

The answers provided in this document are for informational/planning purposes only and are subject to change based on the ongoing development of the MIOES Request For Proposal (RFP). The Final RFP will take precedence.

MIOES Question Matrix - Full DRFP			
Reference Document/Page No./Paragraph/Line	Reference Document Language	Industry Question/Comment/Recommendation	Government Response
Attachment J-01 Basic PWS/Pg. 23 / Para. 10.1.7 and Attachment L-06 Scenarios/Pg. 1/Para. Introduction/ Line 17-18	Attach J-01 Basic PWS: "The contractor shall develop and execute solutions that are sustainable within the MIOES contract, avoiding proprietary solutions to ensure continuity and data rights" Attach L-06 Scenarios: "No proprietary approaches (including but not limited to: software, tools, systems or solutions) shall be proposed"	Can the Government please clarify if this requirement is directed at offeror's company-specific proprietary solutions and not referring to commercial proprietary software, hardware, or systems (i.e., COTS)?	The language has been updated within the PWS. Key thing to note is proprietary is defined as any material that does not rely on connections external to the MDA or anything the gov't cannot use beyond the contract PoP end date.
Attachment J-01 Basic PWS/Pg.4/Para 3.1.1	Develop, upgrade, operate, and maintain an RDT&E/Enterprise worldwide IM/IT ecosystem that provides MDA with a secure development, test, digital engineering and modeling environment. This environment serves as the integration point which facilitates the rapid development and delivery of Missile Defense System capabilities and becomes the RDT&E resource for daily operations that includes data analytical decision making, test events and capability delivery to the Warfighter.	Does "data analytical decision making" include operational data analysis support, or is it limited to infrastructure support for such tasks?	No, in this case it's referring to IT service delivery and it's associated communication architectures vice "post mission" data analysis. It should be noted that network analysis is imperative to provide on time trusted data delivery back to the Data Centers or service delivery point(s) of the supported stakeholder.
Attachment L-06 Scenarios /Pg. 6/Para. L.6 MDSEA (B. Assumptions)/ Line 242-243	"MDSEA shall have the capability to support management of space sensor data from minimum of two (2) endpoints on MDA Space Sensor networks"	Under assumptions, it states the capability to support management of space sensor data from (2) endpoints. Can you please confirm the definition of endpoints (satellites, ground stations)?	Endpoint would be from two Ground Entry Points (GEPs) that would be relaying satellite space sensor data from different satellites.
Attachment L-06 Scenarios /Pg. 6/Para. L.6 MDSEA (B. Assumptions)/ Line 252-254	"Not all Space Sensor data needs to go to every functional stakeholder of a Space Sensor. Data Analysts are interested in the sensor images. Satellite Operators are interested in the space sensor Time, Telemetry, and Communication (TT&C) data."	When talking about data needs, are the functional stakeholders the performers or performers and separate entities?	The paragraph is referring to the different satellite data going to different communities of people. Image data going to Image Data Analysts and satellite TT&C going to satellite Operators. During R&D, the satellite Performers are interested in both image and TT&C data sets.
Attachment L-06 Scenarios /Pg. 7/Para. L.6 MDSEA (C. Scenario Objectives)/ Line 273-276	"Additional Site Activation(s): Support the implementation of an additional site to support development, testing, and remote administration of the MDSEA RDT&E enclave which is supported with MDA Unclassified Local Area Network (ULAN) and Classified Local Area Network (CLAN) connections via existing long-haul communications networks. "	Additional site activation(s) is not well defined. Can you please describe if the intent is for a services DR/COOP site, a warm site similar to the CSSP function or a full-up second operations floor.	The additional site activation requirements are not defined at this time. If additional MDSEA RDT&E enclave(s) were to become a requirement it could be for a services DR/COOP, a site similar to the CSSP function, or a full-up second enclave. A lot depends on the continued success of the MDSEA functionality and the needs and priorities of the MDA Director.
Attachment L-06 Scenarios/Pg. 11/Para. MDIOC Facility Ops/ Line. 422	"Would the prime contractor operate as a General Contractor?"	Can you please elaborate on the requirement, "would the prime contractor operate as the General Contractor"?	Will the MIOES Prime contractor/Teaming partner act as the general contractor or will the Prime, subcontract the GC responsibilities to manage the subcontractors?
Attachment L-06 Scenarios/Pg. 8/ Para. ERB / Line 294	Scenario 2: Engineering Review Board	Could the Government clarify their desired level of integration that the contractor should ensure between the MDIOC Engineering Review Board and other boards (e.g., ERB, CCB) and the Enterprise Monitoring Component (GNOSC)?	The contractor should propose the level of integration required for mission success.
Attachment L-12/Pg. 14/Para. 7.6.2/Lines 441 and Attachment L-12/Pg. 15/Para.7.6.3/ Line 452	Provide services within the timeline requested by the requester.	Are there Service Levels that dictate timelines as opposed to whatever the requester desires? The requester might propose timelines that are not realistic.	Currently, there are not predetermined service levels. It is expected that stakeholders will collaborate together to establish reasonable timelines and work with COTR if a reasonable timeline can't be established.
Attachment L-12/Pg. 2/Para. 2.0/Line 52	2. Contract Deliverable Requirements List (CDRL)	Are there any CDRLs associated with the requirements listed in 7.7 (MIOES Environmental Management) and 7.8 (MIOES Safety and Occupational Health)?	There are reporting requirements but there are no CDRL requirements.
Attachment L-12/Pg. 7/Para. 7.2.5.2/Line 183	...all MDIOC Facility requirements from inception to closeout	What is meant by, "all MDIOC Facility requirements"? Is this in reference to performing facilities maintenance or tracking requirements to deliver CDRLs, etc.? We recommend changing to say, "All MDIOC Facilities Maintenance requirements..."	We accept the recommendation and will make the revision.
Attachment L-12/Pg. 8/Para. 7.2.5.2.3/ Lines 202-204	Develop an automated WO capability to communicate MDIOC facility status and condition of all MDIOC facility systems and Peterson/Schriever Garrison Power Plant availability.	Since the base systems aren't maintained by the IRES contractor today, we recommend Government generalize this requirement by simply asking for an 'automated capability' vice 'automated WO capability'.	This requirement specifically pertains to work orders that are required to maintain the MDIOC facility. This work is currently performed by IRES and will be expected to be performed within MIOES. It is not referring to any Peterson/Schriever Garrison systems. We are asking for an automated WO capability.
Attachment L-12/Pg.18/Para. 7.7/Lines 552-555	Procure and operate data centers and IT equipment in accordance with applicable Energy Star requirements and/or are registered in the Electronic Product Environmental Assessment Tool, as described in MDA Instruction 8400.01-INS, Sustainable Electronics Management Program.	Is the intent for the task order to procure and operate data centers or is the intent to procure IT equipment that meets applicable Energy Star requirements to be used within data centers. This appears to be a MIOES wide requirement. We recommend moving it to the Basic PWS.	This task describes the Environmental requirements across the entire MIOES contract so we want to keep this standard in this section. It has, however, been clarified to show how this task order as responsibility to ensure compliance across the contract. It should be noted that Energy-Star requirements should be adhered to the maximum extent possible without jeopardizing mission critical capabilities. MDA 8400.01-INS 3(c)(1)
Attachment L-12/Pg.6/Para.7.2.1/ Line 120-121	Provide recommended changes and upgrades to the system. Describe execution approach to developing and adopting automation and digital practices.	Could the Government clarify which system is being described in this sentence? Recommend rewording to "Facility systems" or "building monitoring system", etc.	PWS has been updated.
Attachment J-01 Basic PWS/Pg.4/Para 3.1	3.1.4 Provide cybersecurity assurance by utilizing risk management framework (RMF) to establish and maintain security standards and guidance to promote the development of comprehensive and balanced information security programs 3.1.4 Utilize a cloud first strategy that enables cloud computing on-demand access, via secure network connectivity, to deliver global IT services to the warfighter and general user base.	In the Basic PWS, the document lists two paragraph sections labeled as 3.1.4.	The Basic PWS has been updated so there are not two paragraphs numbered 3.1.4
Draft Increment 2/Contract Data/MIOES OCI Guiding Principles	N/A	The Government released a document titled "OCI Guiding Principles (Final)," provided in the Contract Data folder released with Increment 2 that "guiding principles shall apply to MIOES solicitation and contract." We did not see this document referenced in the most recent draft solicitation. We recommend that Section L. require compliance to the OCI Guiding Principles provided in the fully named, "Guiding Principles for Missile Defense Agency Integration and Operations Enterprise Solutions OCI" document (dated November 1, 2023) and also included in the Bidders Library to ensure that Offerors manage OCI in accordance with your intended requirements.	Removed IAW MDA/GCA recommendation.

MIOES DRFP Solicitation SF33/ Pgs.2-42 /Para. Section B	<p>ITEM NO</p> <p>SUPPLIES/SERVICES</p> <p>QUANTITY</p> <p>UNIT</p> <p>UNIT PRICE</p> <p>AMOUNT</p> <p>0003</p> <p>Lot</p> <p>Services/Capabilities (CPAF-Base)</p> <p>CPAF</p> <p>Efforts within the scope of the MIOES Performance Work Statement (Attachment J-01) will be awarded under individual task orders. The contract-level line item structure is created for internal Government administrative purposes only in order to facilitate issuance of task orders and data collection within the contracting writing system.</p> <p>FOB: Destination</p> <p>PSC CD: AC13"</p>	In Section B of the DRFP are line items for CLINs XXX3, XXX5, and XXX7 for CPAF, FPAF, and FP-EPA type work respectively. The Attachment L-04 Notional Requirements EPW does not list these contract types in the calculations of profit/fee and total price. Are these three (3) contract types (CPAF, FPAF, and FP-EPA) applicable to the MIOES work?	<p>The CPAF should be the same as CPFF through the cost total (excluding fee) with award fee negotiated each TO</p> <p>FP-EPA should be same as FFP - with clause for EPA added to</p> <p>FPAF should be same as FFP with award fee negotiated for the TO</p>
MIOES DRFP Solicitation SF33/Pg. 65-71/ Para. Section I	N/A	The Draft Inc2 Q&A pointed us to FAR 252.234-7001, but we did not see FAR 252.234-7001 in the DRFP release. We recommend putting FAR 252.234-7001 clause and provide instructions where offerors to submit the FAR requirements. This will allow offerors to address how they will implement and manage EVMS for MIOES as part of the Management and Leadership Factor.	Added to SF-33 after consulting EV team
MIOES DRFP Solicitation SF33/Pg. 69 of 80/ Para. Section I/252.204-7021, Contractor Compliance with the Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification Level Requirement	"252.204-7021 Contractor Compliance with the Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification Level Requirement JAN 2023"	Can the Government share the expected Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification (CMMC) compliance level that will be required for MIOES?	CMMC Level 2 will be required for MIOES.
MIOES Section L	N/A	There is no direct requirement stated in Section L for the "Volume Cover Pages". The requirement for a cover is stated in FAR 52.215 -1; however, there is no direct reference to such requirement for a cover in the RFP. You mention this FAR in accordance with the proposal due date and time but not in relation to the cover. We recommend updating Section L.2 (F.) to mention Volume Cover requirements as stated in FAR 52.215-1.	Volume Cover Pages do not count towards page count. This has been clarified in Section L.
MIOES Section L /Pg. 29/Para. L.12.G.5./Line 1076-1078	"The Offeror will propose a fee rate for each contract type. CPFF will be the baseline fee proposed. There will no upward adjustment for T&M and Labor Hour. The subcontractor and prime fees will be adjusted up 0.5% for CPIF/FPIF, and 2.5% for FFP."	What will be the fee adjustment or guidance be for CPAF, FPAF, and FP-EPA type CLINs (reference CLINs 0003, 0005, and 0007)?	CPAF will align with CPFF. FPAF and FP-EPA will align with FFP. EPW has been adjusted.
MIOES Section L /Pg. 29/Para. L.12.G.6./Line 1081-1083	"These rate build ups should be customized to reflect the contractor's accounting system. Direct and indirect rates are carried forward (linked) from the Rates worksheet."	Is the contractor allowed to add columns and adjust the layout of the FBLRs worksheet to accommodate their unique accounting structure? Specifically, can the contractor add to and adjust columns E through CF?	Yes and yes.
MIOES Section L/Pg. 16/Para. L.8 A / Line 543	"All Offerors shall submit a Small Business Participation Commitment Document (SBPCD) for evaluation."	For Volume 6, the Government mentions submitting a SBPCD. Does the government intend to provide a template for the SBPCD?	Yes, the SBPCD template will be provided.
MIOES Section L/Pg. 19/Para. L.12/ Line 697-703	Note: Budget/Maximum Ceiling Values are provided below for the three task orders associated with Attachments L-10, L-11, and L-12. A Budget/Maximum Ceiling Value is NOT provided for the Phase-in task order (Attachment L-09). If an Offeror's proposal is above the Budget/Maximum Ceiling Value provided for any one of the task orders (Attachments L-10, L-11, and L-12), their proposal will be considered as unaffordable, rendering it non-compliant and ineligible for award. ***Budget values will be provided prior to final RFP release***	How will the budget/maximum ceiling values be defined (e.g., total, by FY, by CLIN)?	Anticipate total by task order by FY. Plug numbers will be provided for all non-labor cost elements within Final RFP. All provided numbers will count towards the max ceiling.
MIOES Section L/Pg. 20/ Para. L.12.A.3/Line 732	The period of performance of each of the other three task orders is February 9, 2027	L.12.A.3 (line 732) states, "The period of performance of each of the other three task orders is February 9, 2027." Would the Government please clarify period of performance for the three task orders?	That sentence will be corrected to read, "The period of performance of each of the other three task orders will begin February 9, 2027."
MIOES Section L/Pg. 20-36/Para. L.12/Line 688	N/A	The Cost Narrative requirements includes a WBS. Will the WBS be provided, or is it the Government's expectation that offerors will submit a CWBS?	The offerors will submit a CWBS based on the requirements of the PWS(s) provided by the government.

