MRO Global Multiple Award Program solicitation SPE8E326R0001 Amendment 0002- response to timely submitted questions.

Per instructions submitted on amendment 0002, the following are the responses to timely submitted questions:

1. Question: Is there any incumbent/recompete or this is a brand-new project? If yes, could you please provide us with their award number or even if the customer bought similar services in the past.
   **Response: This is a new requirement and there is no incumbent.**

2. Question: I am hoping to confirm whether this is a completely new requirement or if there are incumbents? If the latter, are you able to provide the associated incumbent vendor names and contract numbers?
   **Response: This is a new requirement and there is no incumbent.**

3. Question: We noticed that the first document identified as: SPE8E326R0001- Attachment D- Data specification document.pdf At the top of the document, it is identified as CUI. Should CUI documents be listed in the SAM.gov public folders?
   **Response: Amendment 0001 was issued to provide a corrected copy of Attachment D. Amendment 0001 was published to DIBBS and available on SAM.gov on April 27, 2026.**

4. Question: It appears that you would like the proposal to include delivered pricing on the PEL items. Will there be an opportunity to break it down by region or CONUS vs OCONUS pricing in the offer? Or would you rather one delivered price for each item regardless of the delivery location?
   **Response: Offerors are instructed to provide F.O.B. destination ceiling prices that include all costs, for ANY delivery destination worldwide, for either the exact PEL item specified or an Acceptable Alternate. Offerors must consider any business risks associated with pricing PEL items or Acceptable Alternates and account for them when submitting their Price proposals. The offeror assumes and must take into account any business risk associated with pricing the full requirements of SPE8E326R0001, as set forth in Attachment 1.**

   **The quantity for each PEL item shown for Attachment A, tab 1 under solicitation SPE8E326R0001 is based on historical demand only. The Government is not obligated to purchase at these levels during contract performance. The offeror assumes and must take into account any business risk associated with these quantities.**

   **Paragraph 6 of the Section C (Additional pricing proposal instructions and information) on page 78 of the solicitation has been revised to read: "Unit prices offered for** *PEL items (or an Acceptable Alternate)* ***shall be*** *submitted as* ***<u>one</u> fixed ceiling price applicable to <u>ANY</u> delivery destination worldwide****.***"

5. Question: Please confirm if the NAICS assigned to this program is 333999 or 339999."
   **Response: The Government confirms that the NAICS Code assigned to this solicitation is 333999. This was determined by the Contracting Officer and approved by the SBA based on the principal purpose of the contract and the NAICS codes historically used for DLA's MRO TLS contracts.**

6. Question: Instructions state, "If applicable, copies of the actual signed agreements with suppliers, manufacturers and/or distributors must be submitted" and SOW 5(a) states "Copies of current signed agreements with suppliers, manufacturers and/or distributors shall be available upon request." Will the Government confirm if it is requesting copies of agreements with suppliers are required within the proposal?

**Response: Yes, the offerors should include copies of actual signed agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments with suppliers, manufacturers and/or distributors, as a separate section within the proposal Volume I which (the said separate section) shall be labelled "Appendix A".**

**Second sentence on paragraph "a" under Section 5 (Product Support) on page 21 of the solicitation has been revised to read: "***Copies of actual signed agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments with suppliers, manufacturers and/or distributors shall be available upon request.***"**

**Paragraph 3 under Section C (Volume I, Non-price Proposal Instructions) on page 66 of the solicitation has been revised to read in part: "***If applicable, proposals for Volume I shall include an Appendix A, which must ONLY contain copies of* ***current signed agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments*** *with suppliers, manufacturers and/or distributors, transportation service carriers, warehouses and consolidation providers. While Appendix A is limited to copies of current signed agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments and not subject to the Volume I restrictions in regard to the number of pages, font type and font size under paragraph 2 above, please note that* ***no other narrative, information, graphics, pictures, screenshots or tables are permitted under Appendix A****. Should the Appendix A contain additional information and/or narrative apart from the actual signed agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments, that information will not be evaluated.***"**

**Paragraph A.1 under Factor I – Technical Merit, Sub-factor (a) – Product Support on page 68 of the solicitation has been revised to read in part: "***If applicable, copies of the actual signed agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments with suppliers, manufacturers and/or distributors must be submitted as Appendix A under Volume I.***"**

**7.** Question: Instructions state, "*If applicable, copies of the actual signed agreements with transportation service providers, supply and consolidation locations and/or warehousing resources must be submitted" and SOW 7(a) states "Copies of the actual signed agreements with transportation service carriers, warehouses and consolidation providers shall be available upon request." Will the Government confirm if it is requesting copies of agreements with suppliers are required within the proposal?

**Response: Yes, the offerors should include copies of actual signed agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments with transportation service carriers, warehouses and consolidation providers, as separate section within the proposal Volume I which (the said separate section) shall be labelled "Appendix A".**

**Last sentence on paragraph "a" under Section 7 (Distribution/Delivery) on page 29 of the solicitation has been revised to read: "***Copies of the actual signed agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments with transportation service carriers, warehouses and consolidation providers shall be available upon request.***"**

**Paragraph 3 under Section C (Volume I, Non-price Proposal Instructions) on page 66 of the solicitation has been revised to read in part: "***If applicable, proposals for Volume I shall include an Appendix A, which must ONLY contain copies of* ***current signed agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments*** *with suppliers, manufacturers and/or distributors, transportation service carriers, warehouses and consolidation providers. While Appendix A is limited to copies of current signed agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments and not subject to the Volume I restrictions in regard to the number of pages, font type and font size under paragraph 2 above, please note that* ***no other narrative, information, graphics, pictures, screenshots or tables are permitted under Appendix A****. Should the Appendix A contain additional information and/or*

*narrative apart from the actual signed agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments, that information will not be evaluated.*"

**Paragraph A under Factor I – Technical Merit, Sub-factor (c) – Distribution/Delivery on page 71 of the solicitation has been revised to read in part: "***If applicable, copies of the actual signed agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments with transportation service providers, supply and consolidation locations and/or warehousing resources must be submitted as Appendix A under Volume I.*"

**8.** Question: The RFP states, "The unit prices for the PEL and Acceptable Alternates will become F.O.B. Destination firm-fixed ceiling prices after contract award." Will the Government provide a destination for the PEL items to build in shipping costs?

**Response: Offerors are instructed to provide F.O.B. destination ceiling prices that include all costs, for ANY delivery destination worldwide, for either the exact PEL item specified or an Acceptable Alternate. Offerors must consider any business risks associated with pricing PEL items or Acceptable Alternates and account for them when submitting their Price proposals. The offeror assumes and must take into account any business risk associated with pricing the full requirements of SPE8E326R0001, as set forth in Attachment 1.**

**The quantity for each PEL item shown for Attachment A, tab 1 under solicitation SPE8E326R0001 is based on historical demand only. The Government is not obligated to purchase at these levels during contract performance. The offeror assumes and must take into account any business risk associated with these quantities.**

**Paragraph 6 of the Section C (Additional pricing proposal instructions and information) on page 78 of the solicitation has been revised to read: "Unit prices offered for** *PEL items (or an Acceptable Alternate)* ***shall be*** *submitted as* ***one fixed ceiling price applicable to ANY delivery destination worldwide****.*"

**9.** Question: Can the Government provide historical purchasing data for the PEL items?

**Response: The PEL is representative of items purchased under the current MRO contracts and is comprised of current part numbers and demand for this requirement. The quantity for each PEL item shown for solicitation Attachment A, tab 1 represents the estimated annual demand reflective of historical purchases throughout the DLA MRO CONUS and OCONUS programs. The Government is not obligated to purchase at these levels during contract performance. The offeror assumes and must take into account any business risk associated with these quantities.**

**10.** Question: Procurement Note C08 appears to be applicable to single award IDIQs relying on a single vendor's purchasing system rather than to a multiple award IDIQ with competition at the delivery order level. Procurement Note C08 states it applies to "those items or services for which the Government is relying on the contractor's purchasing system to determine that competition was obtained…" For this contract the competition of the multiple prime awardees will be used for competition. Procurement Note C08 also states "Prior to purchasing any supplies or services, the contractor must solicit a competitive quotation from at least two independently-competing firms." This would seem both redundant to the competition already amongst prime awardees and may not be possible for many unique items. The solicitation already provides a mechanism to ensure fair and reasonable pricing through competition of delivery orders among the seven awardees. Would the government not want a bid from one of the primes if they weren't able to source two competitive quotes? This requirement was recently removed by DLA Troop Support from the multi-award Medical TLSP solicitation SPE2DH-25-R-0001 for this same reason. Will DLA remove it from this solicitation also?

