



NUWCDIVNPT SeaPort-e Council Meeting

May 28, 2014



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q1: Should we escalate labor rates in OY's when bidding on cost reimbursable contracts subject to a SCA Wage Determination (WD)? If so, what approach should be taken given the fact that the WDs are typically revised every other year? Should the escalation rate be based upon the Employment Cost Index (ECI) developed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, since it is the basis for revisions made to the WDs?**
- **A1: The Government cannot specify how offerors propose escalation in response to a requirement. In a competitive requirement, the Government considers the proposed escalation amount, the max escalation percentage agreed to under the MAC, and the published Global Insight Escalation Rate when performing cost realism analysis for all labor.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q2: What approach should be taken if the work proposed in the Solicitation has been subject to a WD in prior years, but a WD has not been attached to the Solicitation?**
- **A2: As early as the Advance Notice, the Government identifies whether the Service Contract Act is applicable to a requirement. If Industry believes SCA is applicable and/or a WD is missing from the Request for Proposal, it should be brought to the attention of the Contract Negotiator and Contracting Officer.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q3: Doesn't the SCA apply to "service employees" under a "service contract" even if a WD is not attached to the Solicitation?**
- **A3: No SCA does not apply unless Wage Determination and Clauses are part of the solicitation. However, if overall percentage of SCA labor proposed is greater than 20%, then SCA applies. If overall percentage of SCA labor proposed is less than 20%, then it does not apply.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q4: Why do solicitations continue to require a questionnaire for past performance submittals? Our customers HATE to fill them out – especially when they have spent a lot of time documenting performance in CPARS. Recommend questionnaires be required only if CPARS don't exist or aren't up-to-date.**
- **A4: NUWC Division Newport does not include questionnaires as part of our RFPs. Section L requires offerors to include Point of Contact information for the past performance references so that the Government can reach out to those individuals if necessary (e.g. no CPARS information available).**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q5: Does the contracting office monitor the execution of SB plans that are required of large businesses in their proposals? If so, what are the repercussions if the plan is not being met? Many times we have been bid as a subcontractor (VOSB) and received no work after contract award – or the work is different from how we bid (e.g. we bid a SME and receive admin work).**
- **A5: Small Business Subcontracting Plans are a FAR requirement that are evaluated at the time of award by DCMA, the Contracting Officer, and the Small Business Advocate in coordination with SBA. During performance, large businesses report on performance annually at the MAC level, which is the responsibility of the MAC Contracting Officer for review.**
- **Our contract is with the prime and we do not have privity with a subcontractor small or large.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q6: For many performance based contracts, a breakdown of labor categories and hours for task orders is no longer being provided by the government – instead allowing bidders to provide their proposal for the labor mix. This gives a tremendous advantage to the incumbents as any change to the status quo will require approval / buy-in from the program office – and most people are adverse to change.**
- **A6: NUWC Division Newport's performance based approach is for industry to tell us how they are going to accomplish the work and the required mix to do so. Technical Evaluation teams are required to evaluate whether the offeror can perform the tasking based on the proposal submitted and not evaluate it against what has been done in the past.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q6 Continued:** We have been in situations where the program office has insisted on an engineer for a position, however, once the engineer is in place, he / she is not doing engineering work (making it very difficult to retain that person). In trying to find a replacement for the engineer, the program office again insists on an engineer to fill the position – and we find ourselves in a revolving door situation. The point being that the program office may not be willing to look favorably at an alternative make-up of personnel.
 - Recommend going back to the government providing a breakout of labor categories and hours for task orders.
- **A6 Continued:** The specifics of this situation should be brought to the attention of the Contracting Officer. A Program Office should not be “insisting” anything pre or post award.



