

SUBJECT: Response to Questions Regarding Draft Solicitation # STOCII-15-KOP-0001 for Live, Virtual, Constructive-Integrating Architecture (LVC-IA) Enhanced Capability (EC)

Ques #	Att #	Document Name	Page #	Para #	Question	Answer
1	N/A	Site Visit			Will we receive copies of the slides used by the Government Team during the Industry Day Briefings?	The slides will be provided by request thru the STRIBOP under a Distribution Agreement (DA) once the final RFP is released.
2	N/A	Site Visit			Please Describe the function of the Risk Reduction Test Bed (RRTB) for the LVC-IA operations.	The RRTB is a collaborative technology lab that is a PM ITE resource utilized to perform analysis/research tasks associated with potential technology solution to be transitioned to Programs of Record. LVC-IA is a key component of the RRTB and is utilized to provide an underlying architecture supporting Integrated Training Environment (ITE) interoperability and component enhancement efforts. SOW paragraph 3.2.3.5 has been updated.
3	N/A	Site Visit			Does the government intend for the operation and support of the Risk Reduction Test Bed to be included in the scope of this contract?	Consider the RRTB as a fielded site and provide “site support” to the efforts of the RRTB (e.g. Software (SW)/Cyber Security updates/patches to LVC-IA baseline, installation, and training) under the scope of Technology Insertion.
4	N/A	Site Visit			Does the contractor provide direct support of individual projects in the Risk Reduction Test Bed?	Yes, on an as needed basis. Consider the RRTB a fielded site and provide “site support” to the efforts of the RRTB (e.g.. SW/Cyber Security updates/patches to LVC-IA baseline, installation, and training) under the scope of Technology Insertion.
5	N/A	Site Visit			What is the frequency and duration of other systems use of the Risk Reduction Test Bed as it pertains to the LVC-IA framework?	Current RRTB gaps/projects were identified as part of Industry Day and are provided within the slides. Consider RRTB a fielded site and provide “site support” to the efforts of the RRTB (e.g. SW/Cyber Security updates/patches to LVC-IA baseline, installation, and training) under the scope of Technology Insertion.

6	N/A	Site Visit			Does the government have a list of risks that are candidates for testing and mitigation in the Risk Reduction Test Bed?	Current RRTB gaps/projects were identified as part of Industry day and are provided within the slides. Additional efforts will be geared towards future Program of Record (POR) requirements and the potential for transition of capability to these PORs.
7	N/A	Site Visit			Will the Government provide the attendee list for the 16 April site visit?	No.
8	N/A	Site Visit			Can the Government please provide a copies of the floorplans for the JDIF Facility and STTC Facility?	Yes, the floor plans of the JDIF lab and STTC RRTB lab area are included in Industry Day Site Visit slide set.
9	N/A	Site Visit			Asked about the STOC II POP end being Sep 2018 and 1 year extension to Sep 2019 and if we felt confident that the requests for extension would be approved	The request to extend the delivery period under STOC II for LVC-IA EC is currently the recommended approach by the PARC and is the approach we are moving forward. If the extension request is denied, then a notice will be issued on the STRIBOP and an alternate path will be pursued. This response is only applicable to LVC-IA EC.
10	N/A	Site Visit			Is LVC-IA planning to move to the new P4 building once it is complete, during the POP of the LVC-IA EC contract? If yes, are any provisions within the SOW for this? A recommendation was made to add a CLIN in the event this does occur.	There is currently no current or future plan to move LVC-IA into P4; therefore, there are no provisions at this time in the SOW and no scope to price within a CLIN.
11	N/A	Site Visit			Are the development workstations GFE?	Yes, the development workstations will be provided as GFE.
12	N/A	Site Visit			Who is funding the RRTB effort?	A gap analysis was performed to identify technology gaps, risk mitigations, and a relevant test bed for PM ITE. Based on this analysis, projects were identified to fill the technology gap(s) or to mitigate identified risk areas, progressing with design and test & evaluation efforts within the RRTB. A determination is then made on the project's feasibility for tech insertion into LVC-IA. The RRTB effort receives customer funding, RDECOM funds and PEO STRI funds (6.3/6.4 funding).
13	1	SOW	8	3.1.6.2 Configuration Management	a. What is meant by "maintain control of the functional baseline ... "?	a. Functional baseline is defined by the system/subsystem specification, interface control documents, and software

