

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 000001	3. EFFECTIVE DATE 09/17/2010	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.

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

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

1. When do you anticipate having a pre-proposal bidders conference?

FNS has concluded that a pre-proposal bidders conference is unnecessary. All questions that have been submitted are answered below. If any new questions arise, answers will be sent to all firms that submitted intent to bid and, in addition, will be posted on the FNS website. All information about the demonstrations – including answers to questions submitted by States in regard to the RFA – is available at:

<http://www.fns.usda.gov/ora/menu/DemoProjects/SummerFood/Announcement.htm>

2. Page 15 of the RFP states that “nutritional status will be examined with relatively simple measures of food choices, nutritional behaviors and Body Mass Index (BMI).” Please provide the criteria for simple measures of nutritional behavior and any examples that FNS has considered. For example, is FNS interested in assessing change in nutritional behavior knowledge, or is FNS interested in a consumption/caloric-based measure?

The statement on page 15 reflects FNS’ belief that 24 hour dietary recalls may not be affordable within the fixed ceiling of \$24,500,000 and that, if true, other measures should be used. Therefore, FNS is looking to offerors to determine what measures of nutritional status are appropriate in light of the analytic utility of different measures, offerors costs to implement particular measures, the need to address all study objectives, and the fixed ceiling of \$24,500,000. The most important objective of the evaluation is to determine the impact of participation in SEBTC-SNAP and SEBTC-WIC on the level of very low food security among children among demonstration participants. While impact on nutrition status is important, none of the other objectives are unimportant.

In regard to the phrase “nutritional behavior knowledge,” FNS notes that changing nutritional knowledge is not an objective or goal of the demonstrations; nor does it seem to be a likely demonstration outcome. However, indicators of behavior change may be useful.

3. Can FNS clarify the difference between the capability proposal and volumes II and III of the full technical proposal? There appears to be a great deal of overlap.

See table at end.

4. On page 20, the RFP states that “Offerors are expected to specify the minimal differences their proposed technical approach will detect and commit to achieving that level of detection in the evaluation should they win.” Please provide more clarification of the phrase “commit to achieving that level of detection.”

Offerors proposed technical approach must specify the minimum detectable differences (MDDs) their proposed approach will achieve when considering sample size and design

effects. Those levels will become a contractual requirement. For the deliverables identified in Q. 11 below, if the analyses cannot statistically detect a difference at the specified level or better, then the deliverable does not conform to contract requirements. Meeting that contractual requirement will depend on several factors (such as response rates) for which the contractor can take remedial action. Therefore, FNS hereby amends the RFP to require as part of the technical proposal that offerors discuss (i) the challenges that may threaten their ability to meet the contractual MDDs, (ii) the specific steps the offeror proposes to use to monitor the challenges (for example, if response rates are lagging or if a larger than anticipated percentage of household contact information is inaccurate), and (iii) the remedial actions and backup plans the offeror will employ if it looks as if the contractual MDDs may not be met. If the contractual MDDs are not met the Government may reduce the contract price to reflect the reduced value of the services performed. The contract will not be reduced in price if the contractor fully complied with the backup/remedial action plan included in their technical proposal.

- 5. Page 9 of the RFP indicates that the demonstrations will deliver benefits to households of K-12 school children eligible for free and reduced-price school meals using existing EBT distribution processes for SNAP and WIC. Would states be permitted to include in their demonstrations pre-K children in households with older children who qualify for eligible for free or reduced-price school meals? If not, how else would offerors be able to examine redemption by specific foods for SEBT-WIC benefits, since children age are no longer eligible for WIC when they reach age 5, and few children start kindergarten before age 5?**

For these demonstrations, FNS will specify a special WIC food package tailored to meet the needs of the K-12 population. Older children will be receiving this package (if they are in the treatment group).

Pre-K children do not lose access to school meals during the summer (since they do not have it during the school year) and are therefore outside the scope of the demonstration. Pre-K children in treatment households with older children are presumably eligible for benefits from the regular WIC program.

- 6. Please clarify the level of advice and support that the winner may be expected to provide to FNS and the States which will operate SEBT demonstrations, as indicated on page 10 of the RFP, particularly in terms of the amount of assistance expected for the following:**
- a. supporting the States implementing the 2011 and 2012 demonstrations (e.g., through assistance with random assignment and opt-out notification);**

FNS will require demonstration grantees to (a) contact parents for notification and bear the costs of, e.g., postage, for doing so and (b) provide the contractor with the contact information and opt-out status of each household.

