

IFIB:

IFIB-ACT-SACT-23-01 PART B

Reference:

Q & A # 1

Date of Issue:

13 January 2023

The following questions were raised with respect to subject IFIB. Responses are to provide clarification.

Questions	Responses
<p>1. Can NATO please clarify if any additional information or documentation should be submitted in addition to Past Performance Information Forms for this Enclosure? Can NATO please clarify where the referenced language, <i>Bidding instructions in part 1 of subject solicitation</i> can be location in the IFIB?</p> <p>(page 13, Enclosure 3: Past Performance Information Form)</p>	<p>Bidding Instructions are located at the front of the IFIB. Please utilize table of contents for clarification and breakdown. Paragraph 11 on page 7-8 highlight past performance (enclosure 3) needing to be included into the content of proposal.</p>
<p>2. Can NATO please clarify if all the Best Value Matrices should be placed last in the proposal as a group, or if each individual one should be placed behind its respective resume?</p>	<p>Recommend after each CV, but this is not a mandate.</p>
<p>3. In one location (box, top of page 47), Total Candidates is listed as 3. In the text below, it states one candidate. Can NATO confirm how many candidates are required for LCAT 20?</p> <p>(Page 47, box at top and text below: <i>Location: Norfolk, VA, USA (On-site)(LCAT 20)</i>)</p>	<p>Page 47 covers LC's 34 (one candidate); 35 (one candidate); 36 (one candidate), which totals to three for the box. The box simply identifies the command's project they would fall under. Please follow what is requested within the LC and the price volume, vice the box. The box is information only.</p> <p>LC 20 is actually is on page 29. Here the box asks for two candidates, which are all for LC 20.</p>
<p>4. Can NATO please clarify in cases where the description of Essential Qualifications and an LCATs' respective Best Value Matrix requirement conflict, which requirement listing takes precedence, Essential Qualifications or the Best Value Matrix?</p> <p>(LCATs: 20, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40)</p>	<p>Please utilize the Best Value Matrix. The matrix combined some of the qualifications into one set of grades, vice breaking out individually.</p> <p>Best Value Matrix is what is graded within the proposals.</p>
<p>5. In one location (box, top of page 80), Total Candidates is listed as 2. In the text below, it states one candidate. Can NATO confirm how many candidates are required for LCAT 38?</p> <p>(Page 80, box at top and text below: <i>Location: JFC-NP, Naples, Italy (On-site) (LCAT 38)</i>)</p>	<p>Similar to question 3, the box is informational only. Please refer to the LC's and Price Volume for number of candidates within each LC.</p>
<p>6. Can NATO please identify each of the positions as either incumbent or as new positions? Additionally, can NATO</p>	<p>All are new positions.</p>

<p>provide companies and associated contract numbers for the identified incumbent positions?</p>	
<p>7. The title of LCAT 39 conflicts on pages 88 and 91. Can NATO confirm the correct title of LCAT 39 is NSD-S HUB POC Transformational Analyst? Additionally, can NATO confirm the tasking and essential qualifications are aligned with the intended title?</p> <p>(page 88, paragraph 1, and page 91, paragraph 2 (LCAT 39))</p>	<p>Amendment is being uploaded to the website. Removed LC 39 from Part B, will be incorporated into Part C upon release.</p>
<p>8. On page 98 (LCAT 40), it states graduation from the NATO Defence Planning Course is desired but not required. In Annex A - Best Value Grading Matrix for LCAT 40 (page 100), it states a grade of 0 points will be given if the candidate does not have this requirement, and that <i>ANY SCORE OF ZERO IS NONCOMPLIANT</i> Can NATO please clarify if this qualification is essential or desirable? If it is desirable, can NATO please adjust the matrix score so it does not read zero?</p> <p>(page 98 and page 100; (LCAT 40))</p>	<p>Score has been amended to reflect 1 point, vice 0 points.</p>
<p>9. The Matrices of both these LCATs do not correlate with the Essential Qualifications. Can NATO please adjust these discrepancies?</p> <p>(LCATs 28 and 29 Scoring Matrices)</p>	<p>There are no 28 and 29 LCs. Please utilize the grading matrix published within each LC.</p>
<p>10. Can NATO please confirm that representative resumes matrixed to specific LCAT positions are acceptable for responses to ifib023001_part-b?</p>	<p>Yes. The past performance portions of the LCs is to ensure the companies submitting the bids have experience in those LCs. If a past performance highlights numerous LCs, that particular past performance only needs to be submitted once. Please indicate which LCs the past performance addresses (request, not mandate).</p>
<p>11. Can NATO please identify each of the positions that are new work?</p> <p>(pages 29-99)</p>	<p>All new.</p>
<p>12. Can NATO please clarify if Partial Bidding is allowed when there is one candidate required in a Labor Category?, i.e. can Offerors choose not to submit to certain categories that require one person?</p> <p>(page 25)</p>	<p>Partial Bidding is allowed.</p>
<p>13. Will SACT be willing to extend the closing date for bids for Part A of IFIB-ACT-SACT-23-01 until 0900 on Friday January 13th to allow for industry to provide a more comprehensive and</p>	<p>No.</p>