MIOES Section L/Pg. 21/ Para L.12.B.2 /Line 750-757	"Minor Subcontractors are not required to provide a Cost/Price Volume to the Government unless the combination of the Prime Offeror and Major Subcontractor EPWs fail to support 80% as proposed by the Offeror. If the 80% threshold is not met, then the Prime Offeror shall designate some number of the largest Minor Subcontractor(s) to submit a Cost/Price Volume to the Government until the 80% threshold is met. These designated Minor Subcontracts are considered Major Subcontracts for the purpose of this solicitation. The Government may request additional Minor Subcontractor cost data as required."	We do not often see this requirement for minor subs to provide a Cost/Price Volume. Usually, only major subs submit cost/price volumes. We recommend you simplify this by major and minor subcontractors by threshold.	The requirement for minor sub cost/price volume submission has been removed.
MIOES Section L/Pg. 29/Para L.12.G.5/Line 1076-1078	The Offeror will propose a fee rate for each contract type. CPFF will be the baseline fee proposed. There will no upward adjustment for T&M and Labor Hour. The subcontractor and prime fees will be adjusted up 0.5% for CPIF/PIIF, and 2.5% for FFP.	Attachment L-04 in the worksheet Rates is showing an upward adjustment for T&M of 0.5%. Can the Government clarify which is the correct guidance?	Adjusted the EPW to reflect Section L. No upward adjustment for T&M and Labor Hour.
MIOES Section L/Pg. 29/Para. L.12.G.7/Line 1085	"Composite Rates for Attachment L-04 Worksheet"	Is the expectation for this worksheet to "populate automatically" or is the offeror expected to input data and/or formulas?	The expectation is that the worksheet will populate automatically, however the offeror needs to confirm and/or correct if necessary.
MIOES Section L/Pg. 7/Para. L.2.C / Line 234-235	"The Government requires proposal submissions be conducted via the PIEE Solicitation Module for unclassified proposals"	In Section L, the Government mandates that submissions be conducted via the PIEE Solicitation Module for both Prime and Subcontractors. Based on recent experiences, subcontractors have found the PIEE tool challenging to maintain and navigate. Considering these difficulties, would the Government be open to allowing subcontractors the option to submit via PIEE or DoD Safe?	PIEE is the only method. DoD SAFE recently determined to be prohibited for source selection use.
MIOES Section L/Pg.16/Para L.8.A.4.a/Line 561	The Government will evaluate the SBPCD to determine which offeror(s) proposed the best value in terms of meeting all the Small Business Participation goals (see Table below).	Section L.8.A.4.a (line 561) states, "The Government will evaluate the SBPCD to determine which offeror(s) proposed the best value in terms of meeting all the Small Business Participation goals (see Table below)." This appears to be introducing evaluation criteria in Section L that is not consistent with the evaluation set forth in Section M. Section M calls for SB participation to be rated as acceptable or unacceptable. We recommend this sentence be removed from Section L.	Language revised/removed within Final RFP
MIOES Section L/Pg.22 / L.12.B.3.h/Line 784-785	Offerors and major subcontractors must provide copies of the Cost and Price volume in the quantities stated in EPW Attachment L-04.	It appears this requirement is for the quantity of Cost and Price Volumes offerors and major subcontractor must submit with the proposal. Table L-1 also addresses Volume quantities. After a review of EPW Attachment L-04, we were unable to find the referenced data. Can the Government please clarify this requirement.	Removed reference and clarified within Final RFP
MIOES Section H, H-38 Clause, Para. b. & c., Industry Day Fee Structure Slide	MDA Local Clause H-38 'Fee/Profit Limitations' (revised October 2024)	The DRFP has the May 2021 H-38 clause. Will the Government be replacing the May 2021 clause with the October 2024 clause as stated in the Industry Day slides?	Updated H-38 clause to reflect the most recent language from Oct 2024. Tailored specifically for MIOES requirements using industry feedback
Attachment J-01 MIOES Basic PWS Final Draft RFP, Attachment 1 Task 10.1, pages 16-29	N/A	We recommend adding Section L requirements specifying where Offerors are to describe their Task 10.1 approach, resources, and price. Furthermore, we recommend adding/expanding Section M evaluation criteria to specifically address the evaluation of an offeror's Task 10.1 approach and resources.	Sections L and M will be updated to provide that clarification. Note: Section 10.1 is now 8.1.
Attachment_L_05_MIOES_Task_Order_EPW	Attachment_L_05_MIOES_Task_Order_EPW & MIOES_Section_L_DRFP_Final_DRFP_	Section L proposal instructions requests one EPW per task order. As it stands now, this would mean five (5) workbooks for the prime offeror. Will the USG confirm major subcontractors are only required to submit the notional workbook that validates the subcontractor rates proposed?	Confirmed. Once the composite rates are established, we don't need any data from the subs.
MIOES_Section_L_DRFP_Final_DRFP_Page 19/Lines 674-675	The OCI plan shall have promulgation of enforcement mechanisms, procedures and training to all employees of the Prime contractor and subcontractors at all tiers, with emphasis on consequences for non-compliance.	This language is written too broadly. Offerors should not be required to provide training to every employee and subcontractor employee as part of the MIOES OCI Management Plan. As a large business with thousands of employees, most of who will never support MIOES, we respectfully believe it is not necessary to provide each employee training specifically regarding the MIOES OCI management plan. General corporate OCI training for all employees, to ensure they are sensitive to OCI risk, and specialized training on the MIOES OCI management plan for personnel who support MIOES should be adequate. Therefore, we respectfully request the Government limit the application of the MIOES OCI management plan's procedures, training, and enforcement to personnel who support the MIOES program.	The Government only wants to know that the Offerors train their employees that will support the MIOES contract on OCI in general, not specifically the MIOES OCI management plan. Will relook the language in the RFP.
MIOES_Section_L_DRFP_Final_DRFP_Page 7/Lines 256-262	Subcontractors are not required to submit a file for every mandatory tab listed in PIEE and will receive a system warning from PIEE stating "Your offer does not contain all mandatory files. Do you wish to continue?"	Will the Government please provide a list of the mandatory tabs that will be specified in PIEE? Providing such a list will ensure the mandatory tabs in PIEE match the RFP prime offeror requirements, and thereby avoid prime offerors from incorrectly receiving the warning message, "Your offer does not contain all mandatory files. Do you wish to continue?"	Currently workaround is available as it still allows you to continue. So long as vendor/offeror adheres to RFP requirements, this should not be an issue.

MIOES_Section_L_DRFP_Final_DRFP_Page 15/Lines 534-537	b. Developing and implementing innovative processes and tools that will be used for integrating personnel, policies, and managerial procedures to allow the Offeror to function as a seamless single entity regarding how work is controlled, performed, reported, and reviewed.	Will the Government please confirm that the response is limited to the "work" that is within MIOES scope, and not integrating personnel, policies, managerial procedures for other adjacent contracts beyond MDA MIOES.	Yes
Attachment_L_06_MIOES_Evaluation_Scenarios_Final_DRFP_Page 11/Lines 425 - 427	MSS3 MDIOC Facility Operations. d. What business unit would perform the purchase of large pieces of equipment such as an air handling unit or a breaker and what types of fees from each business unit would be added to the purchase cost of the equipment item?	Request the Government please clarify definition of Business Unit wrt MDA MIOES assuming that "business unit" is an MDA organizational construct.	What organization (prime, subcontractor, sub to subcontractor) would purchase the equipment? This clarification will be provided in the Final RFP.
Attachment_L_12_MIOES_TO_PWS_MDIOC_Facility_Operations_and_Sustainment_Final_Draft_RFP_.pdf/Page 7/Lines 161-163	The contractor shall perform configuration management activities IAW the MDIOC Configuration management Plan-2022 in support of MDIOC facilities operations and maintenance responsibilities.	Recommend the Government revise this requirement to be IAW with the 2023 MDIOC Configuration Management Plan, as provided in the Bidder's Library.	The final RFP will reference the correct version.
Attachment_L_12_MIOES_TO_PWS_MDIOC_Facility_Operations_and_Sustainment_Final_Draft_RFP_.pdf/Page 9/Lines 227-230		Request the Government provide the following referenced documents in the Bidder's Library: •Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) ID No.: CO6570090096, U.S. Air Force Hazardous Waste Management Plan, Schriever Air Force Base •Affirmative Procurement Plan, Schriever AFB •AFI 90-803, Environmental, Safety, and Occupational Health Compliance Assessment and Management Program (ESOH CAMP) •MDA 6055.02-INS, Accident Investigations and Reporting	These items will be placed in the library.
MIOES_Section_L_DRFP_Final_DRFP_/Page 17/Lines 623-626	A. The Offeror shall submit an Information Management and Control Plan (IMCP) (not a narrative describing what the IMCP will say) that clearly describes its policies and procedures for the dissemination and accountability of CUI, as outlined in the PWS.	Recommend the Government request for a Draft IMCP with proposal submission and a Final IMCP plan 10 days after contract award. This will ensure that the offeror get an opportunity to tailor the IMCP to MDA's environment upon award. A Final IMCP with proposal does favor the incumbent.	Agency direction mandates the submission of an IMCP with the proposal. The acquisition team feels there has been sufficient communication with industry along with the artifacts that will be released in the bidder's library that will enable an offeror to prepare an "acceptable" IMCP.
MIOES_Section_L_DRFP_Final_DRFP_/Page 18/Lines 632-633	IMCP.2. Verifies all NIST SP 800-171 Rev.2 security requirements are implemented and are documented within the SSP.	Request the Government please clarify whether System Security Plan (SSP) is an existing Government document that the IMCP needs to align to or is the SSP to be written by the offeror and also to be submitted w/ Proposal as part of IMCP?	The SSP is templated within eMASS and must be completed at the initiation of each systems authorization. It is not required for submittal as part of the proposal.
MIOES_Section L Attachment L-06, L.5 Volume 3 – Operations Support (Factor 1) Scenario 2: D. Operations Support Subfactor 2 (OSS2): Scenario 2 Cyberspace Operations/Page n/a/ Lines 192-201 Section M, Evaluation Factors for Award, 2. Operations Support Subfactor 2 (OSS2): Scenario 2 Cyberspace Operations./Page 8/Lines 242-248	4. Identifying key components required to develop near-time automated reporting to enable the Government to continuously view and track the lifecycle, availability, open work orders (tickets, projects, outages, billing) and risk posture of all IT assets. (Current Environment) 5. Ensuring security relevant changes are identified, documented and managed throughout the system's lifecycle. (Enhancement) 6. Identifying methods to ensure Computer Network Defense (CND) services are aligned and changes are postured to maintain cyber resiliency throughout the life cycle IAW the Cybersecurity Service Provider (CSSP) - Service-level Agreement (SLA). (Enhancement) d. Identifying key components required to develop near-time automated reporting to enable the Government to continuously view and track the lifecycle, availability, open work orders (tickets, projects, outages, billing) and risk posture of all Identifying methods to ensure Computer Network Defense (CND) services are aligned and changes are postured to maintain cyber resiliency throughout the life cycle IAW the Cybersecurity Service Provider (CSSP) - Service-level Agreement (SLA). (Enhancement Environment)	The OSS2 Scenario 2 Cyberspace Operations requirements for items 4, 5, and 6, do not appear to track with evaluation criteria for Section M, letter d. Is it the Government's intention for the Section M criteria to follow the same order as the Scenario 2 requirements, and if so, will the Government please update the Section M criteria.	Fixed.
Attachment_L_04_MIOES_Notional_Requirements_EPW MIOES_Section_L_DRFP_Final_DRFP_Page 29/Lines 1077-1078	"Rates" tab Section L.12.G.5: "The subcontractor and prime fees will be adjusted up 0.5% for CPIF/FPIF, and 2.5% for FFP."	The Government adjustment by contract type, +0.5% for CPIF/FPIF and +2.5% for FFP over the Offeror proposed baseline CPFF fee rate, does not adequately account for typical assessment of contract risk in accordance with Department of Defense (DD) Form 1547, "Record of Weighted Guidelines Application, Modified," as recommended in Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (DFARS) 215.404-70 which would assess CPIF/FPIF contract risk at +0.5% to +1% and FFP contract risk at +4% to +5% higher than CPFF contract risk. Would the Government allow each Offeror's to propose each contract type in accordance with their contract and performance risk assessment? If not, would the Government re-evaluate their contract risk assessment based on weighted guidelines?	The USG adjustment by contract type is based on DFARS normal values for the contract type with appropriate financing consideration - see no need for adjustment from our original guidance
Attachment_L_04_MIOES_Notional_Requirements_EPW Attachment_L_06_MIOES_LCAT_Descriptions MIOES_Section_L_DRFP_Final_DRFP_page 24/Lines 881-883	"Rates" tab "Labor Descriptions" tab "3. The Government developed these benchmarks based on actual rates and utilizing the Economic Research Institute salary and compensation tool for labor category descriptions and experience under these requirements."	The Notional Requirements workbook provides benchmark rates by LCAT and level (1-4), the LCAT descriptions provide a comprehensive functional description for all levels but does not differentiate educational/experience per skill level. Understand the Government's desire for "the most qualified personnel" however understanding the basis of the benchmark rates it critical foundational understanding for Offerors to start their unique solution from. Will the Government provide the "representative" educational/experience levels used to derive the Benchmark rates?	The government will not provide the "representative" educational/experience levels used to derive the Benchmark rates. For the four awardable task orders, however, Section L will be modified to ask each offeror to justify the chosen LCAT in the Basis of Estimate.
MIOES_Section_L_DRFP_Final_DRFP_	Materials/ODC's/Travel Guidance	Section L provides plug values for Travel/ODC/Materials. The EPWs request a detailed breakout of Materials/ODC's/Travel for the task orders. To maintain a level playing field for all offerors, will the USG provide plug values for each task order for evaluation purposes?	Yes
Attachment_L_05_MIOES_Task_Order_EPW & Attachment_L_04_MIOES_Notional_Requirements_EPW	Locations identified for place of performance	The USG has provided RUS (Rest of United States) as a performance location. For evaluation purposes, will the USG identify a representative location for RUS so all offerors can ensure established rates are realistic for any potential location that may be exercised during contract performance?	No, RUS rate is the same regardless of location. Based on US average.
MIOES_Section_L_DRFP_Final_DRFP_Page 21/Lines 750-752	"Minor Subcontractors are not required to provide a Cost/Price Volume to the Government unless the combination of the Prime Offeror and Major Subcontractor EPWs fail to support 80% as proposed by the Offeror."	Does the 80% threshold apply to only the notional hours portion of the TEP, or the total TEP (task orders + notional hours)?	This requirement has been removed.

