

**Questions from
Statement of Objectives Due Diligence Brief
Conducted 13 February 2015**

Questions from Industry

1. Provide clarification on the Statement of Objective (SOO) timelines with accountability & auditability redesign by FY17 and the materiel management/inventory control reengineering efforts without a defined timeline. Assume we should focus first on the accountability & auditability requirements and then shift focus to the reengineering processes effort for the longer term initiative?
Response: The 60-day phase in period will provide time for a full assessment on where efforts should be focused. Both efforts should be attacked simultaneously... in parallel and not linearly. FIAR materiel accountability and auditability is the hard requirement by FY17; however, by focusing on the materiel accountability and auditability processes and procedural efforts, these actions provide a foundation for and support the materiel management/inventory control reengineering.

2. Do we envision further clarification of the Organizational Conflict of Interest (OCI) requirements prior to solicitation?
Response: When solicited, we anticipate OCI clarification guidance will be issued.

3. Concerned with the Statement of Objectives reference to “advisory” and “assistance” as it relates to the industry standard of Lowest Priced Technically Acceptable (LPTA) contracts. Will this be an LPTA contract?
Response: The acquisition strategy has not been decided. Please refer to parameters of this session to avoid contractual questions. This session is about understanding the technical requirements of the SOO.

4. Has there already been some vetting with Legal and the Organizational Development Office (ODO)? Innovative solutions and redesigning efforts will sometimes step on toes and encounter cultural barriers.
Response: Yes and No... some initial meetings with ODO... none yet with Legal. The Command has initiated the Materiel Accountability Review Board (MARB) which is chaired by the Executive Deputy for LOGCOM and the centers/commands directors and deputy directors are members. In addition we have established a cross-functional Materiel Accountability and Auditability Policy (MAAP) Operational Planning Team (OPT) which is comprised of individuals across the command. These are venues to involve Legal and ODO in the process when required.

5. Do you have an estimated idea of the percentage of current processes/procedures that may carryover and thus not require redesign or reengineering?
Response: No. This is where we really need assistance. The 60-day phase in period will be your opportunity to assess the situation to determine the level of efforts and focus required. The FIAR guide provides guidance on the materiel accountability and auditability processes to be examined.

The DoD Supply Chain Materiel Management Policy and Procedures provides guidance on the Materiel Management/Inventory Control processes to be examined. Brilliance in the Basics... we want to examine the 20% of materiel management/inventory control processes that give us the 80% cost effectiveness.

6. The Statement of Objectives spoke to current value and depreciated value of equipment. Can you provide clarification on the valuation requirement?

Response: Part of auditability is valuation of equipment which includes depreciation. However, it is more about does the property book records match the financial book records. HQMC is working the auditability requirements for materiel valuation and we will incorporate additional policies and requirements as they issue them.

7. Assuming there will be a SharePoint site for collaboration on and off base. Can the team VPN into the network? Will there be a CAC card requirement to access? Will they require access on the NMCI network?

Response: There is a SharePoint site for collaboration, which is on the government network and requires CAC card access. Key personnel will need a CAC card, security clearance, and access. Other on-base or off-base contractors may need access as well depending on the innovative solution being proposed. The government will ensure the team has whatever they need if they cannot access it electronically (email or hard copy).

8. Assuming this is not a "fire and forget" effort... will there be key POCs across all centers and commands to facilitate the processes and efforts (i.e. 12 disciples)?

Response: Yes. The MAAP OPT and MARB are venues which the team can utilize to facilitate the process. The Directors, Commanders, and their action officers are members of these boards and we will ensure the team has full support from across the command.

9. The SOO and questions for clarification alluded to some contractor personnel being on-base and some off-base. Is there an expected # of personnel expected to be on-base? What is the maximum number which can be facilitated on-base? The mix of on and off base does impact the cost of proposals and without clarification it will be difficult to craft proposals.