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q7: The Navy has been migrating to 3-year service contracts (base + 2 option years) from 5-year contracts (base + 4 option years). The contracting offices were already having problems trying to keep up with the 5-year cycle – what changes has Navy contracting community done to support the 3-year cycle?**
 - Has the 3-year cycle resulted in increased competition?
 - 3-year cycles can add risk to contractors trying to break into new areas as most commercial office space requires a 5-year lease.....or a 3-year lease comes at a premium (which inhibits competition).
- **A7: NMCARS Change 13-02 removed the three year limitation on Knowledge-Based Services. NUWCDIVNPT is seeing more competition even with 3-year solicitations.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q8: At the recently held Code 34 EW Pre Solicitation conference it was announced that OCOI applies to all of the 4 RFPs that are expected to be released including both the Design/Development and the In-Service Support task orders. Also, NUWC recently indicated that OCOI clause HQ C-2-0037 ORGANIZATIONAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST (NAVSEA) (JUL 2000) would be included in solicitation N00024-14-R-3303 that was recently advertised. Would the government define what criteria are being used for including clause HQ C-2-0037 in NUWC task order RFPs?**
- **A8: Utilizing FAR 9.5, the Government evaluates the need for inclusion of HQ C-2-0037 based on the scope and tasking of the anticipated work. Section M of NUWC Division RFPs allows offerors the ability to identify any OCOI's and propose a satisfactory mitigation plan to that conflict(s).**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q8 Continued: A broad application of the HQ C-2-0037 is often not applicable to the work defined and unnecessarily limits competition due to the possibility that companies will be excluded from existing or future work associated with these systems. Specifically, subparagraph (e), highlighted below, is overly restrictive. It prohibits a contractor from providing to the government any systems, components or services that are the “subject of the work” to be performed. In the broadest interpretation of that language the contractor would be precluded from selling any system, component or service which is mentioned in the solicitation/contract to the government regardless of the fact that the work being performed in relation to that system would create an OCI. In fact the preclusion from future work would extend to all systems mentioned in the contract even if no work was ever performed on that system.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q8 Continued: We do not believe this is the government's intent, nor in the best interest of competition, and as a result we ask that NUWC consider alternatives to this clause. A modified version of HQ-C-2-0037 that has been utilized in other competitive RFP is provided for reference. Please consider utilizing the modified version of HQ-C-2-0037 and provide clarification of the need for an OCOI clause in NUWC task orders**
- **A8: Code 59 is looking into whether this is possible.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q9: When a small business responds to a Sources Sought, and the Government cancels the request indicating that they received 'no acceptable offers,' why shouldn't the respondent be afforded the courtesy of a debrief?**
- **A9: Sources Sought are not cancelled, nor are they considered "offers". If we do not receive responses that give us confidence that there will be viable small business competition, we will compete the tasking identified in the Sources Sought on an Unrestricted basis. Small businesses are still eligible and encouraged to participate.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q9 Continued:** The rationale provided that a debrief would not be provided because the RFQ did not end up with an award and cannot offer a debrief as it is not fair to other bidders is confusing. As a small business, with limited B&P resources it is important for us to understand why our offer was unacceptable and the areas found to be deficient by the Government review team.
- **A9 Continued:** The analysis of a Sources Sought response is an expedited internal pass/fail review to fairly validate if we will likely get viable small business competition, not a detailed tech evaluation to determine if an offer is acceptable. As a result, we cannot hold negotiations, debriefings or discussions related to a sources sought response.



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q9 Continued:** Additionally, rolling this requirement into another solicitation may preclude original bidders from pursuing the opportunity as the 'new' requirements may be beyond the scope of the small business concern.
- **A9 Continued:** NUWC Division Newport is not aware of any Sources Sought that have been rolled into another solicitation/"new" requirement, nor is this our intent. The end result of a Sources Sought analysis is either the tasking is set-aside for small business, or it is not.