Before the demonstration grantees contact parents, the contractor's level of effort will almost certainly vary by the characteristics of each demonstration. In some demonstrations the contractor may only need to review plans proposed by the grantee, ensure that they are adequate, and monitor implementation, preferably on-site. In other demonstrations the contractor will need to develop the procedures for implementing parental notification and random assignment and provide the labor to implement the procedures (which may include but not be limited to informing the demonstration grantee which students have been randomly selected to receive the SEBTC benefit). Some schools may be able to aggregate students into households, others may need assistance. Some schools will wish to maintain control of student records, so that work must be conducted on-site; others may be satisfied that, with adequate privacy/confidentiality agreements, data files can be sent to the contractor for randomization.

If random assignment and opt-out notification are not implemented properly it will severely undermine the rigor of the evaluation. The successful offeror should expect to provide as much advice and support as needed to ensure that in each demonstration parents have been properly notified and true random assignment was achieved.

b. helping FNS determine the most promising 2011 demonstrations to expand in the summer of 2012 and helping FNS select new demonstration sites to start implementation in 2012

Determining promise and selecting new sites are inherently governmental responsibilities and FNS will do almost all of this work. Since the contractor will have been on site and will have collected some data FNS will solicit the contractor's opinions on some related issues and offerors should plan for involvement in some discussions. At FNS request, the contractor may need to analyze existing data on the characteristics of potential expansion areas within a State or on how potential new demonstration sites compare to existing demonstrations and to national and/or regional data.

7. Does the 12-point pitch apply to the budget pages? Would FNS consider 10-point pitch acceptable?

10 point pitch is acceptable for the budget pages.

8. In light of the substantial ongoing activity on other procurements during the month of September, would FNS consider extending the due date for the capability proposal or

dropping it entirely? The end of the major federal procurement cycle on October 1 may have important implications for staff availability for the proposed project.

No. Please see answer to question # 3 for clarification of what must be in the Capability Proposal. Offerors involved in other procurements should have nearly all of this material prepared already. The availability of proposed staff may change in the last 4 days of the procurement cycle. The response to question # 3 allows for some differences in staff between the Capability and Technical Proposals.

- 9. Can FNS please clarify what information is to be included in the capability proposal to address the "financial capability" requirement specified on page 61?**

Income Statement, Cash Flow Statement, and Balance Sheet

- 10. On page 63, the RFP indicates that summaries for key personnel are to be limited to 3 to 5 pages. On page 66, a maximum of three paragraphs per person is stipulated. Please clarify. Also, please note that if summaries are 3 to 5 pages per person, there will be little room to address the other issues required in volume II unless the page limit (20 pages) is increased.**

Resumes can be 3 to 5 pages only in the Capability Proposal. FNS expects that personnel in the Technical Proposal will have been included in the Capability Proposal; therefore in the Technical Proposal resumes shall not exceed three paragraphs per person. If an offeror wishes to bid someone in the Technical Proposal who was not in the Capability Proposal (for example, a new hire), they may do so and, for that person, provide a resume of no more than 5 pages. However, the page limit of the Technical Proposal will NOT be increased.

- 11. Page 36 of the RFP indicates that the contractor will have no more than 10 business days to submit revised deliverables that incorporate comments from FNS. This requirement seems unrealistic for many of the deliverables. In addition, page 72 indicates that offers should assume that the time between each deliverable is equally divided between FNS and the offeror, implying that FNS will have no more than 10 days to review any deliverable. Please clarify that in developing the schedule of deliverables offerors are free to incorporate assumptions about time between deliverables that are appropriate given the document(s) involved and the likely time required to review them and respond to comments.**

Offerors are free to develop a schedule of deliverables that reflects the nature of each deliverable provided (1) the time allowed for FNS review also reflects the nature of each deliverable and (2) the following deadlines are met:

OMB Package – 11/17/2010

2011 Final Implementation Report – 6/30/2011
2011 Final Congressional Status Report – 10/8/2011
2011 Final Evaluation Report – 3/31/12
2012 Final Congressional Status Report – 10/8/2012
2012 Final Evaluation Report – 3/31/13
Task 11 Final Report – 6/30/2013

The contractor is advised that when each of these reports are published by FNS, they will include a table showing (1) the contractual deadline for the report, (2) the date the report was submitted to FNS, (3) whether the submission was technically acceptable or not, and (4) the date FNS received a technically acceptable report from the contractor. Additionally, the timeliness, responsiveness and quality of these deliverables will be criteria evaluated by FNS for input into the Government-wide Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), which is utilized for Past Performance information by various Government agencies in their source selection processes.”