MIOES_Section_M_DRFP_Final_DRFP_Page 17-18/Lines 623-642	"Notional Requirements Probable Cost – TEP will include 20%..." and "Task Order Probable Cost – TEP will include 80% of the following"	It is unclear exactly how the TEP is calculated. Will the Government please include a TEP calculation tab within Attachment L_04 or Attachment L_05 so Offerors can calculate their proposed TEP?	TEP will equal 20% of the notional requirements and 100% of the four TOs. Offerors will be required to summarize this in the cost volume. Adjusted Section M
Attachment_J_01_MIOES_Basic_PWS_Final_Draft_RFP_Page 16/2nd paragraph Attachment_L_04_MIOES_Notional_Requirements_EPW Attachment_L_05_MIOES_Task_Order_EPW	"Under the MIOES contract, there will not be a single task order for the MIOES Program Management and Program Integration task. Instead, the contractor shall create an "overhead/indirect" type account that collects these costs that can then be charged against each task order."	It is understood that the Government desires PMO and PI cost to be an allocation to all task orders. Typically this is done as an adder to the proposed rates structure, either incorporated into the rate or as a percentage adder to the rate, so the cost is included in the rate card and applied in each task order proposal. It is unclear in both the Notional Hours workbook which establishes the contract rates and the Task Order workbook how PMO/PI cost is supposed to be applied and recovered. Please provide clarification.	The language will be amended to include the following statement: "Describe and justify the labor hours and labor categories required to execute Task 8.1 activities and your approach to collecting costs and then how you will allocate those costs against each task order."
Attachment_J_01_MIOES_Basic_PWS_Final_Draft_RFP_Page 16/2nd paragraph Attachment_L_04_MIOES_Notional_Requirements_EPW	"Under the MIOES contract, there will not be a single task order for the MIOES Program Management and Program Integration task. Instead, the contractor shall create an "overhead/indirect" type account that collects these costs that can then be charged against each task order."	Please confirm the labor categories included in the notional hours are intended to be a direct charge to resultant task order and Offerors are allowed to propose the labor categories necessary to perform PMO and Program Integration scope.	We expect Program Management and Program integration to be direct charge to the contract. These requirements would be managed at the contract level and costs will be allocated/charged proportionately against each Task Order. The LCATs provided should be sufficient to cover the labor required for this requirement.
Attachment_L_12_MIOES_TO_PWS_MDIQC_Facility_Operations_and_Sustainment_Final_Draft_RFP_.pdf	Lines 368-384 (FYDP Prioritization)	Future Year Defense Plan (FYDP): The sustainment plan requires prioritization of items to align with the FYDP. Is guidance available on acceptable weighting methodologies?	The government and contractor will conduct meetings each year prior to FSSP CDRL submission to discuss and make decisions with respect to weighting/prioritization methodologies.
Attachment_L_12_MIOES_TO_PWS_MDIQC_Facility_Operations_and_Sustainment_Final_Draft_RFP_.pdf	Multiple Sections, e.g., Line 265; Line 175 (Definitions)	Definitions: Consider adding a glossary for terms like "critical systems," "technical baseline," and "CMMS" for consistency.	We will define terms as needed in the PWS. Critical systems and CMMS are defined in the PWS.
Attachment_L_12_MIOES_TO_PWS_MDIQC_Facility_Operations_and_Sustainment_Final_Draft_RFP_.pdf	Lines 333-334; Lines 504-505 (Predictive Maintenance and Environmental Metrics)	Recommend to define Success Metrics: Clarify how success in predictive maintenance and environmental management is measured (e.g., percentage reduction in incidents, energy savings).	The "success metrics" are the standards identified in the PWS.
MIOES_Section_M_DRFP_Final_DRFP_Page 17-18/Lines 623-642	"Notional Requirements Probable Cost – TEP will include 20%..." and "Task Order Probable Cost – TEP will include 80% of the following"	The Government has changed TEP approach from preliminary draft documents to include 4 Task Orders (including Phase-In) at 80% of the TEP. This approach places disproportionate value on Phase-In since the total of the proposed Task Order prices is weighted at 80%. Would the Government consider removing the Phase-In TO price from the TEP for the following reasons: 1. Ensures Fair Competition: Including phase-in costs in the TEP often creates an unfair advantage for the incumbent, who usually has little to no transition costs. Excluding phase-in costs levels the playing field for all bidders. 2. Focuses on Long-Term Value: Phase-in costs are generally a one-time expense. Including them in the TEP can disproportionately impact the evaluation, making long-term cost savings or efficiencies offered by non-incumbent bidders appear less competitive. Excluding these costs allows the Government to focus on the overall value and effectiveness of the proposed solutions. 3. Reduces Bidder Complexity: Phase-In costs can vary widely depending on the contractor's capabilities and assumptions. This variability introduces uncertainty. By excluding these costs, the government simplifies bid preparation and ensures proposals are more comparable. 4. Aligns with Best Practices: Many agencies, when appropriate, exclude non-recurring costs such as Phase-In from price evaluations. This practice is aligned with a focus on achieving the best value and emphasizes evaluating recurring costs that have a sustained budget impact. 5. Encourages Competition: When Phase-In costs are included, non-incumbent contractors may feel discouraged from bidding if their proposals seem less competitive due to higher upfront costs. Removing these costs promotes a more competitive procurement process, potentially yielding better technical solutions and pricing. 6. Mitigates Risk of Overweighting Initial Costs: Overemphasis on Phase-In costs might lead evaluators to undervalue proposals offering superior performance or innovative solutions but requiring higher initial investments. Excluding these costs ensures that the focus remains on long-term performance and affordability. While phase-in costs are a legitimate expense, they are short-term and should not overshadow the	The government has weighed all the factors and will include the Phase-In cost in the TEP.
Attachment_L_04_MIOES_Notional_Requirements_EPW Attachment_L_05_MIOES_Task_Order_EPW MIOES_Question_Matrix_DRFP_Inc2_ANSWERED	"With respect to material, software, and ODC, fee will not be allowed on routine tech refresh hardware and software licenses. Fee on all other material, hardware, software, ODC will be allowed. The government expects to set a ceiling for this fee."	The Government previously indicates that fee would be allowed on material, software, and ODC except for tech refresh hardware and software licenses. The Notional Requirements EPW does not have a place for Offerors to propose their fee structure for non-labor cost. The Task Order EPW does apply fee to non-labor cost (excluding travel). Please confirm the Government does not intend on including fee on non-labor cost in the Notional Requirements EPW portion of the TEP	Fee will be included. EPW updated for material profit/fee. No fee on Travel.
Attachment_L_05_MIOES_Task_Order_EPW Attachment_L_10_MIOES_TO_PWS_Enterprise_IT_and_Event_Current_IRES_ Attachment_L_11_MIOES_TO_PWS_C2BMC_Current_IRES_ Attachment_L_12_MIOES_TO_PWS_MDIQC_Facility_Operations_and_Sustainment_Final_Draft_RFP	Attachment_L_05_MIOES_Task_Order_EPW	The Task Order EWP work book is set up to price the contract full period of performance. Due to the long duration and evolution of the technical environment as efficiencies, improvements, or changes in standards are implemented over time, recommend the period of performance for the task order pricing not exceed 3 years. This will allow the Government to reset task order pricing periodically and implement the benefit of technical efficiencies and improvements in the awarded price.	The task order EPW would align to the period of performance of the task order. Extra years are included in TO EPW to allow the excel file to be used throughout contract life.
MIOES_Section_L_DRFP_Final_DRFP_Page 10/Line 371	The Offeror shall provide a complete copy of this RFP...	Will the Government please confirm that "a complete copy of this RFP" equates to the completed RFP sections (i.e., SF33, Section B, SF30(s), and clause fill-ins. Please confirm the Government is not asking Offerors to return every page of the RFP as part of their proposal submittal.	Language revised to include "a complete copy of the model contract"

