

- 1) **Ref.: L.7.4.1. Section 1 is limited to 15 pages. Sections 2 and 3 are limited to 60 pages or less, excluding attachments (no attachments are defined in Section L). All 3 sections contain sub sections that are page limited, combined with sub sections that are not page limited. Counting pages to determine compliance with the 15 and 60 page limit may be confusing.**

Paragraph 1d, e, and g will remain in Section 1, because they apply to both prime (Section 2) and sub contractors (Section 3).

- 2) **Ref.: L.7.4.2.Sect 2a. In the first sentence, which list is referred to? Assume this list refers to the contracts listed in the Relevancy Matrix? In the second sentence, assume the intent was to address each Mission Capability subfactor to facilitate the confidence/color rating by subfactor**

The "list" referred to in the first sentence is the Contract Data Matrix provided in section 1. The intent of the second sentence is for the Offeror to summarize the applicability of the referenced contract to the STEC 2004. No change will be made to the RFP.

- 3) **Ref.: M002.d. Contract sizing is directly relevant to the Program Management factor but is not as relevant to the other subfactors. The effort to accomplish Concept Development, Mission Readiness & Operations Support, Engineering Development, and/or Transition Phase/In is relevant to STEC regardless of contract period of performance or value.**

Disagree, sizing is relevant to all the identified subfactors. No change will be made to the RFP.

- 4) **Ref.: L.7.4.2.Section2.c. What is meant by "items listed in the Past Performance Questionnaire"? Is the intent to repeat the Background Information and the Contract Information? With the exception of "End Item Description(s), Any Major Milestones, Cost:, Schedule: blanks, this information is already provided in the Contract Data Matrix. Do "items listed in the Past Performance Questionnaire" also include PAST PERFORMANCE ELEMENTS 1 through 27? Is the intent to describe our contract performance using PAST PERFORMANCE ELEMENTS 1 through 27 discretely, we estimate that this requirement will consume about 1 ½ pages of the 3 page limit for each contract**

The items referred to are the questions provided in the questionnaire. The intent is for the Offeror to summarize actual contract performance on the referenced contract. No change will be made to the RFP.

- 5) **Ref.: SOW 3.2.1. SOW 3.2.1 is followed by SOW 3.2.1.1. Renumber SOW 3.2.1 as SOW 3.2.2 "Cost Management" in order to mirror the Core SOW.**

No change will be made to the SOW numbering.

- 6) **Ref.: M002(f). Depending upon the depth of risk analysis performed, multiple low, medium, and high risk items may be identified. Is it the government's intent to have mitigation plans described for every risk regardless of scoring (low, medium, high)? In a severely page constrained Volume II, these mitigation descriptions will utilize a large portion of the page count and leave little room for approach details and other Section L required information**

No change will be made to the RFP. It is up to the Offeror to determine how they will respond.

- 7) **Ref.: L.5.5.2 Scenario B and L.5.5.3 Scenario C. Does this mean that the skill mix for all cost formats and basis of estimate sheets for the Representative Customer Workload should be based on only the work which is proposed under SOW Paragraphs 6.2, 7.2, and 8.2? Should the skill mix associated with other SOW requirements such as Management (SOW 3.2) or CONOPS (SOW 5.2) or Training (SOW 9.2) be excluded? Additionally, if other SOW effort is needed to accomplish Scenario C, are we to exclude this other work in the basis of estimates and cost formats?**

The work specified for SOW paragraphs 6.2, 7.2, and 8.2 are a representative sample of the overall customer workload. Use the skill mix developed in response to Scenario C, to determine the overall wrap rate for customer workload. Clearly there are other skills required to perform the total effort but should not affect the overall wrap rate.