					b. How does the Government intend to maintain control of the LVC-IA functional baseline? Will the Government please describe the controls planned by the Government of the contractor's configuration environment?	<p>requirement specifications. SOW paragraph 3.1.6.2 has been updated.</p> <p>b. The Government does not dictate how the contractor performs their configuration management during development. All elements of the LVC-IA Tech Data Package (TDP), to include the Product Drawings, Commercial Drawings, Logistics Product Data and Technical Publications are evaluated against applicable requirements at GAT for formal acceptance and this establishes the Configuration Management Baseline(s).</p>
14	1	SOW	8	3.1.6.3 Configuration Change Management	<p>Section 3.1.6.3 calls for the contractor to document the following: configuration changes, requests for change, variance etc.</p> <p>a. In what format will that documentation be provided to the government?</p> <p>b. With what frequency will documentation be required?</p>	<p>a. Delivery requirements with respect to formats are defined within the individual CDRLs included within the SOW.</p> <p>b. Frequency is also identified as part of the CDRLs.</p>
15	1	SOW	12	3.1.10 Integrated Digital Environment	Is the current LVC-IA IDE and Web Portal Government-owned? If so, will the Government be providing this as GFP/GFD, and/or as part of the transition effort?	The current LVC-IA web portal data is part of the LVC-IA contract and will transition as GFP/GFI to the successful Offeror on the LVC-IA EC contract. The IDE currently uses Redmine as an open source solution, which is not Government owned.
16	1	SOW	13	3.1.10.1 IDE Dev & Installation	Will the Offeror be enhancing existing LVC-IA portal and IDE capabilities or will these be completely new capabilities?	The LVC-IA portal data will transition to the successful Offeror upon contract award as part of the TDP. Enhancement and/or new capabilities of the portal and IDE capabilities will be dependent upon the technical solution of the successful Offeror.
17	1	SOW	18	3.2.1 System Design	Will the Government specify a diagramming tool for creation of the artifacts created under Paragraph 3.2.1 System Design and (DI-MGMT-81644A) DoD Architecture Framework Documentation Ref: CDRL A001?	Components of the DoD Architecture Framework Document currently exist in multiple formats, however there are numerous engineering tools that are available to produce these artifacts. The Government will not be specifying a specific tool; however, the deliverable format

						of the artifacts for CDRL A001 will be as specified in the CDRL.
18	1	SOW	18	3.2.1 System Design	Please define/enumerate the selected systems interfaces referenced in paragraph 3 of section 3.2.1 "The design concept shall incorporate a modular open systems approach which shall be based on an engineering and business strategy to choose specifications and standards adopted by industry best practices and standards bodies for selected system interfaces, products, practices and tools."	The ICD will be provided by request thru the STRIBOP and in the TDP under a DA, once the final RFP is released. Section 3.1 Interface Identification describes the interfaces available to and from the LVC-IA system. Section 3.2 provides additional detail for the specific interfaces external to the LVC-IA architecture. They involve the support capabilities provided as well as the protocol exchanges necessary to provide interoperability between the TADSS.
19	1	SOW	18	3.2.1.1 System Definition Stage	Will the Government please provide the intended list of documentation to be "generated during system definition [and] used to guide subsystem development?"	The SOW references the CDRLs required; however, dependent upon the Offeror's technical approach, the Government anticipates that there will be additional analysis/design artifacts generated.
20	1	SOW	26	3.2.3.5 Tech Dev and Insertion	This paragraph states, "The Contractor shall provide and support collaborative initiatives between PEO STRI- PM CONSIM and other organizations performing research and mature technologies that will benefit the PM CONSIM portfolio." What is meant by "provide" in this sentence? Also the placement of "mature" in this sentence is ambiguous. Does the Government intend for the LVC-IA EC contractor to support collaborative initiatives and then mature the provided technologies, or simply to accept already matured technologies/capabilities for incorporation into the LVC-IA EC baseline?	The Contractor shall identify, develop and integrate new technologies, as well as, support, mature and integrate research initiatives currently in development through collaborative initiatives between PEO STRI - PM ITE and other organizations that will benefit the PM ITE portfolio utilizing the PM ITE collaborative technology lab. SOW paragraph 3.2.3.5 has been updated. Additionally, a Live Synthetic Training, Test & Evaluation Infrastructure Architecture (LSTTE-IA) Information Paper will be provided thru the STRIBOP under a DA, once the final RFP is released.
21	1	SOW	29-30	3.2.6.1 RAM	Will the Government provide the "LVC-IA availability requirements" as part of the final RFP?	Availability is defined in paragraphs 6.1.3, 6.1.4, 6.2.4, 6.2.11, 6.3, 14.1.4, 14.5.3, 15.1.4 and 15.3.3 of the Capability Production Document (CPD) V1.03 dated Nov 14, 2012 that is contained within the TDP.

