

## RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS – RFP FA8629-06-R-2350-0004

### QUESTIONS REGARDING ORIGINAL EVALUATION

**1. Provide the details of O&S realism adjustments made during source selection. How did the Air Force evaluate R&M metrics in the original evaluation? Why did the Air Force use a Manpower Estimate Report (MER) based upon the HH-60 that does not vary? What analyses were conducted to verify the MER? Why do some costs vary by platform and not others? Confirm 13.2 accurately reflects the methodology actually used. Why were the offerors not allowed to provide Attachment 13 data past 2029? The MER used was an AFSOC MER, why wasn't an ACC MER used? Are the CONOPS in the MER consistent? Why does the number of PAA appear to be inconsistent between the Executive Summary and page 10 of the MER? Why are there "non-CSAR-X" missions in the MER?**

The above questions all relate to the original CSAR-X source selection evaluation. The purpose behind these discussions is to answer questions and accept comments relating to Draft RFP Amendment FA8629-06-R-2350-0004. Questions concerning the original evaluation, beyond the scope of the offerors debriefings, were asked and answered during the course of 2 Government Accountability Office (GAO) protests and 5 supplemental protests filed by the original unsuccessful offerors, over 2,600 pages of pleadings submitted by the parties, and 40 hours of hearings conducted by the GAO. Subject questions and concerns were answered in GAO Bid Protest Decisions B-299145, B-299145.2 and B-299145.3 dated 26 Feb 2007; and B-299145.4 dated 29 Mar 2007. If any of the parties believe that their counsel has not accurately conveyed their questions and concerns, or adequately represented their positions on the issues associated with the GAO protests, then that is a matter between the concerned parties and their counsel.

### GENERAL QUESTIONS RELATING TO RFP AMENDMENT 04

**1. What requires the Air Force to "limit" corrective action to GAO Findings?**

There is no requirement that an agency limit corrective action to specific GAO sustained issues. However, the GAO issued two CSAR-X opinions that together clearly sustain only one issue raised in the protest and deny all other issues. Prior GAO decisions make clear that the details of implementing a recommendation for corrective action are within the sound discretion of the contracting agency.

**2. Why is the Air Force ignoring the "OSD Directive" WRT fully burdened fuel costs?**

In line with the Deputy Undersecretary of Defense for Logistics and Materiel Readiness March 2007 memorandum, the Air Force intends to implement these new sustainment requirements for its acquisition programs at the proper time in the acquisition process. With regards to the CSAR-X program, the most suitable opportunity the Air Force will

have to review and make adjustments to the CSAR-X requirements will be during development of the Capability Production Document (CPD) in preparation for the CSAR-X Milestone C and approval for production and deployment. The Air Force has already taken steps to address the importance of life cycle sustainment by including Materiel Availability and Reliability Key System Attributes within the current program. Please be assured the Air Force remains committed to a fair, open and transparent process and will be responsive to changes in acquisition guidance as we move forward with this important program.

**3. Will Air Force conduct oral IEB prior to award?**

Yes.

**4. How many paper/electronic copies, color paper, what volume, page limits, what software should be used for electronic response?**

See RFP, Section L, Paragraph 2.2, Table 2-1, Proposal Organization for required number of copies and maximum page limit. The Amendment 04 proposal shall be submitted as a separate addendum to the Cost/Price volume. See RFP, Section L, Paragraph 2.2.2.1, Electronic Formats, for information on software applications. All submissions shall be in Microsoft Office Suite applications. Submissions shall be on white paper.

**5. Who is SSA? Will the SSA, SSEB, SSAC, SSET remain the same? What regulation makes that information SS sensitive?**

The Air Force does not generally release individual names of those involved in source selections. All official communications regarding this source selection must be directed to the Contracting Officer.

**6. Press reports have indicated deficiencies and schedule risk associated with offered aircraft. Will the Air Force reevaluate Mission Capability in light of newly developed and/or revealed public information regarding the schedule, performance risk, etc., of the respective aircraft? How can the Air Force ignore this information by not re-evaluating technical proposals for Mission Capability and Proposal Risk?**

The Air Force evaluated Mission Capability and Proposal Risk for offeror proposed CSAR-X systems in accordance with Section M of the Request for Proposal (RFP). The Air Force does not rely on media articles for its evaluation of Mission Capability and Proposal Risk.

