

STOC II Draft RFP (W900KK-08-R-0001)
Questions & Answers

Answers to questions submitted, but not included in this set of Q&As, will be provided in a subsequent posting of Q&As in the near future.

Note: Questions 1-46 have already been posted in previous sets of Q&As.

47. The SOW paragraphs referenced do not appear to map to the RFP requirements in Section L technical volume.

Please identify if the contractor is to include information on satisfying these SOW requirements in the RFP and where it should go.

[The Technical Volume has been deleted from the revised Draft RFP.](#)

48. In the SOW, the area of Risk Management is under Program Management, but in the RFP it is under Quality Assurance Plan. Please confirm that this is your desired arrangement for the RFP.

[Per the RFP, Risk Management is under the Management Volume, Subfactor 2.3 Quality Assurance Plan.](#)

49. The Subcontracting Plan, required from Large Businesses, when included with the Small Business Participation Plan is likely to be more than 10 pages. May the Subcontracting Plan be exempt from the page count limitation?

[The Subcontracting Plan is no longer required of Large Businesses. The requirements for Subcontracting Plans IAW 52.219-9 will be addressed at the DO/TO level, as applicable.](#)

50. There are several SOW paragraphs that do not fit into the RFP Management or Technical Volumes cross reference. May SOW requirements be addressed by a separate compliance matrix for self certification?

[See question #47.](#)

51. With regard to clause H.21, Small Business Participation and Attachment 5, Small Business Participation form, if an awardee under STOC II is classified as a Small Disadvantaged Business, and they are capable of fulfilling 100% of the requirements of a delivery order, does that fulfill the requirement for Small Business Participation or are they required to subcontract 15% of the business out to another small business?

For purposes of reporting using Attachment 5, would the awardee's efforts be included in the calculation under Small Disadvantaged Business?

Is the purpose of Clause to prevent small businesses awarded under the full and open competition, from competing for delivery orders and then subcontracting the majority of the work out to large businesses?

[Any work performed by a small business counts towards the Small Business Participation goal, whether the work was performed as a Prime or Subcontractor. An awardee that is classified as a](#)

Small Disadvantaged Business would get credit in that socio economic category for the effort they perform. All awardees (both Large and Small businesses) in the Full & Open LOT will be responsible for meeting the Small Business Participation and Subcontracting goals as set forth in Section H.21. The Small Business Participation requirement and Subcontracting goals do not apply to the Small Business Set-Aside LOT.

52. This corporation is a small business. Does the stipulation stating that 15% participation goal for SUBCONTRACTING to small business apply to a prime small business? As a prime small business, does the primes % count toward "small business" goal of "at least 15%?"

See question #51.

53. With reference to the draft STOC II solicitation, it doesn't appear that PEO STRI anticipates STOC II to include a "services only" domain. During previous Government briefings and discussions we were lead to believe that STOC II would include such a domain. The DRFP includes only Interim Contractor Support. Will the Final RFP include a separate services domain?

No. STOC II will not consist of domains. All awardees will receive a contract that includes a CLIN for Products and a CLIN for Services in Section B.

54. If a bidder has been qualified on STOC II, are they able to bid on any opportunity that is competed under STOC II or is it limited to their area(s) of qualification?

Offerors are not being "qualified" in any particular area. STOC II awardees will be able to bid on any opportunity that is competed under the LOT in which they receive a STOC II IDIQ award. See Section H.19 of the solicitation.

55. Will Small Business not selected as an awardee in the full and open competition, but selected under the small business set aside competition, be able to compete for the full and open contracts?

No.

56. What are the specific PEO STRI socio-economic goals for STOC II?

Subcontracting goals by socio-economic category are as follows (applicable to Full & Open LOT only):

Small Disadvantaged Business	7%
Woman Owned Small Business	5%
Service Disabled Veteran Owned Small Business	3%
HUBZone Small Business	3%

57. In SOW paragraph 3.4, the "STOC II Program Protection Plan" is referenced. Where can we obtain a copy of this document?

The Government has deleted reference to the STOC II Program Protection Plan in the revised SOW.

58. While there is a major section where the prime needs to detail how they will support small business participation, what is not clear is how small businesses are encouraged to propose to STOC II as a prime themselves. The requirements, past performance, etc., are the same no matter what the size of the proposing company. The earlier meetings (ex: industry days) seem to indicate that there would be a specific directed method for small businesses to participate as primes as STOC II in a practical and achievable manner. A clarification on plans for small business is greatly appreciated.