22	1	SOW	35	3.3.3 Tech Pubs	<p>a. Aside from the O&amp;M manual that the contractor is to design and develop, do the publications cited in paragraph "3.3.3 Technical Publications" already exist for the current system or do they need to be created under the new contract?</p> <p>b. Will the government provide Offerors with any of the existing technical publications for the system?</p>	<p>a. Yes, technical publications exist for the current system and they will need to be developed and/or updated for the new system.</p> <p>b. The Government will provide by request thru the STRIBOP under a Distribution Agreement (DA) the technical publications as identified within the TDP, once the final RFP is released.</p>
23	1	SOW	35-36	3.3.4 Item Unique ID (IUID)	<p>a. Have all embedded subassemblies, components and parts in the current system that require unique identification as outlined in paragraph "3.3.4 Item Unique Identification (IUID)" been determined in the existing contract?</p> <p>b. Have all subassemblies, components and parts in the current system been appropriately marked with both machine readable and human readable markings as specified in paragraph "3.3.4 Item Unique Identification (IUID)"?</p>	<p>a. Yes.</p> <p>b. Yes.</p>
24	1	SOW	37-38	3.3.6 & 3.3.8, Interim Contractor Support & Site Support	<p>Paragraph 3.3.6 Interim Contractor Support states "The Contractor shall provide interim contract support (ICS) services at each fielding location". Paragraph 3.3.8 Site Support states "The Contractor shall provide on-site support" and further specifies a period of three (3) months.</p> <p>a. What is the difference between the two tasks?</p> <p>b. Will the Government please identify and define the positions expected for each?</p>	<p>Interim Contractor Support (3.3.6) is assisting the operators at the Mission Training Complex (MTC) with phone, email, help desk support from the PDSS Lab.</p> <p>Site Support (3.3.8) is assisting the operators at the fielded MTC with in-person, over-the-shoulder support during exercise events. Site support has been changed to reflect 3 weeks of support per exercise with approximately 8 exercises per year.</p> <p>SOW paragraph 3.3.8 has been updated.</p>
25	1	SOW	38	3.4 Integrated Training	<p>Would the government provide approved existing government/program-owned test plan documents?</p>	<p>Yes, the current test plan will be provided by request thru the STRIBOP under a DA, once the final RFP is released.</p>

26	1	SOW	38	3.4 Integrated Training	Will the government provide the approved existing Test and Evaluation Master Plan (TEMP) for LVC-IA, preferably prior to the Final RFP?	Yes, the TEMP will be provided by request thru the STRIBOP under a DA, once the final RFP is released.
27	1	SOW	38, 44	3.3.10, 3.6.1 Transition Planning, PDSS	The transition period of 60 days includes the transition of ICS responsibilities, however, there is no mention of a PDSS transition. There will be time and effort required to pack, move, and reestablish the GFE from the current contractor's PDSS facility to the new contractor's facility. Additionally there MAY be a delay in the accreditation of the new contractor's PDSS facility based on the up to 1yr allowance for attaining this accreditation. Therefore can the Government please provide information on its intention for PDSS transition including: which contractor is responsible for packing and moving the equipment, where this activity should be priced, and the timeframe on when PDSS activities must be up and running?	The incumbent contractor will be responsible for packing and shipping the PDSS equipment. The intent is to have PDSS facility up and running at conclusion of the 60-day transition period. In the event the successful Offeror is unable to provide an accredited facility for operation and storage of existing classified PDSS equipment at contract award, the Government will provide space within the JDIF for storage of the classified equipment during the Contractor's PDSS facility accreditation. SOW paragraph 3.3.10 has been updated.
28	1	SOW	39-40	3.4.1 TRR	Paragraph 3.4.1 Test Readiness Review, under the list for documentation to be reviewed during the TRR, mentions "the test management system as required under the contract."  a. Is this statement referring to the Integrated Digital Environment described in paragraph 3.1.10?  b. Will the Government please clarify that test management is a requirement for the IDE?	a. Yes b. The intent is that the contractor must present documentary evidence at the TRR that the contractor, as part of the contract, has developed a test management system to allow storage/retrieval of the project's qualification tests and their results. SOW paragraph 3.4.1 has been updated.
29	1	SOW	40	3.4.2 SMP Event	Can the Government please define the composition of "a scaled down set of LVC-IA systems" in relation to the SMP event?	The intent is to test the LVC-IA as a system under the required maximum loads, and observe and measure the performance. The bottom line is to uncover any bottlenecks and provide mitigation. SOW paragraph 3.4.2 has been updated.

