

<b>AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION/MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT</b>	1. CONTRACT ID CODE	PAGE 1 OF PAGES 3
---	---------------------	-------------------

2. AMENDMENT/MODIFICATION NO. 2	3. EFFECTIVE DATE July 7, 2003	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO. cam	5. PROJECT NO. (If applicable)
6. ISSUED BY U.S. Department of Labor, ETA/OGCM Division of Contract Services 200 Constitution Avenue, NW Room C-4310 Washington DC 20210		7. ADMINISTERED BY (If other than Item 6) U.S. Department of Labor, ETA TBD 200 Constitution Avenue, NW Room Washington DC 20210	

8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR (No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)  To all Offerors/Bidders	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. RFP-DCS-03-24 <input type="checkbox"/> 9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) 06-06-2003 <input type="checkbox"/> 10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.  <input type="checkbox"/> 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 0 copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment of 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 ACKNOWLEDGMENT 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. \*\* HOUR & DATE for Receipt of Offers is EXTENDED to: 2:00 PM, EST 7/22/03

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required) N/A

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

(X)	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.)  
(See Attachment)

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)	16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print) KEITH A. BOND Contracting Officer
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR  (Signature of person authorized to sign)	15C. DATE SIGNED
16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)	16C. DATE SIGNED 06-24-2003

CONTINUATION PAGE

July 7, 2003

NOTICE TO ALL OFFERORS

REFERENCE: AMENDMENT NO. 2  
RFP-DCS-03-24

Additional information has been requested by prospective offerors and it has been determined by the Contracting Officer that this information is made available to all bidders. The closing date and time for the receipt of proposals has been extended to July 22, 2003, by 2:00 p.m. local time.

KEITH A. BOND  
Contracting Officer

Attachment

## 14. RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL TECHNICAL QUESTIONS

1. We would like to know if “net impact” (as used in Objective 6, Section C.3) is being used in the traditional sense of a “cost/benefit” study that takes into account the costs of service delivery and pre-program wages as well as post-program wages. Alternately, does DOL really mean a comparison between pre- and post-program earnings for participants in TAA versus non-TAA dislocated workers? A “net impact” study would necessitate fiscal information for the programs in each state that was part of the study.

a. **Answer:** By a net impact study, we mean a study that uses a “comparison group” – a group of individuals similar to TAA participants who do not receive services or benefits under TAA – to measure the effect the TAA program has on the employment and earnings of its participants. Clearly the identification of such a comparison group is a major issue that should be addressed in the proposal’s technical approach. Offerors may also propose a cost-benefit study – which would build on the net impact study and go a step further to monetize the effects and compare them to costs. Regarding fiscal information, offerors should note that the RFP states “the evaluation should provide information on...funding utilization/fiscal management, including information on obligations and expenditures.” (Page C-3).

2. To what extent is DOL interested in the process by which employers/unions/ workers/ the state TAA coordinator become aware of the potential for TAA certification? There is no mention in Section C objectives about what proportion of eligible companies are getting certified and the process by which that occurs. Will this be a factor in the evaluation process of the new trade law? Alternatively, is DOL only interested in an evaluation of the process and impact from the point at which certification is granted to employers?

a. **Answer:** The process by which companies, unions and individuals become aware of opportunities to obtain TAA certification and the effects of the DOL’s certification process is of interest to DOL, particularly regarding the implementation and longer process study in the proposed evaluation. Specifically, the new legislation shortens the period for review of petitions from 60 to 40 days and requires the Governors and the Secretary to take actions upon receipt of a petition. The major thrust of the impact study in the evaluation should be on the effects after certification has been received, however.

3. Response to question 15 of Amendment 1 indicates that there is only one report on the previous evaluation “International Trade and Worker Dislocation: Evaluation of the Trade Adjustment Program,” April 1993, Mathematica Policy Research, Inc. – which can be obtained through DOL. However, on page 9 of the above referenced report there is also reference to “process evaluation.....a separate report (Corson, Gleason, and Patch, 1992), is based on information that was collected during site visits to .....” We feel it is essential that the study be made available in its entirety, since developing an appropriate proposal without the previous process evaluation would be problematic. Moreover, if Mathematica is a bidder, they will have an unfair advantage in being the only bidder in possession of the previous evaluation of process. Will DOL make available the second report?

- a. **Answer:** Yes. It can be obtained from Chari A. Magruder, Contract Specialist by submitting an email request to [magruder.chari@dol.gov](mailto:magruder.chari@dol.gov).
4. Section M.2.B paragraph 2 requests current employment status of personnel proposed for work under this RFP, i.e. ".....currently employed.... or are **dependent upon planned recruitment** or subcontracting." Section M.2.B.4 and M.2.B (8) of the evaluation factor requests a "modified resume for **each person** involved in the project".
- a. Will resumes be required for **ALL key and non-key personnel proposed** on this project – excluding administrative and clerical personnel?
- i. **Answer:** Yes.
- b. Can personnel be proposed as 'New Hires' by which no resume will be required?
- i. **Answer:** No.
- c. What does DOL consider to be "professional personnel?"
- i. **Answer:** Professional personnel are all staff excluding administrative/clerical positions, and consultants unless consultants are proposed in key personnel positions.
- d. Given that some tasks will not begin until after the first 6-8 months after the start of the project, and that DOL requires a letter of intent/commitment for a minimum of six months, does DOL expect **resumes and letters of intent/commitment** for those personnel who may not actually begin working on the task for another year?
- i. **Answer:** Yes, DOL expects resumes and letters of intent/commitment for those personnel who may not actually begin working on the task for another year?
5. Based on the relevance, impact, and legal implications of the above would DOL consider extending the proposal due date for a minimum of one week so that offerors are given the opportunity to submit a more complete and responsive proposal?
- a. **Answer:** The solicitation's proposal due date is extended to July 22, 2003, 2:00 p.m., local time.
6. Our question about publishing after project completion addressed in question 35 of your amendment may not have been sufficiently explicit. Would it be acceptable to prepare a paper after the project is completed that includes findings from the study as well as other material?
- a. **Answer:** Once DOL releases the study data (see deliverable 7, page F-2), individuals may prepare and publish papers related to the evaluation.