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q10: Contractors make a significant investment in time and effort in identifying the most cost effective personnel mix to satisfy an RFPs requirements. Some recent awards seem to indicate the Government is not conducting “cost realism analysis” of the rates submitted for labor categories based on the geographic area they are to perform in; specifically as it relates to non-SCA labor rates. The Rhode Island Department of Labor & Training Labor Market Information provides a data source which could readily be referred to for a variety of these rates.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q10 Continued: Additionally, NUWCDIVNPT collects significant rate data by labor category through the financial reports NUWCDIVNPT contractors are required to perform. Unlike a large business, small businesses do not have the financial means to manipulate their cost proposals as our cost are so closely tied to our actual cost to operate. Request the Government provide clarification on how cost proposals are evaluated in terms of qualifying the rates proposed by each proposal.**
- **A10: Cost realism is performed in accordance with FAR 15.4. Each proposal/solicitation is unique in terms of circumstances for analysis. However, we do utilize various sources of information including: DCMA, DCAA, payroll journals, NUWC database labor rates and Wage Determinations.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q11: Several recent contract awards have been made which, from a technical perspective, appear to be at unrealistically low prices. Aside from simply reviewing the labor matrix and verifying that the labor mix is realistic, what is the technical code's role in determining whether the labor rates for the bid hours are also realistic?**
- **A11: The Technical Code reviews labor matrix (categories and hours proposed). It does not play a role in determining if rates proposed are fair and reasonable. NUWC Division Cost Price Analyst documents the realism of proposed price and costs as well as the basis thereto.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q12: Is there a percentage below the Independent Government Cost Estimate at which a bid will be subjected to additional scrutiny to determine if it is unrealistically low?**
- **A12: The IGCE is the Government's estimate of the approximate price/cost of a requirement. It is prepared based on knowledge and expertise of the requirement as well as historical information from previous procurements.**
- **Every offer is evaluated on its technical merit and the costs associated with the offer.**
- **Differences between IGCE and the offers are reviewed to determine why differences exist. Results of review can vary such as requiring negotiations to ensure understanding.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q13: After the technical code completes their technical evaluation of proposals, are they included in any further manner in determining who the winning company is?**
- **A13: Yes, the Technical Evaluation Chairperson writes a Source Selection Recommendation Document and submits it for consideration to the Source Selection Authority (SSA), however authority to make the final decision lies with the SSA.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q14: Contracts at NUWC are bid using a fee rate, but they are later awarded with a fee per hour based upon the total amount of fee bid and the total number of hours. As contract extensions become more and more prevalent, it is becoming difficult to fully utilize ceiling available because contractors have either exceeded the average bid rate or performed at lower than the average bid rate – it is nearly impossible to hit the bid rate right on the nail. This make contract adjustments made on a “percentage bid” basis difficult to match up with what has been billed. The result is that contractors may be left with cost ceiling or fee ceiling that can’t be fully utilized. Has NUWC Newport ever considered awarding contracts on a CPFF basis where the fee is the percentage bid instead of the effective fee per hour?**
- **A14: NUWC looks at the benefits of each (fee per hour vs. fee percentage). NUWC historically has determined using a fee rate by hour structure is the preferable method.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q15: The completion of a GPAT is a requirement found in many of the recently-released SeaPort-e solicitations. Oftentimes, the GPAT is not uploaded to SeaPort with the rest of the solicitation documentation. Upon contacting the GSA Government-Wide Section 508 Program Director, we were informed that the Government purchaser generates a GPAT form, the GPAT is attached to the solicitation, and the vendor then fills out the marked sections. Are offerors required to generate their own GPAT forms, or will GPAT forms be generated by the Government purchaser for offerors to complete?**
- **A15: Code 59 is reviewing this process. For solicitations that require the vendor to generate, if you cannot, you need to bring this to the attention of the Contracting Officer.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q16: Recent solicitations have indicated that the award will be based on “best value.” However, after award/receipt of the debrief by a unsuccessful bidder, the procuring contracting officer indicates in the debrief that the bidders weren’t ranked nor is there any justification provided as to why an obviously more qualified bidder wasn’t selected. Lowest cost appears to be the actual basis for the award. Therefore, despite the solicitation indicating the award will be determined by best value, the actual award appears to have been based on “lowest cost, technically acceptable.” How does the government respond? How can the government reconcile the change in the evaluation criteria without amending the solicitation and providing an opportunity for the bidder to respond?**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **A16: The Government did not change the evaluation criteria. The SSA is responsible for independently determining whether non-cost advantages are worth the cost/price that might be associated with a higher rated proposal. The decisive element is not the difference in ratings, but the SSA's rational judgment of the significance of that difference, based on an integrated comparative assessment of proposals. The SSA's decision considers what benefits or advantages the Government is getting for the added cost/price and why it is in the Government's interest to expend the additional funds.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q17: What is the criteria for cost realism? How is it applied? Is the analysis reviewed by another qualified contract person to ensure accuracy, consistency, impartiality and validity? Is the analysis documented in the contract file? Are bidder historical costs (prior track record) reviewed and used in the analysis? Wouldn't a better practice include reviewing the bidder's actual prior cost performance vis-à-vis their bid price on that solicitation and providing the bidder with the opportunity, prior to award, to respond to the cost realism analysis pertaining to that bidder**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **A17: Cost realism analysis is conducted in accordance with FAR 15 and the information contained in the solicitation. All cost realism analysis is reviewed by the Contracting Officer and further validated by a Contract Review Board to ensure accuracy, consistency and impartiality. The documented analysis is always maintained in the contract file. Offeror's information along with DCAA/DCMA information (which often includes historical information) are considered when performing cost realism analysis. Any discrepancies between what is proposed and the cost realism analysis performed is always documented . If award cannot be made on initial offers, any discrepancies noted are addressed with the offeror(s) during discussions.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q18: Recent information indicates that a task order COR provides the annual CPAR rating to his/her supervisory chain of command for review and approval prior to formal submission. While it is understandable and expected that the COR will obtain input from personnel receiving services from the vendor, shouldn't the COR's CPARS assessment be independent and free of the appearance of or actual influence from his/her chain of command? The practice, as it stands, essentially makes the personnel in the chain of command the de facto CPARS evaluators, not the COR who may be just rubber stamping what his/her chain of command wants. Wouldn't a better practice be for the COR to obtain and evaluate input but be prohibited from sharing the actual CPARS rating with his/her chain of command?**