30	1	SOW	40	3.4.2 SMP Event	Are there any specific performance metrics associated with the SMP event?	The Government and the Contractor will collaborate to determine the performance metrics for the SMP. As a minimum, the SMP event shall collect the following metrics: resource usage (Memory, CPU, Disk I/O); distributed operations remote sites network traffic; latency of conversion through each gateway; core systems interactions under required maximum loads. SOW paragraph 3.4.2 has been updated.																								
31	1	SOW	43	3.5.2 Installation Spares	Can the government please provide the list of spares for V1 and proposed list of V2 spares? Would this equipment be listed as GFE under the new contract?	The Spares Lists are included in CDRL C002, and included in the TDP. Spares available at completion of the current effort will be included as GFE to the successful Offeror.																								
32	1	SOW	44	3.6.1.1 Help Desk Support	Could the government please provide statistics regarding the number of annual incidents and severity addressed by the Help Desk team?	<p>The following table contains the number of Help Desk Issues by year and priority level:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Urgent</th> <th>High</th> <th>Medium</th> <th>Low</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2013</td> <td>0</td> <td>4</td> <td>37</td> <td>4</td> <td>45</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2014</td> <td>15</td> <td>32</td> <td>103</td> <td>4</td> <td>154</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2015 (YTD)</td> <td>4</td> <td>1</td> <td>39</td> <td>0</td> <td>44</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The transition from CY2013 to CY2014 includes additional sites that were fielded and growth in the number of training exercises.</p>	Year	Urgent	High	Medium	Low	Total	2013	0	4	37	4	45	2014	15	32	103	4	154	2015 (YTD)	4	1	39	0	44
Year	Urgent	High	Medium	Low	Total																									
2013	0	4	37	4	45																									
2014	15	32	103	4	154																									
2015 (YTD)	4	1	39	0	44																									
33	1	SOW	47	3.6.1.4 Maint/Oper Upgrade & Tech Refresh Training	Where must the annual Upgrade Training & Technical Refresh course facilitation/training take place? Customer site, Contractor site, deployed sites?	The Government anticipates this training to take place at the Contractor's PDSS facility. SOW paragraph 3.6.1.4 has been updated.																								
34	1a	WBS/Dictionary	5 of 8	1.4.2	Would the government provide existing government/program-owned test documentation / test procedures that supports prior and current Integration Events, Functional Verification Test, System Measurement Performance, and Government Acceptance Test activities.	Yes. Test Plans and Test Procedures will be provided by request thru the STRIBOP under a DA, once the final RFP is released.																								

