

AFPEO/BES Vendor Exchange Workshop

System Sustainment PWS Template Discussion #2

Ardis B. Hearn, Acting DoE
Enterprise Services Division

17 July 2012



I'd love to see the PWS on this one!

Purpose/Objectives

- Clarify the role of the Template
- Provide Summary of Feedback from Workshop#1
- Discuss Feedback Topics
- Identify areas to continue to work
- Discussion/Q&As

Role of the template

- ID/IQ Level PWS Templates – USAF
 - Instructions Provided
 - Details must be inserted
 - Tailorable – only applicable requirements, deliverables, performance measures remain
 - Deliverables/Performance Measurements/Standards in Guide
 - Certifications cannot be higher than ID/IQ
- Organizational Specific Templates – PEO
 - Add more details on filling in requirements, deliverables, performance measures, evaluation approach, etc
 - Each requirement will be worked/tailored by individual program MFT

Summary of feedback

- Clearly define requirements
 - Context/Background
 - System scale/scope/priorities/artifacts
 - Use cases/Architectures (As-Is and To-Be)
 - Deliverables/CLINS/Contract Type
 - Performance Measures
- Send out Draft RFPs
- Improve Communication between Vendors & MFT
- Provide Basis of Estimate Information/Tools
- RFP Process Suggestions

Discussion Items

- Clearly define requirements & scope/scale of work
 - “As-Is” and “To-Be” (if applicable)
- Architecture Views, Use-Cases, Detailed Information (number of screens/inputs, database tables, keys, code info, reports, etc)
- Separate Functional from Non-Functional (System) Requirements
- Provide more context per requirement
 - Requirement priority
 - Requirement objective
 - Stakeholder affected

Discussion Items

- Clearly define requirements & scope/scale of work
 - More initial Background Information
 - Top down Context starting with Mission perspective
 - Customer's Vision/Objectives
 - Strategy
 - Governance
 - Stakeholders
 - Environment

Discussion Items

- Clearly define requirements & scope/scale of work
- Innovation vs. Risk Trade-Space – Industry cannot effectively consider potential innovation until all the above is thoroughly understood. We recommend Government provide the following to assist Industry consideration for innovation:
 - Innovation Focus Areas – What areas does the customer hope to achieve innovations and what are their priority of desire?
 - Risk Table – one cannot propose innovation without considering risk. Government should provide their assessment of risk areas so Industry can propose appropriate innovations. The following table should be provided for each TO RFP:

Risk	Concern	Customer's Risk Tolerance (high, medium, low)

Discussion Items

- CLINS – The issue is ensuring the Task Order uses the right contract type. Fixed Price is the preferred type. The guidance for the CLIN structure is clearly provided in the User’s Guide. Provide B tables if applicable.

Base Period (3-yr)	Option Period 1 (1-yr)	Option Period 2 (1-yr)	Option Period 3 (1-yr)	Option Period 4 (1-yr)	Description	Pricing
0010	1010	2010	3010	4010	Network Centric Solutions	Firm Fixed Price (FFP)
0020	1020	2020	3020	4020	Network Centric Solutions	Cost
0030	1030	2030	3030	4030	Network Centric Services	Labor Hour (LH)
0040	1040	2040	3040	4040	Data	Firm Fixed Price (FFP)
0050	1050	2050	3050	4050	Warranty	Firm Fixed Price (FFP)
0060	1060	2060	3060	4060	Other Direct Costs (ODC)	Cost
0070	1070	2070	3070	4070	Travel	Cost
0080	1080	2090	3090		NetCents-2 Post Award Conference	Firm Fixed Price (FFP)
		2080**	3080**		Small Business Graduate Data Submission	Included in CLIN 2010, 2020, 2030, 3010, 3020 or 3030

Discussion Items

- DIDs/CDRLs– Instructions in User’s Guide.

Sequence Number	Data Item Description	Title
A027	DI-IPSC-81427A	Software Development Plan (SDP)
A028	DI-IPSC-81428A	Software Installation Plan (SIP)
A029	DI-IPSC-81429A	Software Transition Plan (STRP)
A030	DI-IPSC-81430A	Operational Concept Description (OCD)
A031	DI-IPSC-81431A	System/Subsystem Specification (SSS)
A032	DI-IPSC-81432A	System/Subsystem Design Description (SSDD)
A033	DI-IPSC-81433A	Software Requirements Specification (SRS)
A034	DI-IPSC-81434A	Interface Requirements Specification (IRS)
A035	DI-IPSC-81435A	Software Design Description (SDD)
A036	DI-IPSC-81436A	Interface Design Description (IDD)
A037	DI-IPSC-81437A	Database Design Description (DBDD)
A038	DI-IPSC-81438A	Software Test Plan (STP)
A039	DI-IPSC-81439A	Software Test Description (STD)
A040	DI-IPSC-81440A	Software Test Report (STR)
A041	DI-IPSC-81441A	Software Product Specification (SPS)
A042	DI-IPSC-81442A	Software Version Description (SVD)
A043	DI-IPSC-81443A	Software User Manual (SUM)
A044	DI-IPSC-81444A	Software Center Operator Manual (SCOM)

