

SeaPort-NxG Questions and Answers
14 February 2018

Q1. Will SeaPort-NxG be announced through SeaPort or FedBizOpps (FBO)? Will you please add a note to SeaPort regarding your intentions? What is the solicitation number?

A1. All SeaPort-NxG notices and information will be posted on FBO under Solicitation Number N00178-18-R-7000. The notes on the public SeaPort web page (www.seaport.navy.mil) and on the SeaPort-e landing page have been updated.

Q2. What is the latest schedule for SeaPort-NxG? When will the draft Request for Proposals (RFP) be released? When will the formal RFP be released? When does the Government expect to make an award?

A2. The *notional* schedule is as follows:

Synopsis – Released 14 Feb 2018
Post Draft RFP to FBO – Second Quarter Fiscal Year (FY) 2018
Post Formal RFP to FBO – Third Quarter FY 2018
Proposals Due – Third Quarter FY 2018
Awards Made – First Quarter FY 2019

Q3. What is the structure of the SeaPort-NxG contract?

A3. Each SeaPort-NxG Multiple Award Contract (MAC) will have a base ordering period of five years, with an option for an additional five year ordering period.

Q4. How will SeaPort-NxG MACs be awarded?

A4. SeaPort-NxG MACs will be awarded based on full and open competition to all qualified offerors.

Q5. Will the Government hold an Industry Day?

A5. No in-person Industry Days are currently planned. The Government will post Industry Day-like presentations and a draft RFP to FBO. The Government intends to allow sufficient time for industry feedback prior to issuing the formal RFP. If at a later date, an in-person Industry Day or any other “road show” event is scheduled, the Government will post an advance notification of the event on FBO. Questions may be sent by email to seaportnextgen.fct@navy.mil. Responses will be provided periodically on FBO.

Q6. Will the Government post the SeaPort-NxG presentations that were given at Navy Gold Coast in August 2017, Charleston Defense Contractor Association (“CDCA”) Conference in December 2017, and Professional Services Council (“PSC”) meeting in January 2018?

A6. Yes, the CDCA presentation will be posted on FBO. The CDCA presentation was updated from the Navy Gold Coast presentation; therefore, the Navy Gold Coast presentation has not been uploaded. Additionally, the PSC presentation has not been uploaded because it is merely a subset of the CDCA presentation. Please note that the notional timeline of events (slide 16) of the CDCA presentation is continually being updated. For the Government’s most up to date estimate of the SeaPort-NxG schedule, see A2.

Q7. What kind of experience is necessary in order to be qualified to be awarded a SeaPort-NxG MAC? What other criteria are required?

A7. A single company (not a joint venture) must have, within the past five years, experience “in direct support of the Navy.” This experience can be either as a prime or as a subcontractor. Experience in support of the Department of Defense, Fourth Estate, Missile Defense Agency, Coast Guard, non-Navy military departments, or other federal agencies is not sufficient. The experience must be related to one of the twenty-three functional areas covered by SeaPort-NxG. In addition, the company must be registered in System for Award Management (SAM), owe no federal taxes, not be debarred or suspended, and if a large business, submit a compliant small business subcontracting plan.

Q8. How many past performance references will be required?

A8. Past performance is not being evaluated for award of the SeaPort-NxG MACs. There is no requirement to submit past performance references. Offerors will provide information, i.e., contract number/subcontract agreement, describing their experience related to one of the twenty-three functional areas, either as a prime or as a subcontractor.

Q9. If the contracting activity issuing the contract is not Navy, but the effort performed was in support of the Navy, will that experience count?

A9. If the scope of work clearly shows that the effort was in direct support of the Navy the experience would count. For example, a contract issued by Aegis BMD, part of the Missile Defense Agency, would be accepted where the effort contracted is clearly in direct support of the Navy. The issuing activity is not criteria, the scope of work is.

Q10. Is there a required length of time for the experience to count? For example, would experience working on a Navy simplified acquisition that only lasted a month count?

A10. The length of experience doesn't matter, as long as it was within the past five years, in direct support of the Navy, and related to one of the twenty-three functional areas covered by SeaPort-NxG.

Q11. What if a company holds a SeaPort-e MAC? Does that count as experience?

A11. Simply holding a SeaPort-e MAC is not sufficient. The company would have had to actually perform work under the MAC, i.e., been awarded a task order under the SeaPort-e MAC.

Q12. What if my team member has the experience but I do not - can I still get a MAC?

A12. No. In that situation, your team member would be eligible, but you would not.

Q13. If my company is a subcontractor under SeaPort-NxG, will that experience be sufficient to qualify as a prime under SeaPort-NxG at a later date? Will there be any on-ramps?

A13. Yes, if your company actually performs work as a subcontractor to a prime SeaPort-NxG MAC holder under a SeaPort-NxG task order, you will have gained the requisite experience in order to qualify as a prime yourself. See A29 for information on on-ramps.

Q14. If my company has no experience in direct support of the Navy in the twenty-three functional areas, does that mean my company can never qualify to hold a SeaPort-NxG MAC?

A14. No. See A13.

Q15. Can a company and its subsidiary or sister organization each have a MAC?

A15. No, there will only be one MAC per corporate entity.

Q16. Can joint ventures receive a MAC?

A16. No, proposals submitted by joint ventures will not be considered for award.

Q17. Would the experience of key employees satisfy the experience requirement?

A17. No. Experience of employees will not qualify a company for award if the **company** has no experience in direct support of the Navy within the past five years related to one of the twenty-three functional areas covered by SeaPort-NxG.

Q18. Should offerors identify their proposed team members in their proposals for SeaPort-NxG?

A18. Yes, offerors should identify their proposed team members so that they and their team members can receive access to the SeaPort-NxG portal once award is made. Otherwise, primes would have to request the SeaPort-NxG MAC Contracting Officer to add their team members post-award, which may take some time due to the Contracting Officer's workload.

Q19. Will there be a Cost Accounting Standard (CAS) compliancy requirement as part of the RFP? Can an offeror receive a SeaPort-NxG MAC without having CAS compliance?

A19. Yes, an offeror can receive a SeaPort-NxG MAC without having CAS compliance, but would not be eligible to be awarded a cost type task order without it. The applicable FAR clauses will be included in the RFP. After award of the SeaPort-NxG MACs, a message will be sent out via the portal providing contact information to assist in facilitating a pre-award accounting system review. Any MAC holder that does not currently have an approved DCAA Pre-Award Accounting System Audit but is intending to propose on flexibly priced task orders (any type other than Firm-Fixed Price without Progress Payments), or has a prior audit older than five years with no other contact with DCAA since that audit, or who's accounting system has changed since their last DCAA audit will want to take advantage of the offered assistance in facilitating a pre-award accounting system review.,

Q20. What dollar size threshold are you using to evaluate 8(a) companies for an award on the MAC (as 541330 is a \$15,000,000 North American Industry Classification System ("NAICS") but has multiple exceptions)?

A20. NAICS 541330 utilizing the exception for marine engineering and naval architecture - average annual receipts - \$38.5M.

Q21. We are a VOSB looking to participate in SeaPort-NxG. Is it possible to increase the revenue threshold to \$50,000,000 for NAICS 541330?

A21. No. Refer to A20.

Q22. Is the SeaPort-e contracting vehicle open to non-Department of the Navy activities (such as the Defense Information Systems Agency)? Will the SeaPort-NxG vehicle be open to non-Department of the Navy activities?

A22. No, SeaPort-e is only open to Department of the Navy activities. SeaPort-NxG will also only be open to Department of the Navy activities except Naval Air Systems Command (NAVAIR) and its field activities. NAVAIR has opted out of SeaPort-NxG and will pursue different business models to best meet their needs. If at some point in the future, it is determined that NAVAIR would like to utilize the SeaPort-NxG vehicle, the inclusion will be advertised and admission process will be held in order for their vendor base to compete for SeaPort-NxG MACs.

Q23. We are a current SeaPort-e prime contractor in two particular zones. We have not proposed on any RFQ to date, typically because the RFQs/ opportunities for which we were qualified were outside our two zones. Since one of the Navy's stated goals for moving to SeaPort-NxG is to essentially get rid of firms that do not propose on RFQs, is it really worth our while to propose on SeaPort-NxG, or will our proposal be dead on arrival since we have never proposed in the past? A candid reply is appreciated.

A23. The Navy's main goal for SeaPort-NxG is for rigorous competition under the MACs. The Navy desires firms to participate. There is also an administrative burden associated with the oversight of MACs held by firms who do not participate. One element of the decision to award the option for the additional five year ordering period will be the extent of a company's participation during the first five years. Companies that never submit proposals will most likely be off-ramped at the five year mark. Consideration for award is discussed in A7. All awardees will receive all zones.

Q24. We understand that the existing SeaPort-e MACs will be extended through December 2019. Does the government have a timeline for when that extension will take place? Has the government determined the surrounding criteria and by what method this will occur (unilateral modification), etc.? Is there an established notational timeline for events leading up to SeaPort-NxG RFP release? Should the government use a "brown-out period" for completion to establish transition from SeaPort-e to SeaPort-NxG, and if so, has it been determined how long that period will be?

A24. The unilateral modifications extending the SeaPort-e MACs are complete. For information relating to the SeaPort-NxG RFP release, refer to A2. There will be a period that has been referred to as a "brown out period" where certain solicitations that normally would have been issued under the SeaPort-e MACs will be issued outside of SeaPort-e because the SeaPort-NxG MACs are not awarded yet. There is no definition of how long that period is or how many procurements may be conducted during the period. The Government is, however, trying to minimize the length of time between the award of SeaPort-NxG MACs and the expiration of the SeaPort-e MACs. It is recommended that you contact the specific Contracting Officers at each activity for more information on specific procurements and where they will be advertised.

Q25. Will product manufacturers be awarded SeaPort-NxG MACs?

A25. SeaPort-NxG is a vehicle for the procurement of services and does not allow for the direct procurement of supplies/hardware. Any and all material or products ordered under SeaPort-NxG shall be in direct support of performed services, i.e., small scale testing equipment, prototypes, or spares for direct performance of services.

Q26. Where can I find information, training, and guides for SeaPort-NxG?

A26. When the SeaPort-NxG MACs are awarded, information for awardees related to operation of the SeaPort-NxG platform will be available on SeaPort-NxG for those companies and their registered team members.

Q27. There is a technical issue on your website - the link for the SeaPort-e contract holders list is not working; and neither is the link in the "contact us" teaming question (see <http://www.seaport.navy.mil/Home/Partners/>). A list of all SeaPort-e prime contract holders would be greatly appreciated.

A27. Due to security requirements, we cannot provide a listing of SeaPort-e contract holders, therefore the links on the website were disabled.

Q28. Will Capability Maturity Model Integration (CMMI) or International Organization for Standardization (ISO) be required at the MAC IDIQ level?

A28. No. There are no CMMI/ISO requirements at the MAC level; however, once the MACs are awarded, solicitations for individual task orders may require CMMI or ISO.

Q29. Will SeaPort-NxG have rolling admissions ("on-ramps") like the previous SeaPort-e?

A29. Yes. There will be rolling admissions but the Government has yet to determine exactly when they will be. They will not be as often as SeaPort-e, which was annually. Any rolling admissions will be advertised well in advance to industry.

Q30. Will there be any cost or price evaluation as part of the source selection for SeaPort-NxG?

A30. No. In accordance with the DPAP Class Deviation – Evaluation Factors for Certain Multiple-Award Task- or Delivery- Order Contracts dated 13 December 2017, price or cost evaluation is not required for certain DOD multiple award contracts. The Contracting Officer has determined that the Government may exclude price and cost as an evaluation factor for SeaPort-NxG.

Q31. Will a small business subcontracting plan be required to be submitted with the proposal for SeaPort-NxG for large business offerors?

A31. Yes, large businesses will be required to submit a small business subcontracting plan in accordance with FAR 19.702 with their proposals for SeaPort-NxG.

Q32. If a company is a small business at the time they are awarded a SeaPort-NxG MAC, but they become a large business later, will they still be eligible to participate in small business set-aside task order solicitations?

A32. Yes, but only for the first five years of the MAC. If a company is a small business at the time they are awarded a SeaPort-NxG MAC, but they become a large

business within the first five years, they can participate in small business set-aside task order solicitations until they have to re-certify their size status in order to receive the additional five year ordering period option. Upon receiving the option, they would now be a large business and ineligible for small business set-asides.

Q33. Is SeaPort-NxG anticipated to be a point score proposal (similar to GSA OASIS/Alliant 2) using past performances, contracts and certifications?

A33. No. See A7.

SeaPort-NxG Questions and Answers
27 February 2018

Q34. Can a company bid on and win a contract in either Engineering Support Services or Program Management Support Services, without bidding on both areas?

A34. Yes.

Q35. Our company's wholly-owned subsidiary performed work which qualifies it for a SeaPort-NxG award. Would the wholly-owned subsidiary's work also qualify our parent company for an award? The subsidiary has a different CAGE code and DUNS, but we are part of the same corporate entity and we are fully responsible for its work.

A35. Because the parent company and the subsidiary are part of the same corporate entity, the subsidiary's experience would transfer to the parent company and would qualify the parent company for a MAC. However, since there can be only one MAC per corporate entity, either the parent company *or* the subsidiary may be a MAC holder – not both. Please also refer to A15.

Q36. Are all labor categories in SeaPort-NxG expected to be professional (and therefore exempt from the Department of Labor Service Contract Act Wage Determinations), or will there be a mix of professional and non-professional labor categories?

A36. There will be a mix of professional and non-professional labor categories. Department of Labor Service Contract Act Wage Determinations may be incorporated on individual Task Orders, as applicable.

Q37. A18 states, "...offerors should identify their proposed team members so that they and their team members can receive access to the SeaPort-NxG portal once award is made." What information will offerors need to provide in order to port existing SeaPort-e team members to the new contract? And what information will be needed to add additional team members as part of an offeror's proposal?

A37. Offerors will be required to submit the Team Member's Name (as registered in SAM), the DUNs Number, and Cage Code. The SeaPort-NxG RFP will include instructions on how and when to submit proposed teammate(s) registration information. Since SeaPort-e and SeaPort-NxG are standalone contracts, a teammate added to SeaPort-e will not automatically be added to a SeaPort-NxG's MAC, or vice versa.

Q38. A16 states that "...proposals submitted by joint ventures will not be considered for award." A9 states (among other requirements) that past experience will only qualify a company for an award if it was performed by a single company, not a joint venture. How do these statements apply to SBA-approved participants in its 8(a) BD Mentor-Protégé Program?

A38. No work will be performed at the SeaPort-NxG MAC level. Therefore a Joint Venture, including SBA-approved participants in the mentor-protégé program, cannot be formed to win

work under NxG. While a JV cannot be formed to win work under NxG, if a partner in a JV can cite experience in direct support to “The Department of the Navy”, it would therefore be eligible for award of an NxG MAC as a single entity.

Q39. Since the United States Marine Corps is part of the Department of the Navy, will work performed for the Marine Corps qualify as work “in direct support of the Navy?” What about work performed for the Marine Corps Technical Service Support Activity (MCTSSA)?