**Response: Procurement Note C08 is not limited to use on single-award IDIQs. The requirements under Procurement Note C08 will not be removed from this solicitation. This solicitation includes requirements for an offeror to have a purchasing system. Section 6 (Purchasing System) of the Statement of Work includes the following requirements:**

*"The Contractor's purchasing system shall –*

*…*

*4) Promote competitive sourcing among dependable suppliers so that purchases are reasonably priced and from sources that meet contractor quality requirements.*

*5) Establish and maintain procedures to document the completion of adequate price analysis or cost analysis on purchasing actions as well as document a complete and accurate history of purchase transactions to support vendors selected and prices paid."*

**11.** Question: Please clarify the difference between questions Subfactor (a) – Product Support A.(1) and Subfactor (a) – Product Support B. They both seem to ask how offerors can provide the full range of MRO products/categories described in the Statement of Work Section 5(b) "Items Covered"." What different information is required for each question?

**Response: When addressing Section 2. Instruction to Offeror- Non-Price Proposal (Volume I), Factor I- Technical Merit, Subfactor (a) – Product Support, paragraph A.1 on page 68, offerors shall describe their relationships with suppliers, manufacturers and/or distributors that make or sell the categories MRO products listed under Statement of Work Section 5(b) "Items Covered".**

**When addressing Section 2. Instruction to Offeror- Non-Price Proposal (Volume I), Factor I- Technical Merit, Subfactor (a) – Product Support, paragraph B on page 68, offerors shall provide examples of specific items within all 17 categories of MRO products listed under Statement of Work Section 5(b) "Items Covered" that the offeror demonstrates it can supply based on their relationship with suppliers, manufacturers and/or distributors for those products. Narrative descriptions are permitted, otherwise, DLA cannot provide any additional guidance other than the existing language under the FAR 52.212-1 in the solicitation. See SPE8E326R0001 Attachment 1 at page 68.**

**12.** Question: Given the extremely wide breadth of scope of items under SOW Section 5(b) "Items Covered", how does the Government want offerors to respond to Subfactor (a) – Product Support A.(3)? With hundreds of suppliers with hundreds of in-scope products, we assume it isn't the Government's intent to have offerors to provide an exhaustive list/catalog of every item/supplier. Please help us better understand the expected level of detail for a compliant response.

**Response: Section 2. Instruction to Offeror- Non-Price Proposal (Volume I), Factor I- Technical Merit, Subfactor (a) – Product Support, paragraph A.3 on page 68 of the solicitation reads:**

*"3) The offeror shall clearly indicate the products that its suppliers or subcontractors will be providing and whether these fall under the categories of MRO products described in the SOW Section 5(b) "Items Covered"."*

**The offeror should clearly indicate: 1. the supplier's name, 2. the category of MRO products this supplier specifically supports and 3. list of item(s) with each category of MRO products this supplier will be providing, in accordance with the current or future supplier agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments with the offeror.**

**Below is an example of a description of one supplier in (current or future) agreement with the offeror to provide multiple items corresponding to 2 out of the 17 categories of MRO products:**

*[supplier's name]* **Company XYZ:** *[category of MRO products]* **Construction Supplies** *[list of items]* **(steel rebar, ready-mix concrete, masonry blocks, insulation, roofing shingles, gypsum board, ceramic tiles, softwood, hardwood, treated lumber);** *[category of MRO products]* **Electrical products** *[list of items]* **(cable lugs, electrical tape, fuses, receptacle outlets)…**

**13.** Question: Page 23 of the RFP references the following: "The following additional Product Support requirements apply but are not required to be addressed in the Product Support plan submitted in the offeror's proposal:…" Please confirm that offerors are not required to address a. Domestic Sourcing Plan 1) – 3) and b. Additional Product Support (1) – (10) (pages 23-26) in their proposal responses at all.

**Response: Confirmed. Offerors are not required to address in their Volume I proposal the additional Product Support requirements listed on paragraphs I (Domestic Sourcing Plan) and paragraph II (Additional product support) under Section 5 (Product Support) of the Statement of Work on pages 23 to 26 of the solicitation.**

**14.** Question: Page 27 of the RFP references the following: "The following additional Purchasing System requirements apply but are not required to be addressed in the Purchasing System plan submitted in the offeror's proposal:…" Please confirm that offerors are not required to address a. through h. (pages 27-28) in their proposal responses at all.

**Response: Confirmed. Offerors are not required to address in their Volume I proposal the paragraphs I to VIII under Section 6 (Purchasing System) of the Statement of Work on pages 27 and 28 of the solicitation.**

**15.** Question: Page 31 of the RFP references the following: The following additional Distribution/Delivery requirements apply but are not required to be addressed in the Distribution/Delivery plan submitted in the offeror's proposal:…" Please confirm that offerors are not required to address a. through g. (pages 31-32) in their proposal responses at all.

**Response: Confirmed. Offerors are not required to address in their Volume I proposal the paragraphs I to VII under Section 7 (Distribution/Delivery) of the Statement of Work on pages 31 and 32 of the solicitation.**

**16.** Question: Please clarify the difference between questions Subfactor (b) – Purchasing System A.(1) and (3). They both seem to ask offerors to describe their purchasing systems and oversight procedures. What different information is required for each question?

**Response:** The Factor I- Technical Merit, Subfactor (b) – Purchasing System, paragraph A.1 on page 69 requires the offeror to describe ***<u>its oversight procedures</u>*** (general process of review, monitoring, evaluating, supervising, reporting and auditing) ***<u>of an acceptable purchasing system</u>*** in terms of organizing quotes, processing and handling orders, managing deliveries, tracking performance metrics, and ensuring the timely processing of electronic invoices. Factor I- Technical Merit, Subfactor (b) – Purchasing System, paragraph A.3 on page 69 requires the offeror to describe ***<u>its purchasing system interaction with the subcontractor/supplier</u>***, including a description of the monitoring and oversight procedures (general process of review, monitoring, evaluating, supervising, reporting and auditing) ***<u>of the subcontractor/supplier within the purchasing system</u>*** from the Prime Level to Purchase Order Level (issued to the supplier/subcontractor).

**Section 2. Instruction to Offeror- Non-Price Proposal (Volume I), Factor I- Technical Merit, Subfactor (b) – Purchasing System, paragraph A.1 on page 69 of the solicitation has been revised to read: "**1) The offeror shall describe ***<u>its oversight procedures</u>*** (general process of review, monitoring, evaluating, supervising, reporting and auditing) ***<u>of an</u>*** ***<u>acceptable purchasing system</u>*** in

terms of organizing quotes, processing and handling orders, managing deliveries, tracking performance metrics, and ensuring the timely processing of electronic invoices.**"**

**Section 2. Instruction to Offeror- Non-Price Proposal (Volume I), Factor I- Technical Merit, Subfactor (b) – Purchasing System, paragraph A.3 on page 69 of the solicitation has been revised to read: "**3) The offeror shall ***describe its purchasing system interaction with the subcontractor/supplier***, which shall be detailed from the Prime Level through to the Purchase Order Level, and ***include monitoring and oversight procedures*** (general process of review, monitoring, evaluating, supervising, reporting and auditing) of the subcontractor/supplier ***detailed from the Prime Level through to the Purchase Order Level.*****"**

**17.** Question (regarding Signed Agreements for Appendix A):

a. SOW Section 5 pg. 21 , references "Copies of current signed agreements with suppliers, manufacturers and/or distributors shall be available upon request". This section seems to contradict page 67, Subfactor (a) – Product Support A.(1) requirement where the Government is asking offerors to provide signed copies of those agreements. Please clarify the Government's intent.

   **Response: The SOW describes the requirements that will apply after award; the Instructions to Offerors describe the requirements for proposal submission. Under Subfactor (a) – Product Support A.(1) of the submission instructions, the Government is requesting that, in the event the offeror has current signed agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments with suppliers, manufacturers and/or distributors, the offeror shall include copies of these signed agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments on a separate section within the proposal Volume I, with this separate section being labelled "Appendix A". Under SOW Section 5, the awardee will be required to provide existing agreements upon request.**

b. SOW Section 7 p.29, references "Copies of the actual signed agreements with transportation service carriers, warehouses and consolidation providers shall be available upon request." This section seems to contradict page 70, Subfactor (c) – Distribution/Delivery Section A. requirement where the Government is asking offerors to provide signed copies of those agreements. Please clarify the Government's intent.

   **Response: The SOW describes the requirements that will apply after award; the Instructions to Offerors describe the requirements for proposal submission. Under Subfactor (c) – Distribution/Delivery Section A of the submission instructions, the Government is requesting that, in the event the offeror has current signed agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments with transportation service carriers, warehouses and consolidation providers, the offeror shall include copies of these signed agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments on a separate section within the proposal Volume I, with this separate section being labelled "Appendix A". Under SOW Section 7, the awardee will be required to provide existing agreements upon request.**

**18.** Question: We are unfamiliar with the Quality Rate performance metric. Where does the underlying data to determine this metric come from – DLA or the offeror's records?

**Response: The Quality Rate Metric is a post-award metric, meaning its data will be collected after award of delivery order. Data is collected from DLA, the TLS Contractor and customer records. Examples of quality rate data sources include proof of deliveries, material discrepancy reports, email correspondence, purchasing system reports, monthly usage data reports, etc.**

**19.** Question: For the Quote Responsiveness Rate performance metric, does DLA consider a no-bid a "response" for purposes of calculating the Quote Responsiveness Rate?