35	1c	Version 1-4 Rqmts Matrix	4	APA 1, CPD Objective, V4 Capability	Requirement - <i>“Provide conduit/translation capability to transmit mission command scenario graphics and Initial Force Plan Data from LVC systems to C2 systems with the additional capability to transmit Geospatial: Terrain and Weather, etc. and the ability to Transmit/Receive Force Plan /Re-task Organization Data to C2 Systems from LVC systems to C2 Systems in real time while maintain 95% data packet accuracy during transfer (O).”</i> Please clarify this requirement. Please clarify this requirement	This is an APA “Objective” requirement for V4. As such it is a desired end state for the LVC-IA system.
36	2	Proposal Submission Instructions & Evaluation Criteria	Tab 1	Rows 16-29, Submission Requirements	How many paper copies of each volume are required?	The Government anticipates an original plus 3 paper copies. Final RFP Proposal Submission Instruction & Evaluation Criteria, Tab 1 will be updated.
37	2	Proposal Submission Instructions & Evaluation Criteria	Tab 1	Rows 16-29, Submission Requirements	How many electronic copies of each volume are required?	The Government anticipates 2 electronic copies total. Final RFP Proposal Submission Instruction & Evaluation Criteria, Tab 1 will be updated.
38	2	Proposal Submission Instructions & Evaluation Criteria	Tab 1	Row 29, Submission Requirements	Does the Compliance Matrix count toward the Technical Volume page count?	No; the compliance matrix has been removed.
39	2	Proposal Submission Instructions & Evaluation Criteria	Tabs 1 and 2	Row 29, Submission Requirements	Is it the Government's intent that Offeror's complete both the Proposal Matrix, and the LVC-IA EC RFP Compliance Matrix provided as Enclosure 8 and include both in the proposal?	No; the compliance matrix has been removed and the proposal matrix will be updated to include a column for WBS element. Final RFP Proposal Submission Instruction & Evaluation Criteria, Tab 2 will be updated.
40	2	Proposal Submission Instructions & Evaluation Criteria	Tab 2	Row 3, Oral Presentations	a. If oral presentations are not going to be evaluated, what bearing do they have on the source selection process?  b. Does the fact that oral presentations are not being evaluated mean neither a poor presentation nor an excellent presentation will have any impact on the	Oral presentations will not be separately evaluated but will be included in the evaluation of the appropriate volume they support. Final RFP Proposal Submission Instruction & Evaluation Criteria, Tab 2 will be updated.

					competition or influence over the source selection process?	
41	2	Proposal Submission Instructions & Evaluation Criteria	Tab 2	Row 3, Oral Presentations	<p>In the first sentence of this section it states "The intent of the oral presentation is to supplement the technical portion (Volumes I, II, and III) of the written proposals. Identification of the corresponding Factor and Sub-factor on each slide will assist the Government during evaluations." This seems to contradict the government's statement in the last sentence of this section that says "Oral presentations will not be evaluated".</p> <p>a. Please clarify how the Oral presentation and Oral presentation material / slides will be factored into the Government's overall evaluation of Offeror's proposals.</p> <p>b. If oral presentations are not being evaluated, how does "the identification of the Factor and Subfactor on each slide" assist the government's evaluation efforts?</p>	See response to question 40.
42	2	Proposal Submission Instructions & Evaluation Criteria	Tab 2	Row 3, Oral Presentations	<p>Other than stating that "The intent of the oral presentation is to supplement the technical portion (Volumes I, II, and III) of the written proposals" the Government is not clear on the types of information required to be presented orally.</p> <p>a. Please clarify the types of information the Government requires for oral presentations associated with Volumes I, II, and III of the technical proposal.</p> <p>b. If the oral presentation slides are meant to supplement the technical portion of the Offeror's proposal, does this mean there should be no slide content that repeats what is in the technical proposal?</p>	See response to question 40. The Oral Presentation is the Offeror's opportunity to support and emphasize the non-cost portions of the technical proposal, at the Offeror's discretion.

43	2	Proposal Submission Instructions & Evaluation Criteria	Tab 2	Row 3, Oral Presentations	The Government instructs that the Offeror's proposal and oral presentation slides must be delivered by the due date. Did the Government consider the demand this places on small businesses with developing both written proposal volumes and oral presentations simultaneously? Recommend a due date for oral presentation slides 2 weeks after written proposals are due.	The Oral Presentation slides are due with the written proposal.
44	2	Proposal Submission Instructions & Evaluation Criteria	Tab 2	Row 3, Oral Presentations	It is understood that the Government intends to make an award without discussions and intends to conduct oral presentations without discussions or exchanges. We suggest that the Government would gain significant benefit from allowing an exchange of information, at a minimum for asking "Clarification" type questions of Offeror's during the oral presentation process. We recommend the government allow 90 minutes for Offeror Oral Presentations, and allow up to 30 minutes for Government clarifications on the Offeror's proposals.	No discussions or clarifications will be permitted, or occur, during Oral Presentations.
45	2	Proposal Submission Instructions & Evaluation Criteria	Tab 2	Row 3, Oral Presentations	Where should Offeror's include the list of Oral Presentation Attendees? Is this list to be included in our Slides, on a separate page in the Administrative Volume, or in a standalone document emailed to the COR/KO separate from proposal submission?	The Offeror's List of Oral Presentation Attendees should be included as part of the Administrative Volume V. Final RFP Proposal Submission Instruction & Evaluation Criteria, Tab 2 will be updated.
46	2	Proposal Submission Instructions & Evaluation Criteria	Tab 2	Row 10, Factor 1, Sub-factor 1a	What are any remaining acceptance activities and program schedule that we would have to assume under the new contract with regard to LVC-IA V2.x development, test and deployment?	With regard to LVC-IA V2.x, the successful Offeror will be responsible for the fielding of LVC-IA v2 capability and the PDSS support of both v1 and v2 as it is fielded.
47	2	Proposal Submission Instructions & Evaluation Criteria	Tab 2	Row 10, Factor 1, Sub-factor 1a	References SOW paragraph 3.1.11 ANTITERRORISM (AT)/OPERATIONS SECURITY (OPSEC). Would this requirement be more appropriately addressed in Factor 2, Sub-Factor b - Information Assurance/OPSEC?	The requirement is more appropriately addressed in Factor 2, Sub-Factor 2b- Cyber Security/OPSEC. Final RFP Proposal Submission Instruction & Evaluation Criteria, Tab 2 will be updated.

