

<b>AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT</b>			1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE OF PAGES
2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NUMBER	3. EFFECTIVE DATE	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQUISITION NUMBER	5. PROJECT NUMBER <i>(If applicable)</i>	
6. ISSUED BY	CODE	7. ADMINISTERED BY <i>(If other than Item 6)</i>	CODE	
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR <i>(Number, street, county, State and ZIP Code)</i>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NUMBER
			<input type="checkbox"/>	9B. DATED <i>(SEE ITEM 11)</i>
			<input type="checkbox"/>	10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NUMBER
			<input type="checkbox"/>	10B. DATED <i>(SEE ITEM 13)</i>
CODE		FACILITY CODE		

**11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS**

The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers  is extended.  is not extended.

Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:

(a) By completing items 8 and 15, and returning \_\_\_\_\_ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or electronic communication which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by letter or electronic communication, provided each letter or electronic communication makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA *(If required)*

**13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS.  
IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NUMBER AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.**

CHECK ONE	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: <i>(Specify authority)</i> THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NUMBER IN ITEM 10A.
<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES <i>(such as changes in paying office, appropriation data, etc.)</i> SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).
<input type="checkbox"/>	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
<input type="checkbox"/>	D. OTHER <i>(Specify type of modification and authority)</i>

**E. IMPORTANT:** Contractor  is not  is required to sign this document and return \_\_\_\_\_ copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION *(Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)*

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER <i>(Type or print)</i>		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER <i>(Type or print)</i>	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR		16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	16C. DATE SIGNED
_____ <i>(Signature of person authorized to sign)</i>		_____ <i>(Signature of Contracting Officer)</i>	

Previous edition unusable

**The following additional updates have been incorporated into this solicitation.**

- 1) DFARS 252.204-7021 is removed from the solicitation. The language reflected in section “L.9. Volume 2, Factor I, - Cyber Security” and section “M.4.1 Factor I: Cyber Security” of the RFP has also been updated.
- 2) The number of bins by each FRC building has been provided in PWS Appendix B.1.
- 3) The statement “For planning purposes the FRCs are working to collectively reduce the number of active bins by ~25% by the time the Gen IV Contract commences broken down as follows: 20K for FRC-E and associated satellite sites; 20K for FRC-SE and associated satellite sites; 25K for FRC-SW and associated satellite sites” has been removed from PWS Appendix B. This removal is represented by a strikethrough of this statement.
- 4) The language reflected in PWS Section 3.1 “Bin Re-Configurations (Sites: A1-A5, B1-B4, B6, and C1-C4)” has been changed from: “The material management fee is applicable to the number of active bins managed, +/-10% on a per site basis. The material management fee can be renegotiated and updated via a bilateral modification when a change exceeding +/-10% on a per site basis occurs from the time of contract award” to read: The material management fee is highly correlated to the number of bins that need to be serviced. As such, the material management fee shall be renegotiated and updated via a bilateral modification when a change, exceeding +/-10%, on a per site basis, occurs from the bin counts, as laid out in Solicitation SPE4A7-23-4-0105, Appendix B (FRC-E- 21,919; FRC-SE- 19,652; FRC-SW- 36,180) Such a modification will reset the new baseline from which a subsequent +/-10% measurement will be applied.”
- 5) Any reference to Jason Elliott as the DLA KO has been revised to reflect Richard Alexander, Jr.

**Please see the below additional questions and answers associated with this solicitation.**

- 1) Customer offers 3 days for responses to scenario-based questions. Is it 3 business days from the due date? Or from receipt of Proposal if submitted prior to due date?  
[From the date that the scenario-based questions are sent, the contractor will be given 3 business days to provide responses. Even if a proposal is submitted prior to the RFP closing date, the scenario-based questions will still be sent out the Monday after the RFP closes.](#)
- 2) Are the Bin counts in Attachment 1 Pricing Worksheet, tab entitled 'Mat Mgmt Pricing Template', reflective of only active Bins, or a combination of inactive and active Bins? If these figures include both active and inactive bins, could the government please provide additional data on the active vs. inactive breakout? For clarification, this information is sought for costing and staffing-planning purpose.  
[The Attachment 1 Pricing Worksheet, tab entitled 'Mat Mgmt Pricing Template' references PWS Appendix B. In Appendix B, the bin counts are comprised of all bins at](#)

all locations (inclusive of remote sites) where labor would be required to service them. There is no benefit in the Government providing a total breakout of active vs. inactive bins because it would merely be a snapshot in time. The number of active and inactive bins continually changes as part of the normal rhythm of contract execution and remains subject to change at any given time.