12. The amount of detail requested by FNS’ for the technical approach is understandable given the importance of the evaluation, the size of the procurement and the need to get into the field early. It seems unlikely that all of the information required for the study plan could be provided with sufficient detail in the space allowed. Would FNS consider either greatly increasing or eliminating the 80-page limit for the technical approach, with the understanding that offerors will be as concise as possible?

Yes. FNS hereby amends the RFP to increase the page limit from 80 to 120 pages.

13. The RFP indicates that benefit cards will be distributed to participants in the treatment group about the last week of the school year. For many school districts, the last week is mid- to late- June. Task 5 indicates that no later than June 30, 2011, the contractor shall deliver a report describing the implementation of the demonstrations. Would it be possible to extend the deadline for that deliverable?

No. The last week of school is earlier in some districts and the demonstration grantees have not been selected yet. More importantly, the Implementation Report is not the vehicle for transmitting the results of the process evaluation; it is an early assessment of – or “heads up” report on – significant failure or success in identifying free and reduced-price children, randomly assigning them, distributing cards, completing any system changes needed for the cards to be used, and so forth. These types of indicators would occur earlier even for districts that end school in June. For districts where the last day of school is in May, the Implementation Report will be able to also address whether or not food retailers are accepting the cards and able to process the transactions.

14. The RFP indicates that there will be 2-4 proof of concept (POC) demonstrations of SEBTC-SNAP and 1-2 POC of SEBTC-WIC in summer 2011 and then 6-10 SEBTC-SNAP

sites and 1-4 SEBT-WIC sites in summer 2012. For the purposes of budgeting, what assumptions should be made for the number of sites in each category?

For purposes of budgeting the base contract fixed price should include 5 2011 proof-of-concept demonstrations, not 6 (e.g., if there are 2 SEBTC-WIC demonstrations there would only be 3 SEBTC_SNAP). The base contract fixed price should include a total of 15 2012 full demonstrations. The number of sites that continue from 2011 and the number of new sites in each category will (a) stay within the specified ranges and (b) total 15 but the allocation among SEBTC-SNAP and SEBTC-WIC is not known. If offerors believe that the costs of evaluating each category are substantially different, they may submit alternative fixed price proposals for different possible combinations of SEBT-SNAP and SEBTC-WIC sites.

15. It will be critical to get OMB clearance as quickly as possible. When determining the timeline, what assumptions should be made about the time needed by FNS for review of the package? In addition, would FNS consider requesting an expedited review process by OMB?

The priority attached by FNS to this project is very high and one can assume that FNS motivation to complete the review quickly will also be high. Even if FNS should decide to request an expedited review, it is impossible to determine at this time whether one would be granted.

16. L.2.9 (a) 2) indicates that the offerors must submit "labor categories and associated schedule rate (with discount) for each person involved in the effort."

- a. Is FNS referring to Schedule B?
- b. Should offerors propose labor categories and rates that they would then use to budget labor costs of staff qualified under these proposed labor categories?
- c. Should offerors propose rates for each contract year?

a. FNS is referring to GSA schedule. (This is applicable in cases where offerors carry GSA contract and are proposing the GSA rates).

b. Yes

c. Yes

17. Referring to Page 7 (c). Please clarify if you will treat travel as reimbursable cost outside of the firm fixed price.

Travel for senior level technical staff and/or staff managing critical tasks (such as data collector training, data collection QC and monitoring, meetings with FNS, and conducting interviews with state and local officials as part of the process evaluation, etc.) shall be handled as IDIQ up to a maximum of \$650,000 in the base contract. This amount is included within, not in addition to, the \$24,500,000 ceiling for the base contract.

Travel for local data collectors (e.g., to conduct household interviews) should be treated as part of the firm fixed price.