**Response: A "no-bid" or a "No Quote" will adversely impact the TLS Contractor's Quote Responsiveness Rate however, the Contractor may request relief from this metric for CLINs no-quoted under an RFQ due to domestic sourcing restrictions or regulatory compliance issues, as long as the RFQ response is submitted timely (before the RFQs response due date and time). TLS Contractors must provide quoted pricing on timely submitted RFQ responses for a minimum of 90% of the total lines/CLINs on each RFQ during each, successive, twelve-month period of contract performance. The Quote Responsiveness Rate metric is calculated as an aggregate at the end of each period of performance. Example:**

If the total (aggregate) number of RFQ lines issued during the twelve-month period of performance evaluated is 100, the TLS Contractor must have quoted at least 90 out of the 100 RFQ lines in order to meet the minimum 90% Quote Responsiveness Rate for the evaluated period of performance.

**The fifth sentence under paragraph d (Quote Responsiveness Rate (Metric)) of Section 9 (Performance Metrics) on page 36 of the solicitation is revised to read: "***TLS Contractors must provide quoted pricing on timely submitted RFQ responses for a minimum of 90% of the total lines/CLINs on each RFQ during each, successive, twelve-month period of contract performance. A "no-bid" or a "No Quote" on an RFQ will adversely impact the TLS Contractor's Quote Responsiveness Rate however, the Contractor may request relief from this metric for CLINs no-quoted under an RFQ due to domestic sourcing restrictions or regulatory compliance issues, as long as the RFQ response is submitted timely (before the RFQs response due date and time)***."**

**The last sentence under paragraph d (Quote Responsiveness Rate (Metric)) of Section 9 (Performance Metrics) on page 36 of the solicitation is revised to read in part: "***The Quote Responsiveness Rate metric shall be calculated as an aggregate at the end of each twelve-month period of performance as follows:***"**

**20.** Question: Please confirm what the use of "the solicitation" in Factor II – Past Performance, Section C refers to.

**Response: Addendum to FAR 52.212-1, Section 2. Instruction to Offeror- Non-Price Proposal (Volume I), Factor II- Past Performance – Confidence Assessment, paragraph C on page 73 has been revised to read:**

***"****C. For all actual annual figures requested under Factor II, please provide figures based on each of the following three (3) calendar year periods: April 23, 2023 to April 22, 2024, April 23, 2024 to April 22, 2025, and April 23, 2025 to April 22, 2026. The offeror may recalculate their actual data for each contract/account under Factor II Past Performance, if needed, and submit only the actual annual data/figures specifically related to performance for the (calendar period) April 23, 2023 to April 22, 2024, (calendar period) April 23, 2024 to April 22, 2025, and (calendar period) April 23, 2025 to April 22, 2026.****"***

**21.** Question: Contract performance metrics (e.g., delivery rates, fill rates, quote rate, etc.) are typically calculated and determined on a yearly basis starting with that contract's award date. Please confirm that for each past performance reference, DLA wants offerors to recalculate performance metrics and supporting information using this DLA MRO Global Support's solicitation SPE8E326R0001 issuance date, April 23, 2026, as the end of the 3-year recency period.

**Response: Addendum to FAR 52.212-1, Section 2. Instruction to Offeror- Non-Price Proposal (Volume I), Factor II- Past Performance – Confidence Assessment, paragraph C on page 73 has been revised to read:**

*"C. For all actual annual figures requested under Factor II, please provide figures based on each of the following three (3) calendar year periods: April 23, 2023 to April 22, 2024, April 23, 2024 to April 22, 2025, and April 23, 2025 to April 22, 2026. The offeror may recalculate their actual data for each contract/account under Factor II Past Performance, if needed, and submit only the actual annual data/figures specifically related to performance for the (calendar period) April 23, 2023 to April 22, 2024, (calendar period) April 23, 2024 to April 22, 2025, and (calendar period) April 23, 2025 to April 22, 2026."*

**22.** Question: We believe 1 week is not enough time for industry to identify whether there are substantive issues with PEL items. Would the Government extend the time for offerors to ask questions and/or provide feedback for PEL related issues to 2 more weeks?

**Response: The April 30, 2026 deadline for submission of questions will not be extended.**

**23.** Question: According to pg. 75 3.A.1 the government is requesting PEL pricing be destination pricing to "any destination worldwide". Does that mean contractors will ship to CONUS depots for government distribution to worldwide destinations? If not and the government intends for contractors to ship directly to any destination worldwide, there is a significant difference in pricing to ship PEL items to Korea vs. Texas. Since PEL list pricing reflects ceiling pricing, is the government's intent that contractors price the most expensive potential pricing destination? Would contractors price that as a single item shipment or use the estimated quantities provided in the PEL for calculation of shipping prices?

**Response: The Government intends for contractors to mainly ship directly to any destination worldwide. Offerors are instructed to provide F.O.B. destination ceiling prices that include all costs, for ANY delivery destination worldwide, for either the exact PEL item specified or an Acceptable Alternate. Offerors must consider any business risks associated with pricing PEL items or Acceptable Alternates and account for them in submitting their Price proposals.**

**The quantity for each PEL item shown for Attachment A, tab 1 under solicitation SPE8E326R0001 is based on historical demand only. The Government is not obligated to purchase at these levels during contract performance. The offeror assumes and must take into account any business risk associated with these quantities.**

**The offeror assumes and must take into account any business risk associated with pricing the full requirements of SPE8E326R0001, as set forth in Attachment 1.**

**24.** Question: Our research shows PEL items 27, 28 and 61 are obsolete/EOL items.

**Response: PEL items 27, 28 and 61 have been replaced. Revised Solicitation Attachment A- Volume II- Pricing is provided with this amendment. Revisions to Attachment A- Volume II- Pricing, tab 1, PEL items are highlighted in yellow.**

**25.** Question: Our research shows PEL 51 is a non-TAA compliant item. Does the government still want pricing on this item or will it be removed?

**Response: PEL item 51 has been replaced. Revised Solicitation Attachment A- Volume II- Pricing is provided with this amendment. Revisions to Attachment A- Volume II- Pricing, tab 1, PEL items are highlighted in yellow.**

**26.** Question (Re: "Executive summaries, graphics, pictures, screenshots and tables are NOT permitted on Volume I."): The solicitation currently prohibits the use of an Executive Summary, graphics, pictures, screenshots, and tables in Volume I. Because several required response areas may include structured information, including distribution/delivery locations, partner locations, lists of covered items, and related operational data, would the Government consider allowing the limited use of tables and graphics

in Volume I when such formats improve readability and support clear evaluation of the offeror's proposed approach? Can we include those if it's within page count?

**Response: No. Executive summaries, graphics, pictures, screenshots and tables are NOT permitted on Volume I.**

**27.** Question: Will the Government define what they consider to be CUI related to performing the contract? Will it all be clearly marked or will things like task orders be considered CUI, even if not marked as such?

**Response: Any CUI provided by the Government to offerors or awardees would be marked as CUI.**

**28.** Question: As written, the Government says that FCI needs to be kept in a CMMC level 2 compliant system. Can the Government confirm that it is correct? CMMC level 2 is usually only required for CUI while FCI can be held in systems with lower levels of security.

**Response: DFARS 252.204-7021 and 252.204-7025 may be applicable on an order by order basis effective November 10, 2028. Offerors must take this into account in pricing their proposals.**

**29.** Question regarding PEL Line Item 1, Manufacturer: 3M | Part No. 8212: Line Item 1 cannot be confirmed as Berry Amendment compliant, and no Berry compliant equivalent has been identified. Can the Government clarify whether an alternate Berry compliant item may be proposed in lieu of this PEL item, or whether the Government intends to revise or remove this item from the PEL?

**Response: PEL item 1 has been replaced. Revised Solicitation Attachment A- Volume II- Pricing is provided with this amendment. Revisions to Attachment A- Volume II- Pricing, tab 1, PEL items are highlighted in yellow.**

**30.** Question regarding PEL Line Item 5, Manufacturer: ALARM LOCK | Part No. DL2800IC/26D: The DL2800 series has been discontinued and replaced by the DL3200 series. Can the Government confirm whether the DL3200 is an acceptable replacement for this PEL item, or whether the PEL will be updated accordingly?

**Response: PEL item 5 has been replaced. Revised Solicitation Attachment A- Volume II- Pricing is provided with this amendment. Revisions to Attachment A- Volume II- Pricing, tab 1, PEL items are highlighted in yellow.**

**31.** Question regarding PEL Line Item 27, Manufacturer: DEWALT | Part No. DC9096: This item has been discontinued, and no TAA-compliant exact replacement has been identified. Can the Government clarify whether an alternate item may be proposed, or whether the PEL will be revised to address this discontinued item?

