

### Questions and Answers

The following answers are provided as a courtesy in response to all questions received during the Draft Solicitation. None of the responses provided take precedence over the final RFP requirements.

#### Section B, Supplies or Services and Price/Cost

#	Question	Response
1	What equipments/machines/supplies/services can we NOT procure/buy using the contract money?	In general, U.S. laws, regulations, and contract/task order requirements dictate what may or may not be purchased with awarded funds.
2	Will NOAA provide access to its HPC or other computational resources to contractors for doing the computation-heavy work as part of this contract?	There is no computation-heavy work as part of this specific contract (the overarching IDIQs). If such a requirement were to arise under a Task Order, those requirements would be defined at that level.
3	Pricing – Due to the different pricing options FFP, T&M, Cost plus and LH, how will pricing be requested? Will NOAA be asking for rates per labor category? Will the LCATs be similar to the previous Protech Weather?	This information is all provided in the Draft RFP. Please review Section L.11.4.4, Section M.5, and Attachments J-1 and J-6 for details.
4	On page 8, section B.4.3. Are there commercially available accounting systems that would qualify as an adequate system? Are there certain certifications a non-commercially available accounting system should hold?	In accordance with FAR Subpart 16.104(i), a contracting officer must consider the "adequacy of the contractor's accounting system. Before agreeing on a contract type other than firm-fixed-price, the contracting officer shall ensure that the contractor's accounting system will permit timely development of all necessary cost data in the form required by the proposed contract type. This factor may be critical– (1) When the contract type requires price revision while performance is in progress; or (2) When a cost-reimbursement contract is being considered and all current or past experience with the contractor has been on a fixed-price basis. See 42.302(a)(12)."
5	Are there any citizenship or security requirements concerning staff working on the resulting contract(s)?	Beyond the requirements defined in the existing clauses and provisions, these types of requirements would be defined at the task order level.
6	Can you provide clarification on the typical distribution of task orders among the different pricing arrangements (Fixed-Price, Cost-Reimbursement, T&M, LH)?	That data is not presently available.
7	What factors will be considered in determining fair and reasonable pricing for task orders?	See RFP Section M.5.
8	What are the specific requirements for providing separate or blended loaded hourly labor rates at the task order level?	Specific requirements such as this would be defined at the Task Order level.

#### Section C, Description/Specifications/Performance Work Statement

#	Question	Response
9	<p>In recent decades, there has been a substantial increase in the availability of non-federal observational assets and data. This has been recognized by Congress and codified in the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2017 (Weather Act) and the House-passed Weather Act Reauthorization Act of 2023, which includes establishment of a formal commercial data buy program. NOAA currently possesses the need and contracts for numerous commercial data buys. As such, it would be appropriate for ProTech Weather 2.0 to have a requirement that addresses these needs. Below are two options for addressing this, modifying or adding the following new language to Section C.3.1.3 - Observation systems of the Performance Work Statement and Attachment J-4 Relevant Technical Experience Self Assessment and Validation Matrix.</p> <p>Modify...</p> <p>C.3.1.3.C The contractor shall support the portfolio management of NWS, NOAA, and other observing systems, including those operated by non-federal partners by providing services such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Impact assessments;</li> <li>● Cost/benefit analyses;</li> <li>● Managing risks and opportunities</li> <li>● Data aggregation, processing, visualization, and dissemination capabilities</li> </ul> <p>Or Add...</p> <p>C.3.1.3.D The contractor shall develop, operate, and maintain aggregation and dissemination capabilities for observational data from external NOAA partner observing systems</p>	The government will take this recommendation under advisement.

10	C.6 Deliverables (referencing Section J List of Attachments) RFP Text: The subject line of the email notice presenting the submission of the monthly report shall be annotated with – Monthly Contract Status Report (state the month and year) (See Section J – Attachment J-3 for the report template). Question: Would the Government please confirm whether they are referencing the “J-2 Sample Monthly Contract Progress Report” or the “J-3 Ceiling Hourly Rate Table by Labor Category” in this section?	This was a typo in the RFP that has been corrected.
11	What will be the specific qualifications to be eligible to bid on the final RFP?	Please review RFP Sections L and M in particular, though the entirety of the RFP dictates the parameters and limitations of the source selection.
12	Are we allowed to leverage subcontractors to carry out services listed in the scope of work?	Yes. Please review the RFP for details on how teammates are evaluated versus prime contractors.
13	Are there any qualification requirements for a non-government private entity to satisfy to be eligible to participate and offer any of the listed services?	Yes, please review all of the requirements found in the RFP under the clauses and provisions.
14	Are we restricted in scope to offering services to only a single service section among C.3.1, C.3.2, and C.3.3? Are we allowed to provide services across different elements in sections C.3.1, C.3.2, and C.3.3?	Offerors may propose on any element, as defined in the RFP.
15	If the research activities in C.3.1.7 lead to the development of novel techniques, are we required to publish them?	Specific requirements such as this would be defined at the Task Order level.
16	Who will own the Intellectual Property should a new technology be developed by the contractors?	Specific requirements such as this would be defined at the Task Order level.
17	C.6 Deliverables refers to Attachment J-3 for “Monthly Reports”. The “Sample Monthly Contract Project Report” attachment is J-2. Will the Government please clarify?	This was a typo in the RFP that has been corrected.
18	Are there any specific project management methodologies or tools that the contractor should be proficient in?	Offerors may share that type of information where/if applicable if they wish. Some may result in increased confidence, but are not required. Task Orders may spell out specific needs at their level.
19	Can you provide examples of the types of consulting services that may be required under the Business Re-Engineering Services element?	Consulting services can be used in a broad variety of manners, and would be specified at the task order level. For the purposes of the RFP, an offeror would need to fully demonstrate their technical experience performing consulting services, and ensure it is relevant.
20	If an Offeror aims to provide DaaS (Data As A Service) facilities to NOAA via its proprietary satellites, will that preclude them from bidding for task order contracts for integrating these data sets into NOAA's modeling suites?	At this time, we do not have any such known requirements at the IDIQ or Task Order level. Those requirements would be defined at the task order level, at which time you could ask a specific question. Please review FAR Subpart 9.5 for requirements around conflicts of interest ( <a href="https://www.acquisition.gov/far/subpart-9.5">https://www.acquisition.gov/far/subpart-9.5</a> ).
21	Can you provide more details about the scope of work for each element listed in the PWS?	The government currently does not have plans to alter sections of the RFP without specific questions or reasons. The intent of an IDIQ is to be broad to allow for maximum flexibility at the task order level.
<b>Section D, Packing and Marking</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
22	Can we seek clarification on if and how the commercial packing standards apply to digital deliverables and if there are additional packing and marking guidelines for the electronic delivery of software products and updates?	Per Sections D.1 and D.2 of the RFP, those types of specifics would be defined at the task order level.
<b>Section E, Inspection and Acceptance</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
23	Regarding digital deliverables, what inspection tests are required from the Contractor, and for what supplies?	Specifics such as these would be defined at the individual task order level.
24	What types of inspection tests will NOAA conduct?	Specifics such as these would be defined at the individual task order level.
25	Could you provide clarification on how each of the incorporated FAR clauses listed here will apply to the inspection and acceptance process?	Specifics such as these would be defined at the individual task order level.
26	Are there any specific procedures or guidelines related to inspection that contractors should be aware of based on these incorporated FAR clauses?	Specifics such as these would be defined at the individual task order level.
<b>Section F, Deliveries or Performance</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
27	How detailed does the IDIQ escalation plan need to be, i.e. how many pages and steps are required? Will the plan be the same for the entire team contracting or will it be different for different teams working on it?	The escalation plan has no page limit and will be unique to each prime Offeror (and if applicable, their teammates). Only one plan is required.
<b>Section G, Contract Administration Data</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
28	Can you clarify the procedure for contractors to follow when receiving task orders issued by authorized individuals? What specific factors will be considered in the performance evaluation process, and how will they be weighted?	Specifics such as these would be defined at the individual task order level.
<b>Section H, Special Contract Requirements</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>