A39. The Marine Corps (including its activities, such as the MCTSSA) is considered to be part of “The Department of the Navy.” Therefore, assuming the work met all other qualification requirements, work performed in direct support of the Marine Corps and/ or its activities would qualify as work performed in direct support of the Department of the Navy. This response clarifies the responses in Answers A7 and A9. The references in A7 and A9 to “The Navy” should be revised to “The Department of the Navy.”

Q40. What if a company has experience contracting with TRICARE (a DoD health care program)? Does this qualify as experience which is “in direct support of the Navy?” The experience otherwise meets all requirements.

A40. No. For purposes of qualifying for a SeaPort-NxG award, TRICARE contracts are not considered to be directly supporting The Department of the Navy. Please also refer to Answer A9.

Q41. Where can an Offeror find information on the 23 functional areas that are contained within the SeaPort-NxG MAC’s scope of work?

A41. The 23 functional areas are listed below:

Engineering Services:

Service areas that are included under the Engineering Services discipline include but, are not limited to the following examples:

1. Engineering, System Engineering, and Safety and Process Engineering Support
2. Software Engineering, Development, Programming, and Network Support
3. In-Service Engineering, Fleet Introduction, Installation and Checkout and Provisioning Support
4. Measurement Facilities, Range, and Instrumentation Support
5. Interoperability, Test and Evaluation, Trials Support
6. Research and Development Support
7. Modeling, Simulation, Stimulation, and Analysis Support
8. Prototyping, Pre-Production, Model-Making, and Fabrication Support
9. System Design Documentation and Technical Data Support
10. Reliability, Maintainability, and Availability (RM&A) Support
11. Inactivation and Disposal Support
12. Biochemical Engineering Support

Program Management

Service areas that are included under the Program Management Services discipline include but, are not limited to the following examples:

1. Financial Analysis and Budget Support
2. Quality Assurance (QA) Support
3. Functional and Direct Programmatic Administrative Support
4. Professional Development and Training Support
5. Analytical and Organizational Assessment Support
6. Database Administrators
7. Public Affairs and Multimedia Support
8. Logistics Support
9. Configuration Management (CM) Support
10. Information System (IS) Development, Information Assurance (IA), and Information Technology (IT) Support
11. Computer Systems Analysts

Q42. Will the Navy conduct an onramp after award of the initial set of SeaPort-NxG MACs in 2019 to allow for vendors that receive SeaPort-e task orders awards in 2019 to be eligible for SeaPort-NxG work?

A42. No, not in 2019. Please also refer to A29.

Q43. I've seen briefs that show NAVSUP as a participant in NXG and others that state NAVSUP is not participating in NxG. Also in the latest bank of Q & A, question #22 stated the only DoN activity not participating was NAVAIR. Will you please confirm if NAVSUP will or will not participate in NxG.

A43. NAVSUP is participating in SeaPort-NxG.

Q44. Must Offerors propose on all subcategories in a functional area?

A44. No, in order to qualify for a SeaPort-NxG MAC, an offerors' proposal must demonstrate experience in direct support to the Department of the Navy related to one of the twenty-three functional areas covered by SeaPort-NxG. Please also see A7.

Q45. Within the CDCA Updates on Seaport Brief, on slide 14, there is an experience requirement that all US Navy experience must be from the prime proposal and must be verifiable via CPARS or government endorsement. What qualifies as a government endorsement?

A45. Since CDCA, the Government has refined the experience requirement. Direct Department of the Navy experience can be as a prime or as a subcontractor. For prime experience, providing a contract number will be sufficient. The Government will look up the

contract in EDA to verify that the scope of work is applicable to one of the 23 functional areas of SeaPort-NxG and was in direct support of the Department of the Navy. For subcontractor experience, a copy of the subcontracting agreement which demonstrates a scope of work applicable to one of the 23 functional areas of SeaPort-NxG and in direct support of the Department of the Navy will be sufficient to qualify an offeror for a SeaPort-NxG MAC. The Government will not check CPARS or do any other type of quality assessment.

Q46. We understand that in order to “qualify” for an award, a vendor must be able to show experience in direct support of the Navy. However, will the RFP also allow for vendors to include other DoD or non DoD type experience to demonstrate capability in the 23 functional areas?

A46. Offerors must show direct support to “The Department of the Navy” in one or more of the 23 functional areas listed in Question 41. If the experience was in one of the 23 functional areas but was experience supporting DoD or non-DoD, that will not qualify an offeror for award of a SeaPort-NxG MAC.

Q47. Is the SeaPort Next Generation contract’s an IDIQ tool that existing Navy and other DOD agencies can utilize to acquire Engineering Support Services?

A47. SeaPort-NxG will be a set of multiple award IDIQ contracts (MACs) for use by the Department of the Navy (but see A22 regarding NAVAIR and its field activities) to acquire services in the 23 functional areas covered by SeaPort-NxG (Also see A41 for a list of the 23 functional areas).

Q48. Is the SeaPort Next Generation contract’s Scope of Work inclusive of Surveillance Systems to protect the Homeland? Is the SeaPort Next Generation contract’s Scope of Work inclusive of Physical Access Control Systems to protect the Homeland? Is the SeaPort Next Generation contract’s Scope of Work inclusive of Border Protection with the use of Electronic Security System? Is the SeaPort Next Generation contract’s Scope of Work inclusive of Drone Detection and Gun Shoot Detection? Is the SeaPort Next Generation contract’s Scope of Work inclusive of Intrusion Detection and Perimeter Protection to protect the Navy’s Facilities? Is the SeaPort Next Generation contract’s Scope of Work centric only to Information Systems?

A48. Offerors must show direct support to “The Department of the Navy” in one or more of the 23 functional areas listed in Question 41.

[END OF 27 February 2018 Q&A]

SeaPort-NxG Questions and Answers
6 March 2018

Q49a. Can more than one subsidiary of a corporate entity hold a MAC if the overarching corporate entity itself is not bidding for a MAC and the subsidiaries have their own different CAGE codes?

A49a. No. (See also Q15)

Q49b. Or if a holdings company or corporate entity is awarded a MAC on Seaport-NxG and declares all CAGE codes of all subsidiaries at the time of bid, could any subsidiary bid on task orders under the MAC held by the corporate entity?

A49b. Yes. (See also Q15)

Q50. The FBO notification dated Feb. 28, 2018 indicates that a document containing questions and answers is being posted. I cannot find the document. Is it possible that it did not post?

A50. The FBO amendment attachment did not post correctly on 28 Feb. It was posted successfully on 1 Mar. The following are all the attachments to date:

1. Q&A 14 Feb 2018
2. CDCA Updates on SeaPort Brief
3. Q&A 27 Feb 2018
4. Announcement 1
5. Q&A 6 Mar 2018

Q51. I am looking to register my business in SEAPORT, but the rolling admission is closed. When is it open?

A51. There will be no more rolling admissions for SeaPort-e. Interested, qualified companies are encouraged to submit a proposal in response to the upcoming SeaPort-NxG solicitation.

Q52. We have been tracking the SeaPort-NxG procurement for some time and noticed that the draft RFP and additional responses to questions were posted on FBO.gov yesterday. Is there something specific I need to do to register my company for the solicitation?

A52. The draft RFP has not been posted on FBO.gov yet. There is no registration for the solicitation. Recommend you periodically check FBO.gov for the posting of the Draft RFP and the ultimate formal RFP.

Q53. I attempted to find solicitation N0017818R7000 on NECO. However, it appears this solicitation does not exist on NECO.

A53. The solicitation for SeaPort-NxG will only be posted on FBO.gov. See Q1.

Q54. Would a SEAPORT E task order for work performed on a joint program – includes Navy aircraft, US Marine Corps aircraft and Air Force – be acceptable as a US Navy experience for SEAPORT NxG?

A54. It would if the work performed was in direct support to the Department of the Navy. Offerors are cautioned that just because a contract is issued by a Department of the Navy DODAAC (even a SeaPort-e contract/task order) does not guarantee that the work meets the requirements of “direct support to The Department of the Navy.”

Q55. Would the Government please consider following a limited price evaluation similar to other Multiple Award MACs such as RS3 where only a handful of LCATs are priced as part of vendors proposal submission?

A55. No. SeaPort-NxG will not have capped rates or a set of master labor categories that are tied to the overarching SeaPort-NxG MAC therefore there is no pricing required at the SeaPort-NxG MAC. Additionally, it is estimated that the preponderance of Task Orders issued under SeaPort-NxG will be issued as cost-reimbursement type orders which require a cost realism analysis as part of Task Order evaluation and award. (See also Q30)

Q56. Would the Government please provide more insight as to whether Technical and Management Volumes will be required as part of vendors proposal submission? If so how will these be evaluated?

A56. Typical technical and management volumes will not be required. The information that is provided by the offerors to meet the experience requirement (See Q7) will be verified (not evaluated) by the Government. The SeaPort-NxG RFP will contain specific proposal requirements.

Q57. If a contractor has experience in functional areas: 1. Software Engineering, Development, Programming, and Network Support and 2 Research and Development Support on a Navy Contract, then are they eligible for the NxG solicitation to submit a proposal for all 23 functional areas?

A57. Experience in any one functional area in direct support to The Department of the Navy is required to be awarded a SeaPort-NxG MAC. The MAC awards will not designate which of the functional areas awardees are qualified or eligible for. All awardees receive all functional areas. Post-award of the MACs, awardees may propose on any Task Order solicitation issued under the SeaPort-NxG MACs for any of the 23 functional areas that they chose.

Q58. Under Seaport-e, small businesses of all sizes and socio-economic status were able to obtain a prime contract and provide services directly to the Navy. The Navy bought many different types of services under Seaport-e, many of which were not primarily 541330/\$38.5 including a high volume of program management and engineering services tasks. Small business (SB) of all sizes still had a shot because they could get a Seaport prime contract and

compete for work directly as demonstrated by your market research. Under SeaPort Next Generation SB who focus on program management services or engineering services have little chance of winning the limited number of SeaPort Next Generation prime contracts and the ensuing task orders. This is because they won't be able to compete successfully against the mature businesses that are more than twice their size, but who will still qualify as "small" under the \$38.5M size standard the Navy has chosen as the single primary NAICS code for the IDIQ. This competitive dynamic is not speculative as it is clearly seen by the size of the winning SB prime contractors on the OASIS vehicle in the larger NAICS code lanes – namely - the larger the NAICS code for the lane, the larger the sb prime contractors are within those lanes. As we understand Seaport Next-Generation, the SB primes will all be considered "small" under the IDIQ primary \$38.5M NAICS code. These SB primes will be priming task orders on program management and engineering services under the IDIQ, though under the NAICS codes truly applicable for the program management and engineering tasks most if not all of the Seaport Next Generation "small" primes would not be considered small. That really hurts the businesses that actually are considered small by the SBA for providing these program management and engineering services under the applicable NAICS codes such as 541611, 541330, 541990, etc. Moreover, these "small" Seaport Next Generation IDIQ award winners will have no incentive to sub to small businesses who actually are small under the applicable program management services or engineering NAICS codes because they won't be required to have small business subcontracting plans because they are "small", under the \$38.5M primary IDIQ NAICS code. The likely result will be that the majority of small businesses who provide program management services or engineering services will be shut out of Seaport Next Generation and by extension the Navy. If our understanding of the Navy's Next Generation strategy is correct, there are serious implications for naval innovation, the Naval defense industrial base, and fairness to small businesses as a whole. Given the likely volume of program management and engineering tasks for which the \$38.5M primary NAICS is not appropriate, will the Navy consider creating separately competed lanes for "business services" and "engineering (excluding the \$38.5M exception)" under the same type of contracting model as OASIS? If not, then how is the Navy's Seaport Next Generation CONOPS fair to small businesses legitimately operating as small businesses in the program management services and Engineering (without the exception) NAICS codes?

A58. SeaPort has always used only NAICS code 541330/\$38.5. SeaPort-e historically has and continues to have vigorous and healthy competition amongst the ~3,200 contract holders, 90% of which are small businesses. SeaPort-e has been very successful supporting small business; since its inception 551 different small businesses have won task order competitions for work directly supporting the Department of the Navy. Further 54 different small businesses have grown to other than small in large part as a result of the work they won under SeaPort-e.

The Navy's plan for SeaPort-NxG is to follow the SeaPort-e model to the greatest extent in order to maintain that healthy competitive atmosphere and continue to support the Navy's industrial base, in particular the small business industrial base that the Navy relies on today.

Q59. As you know that there has been several contracts and proposals that have come out on SEAPORTE for IT related projects for Defense Health Agency (DHA) for example: Defense Health Readiness Engineering Support and Defense Health Agency Cybersecurity Risk

Management Operations Support at SCC Atlantic. Will these types of contracts for DHA count as support of the Navy for a contractor to bid SEAPORT NxG?

A59. See A 58. Not all work contracted for via SeaPort-e is in direct support of the Department of the Navy. SSC Atlantic, as a working capital activity, provides a diverse range of support services to multiple federal organizations, including DHA. These orders are examples of work contracted via SeaPort that is not in direct support of the Department of the Navy and therefore, based on this experience alone, the Contractor would not be qualified for SeaPort-NxG.

SeaPort-NxG Questions and Answers
13 March 2018

Q60. If a contractor has performed work within the past five years (within one of the functional areas) in direct support of the Navy (i.e., Marine Corps), but that work was not executed under a SeaPort-e Task Order, is the contractor still eligible for a SeaPort-NXG MAC award?

A60. Yes, qualifying experience in direct support of the DoN is not limited to SeaPort-e Task Orders.

Q61. What specific information will be required for each proposed team member? For instance, will a list of proposed companies with their CAGE Code and DUNS number be sufficient? Or, will an assessment of each proposed team member's experience against the 23 functional areas be required? Will prime contractors be able to use a teammates' experience supporting the Department of the Navy as part of their proposal response? Having this guidance now will allow prospective offerors to begin compiling necessary information for their proposed team members.

A61. Only the Prime Offeror's experience will be validated for award based on evidence of recent, relevant technical experience in one of the 23 functional areas in direct support of the DoN. Prime Contractors will not be able to use the experience of teammates to satisfy SeaPort-NxG's requirement of providing direct support to the DoN.

Instructions on the submission of Teammate Information will be provided in the RFP. See also A18 and A37.

Q62. I wanted to reach out to you and let you know how much the Navy's industrial base appreciates the approach you have taken with the follow-on to Seaport-e, to include how you solicited information and input from industry on several occasions, the multiple briefings you made to stakeholders at various forums (such as the NAVSEA Industry Day and the CDCA Defense Summit) to raise awareness, and the more streamlined features of the NexGen contract. You have set a new standard in the Navy regarding inclusiveness and the idea of an integrated team seem more real. As most Navy services work is executed via Seaport, your business base has been awaiting information as to how NexGen would look for some time, and we are quite pleased. The majority of firms feared that the Navy might have been influenced to take an approach more similar to GSA OASIS with several contract pools, addressing multiple NAICS per contract pool, and utilized a restrictive points based proposal approach which could have eliminated portions of the Navy's industrial base. We appreciate that the NexGen approach will be very similar to Seaport-e and will be simple and inclusive, which should reduce government and contractor transaction costs and provide the Navy with the largest possible business base and resources to execute the important work of the warfighter. As many challenges as other parts of the DoD and the Navy have with contracting timelines and approaches NexGen seems a breath of fresh air. Why was the Seaport-e contract a 15 year contract and NexGen is only 10 years?

