



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
HEADQUARTERS 653^d ELECTRONIC SYSTEMS WING (AFMC)
HANSCOM AIR FORCE BASE MASSACHUSETTS



U.S. AIR FORCE

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

10 Jul07

SUBJECT: MMP Upgrade RFP Document Review Questions and Answers

1. The attached table lists RFP questions and ESC responses as of 9 Jul 2007. Administrative corrections will be included in a formal amendment to the RFP to be issued on or before 13 July 2007.

MARIAH G. BLAINE
639th Squadron Contracting Officer
653d Electronic Systems Group

Attachment:
RFP Questions and ESC Responses

Draft RFP Questions and ESC Responses

Ref #	Draft RFP Section	Question/Comment	ESC Responses
1	SOW paragraphs 3.7.3 and 4.2.2	There appears to be a conflict between the text of SOW paragraphs 3.7.3 (Failure Analysis) and 4.2.2 (Failure Analysis) and the Data Item Description (DID) for CDRL B053. Should the Contractor interpret that the Government wants to receive "Failure Analysis and Corrective Action Reports" per DI-RELI-81315 for CDRL B053, and that the reference to "Failure Modes Modes Effects & Criticality Analysis (FMECA) is incorrect? Or should the Contractor interpret that the Government wants to receive Failure Modes Effects and Criticality Analysis (FMECA), and the authority reference DI-RELI-81315 is incorrect?	Both SOW paragraphs 3.7.3 and 4.2.2 correctly reference CDRL B053 - DI-RELI-81315 for delivering Failure Modes Effects and Criticality Analysis (FMECA) resulting from a Failure Report Analysis and Corrective Action System.
2	Attachment 13	Regarding the costing tables in Attachment 13, are they just the CP portion or also the FFP portion? Please clarify the instructions in Section L.	Detailed cost information is only required for the Cost Plus portion of the contract. However, the "CLIN Summary" tab should
			be populated with the prices for all CLINs, both Development and Production. In addition, the Offeror must submit a summary of the funding/expenditure profile in accordance with Section L, paragraph 6.4.5.2.
3		Does the FFP Funding include the 17 Spares sets that are called out over the 3 years?	Yes, the funding profile listed in Section L, Table 1.1 includes costs for spare units. BEQ profile for spares is included in the Cost Format spreadsheet within the "Procurement Summary at BEQ" tab.
4		Should the Contractor assume that a Spare kit is equivalent to a "B" kit?	Yes, unless the offeror's design and sparing plan identify spares for items included as part of the "A" kit.
5	Section L paragraph 6.4.5	Section L Section 6.4.5. is the other information described in this section required for are they just the CP portion or also the FFP portion? Please clarify	The requested information in Section 6.4.5 refers to all phases of the program. For the Cost Plus portion the offeror may list

		the instructions in Section L.	the requested information within the Basis of Estimates or under the Ground-rules and Assumptions as applicable. For the Firm Fixed Price portion, the offeror may list the requested information along with the Ground-rules and Assumptions ensuring sufficient detail is provided.
6	SOW references	The SOW references a new Technical Security Requirements Document (TSRD) dated May 2007. However, a copy has not been provided on HERBB. Raytheon requires this new document as the paragraph numbering has changed in the CDRL references and we need to verify the requirements in order to address them correctly in our proposal. Request a copy be released on HERBB.	The SOW should have given the date the TSRD date as June 2007. The Government posted this June 07 TSRD to HERBB.
7	SOW paragraph 3.9.3	SOW paragraph 3.9.3 (Analysis and Source Data) lists CDRL B080. Is this an error? CDRL B080 is not listed in SOW section 7.0 Contracts Data Requirements , nor is it listed in "Exhibit A_MMP_Upgrade_SDD_CD RLs".	Paragraph 3.9.3 should list CDRL B070, not B080.
8	SOW paragraph 3.3.2.7	SOW paragraph 3.3.2.7 (Maintainability) still references CDRL B054, which was the Maintainability Analysis CDRL B054 in the draft SOW, but now is "In-Process Accounting Procedures Documentation" CDRL B054 in the formal RFP SOW. The Maintainability Analysis CDRL is no longer in the CDRL List.	Paragraph 3.3.2.7 should list CDRL B003, not B054.
9	SOW paragraph 3.1	SOW paragraph 3.1 states the Contractor shall build, test and deliver five (5) production representative MMP Upgrade units (A & B Modification Kits), however only three (3) MM Racks are listed in Attachment 6 – Government Furnished Property Listing. Does the Government intend to furnish five (5) MM Racks to the Contractor to support the build, test and delivery of the production representative MMP Upgrade	The MMP Upgrade units (A & B Modification Kits) will be used to modify MMP legacy systems mounted in MMP pre-production racks at SMIC VAFB, and GD. As inferred in the note for Attachment 6, if requested, the Government offer could provide the MMP pre-production rack from these modified sites, as well as the