29	Regarding notification requirements under T&M and cost-reimbursement contracts outlined in Section H.6, what format should our correspondence to the TOCO and TO COR take to ensure compliance?	Specifics such as these would be defined at the individual task order level.
30	Can you provide more information about the online proposal and ordering capability mentioned in Section H.8? What are the expected timelines for the implementation of this capability?	No additional details are available at this time.
<b>Section I, Contract Clauses</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
31	Can you clarify the implications of the minimum order requirement specified in paragraph (a) for our contract? How should we handle orders that exceed the maximum order limitations outlined in paragraph (b)?	ProTech is a mandatory vehicle for NOAA for requirements that exceed the Simplified Acquisition Threshold. Below SAT, anyone within DOC may still use ProTech - it just isn't mandatory. Regarding maximum orders, any such task order would be reviewed to ensure ProTech is the proper vehicle before releasing it.
32	How should companies handle the CAS requirements? FAR 52.230-1-52.230-3.As a small business we are exempt from this requirement.	As regulation related to CAS allows, small businesses may not be held accountable for some requirements. FAR 52.230-1 clearly states it does not apply to small business, to it may be removed in the final RFP. 52.230-3 makes no such statement, but will be reviewed further to determine applicability.
<b>Section K, Representations, Certifications and other Statements of Offerors</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
33	Can you confirm the NAICS code and small business size standard for this acquisition?	See RFP Section K.2.
<b>Section L, Instructions, Conditions, and Notices to Offerors</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
34	Can vendors offer a proposal as a prime contractor and separately offer a proposal as a member of a joint venture?	L.13: Offerors may only submit one proposal as the prime contractor or Joint Venture.
35	Will the phase 2 technical written submission be aligned in the order of the elements or the contractor technical experience projects/examples? Thank you.	L.11.4.1: The experience provided shall align with the elements selected and mapped in Attachment J-4, and incorporate the contents and format of the "Demonstrated Technical Experience Form" in Attachment J-5. Additional content (such as elements provided in Part 3 that were not included in Parts 1 and 2) will NOT be evaluated, and no more than 15 total Demonstrated Technical Experience projects/examples may be included in this submission.
36	On page 106 of the RFP, the past performance states a vendor should provide "three to eight references over the past 5 years", but should that actually be 15 references over the last 6 years? And it's simply a typo?	This section has been corrected to reflect six years instead of five. The rest was correct as written. Please note that Factors I and III have different requirements and should be reviewed separately.
37	Suppose an Offeror is proposing as a Mentor-Protege JV. When selecting experience levels in Attachment J-4, they would select "My Company" as opposed to "My Team", regardless of it that experience comes from the mentor or protege, correct?	L.11.2.1 and M.4.3: Yes select "my Company" here is why: 1) An Offeror may submit a proposal as a Joint Venture (JV), to include SBA-approved mentor-protégé agreements authorized under 13 CFR § 125.9; however, all proposal submission documents must be in the name of the JV, not individual partners of the JV. 2) If a joint venture (JV) is proposed, the past performance of the JV - or the individual companies that form the JV - will be treated as the prime when evaluating past performance.  "My TEAM" is intended to reflect teammate experience, not prime experience.
38	In phase 1 demonstrated Technical experience self-assessment matrix, it says past experience within past 6 years of the proposal submission date? Can you please change it to RFP release date as proposal submission can keep on extending based on amendments? Thanks	Yes, this date will be changed to the RFP release date, and will be changed in the final RFP.
39	Can you use a "collection of task orders" under a single contract vehicle as a single project? For example, if you have a BPA with 6 separate task orders awarded on it, could you aggregate them all together as a single project?	No. Per RFP Section L.11.2.2, a "Project" (also referred to as "example" or "citation") is defined as Task Order, Call Order, Contract, Subcontract, Grant or Agreement under which elements of the ProTech Weather 2.0 requirements were performed as a planned undertaking with a definite beginning and clear termination point that produces a defined output, bound by constraints such as schedule, costs and quality parameters.
40	During evaluations, are volumes evaluated by all evaluators as a whole, or are they broken up for different people? What is the process?	The exact makeup of the evaluation team is not relevant information. Also please keep in mind Section L.11.1: Information shall be confined to the appropriate volume to facilitate independent evaluation. Each volume must be presented on a stand-alone basis so that the Government can evaluate its contents without cross-referencing other volumes of the proposal. The Government may consider information it requires for proposal evaluation that is not found in its designated volume as having been omitted from the Offeror's proposal
41	Professional Employee Compensation Plan: Could the Government clarify if salary information needs to be included in the PECP plan?	Per RFP Section L.11.2.1: "Individual compensation disclosure is not required. Submission of general compensation practices often printed in an employee handbook is sufficient."