**Response: PEL item 27 has been replaced. Revised Solicitation Attachment A- Volume II- Pricing is provided with this amendment. Revisions to Attachment A- Volume II- Pricing, tab 1, PEL items are highlighted in yellow.**

**32.** Question regarding PEL Line Item 28, Manufacturer: DEWALT | Part No. DCD780C2: This item has been discontinued, and the identified replacement is not Berry Amendment compliant. Can the Government clarify whether a Berry-compliant alternate may be proposed, or whether the PEL will be revised to reflect an acceptable replacement?

**Response: PEL item 28 has been replaced. Revised Solicitation Attachment A- Volume II- Pricing is provided with this amendment. Revisions to Attachment A- Volume II- Pricing, tab 1, PEL items are highlighted in yellow.**

**33.** Question regarding PEL Line Item 45, Manufacturer: DUST FREE | Part No. 06182: This item is manufactured in China, and no compliant alternative has been identified. Can the Government confirm

whether this item remains valid as listed, or whether the PEL will be revised to address compliance requirements?

**Response: PEL item 45 has been replaced. Revised Solicitation Attachment A- Volume II- Pricing is provided with this amendment. Revisions to Attachment A- Volume II- Pricing, tab 1, PEL items are highlighted in yellow.**

**34.** Question regarding PEL Line Item 61, Manufacturer: ICOM | Part No. F4001-71-RC: The F4001-71-RC model has been discontinued and replaced by the F2000 series. Can the Government confirm whether the F2000 model is an acceptable replacement for this PEL item?

**Response: PEL item 61 has been replaced. Revised Solicitation Attachment A- Volume II- Pricing is provided with this amendment. Revisions to Attachment A- Volume II- Pricing, tab 1, PEL items are highlighted in yellow.**

**35.** Question regarding PEL Line Item 69, Manufacturer: MCKINNEY | Part No. T4A3786: The specified finish in the item description (26D Satin Bronze) has been discontinued. Can the Government confirm whether an alternate finish (e.g., Satin Chrome) is acceptable for this PEL item, or whether the PEL will be revised?

**Response: The item description under PEL item 69 has been updated. Revised Solicitation Attachment A- Volume II- Pricing is provided with this amendment. Revisions to Attachment A- Volume II- Pricing, tab 1, PEL items are highlighted in yellow.**

**36.** Question regarding PEL Line Item 78, Manufacturer: R.M. YOUNG | Part No. 92000: The 92000 model is obsolete and has been replaced by the 93000 model. Can the Government confirm whether the 93000 model is an acceptable replacement for this PEL item?

**Response: PEL item 78 has been replaced. Revised Solicitation Attachment A- Volume II- Pricing is provided with this amendment. Revisions to Attachment A- Volume II- Pricing, tab 1, PEL items are highlighted in yellow.**

**37.** Question regarding PEL Line Item 83, Manufacturer: SAWRCO | Part No. 1116: The item description references "5-gallon pallet", but the required quantity of 71 EA is unclear. Can the Government confirm whether this line item is intended to represent 71 pallets, each consisting of 32 (5-gallon buckets), or provide clarification on the intended unit of issue and total quantity?

**Response: The item description under PEL item 83 has been updated. Revised Solicitation Attachment A- Volume II- Pricing is provided with this amendment. Revisions to Attachment A- Volume II- Pricing, tab 1, PEL items are highlighted in yellow. To further clarify: The offeror should quote a quantity of 71 buckets (each bucket contains 5 gallons of paint) for each of the five periods on the Volume II Pricing spreadsheet.**

**38.** Question: Because the solicitation states that all questions, including clarifications regarding the Price Evaluation List (PEL), are to be included in the deadline specified in #22 of the Caution Notice (April 30,2026), we respectfully request a three week extension to the question deadline to ensure that all clarifications coming from the industry, specifically regarding notification whether a manufacturer has discontinued an item or if a part number has been superseded, are able to be included.

**Response: The April 30, 2026 deadline for submission of questions will not be extended.**

**39.** Question: To support the submission of high-quality, fully compliant proposals and to strengthen competition for this new global acquisition method, we respectfully request a three-week extension to the proposal submission deadline. This additional time would allow offerors, and the supply chain/industry, to review and incorporate the Government's responses to submitted questions and to develop complete proposals aligned with the solicitation requirements.

**Response: The amendment 0002 has been issued to extend the solicitation closing date to July 6, 2026 at 3PM EST.**

**40.** Question: Does the Government have an anticipated timeframe for award of this new acquisition method?

**Response: DLA cannot provide an anticipated timeframe for award at this time.**

**41.** Question: Can the Government clarify whether this solicitation is intended to operate concurrently with existing MRO contracts, or whether the Government anticipates consolidating ordering under this vehicle upon award?

**Response: This question relates to post-award administration of the MRO program, not the solicitation.**

**42.** Question: Please clarify if the Government intends to cancel solicitations SPE8E3-21-R-0001 and SPE5B1-25-R-0002 as a result of this new acquisition method.

**Response: This inquiry does not pertain to the Solicitation SPE8E326R0001.**

**43.** Question: Please clarify if this new acquisition method will remove all existing MRO contracts. For example:

a) CONUS
   1. South Central Zone 1
   2. South Central Zone 2
   3. Southwest Zone 1
   4. Southwest Zone 2
   5. Northwest Central Zone 1
   6. Northwest Central Zone 2
   7. Alaska/Hawaii Zone 1
   8. Alaska/Hawaii Zone 2
   9. Southeast Zone 1
   10. Southeast Zone 2
b) CENTCOM
c) Pacific:
   1. Japan Zone 1
   2. South Korea Zone 2
d) Europe & Africa:
   1. Northern Europe Zone 1
   2. Southern Europe Zone 2
   3. Africa Zone 3

**Response: This question relates to post-award administration of the MRO program, not the solicitation.**

**44.** Question: If multiple MRO contract vehicles remain active concurrently, can the Government clarify how ordering activities will determine which vehicle to use for MRO requirements during the period of overlap?

**Response: This question relates to post-award administration of the MRO program, not the solicitation.**

**45.** Question: The solicitation requires offerors to be eligible for installation access (e.g., via JCCS) and to perform deliveries in support of DoD installations worldwide. Under existing DLA contracts, Prime Vendors have experienced challenges obtaining DLA sponsorship for Common Access Cards (CACs) for contractor associates requiring installation access. Due to the frequency at which service-related work is performed under this program, Contractor CAC's can ease the administrative burden for the

customer/end user during site visits. Can the Government clarify whether contractor personnel performing under this contract will be eligible for CAC sponsorship, and if so, whether CAC sponsorship will be provided by the Government or remain the responsibility of the contractor? If CAC sponsorship is not anticipated, what alternative access credentials or procedures (e.g., DBIDS, local badges, escorted access) should offerors plan to use to meet installation access requirements?

**Response: TLS contractor employees that are deployed in support of a contract resulting from this solicitation may have the opportunity to apply for Common Access Cards (CACs). However, DLA Troop Support cannot guarantee that any individual employee of the TLS contractor will be approved for a CAC.**

**46.** Question: Can the Government clarify whether any automated tools, including artificial intelligence (AI) or machine-assisted technologies, will be used to support the evaluation of proposals under this solicitation? If so, will such tools be used solely to assist Government evaluators (e.g., organizing, screening, or consistency checks), with final evaluation judgments and ratings made by Government personnel in accordance with the stated evaluation criteria?

**Response: Offerors will be evaluated in accordance with the evaluation criteria provided under FAR 52.212-2 in the solicitation. See SPE8E326R0001 Attachment 1 at pages 80-89. Otherwise, no additional information regarding evaluation of proposals will be provided.**

**47.** Question: As a FAR Part 12 (Commercial Products and Commercial Services) acquisition, and where the offeror may qualify as a small business, FAR 52.203 13 and related ethics program requirements should not apply unless expressly required by statute. Please confirm this section is informational only and not a required compliance condition for commercial items.

**Response: Class Deviation 2026-O0028 – Revolutionary FAR Overhaul Part 12, DFARS Part 212, FAR 12.205(b)(2) lists FAR 52.203-13 in Table 12-3 among the Clauses to be included as prescribed. Class Deviation 2026-O0031 – Revolutionary FAR Overhaul Part 3, DFARS Part 203, FAR 3.1004(a) prescribes FAR 52.203-13 in solicitations and contracts if the value of the contract is expected to exceed $7.5 million and the performance period is 120 days or more. Therefore, the contractor, regardless of small business status, shall comply with the terms of the clause and have a written code of business ethics and conduct; exercise due diligence to prevent and detect criminal conduct; promote ethical conduct and a commitment to compliance with the law within their organization; and timely report any violations of federal criminal law involving fraud, conflict of interest, bribery or gratuity violations found in title 18 of the United States Code or any violations of the False Claims Act. (31 U.S.C. 3729-3733). When FAR 52.203-13 is included in the contract, contractors must provide a copy of its written code of business ethics and conduct to the contracting officer upon request by the contracting officer.**

**48.** Question: Can the Government confirm whether Covered Defense Information (CDI) is expected to be provided or generated under this procurement? If CDI is not anticipated, DFARS 252.204 7025 and CMMC certification requirements should not apply, consistent with DFARS 204.7302.