MIOES_Section_L_DRFP_Final_DRFP_/Page 13/Lines 467-469	H. Proposal Cross Reference Matrix: The Offeror shall provide a matrix found in Attachment L-02 to cross reference its proposal to, at a minimum, the PWS and/or Scenario, Section L (including attachment L-06), and Section M.	Please confirm Cross Reference Matrix is supposed to cover only Volume 3 Operations Support, Volume 4 Mission Support and Volume 5 Management and Leadership	Confirmed. If this changes, an updated SAM.gov announcement will be made.
MIOES_Section_L_DRFP_Final_DRFP_/Page 13/Lines 469-471 and Pages 19-36/Lines 651-1390	H. Proposal Cross Reference Matrix: The Offeror's proposal paragraph number and format shall mirror Section L and Section M paragraph numbering to the maximum extent practicable. L.12 VOLUME 10 – COST AND PRICE (Factor 8)	Can the Government please streamline paragraph numbering in Section L.12 to allow the Industry to mirror the response sections numbering to Section L	The gov't will examine and consider streamlining paragraph numbering as recommended.
MIOES Section L DRFP Final DRFP/Page 24/Line 873; MIOES Question Matrix DRFP Inc2 ANSWERED/Line 202	FPRA substantiating documentation and Labor Category qualifications.	The Draft RFP requires that FPRA categories must map to the RFP labor category requirements. However, the Draft RFP does not dictate education or years of experience, making this mapping challenging. Offerors with an FPRA will have an unfair advantage by their ability to justify direct labor rates below the Government's benchmark without cost realism adjustments. FPRA Direct Labor is by definition generic and the Government's benchmark is specific to MIOES and based on actual rates. We recommend the RFP remove the exception relating to use of FPRA Direct Labor, and make appropriate cost realism adjustments to all offerors regardless of their estimating methodology.	It is the responsibility of the Offeror to substantiate and demonstrate how the FPRA labor categories meet the requirements of the RFP LCAT description. The Gov't will verify the LCATs map accordingly. Technology is new and innovation is key, so years of experience / education is not always a good indicator of expertise.
MIOES Section L DRFP Final DRFP/Page 20/Line 707	Total Evaluated Price calculations	The Draft RFP defines the total evaluated price to be the combination of the price for notional annual hours and the discrete estimates for the four task orders. If the notional hours are representative of the entire effort to be performed, this is duplicative, and makes the price for the notional hours an unrealistic portion of the total evaluated price. As the Government will be providing budget values for the Task Orders, we recommend the notional hours be reduced to correspond with the expected value of the Task Orders.	TEP will equal 20% of the notional requirements and 100% of the four TOs. Offerors will be required to summarize this in the cost volume.
MIOES Section L DRFP Final DRFP/Page 21/Line 750	Minor subcontractor pricing to reach 80% threshold	The Draft RFP requirement to designate minor subcontractors to meet the 80% threshold will impact our ability to use small businesses. Many small businesses do not have the accounting systems required for receiving cost-type subcontracts, and will not be able to provide a Cost/Price Volume in accordance with the RFP requirements. Many small businesses will be used on a T&M or Labor Hour basis to accommodate their lack of an approved accounting system. With respect to the 80% threshold for using small businesses, will the small business minor subcontractors be allowed to submit a cost/price volume that is limited to proposed Direct Labor, Fully Burdened Labor Rates, and fee?	This requirement has been removed.
MIOES Section L DRFP Final DRFP/Page 29/Line 1076	Prime fee rate for CPFF	Are offerors permitted to propose a CPFF fee percentage associated with experimental, developmental, or research work (i.e. >10%)?	Yes, up to 15% for IAW FAR15.404-4(j)(A).
Attachment L 04 MIOES Notional Requirements EPW/"Indirect Rate Build-up" Tab	Other Overhead/Indirect	Please confirm that offerors may add rows on this sheet to align with their accounting practices and any Forward Pricing Rate Agreement or DCAA/DCMA provisional billing rate agreement.	Yes.
Attachment L 04 MIOES Notional Requirements EPW/"Rates" Tab/Line 987	Subcontractor fee/profit	Including subcontractor fee/profit in the Prime's EPW seems unnecessary. We recommend a prime's EPW should include only the major subcontractor price inclusive of subcontractor fee from the subcontractor's EPW.	EPW will continue to have this flexibility.
MIOES DRFP Solicitation SF33/Section G-03.c(2)(a)/Page 51/ and Attachment L 09 MIOES TO PWS Phase In Final DRFP/Page 4/Section 2.0 Background	Phase in Task Order negotiation	Draft RFP section G indicates Task Order negotiation could be a direct cost, and the Transition task order contains these requirements. The Transition PWS identifies 13 Task Orders to be proposed and negotiated during transition. We recommend section L include requirements for each offeror to disclose how task order negotiation costs are accounted for, and how it is reflected in their Transition Task Order pricing.	As stated, 13 task orders will be negotiated during the 6 month phase-in period. The BOE and cost proposal for the phase-in task order shall include an offeror's estimated costs for these negotiations.
MIOES Section L DRFP Final DRFP/Volumes 3 and 4/Page 14/Lines 489 - 506 and Attachment L 06 MIOES Evaluation Scenarios Final DRFP/Lines 192-199 as compared to MIOES Section M DRFP Final DRFP/ Line 244	Disconnect between documents	In Section L (Volumes 3 and 4) Scenario Attachment L-06, there are 7 requirements for D. Operations Support Subfactor 2 (OSS2): Scenario 2 Cyberspace Operations (lines 192-199): ... 4. Identifying key components required to develop near-time automated reporting to enable the Government to continuously view and track the lifecycle, availability, open work orders (tickets, projects, outages, billing) and risk posture of all IT assets. (Current Environment); 5. Ensuring security relevant changes are identified, documented and managed throughout the system's lifecycle. (Enhancement); 6. Identifying methods to ensure Computer Network Defense (CND) services are aligned and changes are postured to maintain cyber resiliency throughout the life cycle IAW the Cybersecurity Service Provider (CSSP) - Service-level Agreement (SLA). (Enhancement); There appears to be an error in the Section M evaluation criteria that omits the end of requirement 4 and requirement 5 (line 244): "...open work orders (tickets, projects, outages, billing) and risk posture of all identifying methods to ensure Computer Network Defense (CND) services are aligned and changes are postured to maintain cyber resiliency throughout the life cycle IAW the...."	The disconnect has been corrected.
MIOES Section L DRFP Final DRFP/L. 12, B, 2 Minor Subcontractors/Page 21/Lines 750-757	Minor Subcontractors are not required to provide a Cost/Price Volume unless the combination of Prime and Major Subcontractor EPWs fail to support 80% as proposed by the Offeror. If the 80% threshold is not met, then the Prime Offeror shall designate some number of the largest Minor Subcontractor(s) to submit a Cost/Price Value to the Government until the 80% threshold is met. These designated Minor Subcontractors are considered Major Subcontractors for the purpose of this solicitation. The Government may request additional Minor Subcontractor cost data as required.	Are all minor subcontractors that may be "graduated" to meet the 80% threshold requirement within L.12 Vol10 - Cost and price (Factor 8), B. Cost and Price Compliance Requirements #2, required to submit their own TCP?	This requirement has been removed.
MIOES Section L DRFP Final DRFP/L. 12, B, 2/Page 21/Lines 750-755	Minor Subcontractors are not required to provide a Cost/Price Volume to the Government unless the combination of the Prime Offeror and Major Subcontractor EPWs fail to support 80% as proposed by the Offeror. If the 80% threshold is not met, then the Prime Offeror shall designate some number of the largest Minor Subcontractor(s) to submit a Cost/Price Volume to the Government until the 80% threshold is met.	Please confirm that 80% represents hours proposed.	This requirement has been removed.
MIOES Section L DRFP Final DRFP/L. 12, B, 3, h/Page 22/Line 784 – EPW	Offerors and major subcontractors must provide copies of the Cost and Price volume in the quantities stated in EPW Attachment L-04.	Attachment L-04 does not provide instructions regarding required copies. Should offerors provide copies of the EPW as displayed in Table L-1?	Table indicates Volume 10 requires 1 EA for all Tabs within, which includes the EPWs.

MIOES Section L DRFP Final DRFP/L.12, B, 4, a/Page 23/Line 835 -- Travel	Travel: \$1.5M annually estimated cost ceiling, inclusive of burdens. Fee will NOT be allowed on Travel. However, indirect rates will be applied in accordance with the Offeror's accounting practices	Please confirm that the provided Travel estimate is inclusive of offerors indirect rates.	Yes, the provided Travel estimate is inclusive of offerors indirect rates.
MIOES Section L DRFP Final DRFP/L.12, B, 4, a/Page 23/Line 839 -- Material	Materials/ODCs: \$7.5M annually estimated cost ceiling, inclusive of burdens.	Please provide the breakout of Material and ODCs to allow for indirect burdening, which may differ.	Notional material/ODCs Gov't provided values are inclusive of indirect burdens.
MIOES Section L DRFP Final DRFP/L.12, G, 2, a/Page 26/Line 968	Attachment L-04 EPW Notional Hours Tab -- Effort Code	Effort Code is not a column in the Notional Hours tab. Should this column be added and what data should be used for the effort code?	This column is not required.
MIOES Section L DRFP Final DRFP/L.12, G, 5/Page 28/Line 1072	In Column S on the Rates worksheet, provide the applicable average direct labor rate for the labor category and location on that row from the Labor Category worksheet.	Attachment L-04 does not have a "Labor Category worksheet" and column S does not have a column heading and is blank.	Labor Category Worksheet is provided as a separate document and column S is corrected.
MIOES Section L DRFP Final DRFP/L.12, G, 5/Attachment L-04 -- Rates Tab	The IT Systems Analyst Labor Categories (1-4)	These labor categories are duplicated for each location & site in L-04 Rates tab. Is this intended?	This duplication is an error and the final RFP will correct this duplication.
MIOES Section L DRFP Final DRFP/L.12, G/Page 30/Line 1124, Attachment L-05	The contractor shall submit a Cost Format A at the Total Summary Cost Level. The sum of each Cost Format A at the CLIN level for a GFY must equal the Cost Format A at the Total Cost Summary level for that same GFY.	The Attachment L-05 "Total" tab is linked to data from the input source tabs. Should the "Total" tab be linked to each of the CLIN "Cost Format A" tabs to ensure the sum of all CLINs are reflected in the "Total"?	The values should match using either methodology.
MIOES Section L DRFP Final DRFP/L.12, H, h/Page 33/Lines 1241, 1246-1255	At a minimum, a contractor submitted BOE must provide: Computation of proposed direct labor hours and estimated direct cost(s) by WBS level that include formulas (or mathematical operations), as well as supporting 1247 program actuals or relevant historic costing data the contractor applies to compute estimated hours/costs. Provide a summary of cost element information, time-phased by CFY. • The contractor shall submit a Cost Volume that includes a Time Phased Pricing Summary by CLIN, and CFY • Total Summary Amount • Total by CLIN • Monthly resource data, summarized by CFY	Is time phased pricing data intended to be provided in the BOEs and reviewed by technical evaluators or should pricing data be provided separately in Attachment L-05/ Cost Volume Narrative?	The BOEs should be provided in the Cost Volume.
MIOES Section L DRFP Final DRFP/Section L.12, G, 5/Page 29/Line 1076	The Offeror will propose a fee rate for each contract type. CPFF will be the baseline fee proposed. There will no upward adjustment for T&M and Labor Hour. The subcontractor and prime fees will be adjusted up 0.5% for CPIF/FPIF, and 2.5% for FFP	Attachment L-04, Rates Tab displays a 0.5% adjustment from CPFF to T&M. Will the Government please clarify if T&M contract types will be adjusted up by 0.5%?	T&M has been adjusted to be equal to CPFF.
MIOES Section L DRFP Final DRFP/Section L.12, G, 5/Page 29/Line 1076	The Offeror will propose a fee rate for each contract type. CPFF will be the baseline fee proposed. There will no upward adjustment for T&M and Labor Hour. The subcontractor and prime fees will be adjusted up 0.5% for CPIF/FPIF, and 2.5% for FFP	If a prime offeror proposes subcontractors with T&M subcontract types, how should major subcontractors and designated minor subcontractors provide their proposed fee in the Attachment L-04 Rates tab since offerors, major subcontractors and designated minor subcontractors are only permitted to provide CPFF fee?	Subs provide CPFF percentages to calculate the other contract type fee percentages. The Subs can propose any contract type agreed to with the prime.
MIOES Section L DRFP Final DRFP/Section L.12/Page 32/Line 1298	3. For hardware and software estimates generated using program or relevant historic cost data, identify the model and vendor; identify inputs, outputs, calibration and a trace to the estimate.	Please confirm if fixed price Task Order (e.g. Facility Operations and Sustainment) estimates should assume transfer of materials from incumbent IRES contractor.	Yes there will be a transfer from the incumbent. For the Facility Operations and Sustainment task order, a list of the current inventory will be provided in the Bidder's Library.
Attachment L-09 MIOES Phase-In Performance Work Statement/Pag 10/Section 10.3 Authorization to Proceed (Time & Materials)	"The contractor shall begin performance on task orders that are in the process of being negotiated that have not been awarded during the MIOES phase-in period."	Within this statement, can the Government clarify that no work will be performed by the incoming contractor on task orders (other than the Transition TO) until the phase-in period concludes on Day 180? This interpretation aligns with the following statement from 3.0 Scope: "The incumbent contractor is responsible for mission accomplishment during the transition window..." Recommended language: "After the 180 day phase-in period concludes, the contractor shall begin performance on task orders that are in the process of being negotiated, but were not awarded during the MIOES phase-in."	It is not anticipated that work will be performed by the incoming contractor on task orders (other than the Transition TO) until the phase-in period concludes on Day 180. Recommended language was incorporated. The phase in period will be utilized to negotiate all task orders that have requirements that need executed beginning Feb 9 2027. If for some reason, the negotiations for one of those task orders, is not completed by this date, we will use the phase-in task order to perform key critical tasks that must be executed beginning on Feb 9 2027. A modification to the phase-in period would occur to execute that work.
MIOES Section L DRFP Final DRFP/Section L.8 Volume 6 - Small Business (Factor 4)/Page 16/Lines 585 - 597 MIOES Section M DRFP Final DRFP/Section M.7 Factor 4: Small Business/Page 12/Lines 406 - 418	-(3) Leverage Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) and Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) program funded technologies with high potential for transition into the program specified in the contract, or increase speed of delivery of new capability to address evolving missile threats. • State goals for applying innovative/advanced technology or SBIR and STTR technologies in MIOES • For contracts with a value at or above \$100 million, establish goal(s) for the technology transition or SBIR/STTR Phase III technologies in MIOES • Report in accordance with (CDRL XXXX) the number and dollar amounts of contracts entered into for technology transition(s) or Phase III SBIR or STTR projects."	The MIOES contractor will not have the ability to implement SBIR/STTR technology without MDA direction and approval. Therefore, how can offerors provide goals for technologies in which they do not have ownership or control?	This requirement will be removed in the Final RFP.
Attachment J-06 MIOES LCAT Descriptions/Rows 14 and 20	IT System Analyst and IT Systems Administrator Labor Categories	The definition in J-06 for the IT Systems Analyst is identical to the description for the IT Systems Administrator. This looks like an unintended cut-and-paste error from the IT Systems Administrator into the IT Systems Analyst. Please provide an updated LCAT Description for the IT Systems Analyst.	The final RFP will have the correct LCAT description.
MIOES Section L DRFP Final DRFP/Section L.H.1(d) and H.1(e)/Page 31-32/Lines 1196 - 1215 Attachment L10 MIOES TO PWS Enterprise IT and Event Current IRES/Page 167/Para 10.16/ Line 5187	Accounting System Adequacy 10.16 The contractor shall provide the MDA Foreign Military Sales (FMS) office with IT administrative and equipment support capabilities and services to MDA personnel supporting security assistance and MDA FMS activities on a full-time basis and as outlined in the MDA FMS SLA. The support includes the MDA FMS efforts listed below and additional efforts as directed 5191 by the MDA FMS office:	Please confirm if Subcontractors must provide evidence of the review and approval by DCAA/DCMA of an approved Accounting System? For offerors to properly respond and prepare BOEs, please add to the bidder's library, the MDA Foreign Military Sales (FMS) SLA documentation that defines the scope, size, and complexity of this additional effort.	Prime Contractor only. The government will provide the requested information in the Bidder's Library (CUI)