- 3) Looking for clarification if Section L and Section M were to contain DFARS 252.204-7021 along with DFARS 252.204-7012/7019/7020.
- Please clarify the requirement for DFARS 252.204-7021 (Section L and M) because DoD CIO "has suspended prior CMMC Piloting efforts" [<https://dodcio.defense.gov/CMMC/about/>] and this clause is not to be included in a solicitation before Oct 1, 2025 (DFARS 204.7503 Contract Clause).
  - Also is the understanding of the statement: "Furthermore, this factor will confirm that the Contractor agrees that at the time the Department of Defense (DoD) imposes the new Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification (CMMC) process, that they will comply with the policy and secure the required certification, regardless of the potential that the new policy may not require active DoD contract holders to comply." indicate that a contract modification will be done to add the clause at a later time and provide for the typical contract modification negotiations and possible equitable adjustments?  
[As the current Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification \(CMMC\) is suspended, DFARS 252.204-7021 is removed from the solicitation. The language reflected in section "L.9. Volume 2, Factor I, - Cyber Security" and section "M.4.1 Factor I: Cyber Security" of the RFP has also been updated.](#)
- 4) In addition to CAC requests, will annual certifications also be required? Will our subcontractors be able to work directly with the USG to submit CAC requests and annual certifications (if required) or will they need to be submitted through the contractor?  
[If there are any subcontractors that will require a CAC or annual certifications, those requests will need to be submitted to the Government through the contractor.](#)
- 5) Are clearances only required for Contractor personnel that need to enter secure rooms to re-stock material or is there other classified work on the contract?  
[PWS Section 7 applies to all contractor personnel working on site, not just those servicing bins in classified areas.](#)
- 6) In reference to the following, prior Industry Day Q&A:  
Q: "Beyond standard EDI Transactions - are there any other interfaces that DLA and Contractor will utilize in order, warehouse, invoice management?"  
A: "NO"  
Taking the above into consideration, the following questions require clarification IAW PWS Paragraph 5.0:
1. PWS Paragraph 5.0 states, "The Contractor shall use a MIS that is compatible with, and provides seamless interface with, existing and emerging DoD systems employed by

DLA, Defense Automatic Addressing System Center (DAASC), Defense Logistics Information Systems (DLIS) and NDMS."

Question: Can the Government please provide clarification to existing and emerging systems employed by Defense Automatic Addressing System Center (DAASC), Defense Logistics Information Systems (DLIS) and NDMS?

Currently, there are no emerging systems by DAASC and DLIS. For NDMS, the contractor will submit the flat file in accordance with Appendix D 6.15 "NDMS Report".

2. PWS Paragraph 5.0 states, "Process transactions under the Military Standard and Issue Procedures (MILSTRIP), as necessary."

Question: This verbiage implies that the requirements are beyond the standard EDI transactions, which signals a contradiction to the prior Industry Day Q&A where the Government confirmed that "no other interfaces, besides EDI, exist. Therefore, can the Government please update this bullet to state: "Process transactions under the standard EDI transactions, as necessary."

PWS Paragraph 5.0 statement "Process transactions under the Military Standard and Issue Procedures (MILSTRIP), as necessary" will remain as is. This is because MILSTRIP Signal Code B orders are generated automatically when the contractor orders DLA sourced material through FEDMALL. The contractor does not self-generate a MILSTRIP.

3. PWS Paragraph 5.0 states: "The Contractor shall have a T-1 or equivalent bandwidth capacity at all Contractor staffed sites to ensure timely processing of electronic data."

Question: Can the Government please provide clarification on "T-1 or equivalent bandwidth capacity"; if timely processing is achievable by Contractor, are bandwidth requirements necessary?

Yes, bandwidth requirements are necessary. The contractor is required to provide its own internet service provider through the government furnished infrastructure.

7) In furtherance of PWS Appendix B, will the Government please provide number of bins, by building?

The number of bins by building has been provided in PWS Appendix B.1.

8) Regarding PWS Appendix B, the Government listed Bin and NIIN counts as of January 2023 for each of the FRC's and associated satellite locations. In furtherance of this - based on Amendment 001 received 24 March 2023, an additional footnote was included at the bottom of this Appendix stating, "for planning purposes the FRCs are working to reduce the number of active bins by ~25% by the time Gen IV contract commences."

Would the government please provide the following clarifications:

There are 77.8K bins listed on Appendix B as of January 2023 (21.9K FRC-E, 36.2K FRC-SW, 19.7K FRC-SE), however, the revision included on Amendment 001 Appendix B referencing ~25% indicates this will be reduced to 65K active bins (20K FRC-E, 20K FRC-SE, 25K FRC-SW). This represents a 16% reduction in aggregate, rather than the 25% indicated. Additionally, on a per-site basis, this reflects essentially no-change in the FRC

SE bin quantity (remains at 20K), with most of the planned future reductions occurring at FRC-SW. Why is a 25% aggregate reduction indicated when the new bin counts show a 16% reduction? Are the 77.8K bins reflecting only active bins? If no, how many active bins are there today? How many active bins will be at the start of the contract?