deeper pool of expertise for proposals against requirements stated in the IFIB?	
14. If an industry firm is otherwise eligible to bid on Part A of IFIB-ACT-SACT-23-01 but chooses not to respond to any requirements of Part A, will that firm still be eligible to bid on Part B and/or any other subsequent parts that SACT may release in the future?	Yes!
15. Could HQ SACT validate the overall value of the grading matrix? Presently, for LCAT 40, the total value of all of the rows is 105 out of 100. (Pages 99-101 (Section 12, LCAT 40 Best Value Grading Matrix))	Amendment applied to Experience with Capability Development Support and Synthesis (CDSS Tool). Went from 20 points down to 15 points, allowing total score to be out of 100.
16. Recognizing that HQ SACT requires qualified and available candidates for Part B on 1 March to begin work, can HQ SACT confirm that provided resumes should not be representative, but rather real candidates being made available to this opportunity and who will be ready to start on 1 March or as identified in the Labor Category requirements? (Q&A #1 Dated 21 December 2022, Row #18)	Yes.
17. Recognizing that HQ SACT will annotate when the last part has been posted and that an estimate is subject to change, is there a present estimate for how many parts are currently anticipated under IFIB 23-01? (Q&A #1 Dated 21 December 2022, Row #4)	Estimated three parts ending with Part C. It will clearly be annotated on the front page of the IFIB's Part Letter once it is the last part for 23-01.
18. The LCAT requires a Master's degree specifically in engineering management. For this role, will a Master's Degree in any engineering or information systems-related specialty, or other related specialty, be acceptable? (Page 52,Grading Matrix Item Number 3)	For this number within LCAT 34, it needs to address engineering management. Number 1 allows the university degree to have flexibility.
19. This section states, "At least Project management experience (Prince II preferred)." Should this read, "At least one project management certification (Prince II preferred)?" (Page 53,Grading Matrix Item Number 7)	No. It asks for Project Management experience, not for a certificate.

<p>20. Could HQ SACT confirm that the range column is accurate? Specifically, the requirement column outlines degree requirements, but the range evaluation discusses knowledge and experience. Should HQ SACT modify the range column for this requirement to a reflect a "Yes/No" scoring matrix?</p> <p>(Page 61, Grading Matrix Item Number 2)</p>	<p>Amended to yes no. No is 0 points; yes is 5 points.</p>
<p>21. Could HQ SACT confirm that the range column is accurate? For example, this item speaks to abilities to participate effectively in high-level discussions, workshops, panels, etc. and prepare professional, high quality documents for review. Could HQ SACT update the range column is updated to state, "Yes - 5 Points; No -- 1 Point?"</p> <p>(Page 71, Grading Matrix Item Number 6)</p>	<p>Amended to Yes. No. No equals 1 point. Yes equals 8 points.</p>
<p>22. Could HQ SACT confirm that this requirements matrix is accurate, as the LCAT 39 title, tasking, and associated requirements mirror LCAT 32 from Part A of IFIB 23-01?</p> <p>(Page 90-95)</p>	<p>Amendment is being uploaded to the website. Removed LC 39 from Part B, will be incorporated into Part C upon release.</p>
<p>23. Who is the ACT PoC to work with on export control for CDMS Part B?</p>	<p>HQ SACT's point of contact for all related contract matters, including export controls, is the HQ SACT Contracting Officers listed on the IFIB in question, who will liaise with other HQ SACT branches and personnel, as requested and/or required.</p>
<p>24. Can you provide a list with addresses of the applicable countries, MoDs, NATO Organizations, and companies to be included in the TAA for the CDMS Part B requirement?</p>	<p>Please note the referenced IFIB is for multiple level of effort contractors to support various requirements; thus, the applicable countries, organisations, countries, etc. varies in accordance with the statement of work. Generally, the transfer of Technical Data and Defense Services is authorised between the United States and current NATO Member States for end-use by NATO, which includes all NATO commands, agencies, organizations, as well as its member states and national representatives, in addition to those specifically listed in the statement of work.</p>