Questions and Answers 08/04/2026

1. RFP a.1.(d) and L.2.(b) provide instructions on what should be submitted. Completing Attachment 008 is not included in those lists. Would the Government please confirm if Attachment 008 should be completed and submitted with proposal response? The offer's proposal must address all the questions from Attachment 0008 LMS TIQ. An example would be for question 1 they could fill out Attachment 0008 LMS TIQ and answer it by saying see attached for technical drawing or just provide the info separately.

2. If Attachment 008 is a required submission document, would the Government please clarify the following:

a. Is it the Government's expectation that bidders submit Technical Drawings/Certified Engineer Analysis as called for in Questions 1-17 at the time of proposal submission OR is it sufficient to provide our approach for each item? The offer is required to submit their technical approach and any associated technical drawings/certified engineer analysis with the proposal.

b. May Offeror provide Technical Drawings and Certified Engineering Analysis for our existing system, demonstrating our current compliance with these requirements, and explain the approach for how we will ensure these requirements will be met on the final LMS design? Yes, that would be an acceptable method of response.

c . What is the Government's expectation for Certified Engineer Analysis (e.g. test results)? Yes, on occasion the Government has allowed certain First Article Test requirements to be satisfied with the submission of Certified Engineer Analysis in place of conducting an actual First Article Test. First Article Test Reports generated by independent testing labs for certain First Article Tests such as environmental testing will also be considered Certified Engineer Analysis.

2. RFP Section B CLINs 001 and 002 list Qty of 1 for each. However, in Section F.1, CLINS 001 and 002 show Qty of 2 for each. Would the Government please clarify correct quantity? It should be two units. Section C 2.4.1.2 calls for two units. Maybe just a clarification to the contractor. That the scope of the CLIN calls for two units and they would be priced as one. As we would fully fund the CLIN.

3. RFP instructions L.A.1(d) and L.2.(b) list 9 items that bidders must complete which include two #6's. Would the Gov't. Correct the 2nd Section (6) SECTION k: RFO 52.209-13 to (7) for compliance verification? Correcting 6 to a 7 via upcoming amendment

4. We do not see any production ready drawings in the solicitation. We assume Offerors need to design, build, and test the box in accordance with the requirements and ICD. Is this an accurate assumption? Yes, that is correct. The S-788 LMS is governed by a performance-based specification ASTM 2377; therefore, there are no Government owned production drawings. Each vendor's S-788 LMS design is unique, and the full Technical Data Package for each design is retained by the vendor.

5. The requirements indicate the need for one or more environmental control units and possibly a generator to power them to meet the inside environment and solar heat gain requirements. However, the weight limit is not consistent with 1 or more ECUs plus a generator. ECUs and generator alone, without the box, would take up the allowable weight. In addition, the ICD does not show power input into the box or ducting to accommodate external ECU's providing conditioned air for heating or cooling:

a. Would the Government provide further information on power and cooling / heating air requirements? The S-788 LMS ICD governs the empty S-788 LMS, the mounting kit and the pintle extension kit, that is all the vendor is required to manufacture. All other integrated equipment to include environmental control units and on-board generators are the responsibility of the program management offices that will be performing the shelter integration. There are multiple missions performed by integrated S-788 LMS systems therefore the Government does not specify standard environmental control units and on-board generators.

b. Would the Government confirm that the weight requirement for the basic box does NOT include ECUs and/or generator? Yes, the published weight limits are for the empty S-788 LMS type variants.

6. IFB Due Date
Reference: Cover Page, Section 9
Observation: The cover page does not identify a bid submission due date or time.
Question: Can the Government confirm the official bid submission due date and time for this IFB?

The solicitation date will be extended. Once that date is determined, the bidding date and information will be posted for all offerors.

7. Section E – Missing Fill-In for FAR Clause 52.246-2
Reference: Paragraph A.1.d.3 and Section L-18, Paragraph L.2.3
Observation: Paragraph A.1.d.3 and Section L-18, Paragraph L.2.3 reference completion of FAR clause 52.246-2 in Section E; however, Section E does not contain the required fill-in.
Question: Can the Government provide the complete text of FAR clause 52.246-2 or identify where it is incorporated within the solicitation, F.o.b ?

FAR 52.246-2 is referenced in Section E of the solicitation. Complete text is located on acquisition.gov

8. Section F – Missing FAR Clause 52.247-48
Reference: Paragraph A.1.d.4 and Section L-18, Paragraph L.2.4
Observation: Paragraph A.1.d.4 and Section L-18, Paragraph L.2.4 reference FAR clause 52.247-48 as being included in Section F, Paragraph F.1. However, Paragraph F.1 does not include this clause or identify the applicable FOB destination delivery locations.
Question: Can the Government provide the complete text of FAR clause 52.247-48 or identify where it is incorporated within the solicitation? The FOB destination delivery locations are required for bidders to accurately determine transportation costs and develop a complete and competitive price proposal.

