolved as a result of questions received and an amendment issued. The Government reconsidered the exclusion of the CMMI DEV L3 based on the similarities in the certifications and the information provided in the questions received upon issuance of the final RFP.

**32. Question:** J.4 Attachment B - Reporting Requirements Checklist notes that the Integrated Safety Management Plan is due Once After Award. As such, recommend that this requirement be stricken from Sections L (#10) and M (M.5 #10) of the RFP. Otherwise, please describe what the Government expects to see in the Contractors proposal to address the Quality Assurance and integrated Safety Management.

**Answer:** The RFP should have included a requirement for how the offeror proposes to develop the QAP and ISMP. As such, this has been corrected in an amendment to the solicitation.

**33. Question:** L.8 indicates there is no page limitation to the past performance provided and that multiple additional pages may be added to individual forms as needed. However, the form at J.14 states only one additional page can be added per form. Please confirm there is no page limitation to the past performance provided and that multiple additional pages may be added to individual forms as needed.

**Answer:** L.8 indicates that past performance is not included in the specific page limitation for the technical proposal. However, only one additional page per form is allowed for submitting information regarding past performance. The form and the additional page are not included in the 80 page limitation for this volume.

**34. Question:** J.14 ATTACHMENT I – PAST PERFORMANCE REFERENCE INFORMATION FORMS provided by the RFP is in font 8 point, which is not compliant with the instructions provided in Section L. Please confirm that offerors may recreate the form within the offeror’s proposal to comply with the formatting requirements of Section L.

**Answer:** Offeror’s are not required to recreate the forms provided by the Government. The responses to questions in the form should comply with the font requirements listed in the RFP.

**35. Question:** Section L Past Performance directs the offeror to submit Past Performance Reference Information Form (J.14 Attachment I). However, there is several information shown in Section L but is not included as a data field in Past Performance Reference Information (J.14 Attachment I). For example, Section L requires providing the "Staffing Level", a data field not included in J.14 Attachment I. Request that the Government provide a revised Past Performance Reference Information Form (J.14 Attachment I) that directly maps to Section L Past Performance Requirements.

**Answer:**  The Government has allowed for one additional page which can be used to provide the additional information requested.

**Questions & Answers as of 03/29/2017**

**1. Question:** CMMI-SVC Level 3 Requirement. Reference Section M.2, H.38. The Government’s requirement for Prime Contractors to be appraised at CMMI-SVC Level 3 is a material change from the previously stated requirement in NETL’s reading room for Prime Contractors to be appraised at CMMI-SVC OR CMMI-DEV Level 3. Narrowing this requirement significantly limits competition under the CIO-SP3 SB GWAC and may materially impact NETL’s ability to obtain the best value vendor for its stakeholder community. In lieu of this requirement, will the government consider any one of the following alternatives to improve competition, while maintaining the quality and process integrity of the Prime Contractor?

1.Maintain the original guidance provided in the reading room for the Prime Contractor to be appraised at CMMI-SVC or CMMI-DEV Level 3.

2.Require the Prime Contractor to have an ISO/IEC 20000-1:2001 Certification instead of CMMI-SVC Level 3. The ISO/IEC 20000-1:2001 Certification is a service management system (SMS) standard. It specifies requirements for a service provider to plan, establish, implement, operate, monitor, review, maintain and improve IT Service Management (ITSM) processes. The International Organization for Standardization provides assurance and independent proof of good practices similar to CMMI-SVC Level 3 and a commitment to ITSM and service excellence for ITSM projects.

3.Require the Prime Contractor to have an ISO/IEC 20000-1:2001 Certification and CMMI-DEV Level 3. The combination of the ISO/IEC 20000-1:2001 Certification and CMMI-Dev Level 3 appraisal provides NETL assurances the Prime Contractor can deliver quality ITSM best practices in the process repeatability structure of CMMI Level 3 criteria.

4.Allow Prime Contractor to be eligible to bid with a commitment to become appraised at CMMI-SVC Level 3 within six months of task order award.

**Answer:** The RFP was amended to incorporate the option to have a CMMI-SVC *or* CMMI-DEV level 3 or higher certification.

**2. Question:** In Section L.7 F of the Draft RFP the government stated that CMMI-DEV Level 3 was an acceptable CMMI certification. Sections H.38 and M.2 of the Final RFP state that CMMI-SVC Level 3 is a requirement for this contract and the reference in Section L.7 of CMMI-DEV has been removed. Will the government accept CMMI-DEV Level 3, ISO 20000 (ITSM), and ISO 27000 (Cyber) in lieu of CMMI-SVC Level 3?