42	<p>Volume IV Past Performance: Requirement: Offerors shall submit past performance information for three to eight contracts having performance within the past five years (from the date of proposal submission). No less than three of the cited references shall be for the prime or JV. Each Past Performance reference must be related to one or more of the Demonstrated Technical Experience projects/examples cited in the Offeror's Volume II, Parts 2 and 3. Question: Can the Government please clarify should the past performance referenced in Volume IV Past Performance be five years or six years?</p>	This was a typo in the RFP that has been corrected. The correct number is six.
43	<p>Volume II – Demonstrated Technical Experience (Phase I): Requirement: A Demonstrated Technical Experience project is hereby defined as "recent" if its period of performance is ongoing AND has had at least a 12-month base period complete or ended within the past six years of the proposal submission date. Question: Could the Government please clarify if the six-year time period for defining a "recent" Demonstrated Technical Experience project could be tied to the calendar year 2024, rather than the exact proposal submission date? Given that the submission date is currently unknown, allowing for flexibility based on the calendar year would provide greater clarity and consistency in determining project eligibility for J-4.</p>	Thank you for your suggestion, which we will consider prior to releasing the final RFP. We plan to change this to the RFP release date, and will be changed in the final RFP.
44	<p>IV – Past Performance. Section I - Reference Information: Question: Can the Government clarify if Section 1 is limited to one page per reference? For example, if an Offeror has 8 references, would they need to fit the example table and all the required sections below within one page for each reference? This seems challenging, especially given the detailed information required for each reference: a. Contract place of performance, CAGE Code, and DUNS/SAM Unique ID Number (as applicable). b. Government contracting activity/commercial entity's name, current address, and telephone and fax numbers; and Procuring Contracting Officer/commercial reference's name, email address, and telephone number. c. Government technical representative/COR/commercial reference's name, current email address, and telephone number. d. Government contract administration activities name, current address, and telephone number; if delegated, the Administrative Contracting Officer's name, current email address, and telephone number. e. Contract Number (if applicable, include both the IDIQ/BPA number, and the Delivery/Task Order Number). f. Contract Type (specified type, such as Firm Fixed Price, Cost Reimbursement, Time and Materials, etc.). In the case of Indefinite Delivery contracts, indicate specific type (Requirements, Definite Quantity, or Indefinite Quantity) and secondary contract type (FP, CR, T&amp;M, etc.). g. Total award value, including options (whether exercised or not). h. original delivery schedule, including dates of start and completion of work. Final or projected final delivery schedule, including dates of start and completion of work.</p>	The RFP will be updated to reflect an appropriate page count for this section.
45	<p>Section III – CAGE, UEI and TIN, and Prime Offeror's Financial Documents: In accordance with the proposal requirements, Offerors must submit finalized financial statements, including a Balance Sheet, Income Statement, Cash Flow Statement, and Statement of Retained Earnings for the Offeror's past fiscal year. If the finalized financial statements for 2022 are available, but the 2023 statements are not yet finalized due to a pending CPA financial audit, should the offeror submit the finalized 2022 financial statements?</p>	Yes, though if the 2023 statements are final by the time the final RFP is released, then those would need to be submitted.
46	<p>Section IV – Representations and Certifications: Could the Government please clarify the following: 1. If the Offeror already has NAICS code 541330 under their representations and certifications, do they need to specifically add Exception 3? 2. Is the second part of the requirement referring to the size classification of the firm (small vs. large) for that particular NAICS code?</p>	1) Yes. 2) The exception merely focuses on a particular area of engineering that NOAA does have a need for, so it has been incorporated here to allow for that flexibility. The size standard for Exception 3 applies to the entirety of the IDIQ.
47	<p>Section III – Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) or Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) Report: If the offeror uses a subcontract as past performance and have received an evaluation assessment from the prime contractor, can this be submitted as equivalent to a CPAR reference?</p>	Yes - it would just need to be submitted via a Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ)
48	<p>Volume III Management: Requirement: For Volume III, slides shall have a font size no smaller than 18 point, either Arial or Times New Roman. If there are graphics or tables included, then a font size no smaller than 12 is permitted. The slide size must be in Standard (4:3) format. Question: Would the Government consider modifying the 4:3 standard slide size format to landscape orientation, and one (1) slide per page?</p>	No, the slide size remains 4:3.

49	IV – Past Performance: Can the Government please clarify if the Prime Offeror received a subcontract evaluation can the offeror use the subcontractor evaluation in lieu of Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) if it includes the same information that a CPAR rating has?	References must be received either via CPARS or PPQs. If there is no CPARS record, then a PPQ must be submitted.
50	One Page 106, The RFP states "Offerors shall submit past performance information for three to eight contracts having performance within the past five years (from the date of proposal submission)." In the following section, it refers to the definition of "recent" as being within the last 6 years. Can the Government please clarify if it is in fact 6 years?	This was a typo in the RFP that has been corrected. The correct number is six.
51	In regard to "Prime Offeror's Financial Documents". A note to the Government that the current version of the SF1408 Form (Preadward Survey of Prospective Contractor Accounting System) expired on 1/31/2024. The GSA and DCAA agencies are aware of this and the current version of the form is located on the GSA site. Would like to confirm that vendors who use this form to address adequate accounting systems may still use this form as it is the most recent on Government sites (despite the date showing expired).	Please continue to use the SF1408 which expired on January 31, 2024, until a new version is made available.
52	For the instructions related to the Oral Presentations, the Proposal states "The Offeror's participants in the oral presentations shall include the anticipated IDIQ Manager." Will the resume of the IDIQ Manager be required in Phase I or in Phase II?	RFP Section L.11.4.2 states "Included in the Phase II instructions that all Phase II Offerors will receive will be the details on what must be addressed in the Management Approach oral presentation. These details will not be provided to any party prior to the release of the Phase II instructions."
53	Would the Government consider providing the draft details of what would need to be covered in the Slides for the Management Approach to allow vendors enough time to prepare beforehand if they so choose?	No, the intent is not to provide that information so that Phase II proposals cannot be prepared in advance.
54	On page 98, the Offeror will provide finalized statements for the past fiscal year and current reporting period as of the date of the proposal and the line of credit. We engage a third party accounting firm to do a Review of previous fiscal year's statements. Do we also have to engage them to do a compilation for the current reporting period or can it be certified by an internal officer?	The government has no say over third parties. How Offerors choose to met solicitation requirements is up to them.
55	Throughout the ProTech 2.0 RFP, the relevant threshold for demonstrated technical experience is defined as the range in size between \$500,000 and \$10,000,000.  Suggest modifying this range to be between \$50,000 - \$10,000,000.  The recently awarded ProTech Oceans 2.0 had a lower threshold set at \$50,000. Additionally, ProTech Weather 1.0 awarded to date 7 of 45 task orders for less than \$500,000. Given these facts and the reality that many small business sized Offerors who have performed/delivered commercial services for federal and non-federal customers have often done so for smaller work scopes. It is important that these smaller, but highly relevant projects/services be applicable to demonstrated experience for the PWS requirements of this acquisition.	The range provided is reflective of the vast majority of existing and known ProTech Weather Domain task orders. Other ProTech Domains set their ranges based on their unique history, for their own procurements, which are separate from the Weather Domain.
56	L.11.4.1 Volume II – Demonstrated Technical Experience (Phase II)  Can Universities or Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO's) be named as teammates?	Yes.
57	L.11.4.3 Volume IV - Past Performance  Can option year task orders under a single multi-year IDIQ contract count as individual project references in the Phase II - Demonstrated Technical Experience Validation Matrix? For example, to meet the Extensive experience option in the technical matrix, three demonstrated projects for that element must be provided. Can those three demonstrated projects be individual task orders, which cover successive year periods of performance for the same statement of work and be from the same multi-year IDIQ contract?	Three separate task orders could count, but the reference to an "option year task order" is confusing. Option Years are not separate task orders or contracts. An exercised option is not a discreet award, and would not be considered an additional example.  Please also refer to the presentation from our industry day to review best practices, and practices best avoided. Specifically, slide 64 stated: "Identical Content for Successive or Multiple Generations of Contracts - Extensive experience is valuable. Capturing successive generations of the same contract work informs successful performance and depth of knowledge. Repeating identical content for successive generations of a contract adds no value to the proposal. The unique challenges and achievements of each generation should be featured." By attempting to "game" the self-assessment, significant risk is introduced in Phase II where all of the demonstrated technical experience must be provided in detail. If the successive examples are all identical, there may be nothing to increase confidence. And this procurement makes awards only to the highest technically rated offerors with a fair and reasonable price.
58	Draft RFP, Section L.10, Page 93 RFP Text: To aid in the evaluations, proposals shall be neatly prepared, clearly and concisely written, properly indexed, and logically assembled. Question: Would the Government please clarify what constitutes "properly indexed"?	This proposal has multiple parts, and some span both phases, so it is important that offerors ensure they are properly connecting everything and submitting complete proposals.