The complete text of the clause can also be found on acquisition.gov

F.o.b. Destination-Evidence of Shipment (Feb 1999)

(a) If this contract is awarded on a free on board (f.o.b.) destination basis, the Contractor-

(1) Shall not submit an invoice for payment until the supplies covered by the invoice have been shipped to the destination; and

(2) Shall retain, and make available to the Government for review as necessary, the following evidence of shipment documentation for a period of 3 years after final payment under the contract:

(i) If transportation is accomplished by common carrier, a signed copy of the commercial bill of lading for the supplies covered by the Contractor's invoice, indicating the carrier's intent to ship the supplies to the destination specified in the contract.

(ii) If transportation is accomplished by parcel post, a copy of the certificate of mailing.

(iii) If transportation is accomplished by other than common carrier or parcel post, a copy of the delivery document showing receipt at the destination specified in the contract.

(b) The Contractor is not required to submit evidence of shipment documentation with its invoice.

(End of clause)

The FOB destination can be found within the CLINs stating Texarkana, Tx

9. Section K – Missing FAR Clauses 52.209-13, 52.225-18, and 52.229-11
Reference: Paragraphs A.1.d.7 through A.1.d.9 and Section L-18, Paragraphs L.2.7 through L.2.9

Observation: Paragraphs A.1.d.7 through A.1.d.9 and Section L-18, Paragraphs L.2.7 through L.2.9 reference FAR clauses 52.209-13, 52.225-18, and 52.229-11 as being included in Section K; however, these clauses do not appear in Section K of the solicitation.
Question: Can the Government provide the complete text of these FAR clauses or identify where they are incorporated within the solicitation?

Completing Amendment to Solicitation to include the clauses. The full text of each clause can be found on Acquisition.gov

10. Missing TDPL Cover Sheet
Reference: Paragraph A.1.d.6
Observation: Paragraph A.1.d.6 indicates that Attachment 0001 includes a TDPL Cover Sheet; however, no TDPL Cover Sheet appears to be included with the attachment.
Question: Can the Government provide the TDPL Cover Sheet or advise where it may be accessed?

Removed "Cover Sheet" from the solicitation. It does not apply.

11. Bid Opening Date Discrepancy
Reference: Paragraph A.1.g and Paragraph L.4.a
Observation: Paragraph A.1.g states that bid opening will commence on **18 August 2026 at 1:00 p.m.** (Warren, MI local time), while Paragraph L.4.a states **20 August 2026 at 10:00 a.m.** (Warren, MI local time).
Question: Can the Government clarify the correct bid opening date and time? The solicitation has been extended until 24 August 2026 at 10:00am (Warren, MI time). The opening bid time and date has been adjusted to 26 August 2026 at 1:00pm (Warren, Mi time).

12. Submission of Subcontracting Plan
Reference: Paragraph L.6
Observation: Paragraph L.6 requires submission of a subcontracting plan but does not specify whether a commercial subcontracting plan is acceptable.
Question: Can the Government confirm whether offerors may submit an approved commercial subcontracting plan in lieu of an individual contract-specific subcontracting plan?No. This is a non-commercial item. A commercial subcontracting plan would not apply.

13. Total Price
Reference: Paragraph M.1.B
Observation: CDRLs A0001 (Maintenance Allocation Chart) and A0002 (Provisioning Parts Lists) are identified as **NSP (Not Separately Priced)**. These deliverables will require engineering and technical effort to develop.
Question: Since these CDRLs are designated as NSP, how should offerors account for the costs associated with developing these required deliverables in their pricing? Should these costs be included in the unit prices for the contract line items, or is another pricing methodology intended? These CLINs are listed as separately priced. A0001 and A0002 are CLINS listed in Section B.

14. Technical Publications Requirements

Reference: Technical Publications Statement of Work and applicable CDRLs

Observation 1: The Technical Publications Statement of Work requires delivery of a **13&P** Technical Manual. However, the **13&P** designation is obsolete and has been superseded by the **12&P** Technical Manual. Additionally, the Statement of Work repeatedly refers to the required technical manual as an **operator manual**, whereas a **12&P** Technical Manual includes operator and field maintenance instructions, as well as the Repair Parts and Special Tools List (RPSTL).

Question 1: Can the Government confirm that the required technical manual is a **12&P Operator and Field Maintenance Manual, including the Repair Parts and Special Tools List (RPSTL)**, in lieu of the obsolete 13&P designation? Yes is should be a 12&P.

Observation 2: The Technical Publications Statement of Work references **MIL-STD-40051-2D**. The current version of this standard is **MIL-STD-40051E**.