Industry Questions and Answers

- A18: NUWCDIVNPT documentation and guidance all indicate the COR is the CPARS evaluator as this is a function delegated, on a non-delegated basis. The COR may request input from other Government personnel involved in the performance of the contract or receipt of the deliverables in order to provide accurate assessments. In addition, each CPAR is reviewed by the Reviewing Official to ensure documentation included in the CPAR supports the ratings assigned. NUWCDIVNPT is not aware of any COR that is required to report to his supervisory chain for their review and approval CPAR submissions. Request you contact the Contracting Officer with the specifics of this concern, so it can be addressed properly.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q19: In a recent RFP, the Past Performance requirements stated "The Offeror shall provide three (3) past performance references". Subsequently, in the same RFP under the Past Performance evaluation criteria it stated "In the case of an Offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the Offeror will not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably on past performance." The two statements appear to be in direct conflict with each other. The 'legal' understanding of the term "shall" indicates this requirement must be met without exception.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q19 Continued: Additionally, how does the Government determine that having no applicable past performance is not “unfavorable?” Not having any demonstrated Past Performance, or deciding not to provide any that may be rated unfavorably would imply the offeror really has no previous qualifying work with which the Government can use to evaluate them against the other offerors. History dictates, and recent discussions with various contracting entities indicates this would be less than acceptable and introduce unnecessary risk to the Government. Please clarify.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **A19: If an offeror does not have any past performance, it needs to indicate this in its response. That way the Government is aware that the vendor acknowledges the requirement . The Government will also attempt to find any recent and relevant information should an offeror not provide any. However if no information is provided or available, the Government will assign an Unknown Confidence (Neutral) rating for Past Performance. In accordance with FAR 15.305, in the case of an offeror without a record of relevant past performance or for whom information on past performance is not available, the offeror may not be evaluated favorably or unfavorably.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q20: One of the tripwires related to labor rates and performance states "The COR will monitor monthly actual average spend rates compared to bid rate averages. Any variation of actual-to-bid rate averages greater than 10% requires notification via email, or other appropriate written communication, to the PCO, Program Manager (or equivalent requirements holder) and the cognizant SEA 02 Branch Head/Field Activity Chief of the Contracting Office. Averages greater than 15% for more than three consecutive months will be elevated to the PEO/Directorate Head/Field Activity CO/TD. The COR will also document this in the applicable monthly report."**
 - **Are NUWC CORs doing this analysis/reporting? What are they using for the basis of their reporting, if for example a contract is not fully funded? Is the analysis based on the labor categories that are funded? If this gets reported are contractors notified and/or required to do anything?**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **A20: Yes, NUWC CORs are doing this analysis. CORs use the reports submitted in ECRAFT and compare those to the offeror's proposed fully burdened labor rates contained in its proposal.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q21: Can you provide an overview of the changes that were made in the June 2013 update to this memo? (NAVSEA HEAD OF THE CONTRACTING ACTIVITY (HCA) SERVICES CONTRACTING TRIPWIRES, POLICY MEMORANDUM (Rev 2) dated 13 JUL 13) This memo has been cited by NUWC contracts during contract discussions and when we asked for a copy for reference we were told it was an internal document and could not be provided. The information would be helpful in ensuring we comply with the tripwires.**
- **A21: Revised to delete the “\$260K/year” labor rate standard and redefined the tripwire as “proposed fully burdened average labor rates in excess of \$156/hour in any labor category”.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q22: NUWC has been trying to decrease the amount of Seaport- e “single offeror” solicitations/task orders. NUWC has stated that they have converted 7 of 10 “single offeror” task orders to “competitive” task orders.**
- **Of these 7 task orders how many were awarded to incumbent contractors?**
A22: 4 to incumbent, 2 to non-incumbent, 1 awaiting award
- **Of these 7 task orders how many resulted in receiving at least 2 “technically acceptable” proposals?**
A22: All 7