Table for Q. 3 Clarification of Content of Technical Proposal and Capability Proposal		
Technical Proposal	Capability Proposal	Notes
<p>Each Offeror shall submit a detailed Study Plan, which describes and explains how the Offeror will answer the research questions and objectives discussed in the Statement of Work from both technical, staffing and management perspectives. The Study Plan shall contain the following:</p> <p>Volume I – Technical Approach (referred to as Study Plan technical approach in Section L.2.4 and as TAB A on page 75 of 93)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proposed evaluation research design, including descriptions of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Sampling Plan. b. Evaluation Approach. 	<p>NA</p>	<p>FNS hereby amends the RFP so that Volume I – the Study Plan – Technical Approach section – shall not exceed one-hundred-twenty (120) pages in length, one-and-a-half line spacing, 12 point font, one inch margins.</p> <p>Pages shall be numbered consecutively; a page printed on both sides shall be counted as two pages. Pages submitted in excess of the page limitations stated above will be removed and not evaluated.</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> c. State and local agency Cooperation. A discussion of offeror’s approach to working with State and local agencies. 	<p>Past Performance: <u>Experience working with demonstration officials and staffs:</u> The proposal demonstrates capability and experience in successfully working with state, federal, local and private officials/staff implementing and operating large-scale demonstrations.</p>	<p>The Technical Proposal section should be specific to this evaluation; the Capability Proposal should be past project experience. Linkage between past contracts and this evaluation does not have to be specific in the Capability Proposal. The Technical Proposal can include footnotes or other brief citations to projects in the Capability Proposal.</p>

d. Training Plan.	<u>NA</u>	
e. Data Collection and Database Development Plan. Discussion of proposed data collection instruments, data collection methods and creation of database, including data obtained from EBT processors.	NA	
NA	<p>Past Performance: <u>Successfully conducting evaluations of multiple, simultaneous demonstrations of a geographic size and complexity similar to the SEBTC demonstrations:</u> The proposal demonstrates the ability to mount large data collection efforts in diverse regions of the country at one time.</p>	<p>The Capability Proposal is where to include material that supports the statement “we know how to do this (e.g., training, national data collection, database development, etc.) because we’ve done it before;” the Technical Proposal should concentrate on this evaluation without the need to justify past experience. The Technical Proposal can include footnotes or other brief citations to projects in the Capability Proposal.</p>
f. Analysis Plan. Discussion of outcome measures to be developed and analytical methodology of producing those measures and comparing results across demonstration	<p>Past Performance: <u>Experience with projects which involved household data collections, sophisticated analyses, and Congressional attention.</u> The proposal</p>	<p>The Capability Proposal should demonstrate the general ability to conduct surveys, complex analysis, etc. and to report the methods and findings of such work to Congressional and policy advocacy audiences. The Technical Proposal is specific to this evaluation.</p>

<p>sites and types (i.e. SEBTC-SNAP vs. SEBTC-WIC).</p>	<p>demonstrates the ability to conduct statistically valid and representative surveys, complex analysis (e.g., econometric analysis and modeling, survival analysis, statistical analysis and testing, sampling, general data manipulation, programming) and reporting the methods and findings of such work to Congressional and policy advocacy audiences.</p>	
<p>g. Description of nonresponse bias analyses to be conducted if response rates do not achieve either the 80% overall or 70% item standard.</p> <p>h. New: Backup/remedial action plan to ensure that the specified minimum detectable differences are met.</p>	<p>Past Performance: <u>Deleted: experience in achieving response rates...</u></p>	<p>This is a change from the RFP and FNS hereby amends the RFP– past performance on response rate issues is deleted from the Capability Proposal and moved to the Technical Proposal, Volume III to allow offerors engaged in September procurements more time to pull the response rate information together.</p> <p>FNS hereby amends the RFP to require that the technical proposal include backup/remedial plans for achieving the minimum detectable differences.</p>
<p>2. Proposed evaluation reporting and documentation plan.</p> <p>3. Description of deliverables.</p>	<p><u>NA</u></p>	

<p><i>Include the following from Section L.2.6(h) in Volume I.</i></p> <p>Tabular Research Design Presentation: To facilitate comparisons across offerors, every offeror shall include a summary table with five columns: The first shall list; row by row, each discrete research objective and sub-objective (see SOW section —scope of work subsection —objectives). The second column shall state whether the objective will be answered in full, in part or not at all by the offeror’s approach. The third column shall indicate the subgroups they will represent in the analysis and at what level. Column four shall briefly indicate both the proposed data source to answer the question/sub-question and the primary analysis method to be performed. The final column shall give a reference to the page or subsection where the item is discussed in the technical approach.</p>	<p><u>NA</u></p>	<p>The tabular research design presentation is not included in the volume I page limit. The tabular presentation should use 1.15 line spacing, 12 point font, and one inch margins.</p>
<p>Volume II – Experience/Management Plan (referred to as Study Plan, “Management” in Section L.2.4 and as Tab B on page 75 of 93)</p> <p>4. Key Personnel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Major responsibilities b. Percentage commitment. Expected time commitment to this project and to all other concurrent 	<p>Staffing (referred to in discussions of Capability Proposal as well as Tab D on page 76 of 93)</p> <p>The offeror shall identify the names of all proposed critical staff for the project. The specific role each person will perform in the overall project does not need to be identified in the</p>	<p>Technical Proposal Volume II shall not exceed twenty (20) pages in length, double spacing, 12 point font, one inch margins. Time loading charts, GANTT charts, proposed scheduling and sequencing of tasks are excluded from the 20 page limit.</p> <p>Resume synopses in the Technical Proposal may be no more than 3 paragraphs and are included in the page limits. Resumes in the Capability</p>