As set forth in the revised Draft RFP, the evaluation criteria for the Small Business Set Aside LOT does not include the Small Business Participation factor. All other evaluation factors are the same for both LOTs and apply to both Large and Small businesses.

59. Section M states: “Hours are associated with the labor categories; therefore, the Government will evaluate all T&M proposed labor rates on an overall unit price basis. The proposed unit price for each labor category will be multiplied by the estimated hours the Government has determined to be representative of the effort anticipated to be expended over the total potential ordering period of ten (10) years. This product will result in a total evaluated price.”

Please provide the estimated hours the Government has determined to be representative of the effort anticipated to be expended over the total potential ordering period.

Revised Draft RFP contains estimated hours.

60. Section L.3.1 states: “MS Word (.doc) files shall use the following page setup parameters:
Page Size, Width – 8.5”
Page Size, Height – 11” “

For ease of presentation of large or complex illustrations, will the Government allow the use of foldouts (11”x17” pages) for illustrations only?

Tables or figures may be printed on fold out sheets, not to exceed 11 x 17 inches. Each fold out sheet will count as 1 page towards the maximum page count for each volume.
Specific language regarding this will be included in the Final RFP.

61. While not specifically stated, can we assume that when you refer to Front-End Analysis, your definition includes all or a subset (as appropriate) of the 5 analyses specified in TRADOC Publication 380-70-6 (Systems Approach To Training (SAT): Analysis (Needs Analysis, Mission Analysis, Collective Task Analysis, Individual Task Analysis and Job Task Analysis) ?

For the purpose of this solicitation, PEO STRI has provided a definition of Front-End Analysis in Section L.5.1 of the revised Draft RFP and in SOW paragraph 3.0.

62. In addition to government programs, is it permissible for a contractor to use a commercial program for past performance?

Yes, relevant past performance on commercial programs is permitted.

63. Does a company compete as a small business or large business if on the RFP submittal date the company qualifies as small business, but has the possibility (not certainty) of graduating to large business prior to contract award due to potential acquisition activity? What actions must be taken if the company does in fact graduate to large business during that interim period?

In accordance with 13CFR121.404, an Offeror's size status is determined at the time of proposal submission. No action is needed if the Offeror's size status changes during the interim period (time between proposal submission and contract award) unless novation/merger/acquisition activity has occurred. Small Business Offerors involved in a novation/merger/acquisition during this interim period will be required to re-certify their size status. Offerors that no longer qualify as a Small Business after such re-certification will not be eligible for award consideration in the Small Business Set Aside LOT.

64. The "draft" solicitation currently offers a labor category of "Project Coordinator" as the only category applicable to "Program Management". The solicitation does not make reference to a labor category of "Program Manager", "Financial Analyst", "Program Controller" or "Scheduler".

The current (as of 12/07/07) Q&A offers that an "increased number of labor categories" will be added to the "final" solicitation

Will the "final" RFP add the above referenced types of labor categories? We respectfully request that the Government consider publishing an update to the draft labor categories in order to facilitate the required 30 day response time to the Final RFP.

The Government has provided a revised Attachment 4 with additional labor categories in the revised Draft RFP package.

65. When will the STOC II Program Protection Plan referenced in the SOW be available for review?

See question #57.

66. Reference SOW paragraph 3.1.2; Final sentence in the paragraph states "The contractor shall establish an automated means to track and account for evolution of requirements ..."

Will use of Microsoft Excel, with appropriate requirement cross reference matrices, be considered compliant or does PEO-STRI consider only fully automated requirements tracking systems like DOORS to be compliant?

See question #26.

67. Will offerors be judged solely on the strength of their individual company capability to meet RFP requirements?

Please clarify that in the full and open competition for STOC II Prime slots, teaming is not considered for any offeror. The cadre of best qualified contractors that will win STOC II prime slots are not teams. In other words, the award of STOC II prime contracts in the full and open competition is to a generically pre-qualified stable of prime contractors who will earn that distinction not on the qualifications of their team but on the prime's qualifications individually.

Primes will be judged on their processes and procedures for performing the direct work, forming teams, synchronizing the efforts of those teams of subs including small businesses to deliver the final product or service, meeting or beating cost, schedule, and performance targets set by the customer.

The Government will consider an Offeror's proposal as it is submitted either as an individual prime company or as a team.

68. Although the DRFP asks for only a Quality Assurance Plan, would PEO STRI's needs be better met with a Quality Management Plan that addresses both Quality Control and Quality Assurance?

No.