48	2	Proposal Submission Instructions & Evaluation Criteria	Tab 2	Row 10, Factor 1, Sub-factor 1a	References SOW paragraph 3.3.5 Training Products. Would this requirement be more appropriately addressed in Factor 3, Sub-Factor b – Logistics?	The requirement is addressed in Factor 3, Sub-Factor 3b-Logistics and removed from Row 10, Factor 1, Sub-Factor 1a. Final RFP Proposal Submission Instruction & Evaluation Criteria, Tab 2 will be updated.
49	2	Proposal Submission Instructions & Evaluation Criteria	Tab 2	Row 10, Factor 1, Sub-factor 1a	References SOW paragraph 3.6 System Technical Support. Would this requirement be more appropriately addressed in Factor 3, Sub-Factor a or b?	The requirement for Technical Support from the PDSS is addressed in Factor 3, Sub-Factor 3a- PDSS Implementation referencing 3.6.1, however, from a Program Management perspective of use of resources 3.6 will be addressed in Row 10, Factor 1, Sub-Factor 1a.
50	2	Proposal Submission Instructions & Evaluation Criteria	Tab 2	Rows 10-11 Factor 1, Sub-factors 1a & 1b	Instructions reference SOW section 3.2.5 for both sub-factors. Suggest PWS section 3.2.5 is most appropriate for Sub-factor b and should be removed as a reference for Sub-factor a.	There is no reference to section 3.2.5 in Rows 10-11 Factor 1, Sub-factors 1a and 1b.
51	2	Proposal Submission Instructions & Evaluation Criteria	Tab 2	Row 11, Factor 1, Sub-factor 1b	According to the SSN announcement on STRIBOP, the approximate contract value is \$49M. Since this does not cross the \$50M threshold for requiring EVMS, why is the Government requiring EVMS?	<p>The threshold for a DCMA formally validated Earned Value Management System (EVMS) is \$50M; however for efforts over \$20 million but less than \$50 million an EVM implementation compliant with ANSI/EIA-748 is required.</p> <p>The \$49M amount is only an estimate and does not reflect the actual cost of the Offeror’s proposal. SOW paragraph 3.1.4 has been updated.</p>
52	2	Proposal Submission Instructions & Evaluation Criteria	Tab 2	Row 11, Factor 1, Sub-factor 1b	Is there a post-award time period within which a successful Offeror must have their EVMS system validated by DCAA?	<p>The Contractor shall implement an EVMS in accordance with DFARS 234.201. Dependent upon the contract price, for efforts over \$50M, IAW with DCMA Instruction 208 policy, the Validation Review (VR) must be completed within 12-16 months from time of award.</p> <p>DCMA Instruction 208 (EVMS compliance) states:          - There is an Initial Visit (IV) process that must be executed within 3-6 months after contract award.          - The Validation Review (VR) must be completed within 12-16 months from time of award.</p> <p>SOW paragraph 3.1.4 has been updated.</p>