		units, and if so, when will the additional two (2) MM Racks be made	racks removed from operational sites to support any proposed offeror plan. The Government continues to seek additional MMP racks, but can not commit to this at this time.
10	Section L 6.1	Section L 6.1 Past Performance states that Offeror shall provide copies of the Performance Questionnaire contained in Section L, Attachment L2 to the relevant program, contracting, and administrative contracting office for the contracts identified in their past performance volume, with a request they complete the questionnaires and return them to the Government at the address/fax number. Is this form required for the IDD phase contract to be sent to the ESC CO?	Yes
11	Section L, Attachment L3	Section L, Attachment L3, references Cost Report Formats Provided in file: MMPU Section L Attachment L-3.xls. However, MMPU Section L Attachment L-3.xls has no been posted to HERBB.	The Cost Report Formats referenced in Section L, Attachment L3, as file: MMPU Section L Attachment L-3.xls were posted to HERBB as file: Attachment 13 - MMP Upgrade SDD Cost Formats.xls.
12	Section L, page 11	Section L, page 11, references Appendix A independent review, however, the review is not mentioned further in the ITO. Please further clarify the requirements of the independent review.	Attachment L1 – Past Performance Information – Paragraph N requests provision of information relating to any independent reviews conducted during the period of performance for any contract/program included for past performance. Previously during the draft solicitation review period, the question was raised regarding how to provide that information. As part of the response to past performance information requirements, offerors should submit any independent review information as Appendix A of the past performance Volume V
13		Section L, 5.1, Section A, states “Blocks 17 and 18 shall be accomplished along	Block 17 and 18 in Standard Form 33 are signature blocks.

		with the price insertion in Section B upon PCO request” however Section 5.2 states that “the Offeror shall fill in the established amounts specified for CLIN 0001 and Option CLINs 0003, 0004, 0006, 0017, 0020, and 0021 in Section B. Pricing information (B-Tables is required for...” Should Blocks 17 and 18 be filled in as well as Section B?	Those would have to be populated in order for the proposal to be considered an “offer”. Offerors should populate both the B-tables and Section B as well as Blocks 17 and 18.
14		In review of the final solicitation, we noted that the basic DFARS Specialty Metals clause (DFARS 252.225-7014) has been modified to reflect a “Deviation”. This deviation removes subparagraph (c) from the clause. This change dramatically alters the intent of the basic clause. The most important impact of the removal of subparagraph (c) is the application of the Specialty Metals restrictions to subcontracted items, but it also precludes the use of metals “Melted in a qualifying country or incorporated in an article manufactured in a qualifying country” (<i>which is actually permitted by Alternate 1</i>). Removal of subparagraph (c) is also inconsistent with the waiver of Alternate 1 made by the Air Force under the current MMP Production Program (Prime Contract F42610-98-C-0001). Thus, the underlying equipment forming the basis for the MMP Upgrade program was based upon designs that did not include the requirements of Alternate 1. Accordingly, it is requested that the RFP be amended to include the basic DFARS clause (252.225-7014), without deviation or application of Alternate 1, for this acquisition.	Section 842 of the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007 established a new specialty metals provision, 10 USC 2533b. DFARS 252.225-7014, Preference for Domestic Specialty Metals (JUNE 2005) has been amended per DFARS Deviation 2006-O60004, Restriction on Procurement of Specialty Metals, issued on 6 Dec 06. This deviation is effective until incorporated into the DFARS or rescinded.