

### General Questions/Comments

- 1) **Could you make drafts of Section L and M available in WORD files as well as PDF files?**  
No.
- 2) **Does the estimated STEC04 contract value (\$55-65M) include only the core support, or core plus all expected customer support?**  
The \$55-65M number reflects the current contract value for STEC99. This number was used as an estimate during the briefing for industry, 6-7 August 2002. Do not use this estimate in developing your proposal.

### FAQs

- 3) **There appears to be a conflict between the answers to one of the questions, and one of the draft documents. According to the STEC 2004 document "FAQs15Nov" question 14 (apparently with reference to small business goals): "Is there an Award Fee guidance as far as desired percentages? No." However, the STEC 2004 document "STEC04-AFPlan-15Nov" appears to contradict the FAQ. Annex 2 "Performance Criteria" Table "Area A: Program Management", Satisfactory Column 14th bullet (Page 11 of 16) states the following: "Successfully implements the Small Business Subcontracting Plan. Achieves minimum percentage goal of 25 percent (emphasis added) of total contract cost for subcontracting with small, small disadvantaged, woman-owned small business, HUBZone and Veteran-owned small business and proposed targets." Which is the correct direction?**  
The FAQ refers to the award fee the Offeror should propose. We are providing no guidance with respect to your proposed percentage of award fee. The Award Fee plan refers to criteria used to evaluate your performance.
- 4) **Ref FAQ Version 1, question #5: Did government personnel submit any of the questions in FAQ version 1?**  
Yes. The FAQ's from version 1 were both government and contractor provided. The government submissions resulted from lessons learned during previous acquisitions. The contractor questions were provided during the tour briefs. Version 2 included written questions submitted by the Offerors after the tours.

### Draft Statement of Work and CDRLs

- 5) **Section 9 "Technical Training", sections 9.1 "Core Operations", subsection 9.1.2 (page 13); and 9.2 "Customer Workload" subsection 9.2.2 (page 14) state respectively: "Obtain current training on industry standard applications, unique applications, and new technologies in the most economical manner available in support of Core Operations (i.e. computer-based, book-based, or class-based)." "Obtain current training on industry standard applications, unique applications, and new technologies in the most economical manner available in support of Customer Workload (i.e. computer-based, book-based, or class-based)." We believe that these items as written may prompt the contractor to select the cheapest method of training, not the "best value" method of training. We propose the following rewrite (suggested change is in italics): "Obtain current training on industry standard applications, unique applications, and new technologies in the most economical manner available *deemed effective in terms of contract execution* in support of Core Operations (i.e. computer-based, book-based, or class-based)." "Obtain current training on industry standard applications, unique applications, and new technologies in the most economical manner available *deemed effective in terms of contract execution* in support of Customer Workload (i.e. computer-based, book-based, or class-based)." The suggested wording changes will not be made. The emphasis is for the contractor to find cost effective solutions.**

- 6) **CDRL Item A001, Block 16: If the draft Phase-in plan is due 30 days after contract award (currently listed as 6/4/03), the document would be due on 7/4/03, which is 3 days before the start of transition. Suggest draft Phase-in plan be due Day 1 of Transition. (7/7/03).**  
The delivery date was not tied to a specific date, but to a timeframe that would "float" with schedule changes. The projected award date is only notional, not fixed. CDRL will not be modified.
- 7) **CDRL Item A001, Block 16: Is the contract termination date to be used for preparation of the draft and final Phase-out plans the end date for the Basic period (9/30/04) or the end date for the Basic plus Options (9/30/08)?**  
The CDRL has been revised: written contracting officer request will initiate preparation of the draft and final Phase-out plans.