A62. In accordance with DFARS 217.204 the ordering period of a task order contract awarded by DoD pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304a shall not exceed 10 years.

Q63. In reference to Q&A 58 - the Navy did not address the concerns I raised about the new SeaPort conops. Instead they highlighted that under the old Seaport conops, SB did quite well (which I agree with). The point is they are changing the mechanism that enabled those results. I believe that my concerns about the new plan is legitimate and that many small businesses providing services in the under 15M NAICS codes are going to lose out. If they limit the new Seaport SB lane to say, 40-60 businesses, it's only going to be the giant smalls/mid-tier that win a prime contract and the rest of us are on the outside looking in - a far cry from the old seaport-e model where 551 different small businesses got to be a prime performing work directly for the Navy. However, the real issue is running a substantial amount of 541330 and 541611 work under a contract competed under the 541330/38.5 exception - that's just not fair.

A63. Since its inception, SeaPort has only ever used the NAICS Code 541330 under the Military and Aerospace Equipment and Military Weapons exception. That is not changing under SeaPort-NxG which will continue to utilize NAICS Code 541330 under the Military and Aerospace Equipment and Military Weapons exception. Additionally, the Navy is not limiting the number of Small Businesses (or Large) who can receive an NxG MAC. All businesses that qualify (see A7) will receive a MAC no matter how many that turns out to be.

Q64. The Navy has previously expressed a desire to significantly reduce the number of awardees for Seaport-NxG. How does the Navy plan to accomplish this? Does the Navy expect the requirement "in direct support of the Department of the Navy" to be sufficient, or will new evaluation criteria be included in the solicitation?

A64. The Navy will award MACs to all companies that meet the criteria for award listed in the RFP however many that turns out to be.

Q65. Reference Answers 7, 44 and 45, will large business offerors be required to propose to more than one functional area to increase their probability of receiving an award, or will one functional area be sufficient?

A65. No. One functional area is sufficient to receive a SeaPort-NxG award. Listing more than one functional area that an Offeror has provided direct support to the DoN will not increase the likelihood of receiving a SeaPort-NxG award.

[END of 13 MAR 2018 Q&A]

SeaPort-NxG Questions and Answers
27 March 2018

Q74. If a firm was a 2nd tier subcontractor for a Prime contractor providing professional support to the Navy, would being a 2nd tier subcontractor qualify that firm for SeaPort-NxG? Please advise.

A74. As long as the work performed by the 2nd tier subcontract is in direct support of the DON and it is associated with at least one of the 23 functional areas, the 2nd tier subcontractor may be found eligible. See A45 for additional information on how subcontractors, at any level, demonstrate this experience.

Q75. A2 provided a notional schedule including a draft RFP to be released in Q2FY18. Is the Draft RFP still expected this quarter and can you provide an update to the schedule for solicitation and award?

A75. The draft RFP is expected to be released the week of 2 April 2018. The remainder of the notional schedule provided in A2 is still valid.

Q76. I did not see the SeaPort NxtGen briefings and draft SOW on FBO. Can you direct me to the location where I can download them? (I do see the Q&A responses).

A76. The only briefing is the attachment entitled "CDCA Updates on SeaPort Brief". A draft SOW has not been posted but will be available as part of the draft solicitation.

Q77. Is the SeaPort-NxG contract being viewed as a logical "follow-on" to SeaPort-e? Or is SeaPort-NxG being viewed as a new requirement?

A77. SeaPort-NxG is a replacement contract vehicle to SeaPort-e.

Q78. With respect to Q&A #24 (posted on 14 Feb 2018), if the SeaPort-NxG contracts are awarded before the period of performance end date of a company's SeaPort-e contract, will that company be allowed to hold simultaneously their "legacy" SeaPort-e contract and the new SeaPort-NxG contract?

A78. Yes.

Q79. I have heard there have been recent changes made in the System for Award Management (SAM). What do I need to do to in order to register?

A79. Effectively immediately due to a new security measure implemented by GSA, every new registrant is now required to provide an original, signed notarized letter identifying the authorized Entity Administrator allowed to register in SAM and make changes to a registration before a registration or registration change will be activated. For further information on the contents of the letter and the mailing address for the Federal Service Desk go to

https://www.fsd.gov/fsd-gov/answer.do?sysparm_kbid=d2e67885db0d5f00b3257d321f96194b&sysparm_search=kb0013183 . A new registration or change to a previous registration may now take several days to become active depending on both the information provided passing existing validations, and the entity's delivery of the notarized letter. GSA has posted information at this link, <https://www.gsa.gov/about-us/organization/federal-acquisition-service/office-of-systems-management/integrated-award-environment-iae/sam-update>.

Q80. In regards to the Government's Answer to Q20:1) please confirm that the answer applies to WOSB and not just 8(a) companies, based on how the question was framed;(2) please confirm that, for a WOSB potential offeror on the SB set aside portion of SeaPort-NxG, the size standard applicable is \$38.5M, applying the NAICS 541330 exception for marine engineering and naval architecture.

A80. Yes, the answer applies to WOSB and not just 8(a) companies. The size standard of \$38.5M in average annual receipts for NAICS 541330, utilizing the exception for marine engineering and naval architecture, applies to all Offerors for the SeaPort-NxG MAC awards. There is no SB set-aside portion to the SeaPort-NxG MAC. Task Orders will be set-aside on an individual basis limited to those awardees that are identified as SBs (or other applicable socio-economic group) in their SeaPort-NxG MAC.

[END of 27 MAR 2018 Q&A]

SeaPort-NxG Questions and Answers
3 April 2018

Q81. If the contractor system complies with NIST SP 800-171 and subsequent NIST/FIPS IT security requirements, will a third party organizational assessment or an authority-to-operate be required prior to any contractor award?

A81. No third party assessment or Authority to Operate will be required. Offerors will be required to certify compliance with DFARS 252.204-7008.

Q82. If a small business subsidiary of a large company bids on the MAC, can it have other small business subsidiaries from the same parent company as subcontractors?

A82. Since these companies share the same corporate entity as their parent company, they are considered affiliates. A subsidiary carries the same size standard as their parent company, so in this example, all of these entities would be considered large businesses. Also, as noted in A15, there will be only one MAC per corporate entity.

Q83. FAR Part 15-404 and DFARS Part 215.404 discuss the requirements for contract fee determination. The current Seaport-e base contract: i) sets a seemingly arbitrary fee limit on ensuing Seaport-e task orders for prime contractor labor, ii) establishes an arbitrary ceiling on pass-through that effectively limits the fee available on subcontractor performance, and iii) does this without taking into account the actual task order work to be performed. This determination was made nearly 15 years ago when the competitive landscape for talent, particularly in computer science and engineering, was quite different. What is the structured approach that the Navy will use to determine the fee on a task order by task order basis? Will it use the DFARS weighted guidelines approach? Will arbitrary limits be removed from the base contract? Will subcontractor fee continue to be restricted to that of the prime contractor notwithstanding the complexity of the subcontractor's particular tasking?

A83. Because the task orders are subject to Fair Opportunity, the structured approach to profit analysis will not be used. The SeaPort-NxG MAC will contain maximum pass-through and fixed fee rate caps of 8% on CPFF type orders which are considered appropriate since, as stated in FAR 15.404-4, the contractor assumes the least cost risk in a cost-plus-fixed-fee level-of-effort contract/task order. The MAC maximum fee rate proposed for each task order by the prime contractor will flow down to all subcontractors/consultants included in the task order proposal.

Q84. There is a growing sense in industry that bids are becoming more and more disconnected from actual execution cost and fee. This has been especially true when offerors are left to choose which labor categories might apply to a body of work. In execution, contracts are very often not being worked consistently with the manner bid. Cost ceiling is being approached much earlier than originally contracted with fewer hours supplied. Are there any changes to Seaport-NxG to ensure that solicitations specify those labor categories that will actually be used for the work described?

A84. The SeaPort-NxG MAC will not contain labor categories. The CONOPS for SeaPort-NxG will encourage ordering activities to include the estimated labor mix and level-of-effort in their task order solicitations. Specific concerns regarding task order solicitations should be addressed to that ordering activity PCO.

Q85 Questions 58 and 63 address part of the small business industrial base issues that the Navy faces by selecting only one NAICS code for such a large and diverse body of work over such a long period of time. The Research & Development professional services industry base should be considered as well. SBA NAICS code size limits are defined as they are to promote competition at the level of company size pertaining to the actual work being contracted at the time of such a contract action. The NAICS codes selected for the OASIS contracting portfolio recognized this dilemma and used multiple NAICS codes in recognition of the range of work expected on the MAC vehicle. It permits the PCO to select an appropriate NAICS pool to solicit responses at the time the work is defined and the contract is needed. We are not advocating pools. What precludes authorizing multiple NAICS codes such as 541330 (base and individual exceptions), 541715, 541611, and others as necessary by modification to be used by the PCO at the time of task order solicitation?

A85. The definition of the NAICS code 541330 with the Military exception most appropriately covers the work to be performed under SeaPort-NxG. While there may be elements of a SeaPort-NxG task order statement of work that touch on other NAICS Codes (541715, 541611, etc.), the statement of work in its entirety is more appropriately classified under NAICS Code 541330.

Q86. Will the Navy please conduct an early on ramp in 2019 to allow existing SeaPort e holders to transition to SeaPort Next Gen without a gap? With SeaPort-NxG award in 1Q FY 2019 and SeaPort-e extension through December 2019, a potential prime can get the required Navy experience on Seaport-e but be precluded from winning a SeaPort-NxG IDIQ for another 5 years. This does not appear to be in the Navy's best interest nor their intent. Having spent all the business development, capture and bid and proposal resources to support the Navy work, there will be a gap without starting the on-board process early in 2019 so that existing SeaPort-e holders can get an award right after the Seaport-e contract expires. We suggest starting the procurement process no later than April 2019 to assure award before Seaport e is shut down.

A86. A rolling admission is not planned for 2019 but will occur prior to the five year point. It should be noted that qualifying experience in direct support of the DoN is not limited to SeaPort-e. See A60 and A42.

Q87. My company is a service-disabled veteran-owned small business and the owner/President is a retired US Navy senior officer with extensive experience performing "work in direct support of the Navy" while on active duty during operational and Pentagon tours, etc. During his time at the Pentagon, he specifically gained extensive experience in all areas of DON resourcing and budgeting. Also, the company has performed one job as a subcontractor for a prime on a contract with the US Navy Strategic Systems Program (within the last year).

The work was within one of the 23 functional areas that you identified. Will the owner's Naval experience during his career, alone, allow the company to bid on Seaport-Nxg? If not, will the company's work as a subcontractor on a US Navy Strategic Systems Program contract within the last year allow the company to bid on Seaport-Nxg?

A87. Experience of an employee does not qualify a company for an award but experience as a subcontractor may. See A7 and A17.

[END of 3 APRIL 2018 Q&A]

SeaPort-NxG Questions and Answers
prior to 10 April 2018

Q88. We recently attended an industry day held by NSWC-Crane contracting office in DC. We learned there, and re-confirmed in the Q&A posted on fbo.gov that only direct Navy past performance will be considered to compete for the Seaport Next Generation award. We have below questions: Will subcontracting work performed within the last 5 years of proposal submission at “US Navy’s Nuclear Propulsion Program (NNPP)” be considered as valid past performance? If we are awarded qualified work at Navy and its virtual Syscom users just after the proposal submission due date, but prior to the awards, can we provide that additional information for consideration?

A88. Section L.2.2 a. of the draft RFP defines “recent” as within the last five years and “relevant” as mapping to one of the subcategories in either of the two functional areas. As stated in A7, a single company must have, within the past five years, experience “in direct support of the Navy.” This experience can be either as a prime or as a subcontractor. Offerors must meet this requirement at the time of proposal submission; there will not be an opportunity to supplement the original proposal submission. Offerors are reminded to use www.fbo.gov as the official source of information concerning SeaPort-NxG.

Q89. If a holdings company or corporate entity is awarded a MAC on Seaport-NxG and declares all CAGE codes of all subsidiaries or affiliates at the time of bid, could any subsidiary or affiliates bid on task orders under the MAC held by the corporate entity?

A89. Task Order awards will be made to the company who holds the MAC but the actual work may be provided by a division, subsidiary, or affiliate of the prime contractor. The Offeror shall identify these relationships in their proposal; see Section L.5.4.2 c. of the draft RFP.

Q90. I have reviewed the Draft RFP for SeaPort-NxG and have a few questions regarding the use of subcontractors. Can a prime use one of their subcontractor's past performance in the technical proposal as proof of recent and relevant experience? If a small business prime uses subcontractors, is that prime required to submit a subcontracting plan?

A90. The Government will not consider the experience of individual employees or of team members as qualifying experience for the proposed prime. See also A12. Subcontracting Plans are required in accordance with FAR 52.219-9 and DFAR 252.219-7003 which do not apply to small business concerns.

Q91. Para 4.3 states that the page limit for the Technical Proposal is 3 pages. However, on page 62, Para 5.4.2(a) states that the Recent, Relevant Experience shall be 5 pages. Which is correct?

A91. Technical proposals are limited to 3 pages. Section L.5.4.2.a will be corrected in the final RFP.

Q92. In reviewing the draft RFP, it is our belief that we are to choose between the two functional areas and then focus on just ONE subcategory from one of the chosen functional areas to describe relevant experience. This is based on the language on page 62 that states, "Offerors are required to submit a description of no more than one of the subcategories...". However, some of the language included in the referenced sections casts doubt on that assumption. On page 58 the draft RFP states, "One Technical Proposal which includes description of recent and relevant experience in at least one of the subcategories listed...", and then on page 66 the draft RFP states, "Offerors will be required to describe recent and relevant DON experience in at least one of the following two major groups" The inclusion of the word least would seem to indicate that we could choose to do more. Can the Government please clarify their expectations for our response? If we are only to focus on one functional area and one of the subcategories in whichever functional area we choose would the Government please consider removing the word least from the final RFP to avoid any confusion? Section L - 2.2.a, page 58 of 67, 5.4.2.a, page 62 of 67; Section M – 3.1.b, page 66 of 67

A92. The final RFP will clarify that one subcategory in one functional area needs to be addressed. See also A57, A65 and A68.