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q23: NUWC has been conducting Pre-solicitation conferences for Seaport-e task orders. Unfortunately, the information presented during these conferences have been negligible. How does NUWC plan on improving these conferences? Has NUWC considered draft SOWs, draft Section L, draft technical evaluation criteria or one-on-one meetings with offerors (FAR 15.201)? Has NUWC considered presenting what a typical work week would be for the incumbent contractor under the subject task order that includes task descriptions, level of effort, material, travel, etc.**
- **A23: The desired result of these conferences is increased competition, and increased awareness of upcoming opportunities, which we are achieving. We are interested in improving these conferences, and have already implemented some of these recommendations**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **A23 Continued:**
- **“Draft SOW”:** we do provide an overview of the technical tasking. For re-competes, the previous SOW is on the SeaPort-e Portal. For new procurements, we are starting to release **DRAFT SOW’s**
- **“One-on-One Meetings”:** there is simply not enough time to for this. It would be logistically unmanageable for us and attendees (30 companies x 15 minutes each = 7.5 hours)
 - There is time provided for group Q&A during the presentation
 - This would also create a disadvantage for the companies that did not attend



Industry Questions and Answers

- **A23 Continued:**
- **“Typical work week”:** material, travel, task descriptions are already discussed. In some cases, we have started to include historical information, for example how many Shipalts are conducted yearly. We will continue this practice where we can.
 - In addition, we are providing Facility Tours
- The biggest recommendation we have is for attendees to ask numerous and meaningful questions during the group Q&A, or via the SeaPort-e Portal.