**7. AFSC approach appears to focus on manpower savings alone, ignoring other cost savings associated with unique approaches.**

The AFSC-Based Maintenance Manpower approach is specifically intended to reflect potential maintenance manpower efficiencies based on the unique

efficiencies/effectiveness, and Reliability and Maintainability characteristics of the proposed CSAR-X aircraft within the structure of the Air Force's maintenance CONOPS. Other platform-specific O&S costs, such as fuel, spares, repair costs, and consumables were offeror-provided in the original evaluation.

**8. Given the approximately one-year delay from the time Final Proposal Revisions (FPRs) were submitted, how does the Air Force intend to evaluate reasonableness, cost impact, or achievability of proposed delivery schedules?**

The risk associated with the offerors proposed approaches (including delivery schedules) was already assessed by the Air Force as part of the CSAR-X source selection. The GAO found no problems with the Air Force's assessment of Mission Capability or Proposal Risk. Amendment 4 to the CSAR-X RFP is issued for the sole purpose of taking corrective action that is responsive to both the sustained and denied issues in the GAO protest rulings.

**9. Will O&S items on Attachment 13 or in MPLCC be re-evaluated?**

No. The purpose of the RFP Amendment 04 changes to Section M paragraph 13.2 is to clarify how the Operations and Support (O&S) costs within the MPLCC were calculated in the original evaluation. The Air Force will not re-evaluate O&S costs within the MPLCC as part of its Amendment 04 evaluation.

**10. Will the Air Force re-evaluate any aspects of Mission Capability, Proposal Risk, Past Performance, or any portion of the Price/Cost factor outside of the AFSC-Based Maintenance Manpower approach?**

No. RFP Section L, Paragraph 1.2 states the following: "The Government will not consider any additional information submitted by the offerors in response to Amendment 04 relating to the Mission Capability, Proposal Risk, Past Performance, or any other portion of the Price/Cost Factors." Section M, Paragraph 13.9 states the following: "The SSA will perform a new integrated Best Value assessment using the results of the October 2006 final evaluation as supplemented by Potential Maintenance Manpower Efficiencies as described in this paragraph in making a best value award decision."

**11. Will the Air Force re-evaluate/re-scope any offeror's proposal under other factors for consistency between Amendment 4 and FPR submissions.**

The Air Force will not re-evaluate any aspects of Mission Capability, Proposal Risk, Past Performance, or any portion of the Price/Cost factor outside of the AFSC-Based Maintenance Manpower approach (See answer to question 10 above). In order to be compliant with the requirements of RFP Amendment 04, offerors must ensure that their submissions under RFP Amendment 04 are consistent with their FPR submissions in accordance with the instructions found in RFP Amendment 04.

**12. Why does the Air Force intend to continue using Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) to evaluate an offerors proposed platform, even though these “SMEs” have no experience with the platforms’ maintenance and logistics support requirements?**

The Subject Matter Experts that the Air Force will use in evaluating the offerors submissions under RFP Amendment 04 are highly skilled helicopter maintenance personnel from the offeror’s Air Force CSAR customer. These Subject Matter Experts possess significant experience maintaining rotorcraft under real-world conditions to include wartime deployments. The SMEs are familiar with Air Force Maintenance practices and have appropriate knowledge and qualifications to evaluate the data to be provided under RFP amendment 04.

**13. Why aren’t Potential Maintenance Manpower Efficiencies included in MPLCC? How does this comply with the GAO decision? What weight will Potential Maintenance Manpower Efficiencies have in the SSA decision? Is there any Air Force guidance that requires the exclusion of Potential Maintenance Manpower Efficiencies from the MPLCC?**

The Most Probable Life Cycle Cost (MPLCC) is only one element of the Cost/Price Factor. By showing potential maintenance manpower savings outside the MPLCC, but within the Cost/Price Factor, the Air Force will provide greater visibility to the SSA of the potential maintenance manpower cost savings which will be used as part of the SSA’s best value determination. The Price/Cost factor is weighted in accordance with Section M of the RFP. There is neither Air Force nor GAO guidance for the inclusion or the exclusion of the AFSC-Based Maintenance Manpower approach in the MPLCC. Section M, Paragraph 13.9 details how Potential Maintenance Manpower Efficiencies will be considered in the source selection decision.