69. In para L.5.4. It stated "Offerors shall provide Not More Than (NMT) five submissions reflecting their Past Performance in providing products and/or services within the last 3 years in the areas below. Offerors shall submit performance information in the format provided in Table L-3.

Is it five submissions at the contracts level (e.g. multi year but requires Task Orders to actual fund) or task orders (up to a year). In other words, we could have 5 task orders against the same contract.

In para L.5.4., do we solicit input from our past customers or do we only provide the requested information provided in Table L-3? If solicited from our past customers, should it be sent from the Gov customer directly to you or through us? Or will you pull from the Gov provided Past Performance from PPIRS? If solicited from our past customers, do you expect a more detailed questionnaire appearing the final RFP?

The submissions may be from the Contract or Task/Delivery Order level. Offerors are to follow instructions set forth in Section L.5.0 regarding submission of past performance data. The Government intends to use past performance questionnaires to assist its evaluation of performance risk for each Offeror. Additional instructions along with the past performance questionnaire will be provided in the Final RFP.

70. We are a small business IAW the NAICS code of the DRFP. We plan on self supporting the efforts that we win. As a small business, are we still required to subcontract to other types of small businesses and provide a small business subcontracting plan?

Small Business Set-Aside awardees are not subject to the goals set forth in H.21. However, all awardees in the Full & Open LOT will be subject to these goals.

71. Reference Table L-2; Instructions indicate the table will also address SOW requirements, but the table only includes Section L and M references. Will the SOW references be included in the next release?

The Government has removed the reference to the SOW in the instructions for Table L-2.

72. PEOSTRI provided an answer that "Any Company/Division with its own CAGE Code may submit a proposal for award consideration. It is possible that multiple divisions within a given company may each receive separate awards."

Our question is if one Division were to be eliminated, does that also eliminate any other Division of that company that also proposed?

The Government will evaluate each company/division's proposal with its own CAGE Code separately. It is possible that multiple Divisions within a company may each receive a separate award. If one Division's proposal is eliminated, that does not automatically eliminate the other Divisions.

73. Can a full and open offeror submit a proposal to prime while at the same time being listed as a potential teammate for a small business offeror submitting a separate proposal?

If allowed, will such collaboration be detrimental to either offeror's proposal as evaluated by the government?

Subsequent to ID/IQC awards, will winning primes be allowed to team with other winning primes from either the full and open or small business set-aside groups, exclusively for each appropriate DO/TO?

Offerors can prime on one proposal and team on another proposal. No, such collaboration is not detrimental because each proposal is evaluated separately. Yes, the Government encourages Primes to team with businesses that augment their capabilities in order to provide the best product/solution to the Government at the DO/TO level.

74. Has the Government determined how it will distribute task orders? Given the number of potential awardees, the Government faces a significant workload in conducting evaluations assuming a large number of awardees bid on any given task order. Has the Government determined a process by which it will reduce this workload by reducing the number of vendors who may receive any given task order?

The Government is in the process of developing the ordering procedures for STOC II which will be included in the Final RFP release.

75. Section B.4 establishes the requirement for a universal T&M rate for defined labor categories applicable for all task orders. Is our interpretation correct that this is to be applicable for all locations, both CONUS and OCONUS? Would it be easier for the Government's evaluation if the Government specified a specific locale (Orlando for example) that the rate would be based on for evaluation, providing a basis for a competitive evaluation while setting the conditions to get the most competitive rates on each task order based on where work will actually be performed? This is the approach taken in the OPTARSS ID/IQ.

Offeror's shall propose their "contractor-site" rates. The Government will revise Section B.4 of the RFP to clarify usage of the rates to be incorporated into the resultant contracts.

76. In paragraph L.5.6.4 of the initial Draft RFP, it is stated the offeror must have a DCAA approved accounting system and DCMA approved purchasing system along with submitting proof of such approvals in the proposal. Is this requirement applicable to all businesses regardless of size? If a company has not been required to have this approval to date and since the audit request must be Government driven, what fast-track avenue to request these audits/approvals are available for support of this proposal? Will a bidder be disqualified if these approvals are not in place by time of proposal submittal? Will statements of planned or on-going audits be sufficient for evaluation?

The Draft RFP has been revised to delete the requirement for all offerors to have a DCMA approved purchasing system. The requirement for a DCAA approved accounting system will stand as stated and applies to both Small and Large businesses. Proof of an approved accounting system shall be provided IAW Section L.8.4 of the solicitation. If a previous accounting system survey has not been performed by DCAA, the Offeror shall so state. For those Offerors, the Government will then request DCAA to perform a preaward accounting system survey to determine the adequacy of the Offeror's accounting system prior to any prospective contract award. Statements of planned or on-gong audits will not be sufficient for evaluation purposes.