#### Draft Sections A-K

- 8) **Section H, page 15, DET 12 - H001: The transition period of performance (PoP) is shown as contract award - 30 Sep 03, but should be 7 July 03 - 30 Sep 03.**  
The projected award date is only notional, not fixed. The clause will not be modified.
- 9) **Section H, page 15, DET 12 - H001: Recommend considering the transition phase be fixed price rather than cost plus award fee. The reasons are a) the PoP is very short and b) the Award fee Plan (pg 5) Performance Criteria do not apply as well to transition effort, since the incoming contractor will not have operational management and technical performance responsibility for core and customer workload.**  
The Award Fee Plan will be adjusted. The first award fee period will be from contract award through 31 Dec 2003. The second award fee period will be 1 January 2004 through 30 September 2004.
- 10) **Reference: H002. Section H002 (Rate Redetermination Clause) requires some clarification.**
- a. **Does it mean that the estimated cost per hour for each of the labor CLINS in Section H001 will be adjusted, based on the updated direct labor, fringe, overhead, G&A, etc?**  
Yes, the estimated cost per hour for each of the labor CLINS in Section H001 will be adjusted, based on the updated direct labor, fringe, overhead, G&A, etc.
- b. **In the event that forward pricing rates have not been negotiated with DCAA, what is the mechanism for obtaining the DCAA approval prior to submission to the Contracting Officer?**  
Submission will be delayed until DCAA negotiation has been completed.
- 11) **Reference: H014. Section H014 mentions a clause requiring the outgoing contractor to provide training for a set of incoming, non-incumbent contractor personnel.**  
The clause does not apply to the incumbent. It applies to the successful Offeror at the time of STEC 2004 closeout.
- 12) **Section H, page 17, H014: Does the current STEC contract include a successor contractor clause that requires the incumbent to provide services as described in paragraphs (b) and (c)?**  
No, the current contract does not contain this clause.
- 13) **Section I, Page 21: AFMCFARS 5352.227.9000 Export-Controlled Data Restrictions (AFMC) (Jul 1997). Request that the Contracting Officer obtain a waiver of this clause from the Directorate for Contracting at AFMC/PK. This clause effectively duplicates requirements already established by the Arms Export Control Act (AECA) and ITAR. The clause imposes expensive and time-consuming coordination requirements and adds to contract schedule risk.**  
The clause will not be removed. We disagree that it will impose undue cost and schedule risk. Reference the DD Form 254 for further clarification.
- 14) **Section I, Page 22 and 23 of 24: AFMCFARS 5352.209-9002 Organizational Conflict of Interest (AFMC) (Aug 2002). Request deletion of this clause in it's entirety as well as the following related clauses: 5352-209-9002 Organizational Conflict of Interest (AFMC) (Aug 2002) – Alternate II (Aug 2002) (Tailored) and 5352-209-9002 Organizational Conflict of Interest (AFMC) (Aug 2002)**

– Alternate III (Aug 2002) (Tailored) and 5352-209-9002 Organizational Conflict of Interest (AFMC) (Aug 2002) –Alternate VI (Aug 2002) (Tailored).  
These clauses will not be deleted.