**14. If the Air Force intends to adjust the resultant contract after award, how can the evaluation be valid? Has the Air Force changed its requirements? Why can’t the offerors change their proposals?**

The contract resulting from the Amendment 4 process shall be based on each offeror's September 2006 Final Proposal Revision in all respects, including price, schedule, etc. This applies to all Amendment 4 offerors equally, including the original awardee. Any offeror not able to execute a contract based on the September 2006 Final Proposal Revision may choose to withdraw from the competition. No offeror should assume post-award negotiations based upon the mere passage of time. As stated previously, the details of implementing a GAO recommendation for corrective action are within the sound discretion of the contracting agency. The Air Force is limiting proposal revisions consistent with the GAO's two CSAR-X bid protest decisions and consistent with protecting the integrity of the original competitive process.

**15. Are Offerors permitted to adjust tech proposal/WSS based upon Attachment 23 Addendum 1 submissions?**

No. Offerors technical proposals and weapon system specifications were evaluated under the Mission Capability and Proposal Risk factors in the original source selection evaluation. The AFSC-Based Maintenance Manpower approach is specifically intended to reflect potential maintenance manpower efficiencies based on the unique efficiencies/effectiveness, and Reliability and Maintainability characteristics of the proposed CSAR-X aircraft. In order to be compliant with the requirements of RFP Amendment 04, offerors must ensure that their submissions under RFP Amendment 04 are consistent with their FPR submissions in accordance with the instructions found in RFP Amendment 04.

**16. Why is the Air Force changing Section M Paragraph 13.2?**

Based upon the GAO sustained item "...on the basis that the Air Force's evaluation of O&S costs was inconsistent with the approach set forth in the solicitation," the Air Force is clarifying the RFP via Amendment 4 to ensure consistency with what was done and what was set forth in the previous solicitation. In Section M, 13.2, the Air Force is clarifying the Operations and Support (O&S) Methodology for the Most Probable Life Cycle Cost that has already been completed.

**17. Why were the words "all relevant" deleted from Section L Attachment 13? Why did fuel cost change on attachment 13?**

The words "all relevant" were apparently subject to differing interpretations between the parties during the GAO protest. The government is clarifying that the data it has required in Attachment 13 is what the Air Force considers to be relevant in the evaluation. The Defense Energy Support Center establishes fuel price per gallon and associated fuel inflation indices. The fuel price per gallon was updated in Jan 2006. Additionally, the fuel inflation indices were also updated at that time. The price per gallon for fuel reflected in Amendment 4, Attachment 13 is the price per gallon that was used in the Most Probable Life Cycle Cost.

**18. 21 days is insufficient time to respond to Amendment 04.**

RFP Amendment 04 requests a response on one element under one evaluation factor (not a complete proposal revision). The offerors provided many assertions regarding the maintenance efficiencies of their particular aircraft during the GAO protests. RFP Amendment 04 requests that these assertions be provided in a format that will enable the Air Force to evaluate these efficiencies in manner that will provide valuable information to the SSA in making a best value determination. The Air Force believes that it has established a reasonable timeframe for response to RFP Amendment 04 given the amount of attention this issue has received since November 2006 and the continued urgent need to provide the Warfighter with a replacement Combat Search and Rescue aircraft.

**19. Why isn't Air Force interested in the opportunity to obtain increased capability with a lower cost and improved schedule for the good of the warfighter?**

The Air Force CSAR warfighter has been involved in every step of the CSAR-X acquisition since its inception. The Air Force CSAR-X team conducted a fair and open integrated assessment of Mission Capability, Proposal Risk, Past Performance, and Price/Cost based on the offerors CSAR-X proposals and selected the proposal that met or exceeded all warfighter requirements and represented the Best Value for the Air Force. As a result of the evaluation of information submitted in response to RFP Amendment 04, the Air Force will conduct a new integrated assessment based on the results of the original evaluation as supplemented by the results of the Amendment 04 evaluation. If the Best Value assessment results in a different decision, the Air Force will change the contractual arrangement accordingly.