Response: The right mix is what we are asking from you with innovative and cost effective solutions. Key personnel must be located on-base but the hard and fast number of key personnel will be determined by you in your proposals. We can facilitate about 6-12 spaces in building 3600 and we can also facilitate a number of analysts (2 -5) co-located within the centers and commands, when and where required. If a requirement is deemed necessary, we will find a location to facilitate.

10. The SOO states teams at Albany, GA and Jacksonville, FL. What about Barstow, CA? Is there a plan to place a team there?

Response: There may be a requirement to support Barstow. However, if we focus on processes and procedures at Albany we can export them to Barstow. The parent organizations for those activities at Barstow are in Albany... the Marine Depot Maintenance Command and the Distribution Management Center. There may be some instances where it is deemed necessary to visit Barstow to capture requirements and this can be supported.

11. Can one company team with another company in proposal solution sets?

Response: YES

12. Is it safe to assume this initiative is unprecedented and new for LOGCOM?

Response: Yes. Separate efforts have been undertaken in past years focusing on realigning the Headquarters Group or the Marine Depot Maintenance Command, but it has never been attempted enterprise wide across all LOGCOM subordinate commands, centers, and staff departments.

13. Can you provide clarification on the transition period following contract award? The SOO states immediate but the answers to the questions state 60-days. Is it safe to assume there is a transition period of 60 days?

Response: Yes, the contractor will have 2-weeks to get key personnel on board and then 60-days to reach full operational capability.

14. Can you decompose the linkage between the two initiatives and the dates for compliance with FIAR? Is it Audit Ready or Actual Audit conducted by FY17?

Response: The intent is to have LOGCOM's materiel accountable and audit ready by FY17. There is no audit scheduled as of yet. The accountability and auditability efforts will assist in achieving the reengineering of materiel management/inventory control processes. The two initiatives are closely linked.

15. With a 3-year Period of Performance period, is it safe to assume that the major efforts will be in the first 2.5 years and institutionalizing training would be the last 6 months? Could there be spillover requirements into 2018 and thus re-compete?

Response: Yes for the major efforts and training timeline. There will be a shortened base year upon award. The re-compete, or spillover into 2018 decision, will be made approximately 1-year after award. This will allow us to identify all of the requirements and determine the timeline to compete. The intent is to end when both initiatives have been completed and not necessarily by the FY17 FIAR deadline.

16. What are the primary information systems for materiel accountability and auditability and materiel management and inventory control?

Response: Primary systems for materiel accountability and auditability are Stock Control System (SCS) and Defense Property Accounting System (DPAS). The capability of the two systems combined is the Accountable Property System of Record (APSR). DPAS can track serial numbers which is lacking in SCS. There are approximately 127+ systems that support our other materiel management and inventory control processes. GCSS-MC 2nd phase of deployment will probably not be implemented for wholesale supply. Thus, the systems will be DPAS and SCS. However, the focus of this effort is on processes and not necessarily the systems. People will have to understand the systems and their capabilities but we do not need coders or IT personnel to fix the systems.

17. When will DPAS be fully implemented?

Response: The implementation plan is a long schedule because it will be phased in at several locations until fully operational. DPAS will account for materiel at the Consolidated Storage Program (CSP) and warehouse management for Remote Storage Activities (RSA) to include local stocks at Albany and Barstow. Safe to assume DPAS will be implemented at Albany by the end of first Period of Performance.

18. Are Item Unique Identification (IUID), Radio Frequency Identification (RFID), and other tagging type technology a part of this effort to improve processes? Seems there is not a DOD standard and can we assume the process created will be unique for LOGCOM?

Response: Yes, Enhanced Yard Management (EYM) will have this capability. However, we want to reiterate that the focus of this effort is not systems based. Do not want to get in the weeds on the systems we use. We are looking for the basic steps/processes for inventory managers to do their job. Need to understand the systems and their interoperability and capabilities but this effort will not be focused on writing code or providing a big software solution.

Questions to Industry

1. Give examples of types of efforts which you may have worked on that are similar to this effort.

Response: Single Army Logistics Enterprise (SALE)... Army PEO-Soldier FIP/FIAR