Q93. Could you clarify the instructions for completing Section B? When the actual solicitation comes out, are we supposed to be filling out the minimum quantity, minimum amount and maximum quantity? How do we determine that across the infinite possible combination of work which may be solicited? Is the UNIT PRICE calculated by dividing the MAXIMUM AMOUNT by the MAX QUANTITY? For example ITEM NO. 1000 MAX QUANTITY 8,000 with MAXIMUM AMOUNT of \$400,000,000.00: Would UNIT PRICE = 50,000? Is the UNIT PRICE left blank and on the \$400,000,000.00 inserted into the MAX AMOUNT section?

A93. Offerors will not be required to fill-in any portion of Section B. The Maximum Amounts shown in the table in Section B are not to exceed amounts for each priced CLIN; maximum quantities are already included. There will be no unit prices at the MAC level, and Data CLINs (4000 and 8000) are not separately priced. All successful offerors will be awarded a MAC with a base period total ceiling of \$10,500,000,000, and option period ceiling of \$10,500,000,000. This will be clarified in the final RFP.

Q94. If we intend to only propose on fixed fee task orders (as a SB, we do not have a DCAA audit – nor would we pursue one) do we only fill out Item number 1000 and 5000 for FF, then Item numbers 3000 and 7000 for travel?

A94. No, all MAC awards will include all CLINs. It is the business decision of each awardee to determine Task Order solicitations on which they will propose.

Q95. On pages 56 and 57, regarding 52.237-10 (e), it notes "The offeror shall include a copy of its policy addressing uncompensated overtime with its proposal" however this isn't included as a required item in the instructions. Is this required?

A95. The requirement of FAR 52.237-10 to provide a policy on uncompensated overtime is not applicable to the MAC but may be applicable to certain Task Orders. This will be clarified in the final RFP.

Q96. Would a Prime contract proving OEM products to the Navy qualify us for submitting a bid?

A96. SeaPort-NxG is only for services, providing supplies does not qualify.

Q97. Will there be a page limit for the Subcontracting Plan that LBs must submit with their proposals?

A97. No. See Section L.5.4.2.b of the draft solicitation.

Q98. As far as proving your direct support to the Navy in the past 5 years, does that 5 year relevancy have to be current throughout the Awaiting Award process, or until just until the Solicitation Period has ended?

A98. The qualifying experience must be relevant at the time of proposal submission. See A88.

Q99. In Section L, para. 4.3 (a) on Page 60, it states that "If the experience was garnered performing as a subcontractor, a copy of the subcontract including the statement of work (SOW) that shows the scope of the subcontract, shall be provided." Our subcontract and SOW are over 20 pages in length. Is it acceptable to include the subcontract and SOW documents as an Appendix to the Technical Proposal? Are these pages excluded from the Technical volume page count limits?

A99. Yes, this information should be submitted as an appendix or attachment to the Technical Proposal. These pages do not count against the page limit.

Q100. As a "next generation" product, isn't it time for an accessibility update? Why does the draft RFP continue to mandate IE from Microsoft for the SeaPort-NxG contract? In doing so, you are inadvertently ENDORSING Microsoft only, as IE is not available on a Mac. There are browsers that are compatible with both PCs and Macs such as Google Chrome. Portal access requirements are: Browser type: 128-bit encryption, https-capable IE 11.x or higher. Will the Government reconsider this requirement, and include Google Chrome and Apple Safari? The existing SeaPort-e portal, in requiring IE, forces users to close a Pop-up warning EVERY time the system is accessed. Over the life of the contract, this wastes countless thousands of hours by contractors using anything other than IE, for no valid reason. In addition, IE is not available on a Mac, and in mandating IE over all other available browsers, the government is endorsing Microsoft only. Below is the warning that must be clicked on every time. Why does that add any value? It only delays accessing the site, EVERY TIME, for YEARS. Again, those on a Mac cannot get IE. Warning, you are using Safari Version 11 The recommended browser to access this site is: - Internet Explorer 11.0 or better.

A100. The Navy utilized Microsoft Internet Explorer because it's been the official NMCI browser configuration. As such, the software developers have performed all system testing with utilizing this browser configuration. While the SeaPort web application is able to be run in the Chrome browser, it has not been specifically tested in this configuration and therefore users may experience performance issues when running the application in this browser. The SeaPort web application is not compatible with Safari or other browsers.

Q101. In Section L, on page 60 of 67, Section 4.3, Volume I, Evaluation Factor 1, sub paragraph (a) states: "If the experience was garnered as a prime contractor, the contract number shall be provided. If the experience was garnered performing as a subcontractor, a copy of the subcontract including the statement of work (SOW) that shows the scope of the subcontract, shall be provided." To be clear, if the offeror's experience was as a 'prime' contractor, there is no requirement to provide a copy of the contract or the SOW. Is that the correct interpretation of this paragraph?

A101. Correct. If the experience was as a prime, a copy of the contract is not required but the Offeror is to provide the contract number.

Q102. There are three areas in the Draft RFP that appear to be conflicting. First - In Section M, on page 66 of 67, section 3.1, (b) states "Offerors will be required to describe recent and relevant DON experience in at least one of the following two major groups: (1) Engineering Support Services - engineering disciplines to technically support development of new and modification of existing Naval capabilities and systems, significant alterations to existing systems, integration and interface of existing equipment or software into different applications or platforms to support the warfighter or (2) Program Management Support Services - applying the business, financial and technical disciplines necessary to assist in managing acquisition efforts/programs, information technology services including system software analysis, design, development, test. No qualitative assessment will be made of the experience described." Second - In Section L, on page 62 of 67, the second paragraph states "If the experience was garnered as a prime contractor, the contract number shall be provided. If the experience was garnered performing as a subcontractor, a copy of the subcontract including the statement of work (SOW) which demonstrates the scope of the subcontract, shall be provided." Third - On page 63 of 67, the sixth line states "Past performance references are not required and will not be evaluated." Given these three statements, the instructions are not clear. For prime contracts, is the Solicitation requesting detailed information supporting the 23 SOW functional areas (similar to a past performance qualification), or simply requesting the Prime contract number and a statement specifying the specific Functional Area (SOW Paragraphs C.3.1 and C.3.2) that the offeror's experience correlates with?"

A102. The Technical Proposal is to provide a description of recent and relevant DON experience in one of the subcategories in one of the functional areas. In demonstrating this experience, the Offeror shall provide a contract number if they gained this experience as a prime contractor and a copy of the subcontract if they gained this experience as a subcontractor. It is expected that this narrative will discuss the work performed on the cited contracts/subcontracts.

Q103. Would the Government like our Cover Letter, SF 33, Section B, and Section K responses all in one document or should each requirement be its own separate file?

A103. Each document that is a portion of the response should be submitted. Section L.4.0 will be revised in the final RFP to identify a naming convention such as: Company Name_CAGE_Name of Document (i.e. ABC Corporation_01234_Cover Letter).

Q104. Reference: Draft RFP Page 20 of 67, Clause 52.219-14. Question: Does this clause apply to IDIQ level, or does it apply to each and every Task Order on Seaport-NxG?

A104. The clause FAR 52.219-14 Limitations on Subcontracting applies to MAC awards to Small Businesses and any Task Order that has been set-aside for Small Business.

Q105. Reference: Draft RFP Page 60 of 67, Paragraph I. (a) "Offerors shall provide information which will show evidence of previous experience providing direct support to the Department of the Navy, as either a prime contractor or a subcontractor, in at least one of the areas listed in Section C." Question: Is there any currency (e.g., within last five years), Period of Performance (e.g., more than one year performance) and/or Contract (Subcontract) value (e.g., more than \$500K) required for the previous experience supporting DoN? If not, as one of the possible scenarios, a \$10K subcontract which supported DoN 15 years ago will be qualified.

A105. There is a requirement that the experience be recent, having occurred in the last five years, but can have been performed as either a prime or subcontractor. There are no requirements concerning the length or dollar value of the work that was performed. The scenario would not qualify because the experience does not meet the definition of recent. See also A10.

Q106. Please clarify the intent and content of the "Meaningful Relationship" letter discussed at the bottom of the Draft RFP page 64. It is understood that this applies to all business entities within a single corporate structure. Will the Government accept one letter listing the requested information on all entities included with appropriate signatures or does it require individual letters for each of the entities?

A106. These letters will identify all corporate entities, other than subcontractors or consultants, which may be included in Task Order proposal and performance. A letter is required for each meaningful relationship identified.

Q107. We are currently collecting questions for submission, by when should the questions be submitted? Is there a deadline for the questions to be submitted?

A107. The Government will answer as many questions as possible up to the release of the final RFP. Once released, the Government will only answer questions related to the final RFP.

Q108. In the past some EOD and Special Forces work has been performed via the existing Seaport contract. Does direct support of this type of work to the USN qualify that contractor for

a Seaport NexGen contract? When citing EOD or Special Forces as the basis for consideration of a Seaport Nex Gen contract, which of the 23 functional areas would be the best to reference for a proposal submission?

A108. Engineering or Program Management Support Services in direct support of DoN EOD or Special Forces activities may qualify the Offeror. It is up to the Offeror to demonstrate how their experience correlates to any one of the subcategories in one of the functional areas.

Q109. Is it correct to conclude the SF-33 and fill-ins will not count toward a Technical Proposal page limit?

A109. Yes.

Q110. Is the maximum pass through rate applicable to subcontractor labor only?

A110. The maximum pass through rate is applicable to subcontractor fully burdened cost on labor CLINs.

Q111. Page 61 of 67, Para 5.3.1 states offerors must propose the maximum amounts specified in Section B. We understand this requirement. However, each CLIN of Section B also includes a unit price. Unit prices for labor hours will vary by geographic location and state/local tax requirements. Are offerors expected to provide a unit price and, if so, will the Government provide a location and Wage Determination (assuming use of Service Contract Act guidelines) to provide fair and equal competition among offers? Please advise.

A111. See A95. Not-to-exceed values have been established for each priced CLIN; no unit prices are applicable at the MAC level. Factors that affect direct labor cost such as location, Department of Labor Wage Determinations, etc. will be identified as applicable by Task Order solicitations.

Q112. Is there a cut off period for the current Seaport-e contract to submit responses to solicitations?

A112. Each Task Order solicitation issued under SeaPort-e will specify the date of proposal submission applicable to that solicitation.

Q113. Page 63 of 67, paragraph 5.4.2.b, states: "Large Business Offerors are required to provide a narrative, which details how the following requirements will be met in their subcontracting plans." We understand that the actual Subcontracting Plan has no page limit. However, is this narrative to be included in the Technical Proposal Volume and therefore subject to the 3-page limit?

A113. The requirement for a narrative in addition to the subcontracting plan will be deleted in the final RFP; Section L.5.4.2.b will be modified to reflect this change.

Q114. Ref. pg 6, Maximum Rates, C. Other Direct Costs and Travel. Please define adders.

A114. Other Direct Costs and Travel on page 6 will be modified in the final RFP to state “Indirect cost elements such as G&A and material handling may be applied to ODCs and Travel but fee may not be included.

Q115. Ref. Q&A 36. Will Collective Bargaining Agreements and Davis Bacon Act be incorporated?

A115. When applicable, Collective Bargaining Agreements would be incorporated on individual Task Orders. Wage Rate Requirements (Construction), formerly known as the Davis-Bacon Act, apply only to Construction which is outside the scope of SeaPort-NxG.

Q116. While we appreciate the Government’s efforts to simplify the SeaPort Next Generation RFP, I am more than taken back by the written statement released by the Navy Contracting Officer on April 5th, 2018. You stated: “Additionally, there are several firms soliciting to help other firms with their SeaPort-NxG proposals for a fee. The SeaPort-NxG proposal process has been designed to be extremely easy. No company should have to pay another company to help them. The process is contained in the draft Request for Proposals which has been posted to fbo.gov. Any questions on the draft RFP should be submitted by email to seaportnextgen.fct@navy.mil and the answers will be posted on fbo.gov. The Government is allowing ample time for questions and answers before issuing the formal RFP. Once the formal RFP is issued, industry will have 30 days to submit proposals electronically.” While I’m sure this was not the intention, the statement comes across as very uniformed of what goes into a RFP response from industry’s side. When a company is considering the internal resource allocation decision of whether to outsource or insource a proposal, the consideration as to how many pages of technical writing are required by the government is rarely the deciding factor. Many small businesses have no proposal resources in house. In some cases—including for this bid because the Navy is allowing subcontract past performance--this may be their first prime bid. Some companies sub all proposals out. Others sub out the simple ones so they can concentrate on the complex bids. In other cases, a proposal like this can be significantly less costly to sub out rather than do in house. Whether they complete the proposal in house or outsource, a company faces proposal development costs. There is a cost to the company whether they are paying an employee or paying an external resource. If the proposal is kept in-house, all tasks need to be completed internally, which may be more expensive on a costed-out basis than outsourcing to a support firm that can provide efficiencies of scale. Because proposal firms are proficient and read hundreds and hundreds of RFPs a year, the Government is more likely to get a compliant proposal. Experienced proposal firms reviewing your RFP and providing comments back on all the discrepancies also save the Government from making protestable mistakes. The Government of the United States has no business telling companies how to make internal resourcing decisions nor how to complete their proposals. Are you going to answer the question from a company as to which past performance they should use? Are you going to help them work out issues related to affiliation, subsidiaries and complex corporate structures? Are you going to review their proposals for compliance and tell them how to correct their mistakes? No. You can’t. But those questions still need to be answered, especially for small businesses. Rather than comment on matters that are inherently not in the purview of government oversight, please focus on improving the RFP. There are many discrepancies and contradictory elements in the draft that deserve your

attention. While I'd like to point those out to you and make suggestions for improvement, you are not fostering industry-government collaboration by putting out such a statement.

A116. The decision to outsource proposal preparation is entirely an internal company decision. Companies receiving advice from a consultant on proposal preparation will not be disqualified from receiving award of a SeaPort-NxG MAC. A draft RFP has been issued to provide Offerors with the opportunity for comment.

Q117. Paragraph 5.4.2 Evaluation Factor 1 – Technical Capability. Is there a definition of what is contained in the subheadings for Engineering Support Services and Program Management Support Services? Specifically, is Program Management Support Services sub item Functional and Direct Programmatic Administrative Support the area for providing direct support to the NAVSEA shipbuilding program offices?

A117. Draft RFP section M.3.1(b) provides the definition of these two general task areas. The subcategories listed are the types of services that are included in either category. It is up to each Offeror to demonstrate how their experience is relevant to the statement of work. As noted, no qualitative assessment will be made of the experience you describe in your proposal; the information will be used solely to ensure your company has experience performing some effort related to the scope of work.

Q118. Reference: Draft solicitation page 60 of 67, Section L, 4.0 PROPOSAL FORMAT, paragraph 4.2 states: "All information contained in the offerors proposal shall adhere to the following: Developed utilizing Microsoft Office Products only" Questions: 1. L.4.2 indicates that all proposals should be "developed" utilizing Microsoft Office products only. Does this mean that the final proposal documents should be submitted in formats compatible with Microsoft Office, such as Microsoft Word? 2. Currently the draft solicitation is provided as a PDF. Will the Government provide the final solicitation in Microsoft Word format? 3. For documents that require signature, such as the Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters and the SF33, can offerors submit those documents in Adobe PDF format?