59	Draft RFP, Section L.11, Page 96-97 RFP Text: Accessibility All Security permissions on the Excel spreadsheet (i.e. ".xlsx") shall be set to allow the Government to select, cut, paste, review, and print text and graphics without the need for a password. All proposal documentation shall allow for the ability to search all text within the document (including images). Question: Most graphic file formats (e.g., .jpg, .png) do not provide editable/searchable text. Please advise what method the Government would suggest we use to make images that can be searched, or remove the requirement for text within images to be searchable?	It is the Offeror's responsibility to comply with these requirements. Submitting text as an image that cannot be searched is a choice. However, this likely would not negatively impact instances such as a logo, where the text portion is not germane to the proposal content.
60	Draft RFP Section L.11.4.3 Volume IV – Past Performance, Pages 106-107 - Also L.11.2.2 RFP Text: Offerors shall submit past performance information for three to eight contracts having performance within the past five years (from the date of proposal submission) ... Recent past performance is hereby defined as a project for which its period of performance is ongoing AND has had at least a 12 month base period complete, or ended within the past six years of the proposal submission date. ... A Demonstrated Technical Experience project is hereby defined as "recent" if its period of performance is ongoing AND has had at least a 12-month base period complete or ended within the past six years of the proposal submission date. Question: Would the Government please verify that the Date for Experience and Past Performance is "ended within the past six years" from the proposal submission date?	This was a typo in the RFP that has been corrected. The correct number is six.
61	Draft RFP Section L.11.1 - Format, Page 95 Table – Phase II, Volume III – Management Approach (20-slide limit) Question: Will the Government consider excluding the cover and agenda slides from the 20-slide limit?	Yes, and the RFP will be updated to reflect this clearly.
62	L.11.4.2 Volume III – Management Approach (Oral Presentation), Page 104 RFP Text: Oral Presentations - General Instructions Included in the Phase II instructions that all Phase II Offerors will receive will be the details on what must be addressed in the Management Approach oral presentation. These details will not be provided to any party prior to the release of the Phase II instructions. Offerors may submit slides to accompany their oral presentations. Question: Will the Government provide an opportunity for Q&A when the management approach requirement details are released?	RFP Section L.8.1 - The Government does not intend to allow for an additional round of questions, after responses are provided during the Draft RFP phase, such as when the Final RFP is released. However, the Government reserves the right to conduct an additional round of Q&As if there are any substantial changes between the draft and final documents.
63	What constitutes a "project," since this is fundamental to the depth score. Page 101 of the RFP states that projects need to be "relevant," which means that projects need to be similar in size and scope to PtW task orders, namely funded at \$500K to \$10M. We are also confirming the 6-year cut off to meet the requirement that a project is "recent."	The RFP defines a "project" (also referred to as "example" or "citation") as a Task Order, Call Order, Contract, Subcontract, Grant or Agreement under which elements of the ProTech Weather 2.0 requirements were performed as a planned undertaking with a definite beginning and clear termination point that produces a defined output, bound by constraints such as schedule, costs and quality parameters.
64	Will you allow a task order that is \$400K in size to be considered?	No, projects submitted that are under the minimum will not be considered as they do not meet the definition of relevant.
65	What is the weight of the past performance questionnaires received in concert with the overall past performance submission?	The PPQs are only a part of a holistic evaluation of past performance as a whole. See RFP section L.11.4.3 and M.4.3 for all instructions and evaluation criteria.
66	Are JV offerors permitted to submit employee compensation plans, OCI plans, etc. from the team lead (small business partner) or both joint venture partners, in lieu of such documents for the JV itself?	13 CFR 125.8 makes no mention one way or the other. Therefore, for the purposes of this solicitation, for any type of JV, the plans must come from both parties.
67	In L.11.4.3, the government writes that "Offerors may not submit Base IDIQ Contracts or Blanket Purchase Agreement (BPA) References" for Past Performance. However, requiring at least one vehicle-level experience (e.g., BPA, IDIQ) illustrates each Offeror's ability to manage multiple concurrent, complex, and large task orders while working in a dynamic environment in which Offerors must rapidly respond to and staff orders. Offerors with an unproven or untested approach to IDIQ or BPA-level management will devote an inordinate amount of time and resources to the administrative aspects of the ProTech IDIQ and detract from the focus of partnering with NOAA to achieve the program objectives and mission. Further, contract vehicles, rather than individual orders or standalone contracts, often include a wide array of scope across disparate areas of expertise, similar to how ProTech covers an array of Task Areas. Vehicle-level references will demonstrate an Offeror's ability to execute on work across distinct scope areas and rapidly staff personnel across disparate expertise areas, all under a single contract. Would the government please consider allowing IDIQ and BPA references as Past Experience?	Unfortunately, winning an IDIQ or BPA does not in and of itself mean anything. The factor being evaluated is "Demonstrated Technical Experience." If an Offeror wins an IDIQ or BPA, but never performs any work under that vehicle, then the scope of the vehicle is irrelevant as the Offeror never performed any of that work, and therefore cannot demonstrate any actual technical experience. The work, and therefore the experience, occurs at the task order level.  Offerors with experience managing large vehicles with multiple concurrent task orders may receive a chance elsewhere in the proposal to highlight that valuable experience.
68	Section L.11.2.2 defines "recent" to include a project that is ongoing AND has had at least a 12 month base period completed. Would the government consider a project that is ongoing AND has had at least 12 months of work completed (i.e., 6 month base plus 6 month option period) to be recent?	In that case, the experience would be considered recent since 12 months of work (including the base period) transpired.
69	Section L.11.4.3 Volume IV - Past Performance defines "recent" to include a project that is ongoing AND has had at least a 12 month base period completed. Would the government consider a project that is ongoing AND has had at least 12 months of their work completed (i.e., 6 month base plus 6 month option period) to be recent?	In that case, the experience would be considered recent since 12 months of work (including the base period) transpired.