**Answer:** The RFP was amended to incorporate the option to have a CMMI-SVC *or* CMMI-DEV level 3 or higher certification.

**3. Question:** Regarding Section H.38 REQUIRED CONTRACTOR CERTIFICATION. Q: Would the Government allow ISO 20000 Certification to serve as an alternative to CMMI-SVC level 3?

**Answer:** The RFP was amended to incorporate the option to have a CMMI-SVC *or* CMMI-DEV level 3 or higher certification, ISO 20000 will not be accepted as an alternative.

**4. Question:** Can companies submit a proposal if they are no longer a small business? The RFP refers to SB, but we received and have access to the RFP notification as an Other Than Small business under the NITAAC CIO-SP3 contract and e-GOS posting.

**Answer:** Recertification is not required for this solicitation as indicated in e-GOS system. A company must be on the CIO-SP3 SB GWAC in order to propose.

**5. Question:** If an Other Than Small Business cannot submit a proposal for this RFP, will NETL respectfully consider a 2-week extension to the posted due date to facilitate making alternate teaming arrangements?

**Answer:** Recertification is not required for this solicitation as indicated in e-GOS system. A company must be on the CIO-SP3 SB GWAC in order to propose. No extension is warranted at this time.

**6. Question:** Per Section G.7.4 Service Contract Act of the CIO-SP3 Small Business GWAC, "The preponderance of the GWAC’s labor categories are considered bona fide executive, administrative, professional labor and are generally exempt from the Service Contract Act (SCA). To the extent that any labor is subject to the SCA and is within scope of a Task Order and the GWAC, the OCO must identify such work under a separate CLIN on the task order and apply wages as required under FAR 22.10, Service Contract Act Wage Determinations." Please identify which CLINs in Section B of the RFP are subject to the Service Contract Act. Additionally, please confirm that those CLINs represent only Service Contract Act applicable labor, as required by the CIO-SP3 Small Business GWAC.

**Answer:** IT related positions can be either SCA covered or professional as indicated on the SCA WDs. The SCA and applicable WDs have been included in this solicitation to account for positions proposed by the offeror to fulfill the requirement that may not meet the exceptions from the SCA. This is a company specific requirement to determine if your employees meet the requirements to be considered professional and therefore exempt from the SCA.

**7. Question:** The RFP includes the following statement in Sections B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J and K, “\* See Chief Information Officer – Solutions and Partners 3 (CIO-SP3) Small Business Conformed Contract for additional applicable X Clauses. \*”, however, there are several clauses in the CIO-SP3 GWAC sections referenced that do not apply to this task order. Will the Government please clarify which specific CIO-SP3 GWAC clauses in these sections are incorporated into this task order?

**Answer:** The ordering office does not repeat clauses from the GWAC in its request. It is expected that the clauses in the GWAC clearly indicate whether they apply to fixed-price, cost-reimbursement, or both and those would be applicable to the specific CLINs as identified in this solicitation.

**8. Question:** In Section L.8, the Government states its intent is not for Offerors to redo graphics to conform to a 12 point font size. In our experience, an 8 point font for graphics is typically required. Will the Government please accept an 8 point font size for graphics?

**Answer:** Graphics with a font size smaller than 12 point can be submitted; however, as stated in the RFP readability is at the risk of the Offeror and graphics with less than 12 point font may not be considered in evaluation of the proposal if they are not legible and clear to the evaluator.

**9. Question:** In Section L.8, the Government instructs Offerors to use a 12 point font to ensure readability of the proposal. Will the Government permit Offerors to use a 10 point font in Tables?

**Answer:** Tables with a font size of smaller than 12 point can be submitted; however, as stated in the RFP readability is at the risk of the Offeror and graphics with less than 12 point font may not be considered in evaluation of the proposal if they are not legible and clear to the evaluator.

**10. Question:** Section H.14 Pg. 23-24, Section L.9 Pg. 167. The government has requested a NETL specific on-site overhead rate to include costs defined as PMO on page 24, and makes the assertion on page 24 that, “Since this rate is specific to this requirement it is not expected that there will be any conflict with a Contractor’s audited rate structure.” However, several of the indirect costs listed in PMO such as contract management, project control, HR, and others are included in our Fringe and G&A indirect rates as disclosed and reviewed by DCAA, our Cognizant ACO, and auditors. Therefore, to be consistent with our standard cost estimating practices and our disclosures to DCAA, and while ensuring such PMO costs including key personnel costs will not be charged as direct costs to the government on this contract, would our proposal be deemed compliant if we used our current provisional billing rates for on-site/government site as submitted and reviewed by DCAA? If not, given that we will be disclosing cost elements of our indirect rates as required in Section L.9 we will be showing the cost elements projected for our company in the applicable indirect rates, C1 Fringe, C3 G&A, etc. in the RFP cost template, “0010408-Cost Exhibits” and while ensuring such PMO costs including key personnel costs will not be charged as direct costs to the government on this contract - would the government find it acceptable if we do not include such PMO costs in our on-site specific overhead rate?