A118. Yes, final proposal documents should be submitted in formats compatible with Microsoft Office. No, the final solicitation can only be posted in a PDF format. Yes, the signed documents may be submitted in PDF format.

Q119. Reference: Draft solicitation page 61 of 67, Section L, 5.2 COVER LETTER Question: As part of the requirements in paragraph 5.2, there is a list of seven (7) items to include in the offer letter. However, #5 is currently missing from this list. Is this a clerical error or is a cover letter requirement missing from the draft solicitation?

A119. A cover letter requirement is missing; #5 should state that the Offeror should identify their size and any socio-economic program that they have certified to in FAR 52.219-1.

Q120. Reference: Draft solicitation page 6 of 67, SECTION B TEXT, B. Maximum Profit/Fee Rate for CPFF CLINS only. "Fee becomes a fixed dollar amount at the time of task order

award and is subject to the provisions of the Level of Effort clause of the task order. The maximum fee rate being proposed at the task order level by the prime contractor shall flow down to all subcontractors/consultants included as part of your (the Prime) proposal.”

Question: Can the Government confirm that if, for example, a Prime contractor bids a Fee at 6.0% on a Task Order, then subcontractor will also be limited to a maximum of 6.0% Fee on their bid?

A120. The example is correct. The fee rate proposed by the prime contractor for a Task Order is the maximum fee rate allowed for subcontractors and consultants proposed on that Task Order.

[END OF 10 APRIL 2018 Q&A]

SeaPort-NxG Questions and Answers
17 April 2018

Q121. RFP Page # 62 Paragraph 1, Section 5.4.2 Evaluation Factor 1- Technical Capability, it says “..... Offerors are required to submit a description of no more than one of the subcategories listed below in either engineering support or program management support in direct support of Department of Navy DoN, i.e., one description of support provided in the area of system engineering and process engineering support not one from engineering support and another from program management support in support of DoN.....” Question: If we select a DON contract reference to address any one subcategory, does the reference need to cover all the words in the subcategory? For example, if we select “Software Engineering, Development, Programming and Network Support”, does the reference need to cover all these 4 areas? A typical software engineering contract would cover software engineering, development and programming. However, it may not cover Network Support. Is this acceptable?

A121. The experience does not have to cover all the words in the description.

Q122. Can the Government tell me if my specific contract would qualify?

A122. The Government cannot make specific assessments on the adequacy of qualifying experience for individual companies as part of the question and answer process. Based on the definitions of recent and relevant experience provided in L.5.4.2, it is the responsibility of the offeror to demonstrate that they are technically qualified. See A117.

Q123. RFP page 2 of 67 Section B, CLIN MINIMUM/MAXIMUM QUANTITY AND CLIN VALUE chart: Please note that CLIN 4000 has been skipped over in the chart though it appears in other areas of the RFP.

A123. Both CLINs 4000 and 8000 do not appear in the table “CLIN Minimum/Maximum Quantity and CLIN Value” because there is no quantity or dollar amount associated with these CLINs. They are for the delivery of data and are not separately priced.

Q124. Draft RFP states, “Offerors are encouraged to exceed the minimums and are directed to review Section M on the evaluation of this information as they determine their subcontracting goals. Section M does not address subcontracting.

A124. The Subcontracting Plan will be reviewed as pass/fail. There will be no subjective evaluation of the subcontracting goals. Section L.5.4.2.b will be corrected in the final RFP.

Q125. Section L makes reference to describing Offeror experience with respect to major areas of support, service areas, subcategories, and Functional Areas of Section C of the DRFP: L.4.3.l(a) states that “Offerors shall provide information which will show evidence of previous experience providing direct support to the DoN in a least one of the areas listed in Section C. L.5.4.2(a) states “There are two major areas of support, engineering support services and program management support services. Each of the two major areas is further broken down into subcategories. Offerors are required to submit a description of no more than one of the

subcategories listed below in either engineering support or program management support in direct support of Department of the Navy (DoN)” L.5.4.2(a) also states “Offerors shall specify the specific Functional Area (SOW Paragraphs C.3.1 and C.3.2) that the offeror’s experience correlates with.” Please clarify if Offerors should specify only if an experience relates to a major functional area (i.e. C.3.1 - Engineering Services or C.3.2 - Program Management Services), OR if Offerors should further specify which subcategory/service area an experience relates to.

A125. Offerors should indicate the subcategory and major functional area. The final RFP will clarify this requirement.

Q126. L.5.4.2.b states that “Large Businesses are required to submit a subcontracting plan, which contains the above goals.” Is a DCMA-approved DoD Comprehensive Subcontracting Plan acceptable to fulfill this requirement, or are Offerors required to submit an individualized plan?

A126. A DoD Comprehensive Subcontracting plan is acceptable; it must be approved by DCMA and a copy provided with the proposal.

Q127. On page 58 of the draft RFP for N00178-18-R-7000, Section 2.0, para 2.1: States that proposals must be submitted to the following email address seaportnextgen.fct@navy.mil . Our question is how do we know that the proposal was received ok? Do we get an email receipt or email confirmation? We want to assure that our proposal was received successfully with a documented receipt.

A127. In order to know that their proposals have been successfully submitted, Offerors should include a delivery receipt with their email.

Q128. Based on the requirement to indicate DCMA office in the cover letter, are you requesting for our company to indicate a DCMA office with which we have an existing relationship or the DCMA office which we would have a relationship based on the requirements of this solicitation? Our company has no existing DCMA relationship established as a subcontractor on our current Navy contract. We've not had a prime contract of sufficient value so we've not established a DCMA relationship. Please advise how we should document this on the cover page of our response to the solicitation.

A128. DCMA offices are assigned based on the geographical location of the company; you will have the same DCMA office for all of your DoN contracts. Even though you have not performed as a prime, you can identify the cognizant DCMA office for your location by using the web page identified in Section L.5.2.

Q129. Will the Government be issuing a ceiling labor rate applicable to all contractors?

A129. No, not at the MAC level.

Q130. Page 9 Section C.6: Can the government confirm that Subcontractors can/may be allowed access to the portal before they make direct submission of information to the government (i.e. on contract award)?

A130. After the MAC award, subcontractors will have to obtain access to the portal before they will be able to make a direct submission to the Government in response to a task order solicitation.

Q131. Page 53 Section K, 52.230-1 Cost Accounting Standards Notices and Certification Note: Per the note, this requirement does not apply to small business, will small businesses have the opportunity to bid on all contract type task orders including cost plus and flexibly priced contracts?

A131. Small business will have the opportunity to propose on all contract type task orders; however, a favorable DCAA accounting system audit is required to be eligible for the award of cost-reimbursement type orders. See the note in Section L.5.2 for further information.

Q132. Page 59 Section L 3.5: Will the government be evaluating proposals for breadth and depth? We recommend removing this requirement as "no more than one" description of services may be provided, limiting the ability to demonstrate breadth and depth.

A132. The Government will not be evaluating depth and breadth; L.3.5 will be revised in the final RFP.

Q133. Page 61 Section L 5.2 Note: Will the government accept a third-party audit (by a private-sector accounting firm to include completion of SF 1408) as the "pre-award survey of the offerors accounting system"? Does a successful third-party audit enable a contract holder to bid on all TOs to include cost type and flexibly priced contracts?

A133. No, the accounting system audit must be conducted by DCMA and DCAA.

Q134. Page 62 Section L 5.4.2 b: Please confirm that for the purposes of this procurement, the list of agencies at: <http://www.doddacm.mil/4th-estate-agencies.html> is the complete list of 4th estate agencies.

A134. The Government cannot make this confirmation.

Q135. Can you confirm whether or not at this time there is a need for pre-proposals or capabilities statements to be submitted?

A135. Pre-proposals or capability statements are not required.

Q136. Questions 18 and 37 (and associated answers) discuss Team Members and adding Team Members. My question: If a company wants to add a Team Member, does that company also have to have certifiable performance in direct support of the Navy?

A136. No, the requirement to demonstrate recent and relevant experience in direct support of the DoN applies to only prime offerors not to their team members. See also A61.

Q137. Reference: L.5.1, pg. 61 states - The completion and submission to the Government of an offer shall indicate the offeror's unconditional agreement to the terms and conditions in this solicitation. Question: Does the Government require a written statement in the Offeror's cover letter or does the submission of the proposal imply the offeror's unconditional agreement to the terms and conditions in this solicitation?

A137. The Offeror's signature on the SF33 implies unconditional agreement as long as there are no noted exceptions in the proposal.

Q138. Reference: Page 7, Section C.3.1 – "Engineering Services : a) engineering disciplines to technically support the research and development of new and existing Naval capabilities and systems; b) technically support development of significant alterations to existing systems; c) support integration and interface of existing equipment or software into different applications or platforms to support the warfighter, and support evaluation of foreign or non-developmental systems, equipment, and technologies" Question: We believe that not all subcategories in Engineering support services will meet all three criteria a, b and c. Therefore, is it acceptable if chosen subcategory meets at least one criterion out of a, b and c.

A138. Yes.

Q139. Reference: Page 7, Section C.3.1 – "Engineering Services : a) engineering disciplines to technically support the research and development of new and existing Naval capabilities and systems; b) technically support development of significant alterations to existing systems; c) support integration and interface of existing equipment or software into different applications or platforms to support the warfighter, and support evaluation of foreign or non-developmental systems, equipment, and technologies" Question: Please explain the term "system". Is it referring to application or network or hardware or software?

A139. The term system has been used broadly in the statement of work and covers anything from a ship or weapon system to the integration of hardware and software.

Q140. Is there an incumbent contractor currently providing these services? If yes, who is it?

A140. There are currently over 3,000 SeaPort-e MAC primes. See also A72.

Q141. Will a detailed description of each subcategory pertaining to the two major areas of support be included in the final RFP (Reference Page 62 of 67, Section 5.4.2a.)?

A141. No, these areas are intentionally broad which is consistent with the intended scope of SeaPort-NxG.

Q142. Reference Draft RFP Page 63 of 67, Section 5.4.2b., Subcontracting, states that 20% of the total amount must be subcontracted to small businesses, but the minimum requirements

to be allocated to each small business type only totals 14.5%. Will the Government please confirm which percentage is correct?

A142. Large Business Offerors are to subcontract at least 20% of the total dollars obligated under the contract. Within that 20%, there are goals for certain socio-economic groups that are a minimum of 14.5%. The remaining 5.5% has no further designation other than small businesses.

[END OF 17 APRIL 2018 Q&A]

SeaPort-NxG Questions and Answers
24 April 2018

Q143. The answer to question 18 states that "Offerors should identify their proposed team members so they and their team members can receive access to the SeaPort-NxG portal once award is made." The answer to question 37 states that "Offerors will be required to submit the Team Member's Name (as registered in SAM), the DUNs Number, and Cage Code. The SeaPort-NxG RFP will include instructions on how and when to submit proposed teammate(s) registration information. Since SeaPort-e and SeaPort-NxG are standalone contracts, a teammate added to SeaPort-e will not automatically be added to a SeaPort-NxG's MAC, or vice versa." The draft RFP does not contain information for including companies as subcontractors in an offeror's proposal. As many existing SeaPort-e prime contact holders have dozens of registered subcontractors, request the Government provide the detailed instructions for submitting proposed teammate(s) registration information so that offerors can begin compiling the necessary data prior to RFP release.

A143. Section L of the final RFP will provide a format for Offerors to provide team member information. The information requested will include: company name, address, DUNs, CAGE, size standard and socio-economic status. At the time of award, all successful Offerors will be emailed information regarding access to the registration site within the SeaPort-NxG portal and information on how to register themselves and their team members. Successful Offerors will need to formally submit the information provided as part of the proposal within the registration site.

Q144. For the initial Seaport Contract many contractors put "mega-teams" together that in retrospect did not seem like the correct strategy. Also, for the legacy contract, adding teammates after award seemed relatively simple. Would the USG please provide guidance on how teammates would be allowed to be added after the upcoming awards are announced? Does the USG have a preference that teams should be created before proposal submission or as needed as individual delivery orders may dictate?

A144. It is preferred that all team members are identified at time of award of the MAC. Team members can be added after award; however, untimely request and the resultant delay in the approval process could impact Task Order proposal submission.

Q145. We have performed as a prime on several relevant and recent contracts for the DoN. In the Technical Proposal should we include information on more than one contract or limit our response to one contract? Is there an upper limit on number of contracts cited for relevant experience?

A145. Offerors are not required to limit their technical proposal to only one contract/subcontract; however, one is sufficient. The final RFP will include a limitation that no more than 3 total references be provided.

Q146. In Section L, on page 60 of 67 Section 4.3, the last sentence states “The offeror is required to submit one entire completed copy (signed by the offeror) of the RFP in their proposal.” On page 61 of 67, Section 5.3, the paragraph states “Standard Form 33 with blocks 12 through 18 completed. DO NOT CHANGE THE SF33 IN ANY WAY EXCEPT TO ADD THE OFFERORS INFORMATION THAT IS REQUIRED IN BLOCKS 12 THROUGH 18. The offeror is to submit one copy of the signed SF33 cover page and any fill-ins.” Does the Government want the signed SF33 along with the entire RFP as part of the submission, or just the signed and completed SF33 as described in Section 5.3?

A146. The SF33 submission should include the Cover Page with Blocks 12 through 18 completed, as applicable, and Section K (at a minimum 52.204-8(b)(2)) completed by the Offeror. These instructions will be clarified in the final RFP.

Q147. In which volume should the Offerors list its proposed subcontractors? What information should be provided for the proposed subcontractors (socio-economic status? company name and CAGE, or DUNS)? Is there any qualification requirement for the proposed subcontractors (e.g., not been debarred or suspended per SAM.gov, etc.)? What’s the page limitation for this part of narrative?

A147. Refer to A143 for the information that will be required for team members; there is no page limit. There is no qualification requirement for the proposed team members since they would not be considered subcontractors until proposed at the Task Order level. As part of each Task Order RFP process, there may be qualification requirements, such as verification of SAM record, that apply to subcontractors.

Q148 Reference: Draft RFP Page 66 of 67, Paragraph 3.1 (a) “. The Government will first determine, by verification in SAM, that the offeror ... and has accurately portrayed their size status.” Question: Should the Offeror certify its size status in its proposal? If yes, in which Volume? If no, how does the Government determine the size status of the Offeror? This has an impact on future set-aside Task Order competition eligibility. This issue also applies to Socio-Economic status such as 8(a), SDVOSB, etc. Should Offeror certify its socio-economic status in its proposal? How does the Government intend to verify/validate the Offeror’s statement on its socio-economic status?

A148. Offerors are to identify in their Cover Letter their company size; the final RFP will be modified to add this requirement in Section L. The Government intends to verify the Offerors’ status with the certifications in SAM. Prime Offerors are not to identify any socio-economic program designations at the MAC level; however, further designation by socio-economic group may be made at the Task Order level. It will be the responsibility of the contractor to ensure their socio-economic categories are accurately reflected in SAM because SAM will be used to verify status at the time of Task Order proposal submittal. (This amends A119 which stated socio-economic program status would be indicated in the cover letter.)