70	Are unpopulated MPJV offerors permitted to utilize awarded contract rates from both joint venture partners to provide price reasonableness for Attachment J-6 ceiling rates?	Rate justifications may come from anywhere, as long as they are justified and clearly meet the requirements of RFP Section L.11.4.4.
71	Is there a Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) template that can be shared with Offerors or will PPQs be submitted via an online form?	No, the intent is not to provide that information so that Offerors cannot begin working on Phase II in advance. If an Offeror is advised not to proceed to Phase II, they would have wasted their time and money, or worse, may feel the need to continue and waste even more time and money.
72	L.11.4.1 Volume II – Demonstrated Technical Experience (Phase II) states “See section L.10 for guidance concerning what may not be considered a demonstration of relevant technical experience for this factor.” Section L.10 does not give guidance for what may or not be considered relevant technical experience. Does the government have further clarification of this guidance?	The information is provided in Section L.10. Please review that section carefully. In part, it states: "All acceptable proposals must demonstrate the Offeror's understanding of the requirements and associated risks. The Government considers statements that the prospective Offeror understands, can, or will comply with the specifications, or statements paraphrasing the requirements or parts thereof to be inadequate and unsatisfactory. The Government further considers mere reiteration of the requirement or standard reference material to also be inadequate and unsatisfactory. Vague statements asserting experience, such as "support," "assist," "help," "manage," or "work with" rarely constitute demonstration without additional supporting information, and may reduce confidence."
73	L.11.4.1 Volume II – Demonstrated Technical Experience (Phase II). Some of the PWS elements state the capability specifically for NOAA. For example, PWS element C.3.3.6.A states "Safety Support - Provide safety technical services in support of NOAA's mission." Does safety support experience for an agency other than in support of NOAA's mission meet the criteria for relevance?	The requirements here are largely NOAA-specific for obvious reasons, but there is no requirement that all demonstrated technical experience must be from NOAA requirements. It is the Offerors responsibility to ensure that any experience being cited is clearly aligned to the element as written.  Consider this best practice on slide 54 of the Industry Day presentation: "Familiarity with NOAA - Identifying and relating proposals to the NOAA mission, understanding the challenges faced by NOAA." If your proposal cites experience that is not related to NOAA mission, and makes no effort to connect how that work might be able to support NOAA's mission, the government cannot be expected to make that connection for the offeror.
74	L.11.4.4 Volume V – Cost/Price – Part 1 states “The Offeror should base the rates on the most highly qualified employee or class of employees within a category working in the highest cost location, considering higher cost of performance at a Government, Contractor, or Work-From-Home”. However, the Attachment J-6 Pricing Matrix for Ceiling Rates – Phase II Only labels the rates tab as ‘Government Site’. Can the government confirm the rates should not only be based on the Government Site and consider revising the tab name for clarification?	The tab name has been corrected.
75	L.11.1 Volume V – Cost Price Part 2 is labeled as “Information about Rates” while L.11.4.4 Part 2 is labeled as “Supporting Information”. Please confirm that these DRFP references are the same.	They are the same. This will be clarified for the final RFP.
76	L.11.1 IV Past Performance Section II is labeled as “Demonstrated Technical Experience Examples”. L.11.4.3 Section II is labeled “Project Description and Performance”. Please confirm that these DRFP references are the same.	They are the same. This will be clarified for the final RFP.
77	L.11.1 IV Past Performance Section III is labeled “CPARS Records” and Section IV is labeled “Past Performance Assessment Questionnaire”. L.11.4.3 Section III is labeled “Past Performance Questionnaire (PPQ) or Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS) Report”. In L.11.4.3 there is no Section IV. Will the Government please reconcile “L.11.1 IV Past Performance” and “L.11.4.3 Past Performance for Sections III and IV” so they are consistent?	Yes, this will be reconciled in the final RFP.
78	L.11.1 Format: Accessibility. “All proposal documentation shall allow for the ability to search all text within the document (including images).” Graphics are normally inserted as “images” in proposals. OCR often is not accurate in creating searchable text in PDFs. Can the Government provide guidance on how to make text in images searchable within required PDFs to meet your requirement?	It is the Offeror's responsibility to comply with these requirements. Submitting text as an image that cannot be searched is a choice. However, this likely would not negatively impact instances such as a logo, where the text portion is not germane to the proposal content.
79	Pg 98, Section III – CAGE, UEI and TIN, and Prime Offeror's Financial Documents. Please confirm that only Mentor companies need to provide proof of an adequate accounting system and financial documents to help the government assess award eligibility for SBA Mentor Protege JV prime bidders.	This is still being researched and will be clarified in the final RFP.
80	Pg 98, Section IV - Representations and Certifications. Offerors must provide proof of their active certification or pending application for certification in the Dynamic Small Business Search (DSBS). Please verify that offerors that have followed proper certification process through the SBA veterans certify website: <a href="https://veterans.certify.sba.gov">https://veterans.certify.sba.gov</a> and have a VSBC number but are not listed in the DSBS meet this requirement.	Offerors must be registered as a small business in SAM. All other further Socioeconomic Set-asides such as HUBZone, Women-Owned Small Business, and Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned status' must be certified through SBA.  While the veterans certify website does meet that requirement today, there is no guarantee that that will be the case at time of award. It would be prudent to ensure proper registration within DSBS as well.
81	Will the Government consider allowing third-party approved accounting systems for the Approved Accounting System?	Not at this time.
82	Can you provide more details about the scope of Phase I submissions?	Please review RFP Sections C, and L.11.2.