Question 2: Is the reference to **MIL-STD-40051-2D** intentional, or should bidders comply with the current **MIL-STD-40051E** revision? MIL-STD-40051E is the latest version and bidders should comply

Observation 3: The Technical Publications Statement of Work requires submission of **Initial, Second, Third, and Final Reproducible Copy** technical manuals. However, the associated CDRL requires only **Initial, Second, and Final Reproducible Copy** submissions.

Question 3: Can the Government clarify which submission schedule governs the contract requirements—the **Technical Publications Statement of Work** or the **CDRL**? Initial, Second, and Final Reproducible Copy

15. ASTM Exception No. 8 – MIL-STD-810 Revision

Reference: Exceptions to ASTM, No. 8

Observation: Exception No. 8 references **MIL-STD-810, Method 516.4, Procedure VIII** for rail transport testing. However, the current revision of MIL-STD-810 is **Revision H**, and rail transport is now addressed under **Method 526** rather than Method 516.4, Procedure VIII.

Question: Which revision of MIL-STD-810 should bidders use to satisfy the rail transport requirement? If the Government intends to require MIL-STD-810H, should Method 526 be used in lieu of Method 516.4, Procedure VIII? Yes it should be to MIL-STD-810 to Revision H and the Rail Transport Test Method to Method 526.

16. ASTM Exception No. 9 – Table Reference

Reference: Exceptions to ASTM, No. 9

Observation: Exception No. 9 references **Table 8** for the ground mobility testing requirements. ASTM E2377-25 does not contain a Table 8; however, the applicable ground mobility requirements appear to be contained in **Table 7**.

Question: Can the Government confirm that the reference to **Table 8** is an error and that **Table 7** is the intended reference? Yes Table 7 is the correct table

17. LMS Proposed TIQ (April 2025) – Verification by Certified Engineer Analysis

Reference: LMS Proposed TIQ, April 2025

Observation: Several requirements identify the verification method as **"Provided Certified Engineer Analysis"** rather than physical testing. For example, Requirement No. 11 (Rail Transport) lists the verification method as "Provided Certified Engineer Analysis."

Question: Can the Government confirm that requirements identified with the verification method **"Provided Certified Engineer Analysis"** do not require physical First Article Testing? Specifically, for Requirement No. 11 (Rail Transport), should bidders exclude the cost of rail transport testing from their First Article Test pricing and instead provide a Certified Engineer Analysis as the means of verification? A physical Rail Transport Test will be required for First Article Testing on this contract; therefore, the cost of rail transport testing should be included as part of the First Article Test pricing. Past Rail Transport Test Reports can be submitted as part of the response to the TIQ to show that the vendor's design is capable of passing the rail transport requirements stated in ASTM 2377-25 and MIL-STD-810H. Any Certified Engineer Analysis that potentially replaces an actual physical test will be considered on a case-by-case basis depending on the vendor's S-788 LMS design

18. Section 4.1 Provisioning Data Development Software: "Contractors may use any software desired as long as the data product is compatible with the Government APD systems and can produce the PPL in LSA036.txt format." However, other areas of this SOW are discussing the creation of a MAC. LSAR-036 does not allow for MAC data. **Are there other LSAR reports required? There are no other reports required**

19. Section 7. Engineering Data for Provisioning (EDFP): "The Contractor shall develop and prepare EDFP for all items listed in PPL that do not have a current NSN assigned. EDFP consists of Provisioning Technical Documentation (PTD) and/or Supplemental Provisioning Technical Documentation (SPTD) for all items listed in the RPSTL/PPL for the end article to ensure sustainment and maintenance support throughout the product's life cycle."
Comment: EDFP for "all items listed in PPL" or for P coded items if the intent is for "all" items this will greatly increase the normal EDFP workload. This statement conflicts with the DID. This DID is applicable to all contracts which contain a provisioning requirement. However, EDFP is not required when the item is • Identified by a military or civilian

industrial specification or standard which completely describes the item including its materiel, dimensional, mechanical, and electrical characteristics.

• Identified as an Item of Supply in the Federal Logistics Information System (FLIS) via a National Stock Number (NSN) deemed suitable for procurement purposes by the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA).

Correct we do not ask an EDFP for an item that already has an NSN. However we still require an EDFP for any item that comes for an industry standard as DLA will not allow us to provision without it.

20. In **Section 7.10 Contractor Configuration Audit:** "The Contractor shall conduct a physical audit of PTD and SPTD against the Government approved end item configuration to assure that each item identified on PTD and SPTD is accurately depicted at the time of submission of PTD and SPTD. The configuration audit results shall be included in a letter included with the EDFP submission that states certification of the PTD/SPTD against the end article and the results of the audit." **Will the PVA require Provisioning support to mark up the PPL?**

Yes, support will be required for the PPL and EDFP. The cost of that should be included in the vendor's submission for each line item.