**Response: DFARS 252.204-7021 and 252.204-7025 may be applicable on an order by order basis effective November 10, 2028. Offerors must take this into account in pricing their proposals.**

**49.** Question: Based on the nature of the requirement as commercial MRO supply and services, we request confirmation that NAICS 339999 accurately reflects the principal purpose of the procurement, and whether a wholesale or distribution NAICS was considered.

**Response: The Government confirms that the NAICS Code assigned to this solicitation is 333999. This was determined by the Contracting Officer and approved by the SBA based on the principal purpose of the contract and the NAICS codes historically used for DLA's MRO TLS contracts.**

**50.** Question regarding SOW Section 3 (Contract Type and Term): The solicitation states that the Government intends to make up to two awards to small business concerns, while delivery orders will generally be competed among all awardees. Can the Government clarify whether it intends to set aside any delivery orders, or categories of delivery orders, exclusively for the small business awardees, or whether all delivery orders will be competed among all contract holders regardless of business size unless otherwise stated?

**Response: The Government does not intend to set aside any delivery orders to be exclusively for the small business contract holders. All delivery orders over the simplified acquisition threshold (SAT) will be competed among all contract holders, regardless of the small business status of the contractors, except where an exception permits the Government to direct orders to a particular source (urgent circumstances, or to provide economy and efficiency as a logical follow-on to an order already issued in accordance with Class Deviation 2026-O0045 – Revolutionary FAR Overhaul Part 16, DFARS Part 216, FAR 16.507-6(b)(3), or to satisfy a guaranteed minimum).**

**51.** Question regarding Addendum to FAR 52.212-1, Instructions to Offerors:

a) The Price Evaluation List (PEL) requires offerors to propose firm-fixed ceiling prices on an F.O.B. Destination basis for worldwide delivery; however, the PEL does not associate items with specific ordering DoDAACs or destination groupings.

Will the Government amend the solicitation to identify representative DoDAACs/regions/delivery destinations for purposes of PEL pricing and evaluation to ensure common delivery assumptions? Absent such designation, offerors will apply different delivery-location assumptions for F.O.B. Destination pricing, which may reduce comparability of evaluated PEL pricing across offerors.

**Response: Offerors are instructed to provide F.O.B. destination ceiling prices that include all costs, for ANY delivery destination worldwide, for either the exact PEL item specified or an Acceptable Alternate. Offerors must consider any business risks associated with pricing PEL items or Acceptable Alternates and account for them in submitting their Price proposals.**

**The quantity for each PEL item shown for Attachment A, tab 1 under solicitation SPE8E326R0001 is based on historical demand only. The Government is not obligated to purchase at these levels during contract performance. The offeror assumes and must take into account any business risk associated with these quantities.**

**Offerors must consider any business risks associated with pricing PEL items or Acceptable Alternate and account for them in submitting their Price proposals. The offeror assumes and must take into account any business risk associated with pricing the full requirements of SPE8E326R0001, as set forth in Attachment 1.**

b) The solicitation requires a "complete technical data package" for both PEL and alternate items. What constitutes a complete technical data package (e.g., datasheets only, drawings)?

**Response: The following language has been added to paragraph i of the Section D (Pricing) on page 9 on the solicitation: "** *"Form, fit, and function" means describing the required overall physical, functional, and performance characteristics (along with the qualification requirements, if applicable) of an item, component, or process to the extent necessary to permit identification of physically and functionally interchangeable items. A complete technical data package shall include product name, model or part number, drawings, product specifications, manufacturer information, description of the product's*

*physical properties (sizes and dimensions, weight, color, material components), functional data, product capacity, durability, certifications and safety standards.*"

c) The Instructions to Offerors prohibit the use of graphics or tables in Volume I (Non-Price Proposal). At the same time, Volume I, Factor 1, Subfactor (d), Performance Metrics and Factor II, Past Performance requires offerors to demonstrate the ability to meet specific quantitative performance thresholds (e.g., on-time delivery rate, fill rate, quality rate, and quote responsiveness).

Can the Government clarify how offerors are expected to present quantitative or numerical performance information in Volume I without the use of tables? Specifically, are narrative explanations that include embedded quantitative values (e.g., percentages, counts, ratios) acceptable for demonstrating compliance with the requirements?

**Response: Narrative descriptions are permitted. Executive summaries, graphics, pictures, screenshots and tables are NOT permitted on Volume I. DLA cannot provide any additional guidance other than the existing language under the FAR 52.212-1 in the solicitation. See SPE8E326R0001 Attachment 1 at pages 62 to 80.**

d) Can the Government clarify whether an organizational chart or process flow diagram is considered a "graphic" and therefore prohibited in Volume I? If these are prohibited, is the Government expecting offerors to describe organizational structure and processes strictly in narrative form (e.g., text descriptions of reporting lines and roles)?

**Response: An organizational chart or process flow diagram is considered a "graphic" and therefore NOT permitted on Volume I. Narrative descriptions are permitted.**

e) The solicitation states that the table of contents is excluded from the Volume I page limitation. Can the Government clarify whether a Glossary of Acronyms is also excluded from the page limitation, given the extensive use of acronyms throughout the solicitation that will necessarily apply to offeror proposals?

**Response: The Volume I page limitation excludes the List of Acronyms.**

**Paragraph B of the Section 3 (Proposal organization/general information) on page 65 of the solicitation has been revised to read in part: "***Volume I page limitation excludes the List of Acronyms.***"**

**Paragraph C of the Section 3 (Proposal organization/general information) on page 66 of the solicitation has been revised to read in part: "***Volume I page limitation excludes the List of Acronyms.***"**

f) Volume I, Factor 1, Subfactor (a), Section A.1 states that "the offeror shall clearly describe its current business alliances, and monetary and contractual relationships with manufacturers, distributors and suppliers that will enable it to provide the full range of MRO products described in the SOW Section 5(b) 'Items Covered'," and further notes that "if applicable, copies of the actual signed agreements with suppliers, manufacturers and/or distributors must be submitted as Appendix A under Volume I."

Can the Government clarify whether letters of supply or similar written commitments from manufacturers, distributors, or suppliers are acceptable to satisfy this requirement in cases where formal signed agreements do not exist or are not customary in commercial practice? If so, are such letters acceptable in lieu of submitting executed agreements in Appendix A where the "if applicable" condition applies?

**Response: Letters of supply or similar written commitments from manufacturers, distributors, suppliers, transportation service providers, supply and consolidation locations and/or warehousing resources are permitted and can be submitted under Appendix A.**

**Paragraph B of the Section 3 (Proposal organization/general information) on page 65 of the solicitation has been revised to read in part: "***3)One Appendix A containing ONLY the copies of current signed agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments with suppliers, manufacturers and/or distributors, transportation service carriers, warehouses and consolidation providers, if applicable.***"**

**Paragraph C of the Section 3 (Proposal organization/general information) on page 66 of the solicitation has been revised to read in part: "***If applicable, proposals for Volume I shall include an Appendix A, which must* ***ONLY*** *contain copies of* ***current signed agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments*** *with suppliers, manufacturers and/or distributors, transportation service carriers, warehouses and consolidation providers.***"**

**Paragraph A.1 under Factor I – Technical Merit, Sub-factor (a) – Product Support on page 68 of the solicitation reads in part: "***If applicable, copies of the actual signed agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments with suppliers, manufacturers and/or distributors must be submitted as Appendix A under Volume I.***"**

**Paragraph A under Factor I – Technical Merit, Sub-factor (c) – Distribution/Delivery on page 71 of the solicitation reads in part: "***If applicable, copies of the actual signed agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments with transportation service providers, supply and consolidation locations and/or warehousing resources must be submitted as Appendix A under Volume I.***"**

g) Volume 1, Factor 1, subfactor (a).A.3 states that "the offeror shall clearly indicate the products that its suppliers or subcontractors will be providing and whether these fall under the categories of MRO products described in the SOW Section 5(b) 'Items Covered'." SOW Section 5(b) identifies seventeen (17) broad MRO product categories. In addition, Volume I is subject to a 60-page limit and includes a prohibition on graphics.

   Can the Government clarify the level of detail required to satisfy this requirement within Volume I? Specifically:

   a) Is the Government expecting offerors to map suppliers/subcontractors at the category level (i.e., identify which of the 17 SOW Section 5(b) categories each supplier/subcontractor will support), rather than providing an item-level listing of products?