83	What specific elements or information are you looking for in Volume II - Demonstrated Technical Experience?	Please review Section L.11 for all submission instructions and requirements.
84	Could you provide more details about the Pricing Template in Volume V?	The pricing template has already been provided as Attachment J-6.
85	Section L.11.2.1 Section III Financial Document pg. 98. What types of information or rationale should be included for a contractor that does not have a report from the cognizant federal auditor (CFA) or the cognizant federal agency official (CFAO)?	The government cannot dictate an offeror's rationale for why they may believe their accounting system to be adequate.
Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award		
#	Question	Response
86	<p>On Page 117 (Section M.4.1.1 Phase I), The RFP states "Optimal will be judged based on proximity to a notional ideal Offeror who performs a "Target Breadth" of 36 PWS elements (i.e. breadth of capability = 0.493) and performs all services at the highest possible level, or a selection of PE (scored at 3 points) for all 36 services (i.e. depth of capability = 1.0)."</p> <p>To confirm, if an Offeror fully meets all the requirements for 36 elements at 3 different projects (PE), then they will move to Phase II. And essentially, there is no advantage to an offeror to propose MORE than 36 elements with a score of PE as the proximity score increases. Is that correct?</p>	<p>The scenario in this question would result in a low proximity score. Whether an Offeror is actually advised to advance to Phase II will depend on whether or not competitive coverage of all 73 service elements has been fulfilled by any other Offerors with lower (closer to 0) Proximity Measures, considering niche vendors as well. NOAA reserves the right to select fewer or more than the Optimal number of Offerors for Phase II, depending on the specific distribution of the proximity measures.</p> <p>Additionally, Offerors should ensure they do not arbitrarily select a number of elements to "game" the system, and assume they will get an award. The entirety of Offerors' Phase II proposals will be evaluated, to include teammate content. Offerors who claim extensive experience with an element cannot supplement that experience with a teammate for that element - all of the available 3 examples would have to be substantiated by the prime alone. If considering a strong value-add teammate, make sure to leave some room for them to submit an example in Phase II. Offerors with limited or increased breadth, but extensive depth, may perform equally well. Artificially underselling capability may also have effects after award, such as during market research for task orders.</p>
87	Will past performance be evaluated differently if you were a subcontractor vs prime in a contract?	<p>No. L.11.4.3: The Offeror proposing as a Prime may include past performance information for contracts in which they performed as a subcontractor which are relevant to this solicitation. In selecting past performance examples, the Offerors should bear in mind the Government will evaluate the extent to which the past performance examples performed are relevant to the PWS elements of this solicitation. Offerors may submit references from teammates/subcontractors.</p> <p>L.11.4.1: Offerors should note that the Government's evaluation of Experience under Factor I is separate and distinct from its evaluation of Factor III (Past Performance).</p>
88	Section M.2. Basis for Award writes that an Offeror may be considered for an award if they demonstrate a high level of technical merit or proficiency for a segment of the PWS services(e.g., 3.1). If an Offeror received an award in this scenario, would the Offeror only be eligible to bid on task orders within that segment of the PWS (e.g., 3.1)?	No, all awardees may participate in any task order competition they are eligible for.
89	Will the government require corporate sustainability goals, targets, and initiatives as part of its selection criteria as we have seen with similar government solicitations (i.e., NASA SEWP VI). It is recommend to incorporate these metrics to align with Sustainable Procurement best practices, if the government has not considered it to date.	Not at the IDIQ level. Sustainability goals, targets, and initiatives (if any) will be defined at the task order level.
90	Section M.4.1.1 states that in Phase I, only Prime experience will be evaluated but Teammate experience should also be entered in Phase I as it will be evaluated in Phase II. How should Offerors denote an element where both the Prime and Teammate have experience? If the Offeror chooses "My TEAM has demonstrated technical experience" the evaluation indicates that this will not be evaluated in Phase I.	If an offeror has prime experience, they should claim it as such - at the appropriate level - rather than credit the teammate, otherwise it will not be considered in Phase I. The teammate's experience can be accounted for in Phase II, as long as all three available examples have not been used by the prime (which they would be if the prime claimed extensive experience in Phase I).
91	Section M.4.1.2 Phase II states that the Offeror's relevant experience examples in Phase II should align with the levels of experience provided in Phase I. In the scenario where the Prime has 1 experience and notes this in Phase 1 as "My company has LIMITED demonstrated technical experience from one project (PL)" is the Offeror able to use past performances from Teammates in Phase II to demonstrate 2 additional experiences to align with the Phase 2 requirements that allow for a maximum of project experiences per element? Is this viewed by NOAA as a deviation between an Offerors stated Phase I and Phase II experience?	This should be fine as long as all other requirements are met. For example, if a teammate submitted example #12 under Factor I, the Past Performance reference for that work could be used as long as all other criteria have been met, such as the minimum number of references from the Prime.
92	How is competitive coverage of all 73 elements being evaluated in Phase I?	Coverage is defined as each service element being covered by a minimum of two Offerors with strong demonstrated technical experience in those elements
93	Can you elaborate on the evaluation criteria for the highest technically rated offerors?	The criteria has been provided in Section M.4.
94	How will you assess the fair and reasonable price?	The criteria has been provided in Section M.5.
95	Could you provide more details on the best value continuum approach and how it will be applied in this procurement?	That information has been provided throughout Section M.



96	How will the Government evaluate the relevance and recency of our past performance?	Those terms are well defined throughout Secs L and M of the RFP.
97	Could you please specify if we can provide commercial past performances which is not in the same domain related to IT consulting services?	Yes, and we would hope that it is not in the IT realm since this procurement makes it very clear that it is not an IT procurement.
98	What are your criteria for distinguishing between high, some, and low confidence?	The criteria has been provided in Section M.4.
99	In testing out the tool, it appears that if a vendor hits 36 of the requirements (all with a score of PE which means they MUST have 3 relevant past performances), then they have a "perfect score". If they add anything else, there scores goes down. So vendors should not add any more?	<p>The scenario in this question would result in a low proximity score. Whether an Offeror is actually advised to advance to Phase II will depend on whether or not competitive coverage of all 73 service elements has been fulfilled by any other Offerors with lower (closer to 0) Proximity Measures, considering niche vendors as well. NOAA reserves the right to select fewer or more than the Optimal number of Offerors for Phase II, depending on the specific distribution of the proximity measures.</p> <p>Additionally, Offerors should ensure they do not arbitrarily select a number of elements to "game" the system, and assume they will get an award. The entirety of Offerors' Phase II proposals will be evaluated, to include teammate content. Offerors who claim extensive experience with an element cannot supplement that experience with a teammate for that element - all of the available 3 examples would have to be substantiated by the prime alone. If considering a strong value-add teammate, make sure to leave some room for them to submit an example in Phase II. Offerors with limited or increased breadth, but extensive depth, may perform equally well. Artificially underselling capability may also have effects after award, such as during market research for task orders.</p>
100	What is the difference between a T score and a PE score	M.4.1.1: "My company has EXTENSIVE demonstrated technical experience from three projects (PE)" worth three points and "My TEAM has demonstrated technical experience from one to three projects (T)" worth zero points during Phase 1 Factor 1. When assessing experience, a distinction must be made between work credited to a prime contractor and work credited to a teammate/subcontractor. In Phase I, only Prime experience will be evaluated. However, Teammate experience will be evaluated in Phase II, and must therefore be entered in Phase I.
101	What if my company has capability AND my team has capability?	If an offeror has prime experience, they should claim it as such - at the appropriate level - rather than credit the teammate, otherwise it will not be considered in Phase I. The teammate's experience can be accounted for in Phase II, as long as all three available examples have not been used by the prime (which they would be if the prime claimed extensive experience in Phase I).
102	If a vendor hits 36 of the requirements (all with a score of PE which means they MUST have 3 relevant past performances), then they have a "perfect score". If they add anything else, their scores goes down. So should vendors not add any more and try and stick with zero?	<p>The scenario in this question would result in a low proximity score. Whether an Offeror is actually advised to advance to Phase II will depend on whether or not competitive coverage of all 73 service elements has been fulfilled by any other Offerors with lower (closer to 0) Proximity Measures, considering niche vendors as well. NOAA reserves the right to select fewer or more than the Optimal number of Offerors for Phase II, depending on the specific distribution of the proximity measures.</p> <p>Additionally, Offerors should ensure they do not arbitrarily select a number of elements to "game" the system, and assume they will get an award. The entirety of Offerors' Phase II proposals will be evaluated, to include teammate content. Offerors who claim extensive experience with an element cannot supplement that experience with a teammate for that element - all of the available 3 examples would have to be substantiated by the prime alone. If considering a strong value-add teammate, make sure to leave some room for them to submit an example in Phase II. Offerors with limited or increased breadth, but extensive depth, may perform equally well. Artificially underselling capability may also have effects after award, such as during market research for task orders.</p>
103	For phase 1 form, is the proposal submission date the phase 1 date or phase 2 date?	All Phase 1 due dates will be specified in the final RFP posting. If a form is related to Phase I, then yes, it would be due during Phase I.
104	Will past performances submitted by team members/subcontractors be weighed less than past performances submitted by Primes?	<p>No. L.11.4.3: The Offeror proposing as a Prime may include past performance information for contracts in which they performed as a subcontractor which are relevant to this solicitation. In selecting past performance examples, the Offerors should bear in mind the Government will evaluate the extent to which the past performance examples performed are relevant to the PWS elements of this solicitation. Offerors may submit references from teammates/subcontractors.</p> <p>L.11.4.1: Offerors should note that the Government's evaluation of Experience under Factor I is separate and distinct from its evaluation of Factor III (Past Performance).</p>