Q149. See Section L.5.4.2.c (page 63) – According to this section an offeror cannot take credit for any prior experience gained as a subcontractor regardless of its relevance. However, this restriction appears to be contradicted by the Evaluation Factor I (Technical

Capability) text (see page 60) that states, “Offerors shall provide information which will show evidence of previous experience providing direct support to the Department of the Navy, as either a prime contractor or a subcontractor, in at least one of the areas listed in Section C.”. Please clarify.

A149. Section L.5.4.2.c is about meaningful relationship commitment letters in the context of an Offeror taking credit for recent/relevant experience of entities within its own corporate structure (see definition on page 64 of the draft RFP). In this context, Offerors cannot take credit for recent/relevant experience of their subcontractors because their subcontractors are not within their corporate structure and the subcontractor’s experience is not their own experience. This should not be confused with the evaluation criteria which requires direct support to the DON either as a prime or as a subcontractor in at least one of the areas listed in Section C.

Q150. In response to paragraph 5.4.2.a, is it the Government’s intent that offerors cite one (1) recent and relevant contract and describe how it correlates to at least one (1) subcategory? OR is it the Government’s intent that offerors write broadly to one (1) subcategory, citing multiple recent and relevant contracts as experience?

A150. Either approach is acceptable; however, the final RFP will include a limit of no more than 3 recent and relevant contracts/subcontracts that can be cited as experience. See also A102.

Q151. Some Prime Task Orders function like IDIQ contracts with work assigned through an additional SOW or Technical Directive. For work performed as a Prime, will the offeror be allowed to submit a SOW or Technical Directive to show direct Navy experience?

A151. The Offeror’s Technical Proposal shall provide a contract number and description of the work performed within the scope of the cited contract. Additional directives issued for the contract may be discussed in the Technical Proposal but copies of technical directives should not be included.

Q152. Page 64 Section L 5.4.2 c bolded paragraph under second numbered list: For the purposes of this procurement, can Meaningful Relationships exist outside a corporate structure? If yes, can the government provide specifics on all other Meaningful Relationships (e.g. Mentor Protégé)?

A152. As defined in the draft RFP Section L.5.4.2.c., a “meaningful relationship” only exists within a corporate structure; a Mentor Protégé is not considered a “meaningful relationship”.

Q153. In the Draft RFP, Paragraph 5.3.2 appears to require the submission of certifications and representations with the proposal, but then directs attention to SAM and ORCA. If an offeror’s certifications and representations are up-to-date in SAM, are offerors still required to submit certifications and representations with their proposal?

A153. All Offerors should complete FAR 52.204-8, Annual Representations and Certifications section (b)(2) indicating whether their representations and certifications in SAM are up-to-date or if they will complete each of the representations and certifications covered by the provision individually.

Q154. Is there a limitation on subcontractors/teaming for small businesses? What will be the submission requirements to demonstrate subcontractor teaming for small businesses?

A154. There is no limit to the number of team members allowed on a team. See A143 concerning the information required for team members.

Q155. Reference: L.5.3.2, pg. 61 states - Section K: All fill-ins to be completed by the offeror. The Offeror shall insert the proposed information where an * appears in Section K. Attention is directed to www.SAM.gov regarding Online Representations and Certifications (ORCA) as outlined in Section K. Question: At the reference (Section K) the only K area that contains a * is within the Full Text Clause of 52.230-1 Cost Accounting Standards Notices and Certifications (Oct 2015). Can Small Business offerors assume that no "*" fill-ins apply to them as the Clause is not applicable or required for completion by Small Businesses?

A155. Yes.

Q156. For the Tech Proposal content, the DoN asks for a "description" and "information" to "show evidence" that our experience correlates to one of the subcategories. How in depth does our description need to be in order to prove relevance? Is the DoN looking for a description of the services and support provided that are relevant to the subcategory? Or a detailed methodology of how the services and support were accomplished?

A156. Offerors should be detailed enough in their technical proposal to show the relevance of their experience to one subcategory in one functional area subject to the page limitation.

Q157. The following statement taken from the Draft SeaPort NxG RFP implies that the requested commitment letter needs to include a "commitment" regarding the performance and utilization of the entity / teammate, i.e., how the identified entity will be used in upcoming task orders as it relates to performance, etc. As it currently reads, it sounds as if the Government is looking for a statement that commits the Prime and the Teammate to a specific way the team mate will be used for upcoming task orders. Is that the intent with this statement? If not, would you please provide clarification regarding this statement? For each meaningful relationship identified for SeaPort-NxG proposal elements, the Offeror must provide a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter that includes the following: 1. Clear and legal identification of the meaningful relationship between the Offeror and entity identified. 2. A statement of commitment as to the performance and utilization of the identified entity's resources on SeaPort-NxG task orders.

A157. In the MAC proposal, Offerors are not required to describe how team members will be used in Task Orders. Meaningful relationship commitment letters only apply within a corporate structure as defined in Section L.5.4.2.c.

Q158. We appreciate the actions the NAVSEA Support Services Acquisition Program Office (SSAPO) is taking to simplify the SeaPort Next Generation (NxG) procurement process. However, requiring offerors to have prior US Navy experience to submit a proposal, is more “restrictive” than “simplification” and is contradictory to the trends of industry. While product diversity in the IT market exists, the industry trend has been centered on enterprise optimization: standardizing processes, data, technology and applications wherever possible across the enterprise. The Federal government and industry have embraced this movement toward standardization, common platforms, and tools that can support multi-vendor environments. This is substantiated by published standards from National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), International Organization for Standardization (ISO), Capability Maturity Model Integration (CMMI) Institute, International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) and other governing bodies. A role of an IT solutions provider and systems integrator is to achieve the most effective utilization and maximum value from IT investments. If only Navy experience is considered, SeaPort-NxG becomes less effective by not incorporating many of innovative solutions being provided to other Federal departments and agencies. With the implementation of standards and common IT frameworks there is no difference in providing Engineering Support Services and/or Program Management Support Services to the different branches of the Department of Defense (DoD) and very little difference in providing these same services to Federal Civilian Agencies. If NAVSEA restricts the past experience to only Navy contracts, it will not only limit competition, it will also reduce the pool of highly qualified contractors that have provided innovative and cost effective solutions to the Federal government – but not to the Navy. Question: Will the SSAPO reconsider the current very restrictive requirement for Navy past performance and accept relevant experience from any Federal agency, thus ensuring reasonable competition and a broader pool of past performance that showcases innovative solutions across multiple Federal agencies and departments?

A158. The requirement for experience in direct support of the DON is based on the unique nature of the mission of the DON and the support necessary to successfully execute that mission as described in Section L.5.4.2.a.

Q159. RFP page 20, FAR clause 52.219-9 (Deviation 2016-O0009), reduces the frequency of Summary Subcontract Report (SSR) submissions under an Individual Subcontracting Plan from biannual to annual. RFP page 63 states, “The reporting of the actual subcontracting information experienced under the SeaPort-NxG contract will occur in the Electronic Subcontracting Reporting System (eSRS). An e-mail notification will be sent twice a year to all prime contractors requiring the information to be entered into eSRS.” Can the Gov’t please clarify the frequency of submission for the SSR?

A159. FAR 52.219-9 Deviation 2016-O0009 is no longer in effect and will be removed from the final RFP. 52.219-9 requires biannual reporting and is consistent with RFP Section L.5.4.2.b.

Q160. Page 23 of the Draft RFP contains DFAR 252.244-7001, Contractor Purchasing System Administration. Can DOD please clarify if a nontraditional defense contractor, per the

definition in DFAR 212.011, would need to have a certified CPSR in place prior to submitting an Offer?

A160. The criteria under which the Administrative Contracting Officer determines the need for a Contractor Purchasing System Review (CPSR) are documented in FAR 44.302. This standard is applicable to any DOD contractor whether or not they consider themselves to be traditional. It is not necessary to have a certified CPSR to be eligible to be awarded a SeaPort-NxG MAC.

Q161. Can DOD confirm that FAR 52.212-1, Instructions to Offerors – Commercial Items will apply to the acquisition of supplies and services from nontraditional defense contractors?

A161. No, FAR 52.212-1 will not be included in the RFP. Commercial purchasing procedures are not included as part of SeaPort-NxG.

Q162. The draft RFP states that “SeaPort-NxG anticipates holding an on-ramp, or rolling admission, approximately two years after award of the initial MAC contracts”. Will the on ramp be available for both large and small businesses?

A162. Yes, rolling admissions will be available to any qualifying business, large or small.

Q163. Request the Government provide descriptions for the Service Areas listed in C.3.1 and C.3.2

A163. The description of the task areas in C.3.1 is intentionally broad. Detailed statements of work will be part of the Task Order process.

[END OF 24 APRIL 2018 Q&A]

SeaPort-NxG Questions and Answers
1 MAY 2018

Q164. Page 63 of the Draft RFP: The Navy requests three final SF 294s from large businesses as evidence of an Offerors' ability to meet the 20% subcontracted goal. Will the Navy please affirm that Offerors classified as a large business for the new solicitation, but a small business on past awards, need not submit copies of 294s if they have not been previously required to submit these forms / have not had any requirements to do SF 294s?

A164. The requirement to provide SF294s will be removed from the final RFP.

Q165. Reference: Draft solicitation page 63 of 67, Section L, 5.4.2 EVALUATION FACTOR 1 - TECHNICAL CAPABILITY, c. Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters, if applicable. Questions: Are the Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters to be submitted as part of Volume I – Technical Proposal or should these letters be submitted separately as their own standalone document? Is there a page limit for the Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters?

A165. The Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letters should be submitted as a separate document. Each letter shall not exceed 2 pages. The final RFP will include amended instructions.

Q166. On page 63 of the RFP it states "The Offerors shall provide copies of three final SF 294s (does not count in the page limitation) for the three relevant contracts, which best demonstrates the offerors ability to achieve the proposed subcontracting goals." The limitation of final SF 294's precludes the use of an offeror's Seaport-e basic contract as all such contracts are still active and SF 294's are submitted at the basic contract level. Offeror requests to know if an exception can be made for Seaport-e basic contracts. In addition, for many medium sized professional services companies in the Navy market, the majority of work has been accomplished under Seaport-e, which has not ended, and thus does not have a "Final" SF 294. Since Seaport-e has existed for up to 14 years for some companies, they may not have three SF 294s from other contracts to submit. Will the submission of less than three SF 294s be acceptable to the government, if no other 294s exist for other prime contracts? If this requirement cannot be relaxed, can the government provide an alternative requirement for showing past small business subcontracting efforts?

A166. This requirement will be deleted. See A164.

Q167. Given that the draft solicitation has pages of detailed requirements for the safeguarding & dissemination of Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI), does the government intend to email any solicitation/RFP documents with CUI markings? If so, it

seems the government would have to first create a distribution list of offerors' CUI-compliant email accounts.

A167. No, the RFP will not contain any CUI markings; the entire RFP will be posted to FBO.

Q168. My company is a wholly-owned PROXY company of a larger foreign-owned company. Since a PROXY company is recognized as a separate, 100% US-operated company, with its own Board of Directors and President, can the wholly-owned PROXY company hold a MAC award and the foreign-owned parent company hold another MAC award?

A168. No, the Proxy company exists within the corporate structure of the parent company.

Q169. Page 61, 5.2 Cover Letter, the RFP does not appear to be requesting submission of approved accounting system documentation to be eligible to receive cost type or flexibly priced task orders. Will the Government require submission of approved accounting system documentation with proposal submission?

A169. Approved accounting system documentation is not required at the MAC level; however, it will be required for cost-reimbursement Task Orders.

Q170. DELETED

Q171. Page 63 of 67, b. Subcontracting. Will Veteran-owned Small Business still be a required socio-economic group under small business subcontracting plan?

A171. Since the SeaPort-NxG MAC is based on DOD Subcontracting goals, Veteran-Owned Small Business (VOSB) are not included. However, individual Task Orders may include VOSB goals to which Task Order Offerors will have to comply.

Q172. The SeaPort-NxG NAICS code is 541330 utilizing the exception for marine engineering and naval architecture which has a size standard of \$38.5 million. Our company is small under NAICS 483111 with a size standard of 500 employees. We do direct support for the Navy Military Sealift Command under that NAICS code and have received small business set aside awards as prime contractor. Is it possible that we could bid task orders if awarded a MAC, and bid as a small business using NAICS 483111?

A172. No, SeaPort-NxG MACs and all task orders will utilize NAICS, 541330, with the marine engineering and naval architecture exception of average annual receipts of \$38.5M. The Government will verify that Offerors have certified to this NAICS in their SAM record.

Q173. What are the anticipated competitive process duration and expected timelines for solicitations of Task Order(s) awarded under SeaPort-NxG? Previously it took eighteen months from Customer generated requirement and funding availability to Task Order award. What is the expected competitive time procurement action lead time from Customer's requirement definition to Task Order Award?

A173. Each ordering activity establishes its own procurement action lead times for Task Order awards.

Q174. Will this contract vehicle provide means for requiring customers to fund and execute multiple year Task Orders? I.e. Customer is not to be limited to one-year performance and funded Task Orders?

A174. It is up to individual ordering activities to determine and obtain approval for their specific type of contract methodology at the Task Order Level.

Q175. L.4.3, pg. 60 Volume I, Technical Proposal does not allow for a cover page or table of contents. These items would assist in identifying offerors and the volume content. Are offerors permitted to submit a volume cover page and table of contents that do not count against page limits?

A175. The Cover Letter and 3-page Technical Proposal will suffice.

Q176. Regarding Q/A 150: Would the Government please confirm that if an offeror chooses to cite more than 1 recent and relevant contract, each of those contracts may address a different subcategory?

A176. Addressing more than one subcategory is not prohibited but it also is not necessary. Demonstrated experience in one subcategory in one functional area is all that is required to have qualifying experience.

Q177. Page 63 of 67, paragraph 5.4.2.b states that "Large Business Offerors are required to provide a narrative, which details how the following requirements will be met in their subcontracting plans" and that "the subcontracted effort must be comprised of meaningful work under the statement of work within the task orders." With the requirements above in mind, are Large Business Offerors required to name specific subcontractors in their subcontracting plans? If yes, how is an Offeror to know subcontractor identities upon contract award before any task orders are solicited and bid?

A177. At the MAC level, Offerors are only required to provide subcontracting goal percentages without identifying specific names of prospective subcontractors.

Q178. Page 21 of 67, FAR CLAUSE 52.244-2 Is the PCO going to retain the right of consent to subcontractors under FAR 52.244-2, rather than having the ACO involved in that process?

A178. Task Order Contracting Officers will retain the right to approve and add subcontractors. The Seaport-NxG MAC Contracting Officer will approve and add team members.

SeaPort-NxG Questions and Answers
8 MAY 2018

Q179. Can you tell me what the latest schedule is for SeaPort-NxG?