53	2	Proposal Submission Instructions & Evaluation Criteria	Tab 2	Row 18, Factor 2, Sub-factor 2a	Would the Government provide specific version numbers of the LVC-IA software baseline and associated interface software versions to Live, Virtual, and Constructive simulation? What are the third party COTS/GOTS used in LVC-IA? What are the anticipated versions for these capabilities when LVC-IA V2.x is fielded? Would the government provide an architecture diagram of V1 and V2?	Software Version Document (SVD), GFE list and System/Subsystem Design Description (SSDD) provided by request thru the STRIBOP under a DA, once the final RFP is released.
54	2	Proposal Submission Instructions & Evaluation Criteria	Tab 2	Rows 18-19, Factor 2, Sub-factors 2a & 2b	Both reference SOW paragraph 3.2.5. Would this requirement be more appropriately addressed in Factor 2, Sub-Factor b - Information Assurance/OPSEC?	The requirement is more appropriately addressed in Factor 2, Sub-Factor 2b- Cyber Security/OPSEC. Final RFP Proposal Submission Instruction & Evaluation Criteria, Tab 2 has been updated.
55	2	Proposal Submission Instructions & Evaluation Criteria	Tab 2	Row 20, Factor 2, Sub-factor 2c	We understand the Offeror will need to allocate resources to support required test events. Since resource requirements can vary widely from one event to another, in order to address the question of how many test events and duration for each event in support of these test activities, will the Government provide a specific Use Case as a reference?	A specific use case will not be provided as each test event is different. The culminating Government test events (GAT and FUA) are defined within SOW paragraph 3.4. Additional test events to support and validate the successful execution of GAT and FUA are dependent upon the Contractor's technical approach. Refer to the schedule for the Government required test event anticipated durations.
56	2	Proposal Submission Instructions & Evaluation Criteria	Tab 2	Row 38, Factor 4	If DCAA has not yet issued an FPRA or FPRR for the Offeror's current fiscal year, will a Forward Pricing Rate Proposal (FPRP) be acceptable?	If there is no FPRA or FPRR, two years of historical information shall be provided in accordance with the instructions in Factor 4.
57	2	Proposal Submission Instructions & Evaluation Criteria	Tab 2	Row 40, Factor 4	As a Task Order under the STOC II ID/IQ contract, Labor Categories, and Labor Category Descriptions were established by the Government for STOC II for performance on Task Orders under the ID/IQ contract, with associated Direct Labor rates awarded as part of STOC II ID/IQ prime contractors proposals. Is it the Government's intent to evaluate and potentially accept other Offeror identified, and defined LCATS and proposed direct rates outside of the STOC II ID/IQ contract for the LVC-IA Task Order?	Yes, the labor rates in the STOCII ID/IQ are for T&M labor categories. No T&M efforts are anticipated under this delivery order. The Offeror should propose the labor categories appropriate for their proposed solution.

58	2	Proposal Submission Instructions & Evaluation Criteria	Tab 2	Rows 53-56, Basis of Evaluation & Award	<p>The draft solicitation defines the Program Management Factor (Factor I) as individually More Important than the remaining factors of Technical Approach (Factor II), Supportability Approach (Factor III) and Cost/Price (Factor IV). While program management is still an important factor to the LVC-IA program, as a very technical and complex development program, technical approach technical solutions and integration and testing are increasingly more important to developing and fielding successful programs of this complex nature to the Warfighter and requiring activity community. The Technical Factor and Offeror proposed solutions encompasses the work required to successfully and efficiently deliver the task areas for LVC-IA. Additionally, as a Task Order under an awarded STOC II ID/IQ contract, the Offeror's Management and Risk approach processes were part of the evaluation for IDIQ award. The current relative order of importance approach for evaluation of Program Management as more important than Technical, may not allow for significant differentiation of the Offeror's Technical approach and solutions to the overall success of the program. As a result the less differentiation between of the non-cost factors of Management over Technical may ultimately increase the importance of cost in the government's evaluation, leading Offerors to make significant assumptions to allow them to deliver the low cost bid. Would the government consider elevating Technical to the most important Factor, as individually more important than Program Management; and Program Management as more important than Supportability; and Supportability as more important than Cost?</p>	<p>LVC-IA is a technically established program; therefore, management of multiple baselines, version fieldings, PDSS activities, exercise support, test events and changing requirements due to integration of multiple core systems, is considered most critical to the successful execution of the program.</p>
----	---	--	-------	---	---	---