      **Response: The offeror should clearly indicate: 1. the supplier's name, 2. category of MRO products this supplier specifically supports and 3. list of item(s) with each category of MRO products this supplier will be providing, in accordance with the current or future supplier agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments with the offeror.**

      **Below is an example of a description of one supplier in (current or future) agreement with the offeror to provide multiple items corresponding to 2 out of the 17 categories of MRO products:**

*[supplier's name]* **Company XYZ:** *[category of MRO products]* **Construction Supplies** *[list of items]* **(steel rebar, ready-mix concrete, masonry blocks, insulation, roofing shingles, gypsum board, ceramic tiles, softwood, hardwood, treated lumber);** *[category of MRO products]* **Electrical products** *[list of items]* **(cable lugs, electrical tape, fuses, receptacle outlets)…**

b) If category-level mapping is acceptable, is identification of representative product types or product families sufficient in lieu of exhaustive item listings?

**Response: A representative list of items is permitted as long as the supplier's name and the category of MRO product is also identified. Below is an example of a description of a supplier's name/category of MRO product/list of items:**

*[supplier's name]* **Company XYZ:** *[category of MRO products]* **Construction Supplies** *[list of items]* **(steel rebar, ready-mix concrete, masonry blocks, insulation, roofing shingles, gypsum board, ceramic tiles, softwood, hardwood, treated lumber);** *[category of MRO products]* **Electrical products** *[list of items]* **(cable lugs, electrical tape, fuses, receptacle outlets)…**

h) Volume I, Factor 1, subfactor (a), Section B further states that "the offeror must demonstrate the ability to supply each of the seventeen (17) categories of MRO products listed in the SOW under Section 5(b) 'Items Covered'." Can the Government clarify how offerors are expected to demonstrate the ability to supply each of the seventeen (17) MRO categories within Volume I, given the page and formatting constraints applicable to the volume? Specifically, is a concise, category-level demonstration of capability for each category sufficient, or does the Government expect a more detailed product-level demonstration for all categories?

**Response: When addressing Section 2. Instruction to Offeror- Non-Price Proposal (Volume I), Factor I- Technical Merit, Subfactor (a) – Product Support, paragraph B on page 68, offerors shall provide examples of specific items within all 17 categories of MRO products listed under Statement of Work Section 5(b) "Items Covered" that the offeror demonstrates it can supply based on their relationship with suppliers, manufacturers and/or distributors for those products. Narrative descriptions are permitted, otherwise, DLA cannot provide any additional guidance other than the existing language under the FAR 52.212-1 in the solicitation. See SPE8E326R0001 Attachment 1 at pages 62 to 80.**

i) Volume I, Factor 1, subfactor (c), Section A states that "if applicable, copies of the actual signed agreements with transportation service providers, supply and consolidation locations and/or warehousing resources must be submitted as Appendix A under Volume I." Can the Government clarify what types of agreements are expected to satisfy this requirement?

**Response: The offerors should include copies of actual signed agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments with transportation service carriers, warehouses and consolidation providers, as separate section within the proposal Volume I which (the said separate section) shall be labelled "Appendix A".**

**Paragraph A under Factor I – Technical Merit, Sub-factor (c) – Distribution/Delivery on page 71 of the solicitation has been revised to read in part: "***If applicable, copies of the actual signed agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments with transportation service providers, supply and consolidation locations and/or warehousing resources must be submitted as Appendix A under Volume I.***"**

Specifically:

a) For consolidation, and/or warehousing resources, does the Government expect offerors to submit copies of executed lease agreements (where applicable), or is identification of the facility relationship sufficient without submission of lease documentation?

**Response: The offerors should include copies of actual signed agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments with transportation service carriers, warehouses and consolidation providers, as separate section within the proposal Volume I which (the said separate section) shall be labelled "Appendix A". Identification of the facility relationship by itself is insufficient.**

b) For transportation service providers, will the Government accept Letters of Intent or other non-binding agreements where an "actual signed agreement" is not applicable?

**Response: Yes, the Government will accept Letters of Intent or other non-binding agreements.**

j) Volume I, Factor 1, Subfactor (d), Performance Metrics:

1. Volume I, Factor 1, Subfactor (d) requires offerors to "describe clearly and in detail" plans for four metrics (On-Time Delivery, Fill Rate, Quality Rate, and Quote Responsiveness), each with multiple sub-elements that substantially overlap (monitoring, corrective action, and controls over subcontracting/oversight). Can the Government clarify whether offerors may address these requirements using a single integrated performance management approach (e.g., one monitoring methodology and one corrective action framework), provided the response explicitly cross-references and addresses each required sub-element under, rather than repeating the same narrative separately under each metric?

**Response: DLA cannot provide any additional guidance other than the existing language under the FAR 52.212-1 in the solicitation. See SPE8E326R0001 Attachment 1 at pages 61 to 80.**

2. Given the Volume I page limitations and formatting restrictions, what minimum level of detail does the Government consider sufficient to satisfy "clearly and in detail" for each metric element (e.g., routine/urgent/emergency monitoring, corrective action, and subcontractor oversight)? Specifically, is a concise narrative description of processes and data sources (without tables/graphics) acceptable, provided it is complete and traceable to each required sub-element?

**Response: Narrative descriptions are permitted, otherwise, DLA cannot provide any additional guidance other than the existing language under the FAR 52.212-1 in the solicitation. See SPE8E326R0001 Attachment 1 at pages 62 to 80.**

3. Each metric includes a requirement to describe "controls over subcontracting, including oversight and surveillance" (and for Quote Responsiveness, oversight of suppliers and transportation vendors). Can the Government clarify whether it expects separate oversight/surveillance descriptions tailored to each metric (delivery, fill quantities, quality, RFQ response), or whether one consolidated oversight/surveillance process description is acceptable if it explicitly covers the differing subcontractor/vendor touchpoints relevant to each metric?

**Response: Narrative descriptions are permitted, otherwise, DLA cannot provide any additional guidance other than the existing language under the FAR 52.212-1 in the solicitation. See SPE8E326R0001 Attachment 1 at pages 62 to 80.**

**52.** Question regarding Addendum to FAR 52.212-2, Evaluation—Commercial Products and Commercial Services:

a) The solicitation indicates that each Factor I subfactor and the overall Factor I will receive adjectival ratings of Outstanding, Good, Acceptable, Marginal, or Unacceptable (NOTES 4–5).

In addition, the Volume I evaluation criteria states that strengths may be assigned when proposal elements exceed specified performance or capability requirements in a way that is advantageous to the Government during contract performance; however, the solicitation does not define what constitutes a "strength," nor does it define the qualitative distinctions between the adjectival ratings or how subfactor ratings roll up to the overall Factor I rating. Can the Government provide the definitions or qualitative standards that will be applied for:

a) "Strength" (including what level of "exceeds requirements" and what types of "advantage" the Government will recognize as a strength);

**Response: A strength is an aspect of an offeror's proposal that exceeds specified performance or capability requirements in a way that is advantageous to the Government during contract performance.**

b) The adjectival ratings (Outstanding/Good/Acceptable/Marginal/Unacceptable) for Factor I subfactors; and

**Response: The respective adjectival ratings will reflect the degree of technical merit assigned to the offeror's proposal for each subfactor or for Factor I overall.**

c) The roll-up methodology used to determine the overall Factor I rating from the subfactor ratings (e.g., weighting, predominance, or integrated judgment)?

**Response: The sub-factor ratings for Factor I, sub-factors (a) through (d) will be used to determine the overall roll-up rating of Factor I, with all sub-factors being of equal importance, See SPE8E326R0001 Attachment 1 at page 81.**

**53.** Question regarding SOW Section 4d, On Ramp/Off Ramp: What objective criteria will be used to initiate an off ramp action versus simply declining option exercise? Will contractors be notified and given an opportunity to respond prior to an off ramp determination based on participation or performance trends?

**Response: DLA cannot provide any additional guidance other than the existing language under Section 4 (Contract implementation) in the Statement of Work. See SPE8E326R0001 Attachment 1 at page 20.**

**54.** Question regarding SOW Section 6h, Discounts and Rebates: How will DLA differentiate enforcement between "commercial rebates received post order" versus volume based incentives realized across aggregated business?

**Response: All discounts and rebates (whether received prior to or after issuance of the delivery order) must be passed on to DLA Troop Support. Offerors shall guarantee that DLA Troop Support and its customers will receive discounts and rebates equal to or better than the offerors most favored commercial customers with similar sales. All prices are subject to verification.**

**55.** Question regarding SOW Section 7, Distribution/Delivery:

a) The SOW states commercial airfreight must be authorized by the Contracting Officer. What is the process and expected turnaround time for obtaining such authorization?

**Response: In the instance a DLA Contracting Officer authorizes the use of commercial airfreight in support of an emergency requirement(s), the TLS contractors will be notified appropriately of the requirement for commercial air freight prior to submission of quotes in response to a Request for Quote (RFQ). Requirements for commercial air freight shall be specifically identified in the RFQ and resulting delivery order(s).**

b) The SOW establishes routine, urgent, and emergency delivery timelines. Are these delivery timelines applicable uniformly worldwide, including remote or austere OCONUS locations, or may exceptions be authorized by the Contracting Officer?