77. Presently, Sections H.21, L.5.5.2, M.3.5 of the initial Draft RFP states, The government cites a goal of "not less than 15% of the total cost of performance, exclusive of profit, of all delivery/task orders awarded under this ID/IQ over the life of the contract." It is not clear from Attachment 5 (Small Business Participation Form) how the government intends to calculate this percentage given the potential for multiple contract types in the DOs/TOs.

Recommend changing the language in the referenced sections to state "not less than 15% of total contracted amount" since this appears to be the structure of the reporting form. If that is not the intent recommend clearly defining how the government will determine the "total cost of performance" and the "profit" for each type order and adjusting attachment 5 to support that calculation

The Government will revise Sections H.21, L.7.2 and M.3.4 for clarification of requirements in the Final RFP release.

78. Presently, the SOW 3.3.4 states, "The Contractor shall use an Earned Value Management System as each specific order defines."

In order to most accurately estimate costs anticipated with EVMS efforts, it is best that the bidder be aware of the level of EVMS that will be required at the Task Order level. For example, smaller task orders may require what is typically in the industry referred to as "EV-Lite" or "Simplified EV," which is a type of project management that uses the best practices of Earned Value without strict baseline control and other full EVMS requirements.

Full EVMS, in accordance with ANSI/EIA-748A criteria, requires a much greater level of support to ensure the 32 criteria are being met in accordance with our certified System Description (SD).

As would be expected, the type and level of Earned Value Management desired would effect our overall pricing structure. The flow-down to our subcontracts would also, therefore, be affected as well as their pricing structures.

Recommend that the government refine the EVMS requirement in the SOW to assure the government has the flexibility to select from the full range of EVMS options e.g., by adding the words "e.g., from EV-Lite to ANSI-Compliant EVMS."

No. The language in the SOW will remain unchanged in order to provide the greatest flexibility to the Government.

79. Reference clause 5152.219-5001. FAR Section 52.219-9 defines its goals to be “expressed in terms of percentages of total planned subcontracting dollars.” This is not the same as the language in H.21 where the goal is cited in terms of “Total Cost of Performance exclusive of profit.” Recommend the government clarify how it calculates the percentage goal for this clause.

The 5% goal referenced in clause 5152.219-5001 applies to the percentage of dollars subcontracted. For example, if the Subcontracting goal for a particular effort is X%, the subcontracting goal for SDB should be at least 5% of the X%.

80. Reference clause 5152.216-5008 in the initial Draft RFP. The RFP estimates between 50-70 total awards under this solicitation. The RFP does not specify any specific goals for time to respond or time to award for different types of DOs and TOs.

Does the government intend to establish goals for response times or award times for this solicitation?

Given the number of awards and desire for rapid response, does the government intend to establish any additional processes or systems that would constrain offerors' approaches for responding to TOs and DOs?

See question # 74.

81. Section L.5.5.1. (Section L.7.1 in second Draft RFP). This paragraph states that offerors “(be specific)” in describing the principal supplies and services to be subcontracted. Section M states that the assessment will be based on the “nature and complexity of the work that small firms are to perform.” Our understanding is that the intent is to relate types of work to types of business; there is no evaluation benefit to citing specific, named, teammates to perform specific types of work. Is that correct?

See question # 25.

82. Section M.1.6 states that the government will not assume that “performance will include areas the Offerors have not specified in their proposal.” Given the intent specified in M.2.0 to focus on the prime recommend deleting the sentence to avoid offerors diluting their response by feeling compelled to specify in their proposal all possible areas of work that a future team could support above and beyond the Prime's core competency/product area.

N/A.

83. The requirements for the Management Volume calls out providing a complete Subcontractor Management Plan, Management Plan and Quality Assurance Plan (QAP), however, the page limit is only 25 pages.

Is it the Government's intent to only provide the portions of the plans that address the subfactor's or as complete plans as possible that stay within the page limits?

The Government has revised the page count from 25 to 30 pages. Offerors should submit proposals that best address the RFP requirements.

84. In Section C.2, should the reference to PWBS be changed to Statement of Work (SOW)? There is no Performance Based Work Statement (PBWS) in the draft RFP package.

The Government will revise in the Final RFP release.