Draft Section L

- 15) **Section L AFMCFARS 5352.209-9003 Potential Organizational Conflict of Interest (AFMC) (Jul 1997). Request this clause to be deleted because it has the potential of limiting some companies' ability to compete.**  
This clause will not be deleted.
- 16) **Section L L021: This clause requires a subcontracting plan be submitted with the initial proposal for a large business, but the proposal instructions (e.g., Section L, paragraph 4.2.5.6) do not require such a plan. Is one required?**  
Yes.
- 17) **Reference: Section L Table 2.2. There is no reference to a Risk section. Do you wish to see Risk addressed within each individual section or a complete Risk roll-up by Subfactor?**  
Risk should be addressed within each individual section.
- 18) **Reference: L Table 2.2 Section L, Table 2.2 states that the Cost Volume is Volume III while Section L.5 states the Cost Volume is Volume V.**  
Corrected
- 19) **Reference: L.2.2.1. Where would the government like to see Key Personnel Resumes, if at all?**  
Provide the resumes as an attachment to Volume II.
- 20) **Reference: L.2.2.3. States the need for a Cross Reference Matrix but does not mention where this should be placed within the proposal.**  
Place the Cross Reference Matrix after the Table of Contents within each volume.
- 21) **Paragraph 2.5 Distribution should read 2.6 Distribution.**  
The correction has been made.
- 22) **Reference: L.3.0. Does the Executive Summary Table of Contents count toward page count?**  
No. Each page shall be counted except the following: cover pages, tables of contents, tabs, glossaries, resumes, security clearance information, relevancy matrices, Subcontractor/Teaming Partner Consent Letter, client authorization letters, and Final Past and Present Performance Tracking Record.
- 23) **Paragraphs 4.2.3.5 – 4.2.3.7, 4.2.4.2 – 4.2.4.4, 4.2.5.7: The large number of sample situations seem to favor the incumbent, since the incumbent has a historical perspective on what was done in previous similar situations and how the customer judged the results. Possible remedy is fewer and more general sample situations.**  
The situations are fictitious to reduce the incumbent advantage to the extent we can. The situations address critical risks that need to be evaluated.
- 24) **Reference: L.4.2.5.4. A 5-year integrated schedule with proper insight and fidelity will require a large amount of space at the current graphics standard.**  
Illustrate how the resources, both skills needed and equipment required, will be allocated through the period 1 Oct 03 to 31 Dec 03 following the transition period. No additional page count should be required.
- 25) **Para 4.2.5.5: Will you provide a list of GFE, including institutional and mission-related GFE ADPE?**  
No. Paragraph 4.2.5.5 is only asking for requirements, not solutions. The base support agreement addresses administrative resources for the contractor.
- 26) **Paragraph 4.2.6: Does the tour briefing in the bidder's library contain the official mission manifest that should be considered to answer this requirement?**

No. The mission manifest that should be used in response to this paragraph will be provided as part of the final RFP.

- 27) **Paragraph 4.2.6.4: paragraph 5.5.2 does not contain software project schedules. Should paragraph 4.2.6.4 refer to paragraph 5.5.3 instead?**  
No. The software project schedules that should be used in response to this paragraph will be provided as part of the final RFP.
- 28) **Paragraph 5.0: "Volume V" should read "Volume III".**  
Yes.
- 29) **Para. 5.3.1 implies that wrap-rates for core and customer workloads should be based on the sample workloads in 5.5.1 and 5.5.2, respectively. Therefore, should the bid costs in response to para. 5.4.3 for core and customer labor and ODCs in each of the five contract years be based on just the sample workloads defined in 5.5.1 (core) and 5.5.2 (customer)? If the answer is yes, then we would show Total Hours in the para. 5.4.3 table to be 70,000 for core labor and 170,000 for customer labor in the first contract year.**  
Yes, your assumptions are correct.
- 30) **Reference: L.5.4.2. Section L.5.4.2 mentions a funding profile in Paragraph 1.1, but paragraph 1.1 is missing.**  
Corrected. Reference to paragraph 1.1 deleted.
- 31) **Reference: L.5.4.4. Section L.5.4.4 states that the offeror should submit Person Loading Schedule and Basis of Estimates in separate attachments to the Cost Volume. Do you want the same data duplicated within Section 2 of the Cost Volume itself or leave the data as attachments?**  
The requirement to place this as a separate attachment has been removed. Include the data within the Cost Volume itself.
- 32) **Reference: L.5.5.1 and L.5.5.2. With all bidders bidding to the Sample Workload (L.5.5.1 and L.5.5.2), can you elaborate on how price is evaluated in terms of reasonableness and realism? Will the composite rates be weighed against one another? Past experience shows the Sample Workload to be very high with respect to STEC historical workload. Can you provide 3400 and 3600 funding profile so that all bidders know what to expect in terms of pricing?**  
As part of the realism analysis we can verify that the proposed rates are consistent with current negotiated or bid rates for that specific contractor and its subcontractors. Reasonableness and realism will also be determined through the technical evaluation on the adequacy of the proposed skill mix to perform the defined tasks. The projected customer workload reflects the government's best estimate factoring in expected growth, which is consistent with the growth experienced over the past five years. We will not provide a funding profile because we have provided the projected hours for both Core (3400) and Customer Workload (mixed).
- 33) **Reference: L.6.0. Is there any specific information or format you desire for the Subcontracting Plan (Section L.6)?**  
Comply with the clauses in Section I. Offeror format is acceptable.
- 34) **Reference: L.7.3. Section L.7.3 mentions that programs less than a year old are not considered relevant. We recommend that Past and Present Performance less than a year old be considered as relevant for these factors: Transition performance, lessons learned, and staffing ability; Start-up (Day 1) performance and lessons learned. With a low-risk transition being so important to the customer, it is of paramount importance that all current transitions occurring on programs of similar size and scope be evaluated as relevant**  
Programs with less than a year of performance will be considered relevant for Program Management (Subfactor 3) and Transition/Phase-In (Subfactor 4).
- 35) **Reference: L.7.4. With so much information required in Section 1 of Volume V (Past and Present Performance) including organizational charts, organizational change histories, relevancy matrices, and associated text, 10 pages is very constrictive to ensuring all data is provided in a manner that is logically assembled and easy to understand.**  
We will increase Section 1 of Volume V page count to 15 pages.