**Attachment J-1, Labor Categories**

#	Question	Response
105	Are there specific qualifications or certifications required for each labor category?	Please see Attachment J-1 for specific qualifications, certifications and functions.
106	What is the expected level of experience for personnel in each labor category?	Please see Attachment J-1 for specific qualifications, certifications and functions.
107	Will the Government consider substituting years of experience for a degree? As an example, if a Meteorologist II candidate has 15+ years of experience with a BA/BS, would they be considered for Meteorologist III position because the years of experience far exceed the Level II requirement?	Specifics such as these would be defined at the individual task order level.
108	The description for "Test Engineers" on pg. 9 only states "Equivalent to Sys Eng" of same level. Since these Labor Categories appear to be the same, should the hours be combined into one category and remove the other category?	No, do not combine the rates and remove labor categories. Please provide rates for both labor categories in question as requested in the Attachment J-6.
109	Will the Government please clarify the intention of the Scientific Services Subcategories "Levels 1-4" in "Attachment J-1 Labor Category Descriptions"?	The goal of Category 1: Scientific Services is to provide the most commonly used labor categories used in that area of expertise. These are only the most commonly used and any specialized labor categories required by specific Task Orders can be added. Levels I through IV are not equivalent to the standard levels 1 through 4 defined at the end of Attachment J-1, please refer to "Labor Category Qualifications" section for specific information.
<b>Attachment J-2, Sample Monthly Contract Progress Report</b>		
#	Question	Response
110	Is there a sample monthly contract progress report template that you recommend to use?	Attachment J-2 provides the template for Monthly Contract Status Report. Further information on this requirement will be provider at a future date (post award briefings).
111	Does the sample monthly contact report include all the labor categories or any specific labor category?	There is a requirement for vendors to provide Monthly Contract Status Report and Monthly Task Order Status Report. Here are the minimum requirements for each report from section C.6.: 1) Monthly Contract Status Report (summation of individual task order activity), which documents the Contractor's task order awards and modifications received during the reporting period, significant activities, issues, corrective actions, and planned significant activities projected in the next 60-day period. 2) Monthly Task Order Status Report, which documents the Contractor's task order modifications received during the reporting period, activities, issues, corrective actions, and planned significant activities projected in the next 60 days. If a contractor does not have any current task order awards, then submission of a monthly report shall not be required. Attachment J-2 provides the template for Monthly Contract Status Report. Further information on this requirement will be provider at a future date (post award briefings).
<b>Attachment J-4, Relevant Technical Experience Self Assessment and Validation Matrix</b>		
#	Question	Response
112	Is there a sample template for 'Demonstrated Technical Experience Self Assessment and Validation Matrix'?	No, this Attachment is a tool/template in it's own right, to be filled out based on an Offeror's experience, or that of their teammates.
113	J-4 Phase I: Can the Government please clarify for the J-4 is it more important to identify the Teams or just the Primes experience for Phase I?	For Phase I, only the Prime's experience will be considered, but teammate experience that is not identified in Phase I cannot be included in Phase II.
114	J-4 Phase I & Phase II Validation Tab: Can the Government please clarify the following: For Phase I, if the offeror selects "Extensive Experience" in completing the J-4, and the offeror proceeds to Phase II, can the offeror identify the 3 projects as "P" in Phase II to receive a green validation, and then add additional teammate experience in Phase II to bring the total number of projects across the element to more than 3 (ensuring that the 3 projects for extensive experience still come from the offeror)? Similarly, if the offeror chooses "Moderate Experience" and identifies 2 projects in Phase II, can the offeror then add teammate experience to the element, resulting in a total of 6 projects (with 2 from the prime and 4 from teammates)? Understanding 15 projects are the maximum. Is this acceptable?	No, the maximum number of projects/examples that can be cited for each element is limited to three examples. Examples beyond 3 will <b>not</b> be evaluated. If you wish to include a teammate's example along with your own, then you must select either LIMITED or MODERATE experience to allow for that. This may create some risk in Phase I, but if you have an excellent teammate that may add significant confidence in Phase II, it may very well be worth the risk to potentially land a higher rating in Phase II. That is a business strategy that each offeror must make on their own.
115	In the J-4 matrix, could one "Contract" include multiple "Projects", as long as the projects are delineated with distinctive scopes?	No, a contract is included in the definition of Project. "Project" (also referred to as "example" or "citation") is defined as Task Order, Call Order, Contract, Subcontract, Grant or Agreement under which elements of the ProTech Weather 2.0 requirements were performed as a planned undertaking with a definite beginning and clear termination point that produces a defined output, bound by constraints such as schedule, costs and quality parameters.
116	Is a CLIN within a Contract or Task Order qualified as a "Project", if it has the relevant scope?	A CLIN, by definition, is a Contract Line Item Number, and would not qualify on it's own. However, if the intent is to use a portion of a contract (perhaps where the offeror was a subcontractor), that would be acceptable. You would cite the contract, and not the CLIN, and also be sure to clarify your role.
117	Is a Task or Subtask within a Contract or Task Order qualified as a "Project", if it has a distinctive and relevant scope? (Usually, a large contract contains many projects as well as project teams).	Yes. See response to Question #116 for more details.