Discussion Items

- Performance Measures – Industry best practices listed in User’s Guide for customer to select from/tailor if applicable. Here are additional from Workshop Feedback:

Legacy systems are sustained without periods of prolonged degradation	Monthly Review
Complex software problems are isolated and resolved	Monthly Review
Backlog of deficiencies do not exceed an average of XX (for example pick an appropriate number such as 50 for that particular project) between releases.	Monthly Review
Mean time to assess (MTTA) and mean time to repair (MTTR) for deficiency reports. Choose an appropriate number for each for the project such as 24 hours for category 1, 48 for category 2, etc. and something like 3 business days MTTR for category 1, 15 business days for category 2, and so on.).	Monthly Review
Defect density of repaired code delivered for deficiency repairs and enhancements from BCRs. This should be expressed in average defects per FP or KSLOC.	Monthly Review
Improvement and technology refresh of the application. This should be expressed in percentage of defect density improvement for code and reduction in maintainable code for using new technologies such as code generators.	Monthly Review
Application enhancement performance. This should be expressed in new Function points delivered and function points touched for BCR improvements.	Monthly Review

Discussion Items

○ Send out Draft RFPs

- Have a stakeholder meeting to draft RFP release to gain solid understanding of requirements –*Government could have an Industry Day with Q&A open to all potential bidders – suggest after DRFP and before final RFP*
- Do not cut off discussions until final RFP is sent—*Government must share information with all potential bidders so discussions cannot be totally free and informal*

○ Improve Communication between Vendors & MFT

- Establish a website for collaboration on the requirements
 - Allow anonymous chat
- Would also be helpful if bidder's libraries were consistently made available during the draft RFP stage
- Utilize a more efficient system of record to handle, store and distribute RFP/RFQ opportunities.
- If a system such as AFWay were to be used, it would be helpful for a more descriptive RFP/RFQ name– Agree and Instructions are in User's Guide

Feedback From 1st Workshop

○ Provide Basis of Estimate

- Having a clearly defined BOE will reduce risk and reduce overall price. It would be helpful if the Government would provide the following to assist offerors development of their solutions, BOE and ultimate price:
 - Effective sizing metrics—*SLOC, FPs, Complexity, etc?*
 - Government Independent Cost Estimate (ICE) assumptions—*Share assumptions on what tools/licenses/operational environment used*
 - The Government ICE when possible—*Did not know this was ever possible; have seen budgets/funding provided in PWS*
 - If Government ICE cannot be provided, identify the specific tools utilized to develop the ICE

Feedback From 1st Workshop

○ RFP Process Suggestions

- When posting efforts, bidders are more responsive when something is out for bid for 3-5 weeks. The size and scope will drive the complexity of the bid but if industry has a 2-3 week period to bid, it is possible that we will not have time to pull a competitive bid together
- Suggestion on format: Recommend the Government issue RFPs in editable PDF and in native format (word, excel) so vendors can allocate the elements of the RFP to the right team members . When documents are scanned, they are rendered as images vice text. This format makes it harder for industry to handle and delays response.

Feedback From 1st Workshop

All of these are addressed in the User's Guide and are tailorable:
Additional Information: Suggest the following information also be included with RFP release:

Training/Certification requirements

DoD 8570.01-M requirements

Workload projections (projected labor hours or FTEs)

Government Furnished Equipment/Items (GFE/GFI)

Any DoD or Air Force relevant guidance

Available requirements documents (i.e., CONOPS, VDD, CDD, etc.)

Security requirements (include Draft DD Form 254 as required)



Challenges

- Keeping up with IT Policies/Guidance over time
- Making this a template that a user has to think through and document individual requirements and not just take it whole
- Giving enough information so that contractors can gauge the scope/scale of the effort so it can be priced—but not so much that there is no discrimination and all proposals are exactly the same
- Making sure it is performance based to a level that makes sense
- Requiring appropriate types and amounts of deliverables
- Ensure the system can be sustained by any qualified contractor
- Ensuring all compliance guidance is complete and clear



Questions??