85. Section M.1.7 states, “The Government may use information other than that provided by the Offeror in its evaluation. Such information, referred to as extrinsic information, is obtained from sources outside the proposal. Sources of extrinsic information may include DCAA, DCMA, Government Databases, past performance questionnaires, as well as other means.” Typically, if past performance questionnaires are going to be included in the past performance evaluation, the Offerors are required to send the questionnaire to former customers and request that they complete the questionnaire and return it directly to the Contracting Officer or Contract Specialist by a prescribed date. There is no mention of the process/procedure in this Draft-RFP. Does the Government intend to have Offerors send questionnaires to past performance customer references?

See question #69.

86. Will the Government consider allowing 11X17 foldouts (count as 2 pages) for large tables and graphics?

See question #60.

87. In Section L.3.1, Will the Government clarify the reference to FAR 3.104 Proprietary Data Notice. There does not appear to be a specific Proprietary Data Notice statement in FAR 3.104.

FAR 3.104-5 provides the specific Proprietary Data Notice - "Source Selection Information -- See FAR 3.104."

88. Is it important for a Prime to address a concern for incorporating foreign companies on TOs/ODs as indicated by PEO STRI? If so, how will that be affected by FAR clauses with regard to Buy America and restrictions on foreign purchases?

The decision to address or how to address incorporating foreign companies is an Offeror's decision.

The effect of the FAR clauses becomes applicable at the DO/TO level.

89. Paragraph L.3.1 says that “The Offeror shall create a Table of Contents using the Table of Contents feature in MS Word. The Government will not include the Table of Contents with the page count for each volume”.

However, Section L does not state whether or not PEO STRI would like a cover page for each Proposal Volume, or whether or not this cover page would be included or not included in the page count for each Volume.

Would you please clarify whether or not a cover page is required? If the cover page is required, would you please clarify whether or not the cover page will be included or not included as part of the page count?

A cover page for each volume is not mandatory. However, if a cover page is included, it will not be counted towards the maximum page count.

90. Question: The past performance format request Primary Points of Contact for: “The Customer Program Manager” and the “PCO”. For those efforts on which we were a subcontractor, should we list the PM and the Contracts person for the company to which we are a sub, or are we to list them and the government PM and PCO?

The Offeror shall provide the Program Manager and Contracts person for the company to which they are a subcontractor.

91. Does the requirement in the initial Draft RFP section L.5.6.4 that states “Offeror must have a ... DCMA approved purchasing system...” apply to small businesses?

See question #22.

92. Reference Section H.25; The section does not describe if it is the governments intent to remain within the general range of the number of awarded contracts or if they intend to greatly expand the size of the competitive pool. Suggest those are two different acquisition strategies and affect the analysis of the benefit of this contract to potential offerors. It is our understanding that the government does not intend to expand the pool to a great extent but to retain the competitive nature of the pool at the same relative size.

Due to the cost, management and technical benefits anticipated to be derived through competitively awarded delivery/task orders issued under this ID/IQC, it is the Government's intention to maintain a presence of both large and small businesses as part of the awardee base. Based upon this premise, the Government reserves the right to add additional prime contractors as deemed necessary in order to sustain the competitive environment for awarding delivery/task orders. The Government anticipates making this determination on an annual basis.

93. Reference Section L.5.0; Can you provide guidance as to whether it will be acceptable to use NON-US Government contracts for Past Performance on the upcoming STOC II Past Performance Volume?

Acceptable. See Section L.5.0

94. On Page 114, specifically Paragraph L.5.0 Volume I Past Performance. The RFP states “Offerors shall provide five (5) submissions reflecting their performance....” What would constitute a single submission? For Example:

Does a STOC I Delivery Order/Task Order constitute one (1) submission?

OR Can the STOC I Contract be considered one (1) submission with a discussion of all Delivery Order/ Task Orders within that one (1) submission?

Each DO/TO will count as a separate submission.

95. In section L & M, the SOW is mentioned under past performance section.

- L.5.1 states, “Offerors shall submit Past Performance information that demonstrates how their business processes and procedures in the functional areas of Front-End Analysis, Design, Develop, Field and Sustain (as defined below and in the **SOW**) enabled them to achieve cost, schedule and performance objectives”

- M.3.2 states, “The Government’s intent in this assessment is to identify those Offerors whose relevant Past Performance represents the lowest performance risk in providing beneficial solutions to the SOW requirements in the execution of Delivery Orders/Task Orders.

The Government will assess Offerors’ Past Performance against a probability of success in performing work specific to the SOW requirements. The Government’s assessment will consider the Offeror’s execution of cost, schedule and performance of the work performed relative to the functional area(s) as described in L.5.1.”