**QUESTIONS REGARDING ATTACHMENT 23 AND ADDENDUM 1**

**1. Can the Offerors use the most current data when completing Attachment 23? Can any other data be updated?**

The offeror should base their response to Amendment 4, Attachment 23, Addendum 1 on the FPR, dated 18 September 2006. The offerors should provide the latest Mean Time Between Failure data based upon the offerors CSAR-X aircraft from the FPR, dated 18 September 2006. The Government will not evaluate or consider any additional information submitted by the offerors in response to Amendment 04 relating to the Mission Capability, Proposal Risk, Past Performance, or any other portion of the Price/Cost Factors.

**2. Why does the Air Force intend to make realism adjustments? How will an offeror's R&M characteristics be considered? How will an offeror's justifications be considered? What justification is sufficient to assist the government with their realism analysis? How will the Air Force conduct discussions concerning justifications? And in what format should the data be provided?**

Realism adjustments will be made after detailed review by the Subject Matter Experts, and only when necessary. These adjustments will be documented and included as part of the evaluation. Any justification provided is at the discretion of the offeror, but should fully support the area being addressed. Examples of justification include engineering prediction (with descriptions of how the prediction was developed), Maintenance databases/collection systems, technical manuals, etc. Offeror justification data will be a key as to type and number of realism adjustments made. Discussions with the offerors will be consistent with previous source selection processes (i.e, EN, telecom, face-to-face) as determined appropriate by the Air Force PCO and the offeror representatives.

**3. Table 3-1 shows 1 person for some AFSCs—wouldn't the minimum be two persons due the need for 2 shift operations?**

Table 3-1 reflects the Required Support personnel. These individuals are not driven by 2 shift operations, and are treated as “on-call” when needed during a second shift.

**4. Can the Offerors assume cross utilization in their responses? What is the basis of the assumption for the Government Baseline figures from Tables 3-1 and 3.2? Can the statement after Table 3-1 also apply to Table 3-2?**

Cross utilization training between AFSCs will not be considered for the purposes of this amendment. Assumptions and manning requirements are based upon the manning at a typical squadron. Additionally, regardless of the aircraft Reliability and Maintainability characteristics, the Air Force believes there will always be a minimum number of personnel as described in Attachment 23. Finally, the following statement from Attachment 23, Section 3-1 has been added to Section 3.2: “In the event the offeror believes their solution to manpower savings may affect change to those AFSCs listed in table 3-2 they shall provide full justification in a separate document.”

**5. If the Offeror's aircraft delivery schedule differs from the government squadron activation, can the Offeror deviate from the squadron activation reflected in Addendum 1? How should the Offerors treat Block 10 aircraft deliveries for phase in purposes?**

The groundrules and assumptions for Squadron activation have changed in Attachment 23 and Attachment 23, Addendum 1. Populate the squadron activation according to your FPR delivery schedule. Additionally, the “Error” check will now appear if a squadron simultaneously occupies a Block 0 and Block 10 squadron, "cross-check" row will generate "ERROR" incorrect column. Total Squadrons should equal 12.

**6. Can the Offerors modify the numbering strategy for Task ID # outlined by the government?**

The Offerors must follow the numbering system provided in Addendum 1, tab “Task Descriptions Definitions” for “Mx Task Description” and “Mx Associated Task ID.”

**7. Can the Offerors break the tasks out by Scheduled and Unscheduled maintenance?**

Attachment 23, Addendum 1 has been updated to allow for a breakout between Scheduled and Unscheduled Maintenance tasks—this is now reflected in worksheet 4a-Offeror Mx Tasks-Unsch and 4b-Offeror Mx Tasks-Sch. Additionally, the associated instructions have been updated for the MTBF column and associated justifications—i.e., for Unscheduled Maintenance tasks, the offerors will provide the associated MTBF; for Scheduled Maintenance tasks, Inspection/Service Interval hours will be provided. An

additional worksheet, 4c- Offeror Mx Tasks-GH&S has also been added to account for Ground Handling and Servicing maintenance tasks.