**Answer:** It is not the intent of this requirement to conflict with DCAA approved practices. The intent is for items that some organizations may expect to direct charge (e.g. contract management and local administrative support) to be added or included into your approved cost elements to derive a NETL-specific indirect rate. Some organizations have chosen to do this as a load to the approved rates, others have elected to add cost elements. That determination is left up to the individual organization, but these type costs will not be allowed as direct cost on the contract.

**11. Question:** RFP Cost template, “0010408-Cost Exhibits”. Is it the government’s intent for the offeror to show the proposed/projected Indirect rates in Exhibit C1, Exhibit C2 and Exhibit C3 which will form the basis of the proposed price and therefore total evaluated price for this proposal? Also, can the government confirm if these proposed/projected rates may differ from the Ceiling Indirect rates to be shown in Section H.15?

**Answer:** The Government’s intent is to evaluate the indirect rates as part of the cost realism for the cost reimbursement CLIN(s). It is anticipated that the proposed provisional rates may differ from the proposed ceiling rates. The ceiling rates may not be exceeded so in many cases those are proposed in a manner to allow some unexpected growth to the provisional rates.

**12. Question:** Section J.14, L.8(F)2. Would it be acceptable to modify the Past Performance Reference Information form provided in Part III, Section J.14 to include the missing requirements from Section L.8 (F) 2. (e.g. places of performance, staffing etc.) and submit one consolidated document per Past Performance Reference? Given that the majority of the requirements in the two sections are the same, this would save considerable space in our 2 page responses.

**Answer:** The Past Performance Reference Information Form is used by the Government in potentially contacting potential references. The additional information is expected to be included in the additional page indicated on the form.

**13. Question:** Section L.9. B – File 1 – Contract Pricing Proposal Cover Sheet. Given that this this contract and pricing proposal submission is a hybrid contract type including both CPFF and FFP – can the offeror just fill in box 6c. to show total price since FEE is not typically shown in a Firm Fixed Price contract.

**Answer:** Yes, in block 6c a total price can be provided without the completion of sections 6a and 6b. In block 8, the total price by line item is to be completed.

**14. Question:** In Section L.9 of the RFP, the Government states that each Prime Participant acting as a prime participant on a cost-plus-fixed-fee activity shall furnish their cost information in the same format and level of detail as prescribed in the RFP for the Prime Contractor. It further states that the Prime Participant shall be allowed to submit the cost information separately from the Prime. If the Prime Participant does not have access to the CIO e-GOS web portal, should their submissions be submitted via email to the DOE NETL Contracting Officer?

**Answer:** The acceptability for a prime participant to provide their information directly to NETL is only in the event that the prime participant is concerned about providing their information to the offeror. In these instances, the prime participant is authorized to provide the information directly to the contract specialist via email. However, as stated in the instructions it must be very clear as to which proposal (offeror) the prime participant is providing information for and the offeror is responsible for ensuring that the rolled-up loaded information is consistent with the prime participants separate full-detailed submission.

**15. Question:** Questions from Offerors are due to the Government on April 7, 2017 at 4pm. Proposals are due at 4:00pm, April 18, 2017. Given the complexity of the response, which includes 14 separate files among three volumes, Offerors will required enough time to map the Government’s answers throughout all related areas within each of the 14 files to (1) ensure full compliance, and (2) ensure accuracy and consistency in our proposal. Will the Government extend the submission due date by two weeks from the date answers are released?

**Answer:** The questions received to-date, and the subsequent responses have not resulted in significant change to the RFP or proposal responses. As such, an extension is not warranted at this time.

**16. Question**: Will the Government consider allowing a paper size of 11” x 17” for graphics and tables?

**Answer:** No, the paper size specified is sufficient for a complete discussion of the requirement.

**17. Question:** To remove the subjectivity in determining whether or not graphics with less than 12 point font are legible and clear to the evaluator, will the Government consider allowing graphics with a font size of no less than 10 point?

**Answer:** The Government’s requirement is 12 point font, deviation from that is at the risk of the offeror for tables and graphics.

**18. Question:** Will the Government consider allowing tables or lists font size to be at least 10 points?

**Answer:** The Government’s requirement is 12 point font, deviation from that is at the risk of the offeror for tables and graphics.