The 77.8K bins listed in Appendix B account for all the bins. As the number of active and inactive bins is subject to change at any given time, the contractor should propose based on the current requirement of the solicitation. Although an ongoing process, the FRCs are continually, and systematically, working to remove inactive material from the PEBs to right size the number of bins needed to support operations. Bin counts change based on the stand-up and removal of depot production lines so providing a breakdown of active/inactive bins today may not necessarily be accurate at the time of contract execution. As such, we request that you propose based on the bins stated in Appendix B and B.1, while recognizing that if bin quantities change by +/- 10% at a given location, the material management fee can be renegotiated and updated via a bilateral modification.

Could the government please provide additional clarity on whether they would prefer contractors to bid to the current bin counts on Appendix B, Column "I" or the planned future bin counts reflecting reductions? For context, the amount of bins being serviced may drive a change in the level of labor support being bid.

Contractors should propose using the current bin counts reflected in Appendix B, under Column I.

How would the government prefer to handle a substantial change in bin counts between proposal submission and time of award? For example, if contractors are told that FRC-SW and associated satellite sites will be reduced to 25K & they bid assuming 25K, and then when awarded the bin counts were actually at 30K. Would an offeror be deemed non-compliant if their bid was conditioned on the accuracy of the indicated reduced bin counts upon contract award, with the contractor being able to pursue an equitable adjustment?

Contractors should propose using the current bin counts reflected in Appendix B. If there is a change in number of bins at one or more locations that exceeds +/- 10%, the material management fee will be renegotiated via bilateral modification.

- 9) Regarding the Transition period between Apr 1, 2024 and Sept 30, 2024, and the incumbent contractor's responsibility to the incoming contractor, the government indicated that the Gen IV contract would include FAR 52.237-03 "Continuity of Services". Does the Gen III contract have a similar clause?

FAR 52.237-03 "Continuity of Services" is expected to be incorporated into the GEN III contract.

Assuming the incumbent contractor's contract expires Sept, 30 2024, Continuity of Services would imply that the incumbent contractor would be required to provide phase-out services from Oct 1 thru Dec 31, but not before then. Could the government

please clarify if the incumbent contractor has any contractual responsibility toward the incoming contractor during the Transition period from Apr 1 through Sept 30? For additional context, in order to achieve FOC by Oct 1, this would likely require the incumbent contractor to support the incoming contractor in the months leading up to Oct.1 rather than after.

Would the government consider modifying the incumbent's contract should another offeror be chosen for the Gen IV contract, to ensure co-operation between the two contractors during the Transition period?

The Government is working to address a transition plan in the current GEN III contract to ensure cooperation between the two contractors, if necessary.

Does the government have a notional CONOPs for the phase-in/phase out of scope during the Transition period? For example, doing a site-by-site rolling wave approach where the incoming contractor would fully stand up / transition one FRC before moving to the next? We intend to propose our preferred approach to executing Transition with our offer with recommendations to the government, but we are seeking additional clarification into what is in the realm of the possible within the constraints of the existing Gen III contract.

The Government is working to address a phase-in/phase out transition approach from GEN III to GEN IV.

10) Regarding Section L.7.2:

- a. Will the Government please clarify whether 8.5 x 11 Letter size in LANDSCAPE format is allowed?

Yes, 8.5 x 11.5 Letter size in LANDSCAPE format is allowed.

- b. Will the Government please consider allowing 11x17 (landscape foldout) pages for tables, charts, graphs, and figures?

No, 11 x 17 (landscape foldout) pages for tables, charts, graphs, and figures are not allowed.

- c. Will the Government please consider allowing the use of 8-point font size for headers & footers?

No, the Government is not allowing the use of 8-point font size for headers and footers.

11) Regarding Section L.8.2, Please confirm that offerors who qualify as a small business under NAICS code 332722 are not required to submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan and their proposal will not be adversely evaluated for not submitting such a plan. Referencing FAR 52.219-9 "Small Business Subcontracting Plan", offerors who qualify as a small business are not required to submit a Small Business Subcontracting Plan in their proposal.

12) Regarding Section L.8.1, What is the duration of the Program Management Review (PMR)? (i.e. hours / days?)

The duration of Program Management Reviews (PMRs) is typically one day.

13) As it relates to Section L.11.2, is it acceptable to include a copy of each contract as a PDF attachment to Volume 4 with reference in the Word submission file?

Yes, it is acceptable to include a copy of each contract as a PDF attachment to Volume 4.