Attachment L 11 MIOES TO PWS C2BMC Current IRES/Pages 2-3/Table 3-1/Rows 130-180	System Test and Operations Center (STOC) Plan, design, and implement MDIOC and MDA IT infrastructure, and support mission and event needs. Labs that connect to operational C2BMC suites for conducting FTs and distributed Ground Tests (GTs), operational integration and testing, and operations deployment support, as well as supporting the Ballistic Missile Defense System (BMDS) Network Operations and Security Center (BNOSC) Watch floor Alternate Support Area.	The table shows multiple labs/facilities that require simultaneous support for test events. What is the government's approach to resource leveling and deconfliction when multiple high-priority test events have competing requirements?	Deconfliction across assets and resources related to events and event scheduling is typically a government led exercise. Regarding labs and other space which host events, multiple teams (Prime Contractor) exist to ensure adequate coverage and technical support.
Attachment L10 MIOES TO PWS Enterprise IT and Event Current IRES/Page 90/Para 10.8.3/ Line 2675	Ensure COMSEC support is provided by certified cryptographic personnel	Please clarify which cryptographic certifications are required to meet this requirement.	Client Platform Administrator (CPA) requires IAT Level II. CPA is responsible for managing and overseeing the security of a specific communication platform within a network, often within military or government settings; essentially, they are the designated administrator for a particular "client platform" related to secure communications.
Attachment J 01 MIOES Basic PWS Final Draft RFP/Page 17/Para 10.1.2 Measurement and Control	Standards: • Implement and administer a compliant Earned Value Management System (EVMS) for utilization on all applicable TOs.	In the list of Task Orders in the Phase-In PWS, please identify the Task Orders, anticipated to require EVMS.	The following statement was added to Section 8 of the Phase-In task order. Generally speaking EVMS is only required on task orders over \$20M. For TO's under the threshold, the contractor has the option to include those into the same EVMS system or have an equivalent system to provide cost data. Traditionally all task orders have utilized the same EVMS system. For FFP CLINs there will only be a schedule element of EVMS that will be required.
Attachment J 01 MIOES Basic PWS Final Draft RFP/Page 31/Para 10.2.2 Task Order Measurement and Control	The contractor shall monitor, measure, control, and report contract cost, schedule, and performance metrics at the TO level. Standards: • Implement and administer a compliant Earned Value Management System (EVMS)	This direction appears to extend EVMS implementation in all TOs vice "applicable TOs" as called out in para 10.1.2. Please clarify this apparent conflict.	The following sentence was added to 10.2.2 of the PWS in order to clarify. "(Note: This paragraph will be tailored for each task order based on the specific EVMS requirements for that task order. Generally speaking EVMS is only required for task orders over \$20M. For TO's under the threshold, the contractor has the option to include those into the same EVMS system or have an equivalent system to provide cost data. Traditionally all task orders have utilized the same EVMS system. For FFP CLINs there will only be a schedule element of EVMS that will be required.)"
Attachment L 11 MIOES TO PWS C2BMC Current IRES/Page 23/Para 7.4.1.1/Line 545 MIOES PWS Cybersecurity Final DRFP/ page 18/ Para 10.6.2/ Lines 761 - 764	Objective #2: The contractor shall manage, plan, schedule, and install developer- 545 provided spiral loads. 10.6.2 Cyberspace Domain Awareness. Utilize cyber defense tools 24/7 to continuously 761 monitor and detect cyber threats within the MDA Area of Operations, and execute incident 762 response activities to mitigate the threat IAW DoDI 8530.01, CJCSCM 6510.01B, the current 763 Evaluators Scoring Metric (ESM) and MDA CIRP. (DoDI 8530.01, CJCSCM 6510.01)	Please provide C2BMC spiral workload information to enable appropriate BOE and narrative development. What is the current Evaluator's Scoring Metric (ESM) version in use at the MDA CSSP?	Examples will be provided in the bidders library ESM v11 both CSSP and CARV. They can be found at the CAC restricted site: https://intelshare.intelink.gov/sites/jfhq-dodin/JD/CSSP/SitePages/Home.aspx
MIOES PWS Cybersecurity Final DRFP/Page 18/Para 10.6.2/Lines 761 - 764	10.6.2 Cyberspace Domain Awareness. Utilize cyber defense tools 24/7 to continuously 761 monitor and detect cyber threats within the MDA Area of Operations, and execute incident 762 response activities to mitigate the threat IAW DoDI 8530.01, CJCSCM 6510.01B, the current 763 Evaluators Scoring Metric (ESM) and MDA CIRP. (DoDI 8530.01, CJCSCM 6510.01)	Has the MDA CSSP been assessed against the current Evaluator's Scoring Metric (ESM) version?	No, MDA CSSP was evaluated against ESM v10 in March 2023 and received a 3 year ATO
MIOES PWS Cybersecurity Final DRFP/Page 18/Para 10.6.2/Lines 761 - 764	10.6.2 Cyberspace Domain Awareness. Utilize cyber defense tools 24/7 to continuously 761 monitor and detect cyber threats within the MDA Area of Operations, and execute incident 762 response activities to mitigate the threat IAW DoDI 8530.01, CJCSCM 6510.01B, the current 763 Evaluators Scoring Metric (ESM) and MDA CIRP. (DoDI 8530.01, CJCSCM 6510.01)	Will the ESM (not the assessment) be made available to bidders for review?	Documents are CUI but can be found at the CAC restricted site: https://intelshare.intelink.gov/sites/jfhq-dodin/JD/CSSP/SitePages/Home.aspx
MIOES_Section_L_DRFP_Final_DRFP_/Section L/Page 6/L.2.B Proposal Preparation Instructions/Lines 227-229	"Upon examination of the initial offers, the PCO will review this determination and if in the PCO's opinion, adequate price competition exists, no additional cost info will be requested and certification under FAR 15.406-2 will not be required."	Request the Government define "adequate" price competition. Please define the number of bids and acceptable price range on which the Government will base its decision that adequate price competition exists.	Yes, the contractor will be responsibility of the contractor, the by list breakdown will be provided later in the bidders library (CUI)
MIOES_Section_L_DRFP_Final_DRFP_/Section L/Small Business (Factor 4) Section B/Page 16/Lines 581-593	"Leverage Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) and Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) program funded technologies with high potential for transition into the program specified in the contract, or increase speed of delivery of new capability to address evolving missile threats."	While we understand the value of leveraging SBIR/STTR technologies for the MIOES contract for innovation, agility and speed, this new requirement was provided late in the acquisition cycle when many offerors have already completed their teams, not having the benefit of knowing that the Government would levy this very detailed SBIR/STTR requirement. Request the language be written more broadly, while meeting the intent for small businesses under this contract to bring innovation, agility, and speed to the MIOES contract and broader MDS Enterprise. Suggest the following: "Offerors will provide a plan to leverage innovative technologies, services and processes from their small business team for potential adoption for the MIOES contract and broader Missile Defense System. This can be but is not limited to SBIR/STTR projects, internal research and development projects, contract research and development projects, etc."	Not included in this task order (DES)
MIOES_Section_L_DRFP_Final_DRFP_/Section L/Pages 10-11/Lines 376-383 MIOES Question Matrix DRFP Inc2 Answered	"The proposal shall be valid at least 365 calendar days from the proposal due date, and Block 12 will be annotated as such by the Offeror. SPECIAL NOTICE: If an Offeror fails to establish proposal validity of at least 365 calendar days from proposal due date, the proposal may be eliminated from consideration. Prime contractors shall ensure subcontractor proposals submitted directly to the Government do not contain conflicting proposal validity information from the 365 day proposal validity requirement in Block 12 or the proposal may be eliminated from consideration." Increment 3 Q&A: Question/Comment/Recommendation: Section L states that the "validation period of proposal shall be 270 calendar days." The validation period does not align with the planned evaluation period. Recommend extending the validity to align with the planned evaluation period. Government response: "Will change to 540 calendar days."	Please clarify if the validity period is 365 calendar days or 540 calendar days.	This information will be provided in the Bidders Library at a later date as (CUI)

MIOES_Section_L_DRFP_Final_DRFP/Section L/Page 12/Lines 427-431	"Financial Resources Summary: Include documentation to facilitate the PCO's determination that the Offeror has adequate financial resources to perform the contract or ability to obtain them (e.g., a letter of credit from a bank or other applicable information). The information provided shall not be dated earlier than three (3) months from the date of the solicitation."	Will the Government please outline the forms of acceptable financial resource documentation to comply with this requirement? For example, is there a dollar threshold that must be listed in a letter of credit from a bank?	This is subject to the offeror's interpretation. The burden is on the offeror to provide any and all evidence to substantiate their financial resources to perform the contract via whatever documentation they deem sufficient.
MIOES_Section_L_DRFP_Final_DRFP/L.7 Volume 5 - Management and Leadership/Page 9	General - Page Allocation	Will the Government consider increasing the page limit to 40 for Volume 5 to provide adequate discussion of various topics including integration across TOs, innovation, configuration management, quality and mission assurance, risk management, human resources related activities, subcontractor management, change management, solution adoption, etc.	The Government will consider an increase to the page limit.
MIOES_Section_L_DRFP_Final_DRFP/L.12 VOLUME 10 – COST AND PRICE (Factor 8)/Page 19/Line 688			
Attachment_L_10_MIOES_TO_PWS_Enterprise_IT_and_Event_Current_IRES/Cover Page	"The two other PWSs will be released Nov 20, 2024."	It appears the TO PWS's are more in line with Statements of Objectives and Outcomes (SOO's). In order to accurately develop the BOEs to price the TOs such as EITS, C2BMC, and Facilities will MDA please provide additional performance requirement detail including performance metrics and historical data?	The performance data/metrics will be provided in the library that will provide the data required to develop BOEs. The content and format of the PWS's will not change significantly.
MIOES_Section_L_DRFP_Final_DRFP/L.12 VOLUME 10 – COST AND PRICE (Factor 8) and Attachment_L_10_MIOES_TO_PWS_Enterprise_IT_and_Event_Current_IRES/Cover Page	"The two other PWSs will be released Nov 20, 2024."	Recommend providing volumetrics with respect to MIOES EITS TO prior to release of final RFP.	Reached out to vendor via email to clarify what they mean by 'volumetrics'. According to vendor, they're definition of 'volumetrics' is metrics associated with workload, performance, network devices, virtual servers, ticket counts, major events (that need problem resolution), materials, etc. This would appear to be artifacts provided within the bidders library from IC. Rerouting to IC for resolution.
MIOES_Section_L_DRFP_Final_DRFP/L.12 VOLUME 10 – COST AND PRICE (Factor 8) and Attachment_L_10_MIOES_TO_PWS_Enterprise_IT_and_Event_Current_IRES/Cover Page	"The two other PWSs will be released Nov 20, 2024."	Is support of databases servers, middleware, web servers, and application servers the responsibility of the MIOES contractor, and if so what is the number of instances of each?	Yes, the contractor will be responsible to support the databases servers, middleware, web servers, and application servers. The number of instances will be defined in the updated PWS and the bidder's library.
MIOES_Section_L_DRFP_Final_DRFP/L.12 VOLUME 10 – COST AND PRICE (Factor 8) and Attachment_L_10_MIOES_TO_PWS_Enterprise_IT_and_Event_Current_IRES/Cover Page	"The two other PWSs will be released Nov 20, 2024."	Is the support for the EWS M&S cloudaaS included in the MIOES EITS TO? And if so, is the number of servers and hardware included in the 3000 servers or is this in addition to those?	Not included in this task order. It is included in the 7300 Task Order.
MIOES_Section_L_DRFP_Final_DRFP/L.12 VOLUME 10 – COST AND PRICE (Factor 8) and Attachment_L_10_MIOES_TO_PWS_Enterprise_IT_and_Event_Current_IRES/Cover Page	"The two other PWSs will be released Nov 20, 2024."	Please provide the storage metrics and rate of usage growth.	This information will be provided in the Bidders Library at a later date as (CUI)
MIOES_Section_M_DRFP_Final_DRFP/Section M/Page 6/Table M-4 Subfactor Risk Rating Method - Low/Line 183	"...disruption of schedule, increased cost or degradation of performance. Normal contractor emphasis and normal Government monitoring will likely be able to overcome any difficulties."	Understanding the critical importance of evaluating risks for mission support, the evaluation criteria for risks as written is generic and subjective and provides significant advantage to the incumbent, who, after performing under the current contract for 7+ years, has depth of knowledge of the requirements and associated nuances. Suggest as part of evaluating risks, that the Government consider adding evaluation of the offeror's risk management framework and mitigation process and past performance associated with the same.	The government disagrees with the statement that it provides a 'significant advantage to the incumbent'. This is standard language copied from the DoD Source Selection Procedures (Aug 2022). Additionally, past performance will not be evaluated which should help mitigate any perceived incumbent advantage.
MIOES_Section_M_DRFP_Final_DRFP/Section M/Page 11/M.7 Factor 4: Small Business/Line 390	"Specific initiatives and tools (e.g., mentor protege program, use of SBIR/STTR technology) that will be employed under the contract to enhance small business participation and develop small business capabilities both in the instant acquisition and to meet future requirements to be supported by the Missile Defense System industrial base."	Please elaborate how the Government will evaluate this requirement under a "pass/fail" construct. Is the requirement for an offeror's small businesses to participate in both the mentor/protege program AND the SBIR/STTR program? Suggest that an acceptable rating be granted in the case where an offeror's small business team participates in the mentor protégé program or MDA's or the broader DoD SBIR/STTR program or is more broadly developing advanced technology services that provide missile defense applications.	The SBIR/STTR requirement will be removed in the final RFP.
MIOES_Section_M_DRFP_Final_DRFP/Section M/Page 12/M.7 Factor 4: Small Business/Lines 396-418	"c. Small business objectives of significant importance to MDA include: (1) Increase use of qualified small businesses through competition for acquisition of components, parts (includes hardware and software), to enhance readiness and sustainment of the program specified in the contract, (2) Engage small businesses to increase missile defense engagement capability and capacity to outpace emerging threats, to serve as alternative sources, to mitigate risks of single point failures in the supply chain, and to increase the quality of supplies or services for the program specified in the contract. (3) Leverage Small Business Innovation Research (SBMIR) and Small Business Technology Transfer (STTR) program funded technologies with high potential for transition into the program specified in the contract or increase speed of delivery of new capability to address evolving missile threats."	We understand the value that small businesses bring with respect to innovation and agility. While the DoD's SBIR/STTR program is an important program, the topics for submission under this program do not easily lend itself to transition to the MIOES scope. Additionally, this is a requirement that was not communicated in the past and most offerors have already formulated their teams. In addition to the comment above, request the Government consider, especially this late in the process, allowing offerors to satisfy this requirement by providing a small business plan to achieve these goals by broader means, including but not limited to SBIR/STTR, i.e., mentor/protege program and other technologies and services that may have application to this contract and the broader MDS.	This requirement will be removed in the Final RFP.
Attachment_J_01_MIOES_Basic_PWS_Final_Draft_RFP/Section 3.1.12 Positioning, Navigation and Timing (PNT) Resiliency Enhancements/Page 5	"Provide PNT enhancements to improve PNT assurance posture for the Missile Defense System."	Will the MIOES prime be developing PNT enhancements directly (from scratch), or integrating PNT enhancements from other programs/contractors into the MDIOC facility and associated systems?	The MIOES prime will be responsible for providing overall enhancements to PNT customer requirements. The contractor must coordinate with the vendor to supply a viable solution based on customer and infrastructure requirements
Attachment_J_01_MIOES_Basic_PWS_Final_Draft_RFP/Section 5.1/Page 11	General	Does the Government anticipate any classified telework and requisite support for classified terminals?	Premium users only (Senior Level and Critical Positions)
Attachment_J_01_MIOES_Basic_PWS_Final_Draft_RFP/Section 3.2.3/Page 7	"Ensure an integrated, repeatable, scalable, and interoperable IM framework in optimizing agile and secure capabilities to meet mission requirements, maintain full spectrum cyber security resilient capabilities and maintain pace with technological advancements for the following Missile Defense System mission enclaves..."	Are there additional future space program centers that should be considered? Would the future program need added attention during the transition phase?	There are some addition space program requirements that will be identified throughout the life of the MIOES contract. The updated PWS for the Space Systems task order will identify some preliminary studies associated with a new program. Attention to these programs during the phase in period will be limited.

