

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 000002	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 10/04/2010	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY CODE FNS-HQ-MGMT-ASD-CMB 3101 PARK CENTER DRIVE ROOM 228 ALEXANDRIA VA 22302		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6) CODE	

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)	(x)	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. AG-3198-S-10-0018
	x	9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 08/25/2010
		10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.
		10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)
CODE	FACILITY CODE	

11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers is extended. is not extended.
 Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods: (a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning _____ copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitation and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)

13. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO MODIFICATION OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS. IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

CHECK ONE	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.
	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(b).
	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
	D. OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)

E. IMPORTANT: Contractor is not, is required to sign this document and return _____ copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)
 Tax ID Number: Not Available
 DUNS Number: Not Available
 Evaluation of The Impact of The Summer Food For Children Household-Based Demos on Food Insecurity

The purpose of this amendment is to: (i) distribute the attached Questions and Answers regarding this RFP and (ii) make revisions to the RFP as a result of the answers.

This is the final round of Questions & Answers

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print) Edward Charette	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR (Signature of person authorized to sign)	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (Signature of Contracting Officer)	16C. DATE SIGNED

**Amendment #02
AG-3198-S-10-0018**

1. In response to Question 4 (Amendment 1), FNS has said that proposed MDDs will become a contractual requirement and that certain deliverables are subject to price reductions if MDDs are not met. This appears to be an extremely onerous requirement given the many unknowns involved, as well as the fact that this is a fixed price contract which already shifts considerable risk to the contractor. In order for contractors to assess the risks and make a informed decisions about participation in the study, can FNS please specify (a) exactly which deliverables would be affected by a failure to meet MDDs and (b) how specifically the amount of the any price reduction would be calculated?

See answer to Q. 2, below

2. In response to Question 4 (Amendment 1), FNS raises the possibility of remedial actions. Could FNS elaborate on 1) when such actions could reasonably be implemented given the very short data collection period 2) whether contractors are expected to include pricing of such actions in their proposals, and 3) whether this price is included in the contract ceiling? We would like to point out that most of the typical mitigation techniques are not available given the time constraints of this data collection.

The last sentence of the response to Q4/Amendment 1 was intended to ensure that the requirement was not extremely onerous. The fact that clarification is still needed has led FNS to reassess what is needed for the project and what is fair to both the successful offeror and the government.

As background to the amendment to the RFP, below:

- FNS has had situations in the past where contractors have told us that a sample size of, say, 3000 cases is needed; assured us that they will obtain a response rate of, say, 80%; and then delivered a 50% response rate and an insufficient sample despite advice from FNS that there were large risks to the approach they were using. That situation is unacceptable. FNS desires a contractual mechanism to minimize the risk of such an occurrence, including substantial, clearly defined and easily assessed incentives and/or penalties. FNS is open to recommendations for a different approach than set forth below. The ultimate goal is to deliver a rigorous evaluation to Congress and have reasonable confidence that the goal will be achieved, not to penalize the successful offeror.
- FNS recognizes that there are limits to remedial actions that can be taken and that there are many unknowns that affect both success and cost. The demonstrations in summer 2011 are proof-of-concept ones to establish feasibility and the most rigorous findings are expected to result from the demonstrations in summer 2012. The RFP may not have adequately communicated that the summer 2011 demonstrations are also intended to be a “dry run” for the evaluation methodology (this is part of the reason why the

Amendment #02
AG-3198-S-10-0018

treatment sample sizes are 2,500 in 2011 and 5,000 in 2012). The 2011 experience should inform the successful offeror and FNS as to different approaches or levels of effort that may be needed to ensure that the 2012 results are rigorous.

- The MDD commitment applies to both the final evaluation report of the summer 2011 and summer 2012 demonstrations. The level of the MDD does not have to be the same in both years. FNS is looking to offerors to propose remedial actions that are useful and feasible within the time windows. The proposed remedial actions do not need to be the same in 2011 and 2012. Some of them may require very close monitoring of data collection and/or a large amount of intense effort. More importantly, some of the components of calculating MDDs (for example the true variance in the sample) will be estimates based on imperfect information.
- Given the unknowns, remedial actions belong in a separate IDIQ type task although the overall ceiling of \$24,500,000 cannot change.

The RFP is amended to add CLIN 005 on an IDIQ basis.

CLIN #	DESCRIPTION	IDIQ FIXED PRICE
005.01	Monitoring data collection response rates, sample variance, and other factors to determine if remedial action is needed to achieve the MDD in 2011 Estimated Quantity: Up to 300 hours of labor Unit Price:	\$
005.02	Monitoring data collection response rates, sample variance, and other factors to determine if remedial action is needed to achieve the MDD in 2012 Estimated Quantity: Up to 300 hours of labor Unit Price:	

Amendment #02
AG-3198-S-10-0018

005.03	Remedial action type 1 (to be proposed by offeror) Estimated Quantity: Unit Price:	
005.04	Remedial action type 2 (to be proposed by offeror) Estimated Quantity: Unit Price:	
005.05	Remedial action type 3 (to be proposed by offeror) Estimated Quantity: Unit Price:	
TBD	Offerors are encouraged to propose additional types of remedial action and, if they do, to add corresponding sub task numbers.	

To ensure equitable comparisons among offerors, for purposes of bidding, offerors should bid all of CLIN 005 at a total price of \$500,000. This amount is included within the \$24,500,000 ceiling for the contract.

3. Please confirm that the contract ceiling of \$24.5 million covers CLINs 1 through 3, plus reimbursable travel associated with these CLINs, but not the CLIN 4 IDIQ activities. Given the potential number of sites under CLIN 4, including this CLIN in the contract ceiling would substantially affect the MDDs that are feasible under both CLIN 3 and CLIN 4. Could FNS elaborate on its expectations for CLIN 4?

That is correct; CLIN 004 is not included in the \$24.5 million ceiling. FNS intends to award the number of demonstrations specified in the base contract and intends to complete the evaluation with the summer 2012 results. The CLIN is there because (1) demonstrations may continue in 2013 and FNS may wish some level of evaluation activity to continue, (2) it is possible that a situation could arise requiring FNS to award more demonstrations than planned in either 2011 or 2012. If that situation were to occur, FNS would not necessarily need to include them in the evaluation but the CLIN is intended to allow FNS the flexibility to do so. More demonstrations would affect the MDDs that are feasible and would expand the types of subgroup analyses that could be done. Offerors should not rely on this possibility but should propose in the base contract everything needed to deliver a robust and rigorous evaluation of the 2011 and 2012 results.

**Amendment #02
AG-3198-S-10-0018**

4. We are interested in pursuing the above-mentioned evaluation but have not yet completed discussions with a potential subcontractor. We did not intend to submit a capability statement as it was not clear that one was required. Can you confirm that the capability statement is not required in order to bid to submit a proposal on the 26th of October?

Page 61, para L.1, of the RFP clearly states when the Capability proposals were due which constitutes a requirement. Also, page 77, para M.1 states in part that, "Each offeror must submit a written proposal in strict accordance with instructions. When evaluating proposals, the Government will consider how well the offeror complied with both the letter and spirit of these instructions."

That being said, it's your business decision whether to participate at this point in the process. The final proposal's due date remains at 26th October 2010.