**8. What is the Air Force's maintenance concept? Do the Aerospace Ground Equipment personnel include a factor for back shop support? How should Offerors address their scheduled and unscheduled depot maintenance requirements? Will the Air Force supply a maintenance concept of operations including sortie rate, sortie times, and weekly flying hour program for purposes of maintenance task analysis? Will the Air Force clarify the ancillary maintenance tasks and their frequencies to be included in Attachment 23, for example launch and recovery, make aircraft safe-for-maintenance, prepare for deployment, rebuild after deployment?**

The Air Force's maintenance concept is two-level maintenance. While unit level aircraft maintenance does not have back shops, the Aerospace Ground Equipment (AGE) is maintained separately from the aircraft, and therefore has back shop or off-aircraft support capabilities. AGE personnel provide support at the flight-line and maintenance support in the back shop. AGE is not based on a two-level maintenance concept and is not restricted to the two-level maintenance concept.

Additionally, the AFSC-based Maintenance Manpower Scenario addresses organizational level maintenance, and does not include any depot maintenance requirements. Attachment 23 has been updated to include the requested information for sortie rate and sortie duration.

With respect to ancillary maintenance tasks, the following tasks will be classified as Ground Handling and Servicing tasks: Towing, Refueling and Launch and Recovery. Offerors shall separately identify these three tasks that are not directly associated with scheduled and unscheduled maintenance tasks. Frequency for each task will be once per sortie. Attachment 23 reflects updated groundrules and assumptions to include these tasks. Attachment 23, Addendum 1 reflects a new worksheet specifically for these tasks along with updated instructions.

The "make aircraft safe-for-maintenance" task is assumed to a part of the identified scheduled or unscheduled maintenance task.

For air shipment of aircraft (Teardown and Build-up), the Offeror should provide the requested data (consistent with Attachment 23 and Addendum 1) required for preparing the aircraft for shipment as well as preparing the aircraft for flight. These items are two separate tasks, and should be reflected in Attachment 23, Addendum 1, Worksheet 4c, "Offeror Mx Tasks-GH&S". These maintenance tasks shall be based on the Offeror's CSAR-X aircraft shall be as described in the offeror's Final Proposal Revision (FPR), dated 18 Sep 2006.

**9. Is the Air Force going to evaluate all maintenance personnel as if they are 5 level journeymen? If so why? Can the Offerors provide data to support the use of a different labor category? Why does the Air Force assume all manpower personnel are military personnel?**

As noted in Attachment 23, Groundrules and Assumptions all information related to maintenance should be based on a 5 level journeyman. This is based on task performance without direct supervision. Offerors are to follow the requirements as established by Attachment 23. Although there are civilian and contractor personnel located at some of the CSAR squadrons, the roles and responsibilities of these individuals are the same as the military maintenance personnel; therefore, for the purposes of this evaluation, all personnel will be military personnel as stated in Attachment 23.

**10. Explain why AFI 21-101 is being used as guidance?**

AFI 21-101 is provided as a guide to allow the offeror to see how Air Force maintenance processes and methodologies are utilized. It is not a requirement for the offeror to use this document. However, the evaluation will be based on the philosophies derived from this document.

**11. Why do maintenance manpower levels remain constant when units are deployed or at home station?**

Levels are based on the UTC and reflect the manpower needed to deploy with the UTC when required. Since this amendment requires 2 UTCs for a squadron the numbers of personnel are constant for the individual UTC, whether deployed or at home.

**12. On Page 2 of Attachment 23 states that offeror proposed manpower loading shall “direct relationship of manpower based on a given maintenance task” and that the offeror “shall not make adjustments to other factors such as spares, support/test equipment, facilities, etc.” Will the Air Force make adjustments to these other factors or does the Air Force assume that these costs will be the same for all aircraft?**

Offerors provided their spares, support/test equipment, and other savings as part of their original O&S cost proposal. There will be no adjustments made to these areas. The Government will not evaluate or consider any additional information submitted by the offerors in response to Amendment 04 relating to the Mission Capability, Proposal Risk, Past Performance, or any other portion of the Price/Cost Factors.

**13. Does the Government agree that the spreadsheet in Amendment 23 is essentially an expanded Detailed Mx Task Analysis as generally described in the Logistics Support Analysis Guide as the LSA 401 Task Series?**

The Air Force does not agree with this assessment. Logistic Support Analysis standards were cancelled in 1995 and replaced with Logistics Management Information (LMI)

Performance Specification in 1996. The Air Force is requesting only the task description and not a detailed maintenance task analysis. It is the offerors decision on what they use to justify their information.