- M.1.6 states, “The Government will evaluate proposals to determine compliance with all proposals for unique, creative and innovative methods, processes, and/or solutions that are beneficial to the Government and demonstrate responsiveness to customer needs. The Government will evaluate each proposal response strictly in accordance with its content and the Government will not assume that performance will include areas the Offerors have not specified in their proposal.”

Question:

Does every element of the SOW need to be addressed in our proposal response?

No.

Based on L.5.1 and M.3.2 (shown above), we assume that most requirements especially functional areas are to be covered in the past performance submissions. Does the Government desire that the past performance areas directly address each of the SOW requirements?

No.

For example, if the Offeror chooses past performance that has no Hazardous Materials Usage or Hazardous Materials Management would the Government assume the Offeror has no such capability?

No.

And if this is the case, where would the Offeror include such a capability if not in past performance?

N/A.

Or is it the Government’s intent to use the SOW as a broad picture of the scope an Offeror is expected to provide in delivery of the PEO-STRI products and services?

Yes. The SOW sets forth the scope of the products and services PEO STRI anticipates procuring under the STOC II contract vehicle.

96. Per the Draft RFP (Revised 18 January, 2008) there is no longer a requirement for a Technical Volume and associated evaluation in the source selection process. It appears that the technical evaluations in the Past Performance volume, which is now the most important evaluation factor, preclude innovation and future advances in technology.

We are a leading-edge advanced-technology small business, and we are alarmed that the emphasis in STOC II has been shifted from future advances in technology to what can be documented as “past performance”.

Please comment on the role of technological advances over the life of STOC II, and how this factor will be evaluated in STOC II proposals.

Technological advances will be addressed as applicable at the DO/TO level.

Offerors wanting to demonstrate a particular capability (e.g., “advanced-technology”) can submit past performance examples showing quality performance in such capability areas.

97. As a Prime Contract, is there a requirement to price all government specified labor categories? Or, can rates be added to the Prime Contract via modification after award if the Prime Contractor is subsequently able to supply services of additional labor categories?

Offerors are required to price all labor categories listed in Attachment 6 – Cost/Price Worksheet.

98. Reference section M.1.2; If a Small Business is selected for the Full and Open Lot is it possible that it can be not selected in the Small Business Lot?

Does selection of a Small Business in the Full and Open Lot guarantee selection in the Small Business Lot? If not, will such selection prevent the Small Business from competing in the Small Business Lot?

No, there is no guarantee that a Small Business selected in the Full & Open Lot will receive an award in the Set Aside Lot.

A Small Business may receive an award in the Full & Open Lot and award in the Small Business Set Aside Lot. An Offeror may only compete for DO/TO awards in the Lot in which they received an award at the ID/IQ level.

99. In question 20 you stated “Yes, a facility clearance to the Secret level is a requirement of the basic IDIQ Award.”

Section 2-102 of DoD 5220.22-M February 28, 2006 National Industrial Security Program states:

2-102 Eligibility Requirements. A Contractor or prospective contractor cannot apply for its own FCL (Facility Clearance). A GCA (Govt. Contracting Authority) or a currently cleared contractor may sponsor an uncleared company for an FCL. A company must meet the following eligibility requirements before it can be processed for an FCL:

a. The company must need access to the classified information in connection with a legitimate US Government or foreign government requirement.

As a small business doing Training and Simulation in the market applicable to the STOC II solicitation we have not currently had a requirement for a Security Clearance for the work we have been awarded and cannot according to Defense Security Service apply for a clearance unless we have a specific requirement as established by a sponsor at the time of the need. There is no reason the FCL would not be granted at that time.

Also numerous companies who have had FCL have had them deactivated because they do not have a current contract with a Security requirement in place with the provision by DSS that the FCL will be activated as needed based when a need arises.

When you say it is a requirement do you mean that the contractor has to have the capability of obtaining a facility clearance to the Secret level at which time the GCA or a currently cleared contractor will sponsor the uncleared company when required.

Or is there an opportunity to request PEO-STRI to provide a sponsor letter for our company in order to submit to DSS to be able to request the required FCL for this IDIQ. Can this process of requesting a sponsor letter and submitting the DD form 441 to DSS for approval of the FCL occur during the award process?

At the time of contract award, the offeror must either have or be eligible to receive a SECRET facility clearance granted by the Defense Security Service. If the offeror does not have a FCL upon award, the Government will initiate the requisite action with DSS.