Attachment_J_01_MIOES_Basic_PWS_Final_Draft_RFP/Section 10.1.2/Page 18	"Measurement and Control. The contractor shall monitor, measure, control, and report contract cost, schedule, and performance metrics Standards: • Implement and administer a compliant Earned Value Management System (EVMS) for utilization on all applicable TOs."	Are there any key or weighted EVM metrics / reports that the Government values greater than others? Can the Government provide examples of EVMS CDRL reports that are part of the standard set of deliverables?	The format of the EVMS reports are outlined in the DD1423 (Contract Data Requirement List) that have been included in the RFP.
Attachment_J_01_MIOES_Basic_PWS_Final_Draft_RFP/Section 10.1.3/Page 18	"The contractor shall provide comprehensive and enforceable, collaborative and agile program integration required to establish enterprise level standards in order to seamlessly execute all activities across the MIOES contract."	What level of agile integration has occurred and which areas have been the most challenging?	There has been agile integration and management in the IRES contract. The government, however, is creating more agile related objectives and standards under MIOES. The demand for key/critical personnel resources during high ops tempo periods is a challenge.
Attachment_J_01_MIOES_Basic_PWS_Final_Draft_RFP/Section 10.1.5/Page 19	"Agile Management -The contractor shall develop and implement agile management and leadership principles."	What level of agile management has occurred and which areas have been the most challenging?	There has been agile integration and management in the IRES contract. The government, however, is creating more agile related objectives and standards under MIOES. The demand for key/critical personnel resources during high ops tempo periods is a challenge.
Attachment_J_03_MIOES_PEIP_Final DRFP/Section 7.7.4/QPI Scorecard/Page 17	"The QPI Scorecard, Exhibit 11, is the master score tracking medium for the Final Period and Cumulative Quality Performance Index."	QPI Scorecard, Exhibit 11, is referenced but is not included in the Performance Evaluation and Incentive Plan. Would the Government please provide the QPI Scorecard template?	It should have read, "The QPI Scorecard, Exhibit 5, is the master score...." Any reference to Exhibit 11 has been changed to Exhibit 5.
Attachment_J_03_MIOES_Final_DRFP Various Pages	General	Are any of the Incentive Fee parameters for each TO negotiable when the TO is negotiated (e.g., target cost, split percentage) and can different parameters be used for different TOs?	Yes and yes.
Attachment_J_03_MIOES_PEIP_Final_DRFP	General	The Service Summary Items (SSIs) are not yet identified in the DRFP. Request that MDA provide at least the four SSIs required on all presently identified and future Task Orders prior to releasing the Final RFP to allow Offerors to take those into consideration in developing their responses. Additionally recommend offerors propose TO-specific SSIs for the four priced TOs.	The Phase-In and MDIOC Facility task orders will be FFP so SSI's are not applicable. The C2BMC task order will be CPIF and the government will provide the SSI's in the PWS that will be released with the final RFP. The IT Enterprise Services/IT Service Delivery task order will be a hybrid mix of FFP and CPIF, so SSI's will be identified as appropriate. For this first round, the government will be providing the SSIs.
Attachment_J_03_MIOES_PEIP_Final_DRFP		When does MDA intend to negotiate the Performance Evaluation and Incentive Plan (PEIP), Attachment J-03?	TO-level incentive plans will be negotiated during task order transition period. The PEIP is a general IDIQ-level guiding document.
Attachment_J_07_MIOES_Award_Fee_Plan_Final_DRFP/Page 5	"Under the MIOES contract, an AFP will only be established for those task orders with Award Fee CLINs. This AFP provides the overall framework for the AFP that will be established for applicable task orders. At the time of contract award, there have been no CPAF CLINs established."	It appears that MDA plans to use Award Fee on various TOs. Has there been a consideration of using Award Fee at the IDIQ level? What is the anticipated size of the Award Fee pool percentage-wise?	Performance will only be measured at the task order level.
MIOES Task Order: MDA Facility Infrastructure Projects/ Pages 1-10/Line 274	General - TCR Process [Technical Change Request]	Please provide a copy of any instructions for the TCR.	This is a change management process that is subject to change under MIOES and will be heavily dependent on contract types within the various task orders. In any case, the current TCR process will be provided within bidder's library.
Attachment_L_06_MIOES_Evaluation_Scenarios_Final_DRFP/Page 7/Section D/Line 284	"Developing and designing data solutions for storage and distribution of Space Sensor data coming from Ground Entry Points (GEPs)."	The current system is operating at a collateral level. Is the Government pursuing an operating environment above the current classification?	As part of the on-going MDSEA R&D efforts, the operating environment could go above current classification levels. Advancement and progress are predicated on incremental success.
PWS Attachments L-09, L-10, L-11, L-12	General	The four Task Order PWS's provided in the final draft RFP (Attachments -09, -10, -11, and -12) identify objectives and outcomes and therefore appear to constitute Statements of Objectives (SOO's) more than PWS's. Even taking the PWS's together with the required BOE's, there is insufficient detail to assess how an Offeror would perform the scope of work. Recommend adding additional definition and requirements data to the PWS's and providing performance metrics. Can the Government please address this prior to release of the final RFP?	The final PWSs that will be released, have been refined and should provide sufficient detail on how to perform the scope of work and additional performance data/metrics will be provided in the bidder's library that will enable the offeror to develop BOEs.
Attachment L 09 MIOES TO PWS Phase-In/Page 5/ Paragraph 7.0/Line 94	"The contractor will assume property management and accountability of approximately 125,000 items"	Recommend implementing a phased property inventory process to mitigate the risk of discrepancies and ensure accurate transfer of accountability.	This will be a phased approach that will be performed under the Logistics and Product Support task order. The approach will be discussed and negotiated during the phase-in period as the task order is negotiated.
Attachment_L_11_MIOES_TO_PWS_C2BMC_Current_IRES	General	Please provide the historical volumetrics for network, compute, storage, and operating systems for the MIOES C2BMC environment.	This will be provided in the bidders library.
Attachment L 12 MIOES TO PWS MDIOC Facility Operations and Sustainment, Section 7.4.1, Preventative/Predictive Maintenance/Page 20/Line 320	"Maintain system availability to 99.999 percent for technical power systems and 99.9 percent for both mechanical and non-technical power systems"	Are there specific reporting formats or tools mandated for tracking and demonstrating adherence to these high system availability thresholds?	Just mathematical calculation of captured outage times vs. operational times, and the percentage is reported in the monthly TOSR CDRL.
SF33 Page 66	52.219-9, Small Business Subcontracting Plan, SEP 2023 52.219-9 Alt II, Small Business Subcontracting Plan (SEP 2023) Alternate II, NOV 2016 FAR 52.246-11, Higher-Level Contract Quality Requirement	Both FAR 52.219-9 and FAR 52.219-9 Alternate II are incorporated by reference in the SF33. Which FAR clause should be used, given that the Alternate requires a substitution of language from the original FAR clause?	Researched and applied Alternate II for now.
SF33 Page 68	The Contractor shall comply with the higher-level quality standard(s) listed below. _____[Contracting Officer insert the title, number (if any), date, and tailoring (if any) of the higher-level quality standards.]	Would the Government please incorporate this clause in full text and include the higher-level quality standards, if any?	Deleted clause as it is not applicable to MIOES. Standards to be defined on the TO-level.