**Response: The delivery timelines for routine, emergency and urgent requirements specified under paragraph d of Section 7 (Distribution/Delivery) on the Statement of Work on pages 29 and 30 are applicable to ANY delivery destination worldwide. These timelines apply unless the Contracting Officer has authorized a longer delivery time frame for a specific delivery order.**

c) The SOW does not appear to require contractors to own, lease, or maintain dedicated warehouse facilities as a condition of performance. However, Volume I, Factor 1, Subfactor C, Distribution/Delivery requires offerors to describe warehouse and/or consolidation geographic locations to be used in support of the contract.
Can the Government clarify whether maintaining a warehouse is a mandatory requirement under this solicitation, or whether the requirement is limited to describing any warehouse or consolidation locations used (if applicable) as part of the offeror's logistics and distribution approach?

**Response: The evaluation criteria provided under FAR 52.212-2 in the solicitation for Factor I, Subfactor (c) on page 85 of the solicitation reads in part: "***The Government will also evaluate the degree to which the offeror's distribution infrastructure, including the sizes and geographic locations (country and state/city/territory/province, etc.) of warehouses and/or consolidation points, will enable it to execute incoming and outgoing deliveries to delivery locations worldwide, as required under element 7(c) of the Statement of Work under Section 7 "Distribution/Delivery"*."

Additionally, if an offeror does not utilize dedicated warehouses and instead relies on direct ship, supplier-managed inventory, or third-party logistics solutions, should the offeror still identify locations, or may the offeror explain an alternative distribution model in lieu of listing warehouse locations?

**Response: DLA cannot provide any additional guidance other than the existing language under the FAR 52.212-1 and FAR 52.212-2 in the solicitation. See SPE8E326R0001 Attachment 1 at pages 62 to 89.**

d) The SOW assigns responsibility for customs clearance to the contractor. Will the Government provide country-specific guidance or points of contact for customs clearance, or is the contractor solely responsible in all cases?

**Response: The TLS Contractor is responsible for all export and import customs documentation required to ship material worldwide as covered by the contract, including, but not limited to: manifests, inspection certificates, and transportation documents. DLA cannot provide any additional guidance other than the existing language under Section 7 (Distribution/Delivery) in the Statement of Work. See SPE8E326R0001 Attachment 1 at page 31.**

**56.** Question regarding SOW Section 9, Performance Metrics:

a) How is "quote responsiveness" measured when a contractor submits a compliant no bid due to documented scope, sourcing, or compliance constraints?

**Response: The fifth sentence under paragraph d (Quote Responsiveness Rate (Metric)) of Section 9 (Performance Metrics) on page 36 of the solicitation is revised to read: "***TLS Contractors must provide quoted pricing on timely submitted RFQ responses for a minimum of 90% of the total lines/CLINs on each RFQ during each, successive, twelve-month period of contract performance. A "no-bid" or a "No Quote" on an RFQ will adversely impact the TLS Contractor's Quote Responsiveness Rate however, the Contractor may request relief from this*

*metric for CLINs no-quoted under an RFQ due to domestic sourcing restrictions or regulatory compliance issues, as long as the RFQ response is submitted timely (before the RFQs response due date and time).*"

b) Will partial line quoting (≥90%) be evaluated uniformly across all RFQs, or can certain RFQs impose stricter expectations depending on complexity or BOM designation?

**Response: The Quote Responsiveness Rate metric shall be calculated as an aggregate at the end of each twelve-month period of performance as follows:**

$$\frac{\textbf{Total (aggregate) number of RFQ lines quoted timely}}{\textbf{Total (aggregate) number of RFQ lines issued}}$$

**57.** Question regarding SOW Section 10a, Pricing: Does DLA intend to adjust, refresh, or retire PEL items during the base or option periods, and if so, on what cadence?

**Response: DLA does not intend to adjust, refresh, or retire PEL items during the base or option periods. For the PEL and Acceptable Alternate items awarded as firm-fixed ceiling prices, the awarded price will constitute a Not to exceed CEILING PRICE for the base period and each applicable option year and shall be the same price for routine, urgent and emergency orders and for ANY delivery destination worldwide.**

**58.** Question regarding SOW Section 12, Information Technology (IT)/Order Receipt Processing:

a) Are any material changes to BidWiser, the KO Portal, or analytics tools planned during the base period?

**Response: As stated in Section 5 (Product Support) of the Statement of Work on page 26, the DLA Construction & Equipment directorate is currently undergoing several ongoing information technology (IT) modernization efforts. The platforms (i.e. BidWiser and Contracting Officer's Portal) that support the MRO TLS Program are subject to change at any time during the period of performance. The TLS vendor will be expected to accommodate any IT change made by DLA to the bid processing platform at no additional cost to the Government. The Government reserves the right to direct the contractor to utilize other methods of quote submission at no additional cost to the Government.**

b) Is DLA considering mandated FedMall participation for all awardees, or selective participation based on item category?

**Response: As stated in the Note under paragraph D (Pricing) of the solicitation on page 9, offerors are cautioned that, for orders below the Simplified Acquisition Threshold, (SAT), the Government intends to make awarded PEL items and acceptable alternates available through an eMarketplace (such as FedMall) to customers for automated ordering. Additional items below the SAT may be added to the eMarketplace as part of the competitive RFQ process. Awarded prices for the non-PEL items valued below the SAT which are added to the eMarketplace after issuance of delivery orders will be considered ceiling prices.**

**59.** Question regarding SOW Section 33. Status of Forces Agreements (SOFA) requirements:

a) Under what circumstances may SOFA status be denied?

**Response: DLA cannot provide any additional guidance other than the existing language under Section 33 (Status of Forces Agreements (SOFA) requirements) in the Statement of Work. See SPE8E326R0001 Attachment 1 at pages 59-61. SOFA requirements specific to any particular delivery order will be identified with that respective order. Offerors are advised that SOFA Status is not guaranteed under this contract. Offerors must review and consider the relevant SOFAs, as well as any other applicable regulations, when preparing offers. Failure to qualify for SOFA Status will not relieve any contractor of the obligation to perform or entitle contractors to increased costs under the resultant contracts.**

b) What alternatives are available to the contractor if SOFA status is denied?

**Response: DLA cannot provide any additional guidance other than the existing language under Section 33 (Status of Forces Agreements (SOFA) requirements) in the Statement of Work. See SPE8E326R0001 Attachment 1 at pages 59-61. Failure to qualify for SOFA Status will not relieve any contractor of the obligation to perform or entitle contractors to increased costs under the resultant contracts.**

c) What is the expected timeline for SOFA determinations?

**Response: DLA cannot provide any additional guidance other than the existing language under Section 33 (Status of Forces Agreements (SOFA) requirements) in the Statement of Work. See SPE8E326R0001 Attachment 1 at pages 59-61.**

**60.** Question: Is there a store front requirement?

**Response: In the event that storefront support is needed, the requirement will be competed amongst the TLS contract holders and supported via an administrative contract to be established via bilateral modification. Please see Section 34. Enhanced Support Services, on page 61 of the solicitation.**

**61.** Question: Will awards for this contract be divided into regions similar to the previous iteration or will there just be one master contract.

**Response: No. There will be no regions or zones, all resulting contracts will support the same Statement of Work, compete the same requirements and provide worldwide support.**

**62.** Question: Will there be a requirement for three quotes?

**Response: No.**

**63.** Question: The government stated it "intends to make awarded PEL items and acceptable alternates available through an eMarketplace." Who will be responsible for managing eMarketplace transactions?

**Response: DLA Troop Support manages FedMall. Otherwise**, t**his question relates to post-award administration of the MRO program, not the solicitation.**

**64.** Question: Regarding all items on the PEL, will we be required to hold pricing for all years, to include option years.

**Response: Yes. Prices offered for exact items or Acceptable Alternate items on the Price Evaluation List will be awarded as firm-fixed ceiling (F.O.B Destination) prices for delivery locations worldwide. The firm-fixed prices will constitute a Not-to-exceed CEILING PRICE for the BASE PERIOD (2-year term) and each OPTION TERM (four (4) two-year terms) for delivery destinations worldwide on any resultant contract for the MRO Tailored Logistics Support Program.**

**65.** Question: Regarding the incidental service scenario in the PEL, will the offeror be held to that price for the life of the contract?

**Response: There is no established ceiling price for incidental services, though the Incidental Service Scenario pricing may be utilized as a benchmark should this type of service be requested during contract performance.**

**66.** Question: Can individual task orders that are part of a larger IDIQ be used as past performance?

**Response: A maximum of three (3) contracts or accounts shall be submitted under Factor II-Past Performance – Confidence Assessment. Each past performance record submitted must correspond to a unique contract or account. For each contract/account, the actual annual**

**data/figures specifically related with performance for the (calendar period) April 23, 2023 to April 22, 2024, (calendar period) April 23, 2024 to April 22, 2025, and (calendar period) April 23, 2025 to April 22, 2026 shall be an aggregate and inclusive of the data/figures from task orders performed by the offeror under the submitted contract/account for the periods April 23, 2023 to April 22, 2024, April 23, 2024 to April 22, 2025, and April 23, 2025 to April 22, 2026.**

**If an offeror provides more than three contracts/accounts, the Government will evaluate only the three highest dollar value, in terms of actual annual value, records. If the offeror provides less than three records, the offeror shall <u>make a clear statement that less than three records have been submitted intentionally</u>.**

**Offerors are reminded that each of the offeror's three contracts/accounts will be evaluated for relevancy to the current acquisition, including the actual (unburdened) total dollar sales; and similarity of service in terms of variety of items provided; list of geographical delivery locations or countries supported; number of customers supported; and number of delivery orders supported.**

**67.** Question: The solicitation states that "The CMMC level required by this solicitation is: CMMC Level 2 (C3PAO)." We have this. Will our subcontractors be required to have this upon IDIQ award or will individual task orders determine whether this is necessary?

