

**Transformation Twenty-One Total Technology Next Generation (T4NG)
Industry Day Questions and Answers
VA118-14-I-0558
November 19, 2014**

Notes:

1. For efficiency purposes, the Government removed duplicative questions.
2. T4 NextGen is an Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) Multiple Award Task Order (MATO) contract.

Number	Questions	Answers
1.	RFP Section J Page 89 refers to attachment 16, Performance Risk Assessment Questionnaire; RFP Section L.6.2.ii(4) page 101 bottom provides instructions for Past Performance, including "Performance Risk Assessment Questionnaires ... must be completed and submitted for all contracts ... identified in Section 1"; and Section M.C.2 page 108 to 109 provides how Past Performance will be evaluated, including "Offerors are cautioned that the government may review past performance data available in Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PIRS)." Would VA amend the instructions to clarify the procedures by which the references are to submit the Questionnaires from attachment 16 to VA? Would VA amend the evaluation criteria to clarify that VA will consider reference responses in completed Questionnaires when evaluating past performance?	<p>As stated in in the past Performance Risk Assessment Questionnaire, Attachment 018, references should return the completed Performance Risk Assessment Questionnaire to the Offeror. The Offeror will in turn submit this questionnaire with its proposal as Volume II, Past Performance Files, Section 4.</p> <p>The RFP Evaluation approach does not require clarification as it states the Government reserves the right to obtain past performance information from any available source.</p>
2.	We are a certified 8(a) SDVOSB and VOSB company. Are we able to submit two separate responses (SDVOSB and VOSB) to the soon to be release T4 Next Generation RFP. This is due to our assumption	Offerors are permitted to provide ONLY ONE PROPOSAL for consideration. A SDVOSB/VOSB will be considered in all steps, unrestricted and reserved. There will not be separate Technical

	that there will be separate Technical Evaluation Boards (TEB) for each Lot (Unrestricted, SDVOSB, VOSB, WOSB, HubZone).	Evaluation Boards for each lot.
3.	Is a company able to pursue the RFP once it's released even if they hadn't submitted anything towards the RFI from August?	Yes.
4.	Is the VA planning on setting aside VA11814I0558 for small business or will they agree to do large as well?	This procurement will not be set-aside. Please see draft RFP for Basis of Award.
5.	For Attachment 1, what is the appropriate location to be assumed for calculation of the OCONUS rates? The VA maintains OCONUS locations in Hawaii, Alaska, Philippines, Guam, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, and the US Virgin Islands. As the VA is aware, labor rates can vary significantly by location.	The Government requires one blended OCONUS rate for each labor category. How this rate is proposed is a business decision left up to the Offeror.
6.	How does the VA intend to validate the truthfulness of the Attachment 17 certification? It is our understanding that there are multiple consultants actively shopping their services for T4NG authorship and/or review of sample task responses.	<p>As indicated in the attachment, proposals must be prepared by the Offeror and its subcontractor(s) with which it has a CTA as defined in FAR subpart 9.6 and is included in the management volume.</p> <p>Statute 18 USC 1001 makes it a criminal offense to make a materially false misrepresentation to the Government. Additionally, the Government will not consider proposals from Offerors that provide falsified certifications and those proposals will be deemed ineligible for award.</p>
7.	Part IV of the Past Performance Questionnaire, "Return Information" instructs the Government person to submit their completed questionnaire back to the Offeror. The completed questionnaires are	Per the RFP instructions, Section L, it is the Offeror's responsibility to provide the completed questionnaires with its proposal. Offerors are reminded that the burden of proving low performance

	generally sent directly to the Contracting Officer (CO) for the solicitation and the Offeror is never privy to what is said by their customer. Will the government amend this instruction to read simply "Please send the completed Past Performance Questionnaire to Mr./Ms. (CO for this procurement)." Will the government also include this revised language in Section L.6.2.c.ii(4)?	risk rests with the Offerors.
8.	The contractor staff roster at Attachment 9 was not reflected in the draft RFP released on 3 October 2014, what is the purpose of this attachment, if any, as related to Section L proposal requirements?	The Contractor Staff Roster requirements are now identified in Section 8.1.5 of the PWS.
9.	Attachment 13 appears to be a partial duplication of the information required in attachment 11. Please confirm that this was intentional.	Yes, this is intentional. Attachment 13 is required and will be evaluated in accordance with RFP instructions, Volume IV. Attachment 11 is required in accordance with PWS paragraph 8.1.6 and clause H-5.
10.	Will the Continuing Resolution impact the release of the solicitation?	No, the Continuing Resolution will not impact the release of the solicitation.
11.	What is the intent of having "Biomedical Engineer" (row 17), "Health Insurance Manager" (row 79), and "Medical Billing/Account Management Specialist" (row 98) Labor Categories? Would VA consider a SME or Consultant labor category for unique expert skills or experience?	These labor categories are in support of potential healthcare IT requirements. No, SME and Consultant are not considered labor categories under this procurement.
12.	Will the final RFP and the Attachment file names be adjusted so they match, are correctly referenced throughout the RFP?	Yes.
13.	Will VA consider adding this note to the 018 - PERFORMANCE RISK	No.

	ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE? “NOTE: if the company or division performing this effort is different than the company to which the effort was awarded due to a company/corporate organizational change, note those changes.”	
14.	If an Offeror writes its own Sample Task responses with the assistance of its proposed subcontractors with which it has a CTA, please confirm that the Offeror can use consultants to review and advise it on the quality of the responses, provided the consultants do not do any writing of any responses or direct what the response should include or exclude.	Consultants shall not contribute to the development of the sample task responses in any way. A consultant may review other portions of the proposal not related to the Sample Tasks.
15.	Will the government delete evaluation credit for participation in the VA Mentor-Protégé Program, as the program is not active and Offerors do not have an option to participate?	The VA Mentor-Protégé program does not expire until December 31, 2014. The T4NG solicitation will close prior to that date and therefore is applicable to this effort per VAAR Subpart 819.71.
16.	The Draft RFP specifies that the Price Methodology file will not be used for price evaluation purposes. Given that the cost elements detailed in the Price Methodology file directly determine the rates proposed, please explain how the Government will make price realism assessments to determine risk to contract performance without evaluating pricing methodology?	The Government will not conduct cost or price realism at the IDIQ level. As stated in the Management Factor Volume, the Government may evaluate the Offeror's proposed blended labor rates to determine if the proposed blended rates are unrealistically low in order to assess the ability of the Offeror to meet the PWS requirements and whether the proposal provides the Government with a high level of confidence of successful performance.
17.	Given that the government will not have privity of contract with a prime vendor's subcontractors, how will the government evaluate the terms and conditions contained in the CTAs? Will the government accept	The Government does not intend to evaluate the terms and conditions of the CTA, however the Offeror must provide the full CTA. The CTA is the only document that must be provided.

	as compliant a signed document that defines a teaming relationship but incorporates by reference a full CTA without providing the full CTA? In other words, in order to be considered compliant to this requirement must we provide all documents that define a CTA between prime and subcontractor?	
18.	Will the government be evaluating small business subcontracting performance for large business Offerors as part of the past performance evaluation?	No.
19.	Will the government consider providing evaluation credit for the involvement of Ability One, specifically involving Ability One firms employing disabled veterans?	While the Government applauds an Offeror's use of Ability One firms, this will not be specifically evaluated for this procurement.
20.	PART 1, Section A, Contract Identification. We understand that this section is to be completed by the Offeror. In the case of T4NG major subcontractors, we understand that they also must complete this section for each of their Questionnaires. Will the Government confirm that our understanding is correct?	Yes, the major subcontractor should complete this section with the appropriate information.
21.	PART 1, Section B, Identification of Offeror's Representative. We understand that this section is to be completed by the T4NG Prime Offeror. The first line says "T4NG Prime Offeror," but we believe our T4NG major subcontractors must also complete this section with their own information. Will the Government confirm that our understanding is correct? How should we indicate who is the T4NG Prime Offeror on each of the major subcontractors' Questionnaires?	The understanding is correct. "T4NG Prime Offeror" has been removed from Part 1 Section B. The prime Offeror is identified in Part 1, A as follows: Prime Contractor Name (if different from the contractor name cited above):

22.	<p>This question is a follow-up question related to Q&A #30 released on October 30 for DRFP VA118-14-I-0558.</p> <p>The answer stated that the VA expects that an Offeror's team be able to address all functionality called for in the PWS. Since this is a Management Plan, is the expectation to document the Team capabilities, depth of experience and processes to address the various types of project work defined in PWS sections 4.1 through 4.11 (the "capability") OR is it expected that a detailed response with understanding and technical approach text, for the inclusive set of 60+ 2nd level and 3rd level PWS paragraphs, be submitted (the detailed "how"). For the latter, with over 60 PWS elements it would appear a 25 page limit would be extremely limiting. Please clarify.</p>	<p>The Government cannot advise an Offeror on how to best submit its proposal. The 25 page limit for the Management subfactor is deemed appropriate.</p>