118	Phase I Tab - "ProTech Oceans 2.0" is mentioned in the top yellow section. Presume this should reference "ProTech Weather 2.0"?	This is a typo that has been corrected.
119	In Phase II, the J-4 has 15 columns for demonstrated experience; however, after three (3) entries, the validation becomes invalid. Is there a reason why there are 15 columns when you can only select up to three (3)?	Yes, it is highly unlikely that all of the elements would fall within one project (performed up to three times). Instead, it is more likely that an offeror can pull experiences with various elements from multiple (up to 15) projects. For example, Project #1 may have all the Elements found under C.3.1.7, but Project #2 only has C.3.1.7.E (which can add technical experience for that element), and also includes a host of elements under C.3.2.9.
120	Attachment J-4, Phase I Instructions RFP/Spreadsheet Text: "Project" (also referred to as "example" or "citation") is defined as a Task Order, Call Order, Contract, Subcontract, Grant or Agreement under which elements of the ProTech Oceans 2.0 requirements were performed as a planned undertaking with a definite beginning and clear termination point that produces a defined output, bound by constraints such as schedule, costs and quality parameters. Question: Would the Government confirm this should be ProTech Weather 2.0?	Yes, this was a typo that has been corrected.
121	"Title of Attachment J-4 is referred to differently throughout the RFP: Page 78 "J-4 Demonstrated Technical Experience Self Assessment and Validation Matrix" Page 100 L.11.2.2 Part I - "Demonstrated Technical Experience Self-Assessment Matrix" Page 103 L.11.4.1. "Demonstrated Technical Experience Validation Matrix". Please confirm that these RFP references are all associated with the title of the actual Attachment J-4."	The language being cited on pages 100 and 103 makes clear that these are referring to the different tabs in Attachment J-4, so no changes will be made.
122	Is there a minimum threshold industry has to meet for Phase I to receive a downselect to proceed to Phase 2?	The evaluation criteria for both phases is detailed in the RFP. Also, please note that a strategy of offering only the "minimum" may not be suitable for a procurement where awards will only be made to the highest technically rated offerors with a fair and reasonable price, and may not be worth the effort.
<b>Attachment J-5, Relevant Technical Experience Form - PHASE 2 ONLY</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
123	PHASE II Part 3 - Demonstrated Technical Experience Written Submission: Can the Government please clarify if the 35 pages is representative of the total of the project examples completed from the J-5 Information?	This Attachment would be used within the up-to 35-page Volume II, Part 3 to begin each project, so that each project has clearly identifiable information that is required, which helps everyone.
124	Are there any specific performance metrics or KPIs that need to be met for each project?	See RFP Section L.11.2.2 for full instructions.
125	Can you clarify the total contract value range for similar projects in the past?	That field is where you enter the total dollar value of that project. Please note that if it is below \$500,000, it cannot be used as an example as it would fail the relevancy requirement.
<b>Attachment J-6, Cost/Price Template for Ceiling Rates - PHASE 2 ONLY</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
126	Are unpopulated MPJV offerors permitted to utilize awarded contract rates from both joint venture partners to provide price reasonableness for Attachment J-6 ceiling rates?	Rate justifications may come from anywhere, as long as they are justified and clearly meet the requirements of RFP Section L.11.4.4.
127	Cell A1: Says "Protech Satellite" - Incorrect Domain name. Should this be "ProTech Weather"?	This is a typo that has been corrected.
128	Regarding "Levels 1-4" in "Attachment J-6" (lines 11-14, 33-36, 72-75, 93-96, 118-121, and 143-146). To assist in pricing, can the government provide additional guidance on what the rates for 'Level 1-4' for each category of services (for example, Category 1: Science Services, Category 2: Engineering Services, etc.) should be based on? The Standard Level Definitions provided in J-1 provides the same years of experience minimums and education qualifications for all of the Level 1-4 categories.	Level 1-4 categories in Attachment J-6 Pricing Matrix for Ceiling Rates, as mentioned in the question with line assignments, are reserved for labor categories that are not mentioned in Attachment J-1 Labor Categories (those labor categories are the most commonly) and are designed to be for broad labor categories that fall within each category of Attachment J-1 (i.e. Scientific Services, Engineering Services etc.). Please use Level 1-4 years of experience as a guideline when establishing your pricing.
<b>General question(s)/comment(s) not applicable to any specific section or attachment in the RFP:</b>		
<b>#</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
129	Is ProTech Weather suitable for Earth-observation commercial satellite data? (Not sure if data is sought or just management efforts and services.)	Possibly, depending on the exact requirements, which would be spelled out at the individual task order level.
130	NOAA is undertaking significant change. Thinking of current employees and engaging them in a positive, meaningful experience from the beginning, how do you see guiding ProTech contractors to serving this goal?	With the major changes that the NWS is undertaking, there are many aspects of professional services that will ensure that we are engaging employees in a meaningful way. In any sort of significant change, it is critical that these initiatives are managed with budget, schedule, and scope to maintain the confidence of the workforce. These initiatives require change management expertise and strategic approaches. To effectively incorporate the employee resources, the NWS requires support with policy and governance, human capital/workforce management, training, and communication. All of these aspects of professional services will provide the NWS with the expertise to successfully execute significant change initiatives.
131	Are slides from this Industry Day going to be made available?	They are available on ProTech website under "News and Events" section and <a href="http://sam.gov">sam.gov</a> draft RFP posting

132	Will these slides be made available?	They are available on ProTech website under "News and Events" section and <a href="https://sam.gov">sam.gov</a> draft RFP posting
133	Must the experience capabilities be awards in NAICS 541330?	No, but an offeror must be registered as a small business under NAICS 541330, Exception 3, to be considered eligible for award.
134	Can the teammates be small or large companies?	Yes, small or large.
135	What is the expected timeline or duration of the project, and are there any key milestones or deliverables that need to be met?	The government anticipates issuing a final RFP late in the summer, and then making award prior to July 14, 2025, which is when ProTech Weather 1.0 expires.
136	For phase 1 form corporate examples validity within 6 years, should we use the proposal submission date the phase 1 date or phase 2 date?	Specific dates will be provided in the final RFP.
137	We are interested in several different areas of the Weather Domain - Is there a limit on the number of topics that we can apply for as a company and will they be bundled into one RFP response?	There is no limit, nor are there minimums or maximums. The intent is to allow offerors to propose to those elements where they can showcase their strengths.
138	How many years do we need to be in business and revenue to qualify for bidding for this RFP?	No such requirement exists, though a new firm may have trouble attempting to prime such an ambitious vehicle without much technical experience, which is the most important evaluation factor.
139	How big a team do we need to be in order to be eligible for bidding for this RFP?	That is business decision to be made by each Offeror. There is no requirement for teaming in the RFP.
140	How many years of professional experience of the team members is needed to bid as prime and as sub-prime?	No such requirement exists, though a new firm may have trouble attempting to prime such an ambitious vehicle without much technical experience, which is the most important evaluation factor.
141	What would be the schedule of getting the invoices paid? Is it with delivery of milestones or monthly?	Invoice payment would be defined at the task order level, and would be in accordance with established regulation.
142	Orals is limited to 20 slides and only the cover is excluded. Will the Government allow a "TOC" type slide and "Introduction to the Team" slide be added to the slides and excluded from page count?	Yes, this will be updated in the final RFP.
143	Can the Government confirm that team members of the prime offeror/contractor are not subject to the small business size standard constraint applicable to the prime offeror/contractor?	That is correct.
144	What previous awarded proposals are available to review?	The government would never share another offeror's proposal as they are protected.
145	If we perform work under the Science PWS and produce data, models, algorithms, techniques, etc., Who owns the work? Is it government owned or available for commercial use? Please explain the data rights associated with the contract, specifically section C3.1 of the draft PWS.	Data rights, and other IP-related issues would be addressed at the task order level, if applicable.