<p>projects. Assurance that future projects will not reduce the time commitment to this project.</p> <p>c. Resume synopses (3 paragraph maximum per person)</p> <p>5. Qualifications of generic personnel, time loading chart by key and generic staff by task, specific project-level management procedures and organization, and specific company-level procedures for oversight of the project and for ensuring adequate commitment of corporate resources to the project.</p>	<p>Capability Proposal. Staff descriptions are not limited to key personnel (e.g., the Principal Investigator/Study Director) but should include all people intended to perform critical study duties such as key research design, analysis, editing, and quality control staff as well. Staff responsible for managing data collection should also be included in the Capability Proposal.</p>	<p>Proposal may be 3 to 5 pages long and there is no page limit on the Capability Proposal.</p> <p>The personnel identified in the two proposals should largely correspond but need not be exact. FNS expects that most, but not all, of the staff identified in the Capability Proposal will be included in the Technical Proposal. As indicated in the answer to question 10 below, staff can be included in the Technical Proposal that were not in the Capability Proposal but there are constraints on resume length.</p> <p>The 3 paragraph resume limit in the Technical Proposal is an upper limit, not an expectation on how much information offerors need to supply. The Technical Proposal can include footnotes or other brief citations to resumes (or to portions of resumes) in the Capability Proposal.</p>
<p>6. Quality Control Plan.</p> <p>7. Data Confidentiality and Security Plan.</p> <p>8. Schedule. Schedule of all activities by task and deliverable to organize and structure the work. This section must include the proposed scheduling and sequencing of tasks and the identification of any key dates not reflected in the RFC’s Schedule of Deliverables..</p> <p>9. Labor. Proposed labor hours</p>	<p><u>NA</u></p>	

<p>for each task and deliverable by personnel</p>		
<p>Volume III – Past Performance:</p> <p><i>Change: content below is deleted from Capability Proposal (see Tab C) and inserted in Technical Proposal:</i></p> <p>Include Experience in achieving overall and item response rates that meet or exceed OMB standards and guidelines for federal statistical surveys. The technical proposal must include a list of overall response rates (proportion of the sample frame that is represented by responding units) achieved on primary data collection from individuals and households for all Federal OMB-approved domestic data collections initiated since July 1, 2005.</p>		<p>This is a change from and amends the RFP– past performance on response rate issues is deleted from the Capability Proposal and moved to the Technical Proposal, Volume III to allow offerors engaged in September procurements more time to pull the response rate information together.</p>
<p>(See Tab C) Completed Performance Questionnaire (see RFP attachment III) for each of the three (3) projects identified in the Capability Proposal. <i>The vendor acknowledges that the Government is not responsible if the point of contact provided by the vendor fails to respond to the Government's past performance inquiry. Vendors are also advised that the Government reserves the right to obtain information for use in the evaluation of past performance from any sources including non-USDA Government systems and sources outside of the Government.</i></p>	<p>Past Performance (also Tab C on page 75 of 93): Provide a list of at least 3 projects you have or have had over the past 5 years of similar size and scope that are deemed to be the best representation of your performance.</p>	<p>The Capability Proposal shall identify the 3 (or more) relevant projects; the past performance questionnaires do not need to be received by FNS until the Technical Proposal is due.</p>
<p>Technical Proposal Appendix L.2.6 DRAFT PARTIAL OMB PACKAGE FNS is concerned that the timing of award, coupled with the time</p>		<p>The Appendix is not included in the page limits.</p>

<p>required to obtain USDA-OCIO and OMB clearance for data collection, will pose significant challenges to successful summer 2011 data collection. In addition to discussing what they can do to minimize this challenge (as required in section L.2.5.2.b), offerors shall submit a draft of Part A of their intended OMB clearance package and their draft household data collection instruments, as an appendix to their proposal. FNS will review and rate the draft partial OMB packages submitted by offerors during the technical evaluation of proposals (see basis for award section). Draft packages are separate from the study plan, required above. Well-thought out packages will receive higher ratings. FNS reserves the right to require substantial revisions in the draft package if the offeror is the successful bidder.</p>		
---	--	--