**Response: DFARS 252.204-7021 and 252.204-7025 may be applicable on an order by order basis effective November 10, 2028. Offerors must take this into account in pricing their proposals.**

**68.** Question: Will other Federal Agencies outside of the DoD be allowed to utilize this contract?

**Response: Customers such as Military Services/Department of War (DOW), other Federal Agencies and Departments, state and local governments, and other authorized customers of DLA Troop Support will be able to utilize this contract.**

**69.** Question: The following part-numbers may be obsolete. Will you provide an updated price list?

a. CL-250W12-55K-E39
b. DCD780C2
c. DC9096

**Response: PEL item 27 (part number DC9096), PEL item 28 (part number DCD780C2) and PEL item 73 (part number CL-250W12-55K-E39) have been replaced. Revised Solicitation Attachment A- Volume II- Pricing is provided with this amendment. Revisions to Attachment A- Volume II- Pricing, tab 1, PEL items are highlighted in yellow.**

**70.** Question regarding Volume I, Non-price Proposal Instructions: Instructions to offerors states: "Executive Summary, graphics, pictures, screenshots and tables are NOT permitted on Volume I." The exclusion of graphics and tables makes the development of a compliant proposal response within page limits very challenging. Graphics are the most efficient method to present and evaluate requirements such as organizational structure, process flows, interaction between plan elements, and purchasing system functions as defined in the solicitation. Can the Government please allow graphics within the Technical Merit (Factor I) response?

**Response: No. Executive summaries, graphics, pictures, screenshots and tables are NOT permitted on Volume I.**

**71.** Question regarding Volume I, Non-price Proposal Instructions: Instructions to offerors states: "Executive Summary, graphics, pictures, screenshots and tables are NOT permitted on Volume I." The exclusion of graphics and tables makes the development of a compliant proposal response within page

limits very challenging. Specific requirements across the subfactors include a description of a product support plan, including details on business alliances to support all categories of products provided. Tables are the most efficient method of clearly presenting and evaluating this information. Similarly, Past Performance requirements include annual figures and metrics across specific date ranges. Again, tables are the more efficient method of presenting and evaluating this information. We request that tables be allowed with the Technical Merit (Factor I) and Past Performance (Factor II) responses?

**Response: No. Executive summaries, graphics, pictures, screenshots and tables are NOT permitted on Volume I.**

**72.** Question: If the Government decides to allow graphics, will the Government allow a smaller, but readable, font size for graphics?

**Response: No. Executive summaries, graphics, pictures, screenshots and tables are NOT permitted on Volume I.**

**73.** Question: If the Government decides to allow tables, will the Government allow a smaller, but readable, font size for tables?

**Response: No. Executive summaries, graphics, pictures, screenshots and tables are NOT permitted on Volume I.**

**74.** Question: Will the Government allow a smaller, but readable, font size for headers/footers?

**Response: No.**

**75.** Question: Given the complexities of the proposal and the requirements for external entity engagement (e.g., suppliers, transportation providers, signed agreements), we request that the Government extend the proposal due date by two weeks?

**Response: The amendment 0002 has been issued to extend the solicitation closing date to July 6, 2026 at 3PM EST.**

**76.** Question: The following requirements only appear applicable to delivery orders NOT competed among the multiple-award contract awardees because reasonable prices will be obtained through the competitive process:
10d) Justifying the need to utilize a third-party integrator and justifying any costs associated with the use of a third-party integrator
10e) Provide the supporting documentation necessary for all pre-award and post-award fair and reasonable price determinations,
11) Prospective price reduction and a retroactive refund for the amount of excessive passthrough charges included in the contract price.

Can the Government clarify whether the above requirements are applicable to competitively awarded delivery orders?

**Response: The requirement under Section 10 (Pricing) and Section 11 (Limitations on Pass-Through Charges) of the Statement of Work on pages 38 and 39 remain unchanged.**

**77.** Question regarding DFARS 252.225-7001, Buy American and Balance of Payments Program - Basic (FEB 2024): Is this clause applicable for this contract in addition to DFARS 252.225-7021, Trade Agreements – Basic (NOV 2024), and for which delivery orders will DFARS 252.225-7001 apply instead of DFARS 252.225-7021?

**Response: Both DFARS 252.225-7001 and DFARS 252.225-7021 are applicable to this solicitation and any contract(s) resulting from award of this solicitation.**

**78.** Question: Can the Government clarify the requirement demonstrate binding monetary agreements for this solicitation that will result in multiple awards and involve completely solicited and awarded delivery

orders? Given the competitive nature of delivery orders how will binding monetary agreements be applicable?

**Response: Letters of supply or similar written commitments from manufacturers, distributors, suppliers, transportation service providers, supply and consolidation locations and/or warehousing resources are permitted and can be submitted under Appendix A.**

**Paragraph B of the Section 3 (Proposal organization/general information) on page 65 of the solicitation has been revised to read in part: "***3)One Appendix A containing ONLY the copies of current signed agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments with suppliers, manufacturers and/or distributors, transportation service carriers, warehouses and consolidation providers, if applicable.***"**

**Paragraph C of the Section 3 (Proposal organization/general information) on page 66 of the solicitation has been revised to read in part: "***If applicable, proposals for Volume I shall include an Appendix A, which must* ***ONLY*** *contain copies of* ***current signed agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments*** *with suppliers, manufacturers and/or distributors, transportation service carriers, warehouses and consolidation providers.***"**

**Paragraph A.1 under Factor I – Technical Merit, Sub-factor (a) – Product Support on page 68 of the solicitation reads in part: "***If applicable, copies of the actual signed agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments with suppliers, manufacturers and/or distributors must be submitted as Appendix A under Volume I.***"**

**Paragraph A under Factor I – Technical Merit, Sub-factor (c) – Distribution/Delivery on page 71 of the solicitation reads in part: "***If applicable, copies of the actual signed agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments with transportation service providers, supply and consolidation locations and/or warehousing resources must be submitted as Appendix A under Volume I.***"**

**79.** Question: Can the Government please clarify the requirement that "offeror shall clearly indicate the products that its suppliers or subcontractors will be providing and whether these fall under the categories of MRO products described in the SOW Section 5(b)"?

**Response: Section 2. Instruction to Offeror- Non-Price Proposal (Volume I), Factor I- Technical Merit, Subfactor (a) – Product Support, paragraph A.3 on page 68 of the solicitation reads:**

*"3) The offeror shall clearly indicate the products that its suppliers or subcontractors will be providing and whether these fall under the categories of MRO products described in the SOW Section 5(b) "Items Covered"."*

**The offeror should clearly indicate: 1. the supplier's name, 2. the category of MRO products this supplier specifically supports and 3. list of item(s) with each category of MRO products this supplier will be providing, in accordance with the current or future supplier agreements, letters of supply or similar written commitments with the offeror.**

**Below is an example of a description of one supplier in (current or future) agreement with the offeror to provide multiple items corresponding to 2 out of the 17 categories of MRO products:**

*[supplier's name]* **Company XYZ:** *[category of MRO products]* **Construction Supplies** *[list of items]* **(steel rebar, ready-mix concrete, masonry blocks, insulation, roofing shingles, gypsum board, ceramic tiles, softwood, hardwood, treated lumber);** *[category of MRO*

*products]* **Electrical products** *[list of items]* **(cable lugs, electrical tape, fuses, receptacle outlets)…**

Specifically, what would be an example of products provided that would not fall under the categories of MRO products described under Section 5(b)?

**Response: Food service equipment such as commercial refrigeration (fridges/freezers), cooking apparatus (ovens, stoves, fryers), food prep tools (processors, blenders) would not fall under any of the categories of MRO products described under Section 5(b).**

**80.** Question (regarding this solicitation. Factor II – Past Performance): The instructions require performance records for three contracts/accounts within three calendar years of the solicitation issuance date. Paragraph B explains that "bridge" contracts and "administrative" contracts will be considered together with their corresponding long-term contracts as one and the same contract. Can the Government please allow follow-on, recompeted MRO TLS contracts for the same region and zone to be treated as the same account/ contract as the predecessor contract, including associated bridge contract(s), for past performance record submission and evaluation purposes?

**Response: No.**