SF33 Page 70	DFARS 252.222-7000, Restriction On Employment Of Personnel: (a) The Contractor shall employ, for the purpose of performing that portion of the contract work in _____, individuals who are residents thereof and who, in the case of any craft or trade, possess or would be able to acquire promptly the necessary skills to perform the contract.	Would the Government please incorporate this clause in full text and include the location of contract work that is applicable, if any?	Deleted clause as it is not applicable to MIOES. There are several locations around the world that the MIOES contract will be applicable to.
SF33 Page 76	252.215-7012 REQUIREMENTS FOR SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS VIA ELECTRONIC MEDIA (JAN 2018) The Offeror shall submit the cost portion of the proposal via the following electronic media: [____ Insert media format, e.g., electronic spreadsheet format, electronic mail, etc.] (End of provision)	Would the Government please update the fill-in portion of this clause with the desired electronic media format for cost proposal submission?	Filled in Microsoft Excel and Word to be the acceptable formats for cost proposals.
SF33 Page 76	252.217-7001 SURGE OPTION (DEC 2018) (a) "General." The Government has the option to -- (1) Increase the quantity of supplies or services called for under this contract by no more than ____percent or ____ [____ insert quantity and description of services or supplies to be increased]; and/or	Would the Government please update the fill-in portion of this clause with the percent or quantity maximum of supplies or services?	Not necessary for MIOES. Not currently in IRES IDIQ. Deleted this clause.
SF33 Section I	General	There are many clauses in the SF33 that are incorporated by reference but require the Contracting Officer to fill in information that are only incorporated by reference. Would the Government please review these clauses and either incorporate them in full text, or remove them as referenced clauses? Examples: 52.217-8, Option To Extend Services 52.217-9, Option To Extend The Term Of The Contract 52.222-2, Payment for Overtime Premiums. 52.223-9, Estimate of Percentage of Recovered Material Content for EPA-Designated Items. 52.246-11 Higher-Level Contract Quality Requirement	52.217-8, Filled in and incorporated by full text 52.217-9, Deleted. Not applicable to MIOES, not currently in IRES contract 52.222-2, Filled in and incorporated by full text 52.223-9, Filled in and incorporated by full text 52.246-11, Deleted. Not applicable to MIOES, not currently in IRES contract.
Remote Site List from the Bidder's Library		For each OCONUS site listed in the Remote Site List from the Bidder's Library, can the Government clarify whether full time equivalent support is required or whether the support is limited to on-call, as needed support? Can the Government provide clarity related to the scope of work required for each of the OCONUS sites?	All remote sites do not have on-site personnel. Any degradation or loss of service at the site will be addressed in accordance with the site up-time requirements. Core site personnel address issues through remote log-in troubleshooting. Fort Greely, PMRF, Vandenberg AFB, Kirtland AFB, and Guam are the only sites (CONUS/OCONUS) with on-site personnel.
Industry Day Slides Attachment_J_04_MIOES_GFP_List		In the slides from the morning session of the Industry Day there is a chart showing the number of laptops and other equipment, however in Attachment_J_04_MIOES_GFP_List there is a different number. Which of these two is authoritative?	The Attachment_J_04_MIOES_GFP_List is the authoritative source. However, the briefing may have information not yet updated in the source document. (The government will provide the most current source document in the Bidder's Library with the release of the RFP)
		Shall offerors assume that the hours for the four task orders are EXCLUSIVE of the notional hours provided in Attachment_L_04 Notional Requirements EPW? Or do the hours in the cost roll up assume all 30 TOs under this IDIQ?	No, the notional requirements are inclusive of all potential requirements through the life of the contract. The four TOs are a subset of the requirements.
MIOES_DRFP_SF33		How and when will the ceiling price for each CLIN be determined? What is the max and min incentive fee a contractor should assume for CPIF and FPFI CLINs?	All necessary information will be provided in the Final RFP.
Section L, L.12-A	Budget/Maximum Ceiling Values are provided below for the three task orders associated with Attachments L-10, L-11, and L-12. A Budget/Maximum Ceiling Value is NOT provided for the Phase-in task order (Attachment L-09). If an Offeror's proposal is above the Budget/Maximum Ceiling Value provided for any one of the task orders (Attachments L-10, L-11, and L-12), their proposal will be considered as unaffordable, rendering it non-compliant and ineligible for award. ***Budget values will be provided prior to final RFP release***	When will the Government provide the budgetary estimates for the three task orders as a part of the 80% TEP?	ASAP but no later than Final RFP release. We hope to release that information in a revised DRFP release.
Section L, L.12-E	Proposed average direct labor rates that are less than the provided benchmarks will be considered unrealistic unless they are supported by an FPRA with mapping to the RFP labor categories and locations, demonstrating the FPRA category meets the requirement of the RFP LCAT. The Government will make cost realism adjustments to the proposed direct labor rates up to the benchmark rate unless the FPRA substantiating documentation is proposed. This adjustment will be reflected in the Offeror's total evaluated price.	Will the government confirm that for offerors who do not have an FPRA, an FPRR or FPRP will suffice to substantiate rates that may be lower than the benchmarks?	FPRR and FPRP are not acceptable without further justification.
MIOES_Question_Matrix_DRFP_inc2_ANSWERED Att L_05 MIOES Task Order EPW	The government is not going to dictate education or years of experience. We want the most qualified personnel and while education and experience can sometimes play a factor, we don't want to arbitrarily define boundaries when they are not always accurate. We expect the contractor to have the capability to determine who is qualified.	Given the response in Q&A that no education and/or years of experience will be provided for the LCATs, how will the Government ensure that a fair comparison between offerors will be made and that offerors are proposing personnel that meet the qualifications assumed in the Government benchmark rates	Section L will be modified to request offeror provide their LCAT justification in the BOE's for the awardable task orders.
		Will the USG please clarify profit/fee for materials input in the Att L_05 TO EPW?	Clarification will be provided in the Final RFP.

Attachment_L_06_MIOES_Evaluation_Scenarios_Final_D RFP.pdf; p.2, lines 67-68	Managing resources and demonstrating in real-time your ability to meet the 24/7/365 67 requirement	Please define "resources". Does this refer to the labor or material required to meet the 24/7/365 requirements. If the questions is referring to material, please provide a network diagram and bill of material so the offeror can propose a compatible solution	Resource management is the process of enhancing efficiency and guiding the use of such project-critical resources as employees, equipment, and tools. Personnel resources must monitor and maintain network availability through monitoring tools available to the current GNOSC. Offeror shall present a cost-effective solution capable of providing status on hardware critical to providing customers with MDA access. Clarification will be provided in the Final RFP
Attachment_L_06_MIOES_Evaluation_Scenarios_Final_D RFP.pdf; p.2, line 70	Monitoring resources real-time	Please define "resources" and/or provide a volumetrics table (manpower, devices, tools, services)?	Resource management is the process of enhancing efficiency and guiding the use of such project-critical resources as employees, equipment, and tools. Personnel resources must monitor and maintain network availability through monitoring tools available to the current GNOSC. Offeror shall present a cost-effective solution capable of providing status on hardware critical to providing customers with MDA access. Network topology to be provided in the bidder's library along with HW/SW list Clarification will be provided in the Final RFP
Attachment_L_06_MIOES_Evaluation_Scenarios_Final_D RFP.pdf; p.06, lines 281-282	The Offer shall propose their approach to and understanding of 1. Designing and developing solutions of the future MDSEA in the MDA environment.	Can you provide details on the specific performance and integration objectives for the future MDSEA solutions within the MDA environment, including any technological, operational, or security constraints that need to be considered during the design and development phases?	The performance and integration objectives for near-term MDSEA solutions within the MDA environment are in the current MDSEA task order 25F4100. The specific performance and integration objectives for MDSEA solutions two years from now are not defined. A lot depends on the continued success of the MDSEA functionality and the needs and priorities of the MDA Director.
Attachment_L_06_MIOES_Evaluation_Scenarios_Final_D RFP.pdf; p.8, lines 303-306, 326-327, 328-330	"...ensuring effective CM in a dynamic environment is a very difficult challenge and requires a concerted effort". "Technical Baseline exists in authoritative data sources that may not be integrated or digitally aligned". (interacting with a technical contractor) "during the ERB process...updating their authoritative data sources".	Can the Government clarify whether the scope here is essentially maintaining current ERB approach and data sources, or includes improvements or innovation of that (e.g., based on Basic PWS 10.1.6/10.1.7)?	The contractor should evaluate and write to the scenario based on what they recommend as the best technical solution.
Attachment_L_06_MIOES_Evaluation_Scenarios_Final_D RFP.pdf; p.8, lines 309-314, 318-320, 334-336, & 340. Section M 2A	"facility control activities...do not...fall within the scope of..." (directive, instruction, process, plan), "because the facility work covered by the MDIOC ERB does not change or control any Element or Component of the Missile Defense System...". "This reconfiguration requires both facility (physical infrastructure) and IT (network connectivity and individual workstations) support." "...ensure the project meets facility standards (both IT and infrastructure)..."	Can the Government clarify what parts of facility changes that may impact mission-oriented infrastructure (such as Missile Defense System IT applications) are subject to standard ERB processes, policy, and guidance, and are not (by virtue of governance instructions not being applicable).	From the MDIOC ERB Charter: MDIOC ERB ENTRANCE CRITERIA: The MDIOC ERB will review all projects that meet any of the following criteria: 1. Efforts that require an MDA Form 80 within the MDIOC and an installation or modification effort that would affect any aspect of the MDIOC architecture, systems, or facilities baselines. 2. Any installation or modification effort that would affect any aspect of the MDIOC architecture, systems, or facilities baselines. 2-Letter space allocation falls within this criteria.
Attachment_L_06_MIOES_Evaluation_Scenarios_Final_D RFP.pdf; p.2, lines 68-69	reliability and redundancy in providing services to end users.	Please define all end user services to be covered under this scenario	The agency provides end-user services and service delivery to nearly 11,000 users across the enterprise. This includes endpoints into DIB partner and remote sites. Services include ULAN and CLAN end user service such as Zero/thin clients, desktops, laptops, and associated peripherals. Not every end-point is a standard solution and may require some customization based upon user footprint and customer needs.
Attachment_L_06_MIOES_Evaluation_Scenarios_Final_D RFP.pdf; p.9, line 346	"Isolating and protecting no-fail missions during project implementation"	Can the Government clarify whether line 346 includes what used to be scope under the Event Protection Scenario in Increment 3, or different scope?	The activities are related, but not identical. For example, if you have a proposed project being adjudicated by the ERB- does the project schedule deconflict with ongoing missile defense systems operations and test? Does the proposed work impact any assets that are planned to support operations and test (for example) activities?
Attachment_L_06_MIOES_Evaluation_Scenarios_Final_D RFP.pdf; p.11, lines 415-429	Regarding approach and understanding of task order, stakeholder, and functional area integration; contracting requirements, and agile PM.	Can the Government clarify whether the Scenario approach and understanding should only reflect the specifics asked for (integration, contracting, and PM) or should also include the requests given in the Background section? Depending on this scope, the approach suggested may vary considerably.	Respond to only the specifics asked for in paragraphs 1, 2, 3.
Attachment_L_06_MIOES_Evaluation_Scenarios_Final_D RFP.pdf; p.2, lines 68-69	reliability and redundancy in providing services to end users.	Please define the required reliability and redundancy. Please also provide a complete site list, bill of material, and network topology diagrams to allow the offeror to provide an enterprise wide solution	Availability is 3 9's. Offeror shall present a cost-effective solution capable of providing status on hardware critical to providing customers with MDA access. Network topology to be provided in the bidder's library along with HW/SW list
Attachment_L_06_MIOES_Evaluation_Scenarios_Final_D RFP.pdf; p.2, line 74-75	ensuring cybersecurity is integrated throughout.	Is the government referring to cybersecurity processes related to the Risk Management Framework/NIST 800-53, or they referring to the infrastructure (firewall, IDS, etc.) needed to provide it.	Yes. The implementation of the security controls early within a systems lifecycle is the most cost-effective means (Baking it in). Basically, building it in and maintaining it is much more beneficial than trying to implement security as an after-thought or often referred to as "Bolting it on". AND securing the architecture by implementing the layered protections and defenses necessary to protect the system throughout it's lifecycle based upon the evolution of threat/risks and environment changes.