- 36) Reference: L.7.4.1. Do the relevancy matrices in Volume V count against the page count?**  
No. Each page shall be counted except the following: cover pages, tables of contents, tabs, glossaries, resumes, security clearance information, relevancy matrices, Subcontractor/Teaming Partner Consent Letter, client authorization letters, and Final Past and Present Performance Tracking Record.
- 37) Paragraph 7.4.2, sect 1d: Are all contracts for all team companies to be included in one “big” matrix?**  
Yes.
- 38) Reference: L.7.4.2.b. Section L.7.4.2.b mentions the need to provide organization structures for every teammate that exceeds the threshold. This threshold is missing.**  
Provide organizational structures for separate divisions or operating locations of the Offeror, all subcontractors, teaming partners, and/or joint venture partners proposed to perform aspects of the effort the Offeror considers critical to overall successful performance. The final RFP will reflect this clarification.
- 39) Reference: L.7.4.2.b. Section L.7.4.2.b lists several criteria for Past and Present Performance relevancy. How do you wish to treat programs that fall within several areas of the relevancy matrix in terms of size, scope, period of performance, etc? For example, if a program is 2 years old and worth \$100M, it is both Medium and High relevancy.**  
For each of the Mission Capability Subfactors, all contracts will be reviewed and given one of the numeric relevancy ratings: i.e. 5 (Highly Relevant); 3 (Somewhat Relevancy); 1 (Low Relevancy); and 0 (Not Relevant). The numeric ratings will help the PRAG focus on the most relevant contracts per subfactor. Intermediate ratings (4,2) may also be used.
- 40) Reference: L.7.4.2.b (Section 2). With Small Business playing such a key role in this acquisition, it is important that SB management and experience be considered.**  
This is an important consideration, and will be addressed through the questionnaire, but will not be part of the relevancy determination.
- 41) Paragraph 7.4.2.d: Recommend that the Contract Data Matrix, defined in Section L paragraph 7.4.2.d (and required in Volume V, Section 1.d for each contract submitted) not count towards the 10 page limit for Volume V, Section 1. Otherwise it will unduly limit the space available to satisfy Vol V, Section 1(b) and Section 1(c).**  
The Contract Data Matrix will be excluded from the page limit.
- 42) Paragraph 7.4.2.d.1: Is the information requested in Section L, paragraph 7.4.2.d.1 actually the contract name and not the contractor name?**  
No. Paragraph 7.4.2.d.3 references the contract number. Contract name was added to paragraph 7.4.2.d.3.
- 43) Reference: L.7.4.2.d.2. Section L.7.4.2.d.2 mentions the need for up to 4 Points of Contact for each Past and Present Performance submissions.**  
Nowhere have we prohibited the use of duplicate POCs.
- 44) Reference: L.7.4.2.d.4 (Section 1). Does the dollar value requested in Section L.7.4.2.d.4 (Section 1) represent subcontracted dollars or total program value?**  
It represents subcontracted dollars for subcontracts vice total program value.
- 45) Paragraph 7.4.2.f: Wording is unclear – Can “other relevant contracts” exceed the 10 contracts per company limit?**  
The 10 contracts per company limit only applies to those contracts listed in the Contract Data Matrix and further elaborated in Sections 2 and 3. The “other relevant contracts” lists other contracts not contained in the Contract Data Matrix, and is not subject to the 10 contracts limit.
- 46) Reference: L.7.4.3. Section L.7.4.3 states the need to provide the Final Past and Present Performance Tracking Record be submitted with the final proposal but does not state where it should be.**  
Include the Final Past and Present Performance Tracking Record an attachment to Volume II. Attachments are not counted against the page count.