A179. The latest notional schedule is:

Formal RFP Release: 01 June 2018
Proposals Due: 02 July 2018
Awards Made: 30 November 2018

Q180. The current SeaPort contract has caps on certain rates, including pass-through rates and fee. While we understand the Government's intent, is to streamline the cost analysis/realism process and negotiate lower costs, we are concerned that this universal policy negatively affects small businesses. It is commonly understood that: 1) Small businesses generally have higher indirect rates (due primarily to lower revenue to spread costs against); and 2) Small businesses are subject to significant fluctuations in sales and variable costs, and thus high volatility of indirect rates. Understanding the above, SeaPort's current rates ceiling structure (generally 8%) can result in a significant negative impact on a small business if the company's DCAA approved indirect rates are greater than the SeaPort contractual ceiling. For example, on a \$1M subcontract with a max pass through rate of 8% (inclusive of G&A and fee), and a small business with a DCAA approved G&A rate of 9% and a contractual fee ceiling of 6% (which cannot be applied in this scenario), the small business would be subject to a \$75,400 loss in revenue / indirect rate recovery (consisting of \$10k in G&A and \$65.4k in fee). With this in mind, will the Government consider establishing separate (higher) caps for small businesses, or accepting DCAA approved rates, and contract fee, on pass through/subcontracts? The ceiling on fee also negatively constrains small businesses on high-risk FFP contracts that lack the capital to take on these riskier contracts. This is compounded on multiple year contracts with fixed unit prices, as well as the passthrough issue noted above. Will the Government consider removing the cap on fee on FFP contracts?

A180. The Navy's plan for SeaPort-NxG is to follow the SeaPort-e model to the greatest extent in order to maintain the same healthy competitive atmosphere and to continue supporting Small Business. SeaPort-e has been very successful in supporting Small Business. Since its inception 551 different small businesses have won task orders, and 54 small businesses have grown to "Other than Small" based in large part on the work they performed under SeaPort-e. As stated in Section B, the maximum fee rate is applicable to Cost-Plus-Fixed-Fee (CPFF) CLINs only.

Q181. Regarding Section 5.4.1 Presence on page 61 of 67 of the draft solicitation, we understand that there is no longer any need to establish presence in the seven Zones, but can you explain how TO contracting activity will work within that Zone structure? For example, is the Zone for each TO release determined by the location of the

contracting office or primary place of performance? Also, will OCONUS contracting offices such as Yokosuka, Sigonella, etc., be able to use SeaPort-NxG?

A181. All awardees will receive all 7 zones. The zones are associated with the ordering office's location; individual task order solicitations may identify personnel location requirements.

Q182. Given the amount of required information that is to be contained in the cover letter, will the Government consider a 2-page limit for the cover letter instead of 1 page as outlined in the Draft RFP?

A182. One page is sufficient.

Q183. Will the final RFP allow for the inclusion of a title page on the file submissions to ensure proper reference to proprietary information restrictions on the proposal submission? Will the Government also please identify that the title pages are excluded from the page limits?

A183. Proposals are not to include any proprietary data.

Q184. Regarding the proposal validity, page 58, 1.0 provides: Proposals submitted shall be valid for 365 days from the date of submittal. Page 62, 5.2 #6 provides: Proposal validity for 365 days after issuance date of the RFP. Will the Government please clarify the validity requirement?

A184. The proposal validity period for all offers shall be 365 days from the closing date of the RFP. Pages 58 and 61 of the RFP will be corrected.

Q185. A144 states that "It is preferred that all team members are identified at time of award of the MAC. Team members can be added after award; however, untimely request and the resultant delay in the approval process could impact Task Order proposal submission." For large businesses with many task orders under Seaport-e, this could involve including 30+ subcontractors who may or may not also be submitting their own bid as prime. a) Will the Government please clarify that the Government wants offerors to include all possible subcontractors with the MAC proposal submission? b) For contractors to provide timely requests for the addition of team members after award, will SeaPort NxG use a similar timeframe as Seaport-e which provides that contractors must allow no less than 3 to 4 business days for team member addition requests to be reviewed?

A185. Yes, the Government does prefer that all potential team members/future subcontractors be identified with the MAC proposal submission. Team members may be added post-award and the MAC PCO will process them as expeditiously as possible but the Government cannot estimate how long it may take to add team members post-award because we expect there will be numerous requests. Therefore, it would be in the offeror's best interest to include all potential team members in their MAC proposal

submission. A spreadsheet will be provided with the formal RFP for offerors to identify potential team members.

Q186. Section L para 2.2 and 5.4.2 require the offeror to show proof of recent and relevant DoN experience with a contract number (prime) or copy of subcontract (sub). If the offeror is proposing DoN experience where work is performed under a classified prime DoD contract (prime) to which the Navy will not have access for verification, will unclassified copies of the Technical Task Order suffice?

A186. The contract number should still be provided. No classified material should be included in the proposal. Offers should provide an unclassified description of work performed and the name, phone number, and email address of the Government contract Point-of-Contact.

A187. If a company is a Small Business under the governing NAICS code but the company did not include this NAICS code in its last SAM update, will said company be allowed to assert its Small Business status via other means? The last sentence in 52.204-8 Annual Representations and Certifications, paragraph (d), appears to accommodate an amendment to SAM with our proposal without revising SAM, and this question would arise if the bidder did not include 541330 in its SAM certification but has pending business under a lower NAICS code threshold that may be impacted if the bidder is forced to update its SAM registration early in order to bid for the SeaPort NxG MAC. Such small businesses may not be able to bid on the SeaPort NxG MAC if certification updates are not permitted by other means.

A187. Offerors must have SAM certification under NAICS 541330 to receive a SeaPort-NxG award. Offerors will be determined to be small businesses or other than small businesses based on what is registered in SAM. The referenced sentence of FAR 52.204-8 (d) does not apply to size standards. It only applies to other representations and certifications promulgated by FAR clauses.

Q188. Will Enterprise-Wide Contractor Manpower Reporting Application (ECMRA) be a requirement in NxG?

A188. It will be incorporated at the task order level.

Q189. Will Electronic Cost Reporting and Financial Tracking (eCRAFT) System be a requirement in NxG?

A189. No, eCRAFT is only applicable to NAVSEA Warfare Center Task Orders.

Q190. Will each IDIQ holder be required to maintain a publicly available Webpage throughout the period of performance of the NxG as currently required in the current Seaport-e?

A190. No, this will not be a requirement under SeaPort-NxG.

Q191. Section I, Page 32 of 67, FAR Clause 52.232-16 PROGRESS PAYMENTS (APR 2012). Is the Government only allowing Progress Payments as defined by this FAR for reimbursement of costs under NxG?

A191. FAR clause 52.232-16 will be deleted in the final RFP. Clauses governing payment are listed on page 21 of the draft RFP. The decision to provide for progress payments will be made at the task order level.

Q192. Why is FAR Clause 52.232-40 PROVIDING ACCELERATED PAYMENTS TO SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTORS (DEC 2013) excluded from NxG? We are a small company and depend upon accelerated payments. Why is the Clause LIMITATION OF COST OR LIMITATION OF FUNDS LANGUAGE (FAR 52.232-20 & FAR 52.232-22) excluded from NxG? Why is Clause PAYMENTS OF FEE(S) (COMPLETION) (NAVSEA) (MAY 1993) & Clause PAYMENTS OF FEE(S) (LEVEL OF EFFORT – ALTERNATE 1) (NAVSEA) (MAY 2010) excluded from NxG?

A192. SeaPort-NxG is a vehicle available across the DON ordering activities listed in Section C and as such, NAVSEA clauses are not applicable at the MAC level. As noted throughout the draft RFP, each ordering activity will insert their own component clauses at the Task Order level as appropriate.

Q193. We will be identifying the past performance of a former wholly-owned subsidiary. However, while the subsidiary still exists as a shell company, the past performance, which is an ongoing contract, now belongs to the corporate offeror. Therefore, our interpretation of L.5.4.2.c. is that we do not have to submit a Meaningful Relationship Commitment Letter since we will not be taking credit for the work of a parent company, affiliate, division, and/or subsidiary. Can the Government please confirm that our interpretation of L.5.4.2.c. is correct?

A193. Since the contract belongs to the company that would be the prime offeror, a meaningful relationship letter is not required. The Government requires either a Meaningful Relationship letter or a contract that has been fully novated to the new name.

Q194. Will the Government please clarify that the “maximum pass through rates” are only applicable for task order bidding purposes and not applicable during task order execution?

A194. As stated in Section B of the draft RFP, the maximum pass through rate is the maximum rate than can be charged against subcontract cost.

Q195. Page 63 or 67, b. Subcontracting. Will the Seaport NxG contract require Small Business Subcontracting reporting at the task order level in the Seaport NxG portal?

A195. Task Order Offerors may be required to address planned subcontracting goals but reporting of actual subcontracting experience will be at the MAC level.

Q196. Will the Government please clarify how the small business size status will be determined in the situation where all the CAGE codes of wholly owned subsidiaries of a Holding Company are included under the SeaPort-NxG MAC? Will the Government please clarify how the 8(a) status will be determined in the situation where all the CAGE codes of wholly owned subsidiaries of a Holding Company are included under the SeaPort-NxG MAC? Will the Govt please clarify the conditions under which a subsidiary can bid on a task order under the MAC held by its corporate entity? For example, if the MAC holder is a graduated 8(a), but the subsidiary bidding on the TO is an active 8(a), does that allow the subsidiary to bid on 8(a) set aside TO? If one of the subsidiaries and cage codes declared by a holding company is a Joint Venture (JV), will the JV be allowed to bid on a Seaport NxG TO on the basis of its parent company being a MAC holder?

A196. Business size is determined by the company that has been awarded the MAC.

Q197. Your answer to question 32 stated that “If a company is a small business at the time they are awarded a SeaPort-NxG MAC...”. I believe the small business certification will be at the time of proposal submission, therefore, if a company was a SB at time of proposal submission but became a LB at time of award, it would still be classified as a SB. Please address.

A197. Size status will be verified by the Government after closing of the RFP. Given the volume of proposals expected, it is not possible to definitively predict when SAM will be checked.

Q198. Page 9 of 67, C.4, “Any change to the status of the SeaPort-NxG awardee does not alleviate the contractual responsibilities including but not limited to: 3) Any CAF not paid in full from the acquired contractor.” As there are no other references to Contract Access Fee (CAF) in the draft RFP, will the government please remove item 3?

A198. Page 9 of the RFP will be updated to remove “3) Any CAF not paid in full from the acquired contractor.”

Q199. Under SeaPort NexGen will the Government require Small Business to re-certify on a solicitation basis? Small businesses must continually struggle to compete against large business who graduated out of their SB Status. Yet, these now large businesses are still allowed to compete as a small business until the MAC has expired. There are contractors with 100 million dollars in annual revenue. yet when a small business set-aside solicitation is released and a question is raised about re-certification the answer is always, “No.”

A199. SeaPort-NxG MACs will require awardees to recertify their size status at the end of the base five year ordering period and prior to option exercise of the option five year ordering period. At the task order level, only socio-economic small business set-aside RFPs will require offerors to recertify their size status and their socio-economic status in SAM to ensure they are eligible for award. For non-socio-economic small business set-aside task order competitions (i.e., just a small business set-aside), offerors will not be required to recertify their size status in accordance with FAR 52.219-28 Post-Award Small Business Program Representation.

Q200. I just wanted to take a second to say thank you to whomever the people are who have the patience to answer all the questions. 178 questions for a proposal limited to three pages where virtually everyone will be accepted? Kudos to you all!

A200. Thank you. The Government will continue to accept questions on the draft RFP and answer as many as we can prior to issuance of the formal RFP, however, when the formal RFP is released, the Government will no longer answer questions on the draft RFP. Any unanswered questions will have to be resubmitted referencing the formal RFP.

SeaPort-NxG Questions and Answers
5/15/18

Q201. Q142 of the Q/A indicates that “Large Business Offerors are to subcontract at least 20% of the total dollars obligated under the contract.” As part of the small business subcontracting plan, the offeror is required to present their small business goals as a percentage of the estimated contract value. For the purposes of the submission, will the Government please confirm that the 20% subcontracting goal is intended to be calculated against the Section B values shown for all CLINs.

A201. The goals presented in the Subcontracting Plan should be expressed as percentages only, not dollar values. The minimum percentages required are stated in Section L, paragraph 5.4.2.b. The Subcontracting Plan must state that the proposed goals are based on the total planned subcontracting dollars under the contract (not per task order). Since Offerors have no way of knowing exactly how much work will be won under the contract, dollar values are not required. The dollar values shown in Section B per CLIN are the maximum dollar amounts that shall not be exceeded over the life of the contract and therefore do not represent the expected amount to be obligated. Large businesses should review the statement of work and determine what work scope they plan on proposing for in task order competitions. Based on that, they should then determine what amount of meaningful work scope they plan on subcontracting to various types of small businesses which must be at least 20%. Within the 20% (or greater percentage), the following minimums are required: Small Disadvantaged Businesses (5%), Women-Owned Small Businesses (5%), Hub-Zones (3%) and Service Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Businesses (3%). See A31, A97, A113, A124, A126, A142, A164, A166, A171, A177, and A195.

Q202. Q144 of the Q/A indicates that “it is preferred that all team members are identified at time of award of the MAC.” Q177 of the Q/A indicates however, “at the MAC level, Offerors are required to only provide subcontracting goal percentages without identifying specific names of prospective subcontractors.” Will the Government please confirm that team members are required to be identified in the submission?

A202. As part of their proposal, Offerors are to provide a list of their team members; see A143. However, the Subcontracting Plan required by FAR 52.219-9 should not include specific names of prospective subcontractors.

Q203. There has been certain Q&A discussions about teaming partners. Will the government require copies of teaming agreements to be included our submission? If not, what will be required about subcontractor and teaming information?

A203. No, copies of teaming agreements are not to be provided with an Offeror’s proposal submission. Team members are not considered to be subcontractors at the MAC level, only at the task order level. See A143.

Q204. Section L, Page 61, Section 5.3.2 states, “Section K: All fill-ins to be completed by the offeror”. A146 stated that regarding the fill-ins, at a minimum 529.204-8(b)(2) is to be completed by the Offeror. A155 confirms that for Small Businesses offerors assume that no “*” fill-ins apply to them as the Clause is not applicable or required for completion by Small Businesses. What about Section K, Page 51, Section 52.209-5 Certification Regarding Responsibility Matters (Oct 2015) – should this be included along with the 52.204-8(b)(2) fill-in as a minimum fill-in even for Small Businesses? Also, in the response, can we cut and paste the applicable Section K fill-in requirements or does the USG want us to include the entire Section K in the response?

A204. The certification at FAR 52.209-5 is covered by FAR 52.204-8(b)(2), and does not need to be provided separately by the Offeror if their SAM Representation and Certifications are current. Offerors may provide only the section(s) of Section K that they are required to provide.