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q24: NUWC has increased the amount of “Sources Sought” FedBizzOpps announcements. During the recent Code 34 Industry Day NUWC stated they were disappointed with the results of these announcements; specifically very few contractors responded to these announcements. Why is there a lack of response from contractors? How does NUWC intend to improve these “Sources Sought” announcements?**
- **A24: There is no lack of responses to our Sources Sought. This includes the four Code 34 TO’s**
 - **The Tech Code was disappointed that our analysis of the submitted Sources Sought did not give us confidence that we would get viable small business competition. This is the exact purpose of a Sources Sought.**
 - **NUWC has a process in place for continuous improvement as weaknesses or opportunities are identified.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q25: Every year NAVSEA issues a Solicitation during the Seaport-e Rolling Admissions. In the past this Solicitation has stated that successful offerors cannot receive cost reimbursement task orders unless the offeror has an Approved Accounting System. The Solicitation further states that the Government will initiate requests for accounting system reviews for any successful Seaport-e offeror that does not currently have an approved system. Will you explain this process and how NUWC will be involved with NAVSEA to facilitate this approval process for local Seaport-e contractors?**
- **A25: NUWCDIVNPT will not be directly involved in rolling admissions with Dahlgren. NUWC's involvement with request for accounting system reviews begins upon task order RFP close when a proposal is received. A pre-award survey is one method we use.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q26: Best Value Determinations - NAVSEA approval is required prior to NUWC awarding Best Value contracts/task orders above a certain percentage from the low offeror's cost/price. At what percentage increase does NUWC require NAVSEA approval? Is this NAVSEA approval for all Best Value contracts/task orders or is there a monetary threshold? If so what is this monetary threshold?**
- **A26: All awards greater than \$10M with a premium of 10% or greater require higher level review.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q27: All the solicitations on FedBizOpps has an “interested vendors list”. By adding its name to this list, offerors are able to track a particular solicitation. Also, offerors can access this list for many other purposes including identifying prime/subcontracting opportunities. Will NUWC contact the cognizant NAVSEA agency to add this “interested vendor list” option to the Seaport-e portal?**
- **A27: NUWCDIVNPT will pass along this request at the next quarterly Seaport-e governance meeting for their consideration.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q28: Do all de-briefs follow the same format and content to ensure consistency?**
- **A28: Yes, NUWCDIVNPT follows FAR 15.505 and 15.506.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q29: Based on recent awards it appears that past performance is not relevant in the evaluation process. Please discuss the relevance of past performance and how they are viewed.**
- **A29: Past Performance is relevant. Past performance information is one indicator of an offeror's ability to perform the contract successfully. The currency and relevance of the information, source of the information, context of the data, and general trends in contractor's performance shall be considered.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q30: We were informed that DFAS will no longer allow payment instructions that are in line with the tracking of costs by SLIN/ACRN. To support this information one of our contracts was modified changing the note to the payment office to DFARS PGI 204-7108-(d)(2) DFARS 252-204-0002 Line Item Specific: Sequential ACRN Order (SEP 2009) which allows DFAS to disburse funds sequentially instead of based on how we invoice. This is leading to payments being delayed and Government financial personnel being unable to match the ERP system to eCRAFT. Will this change be seen across all seaport contracts? And if so how are contractors to handle the effects of this change?**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **A30: Yes, Seaport Task Orders will be modified if they have not been already. While NUWCDIVNPT requires sufficient information be provided down to the lowest level, DFAS systems are not able to accommodate this. Code 59 acknowledges the impacts and is actively working on policy improvements to reduce the administrative impact of payment delays and system reporting issues.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q31: A proposal that has an extremely low price may be reflected as being an inferior technical proposal due to the offeror not proposing labor categories with the required skillset to successfully perform the task order. Does the Government consider this risk and if so, who makes the determination as to whether the proposal is acceptable?**
- **A31: The Technical Evaluation Panel (TEP) is responsible for evaluating the labor category matrix to ensure the proposed labor categories and associated hours for each are appropriate for successful performance. The TEP evaluates the labor matrix and assesses acceptability, strengths, weaknesses or deficiencies, accordingly. The overall rating assigned to the technical factors considers both the approach proposed and risk associated with the it.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q32: If an offeror proposes a labor mix that may be deemed not in compliance with the Service Contract Act(SCA) (i.e. General Clerks proposed for Technical Writing tasks), does the Government consider this a performance risk thereby allowing the proposal to remain in consideration for award or would the proposal be rejected as being technically unacceptable?**
- **A32: All non-key categories for both SCA and non-SCA are evaluated against the typical qualifications as provided in the labor category description to assess how well the team is suited to perform the work. If the TEP determines qualifications of proposed personnel do not clearly meet requirements, a weakness or deficiency may be assessed. Multiple weaknesses may result in an unacceptable technical proposal.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q33: Is there a reason that each NUWC RFP has different support documentation requirements for the cost proposal?**
- **A33: NUWC attempts to standardize required documentation to the maximum extent practicable to reduce administrative burden and increase efficiency. As a result of clause updates and specific solicitation requirements, documentation requirements may vary among RFP's.**



Industry Questions and Answers

- **Q34: Is there are reason that the allocation of hours to government and contractor site appear in the RFP in different sections from RFP to RFP?**
- **A34: Depending on when RFP's were issued, the requirement appeared in several places (Section B, H or L). For consistently new RFP's should address this requirement in Section H.**



COR Information for the Contractor Community

M. Duckett
28 May 2014



Contractor Check In – Check Out

- **All employees (government, military and contractor) are required to check in and out of NUWC**
- **Senior Technical Representatives (STRs) are required to ensure that badges, CACs, and any other assets are returned**
- **Please inform the COR of departing personnel**
- **Contractor Check In Check Out (CCICO) sign out checklists track return of assets**



Conclusion

- **Thank you NCMA for coordinating the questions for this SeaPort-e Council meeting**
- **Once approved by PAO, this Briefing will be distributed via NCMA, AFCEA, SENEDIA, LinkedIn**
- **Upcoming Events**
 - **Code 85 WAF Pre-Sol Conference: June 12, 2014**
 - **Code 25 Trainer Hardware Pre-Sol Conference: June 17, 2014**
 - **Code 25 Submarine Network Pre-Sol Conference: June 17, 2014**
 - **NCMA/DIVNPT Industry Day: June 25, 2014**
 - **MK 54 Lightweight Torpedo Industry Day: June 26, 2014**
 - **Code 40 VPT Industry Day: Summer 2014**
 - **Next SeaPort-e Council Meeting: Dec TBD, 2014**