## Draft Section M

- 47) **M002 (a) There is no Factor 3. Is this a typo, or are additional Factors to be added?**  
This was a typo. The correction will be made.
- 48) **Paragraph M002 (d), Relevancy Criteria Tables for Subfactor 1A: What is the definition of “space control” missions?**  
Space Control is the means by which space superiority is gained and maintained to assure friendly forces can use the space environment while denying its use to the enemy. To accomplish this, space force must survey space, protect the ability to use space, prevent adversaries from exploiting US or allied space services, and negate the ability for adversaries to exploit their space forces (reference Air Force Doctrine Document 2-2, Space Operations).
- 49) **Reference: M0002.d. Currently, you state that contracts with a size standard of under \$5M are not relevant. With such an emphasis on Small Business, Woman-Owned small businesses, and HUBZone companies, this seems contradictory to Best Value. Most of these companies have contracts well under the \$5M threshold but still contain highly relevant lessons learned, contract scope, and period of performance experiences. The evaluation criteria for previous contract relevancy seem to put Small Businesses at a disadvantage because of the contract sizes specified. The value thresholds are too high to allow small businesses to submit highly relevant contracts. If small businesses are to provide 25% of STEC contract performance, they should be able to offer experience and past performance on smaller contracts that can be assessed up to “highly relevant”. Can a separate set of criteria be set up for small business contracts?**  
Agree. Relevancy criteria for contract value only applies to the prime contractor.
- 50) **Reference: M002.d. Several criteria in M002.d are slanted toward the incumbent. For example, few competitors except the incumbent can state they have performed CONOPS development for formation flying and imaging with taskable sensors or have provided 24/7 operations for multiple one-of-a-kind satellites.**  
Agree. The criteria in section M have been re-evaluated, and made less restrictive. The revised criteria will be posted with the final RFP.
- 51) **Reference: M002.e.3. Section M002.e.3 states that the 25% SB achievement is a threshold but the FAQ Part 1 response says it is not. According to the STEC 2004 document “FAQs15Nov” question 13: “Is there a small business requirement vs. goal? No, however, refer to the Award Fee Plan on criteria for Small Business participation.” However, with regards to the STEC 2004 document “Section M-15 Nov:” Section M002 “Evaluation Factors”, Section (e) “Mission Capability Factor”,(3) Subfactor 3 “Program Management” (c) “Threshold requirements” (Page M-16) states the following: “Offeror proposes a logical, cost-effective, and beneficial participation of small business as subcontractors. Proposal meets the subcontracting goal of 25% of the total contract value. Proposal will also be evaluated as to the planned extent of participation of small business firms, expressed as dollars and percentages of total contract value.” Is the “subcontracting goal of 25%” a threshold requirement? Or is “Offeror proposes a logical, cost-effective, and beneficial participation of small business as subcontractors” the actual threshold requirement? If the “subcontracting goal of 25%” is not a threshold requirement as indicated by the FAQ but rather a goal, suggest deleting the first sub bullet and changing the second sub bullet as follows: “Offeror proposes a logical, cost-effective, and beneficial participation of small business as subcontractors. Proposal will be evaluated as to the planned extent of participation of small business firms, expressed as dollars and percentages of total contract value, toward meeting the small business subcontracting goal of 25%.”**  
Section M002.e.3 states that the proposal, not the contract, must meet the 25% goal. Actual on-contract performance will be measured through the award fee process.