

- 1) **Section L.4.2.5.3 (Work Breakdown Structure) requests that a CWBS and CWBS Dictionary be developed to reflect the contractors view of the contract effort. It is our experience that a CWBS Dictionary for a program of this size and scope will take up an immense amount of Volume II page count to ensure proper government insight and fidelity. To ensure we can offer the best product to you in a high quality fashion, recommend that the CWBS Dictionary be included as an attachment to Volume II and excluded from the page count.**

The requirement specifies that the first three levels will be placed on contract. Providing lower-level detail in the proposal is not required.

- 2) **SOW Paragraph 3.2.3.3 states that a contractor "use an information management system, as specified by the government, to share common-user matter across sites, with associate contractors, and with external agencies." Can you please provide specifications and requirements/interface documentation on this information management system that you intend to specify?**

The information management system currently consists of network-accessible drives and HTML documents accessible through an intranet. Future plans include the implementation of Virtual Private Networks across all Air Force sites, and greater reliance on HTML links.

- 3) **Section 4.2.3, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, and 4.2.6 state that "...the Offeror shall include the information requested, as well a an overall summary of risks as described in Paragraph 4.2.1." In the FAQ Part 3, Question #17, you responded that "Risk should be addressed within each individual section." To ensure proper clarification, does the government desire to see risk addressed as:**
- A single Subfactor Roll-Up within sections 4.2.3, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, and 4.2.6
 - An individual Risk section within each subfactor section (i.e. 4.2.3.1, 4.2.3.2, 4.2.3.x)
 - Both a roll-up at the Subfactor level and an individual risk section within each subfactor section

The intent of the paragraphs 4.2.3, 4.2.4, 4.2.5, and 4.2.6 is to remind the Offeror to address risk in accordance with paragraph 4.2.1, and to provide a summary of those risks at the subfactor level which are described in greater detail within each section.

- 4) **Section M002(e)(1)(c) has threshold requirements of "...ability to conduct mission planning and real-time operations..." and "...ability to conduct operations 24 hours per day/7 days a week...". Can you please state your definition for mission planning and real-time operations versus 24/7 operations?**

Threshold M002(e)(1)(c)1 focuses on the skills required to conduct mission planning and real-time operations. Threshold M002(e)(1)(c)2 focuses on the staffing required to conduct mission planning and real-time operations. They are both referring to the Offeror's ability to provide and sustain satellite operations.

- 5) **Section L.4.2.3.1 states the need for "...understanding of the skill mix required to conduct mission planning and real-time operations...". Section L.4.2.3.2 states the need for "...understanding of staffing levels required to conduct operations...". Do you intend for the Offeror to provide a skill mix within L.4.2.3.1 that supports everything it takes to provide operations support (i.e. Orbital Analysis, Readiness, Engineering, Development, etc) or to just provide a skill mix for what it takes to actually provide contact success during a Real-Time Operations. Also, does L.4.2.3.2 require the Offeror provide staffing levels in terms of headcount, number of crews, schedule, etc, or something different?**

Section L.4.2.3.1 requests the Offeror's approach for satisfying the skill mix needed to provide mission planning and real-time operations alone, not readiness nor engineering development. Section L.4.2.3.2 requests the Offeror's approach for providing sufficient manning for mission planning and real-time operations—it's up to the Offeror to determine their approach.

- 6) **Section M002(d) lists the Relevancy Criteria Tables for Past and Present Performance. How would the government like the Offeror to self-evaluate these Subfactors when certain programs fall within several relevance criteria sections. For example, Program X with a size standard of \$55M may have required planning of experiments related to space systems. This would make it fall under Highly Relevant (5) for Sizing and Low Relevant (1) for Research and**

Development/Design of Experiments. Do you intend for the Offeror to self-evaluate at the average of these two? The highest? The lowest?

The Offeror must provide a rating of L, M, or H and describe their rationale for the self-evaluation—it's up to the Offeror to determine their rationale. The PRAG will use intermediate ratings of 4 (for contracts that fall between Highly Relevant and Somewhat Relevant) and 2 (for contracts that fall between Somewhat Relevant and Low Relevant).