Q205. CLINs 2000 and 6000 each have a dollar ceiling of \$4.75B and an hours ceiling of 8,000,000 hours for a 5-year period. While the dollar ceiling is sufficient, we believe the hours ceiling is not and recommend a 35,000,000 hour labor ceiling per cost plus CLIN. An analysis shows that the top 8 Seaport-e vendors each exceed 8,000,000 in any 5-year rolling period for the last three years, with the highest exceeding 25,000,000 hours. The analysis used data from the Seaport-e Task Order Award Report and assumed 2% of the award value was ODC and an average rate of \$75/hr. We believe these are reasonable assumptions for demonstrating that 8,000,000 hours for any rolling 5-year period is not sufficient. Will the government consider increasing the hours ceiling for CLINs 2000 and 6000 to 35,000,000 hours, which is in-line with current Seaport-e Cost Plus CLIN hours ceilings?

A205. Yes, CLINs 2000 and 6000 of the RFP will be revised to 16,000,000.

Q206. This is a question from an earlier Government slide presentation (Dec-2017), if Government users are going to be able to “further restrict set-asides to any designation under NAICS”, will that include the ability to set aside a task order solicitation for VOSB (in addition to WOSB, 8(a), SDVOSB)?

A206. Ordering offices will be able to further restrict set-asides for WOSB, 8(a), SDVOSB, and HUB Zone designations. However, there will not be set-asides for VOSB as this type of set-asides is limited to the Veteran’s Administration.

Q207. Will large businesses be required to include copies of their subcontracting agreements with teammates as part of their Subcontracting Plan submissions?

A207. No. Offerors are only required to provide subcontracting goal percentages without identifying specific names of prospective subcontractors as part of their Subcontracting Plan. Subcontracts are not established at the MAC level, only at the Task Order level. However, Offerors should identify to the greatest extent possible all of their team members with their MAC proposal. (A177)

Q208. Offerors using experience that was garnered as a subcontractor should include a copy of the subcontract and SOW. Does that subcontract need to include the most recent modification, or will the original subcontract suffice?

A208. The original subcontract will suffice, but the most recent conformed copy of the subcontract is desired.

Q209. Our company – currently a large business – will be selling its government contracts to a WOSB, inclusive of our past direct support of the Navy. This sale will likely not occur prior to the deadline for SeaPort-NxG. If we are awarded a MAC as a large business, can the WOSB novate the contract post sale to compete as a small business?

A209. The contracts would have to be novated prior to the closing of the SeaPort-NxG solicitation in order for the qualifying experience to belong to the WOSB. See A66.

Q210. If a company wins an FY18 or FY19 multiple year task order under SeaPort-E, could the period of performance extend through the SeaPort NXG kickoff? Or would there be a re-compete under SeaPort NXG?

A210. SeaPort-e Task Orders can be awarded through 31 December 2019 with a period of performance of 5 years. SeaPort-NxG MACs are planned to be awarded by December 2018; therefore, there will be an overlap between SeaPort-e and SeaPort-NxG. However, SeaPort-e and SeaPort-NxG are completely separate MACs. Task Orders awarded under SeaPort-e will remain under SeaPort-e until complete.

Q211. Would N00178-18-R-7000 Section C.3. work performed for the Military Sealift Command (MSC) be considered in “direct support to the Department of the Navy?”

A211. Military Sealift Command (MSC) is part of the DON.

Q212. What exactly is the content desired in the Technical Proposal? Are offerors to describe “... recent and relevant experience in direct support of the DON **in at least one** of the subcategories ...” or “... submit a description of **no more than one** of the subcategories ...”?

A212. The Technical Proposal shall provide a description of recent and relevant experience in direct support of the DON in one of the subcategories in one of the functional areas. See A92.

Q213. Is correct to conclude the SF-33 and fill-ins will not count toward a Technical Proposal page limit?

A213. The SF 33 and Section K fill-ins WILL NOT count as part of the Technical Proposal 3-page limit. The proposal shall be limited to the following separate email attachments, identified by the identified Naming Convention and page limitations shown below:

<u>Submission Identification</u>	<u>Document Name</u>	<u>Page Limit</u>
Cover Letter	Company_Name_CAGE_Cover_Letter	1
Technical Proposal	Company_Name_CAGE_Technical_Proposal	3
*Subcontract SOW (if applicable)	Company_Name_CAGE_Subcontract_SOW	N/A
SF33 (Cover Page)	Company_Name_CAGE_SF33	1
Section K	Company_Name_CAGE_SectionK	N/A
List of Team Members	Company_Name_CAGE_Teaming	N/A
Subcontracting Plan (if applicable)	Company_Name_CAGE_Subcontracting_Plan	N/A

Q214. Can the Government provide an updated Draft RFP that incorporates all of the answers to questions? This will enable industry to have an accurate and up-to-date Draft RFP.

A214. The Government will continue to revise the draft RFP based on Industry questions up until the final RFP is issued in early June. Once released, Offerors' questions shall reference the final RFP document. Any unanswered questions submitted against the draft RFP will have to be resubmitted referencing the formal RFP.

Q215. Is there a dollar value threshold for a project that a contractor needs to show for a prime contract with the Navy to qualify?

A215. No, there is no minimum dollar threshold for DON experience to qualify.

Q216. I'm writing because a number of businesses have contacted us about being "on their team" for the NXG proposal. My understanding is anyone who 1) has been a prime and 2) won some awards doing Navy work 3) in the two work scope areas of NXG 4) in the last 5 years will be qualified to compete on their own. Isn't this true? More specifically: is there ANY advantage to having a team member in our proposal if we've met the requirements on our own?

A216. Yes, it is true based on your description that companies with attributes 1-4 in your question would be qualified to compete on their own and win a prime MAC assuming they don't owe any federal taxes, are not debarred, etc. (See A7) with one correction – in number 3 above you reference two work scope areas, only one is required. Having team members does not provide any advantage to winning a MAC award. However, if you are going to propose on task order solicitations and you are going to propose subcontractors, it would be advantageous if those subcontractors had been identified as team members in your SeaPort-NG proposal so that they could get access to the portal in a timely fashion. Team members can be added after award; however, untimely request and the resultant delay in the approval process could impact Task Order proposal submission. See A144 and A18.

Q217. According to the draft RFP there is a discrepancy regarding the page limitation for the Technical Capability/Technical Proposal. Within the Draft RFP on Page 60 of 67, the instructions state the Technical Proposal is limited to 3-pages, while on Page 62 of 67, the Evaluation Criteria states Technical Capability/Technical Proposal is limited to 5-pages. Will the

Government please clarify the following: a.) what is the correct page limitation for the Technical Capability/Technical Proposal section and b.) please confirm the name of this section, is it “Technical Capability” or “Technical Proposal”?

A217. The first part of your question has already been answered; see A91. Offerors are reminded to review previous Q&A attachments to the FBO announcement, as their question may have already been answered. “Technical Proposal” is the volume of the Offeror’s proposal that addresses their recent and relevant experience in direct support of the DON. “Technical Capability” is the evaluation criteria the Government will use to determine an Offeror has qualifying experience.

Q218. We are the prime contract for a Navy BPA. However, there have been no task orders issued nor awarded. Will the fact that we are prime on the BPA constitute direct Navy Experience?

A218. Simply holding a Navy BPA is not sufficient. A company would have had to actually perform work (services), i.e., been awarded/issued an order.

Q219. We have been receiving individual TOs under an IDIQ under SEAPORTE. Is each TO considered individually as recent and relevant under section L, 2.2a, of the SEAPORT NXG solicitation?

A219. Yes, recent and relevant experience in direct support of the DON can be demonstrated by individual SeaPort-e Task Order awards.

Q220. Upon reviewing the NAVY’s solicitation SEAPORT-NXG N00178-18-R-7000, it is clear that our company by itself cannot meet the experience requirement. While our company has very good commercial experience and could easily succeed in providing the Navy the required service (in selected areas) we do not have the required “direct” Navy experience. The only way to move forward and overcome this obstacle is to either partner with a prime contractor and work as a subcontractor until we obtain the requisite experience (not ideal given our experience with prime contractors) or convince SEAPORT-NXG to drop the requirement – this is not likely. Perhaps either the PTAC, SBA or SEAPORT resources, who are copied on the email, know of a current and reliable seaport-e prime contractor looking for a new subcontractor otherwise our company is not in a position to proceed.

A220. As stated in the RFP (L.5.4.2), it is recommended that your company pursue direct Navy experience by teaming with a company that does qualify for SeaPort-NxG. The PTAC can advise on how to locate SeaPort MAC holders and companies that hold prime contracts with the DON in the areas your company is interested in pursuing.

Q221. Section L.5.4.2.b requires a subcontracting plan for large business Offerors. Should responses include both a Small Business Subcontracting Plan and a Small Business Participation Plan?

A221. Large businesses are required to submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan only with their proposals for SeaPort-NxG in accordance with FAR 19.702. See A31. Small Business Participation plans are required at the task order level.

Q222. We understand that offerors must have SAM certification under NAICS 541330 to receive a SeaPort-NxG award (Q&A document, Answer #187). Can NAICS code 541330 be one of several NAICS codes we possess or does it need to be our primary NAICS code on SAM?

A222. An offeror can be certified in more than one NAICS code; however, in order to receive award of a SeaPort-NxG MAC, offerors must be certified in NAICS 541330. This does not need to be the primary NAICS. The Government will verify an offeror's certification in SAM.

Q223. Given the Government's responses to Questions 37 143, 144, 147 and 185, would the Government confirm that the spreadsheet that will be provided with the formal RFP for offerors to identify potential teammates as part of their proposal submission will ONLY require the company name, address, DUNS, CAGE, size standard and socio-economic status, and NO other team member information will be needed? 2. A143 states: "At the time of award, all successful Offerors will be emailed information regarding access to the registration site within the SeaPort-NxG portal and information on how to register themselves and their team members. Successful Offerors will need to formally submit the information provided as part of the proposal within the registration site." Would the Government please confirm that this action is just to allow the proposed team members access to the portal, and that these team members would be considered approved team members at this point (as their company name, address, DUNS, CAGE, size standard and socio-economic status would have been evaluated in the proposal) and therefore NO additional information for these team members would need to be entered at that time except POC information to establish their access to the portal? 3. Would the Government please confirm that the ONLY information that will EVER be needed by Primes for their team members at the NxG contract level during proposal preparation, submission, and post award actions to establish portal access will be the company name, address, DUNS, CAGE, size standard and socio-economic status, and that other information such as past performance information, capabilities, will NOT be necessary simply to get team members approved at the contract level?

A223. For the SeaPort-NxG MAC, Offerors are to provide the team member information described in A143. All MAC awardees will then be responsible for registering all of their team members in the SeaPort-NxG portal which will require additional information such as email addresses, etc. Post-award addition of team members to the MAC requires the SeaPort-NxG Contracting Officer's approval. Requests for team member additions are submitted through the portal and will require additional information. Only those entities that are approved as MAC team members may be Task Order subcontractors. Task Order post-award additions of

subcontractors requires Task Order Contracting Officer approval. Information required for subcontractor additions may include past performance information, capabilities, cost information and justification for the need to add the subcontractor after the competitive award of the Task Order.

Q224. A. This question addresses Seaport-e task orders (issued by NAVSEA HQs or its field activities) with level of effort requirements, to include fee per hour payment based upon the clause HQ B-2-0015 PAYMENTS OF FEE(S) (LEVEL OF EFFORT ALTERNATE 1) (NAVSEA) (MAY 2010). The RFP for these task orders sometimes allow for offerors to propose Uncompensated Time, but it is not clear if the Government will pay fee/hour for uncompensated time. Can these RFPs and resulting task order awards clarify whether the Government is paying fee on both compensated hours AND uncompensated hours? Or paying fee on just compensated hours?

B. In CY 2010 NAVSEA HQs issued two new clauses regarding hours on level of effort task orders and payment of fee, a) HQ B-2-0015 PAYMENTS OF FEE(S) (LEVEL OF EFFORT ALTERNATE 1) (NAVSEA) (MAY 2010) and b) NAVSEA 5252.216-9122 LEVEL OF EFFORT - ALTERNATE I (MAY 2010). It is my understanding that these two clauses are supposed to be used together. If these two clauses are supposed to be paired together, can NAVSEA HQs change the first paragraph of each clause to cross-reference its sister clause, and say something to the effect that "This clause is to be used in conjunction with XXX clause." Or is it possible to combine the language into one clause? Since there is no NAVSEA clause book accessible to the general public, this suggestion is really for the benefit of industry. We have encountered situations where, during execution of a task order that had the two CY 2000 clauses, contracting officers replaced only one CY 2000 clause with the CY 2010 version. The end result was a task order with the CY 2000 clause and the CY 2010 clause, thus creating confusion for years regarding payment of fee and delivery. Somehow the task order needs to state the binding relationship between the two clauses.

C. Seaport-e task orders typically include the NAVSEA 5252.216-9122 LEVEL OF EFFORT - ALTERNATE I (MAY 2010) clause, which says "...performance may be extended and the estimated cost may be increased in order to permit the Contractor to provide all of the man-hours listed in paragraph (a) above. The Contractor shall continue to be paid fee for each man-hour performed in accordance with the terms of the contract." This is an open ended commitment, and the Government has used this clause to extend a five-year period of performance into task orders with six, seven, eight and nine years of performance (e.g., 2009 – 2018). Since the Government develops the LOE estimate in the RFP and ultimately controls the burn rate for the expenditure of hours based upon the amount of funding provided, the prime contractor is at the mercy of the Government, and is forced to perform for years past the original POP. In short, NAVSEA has inadvertently given itself the ability to extend services for years past the original POP until all hours are expended. By comparison, FAR 52.217-8 "Option to Extend Services", on the other hand, limits extensions to six months.

D. This is a follow-on question to c) above. While FAR 52.217-8 "Option to Extend Services" limits extensions to six months, it also allows the Government to use "the rates in the contract."

Likewise, when NAVSEA extends performance on task order beyond OY4 and into OY5 - OY9, it uses "the rates in the contract." Specifically, we have task orders with the same OY4 labor rates and OY4 fee/hour rates for performance in OY5 – OY9. This is also inherently unfair, and there has to be a means to increase both the average hourly labor rate and the total fee pool allowing the prime to collect fee at the percentage from its original proposal (be it 4%, 5%, 6% etc.). In a real life example, our company has an LOE contract where at the end of OY5 we've expended 1/3rd of the total LOE. In theory, the Government could make us perform into OY14 (the 15th year of the contract) and collect fee/hour at the OY4 rate, which was proposed 17 years prior. At the time of proposal submission, there was no indication that performance could be extended for 15 years. I'm sure that the circumstances described in question c) (extending POP) and question d) (performing OY5 – OY9 at OY4 labor and fee/hour rates) are loopholes that were not contemplated fifteen years ago, however they need to be addressed in Seaport NxG.

A224. The NAVSEA texts/provisions referenced in the above questions are not applicable at the MAC level. Each ordering activity will add its own component texts/provisions at the task order level.

Q225. What is the definition of "recent" for the experience requirement?

A225. The RFP definition of "recent" is being revised from 5 years to 10 years.