Attachment_L_06_MIOES_Evaluation_Scenarios_Final_D RFP.pdf; p.01, lines 13-13	Offerors are encouraged to propose 11 innovative solutions and approaches that will enable and drive efficiencies.	Does the Government possess any metrics or indicators related to these efficiencies or improvements, and if so, can it share them, perhaps in a Bidder's Library? If not, is it open to contractors proposing KPIs/KSAs and related metrics for the proposed efficiencies and improvements?	The reference to optimization and efficiencies are meant to be general statements, not in reference to a specific KPI/KSA baseline. We will look into seeing if there are metrics that we can share. Offerors can propose KPIs/KSAs and related metrics.
MIOES_Section_L_DRFP_Final_DRFP_, L2 PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS, C, page 6	The Government requires proposal submissions be conducted via the PIEE Solicitation Module for unclassified proposals.	For submission, are there any file size limitations?	Through PIEE the size limitation if 1.9GB per file. Unlimited files
MIOES_Section_L_DRFP_Final_DRFP_, L2 PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS, K, page 8	Graphics may be embedded within text in either 8.5x11 page size, or 11x17 page size.	May we also use 11x8.5 (landscape) that counts as one page?	Yes. IAW the instructions for graphics.
MIOES_Section_L_DRFP_Final_DRFP_, L2 PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS, M, page 8	With the exception of cost/price, all proposal volumes shall be submitted in Microsoft Word to allow evaluators to search documents.	May we submit files in searchable PDF files rather than MS Word files?	No. PDF is not an acceptable format.
MIOES_Section_L_DRFP_Final_DRFP_, L2 PROPOSAL PREPARATION INSTRUCTIONS, O, page 8	The Master Table of Contents contained in Volume 1 does not count against the page limitations for the respective volumes.	Are the Table of Contents in Volumes 2 through 10 outside page count?	Any Table of Contents pages will not count towards page count.
Attachment_L_06_MIOES_Evaluation_Scenarios_Final_D RFP.pdf; p.06, lines 237-241	"MDSEA shall have the capability to support a space sensor data volume of 60 TB / 237 day from all data sources. 238 2. Space sensor data retention requirements range from 1-year minimum for all data, 3 - 239 6 years for data that can support cybersecurity incident investigations, to 7 years for a 240 limited amount of authentication records."	"Can the Government clarify whether the data capability is to be provided by the Government organization itself, or is it expected that the supporting contractor supplies this capability?"	Currently, the Government provides the on-site space for space sensor data retention and the current contractor acquires the hardware and software capabilities for MDSEA to meet the needs for data retention. With the advancements in Cloud technology to retain data it will likely become more cost effective for the supporting contractor to supply Cloud based data retention solutions.
Att 09, 10, 11, and 12	Cover Pages	Can the USG please clarify the contract types for TOs Phase In, EIT, C2BMC, and Facility Ops?	That clarification will be provided in the Final RFP.
DRFP SF 33	H-38b. b. No Fee/Profit on Travel, Other Direct Costs (ODC), material, Subcontractor fee, or Commercial Items as defined in FAR 2.101. Examples of ODC include, but are not limited to: renewable licenses, leases, consultants, special tooling, and royalties. Examples of material include but are not limited to: equipment, hardware and spares/repair parts. In calculating total fee/profit, the Contractor shall exclude travel, ODC, material, Subcontractor fee and commercial item costs from its total cost pool. This limitation shall flow down to subcontractors.	Would the Government please confirm that the language in H-38b is incorrect and fee is allowable on materials and ODCs (with the exception of refresh)?	H-38 will be revised to state fee is allowable on some materials and ODCs (with the exception of tech refresh items and Travel).
MIOES Section L, L.12.B	Minor Subcontractors are not required to provide a Cost/Price Volume to the Government unless the combination of the Prime Offeror and Major Subcontractor EPWs fail to support 80% as proposed by the Offeror. If the 80% threshold is not met, then the Prime Offeror shall designate some number of the largest Minor Subcontractor(s) to submit a Cost/Price Volume to the Government until the 80% threshold is met. These designated Minor Subcontracts are considered Major Subcontracts for the purpose of this solicitation. The Government may request additional Minor Subcontractor cost data as required.	Given the 40% subcontracting language, it is unlikely that Primes and major subcontractors will comprise 80% of the TVC. The requirements to submit a full cost volume with all supporting documentation and EPW are burdensome for SBs. Would the Government consider removing the requirement for the offeror to designate minor subcontractors as major?	The requirement has been removed.
MDIOC Facility Operations & Sustainment/Line 115	"Comply with the MDA and MDIOC Facility Systems Engineering Plans (SEP)"	Are the MDIOC Facility Systems Engineering Plans generated by the Schriever SFB CES, or does the MIOES contractor provide such facilities engineering services for this contract?	Schriever SFB CES does not provide anything for the MDIOC. Everything is developed and managed by the current IRES contractor and it will be the same for the MIOES contractor.
MDIOC Facility Operations & Sustainment - General	General	What level/scope of Engineering Services must the MIOES contractor perform?	The MIOES contractor engineering services include designs, engineering analysis, and project oversight.
MDIOC Facility Operations & Sustainment/Line 168	"continuous status through an automated dashboard"	Is the automated dashboard Government-provided and does it exist now, or is it Contractor-provided and must it be newly developed for this TO?	This capability doesn't currently exist and the contractor will develop and deliver this capability.
MDIOC Facility Operations & Sustainment/Line 181	"The contractor shall utilize a computerized maintenance management system [CMMS], as an authoritative data source, that will integrate a work control approach to create, schedule, approve, estimate, document, track, and monitor all MDIOC Facility requirements from inception to closeout."	Per previous answer to question 58 (see MIOES_Question_Matrix_DRFP_Inc3_ANSWERED), is the current Maximo CMMS owned by the current IRES contractor or the Government? If contractor-furnished, how many licenses/seats does the Government require for its use?	The current CMMS licenses are pay for by the Govt. but managed (software upgrades, etc.) by the contractor. However, the MIOES contractor may bring their own solution.
Basic PWS/Section 3.1.8 TO: MDIOC Facility Operations & Sustainment/Line 320	"Maintain system availability to 99.999 percent for technical power systems..."	The Basic PWS, Section 3.1.8 requires that the contractor "Perform Tier III Cybersecurity Roles and Functions services." A Tier III data center requires an expected uptime of 99.982% which is slightly lower than the 99.999% specified in the TO. Is the MDIOC data center a Tier III level facility?	The MDIOC is not a data center. The MDIOC houses numerous tenants that require high levels of reliability. The MIOES contractor will be expected to provide tech power with 5 x 9s of reliability.
MDIOC Facility Operations & Sustainment/Lines 322-323	"Maintain daily situational awareness of facility maintenance and complete via self-reporting CMMS work orders."	Please define "self-reporting CMMS work orders."	Work orders that were created by the facility team. If someone in the MDIOC reports a hole in a wall and submits a ticket, that is not self-reported. If a FOM tech notices a hole and the wall and develops a work order, then fixes the hole, that is self-reporting.
MDIOC Facility Operations & Sustainment/Line 332	"Achieve a 3 percent reduction in PMs per contract year."	According to question #93 (see MIOES_Question_Matrix_DRFP_Inc3_ANSWERED), the Government will consider removing the 3% reduction per year in PMs for a better alternative. Would the Government consider allowing implementation of Condition-Based Maintenance (CBM) as a proactive maintenance strategy that monitors the actual condition of equipment to determine when maintenance should be performed? The requirement could require a baseline analysis at contract start, followed by semi-annual analyses/reports to substantiate the effectiveness of CBM.	This requirement was removed.
MDIOC Facility Operations & Sustainment/Line 333	"Execute PM activities within 110% of industry performance standards."	The term "within 110% of industry performance standards" is unclear. Industry performance standards will vary depending on type of equipment, preventive or predictive maintenance task steps required, labor hours expended, and results achieved. Please clarify.	Industry performance standards are in accordance with RS Means. The PWS will be modified to reflect this.
MDIOC Facility Operations & Sustainment/Line 333	"Execute PM activities within 110% of industry performance standards."	The previous answer to question 60 (see MIOES_Question_Matrix_DRFP_Inc3_ANSWERED) regarding defined metrics in RS Means does not explain "PM activities within 110% of industry performance standards." Does this mean that PMs can be executed at 100% of RS Means standard and still be acceptable? Please clarify.	Yes. For example, 100% of a 60 mins task is 60 mins. 110% of a 60 min task is 66 mins. Therefore, doing a 60 min task in 66 mins or less is meeting the standard.
MDIOC Facility Operations & Sustainment/Lines 340-342	"This process shall lead to the development of a culture of frequency-based and intrusive Preventive Maintenance (PM) to a culture of Predictive Maintenance (PdM)."	Can it be assumed that a "culture of Predictive Maintenance (PdM)" does not currently exist at MDIOC and must be developed during the MIOES contract?	It is under development by IRES, but the MIOES contractor will need to develop their own RCM program that utilized Predictive Maintenance strategies as much as possible.
MDIOC Facility Operations & Sustainment/Lines 351-352	"Perform RCM analyses and develop system-specific maintenance plans using the MDIOC system-specific RAM requirements."	Do MDIOC system-specific RAM requirements currently exist, or must they be developed as part of the migration to a PdM program and culture?	RAM requirements are developed by this Task Order.
MDIOC Facility Operations & Sustainment/Lines 411-413	"Update CMMS and the DoD BUILDER Sustainment Management System (SMS) with the results of each assessment no later than 30 working days after the assessment is completed."	Will the Government please provide the current BUILDER SMS database for the MDIOC facilities in order for offerors to assess current facilities and equipment asset conditions?	This will be provided in the bidders library.

MDIOC Facility Operations & Sustainment/Line 477	"Maintain a master access control database"	Is this key control/locksmith/safe management master access control database an existing Government-provided database, or is this a contractor-provided database?	Contractor provided database.
Attachment J-04, GFP List	GFP List	The current listing appears only to address the IT function(s) and not the Facilities O&M requirements. Will the Government release the list of tools currently used under IRES for Facility O&M with the Final RFP?	Yes
Attachment L-6 MIOES Evaluation Scenarios Final DRFP	All of the scenarios	Does MDA plan to provide a list of Government furnished equipment (i.e., tools to be used in the Scenarios) as a RFP attachment or within the bidder's library?	No additional GFE/GFP list will be provided specifically for the scenarios. Any specific question about a tool can be asked prior to the release of the final RFP.
Attachment L-6 MIOES Evaluation Scenarios Final DRFP / Lines 358-361	Scenario 3: MDIOC Facility Operations	Will MDA provide hypothetical or actual floor plans of the 5,000 sf area to be renovated, showing items to be demolished/removed, location of Opens Center new video wall, locations/areas for new cubicles, number of personnel per cubicle, etc? This information is critical for offerors to accurately answer Sections D.2.a-D.2.d.	Not necessary to answer the questions presented for the scenario.
Attachment L-6 MIOES Evaluation Scenarios Final DRFP / Lines 363-369	Scenario 3: MDIOC Facility Operations	Will MDA provide information on existing UPS, including size, configuration, location, existing and available conduit routing (for power for new Opns Center equipment and workstations)? Also, will MDA provide information on location on existing breaker section, including size, location, configuration, available space, conduit, etc.?	Not necessary to answer the questions presented for the scenario.
Attachment L-6 MIOES Evaluation Scenarios Final DRFP / Lines 370-377	Scenario 3: MDIOC Facility Operations	Is there an Automatic Transfer Switch available in the Scenario 3 area that can be employed in the redesign/reconfiguration needed for this renovation? Because there "is no documentation to determine the configuration of the(e) legacy equipment which constitutes approximately 75% of the facility," would MDA consider sponsoring a detailed analysis/configuration description exercise in order to upgrade facility engineering drawings and understanding for future upgrades and projects?	There is currently an analysis underway to increase confidence in the electrical technical baseline. We are anticipating that this will not be complete by the time MIOES comes on board.
Attachment L-6 MIOES Evaluation Scenarios Final DRFP / Lines 378-385	Scenario 3: MDIOC Facility Operations	What is the expected new heat load, based on newly added equipment and personnel? Will the MDA provide floor plans showing existing AHU and existing ductwork that must be demolished, the routing of new ductwork, including through the existing SCIF? In addition to the new AHU, will new, more powerful air conditioning unit(s) such as higher capacity CRACs be required in addition to the more robust AHU? These questions will have an impact on offeror's ability to effectively identify and plan for contingencies (e.g., Section B.7) and for coordinating for numerous outages (Section B.8).	Drawings are not available. This is a realistic scenario, however it is fictitious.
Attachment J-01 MIOES Basic Pws Final Draft RFP / Section 3.3.1 and Attachment J-04 MIOES GFP List	PWS states in part "Execute a Preventive Maintenance Program." The PWS further requires the contractor to "Provide a reliable infrastructure supporting mission-critical Missile Defense System activities (and) a clean, safe, and environmentally responsible (and reliable building) infrastructure, (m) maintain a high level of appearance standards, and (p) provide emergency infrastructure to support operations during contingencies." However, the GFP listing, Equipment tab, contains only IT-related items like switches, routers, monitors, laptops, printers, DVD burners, telephones, etc. Similarly, the Material tab contains expendable materials for IT-related work and handtools that lend themselves to IT-related work. There are no facilities infrastructure assets from which to build a comprehensive preventive (PM)/predictive (PdM)/Reliability Centered (RCM) maintenance program.	Will the MDA provide a comprehensive listing of facilities assets, such as air conditioning systems and components (chillers, CRACs, AHUs, VAVs, recirculating pumps, cooling towers, water treatment systems), plumbing systems and components (pumps, vales, piping, drinking fountains, restroom fixtures), dining facility equipment (freezers, refrigerators, coolers, steam tables, disposals, dishwashers, grease traps), electrical systems and components (panel boards, exit and emergency lighting, high voltage substations, transformers, circuit breakers, disconnects, exterior lighting (wall mounted, pole mounted, walkway, etc.), and all other typical facilities O&M related systems and components? These asset listings are crucial for determining the make-up of the preventive maintenance program, building a comprehensive program, and helping to capture facility condition assessment (FCA) data in BUILDER SMS in a reliable manner that allows for effective future planning and design.	Yes, this is provided in the Bidders Library.
3.3.3 Supply Chain Operations page 8; 6.0 Predominate MDA Facilities pages 13 - 16 Att_12 MIOES TO PWS MDIOC Facility Ops and Sustainment	Perform supply chain operations in Colorado Springs, Huntsville, and Fort Belvoir areas in government provided facilities that includes warehouse and receiving area operations such as inspection and acceptance, packaging, shipping, receiving, ground handling, storage, distribution, transportation and inventory management. General	3.3 requires supply chain operations at Colorado Springs, Huntsville and Fort Belvoir. 6.0 indicates MDA contract operations at additional sites Alaska, California, Virginia, Hawaii, and OCONUS/Puerto Rico. Do the supply chain operations described in 3.3 extend to the additional locations identified in 6.0? What historical IRES TOs (F8004, F8600, and F8900) scope will be covered in the Att 12 MIOES PWS scope?	PHS&T support services will be required at the 4 Core MDA Locations and PHS&T support services will also be performed by non-logistics personnel at non-core locations and there will not be a requirement to have a logistic support facility stood up or personnel assigned at any non-core MDA location. With variances being site standup or decommissioning as directed by the government. The list of applicable sites will be included in the Bidders Library. This attachment covers the scope of work that is currently performed under F8004.
Section L - DRFP Page 17 / PP. L8 Volume 6 0 Small Business Factor 4 / Line 617	The Small Business Goals for MIOES are as follows: Small Business Socioeconomic Program Goal Small Business 40% Small Disadvantaged Business 6% Women-Owned Small Business 6% HUBZone Small Business 2% Veteran-Owned Small Business 11% Service-Disabled Veteran-Owned Small Business 10%	Are the small business goals measured as % of Total Contract Value or Total Subcontracted Value?	Total Contract Value.
Attachment_L_04_MIOS_Notional Requirements_EPW	Cost Roll-Up Tab	The formula in the Total column does not contain the values GFY10.	The formula has been fixed.