**14. Will the Government confirm that the Attachment 23 documentation is to include all repair process on all on-aircraft reparable aircraft components?**

Attachment 23 has been updated to reflect all “on-aircraft maintenance tasks shall be provided.”

**15. Will the Air Force confirm that UTC full-time manning must cover on-aircraft activities calculated to be required only once or twice in an aircraft’s life?**

All maintenance tasks that will be performed at the organizational level need to be addressed and accounted for.

**16. Please explain inconsistency between Attachment 23 and DOD directive (material reliability).**

There is no inconsistency between Attachment 23 and DOD memorandum. In line with the Deputy Undersecretary of Defense for Logistics and Materiel Readiness March 2007 memorandum, the Air Force intends to implement these new sustainment requirements for its acquisition programs at the proper time in the acquisition process. With regards to the CSAR-X program, the most suitable opportunity the Air Force will have to review and make adjustments to the CSAR-X requirements will be during development of the Capability Production Document (CPD) in preparation for the CSAR-X Milestone C and approval for production and deployment.

**17. How does the Air Force intend to consider the offer’s Reliability, Maintainability and Deployment characteristics when evaluating the depth of required support personnel identified in Tables 3-1 and 3-2?**

Reliability is considered by the MTBF, which drives the frequency of occurrence. The higher the reliability the less frequency of occurrence. Maintainability drives task duration and manpower. Maintainability is further captured through design of the diagnostics system, which drives lower fault isolation time and less manpower. This reduces repair time and personnel. Attachment 23 has been updated to address air shipment of aircraft.

**18. Explain the cost calculations to include the indirect support calculation? The government states that “Indirect support costs include but are not limited to, costs for such items as personnel training, permanent change of station (PCS), and installation support.” What are the other costs included in the indirect support costs?**

All cost calculations will be completed by the government team. There will be three cost calculations completed: Offeror Proposed, Total Adjusted, and the Government Baseline (described below). Each of the cost calculations will reflect the required support and maintenance personnel costs as well as associated indirect support costs. In calculating the support and maintenance manpower costs, a fully burdened salary rate will be applied to the total support and maintenance personnel using Composite Pay Factors from AFI 65-503.

The indirect support costs include personnel support and installation support costs. Indirect Support costs are dependent upon the number of Active Duty, Air National Guard, and Air Force Reserve support and maintenance personnel. Personnel Support costs include Recurring Training and Permanent Change of Station (PCS) costs and are calculated using Air Force standard factors from AFI 65-503. Installation Support costs includes the cost of non-pay installation support to include Base Operating Support (BOS) personnel.

Additionally, the statement “but are not limited to” has been removed.

**19. How will the “Total Adjusted Maintenance Manpower Cost Calculation” be calculated?**

The Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) will review the offeror proposed maintenance tasks and make realism adjustments IAW Attachment 23, if necessary. These adjustments may include, but are not limited to, compliance with AF safety standards, technical orders and general maintenance practices, as well as realism adjustments to offeror provided MTBF/Inspection&Service intervals in hours, Total Man-hours, Quantity of Personnel by AFSC per Task and/or per Shift, and offeror proposed personnel per UTC (for both required support and maintenance personnel). The realism adjustments made by the SMEs could result in a different quantity of personnel for support and/or maintenance. The total personnel, after any realism adjustments, for both support and maintenance will be dollarized using fully burdened salary rates and phased in accordance with the offeror provided squadron activation schedules. Additionally, the indirect support factors will be applied to the realism adjusted personnel numbers and to calculate the indirect support cost.

**20. Clarify the instructions for Worksheet 5-UTC Manpower Calc by Block. Are the Offerors limited to the AFSCs identified in Tables 3-1 and 3-2 of Attachment 23? Are the Offerors limited to Mx Task Description Definitions identified in the Task Description worksheet? What is the purpose of the “Qty Personnel by AFSC per Task per Shift” column?**

For the Required Support Personnel section of Worksheet 5-“UTC Manpower Calc by Block”, the offeror will proposed the total personnel by AFSC required for Support Personnel (using the AFSCs provided in Attachment 23, Table 3.1). For example, for 2A6X2 Aero Ground Equipment, table 3.1 shows 10 personnel, and the offeror believes

the requirement is 5 personnel, the number in the worksheet for AFSC 2A6X2 should be 5 and the offeror will provide appropriate justification. The illustration is below:

AFSC	Title	Offeror Proposed Support Personnel by UTC--Block 0	Personnel Adjustment Justification (if dif't from Table 3-1) **
2A6X2	AERO GROUND EQUIP	5	**Enter Justification here for decrease from table 3-1

For the Required Maintenance Personnel section of Worksheet 5-“UTC Manpower Calc by Block”, clarification on columns is provided below:

**Mx Hours Based upon Offeror Proposed Task Hours per UTC:** This is truly hours from the previous Mx Task worksheets summed by AFSC

**Mx Personnel Based upon Offeror Proposed Hours per UTC:** This is a direct calculation based upon the hours in the previous column divided by 2952 hours rounded up to the whole person.

**Offeror Proposed Personnel Adjustments (IAW Attachment 23):** This is any “whole person” delta adds or subtracts. This column will be added to the previous column to ensure that the total proposed personnel are accounted for.

**Total Offeror Proposed Mx Personnel by UTC:** This is the sum of the two previous columns—it should reflect the offerors TOTAL maintenance personnel that are needed for that AFSC to accomplish all the maintenance tasks identified and IAW the Attachment 23 Groundrules and Assumptions.

An example follows:

AFSC	Title	Mx Hours Based upon Offeror Proposed Task Hours per UTC--Block 0	Mx Personnel Based upon Offeror Proposed Hours per UTC--Block 0 *	Offeror Proposed Personnel Adjustments (IAW Attachment 23)--Block 0	Total Offeror Proposed Mx Personnel by UTC--Block 0
2A5X2	HELO MAINT	18,523	7	+1	8

**Mx Hours Based upon Offeror Proposed Task Hours per UTC:** In the above example, the sum of all tasks for 2A5X2 was 18,253 hours.

**Mx Personnel Based upon Offeror Proposed Hours per UTC:** The 18,253 hours were divided by 2952 hours (airman available hours per year) = 6.274. The 6.274 was then automatically rounded up to the next whole number = 7

**Offeror Proposed Personnel Adjustments (IAW Attachment 23):** The offeror looks at the number of personnel (7) and determined that due to, for example safety standards, 8 people are needed, a +1 would be entered into this box

**Total Offeror Proposed Mx Personnel by UTC:** This is the sum of the two previous columns—7 people + 1 person = 8 total offeror proposed Mx personnel

The total numbers do not have to match the personnel numbers reflected in Tables 3-1 or 3-2—this should reflect the offeror proposed personnel, but they do need to reflect the AFSCs. Additionally the Offerors are not limited to the maintenance task descriptions identified in the Task Description Definition worksheet—these were for example purposes only.

The purpose of the “Qty Personnel by AFSC per Task per Shift” is to identify the total quantity of personnel needed for a specific maintenance task. For tasks that have a task frequency of less than 1.0 per year, this will be accounted for in Worksheet 4a, “Offeror Mx Tasks-Sch” or Worksheet 4b, “Offeror Mx Tasks-Unsch” or Worksheet 4c, “Offeror Mx Tasks-GH&S” Task Frequency per Aircraft per Year column. Occurrences can be less than one year, and the summation of the hours from column Offeror Total Hours per Yr per Task by UTC (remember, a UTC is five aircraft so we need to account for the total hours for the entire UTC) rolled up by AFSC will take that into account. The round up function on Worksheet 5, “UTC Manpower Calc by Block” will ensure we do not have portions of a person.

**21. Will the government provide the labor rates broken out by AFSC they plan to use for the cost estimates? Will the government provide the inflation indices they plan to use for the cost estimates?**

Labor Rates are not broken out and differentiated by AFSC. In calculating the support and maintenance manpower costs, a fully burdened salary rate will be applied to the total support and maintenance personnel using Composite Pay Factors from AFI 65-503 broken out by Active Duty, Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard. Current OSD Inflation indices for manpower (3500 funds) and Operations & Maintenance (3400 funds) will be used for inflation purposes.

**In the event of any conflict between these answers and RFP Amendment FA8629-06-R-2350-0004, the terms and conditions of RFP Amendment FA8629-06-R-2350-0004 shall govern.**