

Headquarters U.S. Air Force

Integrity - Service - Excellence

Vendor Conference Sustainment PWS Discussion



U.S. AIR FORCE

Ardis B. Hearn

**Enterprise Services
Division, DoE**

28 August 2012



U.S. AIR FORCE

Purpose/Objectives



- **Role of the PWS Template**
- **Summary of Feedback from Workshop #1 & 2**
- **Summary of changes to PWS**



U.S. AIR FORCE

Role of the Template



- **ID/IQ Level PWS Templates – USAF**

 - Instructions Provided**

 - Details must be inserted**

 - Tailable – 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**



U.S. AIR FORCE

Discussion Items



Feedback From Industry - Technical Insight:

- The team identified and discussed belief that the Government may not have sufficient resources or time to interpret highly technical inputs, and is limited in their ability to receive, test, and implement delivered applications.
- Loss of opportunity to stay current in Government experience base
- Technical staff become more focused on QAE/COTR functions, and consequently lose some of their technical familiarity with the state of the technology
- Limited education and training for government technical staff

Latest Feedback focused on causal analysis and recommendations



U.S. AIR FORCE

Discussion Items



Suggestions – Technical Insight:

- This may be an acceptable case of personal services type contracts or consultant contracts to have technical skill/expertise available on an “on call basis” to serve as technical consultants and advisers to a Source Selection
- Training technical personnel specifically for acquisition/source selection roles
- Government could provide sanitized resumes (or position description information) of the source selection team so vendors have sufficient insight to appropriately adjust the depth and complexity of their presentation.
 - It is vital for all parties that statements of qualifications be candid and accurate without “puffery.”



U.S. AIR FORCE

Discussion Items



Feedback From Industry - Tools:

- **The team identified and discussed belief that the Government may not have quality tools for requirements development/tracking and templates for RFI/RFP and proposal responses.**

Suggestion - Tools:

Look at IRSS (Information & Resource Support System) - a system hosted at Wright Patterson to improve quality of delivery order acquisitions



U.S. AIR FORCE

Discussion Items



Feedback From Industry - Innovation:

- Industry concern is that too often, when innovation is proposed, proposals are downgraded because Government assesses innovation as too risky.
 - Industry's perception (reinforced by debriefs) is that Government evaluators have not been as cognizant of many technology innovations which are mature in the market place, but if new to the Government organization, are therefore assessed as "risky"

Suggestion - Innovation:

- Government provides its risk analysis with RFP.
 - This will allow industry to address how innovations actually mitigate Government's risk concerns.



U.S. AIR FORCE

Discussion Items



Suggestion - Innovation:

- Sanitized resumes (or position descriptions) of Government Source Selection personnel on technical evaluation team.
 - Providing an understanding the technical expertise of the Evaluation team will allow industry to tailor its technical response so that the proposal neither insults the intelligence of the evaluators or talks over their heads.
- Oral presentations for proposal with innovations
 - If government evaluators are not cognizant of the state of the market in technical solutions, they may well deem an innovation as overly risky. Oral presentation on innovations allows for a dialogue and clarification to insure that the evaluators have an appropriate appreciation and understanding of the innovation and how well it does/does not meet mission requirements within the Government's risk tolerance.



U.S. AIR FORCE

Discussion Items



Feedback From Government/PEO Divisions:

- **Overall – looks sufficient and flexible enough for program use**
- **Comment – make it clear what can be tailored out and what must remain**
- **Recommend use Mil Std 881 C - a Work Break Down Structure as a guide when writing the PWS**
- **The template does capture a lot of great info. Concern is for smaller programs or programs with limited scope asking for much more detail than is necessary**
- **Throughout engineering section, don't see any reference to PDR, CDR or other Design review meetings that align w/ SEP**
- **Proposals should be written "visually". Include an OV1 and Systems View right up front.**
- **Include Org Charts to help define context**



U.S. AIR FORCE

Discussion Items



Feedback From Government/PEO Divisions:

- Consider adding a "Look to the Future" paragraph. If you are planning to consolidate or close down part of a program or merge programs for instance, as long as you tell the truth there is nothing to be afraid of. If you don't know the future of the program, that is good for contactors to know too.
- Why would we provide stakeholder information? We do not want the vendor going to visit the stakeholder to try to push them in a certain direction for the solution at this point
- PWS Requirements seem to be focused on system attributes – what about functional requirements?
- Risk - Agree we should provide indication of area we would like to see innovation in and the level of risk we are willing to take.



U.S. AIR FORCE

Discussion Items



Feedback From Government/PEO Divisions:

- **ICE - Agree with providing assumptions used to calculate perhaps - Do not agree with providing ICE - if we do that we would get back what we provided? Today we use the ICE to write the comparison to the bid for reasonableness and realism**
- **Communication - it would help if the vendors used the RFI, and/or Industry Day associated with that RFI and the draft RFP more effectively. On some of our recent RFIs some vendors not only did not take advantage of the RFI presentation time yet complained about their interaction with us and did not appear to have thoroughly read the RFI**



U.S. AIR FORCE

Actions Taken - Template



- 1. Add language to template to more clearly define requirements**
Context/Background
System scale/scope/priorities/artifacts
Use cases/Architectures (As-Is and To-Be)
Deliverables/CLINS/Contract Type
Performance Measures
- 2. Put suggestions in guide to send out Draft RFPs, RFIs, and to improve Communication between Vendors & MFT**
- 3. Put language in guide to provide assumptions for creating estimates – not to provide ICE**
- 4. Clarify CLIN guidance and Deliverables based on feedback**
- 5. Clarify that the program's approach – using WBS, Deliverables, performance measures can be done by PMO**



U.S. AIR FORCE

Potential Actions – Causal Factors



- 1. Look at Delivery Order MFT, specifically technical skills on evaluation and requirements**
- 2. Look at process of using oral presentations so that communication of technical issues can be done in real time**
- 3. Look at tools such as IRSS to improve process**
- 4. Look at how to better communicate risk vs innovation tradespace for requirements**



U.S. AIR FORCE

Summary



Received thoughtful, insightful, professional, and applicable comments from many industry partners and many PEO Program Offices

All agree that PEO/BES can improve on the quality and clarity of its acquisition requirements

The PWS template and delivery order guidance will be used as a mechanism to make these improvements

Continuous process improvement is needed – keep comments and suggestions coming

We share the same goal – to deploy/sustain capabilities successfully